10334 10-34

DOCUMENTS
DEC 3 1973
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Y4.Ap6/2:M59/3
974

Senate Hearings

Before the Committee on Appropriations

KSU LIBRARIES
A11900 4711665

Military Construction Appropriations

Fiscal Year 1974

H.R. 11459

93d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Pages 1–305: JOINT HEARINGS BY:

SUBCOMMITTEES ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION:
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Pages 307–551: HEARINGS BY:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION:
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

JOINT HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEES ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

AND THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 11459

AN ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

23-751 WASHINGTON : 1973

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana, *Chairman*

WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Wisconsin
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
Chairman, Ex Officio

RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., Maryland
HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma
MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota
Ex Officio

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri
HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada

JOHN TOWER, Texas

VORLEY M. REXROAD, *Clerk*
JOEL E. BONNER, *Minority Staff Member*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina
HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada
HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Virginia

JOHN TOWER, Texas
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado

GORDON A. NEASE, *Professional Staff Member*

SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE

(The hearings in this volume from page 1 through page 305 were joint hearings of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Armed Services and Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations. Page 307 to the completion of this volume were additional hearings held by the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1974

MONDAY, AUGUST 6, 1973

The Military Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, and the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Appropriations Committee, met in joint session, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 212, Richard B. Russell Senate Office Building.

Membership of the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, is as follows: Senators Symington (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd, Jr., of Virginia, Tower, Thurmond, and Dominick.

Membership of the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, is as follows: Senators Mansfield (chairman), Proxmire, Montoya, Hollings, Schweiker, Mathias, and Bellmon.

Present: Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Armed Services: Senator Symington (presiding).

Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations. None.

Also present: From the Senate Armed Services Committee: Gordon A. Nease, professional staff member; and Joyce T. Campbell, clerical assistant.

From the Senate Appropriations Committee: Vorley M. Rexroad, chief clerk of the subcommittee.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD J. SHERIDAN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND HOUSING) (OVERALL PROGRAM); ACCOMPANIED BY PERRY J. FLIAKAS, DIRECTOR, FACILITIES PLANNING AND PROGRAMING, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND HOUSING) (FAMILY HOUSING); EVAN R. HARRINGTON, ACTING DIRECTOR, FACILITIES PROGRAMING, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND HOUSING) (RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD); FRANCIS B. ROCHE, DIRECTOR, REAL PROPERTY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND HOUSING) (REAL ESTATE AND GENERAL PROVISIONS); MAJ. GEN. KENNETH B. COOPER, U.S. ARMY, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, DCS/LOGISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (OVERALL ARMY PROGRAM); REAR ADM. A. R. MARSCHALL, U.S. NAVY, COMMANDER, NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (OVERALL NAVY PROGRAM); MAJ. GEN. MAURICE R. REILLY, U.S. ARMY, DIRECTOR OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE (OVERALL AIR FORCE PROGRAM); VICE ADM. WALTER D. GADDIS, U.S. NAVY; REAR ADM. FOSTER M. LALOR, U.S. NAVY; HARRY E. BERGOLD, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (EUROPEAN AND NATO AFFAIRS); AND REAR ADM. JOHN G. DILLON, U.S. NAVY, DIRECTOR OF CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND HOUSING)—CONSTRUCTION MATTERS

Senator SYMINGTON. In order that we could complete markup on the military procurement authorization by the time the Congress comes back, at the request of the leadership on both sides, some of us are giving up this part of the recess in order to move along on other legislation pending before the committee. Barring unforeseen circumstances we hope to complete the hearings on military construction today. Considerable time has already been devoted to review the bill in its entirety. Mr. Nease has been over it thoroughly and has reported to Mr. Braswell and to me on it, as well as other members of the committee, thus we will address ourselves primarily to those items of special interest.

Based upon this review, I have a considerable number of questions which I will ask you to submit answers to for the record. These questions will be made available to you by the staff. The printed record will reflect the complete justification for each individual item making up the total bill.

To summarize briefly, the bill, as introduced, calls for new authorization of $2,970,790,000, and an increase in prior years authority of $3,620,000, for a total authorization of just under $3 billion. This includes approximately $1.25 billion for all costs of family housing, including 11,688 new units; about $116.2 million for air and water pollu-

tion abatement; and $109.6 million, the largest amount in some years, for the Reserve components.

Special emphasis has been placed again this year on people related projects, and about 60 percent of the entire program is devoted to housing requirements.

Our first witness today will be Mr. Edward J. Sheridan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Housing, who will address himself to the overall program. While Mr. Sheridan and his staff are present, we will also take up title IV, the requirements of the Defense agencies; title V, which covers family housing and homeowners assistance; and title VII, the requirements of the Reserve components. We will then take up the requirements of the military departments, beginning with the Department of the Army.

I will ask each of you to submit your detailed statement for the record, and address yourselves to the highlights. You should also call the committee's attention to any projects you wish to specifically emphasize, and any changes in your program from that originally submitted.

Mr. Sheridan, you may proceed.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a statement which I would like your permission to submit for the record, and I will highlight it as you have suggested.

I am pleased to appear before these committees in support of S. 1797, the military construction authorization request for fiscal year 1974.

It is essential for implementation of the Nixon Doctrine to insure that our Nation has the most modern and up-to-date base structure for its military forces. There must be increased efficiency of all supporting activities and greater emphasis must be placed on the readiness and effectiveness of our total forces.

The new authorization request for fiscal year 1974 totals $2,970,790,000. Actual enactment in fiscal year 1974 over the revised amount requested in fiscal year 1973 is due primarily to additional emphasis on people-related projects such as bachelor and family housing construction, and medical facility replacement and modernization; facilities for the Navy's Trident weapon system, as well as continued emphasis on the Reserve forces and the pollution abatement program.

The construction proposals contained in the fiscal year 1974 request are located at approximately 300 named installations and there are some 680 separate construction projects. In order to conserve time and avoid duplication in testimony, I have attached summaries of these projects, grouped in like construction categories to permit ready comparison.

A comparison of this year's proposed authorization with that requested and enacted for fiscal year 1973 is on page 3 of my statement.

A large portion of the fiscal year 1974 military construction program is directed to improving the attractiveness of military life in order to maintain an All-Volunteer Force. For example, in this year's budget we are requesting 11,688 new family housing units, compared to 11,938 units authorized last year, recognizing that adequate housing is an extremely important morale factor especially in helping to retain our professional officers and noncommissioned officers in whom we have invested heavily for specialized training. For our single personnel the fiscal year 1974 program calls for constructing nearly 39,000 bachelor enlisted spaces and 450 bachelor officers'

spaces. We are also planning to modernize approximately 55,000 bachelor enlisted spaces, converting open bay dormitory facilities into room-configured spaces that will be semiprivate. We are also planning to upgrade our obsolete medical plant to modern standards and, with your support, we should complete programing this major effort over the next 5 years. In fiscal year 1974 we have included $137 million for improving our medical facilities.

Finally, we are requesting $91.2 million for community support facilities such as exchanges, gymnasiums, servicemen's clubs, overseas dependent schools, and other morale-related facilities.

We have informed these committees in prior years concerning our total backlog of construction and as you will recognize this is also a dynamic and changing index as to the overall construction.

We are proposing in this year's request to devote $868 million to that portion of our backlog which we term replacement and modernization.

This year's program includes a number of projects which are required in the fiscal year 1974 time frame to accommodate relocated personnel and missions. I will discuss this more in detail in the statement.

FAMILY AND BACHELOR HOUSING

For our fiscal year 1974 family housing program, we are proposing $1.25 billion, which includes $424 million for construction. This program would provide 11,688 new units of family housing, 1,340 mobile home spaces, over $62 million for the improvement of existing family housing, and some minor construction and planning. The bachelor housing construction program for fiscal year 1974 amounts to $501 million. This program will provide 39,000 new bachelor enlisted spaces. In addition, $165 million of this request would be utilized primarily to convert existing sound structures which are presently open-bay barracks into modernized room-configured bachelor enlisted spaces. This effort will provide an additional 55,000 adequate bachelor enlisted spaces.

In the Reserve components, a well-equipped and fully manned National Guard and Reserve, deployable on short notice, is potentially the most economical part of our defense system. Their revitalization over the past several years, therefore, is encouraging. The Guard and Reserves are now relied upon as the initial and primary augmentation for the Active Forces. Consequently, construction to support these components is essential in the present timetable. The proposed fiscal year 1974 authorization bill contains a request for $109.7 million to provide urgently needed training facilities for the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

The fiscal year 1974 request is the largest Reserve facilities program proposed to date and represents the third increment of our 10 years' goal to provide an ongoing and continuing program of adequate training facilities for the Reserve components. It is expected that this continuing emphasis, in consonance with corresponding efforts to modernize equipment and other Reserve improvements, will effect a significant improvement in the quality of training and the resultant combat readiness of all Guard and Reserve units. We recognize that modern training facilities and adequate field exercise areas are a vital adjunct of this integrated program for upgrading mobilization capa-

bility. Accordingly, we will continue to emphasize, for the foreseeable future, a program modernization of National Guard and Reserve training facilities.

I would like to briefly discuss the status of Vietnam construction, as I know of the committee's deep interest in this subject in the past.

The cost-plus-award-fee contractor combine of Raymond, Morrison-Knudsen/Brown and Root & Jones completed the work under its contract in Vietnam in June 1972. Lump-sum contractors and Vietnamese Army engineers are completing the remaining projects for improving the South Vietnamese Armed Forces self-sufficiency, as well as the balance of the primary highway program and dependent shelter program. As in 1972 and 1973, no additional appropriations are sought this year. In fact, a total of $23,800,000 has been recouped from Vietnam military construction appropriations so far and is included as a source of financing a portion of the fiscal year 1974 military construction program.

Senator SYMINGTON. Before you go any further, what was the total amount of the contracts that you had with Raymond, Morrison-Knudsen/Brown and Root & Jones?

Mr. SHERIDAN. $1.9 billion.

Senator SYMINGTON. And what fee did you pay on that? You say it is cost-plus.

Admiral LALOR. We will have to provide that for the record.

Senator SYMINGTON. Is there not anybody here that knows the fee that we paid on a $1.9 billion cost-plus contract?

Mr. SHERIDAN. It changed.

Senator SYMINGTON. How do you mean changed? Do we not know what the average fee is?

Admiral LALOR. The fee over the whole life of the contract was 2.2 percent.

Senator SYMINGTON. 2.2 percent. Is that on cost or on sales?

Admiral LALOR. That is on the value of the facilities produced. So the 2.2 percent is in the $1.9 billion.

Senator SYMINGTON. That would be about——

Mr. SHERIDAN. $43 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. When I was in Thailand several years ago some of these companies involved had a contract, and the General Accounting Office told me that the contract was for $300 million, and they had lost $140 million out of it, they could not find any records to justify $140 million. Do you know anything about that?

Admiral LALOR. Yes, sir. I was officer in charge of the construction, sir, in Thailand for 2 years.

Senator SYMINGTON. This was 1966 or 1967?

Admiral LALOR. I was there in 1967, and it could not have been one of our contracts. We had no $300 million contracts.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you check it out with the General Accounting Office? It was a private contract.

Admiral LALOR. Yes, sir. The construction contracts, which would be Mr. Sheridan's area of responsibility here, were one for $123 million, the total value, and the other totaled $40 million. So it could not have been one of those.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, Admiral. Any additional information you have I will appreciate it.

Admiral LALOR. Aye, aye, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Let me ask you this question. You say the contractor completed the work, and that the lump-sum contractors and Vietnamese Army engineers are completing the remaining projects. What does that mean?

Mr. SHERIDAN. That is the completion of the road, the highway program, and certain minor construction or Vietnamization type of projects.

Senator SYMINGTON. Was that part of the Brown-Root contract?

Mr. SHERIDAN. No, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then, why do you say you are completing it?

Mr. SHERIDAN. We are completing the projects, completing the program without the combine in there.

Senator SYMINGTON. You say the remaining projects?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. What are the remaining projects?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mostly highway work. There is a hospital in Saigon. And that is it. We can get a list of that for the record, if you desire.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why was that not under the original contract? You say completing.

Mr. SHERIDAN. We wanted to close out the contract preparatory to the U.S. forces coming out of Vietnam.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why did you want to do that?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Because we did not want to have a large contract still going on for a minor amount of money.

Senator SYMINGTON. What do you mean by the lump sum contractors, what does that mean?

Mr. SHERIDAN. These are not fee contracts; they are paid a lump-sum amount, like you did in this country.

Senator SYMINGTON. Who would they be? Would they be Americans, or Vietnamese, or what?

Mr. SHERIDAN. They are basically Vietnamese.

Senator SYMNGTON. How much did you pay them?

Mr. SHERIDAN. We take bids on that.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much was it to complete it?

Admiral LALOR. My guess would be less than $40 million.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Less than $40 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you supply what the figures are for the record? We are having a very difficult time trying to chase, or trace, whichever word you would want to use, the money that is involved in this Vietnam closeout. And that is the basic thrust of these questions.

[See p. 8.]

Mr. SHERIDAN. In the construction program, Mr. Chairman, we started to close this contract out almost a year before the Vietnamization program.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why did you do that?

Mr. SHERIDAN. First of all, the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and the OSD agreed that rather than let the $1,900 million contract be completed before an audit was made by the General Accounting Office——

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you say that again?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Instead of waiting for the actual completion of all the construction, which would have dragged on for years, the General Accounting Office——

Senator SYMINGTON. Why would it drag on for years?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Because, if we did not cut off the program, as we have. And as Admiral Lalor said, about $40 million is still to be done. That will take quite a bit of time to finish. And for $40 million you are holding up the closing of the $1,900 million contract. So it is far better to do it in pieces.

Senator SYMINGTON. My questions are not necessarily critical. I am just seeking information, we are running out of money and we are going to have to defend this bill on the floor.

Mr. SHERIDAN. This was helpful to the General Accounting Office.

Senator SYMINGTON. Did they ask you to do it?

Mr. SHERIDAN. They did not ask, we proposed. Was that not it?

Admiral LALOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERIDAN. And they accepted.

Senator SYMINGTON. Who is the person in the GAO that you deal with? Give us the name.

Mr. SHERIDAN. It is under the Director of Defense Facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. Can anybody give us a name on this?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I know the name, but I cannot think of it right now.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you supply it for the record?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Although GAO's International Division, under the direction of Mr. Oye V. Stovall, has conducted a number of surveys concerning construction in Vietnam, it was the Defense Contract Audit Agency under Mr. B. B. Lynn who audited the completed contract with Raymond, Morrison-Knudsen/Brown & Root and J. A. Jones.

Senator SYMINGTON. You say: "As well as the balance of the primary highway upgrade programs and dependent shelter program." Was that work that was being done under this company?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Most of the work was being done under the combine. The roadwork and the dependent shelters were a combination of some contract, very low contract work, but mostly self-help, where the materials were given to the Vietnamese. Now, the Vietnamese Army engineers have a limited capability.

Senator SYMINGTON. I am sure of all that, but I am trying to find out how this contract was terminated. You say only $40 million. When I first came to the Senate $40 million was quite a bit of money. I realize that now it is not a spit in the ocean and as far as the Defense Office is concerned. What I would like to know is, regardless of why—if you say you completed the primary highway upgrade program and the dependent shelter program, which was work that was to be done under the contract of this private firm, and you canceled the contract with the private firm, did you use the money that you were going to pay the private firm to have it done by the Army Engineers or by another Defense agency?

Mr. SHERIDAN. The money was held by OSO to cover the remaining projects.

Senator SYMINGTON. And how much was that?

Mr. SHERIDAN. We will have to furnish that.

[See p. 8.]

Senator SYMINGTON. Does anybody here know about it? You have a lot of people here.

Mr. SHERIDAN. We have the data, but we do not have it with us.

Admiral DILLON. The dependent shelter program was primarily funded on a self-help basis, it was not in the contract.

Senator SYMINGTON. I am just asking how much money was it that you transferred over from the contract in order to complete the work that you transferred for the contract. You have a private contractor that you transferred either to the Vietnamese forces, and I would like that as, A, or to American forces, and I would like that as B, to complete the contract.

Admiral DILLON. I will have to develop the first for the record, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you do that, sir?

Admiral DILLON. Yes, sir.

[See below.]

Mr. SHERIDAN. There was none transferred to the American forces.

Senator SYMINGTON. So what you did, then, you paid the money that you got from the Morrison-Knudsen contract, you paid that to the Vietnamese forces?

Mr. SHERIDAN. That is partially correct.

Senator SYMINGTON. And did we have any inspection of what we did with the money?

Admiral DILLON. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And who did that?

Admiral DILLON. We did that through the MAC V forces and through the architect-engineering contract retained for that purpose.

Senator SYMINGTON. And did you keep a record of how they used the money?

Admiral DILLON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And Admiral, what is you position in this?

Admiral DILLON. I am Director of Construction Operations for Mr. Sheridan.

Senator SYMINGTON. And have you reviewed those records?

Admiral DILLON. I have in the past, yes.

Senator SYMINGTON. And do you think they are satisfactory and that they used the money properly?

Admiral DILLON. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. But you do not know how much money it was?

Admiral DILLON. Not at this moment. But it is readily available.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you supply it for the record?

Admiral DILLON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

We feel we have a very good story on it, but I am sorry that we do not have it with us today.

[The information follows:]

In answer to the question, no funds were taken out of the contract. The contract accomplished the prescribed work and was closed out on June 30, 1972, according to the plan approved in January 1971.

Since the closeout, $2.83 million of "Southeast Asia Military Construction" appropriations have been obligated through lump-sum contracts. Also, $2.1 million have been obligated by ARVN Engineers on LOC and $1.2 million of construction placed for Dependent Shelters." The current unobligated balance as of June 1, 1973, is $85.1 million. Of this, $23.8 million is offered as a recoupment to partially finance fiscal year 1974 MCP, and $29.7 is programed to complete the LOC and Vietnamization projects. The $31.6 million remaining is reserved by OSD for contingencies and possible funding of remaining dependent shelter projects and Vietnamization requirements.

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not mean to be contentious, but I wish you could have the facts to back up your story. When we ask what did you do with the money, and how much, we like to get the answers, instead of just a broad statement. We would like to get the facts, because the facts in this case embrace the money.

What I would like to know is, who is it that you work with in the General Accounting Office on this matter?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I know his position. He is in charge of the defense contract.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here in Washington or out in Saigon?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Here.

Senator SYMINGTON. We have a story in the press this morning which makes us look sort of silly, which was that the Army spent tens of millions of dollars more than the legislative limitation on public relations. If we are not going to check on this money, then there is no reason for us to be around here. A broad statement about passing it over from a private contractor and taking the money you were going to give an American firm and giving it to the Vietnamese Government has implications in it that worry me.

Mr. SHERIDAN. This committee was informed on every step we took on the transfer. But I do not have the exact figures with me.

Senator SYMINGTON. I just want to know how much was involved, because even today $1,900 million is a lot of money.

Mr. SHERIDAN. It sure is.

Senator SYMINGTON. And we are running out of money very fast.

Mr. SHERIDAN. So is $40 million a lot of money.

Senator SYMINGTON. It is to me, and I am glad to hear it is to you.

Mr. SHERIDAN. It sure is.

Senator SYMINGTON. Now, Mr. Sheridan, where do you want to go from page 11?

Mr. SHERIDAN. To page 14.

Installation and activity reductions and realinements.

As you know, on April 17th we announced a significant installation and activity reduction and realinement package with annual recurring savings of $375 million after one-time costs.

Since 1969, the DOD announced a total of 2,269 installation and activity reductions, realinement and closure actions worldwide. These actions reduced over 302,000 military and over 195,000 civilian personnel positions and will result in the reduction of annual Defense expenditures of almost $4.4 billion when completed. Although, most of the actions have already been completed, some, including those most recently announced, will not be completed until the end of fiscal year 1974 and a few will take somewhat longer.

TURNKEY CONSTRUCTION

We have proposed revised language in section 604 of the general provisions of this year's bill in order to clarify the application of our one-step turnkey procedure.

The proposed language will authorize the use of the one-step turnkey procedure as an alternative to the use of conventional formal advertising.

On health care facilities, beginning with this year's program, we are embarking on a 5-year health facilities modernization program.

The initial year of the program includes a total of $137 million for medical projects.

The next item of interest is a new generation military hospital project, which is under development. This project involves the construction of a test-bed hospital at Travis Air Force Base, Calif., to study a wide range of cost-effective innovations leading to reduced overall cost of providing modern health care services.

The Air Force, as program manager, has just completed requirement and criteria studies and concept studies are about to get underway. It is proposed to request funds for this 632-bed hospital in the fiscal year 1975 construction program.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much?

Mr. SHERIDAN. It is now $100 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is in the 1974 budget?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Nothing.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are just announcing you are going to do it?

Mr. SHERIDAN. We announced last year, but we are further along now; yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Further along in what?

Mr. SHERIDAN. In developing the criteria, getting the preliminary planning done.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

This year's budgetary request continues the program for abating pollution at military installations which was started several years ago. In keeping with national environmental policies, we have again programed major funding for this important effort. Included in this year's program is $116.2 million for 97 projects to assure compliance with current pollution control standards.

AIR INSTALLATIONS COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

A threat to our ability to maintain adequate air strength is urban encroachment on our airbases. We have begun a policy of establishing compatible use zones in the intensive flying areas.

These zones will be established by many methods, ranging from local land use zoning to Federal purchase of land. This year, we are asking $25.9 million in authorization for the Air Force to acquire some 78,605 acres at 13 bases and $5.4 million to acquire all 14,365 acres at two bases in the Navy program. However, since acquisition by exchange of land will be attempted, only $2 million in appropriations for the Air Force purposes will be sought.

I am most appreciative of the opportunity to appear before you today to present the military construction request for fiscal year 1974 and to discuss subjects in the installations, construction, and housing areas which are of interest to these committees.

I have with me Perry Fliakas, Director for Facilities Planning and Programing. Mr. Fliakas, the staff, and I will be available to answer your questions and we would be pleased to provide such additional information as you may request.

Thank you.

[Mr. Sheridan's statement follows:]

I am pleased to appear before these Committees in support of S. 1797, the Military Construction Authorization request for FY 1974. It is indeed a challenge to participate with members of this Committee and the entire Congress in the development of a strong military base structure to support the President's strategy for Peace. As you know, the President's Strategy for Peace contains three elements: adequate strength, true partnership and a willingness to negotiate. I would like to dwell on the first element—adequate strength—and relate the development of the military construction program to achieving that objective.

It is essential for implementation of the Nixon Doctrine to insure that our nation has the most modern and up-to-date base structure for its military forces. There must be increased efficiency of all supporting activities and greater emphasis must be placed on the readiness and effectiveness of our total forces. The military construction program for FY 1974 is designed to form the basis on which to build toward these objectives.

The FY 1974 military construction program has been developed in consonance with the long-range needs of the active and reserve forces. We have considered present and future deployment, the total force planning concept, the condition of existing facilities and the long-range requirements for modernization and replacements, overall priorities and specialized needs. Taking all of these factors into consideration, we are presenting today our total program for the next fiscal year.

The new authorization request for FY 1974 totals $2,970,790,000. In FY 1973, the Department of Defense requested $2,686,800,000 after reducing the initial construction request for SAFEGUARD facilities which was made possible by the SALT Agreements. Actual enactment in FY 1973 totalled $2,549,525,000. The increase requested in FY 1974 over the revised amount requested in Fiscal Year 1973 is due primarily to additional emphasis on people-related projects such as bachelor and family housing construction, and medical facility replacement and modernization; facilities for the Navy's TRIDENT weapon system, as well as continued emphasis on the Reserve Forces and the pollution abatement program.

The construction proposals contained in the FY 1974 request are located at approximately 300 named installations and there are some 680 separate construction projects. In order to conserve time and avoid duplication in testimony, I have attached summaries of these projects, grouped in like construction categories to permit ready comparison.

A comparison of this year's proposed Authorization with that requested and enacted for Fiscal Year 1973 is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		
	1973 request	1973 enacted	1974 request
Army	$593.4	$558.8	$660.1
Navy	540.9	515.7	630.1
Air Force	341.6	284.2	303.2
Defense agencies	16.4	15.5	17.1
Secretary of Defense contingency	30.0	17.5	
Family housing	1,067.3	1,050.7	1,250.6
Reserve components	97.2	107.2	109.7
Total	2,686.8	2,549.6	2,970.8

PROGRAMMING

The Five-Year Defense Program (FYDP) is the heart of the planning, programming, and budgeting system in the Department of Defense. In construction, we seek the orderly replacement of obsolete facilities and construction of new facilities as new weapons systems and changes in manpower and missions impact our military installations. The steady decline of active forces since the peak of the United States participation in Vietnam in FY 1968 to a FY 1974 active duty end strength of 2,233,000 has completed the transition from war to peace. The FY 1974 military construction program reflects, (1) support of a base line military strength which is the lowest since the pre-Korean War period in early 1950, (2) consolidation and realignments of the missions performed by the major installations, (3) the shift from a draft-dominated force to an all-volunteer force, and,

(4) greater reliance on the mobilization readiness of the reserve forces. The dynamic aspects of this military construction program are a reflection of the great changes that have occurred and will continue to occur as we move toward the generation of peace that the President has set as our goal.

A large portion of the FY 1974 military construction program is directed to improving the attractiveness of military life in order to maintain an all-volunteer force. For example in this year's budget we are requesting 11,688 new family housing units, compared to 11,938 units authorized last year, recognizing that adequate housing is an extremely important morale factor especially in helping to retain our professional officers and non-commissioned officers in whom we have invested heavily for specialized training. For our single personnel the FY 1974 program calls for constructing nearly 39,000 bachelor enlisted spaces and 450 bachelor officers' spaces. This compares with the 35,430 new bachelor enlisted spaces and 905 new officer spaces approved last year. We are also planning to modernize approximately 55,000 bachelor enlisted spaces, converting open bay dormitory facilities into room-configured spaces that will be semiprivate and will be decently furnished. Last year, 72,334 bachelor enlisted spaces were approved for modernization. Nearly 60 percent of the entire FY 1974 authorization request is devoted to meeting housing needs, including operations and maintenance of the existing military family housing inventory and debt payment. In the area of personnel support, we are also planning to upgrade our obsolete medical plant to modern standards and, with your support, we should complete programming this major effort over the next five years. In FY 1974 we have included $137.0 million for improving our medical facilities. Finally, we are requesting $91.2 million for community support facilities such as exchanges, gymnasiums, servicemen's clubs, overseas dependent schools, and other morale related facilities.

The FY 1974 program also contains substantial amounts for construction of facilities for our reserve components as well as the pollution abatement program. I will discuss these in more detail later in my statement.

We have informed these Committees in prior years concerning our total backlog of construction and as you will recognize this is also a dynamic and changing index as to the overall construction needs of the Department of Defense. The most recent figure would indicate that we have a backlog of $22.5 billion for the active forces, a $1.4 billion backlog for the reserve forces and $1.4 billion for new family housing. There has been a drop from the figure furnished last year for the active forces and this comes about generally from three factors: elimination of facilities needed for the original 12-site SAFEGUARD program, a reduction in the overall estimate of construction needed for TRIDENT, and a general screening out by the military departments of marginal projects, which I might note here, is a continuing and ongoing review within all the military departments. In the case of family housing, the nearly $0.9 billion decrease from the estimated deficit of $2.3 billion reported last year results largely from the increase in the pay structure for the military personnel wherein we have enabled our military personnel to compete on a more equitable basis within the civilian sector of the economy. We are pleased in the case of the active forces, for example, that we are proposing in this year's request to devote $868 million to that portion of our backlog which we term replacement and modernization. That segment is presently estimated to be $10.3 billion or nearly 45 percent of the total backlog for the active forces.

Finally, we have had to make some painful, but overdue decisions regarding our base structure. This year's program includes a number of projects which are required in the FY 1974 time frame to accommodate relocated personnel and missions. While certain adjustments have been made in the past to reduce the size and cost of maintaining military installations, it has become clear that we can no longer afford to defer decisions regarding closure and realignment of the base structure, and I will discuss this in more detail later in my statement.

FAMILY AND BACHELOR HOUSING

As we move from a draft-dominated force to an all-volunteer force, increased emphasis is being placed on programs which will better military life and stabilize manpower. We plan to continue to improve the quality of life in the military services in the environment of the all-volunteer force and with that end in mind, we have substantially increased the military housing programs during the last few years. A balanced multifaceted approach to improving the housing situation in the shortest feasible time has been developed. This includes both provision of new housing and upgrading the standards of livability of existing on-base housing. Efforts being directed to the on-post family housing program include:

The Air Force, as program manager, has just completed requirement and criteria studies and concept studies are about to get underway. It is proposed to request funds for this 632-bed hospital in the FY 1975 construction program. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Veterans Administration have coordinated on the development of the studies, and the studies and the benefits derived will be shared with those agencies and the private sector.

Also in connection with medical facilities, you will recall that last year Congress passed legislation which established the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. Now for the first time in history, Defense will have the internal capability for training physicians, which will greatly enhance the all volunteer Service goal. The Board of Regents has recently been confirmed and it will establish the necessary policy guidance to permit site studies and development of the physical facilities to proceed in an expeditious manner.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

This year's budgetary request continues the program for abating pollution at military installations which was started several years ago. In keeping with national environmental policies, we have again programmed major funding for this important effort. Included in this year's program is $116.2 million for 97 projects to assure compliance with current pollution control standards.

1. Continuing the high level of new construction.
2. Major modernization of existing housing.
3. Provision of mobile home facilities.
4. Broadening the programming base to include all enlisted personnel in the E–4 grade when computing housing requirements.
5. As authorized by legislation approved last year, designating marginally adequate housing as substandard, and renting these units at less than full forfeiture of BAQ.

In addition to these efforts to improve the family housing situation on-base, we are also continuing to direct our efforts to securing a greater share of housing in the civilian community by:

1. Utilizing the Department of Housing and Urban Development programs.
2. Leasing of family housing for recruiting personnel.
3. Continuing the vigorous housing referral programs at all major bases and installations to assist in securing housing in the civilian community, and
4. At overseas areas, we are proposing to expand the foreign leasing program and encourage lease-construct agreements for military housing as a supplement to our continuing efforts under the rental guaranty program authority. A viable rental guaranty program in conjunction with an expanded leasing program will considerably assist our housing problems overseas at a minimal risk to the United States Government.

For our FY 1974 family housing program, we are proposing 1.25 billion dollars, which includes 424 million dollars for construction. This program would provide 11,688 new units of family housing, 1,340 mobile home spaces, over 62 million dollars for the improvement of existing family housing, and some minor construction and planning. In addition, we are proposing increased livability standards for family housing and an increased statutory cost limitation on new construction. The program also reflects an administrative limitation on the number of two bedroom units which may be constructed. The bachelor housing construction program for FY 1974 amounts to $501 million. This program will provide 39,000 new bachelor enlisted spaces. In addition, 165 million dollars of this request would be utilized primarily to convert existing sound structures which are presently open-bay barracks into modernized room-configured bachelor enlisted spaces. The effort will provide an additional 55,000 adequate bachelor enlisted spaces. We are pleased to note that the bachelor housing request for this year is about 30 percent higher than last year's request.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

A well-equipped and fully manned National Guard and Reserve, deployable on short notice, is potentially the most economical part of our defense system. Their revitalization over the past several years, therefore, is encouraging. The Guard and Reserves are now relied upon as the initial and primary augmentation for the active forces. Consequently, construction to support these components is essential in the present timetable. The proposed fiscal year 1974 authorization bill contains a request for $109.7 million to provide urgently needed training

facilities for the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

The FY 1974 request is the largest Reserve facilities program proposed to date and represents the third increment of our 10 years goal to provide an ongoing and continuing program of adequate training facilities for the Reserve Components. It is expected that this continuing emphasis, in consonance with corresponding efforts to modernize equipment and other Reserve improvements, will effect a significant improvement in the quality of training and the resultant combat readiness of all Guard and Reserve units. We recognize that modern training facilities and adequate field exercise areas are a vital adjunct of this integrated program for upgrading mobilization capability. Accordingly, we will continue to emphasize for the foreseeable future, a program of modernization of National Guard and Reserve training facilities.

STATUS OF VIETNAM CONSTRUCTION

I would like to briefly discuss the status of Vietnam Construction as I know of the Committees' deep interest in this subject in the past.

The Cost Plus Award Fee contractor combine of Raymond, Morrison-Knudsen/Brown and Root & Jones completed the work under its contract in Vietnam last June. Lump sum contractors and Vietnamese Army engineers are completing the remaining projects for improving the South Vietnamese Armed Forces self sufficiency, as well as the balance of the primary highway upgrade program and dependent shelter program. As in 1972 and 1973, no additional appropriations are sought this year. In fact, a total of $23,800,000 has been recouped from Vietnam military construction appropriations so far and is included as a source of financing a portion of the FY 1974 Military Construction Program.

REAL PROPERTY SURVEYS

In February 1970, Executive Order 11508 was promulgated by the President, assigning responsibility to the General Services Administration (GSA) for conducting surveys of all Federal properties in order to identify unneeded and underutilized properties. The order also established the Property Review Board (PRB) to make recommendations to the President on the highest and best use to be made of the resulting excess properties.

Closely allied to this program, in February 1971, the President proposed a new "Legacy of Parks" program to help States and local Governments provide parks and recreation areas for public use. In discussing the objective of the "Legacy of Parks" program, the President stated that "among the most important legacies that we can pass on to future generations is an endowment of parklands and recreational areas that will enrich leisure opportunities and make the beauties of the earth and sea accessible to all Americans." As part of this program, he has directed the PRB to give priority to potential park and reacreational areas in its search for alternative uses of Federally held real property determined to be excess.

Since July 1971 and in consonance with EO 11508, the Department of Defense conducted surveys of Defense installations in addition to those being conducted by the GSA. The Defense objective in these surveys was to insure that real property being retained was sufficient and adequate to support current and long-range requirements and that property no longer needed was reported for disposal. With this purpose in mind the DoD agreed to over 487 separate actions involving the release of approximately 1.2 million acres of land during the period of January 1970 to June 1973. As part of surveys was to insure that real property being retained was sufficient and adequate to support current and long-range requirements and that property no longer needed was reported for disposal. With this purpose in mind the DoD agreed to over 487 separate actions involving the release of approximately 1.2 million acres of land during the period of January 1970 to June 1973. As part of this effort the DoD undertook over 470 installation surveys and special projects involving over 14.3 million acres of Defense land since July 1971. Since February 1970 the GSA accomplished 200 surveys of Defense installations involving about 5.0 million acres of land. We are proud of our achievements in these areas. We are also pleased that the President up to the present time has been able to announce that 325 properties had been transferred to State and local Governments in the 50 States, Puerto Rico and Washington, D.C. as part of the Legacy of Parks program. These properties consist of about 53,717 acres of land with an estimated fair market value of $147.9 million. Of the 325 properties, 174 or 54%

were formerly DoD properties representing approximately 29,800 acres or 56% of the total acreage conveyed.

We are pleased with the results of these programs. While a new Executive Order has replaced E.O. 11508, this change will not affect our efforts. We plan, therefore, to continue the installation survey effort in 1973.

INSTALLATION AND ACTIVITY REDUCTIONS AND REALIGNMENTS

As you know, on April 17 we announced a significant installation and activity reduction and realignment package with annual recurring savings of $375 million after one time costs. These actions relate to our identification of those military installations which should be retained in order to meet our national priorities. Without such installation and activity consolidations, reductions and closures, it would not be possible for the DoD to remain within budget levels. In addition, installations and activity consolidations and closures had to follow the significant reductions in force levels which occurred.

Since 1969, the DoD announced a total of 2,269 installation and activity reduction, realignment and closure actions world-wide. These actions reduced over 302,000 military and over 195,000 civilian personnel positions and will result in the reduction of annual Defense expenditures of almost $4.4 billion when completed. Although most of the actions have already been completed, some, including those most recently announced, will not be completed until the end of FY 1974 and a few will take somewhat longer. As part of these actions, the DoD closed over 400 installations, activities and properties world-wide since January 1969.

TURNKEY CONSTRUCTION

We have proposed revised language in Section 604 of the General provisions of this year's bill in order to clarify the application of our one step turnkey procedure.

To review briefly, the turnkey concept involves the use of performance or narrative specification of the facility requirement rather than the use of a definitized government design, with competing contractors submitting a technical concept which will satisfy these requirements together with a price for the construction. We have utilized these procedures most advantageously in our family housing program, and during the past year we have completed the development of policy and guidance directed towards the enhanced and uniform application of the turnkey procedures by the Military departments.

The proposed language will authorize the use of the one step turnkey procedure as an alternative to the use of conventional formal advertising.

HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

In the area of health care facilities, there are some important and challenging developments.

Beginning with this year's program, we are embarking on a five-year Health Facilities Modernization Program. This program has been initiated to accelerate the construction of necessary new medical facilities and modernization of existing hospitals to provide modern and efficient medical care. Also, the provision of these improved facilities at an early date will permit better utilization of scarce professional talent and reduce requirements for health personnel. As I indicated earlier, this initial year of the program includes a total of $137.0 million for medical projects. This compares to an average of $90 million over the past 5 years. It is anticipated that funding for this important program will increase over the next four years to assure that the needed medical facilities are constructed.

The next item of interest is a New Generation Military Hospital Project, which is under development. This project involves the construction of a test-bed hospital at Travis Air Force Base, California, to study a wide range of cost effective innovations leading to reduced overall cost of providing modern health care services. The features to be tested in this hospital were the product of two comprehensive systems analysis studies conducted by private industrial management consortiums.

With respect to our present standards, we have turned the corner in our pollution abatement effort. This is reflected in the fact that funds being requested this year represent a decrease of 33% over our last year's request. However, it is important to note that the comprehensive Water Pollution Control Act, passed in October 1972, will result in more stringent standards which will be reflected in future programs.

Basically, the program proposes projects to provide proper treatment for sanitary and industrial water borne wastes. Included in this effort is a continuation of the program initiated last year to provide on-shore treatment of wastes from Naval vessels. The air pollution program provides funds for heating plant projects to eliminate sulfur and fly ash, facilities for processing industrial exhausts and the construction of incinerators and sanitary land fills.

As in the past, all air and water pollution projects in the FY 1974 program have been coordinated with the Environmental Protection Agency. We very much appreciate the support which these Committees have given to this program in previous years and we trust that this year's projects will similarly receive your favorable consideration.

AIR INSTALLATIONS COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

A threat to our ability to maintain adequate air strength is urban encroachment on our air bases. To protect the hard-core bases, we have begun a policy of establishing compatible use zones in the intensive flying areas. A Draft Environmental Impact Statement covering this action has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

These zones will be established by many methods, ranging from local land use zoning to Federal purchase of land. Development in the zones will not be prohibited, but will be directed along lines compatible with the characteristics of airport operation. Typically, residential development would be discouraged as would development that would create flight hazards. Light industry, open space recreation, and commercial uses insensitive to noise would be encouraged. The amount of land involved will vary with the base and the type of mission supported. This year, we are asking $25.9 million in authorization for the Air Force to acquire some 78,605 acres at 13 bases and $5.4 million to acquire all 14,365 acres at 2 bases in the Navy program. However, since acquisition by exchange of land will be attempted, only $2 million in appropriations for the Air Force purposes will be sought. The Congress can expect to receive future requests for similar purposes as further encroachment on military airfields becomes evident.

I am most appreciative of the opportunity to appear before you today to present the military construction request for FY 74 and to discuss subjects in the installations, construction and housing areas which are of interest to these Committees. I have attempted to provide you with some measure of our efforts to achieve a strong base structure in line with the President's policy of "adequate strength" and we are hopeful that these efforts will continue for many years to come. We have been extremely fortunate to have had the support of these Committees over the years and for that, we are sincerely grateful.

I have with me Perry Fliakas, Director for Facilities Planning and Programming. Mr. Fliakas, the staff and I will be available to answer your questions and we would be pleased to provide such additional information as you may request.

Thank you.

Enclosures:

1. Summary of fiscal year 1974 military construction authorization program.
2. Addendum—Proposed construction of major facilities categories.
3. Proposed family housing program.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

[In millions of dollars]

Facility class	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Operational and training	102.3	123.5	60.4	286.2
Maintenance and production	16.4	130.7	36.9	184.0
R. & D. facilities	11.2	26.8	10.0	48.0
Supply facilities	8.1	2.1	11.7	21.9
Hospital and medical	35.0	65.3	36.7	137.0
Administrative facilities	2.8	17.6	31.1	51.5
Housing and community	453.4	104.0	68.1	625.5
Utilities and ground improvement	28.2	152.9	22.0	203.1
Real estate	2.7	7.2	26.3	36.2
Subtotal	660.1	630.1	303.2	1,593.4

Defense agencies	$17.1
Family housing	1,250.6
Reserve forces	109.7
Subtotal	1,377.4
Grand total	2,970.8

Enclosure 1.

ADDENDUM TO STATEMENT BY EDWARD J. SHERIDAN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND HOUSING) BEFORE THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE AND SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION IN MAJOR CATEGORIES OF FACILITIES

Active forces (titles I, II, III, and IV)

The Active Forces portion of the Military Construction Authorization Program for FY 1974 totals $1,610.5 million for the three Departments and Defense Agencies. This portion of the program is related to the regular military establishment and provides for facilities and installations necessary to meet operational, logistical and other mission requirements of the three Military Departments and the Defense Agencies, other than family housing. For purposes of easy summation, we have grouped the total request into nine standard Department of Defense construction categories. I would like to describe the principal items contained in each of these categories for the individual Services. I will omit reference to the Defense Agencies in these descriptions, inasmuch as I will summarize their requirements separately at the end of this presentation. The first of the categories is:

Operational and training $286.2 million

The operational facilities contains essential airbase, fleet operations support, communications, security, command and control, and other operational facilities necessary to support the combat readiness capability of the Services. Under training facilities we seek to provide the instructional and training facilities necessary to the development of not only the basic soldier, seaman, airman and marine, but also the technical and professional specialists required to operate, maintain and repair the complex tools of modern war.

Within the above total, the requests for such facilities are:

	Million
Army	$102.3
Navy	123.5
Air Force	60.4

The most significant portion of the Army's request, which totals $102.3 million, involves $80.0 million of authorization for the U.S. share of the NATO Infrastructure Program; additionally the program provides $7.2 million for aircraft facilities at Fort Hood, Texas; $1.6 million for helicopter facilities at Fort Belvoir, Virginia; $7.6 million for academic and school facilities at Fort McClellan, Alabama, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, Fort Meade, Maryland, and Fort Sheridan, Illinois; $0.9 million for Petroleum-Oil-Lubricants (POL) facilities in Korea; and various operational and training facilities at 5 other installations for a total of $5.0 million.

Of the $123.5 million included in this category for Navy, $72.3 million is for operational facilities and $51.2 million for training facilities. Of the $72.3 million for operational facilities, $9.9 million will provide improvements and additions to airfield pavements at six Navy installations; $5.7 million for communication facilities at eight Navy installations; $3.5 million for aircraft operations facilities at seven installations; $21.8 million for waterfront facilities at three Navy installations; and $31.3 million for a wharf and dredging in support of TRIDENT at Patrick AFB, Florida. The Navy's training facilities request includes $6.0 million for academic instruction facilities at Annapolis, Dam Neck, and San Diego; and $45.2 million for urgently needed enlisted training facilities at 18 Navy installations.

The Air Force program for operational and training facilities totals $60.4 million, of which $52.6 million is for operational facilities and $7.8 million for training facilities. Significant items within the operational facilities portion include $13.5 million for facilities for the newly approved airborne command

post to support national command authorities at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland; $11.0 million for an addition to the Technical Intelligence Operations Facility at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio; $7.9 million for communications facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting; $4.1 million for airfield payments; $5.4 million for a composite support facility at Cape Newenham Air Force Station, Alaska; $4.5 million for an air freight terminal at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii; $4.7 million for operations buildings and a fire station; and $1.5 million for miscellaneous facilities. The training facilities include $2.8 million for a base maintenance training facility at Sheppard AFB, Texas; $2.8 million for a flight simulator training facility at Reese AFB, Texas; and $2.2 million for four miscellaneous training facilities.

Maintenance and production facilities $184.0 million

This category includes all types of facilities necessary for the production, maintenance and repair of military hardware, including field and depot maintenance shops and hangars, shore-based marine maintenance facilities for the fleet, and production, assembly and maintenance facilities for rockets, guided missiles and various types of conventional ammunition.

The totals of the Services' requests for such facilities are:

	Million
Army	$16.4
Navy	130.7
Air Force	36.9

Within the Army's portion of their total request, the authorization would provide $16.0 million for various shop and maintenance facilities at four major bases in the U. S. Approximately $8.4 million of the request entails construction of Phase III of an airfield complex to support an Airmobile Division at Fort Campbell, Kentucky; $3.8 million would finance vehicle repair and processing facilities at Anniston Army Depot, Alabama; $2.7 million is required for tactical equipment shops at Fort Bragg, North Carolina; $1.1 million for turbine engine test cells at the Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas; and $0.4 million for medical equipment maintenance facilities at Defense Depot, Memphis, Tenn.

Significant items included in the Navy request for maintenance and production facilities include $20.7 million related to aircraft maintenance at 12 air stations; $12.1 million for ships maintenance facilities at five installations; $1.0 million for a vehicle maintenance facility; $6.5 million for ammunition maintenance facilities at three installations; $90.1 million for the first phase of the TRIDENT Refit Complex at Bangor Annex, Washington; and $0.4 million for three miscellaneous projects.

The authorization requested for the Air Force in this category will provide the necessary facilities to support the maintenance of new weapons systems and will provide for increased Air Force missions, changes in missions, and safety of operations. Significant amounts entered in the category are $22.9 million for various aircraft maintenance shops including among the major items, a depot aircraft engine fuel system overhaul and test facility at Kelly AFB, Texas, $3.2 million; alteration of a depot aircraft overhaul facility at Robins AFB, Georgia, $1.4 million; a depot aircraft landing gear overhaul facility at Hill AFB, Utah, $6.9 million; a weapons system components plate shop at McClellan AFB, California, $2.5 million; a depot aircraft electronics system overhaul and test facility at Tinker AFB, Oklahoma, $3.3 million; and 10 miscellaneous aircraft maintenance shops at six locations, 5.6 million. In addition, this category includes 5 aircraft corrosion control facilities at 5 locations, $1.9 million; 3 precision measurement equipment facilities at 3 locations, $2.3 million; a base civil engineer maintenance complex at Dover AFB, Delaware, $0.8 million and at Peterson Field, Colorado, $1.8 million; short-range attack missile maintenance support facilities at 2 locations, $1.0 million; communications and electronics shops at 3 locations, $1.1 million; and 7 miscellaneous maintenance facilities at 7 locations, $5.1 million.

Research and development facilities $18.0

This portion of the authorization program is necessary to sustain our search for new and improved weapons systems. Despite its modest size, the Department considers the projects included herein to be of high essentiality and vital to the maintenance of U.S. leadership in the development and testing of new defense systems.

The total of the Services' requests for R & D facilities are:

	Million
Army	$11.2
Navy	26.8
Air Force	10.0

The Army's request involves $11.2 million with $3.0 million required for a human factors engineering laboratory at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland; $2.7 million for an explosives laboratory at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey; and $2.7 million to provide improvements to test range facilities at Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona. Additionally, $2.8 million is requested to provide for various laboratories and support facilities at six locations in the United States and instrument test facilities at Kwajalein Island.

For the Navy, 12 research and development facilities total $26.8 million, and includes $6.4 million for the second phase of an environmental health effects laboratory at Bethesda, Md.; $4.7 million for an integrated electromagnetic test and analysis laboratory at NRL Washington, D.C.; $3.6 million for an engineering building at New London, Conn.; $3.5 million for an electronic development and test laboratory increment at San Diego, California; 3.5 million for facilities at the Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory at Panama City, Florida; $3.8 million for facilities at Patrick AFB, Florida, in support of the TRIDENT missile development; and $1.3 million for miscellaneous facilities at three Navy installations.

The Air Force program for RDT&E facilities contains the following significant items: $4.9 million for aircraft fuels and lubricants laboratory and $1.9 million for alterations to an aircraft engine components and research laboratory at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio; $0.9 million for alterations to a rocket propulsion research laboratory at Edwards AFB, California; $0.9 million for a weapons guidance test facility at Holloman AFB, New Mexico; and $1.4 million for 5 miscellaneous projects at five locations.

Supply facilities $21.9 million

This category includes various supply facilities, including fuel storage, ammunition storage, cold storage, depot and arsenal warehouses and open storage facilities.

The total of the Services' requests for such facilities are:

	Million
Army	$8.1
Navy	2.1
Air Force	11.7

The Army's request includes a container transfer and marshaling facility at Sunny Point Terminal, N.C., $1.6 million; a multi-unit supply operations and storage building at the Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas, $5.2 million; a logistics and storage facility at Cold Regions Laboratory, N.H., in the amount of $0.6 million; and a supply and administrative facility at Fort Eustis, Virginia, for $0.7 million.

The Navy's request includes two warehouse facilities and one cold storage facility totaling $2.1 million. The $11.7 million requested for supply facilities for the Air Force will provide $5.4 million for a logistical materials storage facility at Tinker AFB, Oklahoma; $1.0 million for a base supply facility at Reese AFB, Texas; $3.0 million for a ballistic missile processing support facility at Hill AFB, Utah; and $2.3 million for five miscellaneous storage facilities.

Hospital and medical $137.0 million

Replacement and improvement of our outmoded and absolescent medical plant continues as one of our urgent priorities. A great portion of our hospital and medical facilities were constructed from 25 to 50 years ago, and over the years have become increasingly inadequate to the needs of modern medicine. In FY 1974, we have included a substantial increment to continue the replacement of the most inadequate of such facilities.

The total of the Service's requests for such facilities are:

	Million
Army	$35.0
Navy	65.3
Air Force	36.7

Army's request for hospital and medical facilities includes a new hospital at the U. S. Military Academy, $25.0 million; an addition at Fort Lee, Virginia,

for $5.3 million; three dental clinics at Fort Carson, Colorado, Fort Lewis, Washington and Fort Monmouth, N.J., for $3.5 million; and a medical-dental clinic at Fort Shafter, Hawaii, for $1.2 million.

Significant items included in the Navy request for health and medical facilities include the $22.3 million, 310-bed hospital at Orlando, Fla.; $3.4 million, 150-bed addition to the hospital at New Orleans, La.; and $39.6 million for dispensaries, dental clinics and upgrading of medical facilities at 20 Navy installations.

Within the Department of the Air Force, the $36.7 million requested for hospital and medical facilities will provide for the following: additions and/or alterations to the composite medical facilities at Maxwell AFB, Alabama, $4.9 million; Tinker AFB, Oklahoma, $3.9 million; and Richards-Gebaur AFB, Missouri, $3.8 million; new composite medical facilities at RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom, $5.5 million; Laughlin AFB, Texas, $4.6 million; and F. E. Warren AFB, Wyoming, $5.8 million; aeromedical staging facilities at Andrews AFB, Maryland, $1.7 million, and Scott AFB, Illinois, $2.0 million; and dental clinics at Keesler AFB, Mississippi, $1.7 million; Barksdale AFB, Louisiana, $1.2 million; and Shaw AFB, South Carolina, $1.1 million; and a medical clinic at Lackland AFB, Texas, $0.5 million.

Administrative facilities $51.5 million

This category includes various administrative facilities, including headquarters, squadron operations and similar facilities. The total of the Services' request for such facilities are:

	Million
Army	$2.8
Navy	17.6
Air Force	31.1

Army's request for administrative facilities is relatively minimal in nature and is comprised of only six projects. These include alterations to an existing structure at Fort McClellan, Alabama, for an addition to WAC Headquarters in the amount of $0.3 million; conversion of buildings at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, for $1.2 million; conversion of existing structures at Fort Dix, New Jersey and Fort Knox, Kentucky, totalling $0.6 million; and construction of an administration building at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, for $0.7 million.

The Navy's $17.6 million request for administrative facilities includes $1.8 million for relocation of the Military Sealift Command from Brooklyn to Bayonne, New Jersey; $9.8 million for administrative facilities at New Orleans, Louisiana; $5.2 million for administrative facilities at Albany, Georgia; $0.2 million for a computer support facility at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and a $0.7 million administrative facility at Meridian, Mississippi.

The Air Force program provides $31.1 million which includes $20.4 million for the Air Force Accounting and Finance Center at Lowry AFB, Colorado; $4.0 million for an Armament Development Test Center Headquarters at Eglin AFB, Florida; $3.6 million for base personnel offices at Nellis AFB, Nevada ($1.9 million) and at Mather AFB, California ($1.7 million); $1.5 million for a Data Processing Plant at Randolph AFB, Texas; $0.9 million for alterations to a Command Headquarters Facility at Howard AFB, Canal Zone; and $0.7 million for air conditioning administrative facilities at two locations.

Housing and community facilities $625.5 million

Troop housing is one of the most important and vital requirements in our construction program. We recognize the importance of this item in persuading personnel to stay in the military service as a career, and we believe implicitly that improved housing will provide both immediate and long-range benefits through increased re-enlistment, heighten morale, and reduced recruitment costs. The Service programs in FY 1974 are:

	Million
Army	$453.4
Navy	104.0
Air Force	68.1

The Army's request for troop housing and community facilities, represents a continuation of last year's reorientation of construction priorities with major emphasis being placed on "peoples projects" designed to improve the conditions under which Service personnel and their families work and live. The request includes construction of 24,553 bachelor enlisted spaces and support facilities at $237.7 million; modernization of 46,896 existing bachelor enlisted spaces at $143.6 million; construction of 285 bachelor officer quarters at $4.9 million; modernization of 528 existing bachelor officer spaces at $2.7 million; a bachelor

enlisted complex support facility at $2.6 million; and three projects for consolidated dining facilities and centralized food preparaton plants at $13.7 million. Additionally, the program includes 22 community facilities at $48.2 million. These provide two new dependent schools in Germany, as well as urgently needed additions to existing inadequate facilities at $12.1 million; two confinement facilities in the U.S. at $10.7 million; and various chapels, commissaries, libraries, gymnasiums and similar facilities at 16 other CONUS bases in the amount of $25.4 million.

The Navy's programming for this category will provide 9,368 new bachelor enlisted spaces at a cost of $58.4 million; 2,719 modernized bachelor enlisted spaces for $8.6 million; 103 new bachelor officer quarters at a cost of $3.3 million; 126 modernized bachelor officer spaces for $1.4 million; enlisted dining facilities at a cost of $8.2 million; community support items totaling $14.6 million; and completion of the naval home facility at Gulfport, Mississippi, for $9.4 million.

The Air Force program for this category provides $39.7 million for troop housing facilities and $28.4 million for community facilities. The $39.7 million will provide 4,768 bachelor enlisted spaces at a cost of $25.6 million; modernization of existing bachelor enlisted quarters to provide 4,757 spaces at a cost of $11.3 million; 60 bachelor officer quarters for $1.2 million; $0.6 million for construction of an airmen dining hall at Webb AFB, Texas; and $1.0 million for modernizing a dining hall at Lackland AFB, Texas. The $28.4 million for community facilities will provide for additions and alterations to three chapel centers, $1.0 million; three commissaries, $7.4 milllion; three gymnasiums, $2.7 million; two high schools and one intermediate school, $7.4 million; two airmen open messes, $2.0 million; four noncommissioned officer open messes, $5.4 million; one officers open mess, $1.1 million; and four miscellaneous community projects, $1.4 million.

Utilities and grounds improvements $203.1 million

This portion of the program provides for expansions and additions to utility systems and road nets at various U.S. and overseas locations. A significant element of this year's, as in last year's program is directed toward further implementing the national policies for controlling water and air pollution. The Military Department totals in the category of utilities and ground improvements are as follows:

	Million
Army	$28.2
Navy	152.9
Air Force	22.0

In compliance with federal, state and local air and water pollution control regulations and Executive Order 11507 (4 Feb. 1970), there is included a total of $116.2 million for 97 pollution abatement projects as a continuation of the program begun five years ago to eliminate pollution at our military installations. All of these projects have been coordinated with the Environmental Protection Agency.

The pollution abatement projects in each of the Service programs are summarized as follows:

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Air pollution abatement			Water pollution abatement		
	Amount	Projects	Installations	Amount	Projects	Installations
Army	$7.3	7	7	$6.8	6	5
Navy	27.6	18	15	64.7	45	39
Air Force	3.7	6	6	6.1	15	15
Total	38.6	31	28	77.6	66	59

The Army's request includes $14.1 million for pollution abatement; $14.1 million for utilities systems including $8.3 million for electrical distribution or augmentation of power facilities; $0.3 million for a gas generating plant; and $5.5 million for miscellaneous utility extension items at the U.S. Military Academy, N.Y., Atlanta Army Depot, Georgia, Fort Polk, Louisiana, and Fort McClellan, Alabama.

Significant items included in the Navy request for utilities include $92.3 million for pollution abatement, $42.8 million for electrical power distribution

improvements at 26 installations; $8.3 million for heating plant and distribution system improvements at four installations; $3.1 million for water supply and distribution improvements at three installations; and $6.4 million for miscellaneous utilities and ground improvements at nine installations.

This portion of the Air Force FY 1974 Military Construction Program will provide expansion and additions to existing utility systems world-wide. Significant items included in this category are $9.8 million for 21 pollution abatement projects; $3.5 million for electric power distribution lines, emergency power and substations at four locations; $3.3 million for power and air conditioning improvements at six locations; $3.9 million for expansion of base utility systems at two locations; and $1.5 million for three miscellaneous utilities projects.

Real estate $36.2 million

This portion of the program provides for real estate acquisitions and is by far the smallest category in the FY 1974 request. The Services' requests are as follows:

	Million
Army	$2.7
Navy	7.2
Air Force	26.3

The Army's request of $2.7 million provides for acquisition of 71,159 acres of privately-owned land located within the boundaries of the White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico.

The Navy's request includes $2.2 million to acquire approximately 365 acres of land at Jacksonville, Florida, to provide a buffer between the community and the noise generated by Navy aircraft; $3.8 million to acquire approximately 129 acres of land for an aircraft missile storage and build-up facility and 14,000 acres of restrictive and sound easements both at the Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona; and $1.2 million to acquire 1,700 acres of land at Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico, to provide a buffer zone for the Navy's antenna system. The Navy intends to acquire most of the above land interests through the exchange process.

Approximately $5.1 million is included under the TRIDENT Refit Complex to acquire land at the Bangor Annex, Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Washington.

The Air Force request for real estate totals $26.3 million. Of this amount, $25.9 million is the estimated cost of a second increment to acquire land and restrictive easements at 13 locations in support of the Air Installation Compatible Use Zones program, and $0.4 million is for the exchange of other government-owned land of equal value for fee title to approximately 187 acres of land adjacent to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma.

Defense Agencies (title IV) $171 million

The request for activities of the Defense Agencies contains $17.1 million for new construction and rehabilitation of existing facilities at 12 installations. The $17.1 million program is divided as follows:

Defense Nuclear Agency ($0.6 million) to provide for a Advance Research Electromagnet Pulse Simulator (ARES) Support Building at Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico; and a DNA Administration Building at the Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Defense Supply Agency ($8.4 million) to provide for an improved electrical distribution system, and a truck entrance and control facility at the Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio; medical materiel climatic controlled storage, upgrade restroom and lunchroom facilities and a troop subsistence support facility at the Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania; ventilation of warehouses at the Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee; upgrade restroom facilities at the Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah; an operational equipment maintenance facility, fire station and improvement and modernization of the water system at the Defense Depot, Tracy, California; a photographic materiel storage facility and a Defense Fuel Supply Center at the Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia; a parking lot at the Defense Logistics Service Center, Battle Creek, Michigan; quality control laboratory improvements at the Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and facility improvements at the Regional Office, Defense Contract Administration Services, Chicago, Illinois.

National Security Agency ($8.1 million) to provide for relocation of shop facilities, logistics support facility, modernization of bachelor enlisted quarters, and an automated waste collection system at NSA Headquarters, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.

ADDENDUM TO STATEMENT BY EDWARD J. SHERIDAN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND HOUSING) BEFORE THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE AND SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The FY 1974 Family Housing Program contains a request for 11,688 new units and a total authorization request of $1,250,567,000 for the following functions:

Construction of new housing (11,688 units):	
Army (6,135 units)	$178,208
Navy (3,741 units)	117,675
Air Force (1,800 units)	55,501
Defense Intelligence Agency (12 units)	520
Total	351,904
Construction of mobile home facilities (1,340 spaces)	5,700
Acquisition of utility system	240
Improvements to existing quarters	62,510
Minor construction	2,720
Planning	700
Total authorization request, construction	423,774
Operating expenses	334,210
Leasing	44,703
Maintenance of real property	294,419
Debt payment—principal	103,585
Debt payment—interest and other expense	58,408
Mortgage insurance premiums—Capehart & Wherry	2,206
Serviceman's mortgage insurance premiums	3,780
Total O. & M. and debt payment	841,311
Less: Anticipated reimbursements and amounts available from prior years	14,518
Authorization request, O. & M, and debt payment	826,793
Total authorization request	1,250,567

Enclosure 3.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Sheridan.

Again let me emphasize that I am not being critical in my questioning. I just want to know what the facts are. I came up through auditing in private business, and we cannot seem to get a handle on this money aspect incident to military operations in Indochina, which has cost us already about $150 billion.

Mr. SHERIDAN. I hope I did not give the impression that I did not feel a little embarrassed that I could not give you the exact answers. But we do have them.

NATO

Senator SYMINGTON. OK. Let's get them, and let's understand what we are talking about.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. I am going to ask some questions about Germany. We understand that in the last 2 years the dollar has dropped 55 percent in relation to its value to the mark.

How has that affected your plans for spending money in Europe?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I have a representative of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, ISA, here.

Mr. BERGOLD. I am Harry Bergold, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, ISA, for Europe and NATO.

Mr. Chairman, we are at just the threshold now of beginning talks with the Germans on the offset.

Senator SYMINGTON. I know all about that. But I am just wondering, what are you doing in the construction field? If the pay that we give the GI or an officer in the lower grades is cut over half in its purchasing power, that must reflect itself in the construction.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Harrington from my office will attempt to answer that.

Senator SYMINGTON. I know we have been negotiating with the countries of Europe ever since 1950 in order to get a more equitable adjustment of the situation over there, but I am only interested this morning in how the devaluation has affected your construction costs.

Mr. HARRINGTON. With respect to fiscal year 1974, Mr. Chairmain, recently the military services testified before the House Appropriations Committee with respect to the impact of both the 1971, the October 1971, devaluation, and the February 12, 1973, devaluation. At that time the aggregate impact estimated against the 1974 program—and I must emphasize that—was roughly about $21 to $22 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. I cannot put it in money, but I do know the Federal Reserve Board told us that the drop in 2 years has been 55 percent.

So with that premise, how does that affect your construction?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Obviously, sir, it makes it just about twice as expensive for us to build over there. In the NATO area where we have made obligations previously, and we are liquidating those obligations by payments against those existing contracts, we are having to pay more money, and we have to have more authorization for this.

Senator SYMINGTON. Are you asking us for more money, or are you cutting down your commitments?

Mr. HARRINGTON. No, sir, we are asking for more money. And this year we did not in the fiscal year 1974 budget reflect the full value of the February 12 devaluation. We did reflect the value of the October 1971 devaluation as we saw it at the time of the budget submission.

Senator SYMINGTON. So that what you are saying is that the first devaluation is reflected in these figures and the second devaluation is not?

Mr. HARRINGTON. That is correct, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much money do you need for the second devaluation, which was a good many months ago?

Mr. HARRINGTON. The total amount is $43 million for both devaluations. And the breakout is roughly $20 million for the first one, and $23 million for the second one.

Senator SYMINGTON. What percent is that of the total you are requesting?

Mr. HARRINGTON. That would be against both fiscal years, and it was $58 million last year and $80 million this year. So it would be roughly $138 million. Our impact is about 33 percent, sir.

I will correct that for the record if necessary, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then the total amount that you are requesting is not the 55 percent difference that I referred to, but considerably less than that?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why is that? Is there any cooperation that the German Government is giving you, for example, that it did not give you before in the way of putting up some of the money.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I would not be able to respond to that, because I am not privy to the initial discussions on the offset agreement. I know that our position is that we are going to seek German financing of certain facilities which up to this point we have borne the burden on.

How successful we will be, sir, I cannot tell you.

Senator SYMINGTON. If it gives us any impetus, in case you are one of the negotiators—if not, I wish you would tell them—we have been negotiating that way for 23 years, and I have yet to see any major change in the general situation.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I appreciate the validity of that remark, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. I thank you very much for saying that, because we are running out of money.

Incidentally, I heard only last week that in the last year or so 22 countries have gone off the dollar as representing their currency. Even though they have these fixed rates of exchange formally, the person who has just come to Europe and goes in the store over there, the rates are a great deal worse from his standpoint than the fixed rates, unless he goes to the bank.

Mr. HARRINGTON. My reports are that if you go into a store or some other place other than an exchange or a bank, you lose at least 10 to 25 percent over there.

Senator SYMINGTON. Over the formal rate?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Over the formal rate.

OFFSET AGREEMENT

Senator SYMINGTON. I should now like to ask about the status of the offset agreement in Germany. As I recall, in December 1971, the Federal Republic of Germany agreed to provide 600 million deutsche marks, what then amounted to about $183 million, for barracks rehabilitation in Germany. Last year you estimated that there would still be an unfunded requirement of about $40 million for the Army, and some $9.6 million for the Air Force.

What is the status of this program, and what effect has the devaluation of the dollar had on the program, particularly insofar as your unfunded requirement is concerned?

Mr. SHERIDAN. The offset agreement, as you pointed out, provided 600 million deutsche marks for the barracks rehabilitation; 183 million deutsche marks remain to be obligated out of that 600 million. That covers 26 kaserenes. The projects at all 26 kaserenes have been advertised, and contract awards are expected in the next 3 months.

Senator SYMINGTON. Where are those kaserenes located?

Mr. SHERIDAN. They are scattered through the country.

Senator SYMINGTON. If you have received this money, and if there has been this heavy reduction in the value of the dollar, then you need more money, do you not?

Mr. SHERIDAN. These are deutsche marks. And not being an economist, I cannot answer that.

Mr. HARRINGTON. That is right, sir. The agreement was for the expenditure in deutsche marks, so that the exchange rate was not affected.

Mr. SHERIDAN. We use their money.

Senator SYMINGTON. So in spite of the further fall in the value of the dollar, we do not need any additional money because they agreed to do it at the whole price out of the contract; is that right?

Mr. HARRINGTON. That is right, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

Mr. SHERIDAN. We will need more to complete the program, that covers two-thirds of the total program, so we will need one-third more. So that would involve further negotiations.

Senator SYMINGTON. You mean the 183 million?

Mr. SHERIDAN. The 600 million; 183 remains to be obligated.

Senator SYMINGTON. Does that mean that it remains to be negotiated?

Mr. SHERIDAN. No, that has been negotiated. That is 183 of the 600 million deutsche marks in the current offset agreement. That will cover about two-thirds of the total facilities needed. So what would be negotiated would cover the other one-third of the kaserenes.

Senator SYMINGTON. So you have an additional 300 million to negotiate?

Mr. FLIAKAS. It is about $117 million, or 382 million deutsche marks.

Senator SYMINGTON. 382 million deutsche marks, or $117 million that remains to be negotiated?

Mr. FLIAKAS. To complete the barracks program. We hope to get it in the next offset agreement.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is the status of that negotiation? When do you expect to complete it?

Mr. SHERIDAN. It will take about 90 days, sometime in the winter, in early calendar 1974.

There have been preliminary discussions, but nothing formal.

Senator SYMINGTON. When did those negotiations start, roughly?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Those discusions started early this year.

Senator SYMINGTON. The longer the negotiations go on the more it is going to cost American taxpayers; is that a fair statement?

Admiral DILLON. No, sir.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Not if they are deutsche marks, because we do not buy the deutsche marks; if we bought the deutsche marks it would.

Senator SYMINGTON. As I understand it, you have a previous agreement that, regardless of the value of the dollar, they are going to produce certain things for you?

Mr. SHERIDAN. They had agreed to provide a specific amount of deutche marks for barracks rehabilitation at a number of kaserenes.

Senator SYMINGTON. And they are going to do it regardless of any relationship of their currency to our currency?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. If you make that commitment, then, what are the negotiations about?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I cannot guarantee that the Germans will agree to do it all, that is what I am saying.

Senator SYMINGTON. I am only saying that if you and I bought two cars, and we are going to buy a third, and in the meantime currency has fallen, if you say that it does not make any difference what the

value of what I have is as against what you have for the third car, you already have a deal, then what are you negotiating?

Mr. SHERIDAN. What I am trying to explain is that the Germans may want to put their emphasis to support offset in another area.

Senator SYMINGTON. How do you mean?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Other than the rehabilitation of barracks.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do we leave it up to them where they are going to spend the money?

Mr. SHERIDAN. No.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then how can they do it?

Mr. SHERIDAN. We still try to work out an agreement.

Senator SYMINGTON. Where else would they put their money? If it was not in construction, would they put it in something else?

Mr. SHERIDAN. They could.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the outline of the negotiations includes a very large area for procurement in the United States as an offset. So this is another area where they might wish to put more emphasis rather than construction.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you repeat that, please?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I say, within the framework of the negotiations, there are various elements to be negotiated within the total deutsche mark package. One of the areas is procurement, and it is a rather large area in terms of total deutsche mark value.

So what Mr. Sheridan is saying is that in the negotiations the Germans may wish to put more procurement, put more of the total dollar package against procurement rather than construction. And this will be one of the subjects of the negotiation.

Senator SYMINGTON. I see. In other words, as far as this large third is concerned, they may say we want to buy more tanks?

Mr. HARRINGTON. That is correct, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Instead of more housing; is that it?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Right, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. So you are not sure yet whether you are going to get this money for the housing at all?

Mr. HARRINGTON. No, sir. This is one of our objectives.

Mr. SHERIDAN. We are hopeful, but we are not positive at this stage.

Mr. HARRINGTON. This promises to be a tough negotiation from what they tell us.

Senator SYMINGTON. Have they given you any idea that makes you think that they may want to change to some formal procurement?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Not me, sir. I am not that close to it. Perhaps Mr. Bergold can respond to that more definitely.

Senator SYMINGTON. From their standpoint, you would rather buy a tank presumably, but from our standpoint you would rather have better military housing.

I have seen some of that housing over there, and it is still horrible.

Mr. BERGOLD. I think they are still pretty much making up their mind, Mr. Chairman, and they are looking at both of these things. Until we get a Cabinet decision from the Federal Republic sometime in September on this, we probably will not know just what their decision is.

Senator SYMINGTON. For the record, what is that decision going to be?

Mr. BERGOLD. A negotiating position for the Federal Republic so that we can begin negotiations, and we can then get an outline of what their preference is. So far as we know now, they continue to aim at the kaserenes program.

I think what these gentlemen are saying is that the possibility exists that they may divert into procurement, which is also an area of interest to them.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would procurement involve what they did previously; namely, purchase American bonds?

Mr. BERGOLD. That is another area, sir, which we are looking at very closely. And purchasing long-term securities is another area. I think when we talk about procurement, we are talking more about material and equipment.

Senator SYMINGTON. And those bonds would bear interest, would they not?

Mr. BERGOLD. Yes.

Senator SYMINGTON. As Senator Mansfield said in his speech, we would be paying them in order to defend them, would we not, if they buy our bonds?

Mr. BERGOLD. There are certainly arguments on both sides on that proposal. But we have not formulated what our proposal is going to be exactly on the securities, either in terms of interest rates or duration.

Senator SYMINGTON. Nor do we know what their response to our proposal will be, do we?

Mr. BERGOLD. Definitely not.

Senator SYMINGTON. So from the standpoint of the way this has gone in the past, we might as well write off this until we know more facts?

Mr. BERGOLD. I would have to leave that to Mr. Sheridan.

Senator SYMINGTON. Is that not correct, Mr. Sheridan?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes: I would think so. That is why I say we are not positive we are going to get it.

Senator SYMINGTON. Has any effort been made by the Department of Defense or the State Department to get the Federal Republic of Germany to further implement this program?

I would imagine, based on our discussion, that the answer would be yes.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. But we have no concrete answer yet, is that correct?

Mr. SHERIDAN. That is right.

Senator SYMINGTON. Last year Congress granted the authority but denied the funds for about $5.5 million for repairs to family quarters in Germany. This committee felt that these repairs should be made by the Germans under an offset agreement. Has progress been made along this line?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Fliakas is in charge of our housing.

Mr. FLIAKAS. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you are referring to certain boiler conversions in family housing in Germany. We are still continuing to maintain and operate the housing as best we can, but without the boiler conversions.

There is, as a result of the devaluation, as mentioned earlier, an estimate of some $18 to $19 million that will have to be absorbed out of our maintenance program because of devaluation.

In addition we are proposing for the new offset agreement, that there be additional housing approved, because we have a sizable deficit in Germany. We are proposing that the FRG sponsor additional housing as part of the offset agreement.

Senator SYMINGTON. You say "sizable deficit." Sizable deficit of what?

Mr. FLIAKAS. Of housing for eligible personnel in Germany. This is for Army family housing, sir, as opposed to the bachelor housing that we were discussing earlier.

Senator SYMINGTON. And you propose that we get better housing in order to defend the country with better quarters for our troops, is that right?

Mr. FLIAKAS. In this case, sir, it is for dependents?

Senator SYMINGTON. For dependents?

Mr. FLIAKAS. That is correct.

Senator SYMINGTON. And what is their answer to that?

Mr. FLIAKAS. This is another part of the offset agreement that we hope will be considered.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

GERMAN REAL ESTATE TAXES

In 1966, the State Department and the Department of Defense concluded that the United States was legally obligated to pay local German real estate taxes on off-base military family housing. Now I understand the FRG is attempting to apply this to property and for nonappropriated fund activities such as officer and NCO clubs, base exchanges, et cetera.

Is that correct?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Senator SYMINGTON. What justification do they give you for additional taxes on the soldiers that are over there, the sailors and the airmen, to defend them; what is their argument?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Their argument is based on German court decisions, which find that under German law the United States is liable for local land tax on that type of installation. We recognize no such obligation, and the administration feels that there is a strong legal case that the U.S. Government is not obligated to pay or reimburse the FRG.

So we are at an impasse on that at the present time.

Senator SYMINGTON. We are at an impasse, but we are over there and they are not over here, right?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. The German court, I would imagine, would be sympathetic to the Germans.

Mr. SHERIDAN. I would think so. They have been in the past. Their decisions have shown that.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would say so. I know of some matters that had to do with NATO along these lines.

What do these taxes amount to, anyway?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Do you have any idea?

Mr. HARRINGTON. No, sir; I do not. I think they are relatively minimal—I hesitate to use that word, but I think they are less than several million dollars to us.

Mr. FLIAKAS. The tax, sir, for family housing that we have been paying is $2.9 million per annum.

Senator SYMINGTON. You see, you add up these relatively little amounts $8 million and $75 million, and $40 million, and then you look at our balance-of-payments situation, which is deteriorating very rapidly, and it sort of makes you wonder what the purpose of it is.

When I was in Germany 2 years ago we found that American GI's could not get a job on the base, our base, for their wives, because the Germans demanded the right to have all those jobs go to German women. The way I found out was, a young GI from Missouri came up to me and told me about it. He said, "I came over here to defend this country, I am drafted, I did not want to come, I have no children and I have no money. My wife is with me and she cannot get a job."

So I asked the general in command of the base, and he said, well, we pay a little more than the Germans do, and they want everything they can get.

We had six million unemployed in this country, and they were importing people from all over the place, including from behind the Iron Curtain, to work in Germany.

So it was hard for me to understand that. I checked it out and found it was also characteristic of the whole base structure in Germany. It seems like we have the same kind of a problem here, too.

Incidentally, the next day in the paper over there I read a lecture from the German Finance Minister as to how we were handling our economy; that we were not handling it too well, we were spending too much money, and so forth and so on.

So that is some of the thrust of these questions.

I would just like to know what we are going to do as the value of the dollar continues to drop, as anybody living in this country knows only too well, and even more so if they live over there.

Will you supply for the record, then, if you do not know, what these taxes amount to annually?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Although the local (land) governments of the Federal Republic of Germany have sought to levy taxes on U.S. off-base properties operated as community support activities, i.e.; commissaries, post exchanges, clubs, etc., the United States has argued in positions taken with the Federal Government that we are not legally obligated for such taxes, and has resisted payment. At the present time the only such local taxes which the U.S. is currently paying are those levied against U.S. dependent family housing and these are estimated at approximately $2.7 million yearly.

Senator SYMINGTON. Also, what steps have you taken in detail to seek relief from this year's claim on the part of these local people?

I presume there are local governments involved.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. For the Army and the Air Force, you are asking for about $18.4 million for Germany this year, including two or three new schools or additions to existing ones. Would it not be prudent to defer some of these projects pending that outcome of the talks soon to start between the United States and Russia with a view to reducing troop strengths in Europe?

Mr. SHERIDAN. There was some thought given to that. But the decision was made within Defense that since this $18.4 million for new schools is needed right now for dependents who are there with inadequate, crowded schools, it was decided that this should be a portion of

the 1974 military construction authorization. Then when we have definite knowledge of these types of facilities, we feel the authorization should be retained as part of the military construction 1974 bill.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would not argue about that.

Mr. SHERIDAN. I have seen the schools, and they are terrible.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would point out that each year, for the last 8 years, the argument against pulling any troops out of Germany has been that we were in the process of negotiating a new balanced force reduction.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE

This year you are asking $80 million for NATO infrastructure, as opposed to $58 million granted last year. You told us recently that you had run out of authority and that devaluation of the dollar had resulted in a $43 million deficit.

Is the increase in your request this year the result of this?

Mr. SHERIDAN. When the 1974 budget was prepared last fall, the NATO infrastructure obligation of the United States was estimated at $60 million for 1974. The additional $20 million to reach the $80 million was to provide sufficient balance of unfunded authorization to cover the first few months of fiscal year 1975, pending the enactment of fiscal year 1975 legislation.

This cannot be considered the case now, because the U.S. fund requirements have been increased, as Mr. Harrington said, by $42 million, as the result of the two recent dollar devaluations. The additional $42 million requirement is being partly met by the recent $20.6 million reprograming, action for fiscal year 1973, plus the deferral of $12 million in projects——

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Sheridan, will you file that for the record—whatever it is you are reading from?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

At the time of preparation of the President's FY 1974 budget last Fall U.S. obligations for NATO Infrastructure were estimated at $60 million in FY 1974. The additional $20 million requested—to reach $80 million authorization—was to provide sufficient balance of unfunded authorization to cover the first few months of FY 1975, pending enactment of FY 1975 legislation. This can no longer be considered the case, however, since U.S. fund requirements have been increased by some $43 million as a result of the two recent dollar devalautions. This additional $43 million requirement is being partly met on an immediate basis by the recent $20.6 million reprogramming action for FY 1973, plus deferral of some $12 million in projects from FY 1973 to FY 1974, and a concerted effort to squeeze as much unutilized authorization as possible out of existing balances of unliquidated prior obligations.

Senator SYMINGTON. And now would you answer my question yes or no.

I will repeat the question.

You told us recently that you had run out of authority and that the devaluation of the dollar had resulted in a $42 million deficit. Is the increase in your request this year the result of that?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Partly.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then will you file for the record what part of the addition—as I have it here, you say 60, I have 58, but whatever it is, what part is due to devaluation?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Projects of $12 million have been deferred. So it would be the difference between $20 and $12, $8 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

As we recall, the U.S. contribution to NATO is a little over 29 percent. Here we are over there, with all our problems over here, and all our problems in the Far East, and all our bases all over the world, and we are still putting up 30 percent of this money, even though, with the possible exception of Japan, these countries of Europe are the most prosperous countries today in the world.

What steps, if any, are being taken to reduce the amount of the U.S. contribution to NATO?

Mr. SHERIDAN. It is the intention in the next 5-year period to seek a reduction from the just under 30 percent level to approximately 20 percent.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why do we not just do it? They are our troops, and it is our money.

Mr. SHERIDAN. It is still covered by negotiations, and our Government does not come to a conclusion and arbitrarily tell the other government what our position is flatly; they try to negotiate. And that is a field I wish you would not get me into, Mr. Chairman, because I am not very knowledgeable in State Department negotiations with foreign countries.

I do not know if we have someone with us who can answer that.

Senator SYMINGTON. Who can answer?

Mr. BERGOLD. I think the answer, Mr. Chairman, is that we are talking about in this case a multilateral NATO negotiation instead of a bilateral situation.

Senator SYMINGTON. We have been talking about it for 15 years to my certain knowledge, and I think for all of the 21 years I have been on this committee we have been talking about it.

Mr. BERGOLD. But we have to negotiate again for the new agreement, which would begin in 1975, with all of the NATO allies, to work out the proportional share of each member. As Mr. Sheridan said, our intention is to seek a substantial reduction of the U.S. contribution at that time.

Senator SYMINGTON. It is our money, is it not?

Mr. BERGOLD. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why do we not say, we have made you very rich in the 25 years since we were fighting, and we just cannot afford to pay you 29 percent. It is your country you are defending; why do we not just say that?

Mr. BERGOLD. It is our intention to say that, Mr. Chairman, but we are obligated to the present levels unless it is an agreement.

Senator SYMINGTON. We are going to substantially reduce this amount, are we not?

Mr. BERGOLD. We are going to make that position very clear.

Senator SYMINGTON. What do you mean, make it very clear?

Mr. BERGOLD. We are going to make our position very clear that we intend to seek a reduction.

Senator SYMINGTON. Are you saying that we intend to reduce it, or that we intend to try to reduce it? Because we have been intending to try to reduce it for 15 years.

Mr. BERGOLD. We intend to try to reduce it substantially. I cannot guarantee the results of the negotiations.

Mr. SHERIDAN. The U.S. basis for negotiation is being developed, and it is going to be presented to the Armed Services Committee shortly.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, you would make a very able negotiator for our side.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would say this, Mr. Harrington: If the negotiator can negotiate like the average private businessman does, maybe we would have better results. I do not understand this, and I have been trying to understand it.

I have nothing but sympathy for everybody in the world, but perhaps a little more for our people, as we watch the dollar go down the drain. And a sound economy and a sound dollar is just as important to national security as the latest weapons system. I know you will agree to that.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

GREECE—HOME PORT

Senator SYMINGTON. We have some other questions here I would like to ask on Greece; we had an interesting development on Greece. I am on the Foreign Relations Committee, and we decided that we would not give any more foreign aid to Greece. And that went through. Them all of a sudden the Defense Department said that in order to maintain morale in the fleet in the Eastern Mediterranean they have to have a home port in the East Mediterranean—I believe I am stating it correctly. If I am not I will correct the record.

So they recommended that we establish a base at Athens.

So we asked them if they needed any money to do this. They assured us that, no, there was no money involved, and that there were facilities there erectable and so on. It is all on the record. They were adequate facilities and very little, if any, money would be needed. So on that basis, after the aid program was turned down in one committee, in effect it was granted through the heavy addition of money through this other transaction incident to the base in Athens. We would like to ask a few questions about the home porting of this carrier task force in Greece.

Let me first run down what we have spent thus far in carrying out this program, and what additional cost we may expect.

Last year we were advised that the one-time cost would not exceed $14.4 million, and the annual recurring cost would be no more than $13.7 million. Where do we stand on that?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I would like to ask Admiral Gaddis.

Admiral GADDIS. I am Vice Admiral Gaddis of the Navy, sir.

That is precisely correct, as to our estimate. Our current projection with revised estimates in the same program is that our initial cost we now estimate at $13.7 million vice $14.4, sir. The annual recurring cost is now $11.3 million vice the $13.4 that was testified to a year ago, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, Admiral.

Under date of July 16, the committee received a notification from Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bowers that the Navy proposed to

use emergency construction authority to reprogram funds to provide aircraft support facilities at Elevsis, Greece, at a cost of $1.948 million. I advised both Secretary Bowers and Admiral Zumwalt that we considered this procedure wrong, and that this project should be considered by this subcommittee at any other military construction project.

I consider this matter of sufficient importance to take up now, rather than when Navy line items are heard.

Would you let us know just what are the justifications for this project, what is the urgency, and what kind of an arrangement do we have with the Greek Government for use of an airfield?

Admiral GADDIS. We have a letter from the Greek Government certifying their agreement in principle for our use of the airfield. We would have to install this $1.948 million military construction on the airfield, sir.

The specific facilities I would like to put a little of in the record. It consists principally of a preengineered hanger plus such things as hard stand, fuel, and support for some 16 personnel at the airbase.

The proposal we felt was justified as a reprograming action, but we have absolutely no objection, Mr. Chairman, to its being incorporated in the 1974 military construction program. This would represent a minor delay in start time, and it would be manageable, as we envision the program, sir.

[The information follows:]

The scope and estimated cost of the airfield facilities at Elevsis are as follows:

Facility	Scope	Estimated cost
Nose hangar (4 aircraft)	9,000 square feet	$180,000
Maintenance shops and administration	16,000 square feet	285,000
POL storage (JP-5)	94,000 gallons	176,000
Aircraft parking apron	27,500 square yards	220,000
Aircraft washrack	1,000 square yards	65,000
Compass calibration pad	5,000 square yards	45,000
High-power turnup pad with deflector	2,000 square yards	21,000
Bachelor enlisted quarters (16 men)	2,400 square feet	72,000
Optical landing system hardstand	1 each	26,000
Liquid oxygen storage	1,000 gallons	25,000
Mobile maintenance facility hardstands	8 each	10,000
E-28 arresting gear	1 each	65,000
Water supply and storage	100,000 gallons	175,000
Electrical distribution lines	9,000 linear feet	350,000
Roads, security fencing, lighting, draining and site improvements	LS	233,000
Total		1,948,000
Naval construction force labor (non-add)		1,700,000

Senator SYMINGTON. We have a letter dated April 6, 1973, from Major General Papavassiliou of the Hellenic Air Force Command to Major General Ryder, CHJUSMAAG, Athens, Greece.

DEAR GENERAL:

1. In reply to your oral inquiry about utilization of Elefsis Airfield by USN carrier-based aircraft during CV RAV periods, I have to inform you as follows:

a. In principle, Elefsis Air field will be made available to satisfy aforementioned requirements.

b. Utilization of Elefsis Airfield has to be considered in conjunction with Phase II of Sixth Fleet homeporting. Consequently, although preparatory work may start at an earlier stage, the Technical Agreement on utilization of Elevsis Airfield cannot be signed before Phase II Homeporting Technical Arrangements is signed.

c. In due time you will be notified to inviting authorized officers of the USN who will participate in the appropriate discussons.

2. I hope that this letter answers, for the time being, your questions on the availability of Elevsis Airfield within the framework of Phase II Homeporting Technical Arrangements.

Do you know that letter?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

It was the one I was referring to, sir. And I would note that the technical agreement for phase I involving the escorts for the carrier, between the Greek and U.S. Governments, was signed at the Navy level. It is expected that the phase II agreement will be written as an amendment to the existing arrangement.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

I have a letter of August 3 from Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bowers which I ask unanimous consent be placed at this point in the record.

[The letter of August 3 follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1973.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Senate Armed Services Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of July 24, 1973 to the Chief of Naval Operations, I will provide the information requested.

The Navy thoroughly agrees that the homeporting of a task force in Greece is a very important matter that should be reviewed and acted upon by the Committee as a whole. The Navy is ready to provide fact sheets and briefings for the Committee members as desired. It is further understood that the requirement for homeporting of a task force in Greece will be addressed during the forthcoming hearings on the FY 1974 Military Construction Program.

To clarify the aspect of costs are discussed in our prior correspondence, reduced to its essence the Navy initially estimated and presented to the Congress the costs of homeporting as $14.4 million in initial costs and $13.4 million in recurring costs. Under an identical cost technique, our current estimates of these same costs, refined by reason of our experience of the last year, are $13.7 million and $11.3 million, respectively, including the aircraft support facilities project of $1.948 million. The above does not include the cost of a carrier pier with a preliminary estimate of $13 million. Our firm plan is that this pier, when programmed, will be requested under the NATO Infrastructure program. A detailed breakdown of the current estimate for initial and recurring costs is provided by enclosure (1). The benefits received from homeporting a carrier in Greece, even in a total cost/benefit analysis, are heavily weighted on the side of the benefits, which are an improvement to the Navy's worldwide readiness posture and its ability to carry out NATO commitments. Although not readily quantifiable, we are positive the costs of homeporting in Greece will be returned in a short time through improved retention.

The arrangements with the Greek government are reflected in a letter received from the Hellenic Air Force of April 7, 1973 which approved "in principle" the Navy use of the Elefsis Airfield and implied that details will be worked out after Congressional approval of the project. A copy of this letter is provided as enclosure (2).

I trust the above data satisfactorily answers all the questions of fact, but if not, my staff is ready to provide any other information desired.

Sincerely yours,

JACK L. BOWERS,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Installations and Logistics).

COMPARISON OF NAVY ESTIMATES

[In millions of dollars]

	Recurring costs		Nonrecurring costs	
	Original	Current	Original	Current
1. Additional PCS	3.5	4.093	3.0	
2. Dependent support ship	2.5	.914	10.8	10.650
3. Expansion and operation of USAF facilities	2.8	3.015	.2	.296
4. Port operations, charter, hire and pier costs	3.0	1.182		.050
5. Logistics costs	1.7	2.700		.714
6. Transportation/vehicle maintenance	(1)	(2)		
7. Leased transient berthing	(1)			
8. Airfield operations	1.0	.400	.4	1.948
Subtotal	14.5	12.304	14.4	13.658
Savings from reduced transits	1.1	1.000		
Total	13.4	11.304		

[1] Costs are insignificant.
[2] Included in logistics costs.

Senator SYMINGTON. That letter has a sentence, "The above does not include the cost of a carrier pier with a preliminary estimate of $13 million."

Do you have any thoughts on that?

Admiral GADDIS. It has been for a number of years one of our desires to, sometime in the future, build a carrier pier in the Mediterranean so that the carriers assigned in the Mediterranean, normally two at a time, would be able to go cold iron during the time that they are in port to do maintenance on their engineering plant and various areas of the ship that you cannot work on when you are steaming.

Obviously if we are to homeport a carrier task group in Athens, Athens becomes a prime candidate spot for the development of such a NATO infrastructure project. That project has not been submitted as of this date, and it is not anticipated in the immediate future. But it is something that we would like to work into the NATO construction program at a later time.

Senator SYMINGTON. Even though the rapid developments in missilery—air to sea, sea to sea, and perhaps above all, land to sea, because most all of the northern littoral of Africa is not in the hands of countries that are either Communist or sympathetic to communism, there is no change in the position of the Navy with respect to carriers in the Mediterranean.

Admiral GADDIS. We still have the firm commitment to maintain two carriers task groups in the Mediterranean.

Senator SYMINGTON. Commitments to whom?

Admiral GADDIS. It is a matter of national policy and commitments to NATO, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Can't we use those commitments to NATO to get a little better deal in Germany, as we were discussing a few minutes ago?

Admiral GADDIS. I would like the gentleman from ISA possibly to handle that. My personal estimation is that we have been reasonably successful in the past in our negotiations with Germany. Obviously we would like to do better than we have.

Senator SYMINGTON. But you say the negotiations to date have been quite successful?

Admiral GADDIS. I say we have been reasonably successful, I think, personally.

Senator SYMINGTON. Reasonably successful?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

Last year when the Navy was asked to submit their estimate on the cost of the homeporting, they gave a figure of $400,000 for aircraft support facilities. How do you reconcile that with your current estimate?

Admiral GADDIS. At the time that that estimate was made sir, it was based on the hope—we did not have any specifics—on the hope that we would be able to use Greek facilities. The survey which has since been conducted indicates that there are no excess facilities available, that those facilities that would support the maintenance of aircraft of the homeported air wing would have to be built from the ground up. This proposal of $1.948 million is what we consider a fairly austere total facility utilizing preengineered buildings and performing the construction with Seabee labor.

Senator SYMINGTON. It was $400,000 and it is now a million nine?

Admiral GADDIS. It was $400,000 based on the use of Greek facilities rather than in this case now, one time MILCON cost of $1.948 million, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. I don't mean to quibble about this, but I was in on this when it started; and I know what happened in the other committee.

I warned that the facility in Greece was bound to cost more, but I didn't get very far.

Admiral GADDIS. We have made reductions at various places in the program that, even though this is a single increase, provide decreases to offset this increase so that our expenditures are still within our projected totals.

Senator SYMINGTON. Of $13.7 million?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Admiral Zumwalt, in a letter to me, stated that the Navy was evaluating cost estimates to arrive at a more precise estimate, and preliminary data indicate costs may be reduced to $5.4 million initial, including airfield construction costs, and $10 million recurring. Yet we were earlier advised that $13,700,000 had already been spent on one-time costs, including the airfield construction, and $11,300,000 on annual costs.

How do you reconcile this, particularly when your estimate to convert the ship *Sanctuary* as a personnel support facility was $10.8 million?

Admiral GADDIS. The reason for Admiral Zumwalt's revised figures involves the question of the categorization of the figures. In the $13.7 million one-time and $11.3 million recurring costs of which he speaks we have, we feel, been most hard on ourselves in including all costs that anyone could attribute to Athens. In the letter he detailed that portion of those costs which we are prepared to stand behind which are strictly assignable to Athens.

For example, take *Sanctuary*. He feels that strictly attributable to Athens should be only those reconfiguration actions on *Sanctuary* that were aimed specifically at that assignment, and that the total

cost of rehabilitation, which was $10.65 million, the balance of those costs should be assignable to the general Navy programs just as costs involving any other ships that go into commission is assigned.

In other words, it is a matter of emphasis rather than a change in the total cost.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are in the process of leasing a pier for the use of the *Sanctuary* and the destroyers now in Greece, for around $1 million per year.

What are your intentions insofar as providing a pier for the carrier?

How will it be funded?

Admiral GADDIS. The plan for the carrier, sir, is for it to anchor off, as all carriers, in the Mediterranean, do now all over the Mediterranean. As we discussed earlier, there is the possibility in the future of asking for a Mediterranean carrier pier in NATO infrastructure. We have no intention of unilaterally attempting to build a carrier pier at Athens.

Senator SYMINGTON. Have any steps been taken to enlarge or increase existing Air Force facilities in Athens to accommodate Navy dependents?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

We have an interservice support agreement with the Air Force through which we have provided them in fiscal year 1973 some $644,000, and in 1974, an estimated $1.634 million, for lease costs, civilian salaries, and operating costs, which are the result of the use by Air Force facilities of Navy dependents.

Senator SYMINGTON. Have those costs been considered a part of this homeporting?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. What part will Souda Bay, Crete, play in this homeporting?

Admiral GADDIS. The only thing involved in Souda Bay, Crete, is if and when the carrier is homeported at Athens. During those periods when she is in port for restricted availability, and therefore the air wing cannot fly for maintenance of proficiency from the carrier, we would conduct proficiency flying in the Souda Bay area, which is an extremely fine area for all of the kinds of training that the carrier air wing would require. We would commute to Souda Bay from the Elevsis Airfield for that proficiency flying. This would be for two 30-day periods and two 21-day periods a year while the carrier was homeported, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

ICELAND

The Navy and the Air Force together are requesting about $13.5 million for operational facilities, troop housing, and 150 units of family housing for the NAS Keflavik, Iceland. Isn't it true that a new agreement must be worked out with the Icelandic Government quite soon, and that there is some doubt that we will be permitted to remain in Iceland?

Mr. SHERIDAN. We are hopeful that the new agreement will be satisfactory. It is true that it is being worked out right now.

Senator SYMINGTON. Shouldn't we defer this construction expense pending the outcome of the new agreement?

Mr. SHERIDAN. We wouldn't proceed with the construction until the agreement was negotiated safely.

Senator SYMINGTON. So the construction is dependent upon the agreement, is that right?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

BASE CLOSURES

Senator SYMINGTON. How much are you requesting in this bill for projects resulting from the base closures announced in April?

Mr. SHERIDAN. $53,158,000. That is $4,504,000 for the Army; for the Navy $45,499,000; for the Air Force, $3,155,000.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much more do you contemplate?

Mr. SHERIDAN. None, in fiscal year 1974.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you want to comment on that, Admiral?

Admiral GADDIS. I would note that in the Navy we have the need for additional military construction in the 1975 program, obviously not programed to date, of approximately $30 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you all get together and get this straightened out?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Is that in the 1975 program?

Admiral GADDIS. We are hopeful of submitting it for the 1975 program.

Senator SYMINGTON. After you do get that straightened out will you supply us a figure for the record?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

The Navy FY 1975 Military Construction Program is not yet firmly formulated. It is probable that some $30 million in base closure-related items will be included in the final program to be submitted to Congress. However, this is not yet determined.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you supply for the record a list of projects showing what closure realinements generated the requirement?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

List of projects included in the fiscal year 1974 military construction program that are associated with base closures

Installation, State, and item	*Cost*
Army:	
Fort Rucker, Ala.: Upgrade airfield facilities	$534,000
Fort Wainwright, Alaska:	
Relocation of activities to south post	1,965,000
BOQ modernization	750,000
Atlanta Army Depot, Georgia: Security fencing	119,000
Memphis Defense Depot, Tennessee: Medical equipment, maintenance facility	456,000
Fort Eustis, Va.: Supply and administrative facilities	680,000
Total	4,504,000

	Cost
Navy:	
NSA, Brooklyn, N.Y.:	
BEEQ modernization	$1,056,000
Relocate teletype switchboard	75,000
NSY, Philadelphia, Pa.:	
Computer support facility	180,000
Electronics equipment facility	735,000
NAS, Norfolk, Va.: Helicopter maintenance hangar	2,525,000
NS, Norfolk, Va.:	
Relocation of flight landing	803,000
Dredge southside pier 2	314,000
Vehicle parking area	310,000
Applied instruction building	3,950,000
FCDSTC, Dam Neck, Va.: Applied instruction building	5,959,000
MCSC, Albany, Ga.: Administrative building	5,204,000
NAS, Cecil Field, Fla.:	
Intermediate maintenance building	2,845,000
Weapons system training facility	791,000
NAS, Jacksonville, Fla.:	
BOQ modernization	850,000
Bachelor enlisted quarters	1,494,000
NAS, Memphis, Tenn.: Applied instruction building	4,478,000
NS, San Diego, Calif.: Berthing pier	10,000,000
NAS, Miramar, Calif.:	
Avionics shop addition	331,000
Applied instruction building	1,123,000
NAS, North Island, Calif.: Applied instruction building	476,000
NSY, Hunters Point, Calif.: Dry dock support facility	250,000
NSY, Mare Island, Calif.: Electronic shop alterations	200,000
NAS, Moffett Field, Calif.:	
BEQ modernization	500,000
Parking apron	750,000
Fuel storage	300,000
Total	45,499,000

Air Force

Little Rock AFB, Ark.: Aircraft maintenance docks	1,165,000
Keesler AFB, Miss.:	
Alter aircraft operational apron	865,000
Add to and alter maintenance hangars	1,125,000
Total	3,155,000

April 17, 1973, base realinement list

Service and installation	*Relocation plan*
Army:	
Fort Wainwright (north portion) Fairbanks, Alaska.	Consolidate on southern portion of post.
Valley Forge General Hospital, Pennsylvania.	To Fort Detrick, Md., and other Army hospitals. To be determined.
Charleston Army Depot, Charleston, S.C.	Contingency supply packages and petroleum stock missions to Anniston Army Depot, Ala., and rail stock storage mission to New Cumberland Army Depot, Pa.
Fort Wolters, Mineral Wells, Tex.	Helicopter training to Fort Rucker, Ala.

April 17, 1973, base realinement list—Continued

Service and installation—Con.	*Relocation plan*—Continued
Navy:	
Naval Shipyard, Hunters Point, San Francisco, Calif.	Relocate portions to Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.; Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Calif.; Naval Support Activity, Vallejo, Calif.; and to Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Va.
Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif..	Relocate portions to Naval Station, San Diego, Calif.; Bremerton, Wash.; Charleston, S.C.
Naval Undersea Center, Pasadena, Calif.	To Naval Underwater Center, San Diego, Calif.
Torrance Annex, Naval Supply Center, Long Beach, Calif.	Disestablish.
Naval Station, Key West, Fla.....	Relocate portions to Naval Air Station, Key West, Fla.; DSRON–18 to Mayport, Fla.; Fleet Sonar School to Norfolk, Va.; Underwater Swimmers School to San Diego, Calif.; ASR Det, ASR–16 and 1 SS to Norfolk, Va., and 1 AR Det and 1 SS to Charleston, S.C.
Naval Air Station, Albany, Ga....	Flying units and selected other units relocate to Naval Air Station, Key West, Fla.
Naval Air Station, Glynco, Brunswick, Ga.	Relocate portions to Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.; Dam Neck, Va.; and Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tenn.
Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass.	Portions to Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa.; Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Va.; Naval Supply Center, Charleston, S.C.; and Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Va.
Chelsea Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.	To various other naval hospitals.
Naval Support Activity, Boston, Mass.	Disestablish.
Naval Support Activity, Fort Omaha, Nebr.	Disestablished.
Naval Hospital, St. Albans, N.Y....	Portions to Navy Hospital, Portsmouth, Va.; Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa., and Naval Hospital, Charleston, S.C.
Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, Pa.	Marine Corps construction and other to Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Ga.; 4th Marine Corps District elsewhere in Philadelphia.
Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R.I.	Relocate units to Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Mass.; Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.; Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.; and Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, R.I.
Naval Communications Station, Newport, R.I.	Portion to Naval Schools Command, Newport, R.I.
Naval Public Works Center, Newport, R.I.	Do.
Naval Station, Newport, R.I.....	Do.
Naval Supply Center, Newport, R.I	Do.

April 17, 1973, base realinement list—Continued

Service and installation—Con.	*Relocation plan*—Continued
Air Force:	
Hamilton Air Force Base, Novata, Calif.	Fighter Interceptor Squadron to Castle AFB, Merced, Calif.; Aerospace and Recovery Squadron to McClellan AFB, Sacramento, Calif.; and Aircraft Delivery Group to Mather AFB, Sacramento, Calif.
McCoy Air Force Base, Fla	Elements of Refueling Squadron to McConnell AFB, Wichita, Kans., and Lockbourne AFB, Ohio; Detachment of Airborne Early Warning Control Squadron to Homestead AFB, Fla.; and Air Division to Blytheville AFB, Ark.
Forbes Air Force Base, Pauline, Kans.	1 C–130 squadron to Dyess AFB, Abilene, Tex.; 1 C–130 squadron to Little Rock AFB, Jacksonville, Ark.; MAC Aerial Cartographic and Geodetic Squadron to Keesler AFB, Biloxi, Miss.; and School Squadron to Kirtland AFB, N. Mex.
L. G. Hanscom Field, Mass	Relocate portion to Kirtland AFB, N. Mex., and other to Westover AFB, Mass.
Otis Air Force Base, Mass	Inactivate SAC satellite activity. Civilianize communications and weather facilities.
Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.	Refueling Squadron to Plattsburgh AFB, N.Y. and Pease AFB, N.H.; Defense Systems Evaluation Squadron to Dover AFB, Del., and Civil Engineer Squadron to McConnell AFB, Kans.
Ramey Air Force Base, Aguadilla, P.R.	Weather Recon Group to Keesler AFB, Miss.
Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Tex.	No unit relocations.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

AICUZ

Under your program to protect certain airbases from encroachment we granted you $52.4 million in authority last year, and you are asking for another $31.3 million this year. While I realize you are asking funding for only a small portion of this, I would like to see a reduction in the authority granted.

What has been your experience over the past year in working out zoning arrangements with local authorities? In other words, how much of the authority thus far granted has been used?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I would like to ask Mr. Roche from our real estate office in OSD to respond to that, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Chairman, presently we have authorizations to protect the approaches to the Marine Corps Air Stations at El Toro and Santa Ana, Calif. Additionally we have the authority in last year's program to insure compatible use at the Air Force bases at Altus, Okla.; Tinker, Okla.; and Williams, Ariz. To date no money has been expended against any of these. The acquisition for the Marine stations was to be strictly by exchange. On the Air Force program, $2 million was funded against the authorization.

Senator SYMINGTON. You haven't spent any money yet, why can't we defer this? We needed $52.4 million last year, and you haven't spent any of that $52.4 million. Why do you need $31.3 million?

Mr. ROCHE. As far as the Marine Corps Air Stations are concerned, the Department of the Navy attempted to negotiate with the two major land owners, Irvine and Rossmoor. The Rossmoor property has just been the subject of a suit by Rossmoor against the United States. And a claim awarded for an allegedly unjust taking through zoning. As far as the Air Force is concerned, they have been working very strenuously on zoning, and we think we may have a solution to the problem there.

Senator SYMINGTON. We will give you E for effort, but if you haven't spent any money yet and you had $52 million, why would you need any more money in this budget?

Mr. ROCHE. The $52 million authorization, which included $2 million appropriation, was earmarked for five specific installations: MCAS El Toro and Santa Ana and the three Air Force bases just mentioned: Altus, Tinker, and Williams. These authorizations, if not used or funds obligated against them, will expire under the repealer provision of section 705b Public Law 92-545 on January 25, 1974. The repealer provision with regard to El Toro and Santa Ana has already been extended once. It is our interpretation that the specific authorizations in last year's act cannot be applied to the 13 new Air Force installations for which compatible use protection is sought in this year's bill.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much is that total, roughly?

Mr. ROCHE. I believe it is about $26 million worth.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you supply that figure for the record?

Mr. ROCHE. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

The Air Force authorization in the FY 1973 Act is $12,000,000 of which $2,000,000 is funded. New authorizations in the amount of $26,300,000 with an appropriation of $2,000,000 are being requested for the Air Force in the FY 74 bill.

BOLLING/ANACOSTIA COMPLEX

Senator SYMINGTON. Now I want to inquire about the status of construction at Bolling AFB here in the District of Columbia. Over the past couple of years the Congress has authorized and appropriated for around $34 million in construction for this site, which includes over 1,000 units of badly needed family housing. You are asking another $1.5 million this year, yet I understand little, if any, of this construction has been placed under contract due to either the objections or procrastination of the National Capital Planning Commission. This is not the first time this group has caused costly delays in construction approved by Congress.

Will you comment on this?

Mr. SHERIDAN. It is not the first time that we have been held up at Bolling, Anacostia, with our authorized program. But the National Capital Planning Commission does have the legal authority over our plans pursuant to Public Law 684, dated June 20, 1938. We have filed a final environmental impact statement with the Council on Environmental Quality on July 26.

We can proceed with about $6 million any of that $34 million of construction, Mr. Chairman; for the rest we would have to have relief,

congressional relief from the authority that the NCPC has now to hold up on it.

Senator SYMINGTON. You have Andrews, and Patuxent, and Dulles, and National, and a lot of problems with space.

Why do you need Bolling?

Mr. SHERIDAN. The main purpose of Bolling at the present time is for a defense center for the three services. That plan was presented to the Congress in June 1972. And we felt that the plan would provide the most logical development at one central location. Andrews doesn't have the space for further development at the present time.

Senator SYMINGTON. You know how crowded we are for land around here, and I get complaints from all these various congressional committees interested in the District of Columbia development, and the Defense Department has so many places.

Couldn't we put this somewhere else, with all the bases we have? I am not suggesting putting it abroad. But I don't see why, especially since we are closing so many bases over here, if we can take $250 million the other day out of the payroll of the smallest State in the Union, and naturally that has upset the people that live up there, especially some of them that worked up there for generations on this work, and defense work, why can't we put this somewhere else, why do we have to have that at Bolling?

Mr. SHERIDAN. The plan that was presented in 1972 went into all the alternatives of other locations. It is really a support activity, basically, for troops that are stationed in this area. So long as they are stationed here——

Senator SYMINGTON. How do you mean a support activity for troops stationed in this area?

Mr. SHERIDAN. The family housing and the barracks and facilities of that type.

Senator SYMINGTON. How many troops have you got stationed around it?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I will have to furnish that for the record.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you furnish that for the record?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

As of June 30, 1972, there were 41,882 enlisted personnel stationed in the National Capital Region.

Senator SYMINGTON. And how many officers have you stationed there?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I will have to furnish that at the same time.

Senator SYMINGTON. Furnish that for the record.

We are getting awfully crowded around here. You can tell that by how many miles you travel in the metropolitan area when you go into Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. SHERIDAN. That is right.

[The information follows:]

As of June 30, 1973, there were 30,339 officers stationed in the National Capital Region.

Senator SYMINGTON. Is there some way we could work this out? I have had a lot of letters of complaint from various people about it.

There are no further plans except what you have told us, is that correct?

Mr. SHERIDAN. That is correct, sir.
Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Sheridan.

DEFENSE AGENCIES—TITLE IV

Title IV, the requirements for the defense agency.
Will you summarize that for us?
Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.
I have statements which I would like to have your permission to place in the record by the Director of each one of the agencies.
Senator SYMINGTON. Without objection.
[The statements referred to follow:]

OPENING REMARKS, MR. EDWARD J. SHERIDAN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND HOUSING)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the request for activities of the defense agencies totals $17.1 million for new construction and rehabilitation of existing facilities at 12 installations. The proposed construction for the Defense Agencies is as follows:

1. *Defense Nuclear Agency* ($0.6 million) to provide for a Advanced Research Electromagnetic Pulse Simulator (ARES) Support Building at Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico; and a DNA Administration Building at the Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site, Las Vegas, Nevada.

2. *Defense Supply Agency* ($8.4 million) to provide for an improved electrical distribution system, and a truck entrance and control facility at the Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio; medical material climatic controlled storage, upgrade restroom and lunchroom facilities and a troop subsistence support facility at the Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania; ventilation of warehouses at the Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee; upgrade restroom facilities at the Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah; an operational equipment maintenance facility, fire station and improvement and modernization of the water system at the Defense Depot, Tracy California; a photographic materiel storag facility and a Defense Fuel Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia; a parking lot at the Defense Logistics Services Center, Battle Creek, Michigan; quality control laboratory improvements at the Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and facility improvements at the Regional Office, Defense Contract Administration Services, Chicago, Ill.

3. *National Security Agency* ($8.1 million) to provide for relocation of shop facilities, logistics support facility, modernization of bachelor enlisted quarters, and an automated waste collection system at NSA Headquarters, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.

Witnesses for the Defense Agencies are present and prepared to provide details as required in support of the projects for which authorization is requested.

We appreciate this opportunity to appear before you.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS B. WOOD, USAF, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS, NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am pleased to appear before you today to present the National Security Agency Construction Budget for Fiscal Year 1974. We request approval in that year for four projects at Fort Meade, Maryland at an estimated cost of $8,156,000.00.

A principal mission of the National Security Agency is the organization, operation and management of certain activities and facilities for the production of intelligence information. The successful conduct of these vital activities requires facilities meeting the specialized needs of our missions. Our FY 1974 Construction Program includes one project for the improvement of troop facilities and three projects responsive to mission requirements.

The first project is for the Relocation of Shop Facilities at a cost of $742,000.00. Space requirements for computers, a principal item of concern to NSA, have re-

sulted in extensive consolidation and relocation of attendant activities. Now the machine space in our Operations Building is virtually depleted and we also have a potentially hazardous condition from a safety standpoint. Shops which have toxic and explosive characteristics are adjacent to the computer complex. The FY 1974 construction project proposes to relocate these shop activities from the Operations Building to another building, which will not only remove the hazard but also will provide needed space for computers.

The second project is for the construction of a Logistics Support Facility at a cost of $3,529,000.00. The National Security Agency's logistics activities are decentralized, and therefore more costly to operate and maintain, because of the present lack of suitable facilities. The closure of Fort Holabird will eliminate marginal storage facilities which have been used by the Agency. Last year, the extra vehicle and manhour costs resulting from the decentralized operations at Fort Holabird and other locations are estimated at nearly $100,000.00. Our FY 74 construction project will consolidate at Fort Meade these dispersed activities in a facility specifically designed for this purpose. Additionally, it will give us a capability for direct rail deliveries to reduce double handling of paper stock and will permit NSA to make better use of GPO bulk purchasing procedures which will achieve further savings by taking advantage of industry's season price fluctuations.

The third project is for the Modernization of Bachelor Enlisted Quarters at a cost of $1,945,000.00. This barracks was built in the early 1950s to accommodate about 500 men in large open bay areas and is now substandard by current criteria. The military personnel at NSA work around-the-clock shifts. Men assigned to one shift are trying to sleep while those on other shifts may be coming and going on other personal or official matters. The result is a constant turmoil which jeopardizes the productivity of the troops and renders the quarters unacceptable for modern military forces. This project will alter the existing facilities into one-man rooms with private baths and two and three-man rooms with shared bath to provide the privacy and quiet needed for the men. The project will also isolate all troop command and recreational functions in the converted unit mess area.

The fourth project is for the construction of an Automated Waste Collection System at a cost of $1,940,000.00. The disposable classified material generated by NSA and associated Defense components is currently between 34 to 40 tons daily. Increasing amounts of material requiring disposal and the rising costs for labor and security control measures to handle its disposal has resulted in a significant problem for the Agency. The resolution of this problem requires the implementation of new and ingenious techniques. The system proposed by NSA in this FY 1974 construction project will automatically transport this material from pick-up points to the collection facility under a high degree of security and will eliminate nearly all of the manpower assigned to transporting and security control. The expected reduction in operating costs will amortize the proposed system in five years.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, this is our FY 1974 Construction Program for which we are requesting $8,156,000.00. I will be pleased to answer any questions you may have concerning these projects.

Family Housing

Brig. Gen. Thomas B. Wood, USAF, Assistant Director for Installations and Logistics, National Security Agency

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. I am pleased to appear before you today. This Agency's request for Family Housing, Defense Appropriation in FY 1974 totals $965,000.00. This budget includes $304,000.00 for operating and maintenance expenses of 91 sets of family quarters located on an installation operated by this Agency at a classified location overseas. The remainder of $661,000.00 is to cover costs of 172 leased units occupied by Agency personnel. Two of these leases are used by our senior representatives at London, England and seven others by our representatives at various other locations. They require suitably located quarters for the accomplishment of their assigned functions. The remaining 163 leases are used by the personnel located at the aforementioned overesas installation because the number of family quarters on station is inadequate to handle the assigned Agency work force.

The FY 1974 budget request of $965,000.00 for NSA family housing requirements reflects an increase of $225,000.00 from the FY 1973 funding level. This results primarily from rising costs of leased quarters and also increased utility and labor rates applicable to the maintenance and operation of both leased and government owned quarters. The FY 1974 budget also contains funds for a major maintenance project involving the replacement of exterior siding on 33 on-Post units. The siding on these units has been severely damaged by the weather and presents a safety hazard to the occupants. The rest of the FY 1974 increase results from inclusion of this project.

NSA does not have a budget request for the construction of family housing in FY 1974.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. DARRIE H. RICHARDS, U.S. ARMY DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

I am appearing today in support of the agency's fiscal year 1974 military construction program to request approval of 15 projects for nine defense supply agency installations at a total cost of $8,370,000. I will now highlight the urgency of the various line items.

Two of the projects are at Columbus, Ohio. One of them (on page 15) provides for the conversion and improvement of an unsafe substandard primary electrical distribution system. Approval of this project will alleviate prevailing hazardous conditions and ensure the continuity of essential supply center operations.

The other project (on page 16) at Columbus provides for the construction of a new truck entrance and control facility. The existing truck entrance, located in an urban sector of the community, creates traffic congestion and presents safety hazards. Execution of the project is in consonance with road and highway developments being performed by the city of Whitehall and the Federal Highway Administration and will resolve traffic problems and improve safety.

Three of the projects are at Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania. The first on these (on page 18) provides for a controlled temperature facility for medical materiel storage. Medical materiel requiring chill and freeze facilities is presently stored in sixteen (16) refer type units located in three (3) buildings. The current operation involving medical stock necessitates manhandling and therefore is costly and inefficient. Approval of this project will facilitate operational efficiency through the use of forklifts and consolidation of location.

The second project (on page 19) at Mechanicsburg, provides for the upgrading of restroom and lunchroom facilities. Present facilities, constructed during World War II, do not meet present health and quality standards. Approval of this project is needed to improve morale and working conditions for 1,050 employees in twenty three (23) buildings.

The third project (on page 20) at Mechanicsburg, provides for facility expansion to accommodate the increased mission and workload assigned to defense depot Mechanicsburg for overseas direct troop subsistence and commissary support. Approval of this project will permit consolidation and mechanization of operations under one roof and result in savings that will amortize the project in less than four (4) years.

Next is a project (on page 22) which provides for the ventilation of six warehouses at Memphis, Tennessee. Approximately 600 personnel employed in these warehouses are being subjected to noxious fumes from MHE and other equipment due to inadequate ventilation. This project is to eliminate an environmental health hazard, improve the morale of 600 people and increase operational efficiency and effectiveness.

The next project (on page 24) provides for upgrading or restroom facilities at Ogden, Utah. Existing facilities constructed during World War II have become substandard. In addition, building use changes and the gradual increasing employment of women have generated additional facility requirements. Approval of this project will result in the modernization of twenty (20) restrooms and the construction of eleven (11) additional units for the benefit of 3,200 men and women employees.

There are three projects at Tracy, California. The first (on page 26) provides for construction of an operational equipment maintenance facility. Equipment maintenance is presently performed in six (6) buildings, five (5) of which are temporary structures, unsafe and deteriorated beyond economic repair. Approval

of this project will improve maintenance operations, eliminate excessive costs, improve safety and consolidate the maintenance functions into two buildings.

The second project at Tracy (on page 27) provides for the replacement of an inadequate fire station. The present fire station is housed in a temporary wood frame building constructed in 1943. This building is structurally unsound and is beyond economical repair. This project is to provide an efficiently designed facility and eliminate the need for continually maintaining an obsolete, deteriorated, unsafe structure.

The third project (on page 28) at Tracy provides for improvement of existing water and sewage facilities. Present systems are deficient to the extent that potential health hazards exist and continued uninterruptible service is questionable. Approval of this project will correct deficiencies, eliminate health hazards and restore water and sewage system reliability.

The first of two projects (on page 30) at Richmond, Virginia, provides for a photographic materiel storage facility. Currently, the photographic storage mission is being performed in an unreliable, obsolete cold storage plant located 15 miles from the supply center. Approval of this project will provide for a modern refrigerated facility at the supply center, ensure continued mission capability, avoid $100,000 repair expenditures, reduce operating costs by $85,000 annually, and result in project amortization within two (2) years.

The other project (on page 31) at Richmond provides for construction of office space to house the Defense Fuel Supply Center, presently located at Cameron Station, Alexandria, Virginia. The operations of this activity are such that location within the national capital region is not required. Approval of this project will provide a new facility for the Defense Fuel Supply Center and permit DSA to comply with the Department of Defense plan to reduce activities in the national capital region.

There is a project (on page 33) which provides for improvement of a parking lot at Battle Creek, Michigan. The existing condition of this parking lot, which is utilized on a 24-hour, seven day per week basis, is totally substandard, hazardous and subjected to numerous incidents of theft and vandalism. Approval of this project will permit the upgrading of an existing facility for approximately 390 vehicles, reduce vandalism and theft, improve the safety and morale of men and women employees and permit full utilization of the parking lot during inclement weather.

There is also a project (on page 35) to provide for quality control laboratory improvements at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. At present approximately 85 personnel are required to perform laboratory tests on clothing and textiles under adverse environmental conditions in a poorly lighted, inadequately ventilated facility. Approval of this project will provide for the installation of proper climatic controls, new lighting and freight elevator to ensure a safe and efficient work environment.

The last project (on page 37) provides for improvement of office and restroom facilities in Chicago, Illinois. At present defense contract administration personnel are required to perform office type functions in an inadequately lighted and ventilated facility. Approval of this project will permit the renovation of restrooms, provide for additional air conditioning and other building alterations to upgrade working conditioning and improve the morale of 750 personnel.

OPENING STATEMENT, FISCAL YEAR 1974 DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman: I am Earl L. Eagles, Director of Logistics, Defense Nuclear Agency. I am pleased to appear before this Committee to present that Agency's Fiscal Year 1974 Military Construction.

For our Fiscal Year 1974 program, we request $574,000 for two projects as follows:

At Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex. ARES support building	$374,000
At Atomic Energy Commission, Nevada Test Site, Las Vegas, Nev. DNA administration building	200,000
Total request	574,000

The DNA Advanced Research Electromagnetic Pulse Simulator (ARES) has the capability to produce electromagnetic pulses similar to those resulting from

nuclear explosions. This permits testing of the vulnerability of strategic weapons systems and their components. This project provides an equipment and instrument checkout laboratory, data processing and administrative space needed for efficient operation of the ARES facility. The activities to be housed in this building are currently carried on in corridors, trailers and improvised space which results in increased security problems, loss of data due to poor shielding and overcrowded conditions.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense carry out an extensive underground test program at the Nevada Test Site. This underground testing program was implemented as one of the safeguards imposed for our national security subsequent to ratification of the Limited Test Ban Treaty. A DNA administration building is required at the Nevada Test Site to replace six small quonset huts which have outlined their usefulness and provide substandard accommodations with inadequate latrine and water facilities as well as security and interoffice communication problems created by the functional division of the space into small isolated parcels. The standard of accommodations provided by these DOD buildings is now that provided other activities at the Test Site.

I am prepared to discuss any of the above projects, if you desire.

Mr. SHERIDAN. The total request for the activities of defense agencies total $17.1 million for new construction and rehabilitation of existing facilities at 12 installations. And the statement explains in detail what the requirements are. And we are available to answer any questions you may have on that.

PREPARED QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR SYMINGTON

Senator SYMINGTON. If we have any we will supply them for the record.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[Questions submitted by Senator Symington. Answers supplied by Department of Defense.]

Question. With respect to the Defense Agencies Justification book on page 6, Defense Nuclear Agency, Kirtland AFB, New Mexico, ARES Support Building. Would you explain to us just what the Advanced Research Electromagnetic Pulse Simulator program is all about.

Answer. The Advanced Research Electromagnetic Pulse Simulator (ARES) simulates the electromagnetic pulse (EMP) produced by a high altitude nuclear burst. Therefore, the ARES facility provides to the Department of Defense (DOD) the capability of testing strategic systems such as missiles, small aircraft and satellites to the effects of high altitude EMP. Before going further into the ARES program it is appropriate at this time to define why this testing capability is required. Although EMP is one of many nuclear weapons effects produced by a nuclear explosion, it is unique in that it can disable electronic circuits at distances where other nuclear weapons effects cause no damage. The damage to electronics is caused by the EMP transferring its energy to the missile, aircraft or satellite and therefore generating undesired electrical signals throughout components of the system. The potential result of this is that mission effectiveness is reduced or destroyed. Specifically, missile systems can go out of control, aircraft guidance and communications systems can become non-operational, and satellites can go silent or become unresponsive to commands. Due to these potential hazards it is necessary to harden our strategic systems to EMP and then test to verify that the system can survive. In addition, the information gained from testing is then applied to the design and fabrication of future systems.

The ARES program has supported the DOD needs for EMP hardness by conducting, over the past three years, tests of the SPRINT, SPARTAN and Minuteman missile systems. In February 1974 testing of the Air Force's FB–111 bomber will begin, followed by various satellite systems commencing with the Navy's Fleet Communications Satellite in early 1975.

Question. Turning to page 30 of the book, Defense Supply Agency, Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia. I notice that this project for the Defense Fuel Supply Center will permit you to remove certain activities from Cameron Station to Richmond in consonance with the Department of Defense's long-range plan to reduce the number of military activities in the National Capital

Region. I agree that this is a good move, but isn't there some kind of existing quarters these people might use in Richmond rather than building a new building; perhaps through a leasing arrangement?

Answer. There are no existing facilities which would adequately meet this requirement.

An economic analysis was developed by the Defense Supply Agency for the purpose of evaluating the various options for relocating the Defense Fuel Supply Center to Richmond, Virginia. The Analysis considered:

1. Renovation of an existing warehouse building.
2. Use of leased space.
3. The construction of a new structure.

The analysis indicated that construction of a new building at the Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, would be the most economical alternative.

Question. On page 39 in the book, National Security Agency, Logistics Support Facility, Fort Meade, Maryland. What kind of equipment and supplies are stored here? What type of storage space is now being used? Why must the cafeteria be furnished?

Answer. NSA will store electronic equipments, spare parts, sensitive cryptologic materials and standard supply items. Additionally the building will be used to consolidate the NSA logistics maintenance, support and procurement functions at one location for greater efficiency of operation.

NSA is currently using 17 wooden WW II buildings constructed originally for Army use at widely dispersed locations on Fort Meade. Additionally NSA has interim use of a WW II substandard warehouse at Fort Holabird.

Since the Logistics Support Facility will be located in the industrial section of the NSA Complex at Fort Meade, it will be isolated from dining facilities located in the Headquarters and Operations Buildings. The cafeteria included in this project will provide food service for approximately 500 persons assigned in the Logistics Support Facility and other buildings located in the same area.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Senator SYMINGTON. Now we go to general provisions, title VI, Mr. Sheridan.

Will you comment on that?

Mr. SHERIDAN. The general provisions follow the pattern of the previous years of the necessary language changes that are made each year to complete the development of the bill. But we have two provisions in this year's bill on the acquisition of land interests.

Mr. Roche, would you comment on that, please?

These are new provisions.

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Chairman, the first proposal would amend section 2676 of title 10 of the United States Code to permit us to exchange property through GSA, in those limited number of cases where it would be feasible and desirable to do so.

Section 2676 of title 10 now says that no military department may acquire real property without specific authority. While we have been able to use the GSA authority for those properties now in their inventory, we cannot ask them to go out and acquire title to new properties.

The second provision would amend section 2672 of title 10 to provide the Secretary of Defense with a flexibility to respond to unforeseen encroachment problems. In essence it would be a type of contingency authorization.

Senator SYMINGTON. Since none of these seem to be controversial, we will provide you a list of questions relating to the proposed changes and ask that you answer them for the record.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The questions are as follows:]

Question. Section 604: This section relates to the execution and award of construction contracts. This year you propose a change to accommodate the selected use of one-step competitive negotiation procedures (Turnkey) as an acceptable alternative to competitive award based upon the lowest responsible bidder.

Will you explain the reason for this proposed change, and what advantages might accrue to the government as a result? This committee has long urged the use of Turnkey procurement particularly in the area of family housing.

Answer. The reason for the change is that the general provisions in their present form require that contracts be awarded insofar as practicable on a competitive basis to the low bidder. Under our one-step procedure we do receive competitive price proposals or bids, but the award is made to the bidder whose combination of price and technical proposal offers the maximum advantage to the government. Award may thus be made to other than the low bidder when advantageous. We believe it desirable to clarify the language of the general provisions to authorize the controlled use of one-step procedures as an alternative to conventional competitive bidding.

We feel that one-step procedures offer significant advantages in procurements for which standard designs or products used in the private sector will satisfy our requirement. As an example, consider a project for industrial lighting. Rather than designing the project, under one-step we would outline our performance requirements (lighting intensity, minimum bulb life, etc.) and allow contractors to use standard designs and select fixtures and other components which are commercially available as a basis for their proposals and bids. One-step procedures offer a means for increased direct participation by industry with potential advantages of reduced cost and improved functional solutions.

Question. Section 605: This section has the effect of repealing all unused construction authorization outstanding after a period of approximately two years, including family housing. Heretofore family housing has been treated separately, and the repeal date has been 15 months after the enactment of the authority.

While I know of no good reason why family housing should not be treated the same as other construction authority, I am wondering why the change is requested at this time, and why family housing has been treated differently in the past?

Answer. In the past, most family housing projects were formally bid based on Government prepared plans and specifications. Because of the availability of advance planning funds, most projects were ready for advertisement upon enactment of appropriations. Even if unacceptable bids were received, and a project had to be rebid, with or without design changes, the 15-month authorization life was generally adequate. Recently two factors have resulted in the 15-month period being inadequate in many cases; namely, the trend toward turnkey procurement, and the requirement to delay contract award until 30 days after the filing of the final environmental impact statement. In cases where the initial effort to obtain satisfactory responses to the turnkey request for proposals were not satisfactory, extended delays have been involved in either generating adequate interest or developing plans and specifications for formal advertising.

Question. Section 606: This section places a cost limitation on bachelor housing. You are asking for a little over a 5 per cent increase this year. The current square foot limitation is $27 for permanent barracks, and $29 for bachelor officer quarters. You propose to increase each of these by $1.50 per square foot. Only last year we permitted you to estimate your cost on a square foot basis, as opposed to a cost per man basis, in order to give you more flexibility.

Why is the increase proposed this year necessary?

Have you had difficulty in placing any of last year's projects under contract at the current price?

How much does this increased cost add to this year's budget request?

If we grant a new limitation it will, of course, apply to previously authorized projects not yet placed under contract. How many such contracts are outstanding, and what does the dollar volume amount to?

Answer. The increase in the statutory limit of about 5 percent for bachelor housing is being requested to reflect the cost escalation in construction which has been experienced the past years. As of the present, the Engineering News Record building cost index has increased about 8 percent over the past 12 months.

We have had some difficulty in placing some of last year's projects under contract under current cost limitations. As of the present, it has been necessary to waive the statutory cost limitation for three fiscal year 1973 barracks projects

The proposed increase of $1.50 per square foot to the current statutory limitations for bachelor housing projects inside the United States adds about $10 million to the budget request. Anticipating the enactment of this new limitation on October 1, 1973, we will have outstanding at that time 17 projects for permanent barracks at an estimated cost of $37,374,000 and 3 projects for bachelor officers' quarters at an estimated cost of $3,671,000. Although the new limitation provides a higher statutory ceiling for the living quarters, the total authorization for each project remains unchanged.

Question. Section 607: I understand that this section is in the nature of a technical amendment to permit the granting of utility and power line easements at Camp Pendleton, Calif.

Would you explain the need for this?

Answer. Section 708 of Public Law 92–545 restored to the Secretary of the Navy his authorities to grant leases, licenses or easements on Camp Pendleton pursuant to his authority in chapter 159 of title 10 United States Code. This authority had been cancelled earlier by section 709 of Public Law 92–145 when the requirement was enacted that no land constituting Camp Pendleton would be sold, transferred or disposed of unless authorized by law. In the restoration of the Secretary of the Navy's ability to make outgrants under section 708 of Public Law 92–545 his authority to issue easements under other authorities such as powerline easements pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 961 was inadvertently overlooked through the limited reference to chapter 159 of title 10 of the United States Code. Section 607 of of this year's bill would restore to the Secretary of the Navy all of his outgranting authorities.

Question. Section 608: This section is entirely new and falls into three parts. As I understand paragraph 1, it is designed to permit you to report to the Congress all minor construction projects annually, rather than semi-annually as in the past. I see no objection to this, and it will undoubtedly result in some manpower savings.

Paragraph 2, as I understand it, will give the Department authority to accept real property acquired by the General Services Administration pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. This may be done without specific authorization by the Congress.

Why do you feel you need this authority, and what do you expect to gain if it is granted?

Answer. Under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the General Services Administration is authorized to obtain privately-owned real property interests in exchange for Government-owned real property interests and transfer such interests to other Government departments. Because of the Provision of 10 U.S.C. 2676 which states: "No military department may acquire real property not owned by the United States unless the acquisition is expressly authorized by law," there exists a serious question as to whether the military departments may acquire from GSA any real property interest obtained by GSA via their exchange authority without separate, express statutory authority to do so. This proposed amendment to 10 U.S.C. 2676 would make clear that the military departments would not need separate acquisition authority in those cases where it would be feasible and desirable to accept certain real property interests acquired under the GSA "exchange" authority. This would be in such cases as boundary or encroachment adjustments over $50,000 in value, conversion of interior leaseholds to fee estate, etc. Any proposed acquisition over $50,000 under this amendment would be reported by the military department concerned to the Armed Services Committees 30 days in advance under 10 U.S.C. 2662. In addition, if the Government-owned real property exchanged by GSA had been obtained by it by virtue of the property being declared excess by a military department for this purpose or otherwise, such excess declaration over $50,000 would have been first made known to the Armed Services Committees. Further, any such exchange of real property interests accomplished by GSA would continue to be under the surveillance of the Government Operations Committees of the House and Senate pursuant to Section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. In this manner, close scrutiny by the Congress of such arrangements would be assured.

Question. What safeguard will the Congress have to be certain you are not acquiring unneeded real property through this procedure?

Answer. Section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, states among other things, that the Secretary of a military department may not acquire fee title to any real property if the estimated price is more than $50,000 until after the expiration of 30 days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the acquisition is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives. Through this reporting requirement, we believe that the Congress would be fully informed and could express its judgment if it thought the authority was being abused or that unneeded real property was being acquired.

Question. If approved, it would give you broad general authority to acquire land regardless of cost if the Secretary of Defense deemed it in the interest of national security, and without specific authorization by the Congress. Under Title 10, USC—2672, the Secretary of a Military Department can now do this if the cost does not exceed $50,000. Also, under Title 10, 2677, the Secretary of a Military Department can acquire options on land prior to specific authorization. I described earlier, sufficient to protect the government's interest?

Why do you need this additional authority? Isn't the existing authority, which I described earlier, sufficient to protect the government's interest?

Answer. The authority in Section 2672 of Title 10 U.S. Code does give us a flexibility to respond to the small encroachment but is limited to $50,000. With escalating land values, the threats of encroachment from large land owners could far surpass this amount. Section 2677 of Title 10 is also a good tool in that it permits us to acquire options in advance of authorization and funding to purchase. Its application is limited, however, to the willingness of the land owner to negotiate. You cannot acquire an option, per se, by eminent domain action. The flexibility of the new paragraph 3 would allow us to respond quickly to unforeseen threats to our multi-million dollar installations. We would expect to use this authority judiciously and only for imminent threats which could not await orderly MILCON programming.

Question. Give us examples where you feel this additional authority might be helpful.

Answer. This contingency type authority would provide the Secretary of Defense with a flexibility to respond to unforeseen encroachment threats to military installations resulting from such things as capricious changes in the zoning of land areas around these installations or expanded development to more intensive use of already improved areas. Under present practices, the acquisition of minimum land interests to assure compatible use must be included in a military construction program, the timing of which could run from 9 to 15 months. In the interim, construction incompatible with operational requirements of an installation could be initiated. The amendment would provide a contingency authority in the Secretary of Defense to acquire those minimum land interests, the need for which were not anticipated and which cannot wait orderly programming action. As an example, we are now faced within an unanticipated change in the zoning of the agricultural land at one end of the Jacksonville, Florida Naval Air Station to highrise condominium and apartment use. Another situation could arise where a highrise office building which would penetrate the Aircraft Glide Plane is scheduled to replace a one story bowling alley or some other similar low profile commercial or industrial structure. The proliferation of master TV antennae or other communication towers is another situation facing us as urban encroachment expands.

Question. We have given you considerable authority the past couple of years to acquire land under your "Air Installation Compatible Use Zone" program. For example, last year the Air Force was granted $12 million for this purpose, most of which I understand has not been used; and this year the Air Force is requesting about $26 million more.

If this amendment is approved, shouldn't the last sentence include the words "exchange of land owned by the United States"? I should think this might be particularly pertinent under your "Air Installation Compatible Use Zone" program.

Answer. We would agree that while "exchange of land owned by the United States" could be implied in the phrase "or otherwise" its addition to this sentence does make it more specific. We would caution, however, that our use of the new authority requested in paragraph (3) of Section 608 is intended to be used only in unforeseen or contingency situations and that we would continue to program

in increments through the Annual Military Construction Program those foreseen Air Installation Compatible Use Zone land requirements.

Senator SYMINGTON. At this point I should like to submit for the record a statement from Senator Mansfield.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D.-MONTANA)

Mr. Chairman: It is a pleasure to appear before the Committee this morning to discuss a matter of great importance to a number of my constituents in Montana and to provide additional information pursuant to my letter to you of July 27, 1973.

During construction of the ABM complex near Conrad, Montana, a water supply and transmission system was built to serve the proposed missile facilities. When the SALT agreements halted further construction of the Montana project, the water line was 100% complete. Recognition by state officials and people within the local community that the line would probably become surplus to Government needs and may even be dismantled resulted in a study to determine the feasibility of conversion to a rural water system. The proposed system would use the existing ABM water line which was designed to take water out of the Tiber Reservoir and pump it 3.8 miles to the new abandoned PAR site. There it is filtered, chlorinated, and placed in underground storage reservoirs. The water is then pumped southwesterly, a distance of 23.3 miles, to the MSR site. Using the ABM main line pump stations and reservoir as a backbone, a complete system of mains has been designed to serve all dry land farm homes in the area.

Some confusion may have resulted concerning the dismantlement implications of the ABM Treaty. In order to assure myself that the pipeline proposal is compatible with the SALT agreements, I asked the Secretary of State on June 28 whether the ABM Treaty could in any way be interpreted as prohibiting civilian utilization of the Tiber Reservoir pipeline. I would like to submit a letter dated July 31 from Marshall Wright, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. The Committee will note that it is the Department's view that the pipeline proposal is not incompatible with the provisions of the Treaty.

Serious attention has been given to seeking a "balance in economics" in the conversion of this system to civilian utilization. The area to be served is essentially arid, non-irrigated wheat and livestock production land with limited access to badly needed subsurface water. The initial thrust in the conversion I have discussed is to provide water for ranch buildings and livestock use. It may be possible in future years with improved technology and installation of additional equipment to provide limited irrigation water via this system.

In comparing this proposed rural water system to systems which have been built in other states such as Kansas and the Dakotas, it is necessary to recognize the difference between the rolling terrain around Conrad and the table flatland of the other states. This contributes to a per mile cost which is significantly higher than that encountered elsewhere.

We know that the Federal aid situation relative to financing of rural water systems is in a state of flux now. Most rural water projects which have been constructed in the past few years have relied on outright grants from the Farmers Home Administration and other agencies of the Federal government.

With the current reduction in the availability of Federal dollars the grant process for application to this project is impossible. The Farmers Home Administration can, however, make long-term loans for the construction of rural water systems. The Montana group interested in the Tiber line is currently discussing with the Farmers Home Administration the possibility of 50% financing.

I appear today to ask the Committee's favorable consideration of a proposed new Section to the Military Construction Authorization Bill for FY 1974 to assist in securing a direct Federal fund allocation which will bring the local costs for conversion of this surplus line down to a financially feasible level. The 269 ranchers who would be served by this system have indicated a ready willingness to assume encumbrance of one half of the project cost.

I am sure the Committee will recall that at the time the Administration requested authorization for ABM construction that the citizens of Montana in general opposed the selection of the State as a site. However, once the decision was made, Montanans accepted their responsibility to again make a contribution to the national defense. The abrupt closing down of the ABM missile project

in the Conrad area has resulted in a severe financial impact. In recognition of this problem, the Committee last year approved Section 610 which, I might add, has been of great assistance to my constituents in adjusting to the situation in which they find themselves.

The Tiber water line has cost the government to date in excess of $4 million. I have been advised by the Department of Defense that it has no further military application. No other Federal agency has indicated an interest in the line. Unless the proposed conversion takes place, the expenditures to date will result in a total and tragic loss of taxpayers' dollars. The economic realities confronting my constituents make it imperative that Federal assistance be provided to make the project feasible. The need for adequate quantities and qualities of water in this five county area is real.

The firm of Hurlburt, Kersich, and McCullough of Billings, Montana has prepared a preliminary study and report for this proposed Tiber water users system. This report accompanied my letter of July 27, 1973.

In summary, the new Section I seek will allow the release of previously appropriated Section 610 monies to provide through direct grant 50% of the cost of system conversion. Release of these funds should, of course, be contingent upon a firm commitment from appropriate Federal agencies for financing of the remaining fifty percent.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C. July 31, 1973.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: As I indicated in my letter of July 25, Department officials have been looking into the question you raised in your letter of June 28, 1973, as to whether the provisions of the ABM Treaty could be interpreted as prohibiting civilian utilization of the water pipeline from the Tiber Reservoir to the former Malmstrom ABM site. We have now concluded that implementation of the Treaty should not in any way interfere with such use of the pipeline.

The ABM Treaty deals with the question of dismantling in rather general terms. Article VIII provides that

> ABM systems or their components in excess of the numbers or outside the areas specified in this Treaty, as well as ABM systems or their components prohibited by this Treaty, shall be destroyed or dismantled under agreed procedures within the shortest possible agreed period of time.

The Treaty itself makes no reference to the Malmstrom site. However, Common Understanding B indicates that the one ABM site that the United States will elect to maintain under the ABM Treaty for defense of ICBM silo launchers "will be centered in the Grand Forks ICBM silo launcher deployment area." Therefore, ABM systems and components situated at the Malmstrom site are required to be destroyed or dismantled pursuant to Article VIII of the ABM Treaty.

Article XIII(e) of the ABM Treaty provides for the establishment of a Standing Consultative Commission within the framework of which the parties will

> agree upon procedures and dates for destruction or dismantling of the ABM systems or their components in cases provided for by the provisions of this Treaty.

Article II of the ABM Treaty lists the current components of ABM systems as "ABM interceptor missiles . . . ABM launchers . . . and ABM radars." It is clear, therefore, that the pipeline to which you have referred is not itself a component of an ABM system.

The question, rather, is whether the components at the Malmstrom site can be said to be fully dismantled if the pipeline is allowed to remain in place and fully functional. The Treaty does not, of course, attempt to specify the measures which must be taken with respect to all structures and equipment at fixed installations at which components are to be destroyed or dismantled. Rather, the Treaty provisions quoted above leave to the Standing Consultative Commission the task of developing procedures which will ensure effective dismantling of all components in excess of those permitted under the Treaty. This process is already well underway in the Commission.

While the specific provisions of the Treaty thus provide no direct answer to the question you have raised, the requirement of dismantling and destruction must be read in light of the basic purpose of the Treaty. The Office of the Legal Adviser is of the opinion that no reasonable interpretation could require the

dismantling of so peripheral a part of the ABM installation at Malmstrom as the pipeline from the Tiber Reservoir. This view is fully consistent with the discussions to date in the Standing Consultative Commission with respect to procedures for dismantling and destruction of ABM components in accordance with Article VIII of the Treaty.

The only modifications in the pipeline which might conceivably be required in order to carry out any necessary dismantling or destruction of the presently existing structures for the actual ABM components would be the cutting off and sealing of the immediate connections between the pipeline and certain of the building sites. As we understand it, this would in no way interfere with the civilian uses which are contemplated for the pipeline itself.

I hope this reply will be adequate to your purposes but that you will not hesitate to call on me for any further assistance which may be necessary.

Sincerely,

MARSHALL WRIGHT,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

viz: At the appropriate place in the bill insert a new section as follows:

Sec.—. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to use any unobligated funds, not in excess of $1,500,000, heretofor appropriated to carry out the provisions of section 610 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1971 (84 Stat. 1224) for the purpose of assisting communities near Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, to pay their respective shares of the cost under any Federal program providing assistance for the adoption, to the needs and uses of such communities, of the water system, and appurtenances thereto, installed to support the Safeguard Anti-ballistic Missile site near such air force base.

Senator SYMINGTON. Very well, Mr. Fliakas will now talk about family housing.

FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. FLIAKAS. Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I will submit my total statement for the record and very briefly highlight it this morning.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before these committees to present the military family housing program for fiscal year 1974 as reflected in S. 1797. The programs included in the budget request before you reflect a continuing emphasis being placed by the Department of Defense on the maintenance of our forces and the welfare of our individual servicemen. As stated by the Secretary of Defense, adequate housing is a moral factor of prime importance.

We are pleased to be able to report continued and significant progress in providing more adequate housing on base for upgrading the condition of our existing inventory, and in securing suitable quarters offbase in the community for our military families. These improvements and program increases have been built up by gradually increasing annual increments in our defense programs beginning with fiscal year 1970, and continuing in each successive annual program since then. The authorization request for fiscal year 1974 for the account "Family Housing, Defense" amounts to $1,250,567,000.

A comparison of this year's proposed authorization with pertinent element breakouts for a 5-year span is shown on page 2 of my statement.

You will note that the trend and growth pattern are significant.

The fiscal year 1974 authorization request of $1,250.6 million compares with $1,050.7 million for fiscal year 1973, an increase of $199.9

million, or approximately 19 percent. One of the principal features is the proposed construction of 11,688 family housing units. The number of units for new construction in the fiscal year 1974 program continues the high level attained in the previous 3 years.

Other important elements in this year's construction program are mobile home spaces to provide safe, sanitary, and reasonably priced accommodations for those servicemen who own mobile homes, and a total of $62.5 million in the improvement and alteration of existing public quarters to modernize and renovate older and deteriorated units.

The balance of the fiscal year 1974 request covers minor construction and planning as well as annual costs for leasing, operation and maintenance, and debt payment. The total authorization requested is $423,747,000 for construction requirements, and $826,793,000 for the O. & M. and debt payment portion, or a total of $1,250,567,000.

In my prepared statement, sir, there is considerable detail regarding our programing policy, our request for higher space standards and costs, and the leasing and rental guarantee programs. I will not go into detail on those, but I would like to say that these programs represent our efforts to achieve a balanced program of providing adequate housing for our military servicemen and their families.

I would like to skip, sir, to page 13 of my statement to talk about the amendments to the program.

We are proposing three new amendments to the fiscal year 1974 military construction authorization bill. Those amendments did not receive clearance in time to be included in the committee print before you. The first proposal concerns the conveyance of approximately 57 acres of land and improvements at the Fort Ruger Military Reservation, Hawaii, to the State of Hawaii.

This proposed legislation would replace the original act and would permit the conveyance of this property to the State of Hawaii, and would further permit the value of the Fort Ruger property to be credited to the development costs of a Defense housing complex at the Defense-owned Aliamanu Crater in Hawaii.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Next, sir, I would like to discuss the homeowners assistance program. The second proposal would authorize an additional $7 million to be appropriated for the homeowners assistance program.

Analysis of the April 17, 1973, base realinement announcement indicates that current authorization and appropriations carried over in the Homeowners Assistance Fund are insufficient to indemnify in fiscal year 1974 military and civilian personnel for losses sustained in disposing of their homes.

The third proposal would provide for a modest expansion of the homeowners assistance program to cover personnel currently not eligible for assistance at some installations. These are individuals who are assigned or employed at or near an installation which is being realined, but are not themselves involved in that realinement, and who will relocate because of normal reassignment or routine transfer.

I have touched very briefly, sir, on the main elements of this year's military family housing program. The Department of Defense is

deeply committed to the housing needs of the serviceman, and we will continue to develop and recommend programs to meet these needs.

In summary, I would say that the DOD military family housing program reflects a balanced approach to achieving our objective of decent and adequate housing for all servicemen and their families.

I would like, sir, to express my appreciation for your continuing support for the Department of Defense family housing program. And I am available to answer any questions that you may have, sir.

[Mr. Fliakas' statement follows:]

Messrs. Chairman and Members of the Committees: I am pleased to appear before these Committees to present the Military Family Housing Program for Fiscal Year 1974 as reflected in S. 1797. The programs included in the budget request between you reflect the continuing emphasis being placed by the Department of Defense on the maintenance of our forces and the welfare of our individual servicemen. As stated by the Secretary of Defense, adequate housing is a morale factor of prime importance. The principal objective of this program therefore, is to assure that married members of the Armed Forces have suitable housing. To this end, the objectives of the military family housing program are closely aligned and dovetail with the objectives of the zero draft and the all-volunteer force.

We are pleased to be able to report continued and significant progress in providing more adequate housing on base, for upgrading the condition of our existing inventory, and in securing suitable quarters off-base in the community for our military families. These improvements and program increases have been built up by gradually increasing annual increments in our Defense programs beginning with FY 1970, and continuing in each successive annual program since then. The authorization request for FY 1974 for the account, Family Housing, Defense, amounts to $1,250,567,000.

A comparison of this year's proposed authorization with pertinent element breakouts for a 5-year span is shown below. You will note that the trend and growth pattern are significant:

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—SUMMARY OF SELECTED AUTHORIZED AMOUNTS

[Dollars in thousands]

	Enacted (fiscal year)				Request fiscal year 1974
	1970	1971	1972	1973	
New construction	$105,507	$194,833	[1] $255,740	$270,987	$351,904
(Number of units)	(4,800)	(8,000)	[1] (9,862)	[2] (11,938)	(11,688)
Mobile home facilities	0	1,200	7,280	5,387	5,700
(Number of spaces)	(0)	(439)	(2,350)	(1,403)	(1,340)
Improvements	11,540	19,196	31,668	39,498	62,510
Leasing	23,658	28,684	33,589	37,643	44,703
(Number of leases, end year)	(9,669)	(11,466)	(13,482)	(13,964)	(17,262)
Operation and maintenance	373,219	395,686	440,706	535,842	622,913
Total authorization	688,476	806,464	[1] 915,201	[1] 1,050,741	1,250,567

[1] Includes 430 units for $11,070,000 for Safeguard sites enacted in the DOD Appropriations Act, Public Law 92-204.
[2] Includes 218 units for Safeguard site authorized in Public Law 92-436, but which are to be financed from savings and for which no appropriation was made.

The FY 1974 authorization request of $1,250.6 Million compares with $1,050.7 Million for FY 1973, an increase of $199.9 Million or approximately 19 percent. One of the principal features is the proposed construction of 11,688 family housing units. The number of units for new construction in the FY 1974 program as reflected in Section 501, continues the high level attained in the previous three years and is nearly six times as many new units as were in the program just five years ago. This significant growth has been realized only with the complete support of these Committees without whose cooperation there could not have been the same measure of progress.

Other important elements in this year's construction program are mobile home spaces to provide safe, sanitary and reasonably priced accommodations

for those servicemen who own mobile homes and a total of $62.5 Million in the improvement and alteration of existing public quarters to modernize and renovate older and deteriorated units. The military departments have estimated a backlog of over $700 Million in necessary improvements to upgrade our inventory. I know of no program that will pay quicker dividends and provide such substantial benefits in terms of increased morale to the military families who occupy on-base housing as well as provide increased life and livability to the structures themselves.

The balance of the FY 1974 request covers minor construction and planning as well as annual costs for leasing, operation and maintenance, and debt payment. Total authorization requested is $423,774,000 for the construction requirements and $826,793,000 for the O&M and debt payment portion or a total of $1,250,567,000.

Now I would like to discuss briefly, some of the features of this year's program and to highlight the subjects that are of particular interest to this Committee.

PROGRAMMING

DoD policy with respect to housing our married military servicemen is to rely on the local civilian housing market in communities near military installations as the primary source of family housing. Only when community support is limited or inadequate as to cost, distance, or quality, do we seek authority to construct on-base housing. Particular care has been taken in the programming review to assure that our request for new construction reflects requirements only at hardcore installations. Because of this concentration on hardcore bases, coupled with the recent 5-year buildup of new construction and continued reliance on the local community, our programmable deficit is now estimated to be about 60,000 units. This compares with prior estimates in recent years of 90,000 to 110,000. The reasons for the reduction of the deficit to what is now considered to be a manageable level, are the declining force structure, the contraction of our base establishment and the cumulative effect of recent military pay raises, particularly in the lower grades, which put more community housing within the economic means of our servicemen. As in previous years, we continue to place the most attention of the on-base construction to enlisted and junior officer units. This year's program includes about 11,000 units or 94% of the total program for these categories.

CONSTRAINT ON PROGRAMMING 2-BEDROOM UNITS

Now I would like to say a few words about the bedroom composition of our program requested. Each year, a substantial part of our program has been concentrated on the new construction of 2-bedroom units. This was based on programming calculations using actual surveys at individual bases that show statistically, a need for 2-bedroom units. The military departments have recommended that the proliferation of this size unit in the inventory be controlled and the Congress also has questioned this requirement. In the FY 1974 program, you will see therefore, a programming policy applied to the makeup of the program, which limits the number of 2-bedroom units at any one bas to 30% of the enlisted and junior officer inventory at that base. Our rationale for this is as follows:

First—the 2-bedroom unit is the predominate size found in the local community. The 3- and 4-bedroom units are scarce and those available are normally priced beyond the serviceman's ability to pay.

Second—a military controlled 3-bedroom unit on-base offers more flexibility for assignment purposes. This policy will enhance maximum utilization and flexibility of assignment on post.

Third—as we move toward an all-volunteer force, we expect the troop composition to stabilize. Our statistics based on experience to date, have been largely draft driven. As we develop a more permanent force, more stability in terms of marital rates and consequently, more children will result. So we think that we can look for an increase in bedroom requirements as our force matures and becomes more permanent.

Our conclusion therefore, is to establish a general programming policy that puts a constraint on the number of 2-bedroom units to be normally constructed at any one base. We have established a 30% factor as being realistic and responsive to this concept. We will, of course, look at each installation on a case basis to determine the application of this policy.

INCREASED SPACE LIMITATIONS—SECTION 509

Now I would like to turn to a discussion of the construction standards for the maximum square foot limitation on floor area prescribed for military family housing by the United States Code. As you know, we are constrained by specific maximum limits on size by rank or grade of the military occupant. These limitations have not been upgraded in years with the result that today, we are building to standards that no longer meet the lifestyle of modern day living. Research on civilian housing design trends and a survey of information and opinions of our own military servicemen and their wives as to the adequacy of military housing, indicate a critical need for additional floor area to accommodate contemporary living habits and requirements. As a result of these surveys and analysis of current statutory net area limitations, we are requesting changes which will allow appropriate increases in dining areas, secondary bedrooms, and the bathroom area and the appropriate circulation and storage space to support the enlarged areas. The total impact of the requested increases will be improved overall livability.

We have worked very closely with the military departments on the review of space requirements and have been very selective on the application of increases. A comparison chart showing the current statutory limits and the proposed changes is attached to my statement. The increases range from zero to 11%. For example, we are seeking no change in space criteria for general officers but an increase of 120 square feet or 11% for a 3-bedroom enlisted unit. Another increase is for 50 square feet or 4% for a 4-bedroom company grade officer unit. In addition, we are proposing that the maximum space limitations for senior enlisted personnel in the grades E–7 through E–9 be the same as those for junior officers. The military departments were unanimous in their recommendation that senior enlisted personnel be accorded this benefit commensurate with their extended service. Also a benefit will accrue to the base management of the inventory by affording greater flexibility in assignment of housing between junior officers and senior NCO's. However, due to budget considerations the number of enlisted units proposed for construction in the FY 1974 program at the higher senior enlisted standards have been held to only 30%.

COST LIMITATIONS—SECTION 502

Next, I would like to discuss the statutory average unit cost limitation on the construction of military family housing and where we stand with respect to the adequacy of the current CONUS limit. As you know, the Department of Defense did not seek a cost increase last year so that the FY 1972 limit of $24 000 applies also to 1973. This appeared appropriate at the time because of judgments and cost growth projections that proved now to have been understated. For example, it was believed that a normal cost growth during this period would be offset by the content and geographic location of our 1973 program—that is, more enlisted and junior officer units including a liberal number of 2-bedroom units, in lower cost regions of the country. Also, certain exclusions from the average unit cost were requested but were not favorably considered by the Congress. These were the exclusion of land acquisition and off-site development costs.

These considerations have now been overtaken by events, namely the spiraling costs of construction. Consequently, the military departments have been required to take an increasing amount of deductive alternatives in order to make contract awards within available funds for those projects being competitively bid; and for turnkey projects, a reduction in quality and/or desired scope is being realized because of the current fiscal constraints. Sufficient experience is not available as yet for the FY 1973 program but, based on the actual cost growth of 8.5% for FY 1972 it is expected that we will have difficulty with a majority of the projects which can only result in penalizing the resultant housing and its occupants because of quality deficiencies.

Based on the above, the proposed FY 1974 program average cost of $27,500 for units constructed in the United States exclusive of Alaska and Hawaii reflects the updating of the FY 1973 average unit cost to eliminate quality deficiencies.

In addition a cost growth factor of 6% is included. Authoritative construction cost indices such as reported by Engineering News Record had predicted a 7% cost growth for building construction for CY 1972. The actual increase however amounted to 8.5%. This experience reflected a sharp rise especially in the cost of plywood and lumber. We now believe this to be conservative because as of this date, the increasing trend has not shown any sign of leveling off.

We understand that the proposal before you is ambitious. But we believe firmly that this is the proper direction, that is, to upgrade our standards and to establish realistic goals and prices accordingly. If spiraling costs are not halted then we may not be able to accomplish all we have set forth in this request. But, these standards should be established as a target to shoot for in order to get the most house for the dollar and for the occupant within reasonable limits.

DOMESTIC LEASING (SEC. 507), FOREIGN LEASING, AND RENTAL GUARANTY (SEC. 508) PROGRAMS

The domestic leasing program authorizes under specific criteria and cost limitations, the lease of housing in the civilian community in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Guam for assignment to military personnel as public quarters. The statutory limitation on the number of domestic leases is 10,000. All of these have been allocated to the military departments and approximately 87% are currently under lease. About 3,000 leases are allocated to the recruiting commands. We plan to continue this program as an important supplement to our balanced program for the acquisition of adequate housing both in the community and on-base. No charges are proposed in the FY 1974 program.

Foreign leasing of family housing is authorized under the general authority of 10 USC 2675. A limited number of units have been leased under this authority primarily for persons occuping special command type positions or to alleviate undue hardship cases. However, it is believe that leasing, particularly lease-construct agreements in selected overseas locations, represents a viable potential for producing additional housing for military families in foreign countries with limited risk for the U.S. Government. Accordingly, the FY 74 program request reflects an expanded foreign leasing program for 7,262 units and $19.9 million, an increase of 3,298 units and $6.8 million.

Another method of acquiring military family housing in overseas locations is the rental guarantee program. By Public Law 88–174 as amended, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements guaranteeing the builders of such housing a return equivalent to a specified portion of the annual rental income which would be received if the housing were fully occupied. These projects are privately financed, and constructed and maintained by the sponsor for occupancy by U.S. military personnel on a rental basis. The guarantee period is limited to 10 years under existing legislation. A total of 2,415 rental guarantee units are under contract in Spain, the United Kingdom, Germany and Korea. We are exploring the feasibility of obtaining additional rental guarantee projects but do not consider it possible without an increase in the average guaranteed rental ceiling. The present ceiling of $225 per unit per month was authorized last year. However, the international economic situation, compounded by increased construction costs in foreign countries, has made this ceiling obsolete. For example, the Deutschemark was revalued upward, and this was followed by the recent devaluation of the dollar. Meanwhile, construction costs have increased substantially. Consequently, we are requesting in Section 508 that the average guaranteed rental be increased to $275 per unit per month to permit the continued effective use of this program.

We believe that these programs, administered wisely in selected locations, will provide suitable family housing for our military servicemen at a minimum risk to the U.S. Government, especially in areas where U.S. military tenure could be subject to change.

BASE CLOSURE IMPACT ON FAMILY HOUSING

On April 17, 1973 the Secretary of Defense announced 274 actions to consolidate, reduce, realign, or close military activities. There are 15,500 family housing units affected at locations scheduled for closure or reduction. Of these, only 4,471 units or 28% have been built with appropriated funds and most of them were constructed prior to 1966. The balance are Capehart, Wherry, and other public quarters, including about 1,350 inadequates. The Military Departments have completed their review of housing requirements at affected installations to provide data as a basis to determine how many of the units can be retained by the owning service, how many can be used by another Military Service, and how many may be excess to Department of Defense requirements. Based on screening to date, 5,658 units are to be retained within DoD, 304 units are to be transferred to the Coast Guard, and 7,980 units are to be declared excess. The excess housing will be reported to the General Services Administration, in the usual

manner, where it will be screened for other Government use, and disposed of by sale or otherwise if no use is found. Every precaution will be taken to minimize any possible adverse economic impact on surrounding communities. There are 1,558 units still under review to determine what action is to be taken.

AMENDMENTS

We are proposing three new amendments to the FY 1974 Military Construction Authorization Bill. These amendments did not receive clearance in time to be included in the Committee Print before you.

FORT RUGER EXCHANGE

The first proposal concerns the conveyance of approximately 57 acres of land and improvements at the Fort Ruger Military Reservation, Hawai, to the State of Hawaii. Public Law 91-564, authorized the Secretary of the Army to convey these lands and improvements to the State of Hawaii in exchange for the conveyance by the State to the United States of approximately 259 acres of land adjacent to the Tripler Army Hospital Reservation. The land adjacent to Tripler Hospital was to be used as a site for additional military family housing. The Act also provided for the State to make certain site preparations on the land to be transferred to the United States, which will equal in cost the dollar difference between the fair market values of the properties being exchanged. Subsequent evaluation by the Army of the 259 acres adjacent to Tripler Hospital revealed however, that only 45 acres were usable as family housing sites, thus making its potential development too costly for military housing.

The proposed legislation would replace the original Act and would permit the conveyance of the Fort Ruger property to the State of Hawaii. It would further permit the value of the Fort Ruger property to be credited to the development costs of a Defense housing complex at the Defense-owned Aliamanu Crater, Hawaii.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The second proposal would authorize an additional $7 million to be appropriated for the Homeowner's Assistance Program. The Homeowners Assistance Program, authorized by Section 1013 of Public Law 89-754, provides assistance to military and civilian employee homeowners by reducing their losses incident to the disposal of their homes when the military installations at which they are serving are ordered to be closed in whole or in part or the scope of operations is reduced. Analysis of the April 17, 1973 Base Realignment Announcement indicates that current authorization and appropriations carried over in the Homeowners Assistance Fund are insufficient to indemnify in FY 1974 military and civilian personnel for losses sustained in disposing of their homes.

The third proposal would provide for a modest expansion of the Homeowner's Assistance Program to cover personnel currently not eligible for assistance at some installations because of a lack of a causal relationship between the loss sustained in disposing of their homes and the installation realignment. These are individuals who are assigned or employed at or near an installation which is being realigned, but are not themselves involved in that realignment, and who will relocate because of normal reassignment or routine transfer. These personnel can sustain the same losses as personnel covered by the Program at the realigned installations. The expansion of the Program in the United States is the same as the expansion authorized by the Congress last year for overseas areas.

CONCLUSION

I have touched briefly on the main elements of this year's military family housing program. The Department of Defense is deeply committed to the housing needs of the serviceman and we will continue to develop and recommend programs to meet those needs. In summary, I would say that the DoD Military Family Housing Program reflects a balanced approach to achieving our objective of decent and adequate housing for all servicemen and their families, by continuing a prudent and moderate on-base construction and improvement program coupled with an aggressive policy for obtaining suitable off-base housing in the civilian communities near our military installations.

I would like to express my appreciation for your continuing support of the Department of Defense family housing program. My staff and I are available to

answer your questions and would be pleased to provide such additional information as you may request.

Thank you.

Enclosure: Proposed FY 1974 Space Criteria.

PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1974 SPACE CRITERIA

	Current stat. limit net	Legislative proposal	Percent increase stat. limit net
General officers	2,100	2,100	0
Senior grade	1,670	1,700	2
Field grade:			
3-BR	1,400	1,400	0
4-BR	1,400	1,550	11
Company grade: [1]			
2-BR	[2] 950	950	0
3-BR	1,250	1,350	8
4-BR	1,400	1,450	4
5-BR	1,400	1,550	11
Enlisted: [3]			
2-BR	950	950	0
3-BR	1,080	1,200	11
4-BR	1,250	1,350	8
5-BR	1,400	1,550	8

[1] Includes senior NCO's.
[2] Administrative control.
[3] E-6's and below.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

Certainly, one thing that we have to consider is decent housing for the people who serve in our military.

This year you are requesting authority for 11,688 new units of family housing, at a cost of about $352 million. We do not intend to go into each individual project, but there are three projects in the Navy program I would like to ask about.

(*a*) There are seven units for Thrumont, Md., which, I believe, is the Presidential retreat at Camp David. Am I correct in my understanding that this project is no longer valid?

Mr. FLIAKAS. That is correct, sir. If I may correct your statement, it is a 6-unit project in the bill, and because of a reevaluation of requirements, the Department of Defense has no objection to removing this project from consideration.

Senator SYMINGTON. What were these units going to be used for before?

Mr. FLIAKAS. As I understood it, sir, it was to support additional enlisted personnel assigned to Camp David.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is the definition of a unit?

Mr. FLIAKAS. Family housing unit.

Senator SYMINGTON. A family housing unit?

Mr. FLIAKAS. Yes, sir.

KEFLAVIK

Senator SYMINGTON. The Navy has also requested 150 units for Keflavik, Iceland. Is it not true that a new base agreement must be worked out with the Icelandic Government within the next few months?

Mr. FLIAKAS. Yes, sir. But I might add, sir, that one of the negotiating points is to remove approximately 400 families that are now living off base from the community and have them billeted on the base.

Senator SYMINGTON. It is your understanding that you will not proceed with that until negotiations are completed?

Mr. FLIAKAS. With the construction, that is correct, sir. We feel that we should seek the authorization because it is a negotiating point.

NAVAL TRAINING CENTER, ORLANDO, FLA.

Senator SYMINGTON. The Navy is also requesting 300 units for the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla. With the closing of the McCoy Air Force Base at Orlando, which has, I believe, some 668 units of housing, will this not adequately take care of the Navy needs, thus eliminating this requirement?

Mr. FLIAKAS. No, sir. At the time this project was considered for inclusion in this bill we were aware of the possible closing of McCoy and considered those available assets, some 668 units. After consideration of these units in the program, there still will be a deficit of some 300 units in that area.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are asking for 300 units, and you are closing 668, and there still will be a deficit. Does that mean you are not going to use the 668?

Mr. FLIAKAS. No, sir. We are using the 668, and we have a total of 604 units either under construction or requested.

Senator SYMINGTON. You have an overall major deficit all over the country, as I understand it, in your figures.

Mr. FLIAKAS. That is correct.

Senator SYMINGTON. That will be my next question. But on the other hand, we are tight on money, and if you are closing 668 units and you want 300, can you not use the 668 for a while and not ask for the 300?

Mr. FLIAKAS. We will definitely use the 668 units. As you know, sir, this is a resort area. The advent of Disney World in that part of the country has caused prices and rentals to skyrocket. It is a definite hardship on our career people to be stationed there.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why do we not put the naval training center somewhere else?

They just closed a lot of bases up in Newport, R.I., a quarter of a billion payroll you took out of this little State. Why do you not put this up there?

Mr. FLIAKAS. I can only say, sir, that this facility obviously was considered from the standpoint of the investment and the physical characteristics of the facilities. It is considered a hard core base. It is a new training center that has been established.

Senator SYMINGTON. You have not completed it yet, have you?

Mr. FLIAKAS. No, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. When I was with the Air Force I found that everybody wanted to move south as fast as they could. But from the standpoint of a tax base, which is something that you ought to consider as these costs mount up, and you see this increasing resistance, I think you ought to consider utilizing the things that you are giving up as against asking for a new addition to the base. I understand this base is not completed yet.

Mr. FLIAKAS. No, sir, it is a relatively new base, that is correct. There has been a substantial investment in this base over the last few years.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much?

Mr. FLIAKAS. I would have to furnish that for the record in terms of the total military construction.

Mr. SHERIDAN. $50 or $60 million.

Mr. FLIAKAS. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. $50 or $60 million?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLIAKAS. At least that much, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you supply the figure for the record?

Mr. FLIAKAS. I will, sir.

[The information follows:]

Total military construction authorization since fiscal year 1967 for the Naval Training Center at Orlando, Florida, was $71,656,000, which included family housing.

Senator SYMINGTON. And you cannot use it anywhere else, you could not shift it anywhere else, you have got to have 300 units, is that right?

Mr. FLIAKAS. Yes, sir, because we will still have an outstanding deficit.

BASE CLOSURES—HOUSING

Senator SYMINGTON. What are you going to do with the excess family units as a result of closing of those bases in Rhode Island, give them back to the State or city or what?

Mr. FLIAKAS. Some of them will be retained by the Navy.

Senator SYMINGTON. What percentage?

Mr. FLIAKAS. I can furnish that.

To answer your question generally, we go through a regular screening process to establish what military requirements there are for available housing that are surplus as a result of base closures.

Senator SYMINGTON. You see, we are running out of money, and we are running out of it fast. And at the same time, you are closing all these naval bases you have got a program that will cost over $123 million. That is a fact, is it not?

Mr. FLIAKAS. A planned investment, yes, sir.

To answer your question, sir, in Rhode Island out of a total of 2,095 units at Newport the Navy will declare excess 735 units that are no longer required. These will be given over for disposition to GSA. Since 306 of them are units that are encumbered, they will be sold, and the proceeds will then be provided back to this account for debt retirement purposes.

Senator SYMINGTON. What are you going to do with the remaining 1,400, roughly?

Mr. FLIAKAS. There will still be the Naval War College and other activities that will remain at Newport which will require some housing.

Senator SYMINGTON. And your operations in Massachusetts, what did you close up there in the way of family housing?

Mr. FLIAKAS. At Westover Air Force Base there are 1,568 units that are affected. The Air Force will retain 324 Capeharts and 5 MCA houses. The remaining number of units will be declared excess.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is the Air Force going to do with those bases?

Mr. FLIAKAS. Some of these will be put in caretaker status. Others will just be completely excessed. For example, Laredo, Tex., to give an example out of the Northeast area, as I understand it, will be declared surplus, and turned over to whatever civilian use can be made

out of it. I can furnish for the record the plans for the Northeastern bases in Massachusetts. Some of them will be retained for Reserve and Guard flying, and I do not have the details here.

[The information follows:]

The installations in the northeast area of the country affected by the April 17, 1973 realignment and their status or planned usages are as follows:

(*a*) Boston Naval Shipyard Complex, Massachusetts. Report the Charlestown Navy Yard and the greater portion of the South Boston Annex as excess to the General Services Administration (GSA) for disposal. A small portion of the South Boston Annex (former Boston Army Base) will be retained pending a determination of replacement facilities for the U.S. Army Reserves, Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Station and the Defense Contract Administration Services Region.

(*b*) Chelsea, Massachusetts Naval Hospital. Report as excess to GSA for disposal.

(c) Naval Support Activity, Boston, Massachusetts. Retain greater portion pending a determination on need for Fargo Building to accommodate Navy and Marine Reserves as well as activities now in former Boston Army Base (see above).

(*d*) L. G. Hanscom Field, Massachusetts. Transfer Air Force Reserve flying activities to Westover AFB, MA and return airfield to the Massachusetts Port Authority.

(*e*) Otis Air Force Base, Massachusetts. Responsibility for the base will be transferred to the Massachusetts Air National Guard. U.S. Army Reserves training activities on the Camp Edwards portion of Otis AFB will not be affected. Approximately 108 acres of land with 304 family housing units and other improvements will be reassigned to the U.S. Coast Guard. Any excess land will be returned to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

(*f*) Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts. This base will be closed by June 1974 except for Air Force Reserve activities which will relocate from L. G. Hanscom Field (see above) and some limited active Air Force requirements. Disposal of excess real estate is expected to be in two increments with 2,102 acres in fee, 168 acres in easements plus improvements scheduled to be reported to GSA for disposal by early fall 1973. Out of a total of 1,568 family housing units, 329 units will be retained for residual Air Force requirements.

(*g*) Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island. The Naval Air Rework Facility at NAS Quonset Point will be disestablished by June 1974. Approximately 1,847 acres of land with improvements have been identified by excessing to GSA with more probable as the requirements of the contiguous Construction Battalion Center, Davisville are refined. The Adjutant General, State of Rhode Island has indicated a possible use of a portion of the Air Station for consolidation of all National Guard activities.

(*h*) Naval Communications Station, Newport, Rhode Island. In line with the reduction in scope of operations, approximately 50 acres of unimproved land will be reported as excess to GSA for disposal.

(*i*) Naval Public Works Center, Newport, Rhode Island. Approximately 130 acres of the 566 acres comprising the Naval Public Works Center have been identified for excessing to GSA for disposal. The balance of the property, primarily housing, will be reassigned to the Naval Schools Command, Newport.

(*j*) Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island. Approximately 658 acres with improvements of the 839 acres of land comprising this installation will be reported as excess to GSA for disposal by early fall 1973. The remaining real property will be reassigned to the Naval Schools Command, Newport.

(*k*) Naval Supply Center, Newport, Rhode Island. The requirements for all or a portion of this fuel storage complex are under review by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In view of the changing energy situation, retention may be necessary to provide needed flexibility in meeting emergency requirements and coping with current and prospective military supply problems.

PREPARED QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR SYMINGTON

Senator SYMINGTON. I have quite a few more questions here, and if you do not have details on some of them, instead of going over them now, I will submit them to you for the record.

Mr. FLIAKAS. All right, sir.

[Questions submitted by Senator Symington. Answers supplied by Department of Defense.]

Question. What is your estimated deficit of family housing this year if this year's program is approved?

Answer. The programmable deficit for eligible personnel reported by the military departments based on FY 1974 housing surveys is 59,782. Should the FY 1974 program be approved, the deficit would then amount to 48,094.

Question. How many units of housing will you lose as a result of the base closures and realignments announced last April? What kind are they, and what is the balance of the outstanding mortgages relating thereto?

Answer. The number of houses involved in the recent base closure announcement totals 15,670. Of these, 5,997 will be retained within DoD; 304 will be transferred to the Coast Guard; 7,837 will be declared excess; and 1,532 are still under review. The latter units are located at Ramey AFB, Puerto Rico, some of which will probably be retained for Naval use.

A summary of the kind of units determined excess up to this date is as follows:

Appropriated Fund	2,396
Capehart	1,445
Wherry	2,648
Inadequate	1,348
Total	7,837

A summary of outstanding mortgage balances on the excess Capehart and Wherry units is as follows:

	Number of units		Mortgage amounts outstanding, July 1, 1973
	Capehart	Wherry	
Army: Hunter Army Airfield, Ga		500	$2,318,537
Navy:			
NAS, Albany, Ga		270	899,290
NAS, Glynco, Ga	225		2,493,107
NTC, Bainbridge, Md		505	3,301,551
NPWC, Newport, R.I		306	1,706,225
Total, Navy	225	1,081	8,400,173
Air Force:			
Forbes AFB, Kans	1,054		9,458,336
Westover, AFB, Maine	166		1,708,809
		1,067	5,302,630
Total, Air Force	1,220	1,067	16,469,775
Total, DOD	1,445	2,648	27,188,485

Question. How will these mortgaged houses be disposed of; that is, will whoever acquires them be required to assume the mortgage?

Answer. Disposition procedure is generally the same for both encumbered and unencumbered housing. Immediately following a base closure announcement, all military family housing involved is screened by the other Military Departments and Defense Agencies to determine possible use. Houses required by another Military Department or Defense Agency are transferred as required. After this screening, the remaining houses are declared excess via the usual procedures, with notification to Congressional committees, and turned over to GSA for disposal under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. The latter then screens the houses with other Government agencies to determine potential use. Houses not required for other Governmental use are then declared surplus by GSA and sold at fair market value, except in some instances where the houses are turned over to a non-profit organization at a discount. Mortgaged houses are excluded from this provision.

Buyers of mortgaged houses do not assume the mortgages. The mortgagee releases the mortgage in return for application of all net proceeds received from either a cash or credit sale and assurance that the residual note, if any, represents a full faith and credit obligation of the United States Government. Any balance is then paid off by DoD in regular installments.

Question. I understand there are some 1,350 units of housing authorized in fiscal years 1972 and 1973 that will not be built as a result of the realignement pro-

gram. The estimated cost of these units is $33.2 million. If this is true, why should we not reduce the amount you are requesting for new construction by this amount?

Answer. The $33.2 million does not take into account the funding of certain reprogramming actions which have been authorized by the Committees and which are now in process. Considering these reprogramming actions, we estimate that about $32 million in net savings will accrue from projects not built because of base closures.

Question. Section 502 of the bill places certain unit cost limitations on family housing. You are proposing substantial increases. As a matter of fact, you are requesting 32 units less than were authorized last year, but at an estimated cost of $81 million more. Current limitations were established in fiscal year 1972. The cost growth for mid-calendar year 1972 to mid-calendar year 1973 is estimated at about 6 percent, yet you propose a substantially higher increase. For example, you would increase the average unit cost within the United States, other than Alaska and Hawaii, from $24,000 to $27,500, which is about a 14.6 percent increase; and you would increase the maximum unit cost from $42,000 to $45,000, for an increase of over seven percent.

Outside the United States, and in Alaska and Hawaii, you are asking that the average unit cost be increased from $33,500 to $38,000 and the maximum from $42,000 to $45,000.

I wish you would state for the record what factors, in your opinion, justify these increases.

Answer. Based on the recommendations of the Military Departments and an evaluation of surveys from family housing occupants regarding desirable amenities, the following factors are involved in our requested increases:

Eliminate quality deficiencies expected in the development of the fiscal year 1973 program (deductive alternates 2.2%) to enable award within budgeted amounts.

Cost growth from mid calendar year 1972 to mid calendar year 1973 (estimated to be 6% at the time of budget preparation, but was actually 9%).

Proposed reduction in magnitude of two-bedroom units normally planned to be constructed (1.5%).

Proposed new space standards and the programming of 30% of the enlisted units to be constructed for senior NCO's (4.2%).

Question. In section 503, you provide for alterations, et cetera, to existing public quarters. You are asking about $62.5 million this year as opposed to $43.6 million last year. This is over a 43 percent increase. How do you account for this, and just what is your backlog of deferred maintenace of this type?

Answer. The increased emphasis on the improvements program reflects our recognition of the growing need to bring much of our older family housing inventory up to today's standards of adequacy. The $62.5 million requested is only 8 percent of the backlog of needed improvements as of June 30, 1973, which is shown below by Military Service. Thus, a continuing annual effort at the $62.5 million level would require over 12 years just to clear up deficiencies we know about now, with no provision whatever made for any which develop hereafter.

Backlog of required family housing improvements, June 30, 1973 (estimated)

	In millions of dollars
Army	278
Navy	147
Air Force	324
Marine Corps	36
Total	785

Question. If section 504 is approved, it would permit any unit cost increase we might grant this year to apply to any previously authorized projects not yet placed under contract. How many units authorized in prior years have not yet been placed under contract, and what will this amount to dollarwise? Basically, I think any housing project authorized at a particular unit cost prevailing at the time should be built for that amount.

Answer. There has been legal determination that the provisions of section 504 are applicable to any project for which a construction contract had not been

awarded for the housing units. (Authorization for several fiscal year 1972 projects has been saved by the award of miscellaneous contracts for work other than the housing units. In the past, based on Defense administrative policy, the date of such awards determined what program year average cost was applicable.) Acceptance of this legal interpretation and assuming that fiscal year 1974 authorization and appropriation legislation will be enacted by October 1, 1973, it is estimated that 7,878 units would become eligible for the increased costs permitted by section 504. Theoretically, this would permit a maximum increase of $3,500 per unit for 6,138 CONUS units and $4,500 per unit for 1,748 overseas units. However, program year total dollar authorizations (usually in section 501) cannot be exceeded and any increase in a particular project must be offset by a corresponding decrease in one or more other projects authorized in the same Act. Therefore, the application of section 504 to previous year projects would not result in any increase in authorized program year costs in the absence of increases in prior year total dollar authorizations.

Question. In section 505, you are requesting 12 units of housing in foreign countries at a cost of $520,000, or approximately $43,334 per unit. I understand these are for Defense Intelligence Agency personnel assigned to various embassies.

(a) Where do you propose to build or acquire these units, and what are the estimated costs by countries?

(b) What grade of personnel are generally assigned to these quarters?

(c) Why do you now ask for a $60,000 maximum limitation on these quarters when, in section 502, you request a maximum ceiling of $45,000 elsewhere outside the United States? It seems to me this type of personnel should be treated the same as any other.

Answer. We propose to build housing for Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) personnel as follows:

Location	Units	Maximum cost
Canberra, Australia	5	$210,000
The Hague, Netherlands	4	175,000
Lima, Peru	3	135,000

These units, as well as those normally provided for DIA personnel, are for occupancy by field grade officers and senior noncommissioned officers. The $60,000 maximum limitation requested does not arise from the need to provide quarters different from those provided other personnel of equivalent rank. The increased cost results from the need to purchase land and higher costs associated with the acquisition of housing in such small quantities, or for the acquisition of condominium apartments. In each of the countries involved, there is rapidly escalating inflation, and it is in the U.S. Government's best interests to own permanent quarters rather than try to lease in such an economy. The estimated costs are based on U.S. State Department advice and experience.

Question. In Section 506 you propose to increase from $10,000 to $15,000 the amount you may spend on any one set of quarters without specific congressional approval. You are asking for five diffrent projects in excess of $15,000 per unit, ranging up to $40,074 on one set of quarters at Fort McNair. This seems like a lot to spend for repairs on any set of quarters.

Just how many sets of quarters are in this bill where you expect to spend more than the current $10,000 limitation?

Answer. In addition to the five projects in excess of $15,000 per unit, there are seven projects consisting of 1,510 sets of quarters for which we propose to spend in excess of the current $10,000 per unit limitation. These seven projects include such work features as enlargement; modernization of interiors including mechanical, plumbing and electrical systems; provision of central air conditioning where authorized and accomplishment of essential repairs. These projects are considered to be economically sound when consideration is given to the alternative of scheduling replacement housing in the future. The cited example of $40,074 for one set of quarters at Fort McNair involves a unit containing in excess of 9,000 square feet of area. Therefore, the estimated cost of less than $4.50 per square foot for improvements is considered acceptable.

Question. Section 507 extends the domestic leasing program for another year. This year we are considering extending this provision to include foreign leasing.

At the present time there is no statutory limitation on the number of overseas leases. Back in FY 1968 this Committee did request that foreign leases be held to a maximum of 4,525 units. Now in fact this year you asked for and was granted authority to increase your overseas leasing by 500 to take care of a certain emergency situation.

(a) Will you explain the need for additional overseas leases, and how many have you budgeted for this year?

(b) What would you consider to be a minimum average cost and a maximum cost for any one unit overseas?

(c) Considering you have budgeted this year for 7,262 houses, what do you feel is an adequate unit limitation for overseas comparable to the $10,000 for the United States?

(d) I understand that the Department of Defense presently has under lease overseas some 276 units of housing costing in excess of $500 per month. A review of these leases revealed they range, including operation and maintenance costs, from a little over $6,000 per year to as high as $38,665 per annum.

(1) Just how will these be handled if we decide to establish a reasonable average rental cost?

(2) Frankly, this program overseas seems to be out of hand, and prompt steps should be taken to reduce the number of these expensive leases. We all recognize the need for a certain number of representational quarters, and the lack of adequate suitable housing in other high cost areas, but some of these leases seem to be completely out of line.

(3) The Defense Intelligence Agency seems to be the worst offenders, and have 154 of the total 276 high-cost leases, many of which are occupied by junior grade officers and enlisted men. Will you comment on this?

(4) I would like for you to submit for the record a list of these leases by Services.

(5) I will ask you to work with the staff to prepare the necessary provision to set the proper limitation on overseas leasing. I want the provision liberal enough to care for your legitimate needs, but firm enough to eliminate, in a proper manner, the excessive number of high-cost leases.

Answer. (a) Foreign leasing of family housing is authorized under 10 USC 2675. Until recently units were leased primarily for persons occupying representational type positions or to alleviate undue hardship cases. It has now been determined that leasing, and particularly lease-construction agreements in selected overseas locations, represents a viable potential for producing adequate housing for military families in foreign countries with limited risk for the United States Government. Accordingly, the Military Departments in budgeting for 7,262 units of foreign leased family housing in the FY 1974 program identified several locations where there currently is an opportunity to lease housing in existence or under construction or there is an opportunity for a favorable lease-construction arrangement. This expanded leasing program would produce housing primarily for enlisted personnel and junior officers.

(b) Excluding certain high cost leases for representational positions, foreign leases in general should require on the average no more than $325 per month; in any event, none should exceed an individual cost of $625 per month.

(c) A numerical ceiling on foreign leases at 8,000 would afford us the flexibility required for the program. This would include about 300 units for representational positions, and cases of undue hardship.

(d) (1) As we discussed above, we could except about 300 units from the general cost limitations in order not to distort a general picture of normal foreign leasing with the inclusion of high cost leases for incumbents of representational positions, and hardship cases.

(2) and (3) It is true that we have in existence 272 leases which are estimated to cost more than $6,000 per year. Most of these are representational positions or are located in areas of the world where the cost of housing is extremely high. However, in the latter case, even though the units are occupied by junior officers or enlisted men, the quarters so leased are not considered ostentatious but the minimum needed to obtain suitable housing commensurate with the grade of the incumbent.

(4) A listing of foreign leases exceeding $6,000 per annum is attached.

(5) We will be happy to work with the Committee staff to establish meaningful statutory controls on the program.

Attachment.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING FOREIGN LEASING PROGRAM—LEASES WITH TOTAL COST OF $6,000 OR MORE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

Country and grade of occupant	Service of occupant	Position of occupant	Annual rent	Annual O. & M. cost	Total cost
Argentina:					
O-7	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	$10,200	$800	$11,000
O-6	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	8,100	800	8,900
O-6	Navy	Chief, Navy Section	9,240	650	9,890
O-6	Army	Chief, Army Section	7,680	450	8,130
O-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	8,400	3,000	11,400
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	8,640	2,640	11,280
Australia: GS-15	Civilian	Senior U.S. Liaison Officer, Melbourne	7,000	1,500	8,500
Bahrain: O-8	Navy	Commander, Mid East Forces	6,700	4,300	11,000
Belgium:					
O-9	do	Deputy Chairman, NATO Military Committee	24,369	14,296	38,665
O-9	Army	Deputy Director, NATO Integrated Communications Management Agency	13,109	5,594	18,703
O-10	Air Force	U.S. Representative Military Committee, NATO.	15,954	5,530	21,484
O-8	Navy	Deputy Defense Adviser, U.S. Mission to NATO.	14,598	8,263	22,861
O-8	do	Deputy Chief of Staff, U.S. Representative NATO Military Committee.	15,423	5,126	20,549
GS-18	Civilian	Defense Adviser, U.S. Mission to NATO	19,175	10,000	29,175
O-6	Army	Commander, NATO Support Activity	6,999	1,287	8,286
O-10	Air Force	Chief of Staff, SHAPE	13,908	18,298	32,206
O-8	Navy	Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff (Plans and Programs SHAPE.	6,779	2,834	9,613
O-8	Air Force	Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff (Operations) SHAPE.	6,682	7,469	14,151
O-7	Army	Chief, Nuclear Activity, SHAPE	5,397	3,930	9,327
O-6	do	Commander, 196th Station Hospital	5,487	1,000	6,487
O-8	Air Force	Special Projects Officer, SHAPE	7,077	8,389	15,466
O-7	do	Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff (Live Oak) SHAPE.	7,775	5,492	13,267
Brazil:					
O-6	Navy	Deputy Chief, Navy Section	8,640	960	9,600
O-6	do	Adviser, National War College, Brazil	10,200	720	10,920
O-5	Army	Project Director, Inter-American Geodetic Survey (IAGS).	8,580	960	9,540
O-6	Air Force	Deputy Chief, Air Force Section	7,800	720	8,520
O-7	do	Chief, Air Force Section	16,560	1,200	17,760
O-6	Army	Deputy Chief, Army Section	11,376	960	12,336
O-9	Navy	Chief, Navy Section	16,200	960	17,160
O-8	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	13,800	1,200	15,000
O-5	do	Engineer Adviser	6,475	1,200	7,675
O-5	Marine	Senior Marine Officer	6,564	1,800	8,364
O-5	Army	Military Adviser	8,911	1,600	10,511
E-7	do	Administrative Noncommissioned Officer (NCO).	4,400	1,600	6,000
O-6	Air Force	Chief, Joint Section, Joint Brazil-U.S. Military Committee.	7,776	1,600	9,376
E-8	Army	Administrative NCO	4,754	1,400	6,154
E-7	Navy	do	6,000	1,100	7,100
E-7	do	do	6,000	1,100	7,100
E-7	Air Force	Staff personnel, DIA	6,573	2,500	9,073
O-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	7,704	2,400	10,104
E-7	Air Force	Staff personnel, DIA	7,206	2,500	9,706
E-7	do	do	7,080	2,000	9,080
Burma:					
W-4	Army	do	4,050	4,000	8,050
E-7	Navy	do	4,200	4,600	8,800
Chad:					
W-2	Army	do	9,796	9,026	18,822
E-5	Air Force	do	7,347	9,026	16,373
E-5	do	do	12,734	7,958	20,692
O-3	do	Assistant Air Attaché	7,837	7,970	15,807
E-6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	6,707	9,026	15,733
O-4	do	Air Attaché	4,725	8,894	13,619
Chile:					
O-6	Army	Chief, Army Section	6,600	1,200	7,800
O-5	do	Officer in Charge, IAGS Project Officer	6,000	1,200	7,200
O-6	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	6,600	1,200	7,800
O-6	Navy	Commander, U.S. Military Group	6,000	1,200	7,200
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	7,200	2,566	9,766
O-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	5,300	2,566	7,866
O-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	7,200	2,568	9,768
Colombia:					
O-6	do	Chief, Navy Section	5,434	800	6,234
O-6	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	5,242	800	6,042
Czechoslovakia:					
O-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	15,048	3,900	18,948
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	12,516	3,900	16,416

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING FOREIGN LEASING PROGRAM—LEASES WITH TOTAL COST OF $6,000 OR MORE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974—Continued

Country and grade of occupant	Service of occupant	Position of occupant	Annual rent	Annual O. & M. cost	Total cost
Dominican Republic:					
O–5	Navy	Navy Attaché	$5,400	$2,784	$8,184
O–4	Army	Army Attaché	4,800	2,784	7,584
O–5	Air Force	Air Attaché	4,800	2,784	7,584
Ecuador:					
O–5	Army	Project Director, IAGS	5,820	600	6,420
O–6	do	Army Attaché	5,400	2,360	7,760
England:					
FSO–2		Political Advisor to CINCUSNAVEUR, London	6,060	3,440	9,500
GS–17	Civilian	Senior U.S. Liaison Officer (SUSLO), London	5,092	1,050	6,142
O–7	Navy	Chief of Staff, CINCUSNAVEUR	4,810	4,030	8,840
O–7	do	Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and operations, NAVEUR.	5,033	3,825	8,858
GS–15	Civilian	Operations Officer, SUSLO	6,125	1,150	7,275
O–6	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	5,420	2,300	7,720
Ethiopia:					
GS–15	do	Naval Medical Research Unit No. 3	4,750	1,840	6,590
E–6	do	do	4,450	1,840	6,290
E–7	do	do	4,560	1,670	6,230
O–4	do	do	4,160	1,840	6,000
O–3	do	do	4,160	1,840	6,000
E–8	do	do	4,160	1,840	6,000
E–6	do	do	4,160	1,840	6,000
O–5	Air Force	Air Attaché	5,607	3,250	8,857
E–7	do	Staff personnel, DIA	4,030	2,900	6,930
E–6	do	do	4,293	2,850	7,143
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	7,506	3,000	10,506
E–8	Air Force	Staff personnel, DIA	4,614	3,000	7,614
Germany:					
O–7	Army	Assistant Division Comander, 1st Armed Division.	5,901	5,154	11,055
O–6	do	Commander, 56th Artillery Group	5,912	8,302	14,214
O–9	do	Commander, U.S. Theater Army Support Commander, Europe.	10,755	7,090	17,845
O–8	do	Deputy Commander, U.S. Theater Army Support Command, Europe (area support).	9,036	6,388	15,424
O–7	do	Deputy Commander, U.S. Theater Army Support Command, Europe (tactical support).	9,036	6,974	16,010
Ghana:					
E–7	do	Staff personnel, DIA	3,320	3,200	6,520
O–6	do	Army Attaché	5,798	3,650	9,448
W–1	do	Staff personnel, DIA	4,532	3,300	7,932
Greece:					
O–7	Navy	Commander, Carrier Division No. 2, Athens	10,350	1,750	12,100
O–6	Air Force	USAF 7206 Commander, Athens	4,000	2,189	6,198
O–5	Army	USA 558 Artillery Commander	4,483	1,530	6,013
Guatemala:					
O–6	do	Commander, U.S. Military Group	7,200	720	7,920
O–6	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	5,700	720	6,420
O–5	Navy	Chief, Navy Section	5,400	800	6,200
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	4,800	2,064	6,864
Honduras:					
O–6	do	Commander, U.S. Military Group	6,480	500	6,980
O–5	Air Force	Air Attaché	3,600	2,764	6,364
Hong Kong:					
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	10,800	2,635	13,435
O–6	Navy	Navy Attaché	12,000	2,690	14,690
O–6	Air Force	Air Attaché	11,500	2,875	14,375
E–5	do	Staff personnel, DIA	5,760	2,387	8,147
O–4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	9,780	2,363	12,143
E–7	Navy	Staff personnel, DIA	7,680	2,450	10,130
W–2	Army	do	7,630	2,450	10,080
E–5	Air Force	do	7,920	2,350	10,270
E–5	do	do	6,720	2,350	9,070
O–5	do	Assistant Air Attaché	9,600	2,452	12,052
E–5	do	Staff personnel, DIA	6,000	2,350	8,350
O–4	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	9,120	2,550	11,670
E–8	do	Staff personnel, DIA	7,630	2,450	10,080
O–5	Marine	Assistant Navy Attaché	8,640	2,650	11,290
O–4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	8,160	2,550	10,710
Hungary: W–2	do	Staff personnel, DIA	5,314	2,568	7,882
India:					
O–4	do	Assistant Army Attaché	2,842	3,700	6,542
O–4	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	3,158	3,300	6,458
W–2	do	Staff personnel, DIA	2,842	3,700	6,542
O–4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	3,316	3,400	6,716
O–4	do	do	3,947	3,500	7,447

EPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING FOREIGN LEASING RPROGAM—LEASES WITH TOTAL COST OF $6,000 OR MORE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974—Continued

Country and grade of occupant	Service of occupant	Position of occupant	Annual rent	Annual O. & M. cost	Total cost
Indonesia:					
E-7	Navy	Naval Intelligence Command	$7,000	(1)	$7,000
E-7	do	Naval Medical Research Unit No. 2	4,170	$2,830	7,000
E-5	do	do	4,170	2,830	7,000
O-6	do	do	3,600	3,000	6,600
O-3	do	do	3,600	3,000	6,600
E-7	do	do	3,600	3,000	6,600
W-3	do	Staff personnel, DIA	4,500	2,000	6,500
E-7	Marine	do	4,500	2,000	6,500
E-7	Navy	do	4,500	2,000	6,500
E-7	do	do	4,500	2,000	6,500
O-5	Air Force	Assistant Air Attaché	5,500	2,000	7,500
O-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	5,500	2,000	7,500
O-6	do	Army Attaché	8,400	2,000	10,400
O-4	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	4,800	2,000	6,800
O-3	do	do	4,500	2,000	6,500
O-3	Marine	do	4,800	2,000	6,800
O-6	do	Navy Attaché	7,000	2,000	9,000
O-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	5,000	2,000	7,000
O-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	8,000	2,000	10,000
Israel: O-4	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	6,000	2,700	8,700
Italy:					
O-9	do	Commander, Sixth Fleet, Gaeta	6,300	10,400	16,700
O-9	Army	Chief of Staff, CINCSOUTH, Naples	6,780	6,060	12,840
O-7	Navy	Commander, Submarine Flotilla No. 8, Naples.	6,500	6,020	12,520
O-8	do	Commander, Fleet Air Medical, Naples	6,500	5,860	12,360
O-7	do	Deputy Commander and Chief of Staff, ASWFOR 6th, Naples.	9,440	2,710	12,150
O-9	Air Force	Commander, Air South, Naples	6,780	4,970	11,750
O-7	Army	Assistant Chief of Staff (P. & O.) CINCSOUTH, Naples.	8,500	3,230	11,730
O-6	Navy	Commander Officer, Naval Support Act, Naples.	6,970	4,310	11,280
O-7	do	Deputy Commander NATO Defense College, Rome.	8,680	2,320	11,000
O-7	do	Assistant Chief of Staff, Logistics, CINCSOUTH, Naples.	7,500	3,200	10,700
O-7	do	Deputy Commander, STRIKE Forces South, Naples.	5,850	3,650	9,500
O-8	Air Force	Chief of Staff, Commander Air South, Naples	6,200	2,400	8,600
O-6	do	USAF 49th Group Commander, Aviano	4,950	2,370	7,320
Italy:					
O-6	do	Assistant Army Attaché	7,025	2,300	9,325
O-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	7,280	2,300	9,580
O-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	7,280	2,300	9,580
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	7,280	2,300	9,580
Ivory Coast:					
O-6	do	do	10,617	5,477	16,094
O-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	8,000	5,477	13,477
Japan:					
O-6	do	do	9,000	4,700	13,700
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	11,000	4,000	15,000
E-7	Navy	Staff personnel, DIA	9,100	3,750	12,850
O-5	do	Assistant Navy Attaché	10,000	3,500	13,500
E-6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	8,000	3,100	11,100
O-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	12,000	4,200	16,200
Jordan:					
W-1	do	Staff personnel, DIA	3,882	3,550	7,432
O-4	do	Assistant Army Attaché	3,106	3,650	6,756
O-6	do	Army Attaché	7,454	4,200	11,654
Liberia:					
O-5	Navy	Navy Attaché	5,500	5,896	11,396
O-3	Air Force	Air Attaché	4,400	4,540	8,940
E-7	Navy	Staff personnel, DIA	4,300	4,948	9,248
E-8	do	do	3,700	4,468	8,168
E-6	do	do	4,300	4,324	8,624
Malagasy:					
O-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	6,600	4,340	10,940
O-4	do	Assistant Air Attaché	5,335	4,200	9,535
E-5	do	Staff personnel, DIA	4,280	3,670	7,950
E-6	do	do	4,540	3,670	8,210
E-5	do	do	4,280	3,670	7,950
E-6	do	do	4,280	3,670	7,950
Malawi:					
E-7	Army	do	4,110	1,926	6,036
O-5	do	Army Attaché	5,875	2,188	8,063

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING FOREIGN LEASING PROGRAM—LEASES WITH TOTAL COST OF $6,000 OR MORE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974—Continued

Country and grade of occupant	Service of occupant	Position of occupant	Annual rent	Annual O. & M. cost	Total cost
Malaysia:					
E–6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	$4,000	$3,610	$7,610
O–6	do	Army Attaché	5,500	4,120	9,620
E–6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	3,500	3,610	7,110
GS–7	Civilian	do	3,000	3,450	6,450
O–6	Air Force	Air Attaché	7,000	4,700	11,700
Mexico: O–7	Army	Army Attaché	6,900	4,500	11,400
Morocco:					
O–6	Navy	Navy Attaché	9,318	2,846	12,164
E–7	do	Staff personnel, DIA	5,083	2,384	7,467
Nepal:					
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	4,300	2,400	6,700
E–7	do	Staff personnel, DAI	3,390	3,100	6,490
Nicaragua:					
O–5	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	8,400	940	9,340
O–5	Army	Chief, Army Section	6,600	940	7,540
O–4	do	MP Advisor	6,000	900	6,900
O–4	do	Engineer Advisor	6,000	900	6,900
Nigeria:					
E–6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	5,710	2,900	8,610
O–4	do	Assistant Army, Attaché	12,280	3,200	15,480
E–8	do	Staff personnel, DIA	5,833	3,200	9,033
O–6	do	Army Attaché	9,210	4,100	13,310
Norway: O–8	Air Force	Deputy Chief, Air Force North, Oslo	5,500	1,500	7,000
Pakistan:					
O–4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	2,909	3,600	6,509
O–6	Air Force	Air Attaché	3,394	3,900	7,294
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	3,394	4,000	7,394
O–6	Navy	Navy Attaché	3,636	3,800	7,436
Panama: O–6	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	8,580	840	9,420
Paraguay:					
O–5	do	Project Director, IAGS	4,200	1,900	6,100
O–5	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	4,400	1,900	6,300
O–6	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	6,600	1,900	8,500
O–5	do	Chief, Army Section	4,200	1,900	6,100
Peru:					
O–6	Navy	Navy Attaché	6,916	2,700	9,616
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	6,000	2,700	8,700
O–6	Air Force	Air Attaché	6,000	2,700	8,700
Poland:					
W–2	Army	Staff personnel, DIA	4,195	2,600	6,795
E–6	do	do	4,445	2,600	7,045
Romania:					
O–6	do	Army Attaché	10,188	1,200	11,388
O–5	Air Force	Air Attaché	11,747	1,275	13,022
Saudi Arabia:					
O–5	Army	Army Attaché	4,820	6,350	11,170
E–6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	4,685	4,000	8,685
E–6	do	do	4,820	4,000	8,820
Senegal: O–5	Navy	Navy Attaché	8,685	4,950	13,635
Singapore:					
O–5	Air Force	Air Attaché	12,500	2,650	15,150
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	9,500	2,300	11,800
E–6	Navy	Staff personnel, DIA	6,000	2,000	8,000
O–4	do	Assistant Navy Attaché	9,000	2,000	11,000
E–7	do	Staff personnel, DIA	6,500	1,800	8,300
E–6	Army	do	6,000	1,800	7,800
South Africa:					
O–4	Air Force	Assistant Air Attaché	3,408	2,700	6,108
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	4,260	2,700	6,960
Sweden:					
O–6	do	Army Attaché	6,689	1,250	7,939
O–5	Air Force	Assistant Air Attaché	5,351	1,250	6,601
O–4	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	5,909	1,200	7,109
O–6	do	Navy Attaché	7,492	700	8,192
O–4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	6,154	1,600	7,754
Taiwan:					
O–8	Air Force	327th Air Division Commander	6,000	1,500	7,500
O–7	do	Chief of Staff	5,500	1,500	7,000
O–5	do	Assistant Air Attaché	3,526	2,500	6,026
O–6	Navy	Navy Attaché	3,789	2,608	6,397
O–6	Air Force	Air Attaché	5,053	2,352	7,405
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	5,053	2,404	7,457

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING FOREIGN LEASING PROGRAM—LEASES WITH TOTAL COST OF $6,000 OR MORE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974—Continued

Country and grade of occupant	Service of occupant	Position of occupant	Annual rent	Annual O. & M. cost	Total cost
Thailand:					
O–10	Air Force	Commander, U.S. Support Advisory Group	$10,660	$3,900	$14,560
O–8	Army	Deputy Commander, U.S. Support Advisory Group.	6,260	1,200	7,460
O–7	Air Force	Assistant Chief of Staff, J–2 (Intelligence) U.S. Support Advisory Group.	10,600	2,710	13,370
O–7	Army	Assistant Chief of Staff, J–4 (Logistics) U.S. Support Advisory Group.	9,950	1,870	11,820
O–6	do	U.S. Army Support Group	6,800	2,730	9,530
O–7	Unassigned	U.S. Support Advisory Group	9,230	2,480	11,710
O–7	do	do	6,430	2,210	8,640
Turkey:					
O–8	Air Force	Commanding General, The U.S. Logistics Group (TUSLOG).	4,143	2,107	6,250
O–6	do	TUSLOG Vice Chief, Ankara	4,143	2,107	6,250
O–6	do	USAF Detachment 26 Commander, Ankara	4,142	2,107	6,249
O–7	Army	Chief of Staff, LANDSOUTHEAST	4,285	5,500	9,785
O–6	Air Force	Air Attaché	5,929	3,200	9,129
O–6	Navy	Navy Attaché	6,667	2,800	9,467
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	6,800	2,800	9,600
Uruguay:					
O–5	Navy	Chief, Navy Section	6,600	1,200	7,800
O–5	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	6,000	1,200	7,200
O–6	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	6,600	1,200	7,800
O–5	do	Chief, Army Section	6,600	1,200	7,800
O–6	Navy	Navy Attaché	7,200	3,000	10,200
Venezuela:					
O–6	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	6,696	900	7,596
O–6	Navy	Chief, Navy Section	8,200	880	9,080
O–6	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	8,768	1,100	9,868
O–6	Army	Chief, Army Section	8,360	800	9,160
Yugoslavia:					
O–5	Navy	Navy Attaché	6,500	3,000	9,500
O–6	Army	Army Attaché	5,100	3,000	8,100
Zaire:					
E–7	Air Force	Staff personnel, DIA	3,674	3,200	6,874
O–5	do	Air Attaché	5,816	4,200	10,016
O–3	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	6,123	4,200	10,323
O–3	do	do	6,024	4,200	10,224
O–6	do	Army Attaché	4,800	4,200	9,000
Classified location: GS–15.	Civilian	National Security Agency/Central Security Service Europe Representative.	6,000	1,000	7,000

Question. Section 508 will extend the rental guaranty program another year, but will increase the maximum rental from $225 to $275 per month.

(a) What success are you having with this program at the present time?

(b) Why do you feel you need to increase the average rental cost?

(c) Does this rental figure include the cost of maintenance and operation of these units—the amount seems inconsistent with the $325 monthly average you are requesting under the foreign leasing program?

Answer. The present ceiling of $225 was authorized last year, based in a DoD request to raise the ceiling to $275 based on construction cost increases and dollar revaluations through 1971. Inflationary trends and currency revaluations during 1972 and early 1973 indicate that the $275 figure is the minimum needed if the program is to remain viable. Recent experience by the Army in attempting to place an 1,800 unit plus project under contract met with no success. Potential bidders indicated to Army that average rental would have to be between $275 and $320 per month; this data was made known to us subsequent to introduction of the bill now under consideration by the Committee. Overall costs of the leasing and rental guarantee programs are comparable. Rental guarantee monthly cost limitations are somewhat lower inasmuch as cost of utilities are not part of the dollar limitation as is the case in costs associated with foreign leasing.

Question. Section 509. You propose under this section to increase the maximum limitation on space allowances from the lowest enlisted personnel (E–1) through the rank of colonel. No proposal is made for increasing the space allowance of general officers.

(a) What is your objective in increasing the space allowance? Is it simply to provide larger rooms, or does it provide for additional rooms?

(b) Can you give us some specific examples? For instance, you would increase the space for a colonel by 30 square feet, and in the acse of a three-bedroom house for enlisted men grades E–7 through E–9, the increase would be 270 square feet Just what will these increases provide?

(c) Will you submit for the record a chart showing a comparison of the space allowance and what you are proposing?

(d) What does this mean dollarwise insofar as your program is concerned, as well as your projection for the future?

(e) What is your order of priority—increased space or more units of housing?

Answer. The information follows in the same order as the subparagraphs above:

(a) The objective is to provide improved overall livability in military family housing by appropirately increasing the sizes of various spaces to eliminate problem areas found as a result of the recently completed survey of occupants and triservice analysis of existing space. The proposed increases are intended to provide for larger rooms and improved circulation.

(b) In the case of the colonel's unit, the adidtional 30 square feet requested will be used to improve circulation by providing the opportunity to slightly increase hallway, entry foyers, and stair widths. Such increases to permit easier access to prime living areas and provide more convenient moving of furniture on change of occupancy. The incerase proposed for enlisted grades E–7 through E–9 will provide the same size units for company grade officers and senior enlisted personnel and larger size rooms commensurate with needs of these grades. While the primary aim of this change is to improve the living environment of these key personnel, it offers the additional advantage of providing a greater degree of standardization in housing types and flexibility in assignment of the company grade inventory. Changes requested will provide for appropriate increases in the size of dining rooms, secondary bedrooms and the bathroom area to permit two full baths on the second floor of three-bedroom, two-story units in lieu of one and one-half now permitted. the appropriate circulation space required to support the enlarged areas and additional interior storage.

(c) *Proposed FY 1974 Space Criteria Floor Areas by Grade Current Versus Proposed*

	Current statutory limit net	OSD proposed	Percent increase statutory limit net (percent)
General officers	2,100	[1]	----------
Senior grade	1,670	1,700	2
Field grade:			
3–BR	1,400	[1]	----------
4–BR	1,400	1,550	11
Company grade: [2]			
2–BR	[3] 950	950	----------
3–BR	1,250	1,350	8
4–BR	1,400	1,450	4
5–BR	1,400	1,550	11
Enlisted: [4]			
2–BR	[3] 950	950	----------
3–BR	1,080	1,200	11
4–BR	1,250	1,350	8
5–BR	1,400	1,550	11

[1] No change.
[2] To include senior NCO's.
[3] Administrative control.
[4] To be limited to E-6's and below.

(d) The dollar impact on the FY 1974 program of the proposed space increase and the new standards for senior enlisted units is estimated to be $12.9 million. Assuming that future programs are at the same program level, it is expected that this dollar value will increase only by the cost growth in the applicable program year.

(e) The proposed new space standards take priority over more units at this time. However, if we have difficulty in implementing these across the board

because of more cost growth than predicted, we will build the senior NCO units to the new standards for other enlisted personnel.

Question. Section 510 authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to settle a claim in the amount of $41,221.92, resulting from certain repairs and improvements to family quarters at the F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming. Will you submit for the record the details concerning this matter?

Answer. The details are as follows:

Background.—Francis E. Warren AFB, Wyoming, has 156 historically significant family housing units built between 1880 and 1933. The units vary in size, amenities, construction details, and materials. The Air Force decided in 1963 to rehabilitate these units through repair and improvements. The feasibility study and design work for all 156 units were accomplished and cost estimates were prepared. Limited resources dictated funding the construction work in three fiscal year increments. Work on the first 42 units was done as part of the 1965 program.

This Project.—Plans and specifications were revised to reflect experience, the second project for 62 units was advertised, and 11 bids were received. Globe Construction Company of Aurora, Colorado, was the low acceptable bidder and was awarded the contract on July 21, 1967. Contract completion was scheduled for August 18, 1968. In general, Globe's performance was considered unsatisfactory in a number of ways. On three separate occasions "show cause" letters were given Globe, and on May 14, 1968 the contract was terminated for default at about 56% job completion. The base, with Contractor's Surety, secured a completion contractor and the work was completed on September 25, 1968.

The Claims.—Globe then filed 27 claims with the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals (ASBCA). These included 7 for ordered changes, 5 for ordered extra work, 10 for discovered changed conditions, 4 for time extensions and 1 for impact and disruption or excess performance costs. ASBCA Decision No. 13316 of September 10, 1971 changed the cause of termination from default to convenience of the Government, approved 25 of the 27 claims and remanded the case to the Contracting Officer to determine and negotiate the amounts due Globe on a total cost basis, including unpaid subcontractor claims then pending in U.S. District Court, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

The Settlement.—Settlement was delegated to a Defense Supply Agency Termination Contracting Officer (TCO). Total costs incurred by Globe were verified by the Defense Contract Audit Agency and the TCO then negotiated the total amount due Globe. The final settlement agreement was reached on December 19, 1972 in the gross amount of $934,516.71. Globe had previously received $378,910.68 leaving a balance of $555,606.03 due. On January 15, 1973, Globe was paid $514,384.11, the maximum legally payable without violating the applicable $20,000 per unit limit on rehabilitation in Section 609, Public Law 87–57. Payment of the $41,221.92 balance due Globe awaits enactment of the proposed waiver included in the Military Construction Authorization request for 1974. A summary of pertinent financial data is attached.

Discussion.—Before settlement on December 19, 1972, project costs were well within all applicable legal limits. The project current working estimate (CWE) based on the settlement agreement totaled $1,225,436.02, including $17,580.99 in design costs and $157,933 in settlement costs. Analysis of the balance, $1,049,922.03, by type of housing using proration based on the contract bidding schedule indicates four instances in which rehabilitation costs exceeded the applicable limit on new construction, requiring notification of both Armed Services Committees before rehabilitation, and two instances in which rehabilitation costs exceeded the absolute limit of $20,000 for rehabilitation of any one unit. Applicable limits are in Section 609 of P.L. 87–57.

Rehabilitation work was complete before the extremely high costs were known. Trial date of the subcontractors' claims against Globe had been set for January 15, 1973 and the Court would not grant further delay. In view of these facts, on advice of Counsel, the January 1973 payment noted above was made to avoid increased settlement costs, because the law permits payment of costs exceeding new construction costs, and compliance with the pre-conditional notification was impossible. Globe paid the subcontractors, thus cancelling the pending trial.

The Air Force intended to comply with all legal requirements, but ASBCA action could not be controlled by Air Force. The decision to change cause of termination allowed Globe to claim costs not permitted if default has been sustained.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE, IMPROVE AND REPAIR 62 UNITS—F. E. WARREN AFB, WYO., COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	Contract award CWE Feb. 21, 1967	Job completion CWE Sept. 25, 1968	Settlement CWE Dec. 19, 1972	Paid to date	Due
Improvements	$334,866	$334,866	$633,952.42	$609,280.02	$24,672.40
Repairs	205,549	205,549	389,135.61	372,586.09	16,549.52
Subtotal, contract	540,415	540,415	1,023,088.03	981,866.11	41,221.92
Contingency	6,412				
Supervision and inspection	9,862	26,834	26,834.00	26,834.00	
Subtotal, construction costs [1]	556,689	567,249	1,049,922.03	1,008,700.11	41,221.92
Design	17,581	17,581	17,580.99	17,580.99	
Settlement costs			157,933.00	157,933.00	
Total cost	574,270	584,830	1,225,436.02	1,184,214.10	41,221.92

[1] See analysis by type of unit below.

Note: CWE—Current working estimate.

Number of units (type and description)	Improvements cost	Repair cost	Total cost	Average cost per unit	Limit on new construction
Contract award CWE, July 21, 1967:					
I—6-4BR SGO	$46,001.00	$29,262.00	$75,263.00	$12,543.83	$19,800
IV—6-4BR FGO	44,914.00	28,914.00	73,828.00	12,304.66	17,600
V—14-3BR FGO	83,177.00	50,363.00	133,540.00	9,538.57	17,600
VI—10-5BR FGO	62,385.00	27,972.00	90,357.00	9,035.70	17,600
XX—22-3BR airmen	89,904.00	58,361.00	148,265.00	6,739.31	13,200
XXV—4-2BR airmen	24,759.00	10,677.00	35,436.00	8,859.00	13,200
Total	351,140.00	205,549.00	556,689.00		
Job completion CWE, Sept. 25, 1968:					
I—6-4BR SGO	47,384.00	29,262.00	76,646.00	12,774.33	19,800
IV—6-4BR FGO	46,264.00	28,914.00	75,178.00	12,529.66	17,600
V—14-3BR FGO	85,679.00	50,363.00	136,042.00	9,717.28	17,600
VI—10-5BR FGO	64,260.00	27,972.00	92,232.00	9,223.20	17,600
XX—22-3BR airmen	92,609.00	58,361.00	150,970.00	6,862.27	13,200
XXV—4-2BR airmen	25,504.00	10,677.00	36,181.00	9,045.25	13,200
Total	361,700.00	205,549.00	567,249.00		
Settlement CWE, Dec. 19, 1972:					
I—6-4BR SGO	86,566.09	55,397.43	141,963.52	[1] 23,660.58	19,800
IV—6-4BR FGO	84,519.79	54,738.61	139,258.40	[1] 23,209.73	17,600
V—14-3BR FGO	156,525.00	95,344.84	251,869.84	[2] 17,990.70	17,600
VI—10-5BR FGO	117,396.71	52,955.26	170,351.97	17,035.20	17,600
XX—22-3BR airmen	169,185.60	110,486.28	279,671.88	12,712.36	13,200
XXV—4-2BR airmen	46,593.23	20,213.19	66,806.42	[2] 16,701.61	13,200
Total	660,786.42	389,135.61	1,049,922.03		

[1] Exceed limits on new construction and absolute limit of $20,000.
[2] Exceed limits on new construction.

Note: SGO—senior grade officer; FGO—field grade officer.

Question. In December 1970, at the request of the Army, the Congress passed a bill (P.L. 91–564) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Hawaii approximately 57 acres of land, comprising a part of the Fort Ruger Military Reservation in exchange for approximately 259 acres of land to be acquired by the State adjacent to the Tripler Army Hospital.

The Fort Ruger property we estimated to be worth between $4½ and five million, as compared to about $1 million for the land adjacent to the Tripler Hospital. The difference was to be made up by the State in preparing the site to be occupied by the Army suitable for family housing construction.

It subsequently developed that the Tripler site was not suitable for family housing and the Army is desirous of still conveying the Fort Ruger property to the State of Hawaii and using the proceeds for site preparation work in the Aliamonu Crater, which property is owned by the Army. It is understood that the Aliamonu property can accommodate several hundred units of housing. Rather than amending P.L. 91–564 by separate legislation, it has been suggested

that the necessary language may be included in the military construction authorization bill.

Will you comment on this, please?

Answer. Section 512 repeals P.L. 91-564 which authorized the Secretary of the Army to convey approximately 57 acres of land and improvements at the Fort Ruger Military Reservation, Hawaii, to that State in exchange for the conveyance by the State of Hawaii to the United States of approximately 259 acres of land adjacent to the Tripler Army Hospital. The land adjacent to the Tripler Hospital was to be used as a site for additional family housing. Because of the difference in land values of parcels involved in the exchange, the Act also provided for the State to do certain site preparations on the land to be conveyed to the United States.

Subsequent evaluations determined that development of land to be conveyed to the United States was too costly for military housing; therefore, Section 512 as proposed would continue to permit the Secretary of the Army to convey the Fort Ruger properties to the State of Hawaii, but in lieu of the State conveying land to the United States as heretofore provided, the State would provide for, convey or pay to the United States, either in facilities and services or money, or a combination thereof, a sum equal to the appraised fair market value of the Fort Ruger property to be available for site preparation for military family housing at the Defense-owned Aliamanu Military Reservation, Oahu. The cost of the site preparation, roads and streets, utilities and other support facilities borne by the State would not be considered in arriving at the average cost of any family housing units or the cost of any single family housing unit to be constructed within the boundaries of the Aliamanu Military Reservation, Oahu, Hawaii.

Because the military family housing development at the Aliamanu Military Reservation is to be for tri-service utilization and will provide 2500 to 3000 family housing units, the Office of the Secretary of Defense will insure that the application of the funds from the State of Hawaii will be equitable and appropriately utilized in the proposed housing development.

Question. Since the bill was submitted to the Congress you have proposed two amendments affecting the homeowners assistance program.

(a) First, you ask for additional authorization of $7 million for the purpose of aiding both military and civilian employees who were affected by the base closures, in the disposal of their homes. Will you explain why this is needed, and the magnitude of this program; that is, how many families are affected, et cetera?

(b) Secondly, you have proposed an amendment to include certain personnel not now covered by the program, but who will be affected by the base closures. Will you explain the need for this provision and the scope of it?

Answer. (a) An additional authorization of $7 million for the Homeowners Assistance Program is needed in Fiscal Year 1974 because the funds in the Program available from the previous year and revenue anticipated in Fiscal Year 1974 will be insufficient to provide for the continuing needs of the Program and especially for the considerable impact from the April 17, 1973 Base Realignment Announcement. It is estimated that a program of $46.4 million is necessary in FY 1974 to provide assistance payments of $13.7 to 2,800 affected homeowners, for the assumption of 1,775 mortgages of affected homeowners in the amount of $27.2 million, and for operating costs of $5.5 million for the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Executive Agency for the Program, and especially for the Federal Housing Administration which maintains and disposes of the homes acquired under the Program.

(b) There is a need for a limited expansion of the Homeowners Assistance Program to cover otherwise eligible personnel currently not assisted by the Program, who are assigned or employed at or near an installation which is being realigned but are in an organization not directly involved in the realignment, and who will relocate because of normal reassignment or routine transfer. They are not currently eligible for the Program since the existing statute, applicable to the United States, requires that a causal relationship exist between the termination of assignment or employment and a realignment action. Nevertheless, they can sustain the same losses in disposing of their homes as the personnel covered by the Program at the realigned installation.

The limited expansion applies to the 50 States and the District of Columbia because a similar limited expansion of the Program for areas other than the 50

States and the District of Columbia was provided for by Section 601 of Public Law 92-545, October 25, 1972.

It is estimated that 170 applications will be received under the expanded Program and benefits in the amount of $750,000 will be paid. It is anticipated that the major portion of the funds will be expended in FY 1974.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Fliakas. You always give us a lot of information. But this business of building very expensive new units and scrapping older units, especially considering the very limited reduction of bases allowed, is not just going over very well with a lot of Members of Congress.

Mr. SHERIDAN. I realize that.

Senator SYMINGTON. Including me.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLIAKAS. For the record, sir, with respect to family housing, I do not believe our record has been so bad. Of the 15,000 units or so that are affected, more than half of them will be retained either by the using service or by another service, the Coast Guard, for example, is interested in some. And I think it also speaks well that of those to be excessed, less than a thousand of them have been built within the last 10 years.

Senator SYMINGTON. You could have come in and asked for a lot more bases, a lot more family housing. How many are you short in this country today?

Mr. FLIAKAS. We have a deficit of some 60,000 units for eligible personnel.

Senator SYMINGTON. And yet, you do not feel that inasmuch as you have that heavy deficit that you could pass over these thousands of units that you in turn are passing over to GSA or the local community?

Mr. FLIAKAS. It is also a question of distribution, sir, location.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

Mr. FLIAKAS. Thank you, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. At this point I will submit for the record a letter received from the National Association of Home Builders.

[The information follows:]

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1973.

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the National Association of Home Builders, I should like to request that this letter be included in the Committee's hearing record on military construction authorization.

The National Association of Home Builders is the trade association of the home building industry. Its membership totals more than seventy-one thousand throughout the fifty states and Puerto Rico.

Our Association believes that the private home building industry is capable of supplying the housing needs of military families more efficiently and at a lower cost to the Federal Government than if such housing is built by direct Federal funding. I am attaching resolutions adopted by NAHB's Board of Directors last October and in January of this year. These elaborate our position that, with a realistic quarters allowance system, the home building industry, operating in a highly competitive field, is the best instrument for meeting the needs of our service families in the most economical manner.

Current housing allowances are not realistic in many parts of the country in terms of present economic conditions, in that they do not bear a realistic relationship to the average rentals prevailing in the community. Nor do they bear

any relation to the actual cost to the government of directly funded construction and maintenance. We urge the Committee to deplore the relationship of housing allowances to the actual cost of land acquisition and construction. We believe that such an investigation would show that, with an economically realistic housing allowance and private industry constructing the housing, housing our military families would be far less costly, in the long run, than the present system.

Another aspect of the present method of providing military family housing is that it fails to utilize most effectively the one industry best equipped and developed to produce housing. As a general rule, only very large general contractors are employed by the services to produce on-base housing and such contractors do not ordinarily have the experience or expertise to produce this housing at the lowest possible cost. They are more accustomed to constructing commercial and industrial type installations.

Two factors operate to exclude the average home builder from competing with the general contractor in an area the home builder knows best. One is that military housing construction contracts generally require various types of bonds which only the large contractor has the financial capacity to obtain. Another is that the larger contractor is able to outbid the smaller employer for the available labor, with resultant unrealistic higher wage rates which often have damaging effects on the local labor market. Thus, incentives to the larger contractor to keep costs as low as possible are frequently absent.

I should like to urge the Committee also to consider the economic multiplier effect on local economies of privately owned housing. Such housing pays full taxes and bears a full share of the costs of various municipal services as compared with directly funded housing situated on government-owned land, whose occupants nevertheless enjoy the benefits of such municipal services. Impact aid for federally connected school children does not begin to replace the tax revenues and other monies cities would receive if military family housing was privately built and owned.

We respectfully urge the Committee's consideration of these factors as it considers the Defense Department's request for authorization and funding of its military family housing operations.

Sincerely,

GEORGE C. MARTIN,
President.

Enclosures.

NAHB RESOLUTION

HOUSTON, TEX., *January 7, 1973.*

THE NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

MILITARY HOUSING

Whereas, the President of the United States is conducting an economy move to eliminate waste in government and to hold spending to $250 billion in fiscal year 1973, and

Whereas, there is a great deal of waste and unnecessary spending in military housing programs which could be eliminated in achieving the President's goal.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that NAHB reaffirm its position that there be developed a realistic system of quarters allowances that recognizes actual costs or rentals of housing developed by private developers and that it urge that the military housing program be immediately recast in this time of financial stringency to effectuate this more efficient private enterprise system of meeting the housing needs of our military families at a much lower total cost to the Federal Government.

NAHB RESOLUTION

PORTLAND, OREG., *October 9, 1972.*

HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF VIRGINIA

MILITARY HOUSING

Whereas, the military is engaging in construction and development of apartments and housing throughout the United States and operating them in competition with private industry, and

Whereas, private industry is and always has been capable of providing necessary housing for the military, and

Whereas, the basic problem is the fact that the quarters allowances for military personnel in the lower grades or rankings are too low and becoming inadequate because of inflationary conditions, and

Whereas, an increase in quarters allowance would be more than offset by the savings in construction and maintenance costs incurred by the military when it is in competition with private industry.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the appropriate committees in Congress conduct an investigation and study of quarters allowances with the aim of developing a realistic system that recognizes actual costs or rentals of housing developed by private developers in the locations in which the housing is sought.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

Senator SYMINGTON. Next, we would like Mr. Harrington.

You are the Acting Director on the Reserve components?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you have a statement?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Yes, sir, I have.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you present it?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I have a one-page summary of that three-page statement.

Mr. Chairman, for fiscal year 1974 the Department of Defense is requesting a total of $109,658,000 in authorization of training facilities for the Reserve components.

Within the total requested, and in accordance with the usual lump sum authorization procedures, specific projects within the total request can only be tentatively identified at this time. However, current indications are that $39,031,000 would be used to construct or expand 69 Army Reserve centers and Army National Guard armories, and $26,769,000 would be used for 59 projects to provide aviation support, vehicle maintenance, and miscellaneous summer training and other non-armory facilities. Similarly, $8,971,000 would be required for seven joint-use Reserve centers for Naval and Marine Corps reservists, and $9,887,000 for aviation maintenance facilities, personnel support, berthing and storage facilities. The remaining proposed authorization for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve would provide $11,100,000 for aviation operational facilities; $9,900,000 for maintenance projects; $3,300,000 for training facilities, and $700,000 for general support facilities and real estate acquisition.

We will be pleased to attempt to answer any questions you may have on the facility programs or the Reserve components generally.

[Mr. Harrington's statement follows:]

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I am pleased and honored to again have the privilege of appearing before this Committee to present the Reserve Forces Facilities Program of the Department of Defense for Fiscal Year 1974.

This is my fourth appearance before this distinguished Committee in support of a continuing program which, in my opinion, is one of the most essential within the Department of Defense in contributing toward a strong and credible National Defense posture.

During the last three years, and due largely to the sustained interest and support of this and other Committees of the Congress, we have seen the Reserve Facilities Program grow steadily as a reflection of the joint Congressional and

Department of Defense concern that our Guard and Reserve Forces be brought to a maximum readiness capability.

During previous testimony by the Secretary of Defense, he emphasized the Departments current policy and intent that the Guard and Reserve Forces be considered the primary source of Active Force augmentation in lieu of the now expired draft. This policy, which as never before brings the Reserve Components into a full partnership with the Active Forces, requires a common sharing of many military missions if the Total Force Concept is to succeed. Similarly, this policy not only reflects the high regard which characterizes the Departments appreciation of the Guard and Reserve Capabilities, but also the realistic assessment that if we are to be successful in maintaining a strong Defense posture within the constraints of increasing pressure for lower Defense budgets, we must achieve maximum use of our relatively low cost Guard and Reserve potential.

The increased responsibilities of the Reserve Components carries with it a corollary requirement that we make every effort to insure that the Reserves and Guard are so trained and equipped that they will in every sense, fully merit the title of Minutemen in their capability for quick mobilization and deployment. One of the key elements in the matrix of total equipment and training needs is the provision of modern and effective Training Centers and Armories, and the Weekend Training sites for field training of individuals and units. The program we propose in FY 1974 is a substantial step toward achieving an adequate annual increment of these requirements.

For FY 1974 the Department of Defense is requesting a total of $109,658,000 in authorization of training facilities for the Reserve Components. This amount would be divided as follows:

Army National Guard	$29,900,000
Army Reserve	35,900,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	18,858,000
Air National Guard	16,000,000
Air Force Reserve	9,000,000
Total	109,658,000

This year's request compares favorably with prior years and represents an increase of approximately 13 percent over the $97.3 million requested in FY 1973, and some 37 percent higher than the $80.3 million requested in FY 1972.

Within the total requested, and in accordance with the usual lump sum authorization procedures, specific projects within the request can only be tentatively identified at this time. However, current indications are that $39,031,000 would be used to construct or expand 69 Army Reserve Centers and Army National Guard Armories, and $26,769,000 would be used for 59 projects to provide aviation support, vehicle maintenance, and miscellaneous summer training and other non-armory facilities. Similarly, $8,971,000 would be required for seven joint-use Reserve Centers for Naval and Marine Corps reservists, and $9,887,000 aviation maintenance facilities, personnel support, berthing and storage facilities. The remaining proposed authorization for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve would provide $11,100,000 for aviation operational facilities; $9,900,000 for maintenance projects; $3,300,000 for training facilities, and $700,000 for general support facilities and real estate acquisition.

Mr. Chairman, I have with me representatives of the Military Departments who are prepared to discuss their individual Reserve facilities programs in more detail if the Committee so desires. We will pleased to attempt to answer any questions you may have on the facility programs or the Reserve Components generally.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Harrington, would you put your State list in the record?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I will be happy to do so, sir.

[The State list follows:]

RESERVE FORCES, TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

[Thousands of dollars]

State	ARNG	USAR	N&MCR	ANG	AFR	Total
Alabama	1,244	1,651		950		3,845
Alaska	2,975					2,975
Arizona		572			181	753
Arkansas	855	792		1,162		2,809
California	1,515	1,435				2,950
Colorado				230		230
Connecticut	133	798		170		1,101
Delaware	442	291				733
District of Columbia	517			[1] 350		867
Florida	824	148			982	1,954
Georgia			529	984	296	1,809
Hawaii	816	2,754				3,570
Idaho	325	219				544
Illinois	530		2,036	725	1,088	4,379
Indiana	594	2,552	923		110	4,179
Iowa	128					128
Kansas		995		610		1,605
Kentucky	344	695				1,039
Louisiana	469	436				905
Maine	63					63
Maryland	1,094	1,466			174	2,734
Massachusetts	676	523	300			1,499
Michigan	1,048	474	518		935	2,975
Minnesota	795			465		1,260
Mississippi	714	1,005		1,334	375	3,428
Missouri	377			350	518	1,245
Montana		950				950
Nebraska	138	701		311		1,150
Nevada	238			410		648
New Hampshire	162					162
New Jersey	326			350		676
New Mexico	169					169
New York	1,688		481	926	175	3,270
North Carolina	866	1,965		1,200		4,031
North Dakota	61	537				598
Ohio	1,209					1,209
Oklahoma	1,616	1,230		882	199	3,927
Oregon	267					267
Pennsylvania	826	7,249	2,820	352	1,927	13,174
Puerto Rico	619	120				739
Rhode Island	60	1,195	2,039	140		3,434
South Carolina	266					266
South Dakota	364	213				577
Tennessee	655			605		1,260
Texas	553	386	9,212	922	1,751	12,824
Utah	286	2,027			135	2,448
Vermont						
Virginia	1,542	1,816				3,358
Washington	756			675		1,431
West Virginia	156			325		481
Wisconsin	373	705			154	1,232
Wyoming	226					226
Various Locations				1,572		1,572
Subtotal	29,900	35,900	18,858	16,000	9,000	109,658
Minor construction	3,300	2,500	300	2,000	200	8,300
Planning and design	2,000	2,300	1,142	2,000	800	8,242
Total	35,200	40,700	20,300	20,000	10,000	126,200

[1] Andrews AFB, Md.

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, ARMY RESERVE

Location, project, and cost

	Thousands
Alabama:	
Huntsville—300-man center with 2-bay shop and area maintenance support activity	$730
Montgomery—400-man center with 3-bay shop, area maintenance support activity, and fuel system supply point training facility	921
Arizona, Phoenix—Expand 450-man center with 3-bay shop to 600-man center with 4-bay shop	572
Arkansas, Fort Chaffe—Annual training facilities	792
California, Oakland—600-man center with 4-bay shop	1,435
Connecticut, West Hartford—Expand 750-man center for command and control facility and medical addition	$798

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, ARMY RESERVE—Continued

Location, project, and cost	*Thousands*
Delaware, Dover—Expand 150-man center to 300-man center	$291
Florida, Lakeland—Alter existing 200-man center with 2-bay shop	148
Hawaii, Fort Shafter—1,000-man center with 5-bay DS/GS shop	2,754
Idaho, Idaho Falls—Expand 50-man center to 100-man center	219
Indiana:	
East Chicago—300-man center with 2-bay shop	841
Evansville (Jt. with Navy)—Expand 300-man center to 400-man center with DS/GS shop	507
North Judson—Expand 50-man center to 100-man center	249
Rushville—Expand 50-man center with 1-bay shop to 150-man center with 2-bay shop	469
Scottsburg—Expand 50-man center with 1-bay shop to 150-man center with 2-bay shop	486
Kansas, Wichita—Expand 750-man center to 1,000-man center with command and control facility and medical addition	995
Kentucky, Ashland—150-man center with 2-bay shop	695
Louisiana, Bogalusa—Expand 50-man center with 1-bay shop to 150-man center with 2-bay shop	436
Maryland, Fort Meade—600-man center with 4-bay shop and command and control addition	1,466
Massachusetts, Taunton—Expand 300-man center to 400-man center with medical addition	523
Michigan, Battle Creek—Expand 150-man center to 300-man center with DS/GS shop	474
Mississippi:	
Laurel—200-man center with 2-bay shop and area maintenance support activity	620
Pascagoula—100-man center with 1-bay shop	385
Montana:	
Great Falls—Expand 150-man center to 200-man center with area maintenance support facility	267
Kalispell—Expand 50-man center to 100-man center	224
Lewistown—100-man center with 1-bay shop	459
Nebraska, Fremont (Jt. with Navy)—200-man center with 2-bay shop	701
North Carolina:	
Fort Bragg—400-man center with 3-bay shop and parachute packing and repair facility	1,023
Raleigh (No. 2)—200-man center with 2-bay shop	563
Wilson—100-man center with 1-bay shop	379
North Dakota, Minot—100-man center with 1-bay shop	537
Oklahoma, Norman—Aircraft maintenance hangar	1,230
Pennsylvania:	
Altoona—Expand 150-man center to 300-man center with DS/GS shop	521
Edgemont—1,000-man center with 5-bay shop and DS/GS shop	2,376
Indiana—Expand 50-man center with 1-bay shop to 150-man center with 2-bay shop	471
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation—Annual training facilities	989
Willow Grove—600-man center with 4-bay shop and command and control addition	1,749
Aircraft maintenance hangar	1,143
Puerto Rico, Puerto Nuevo—Expand military parking area	120
Rhode Island, Providence (Jt. w/Navy)—600-man center with 4-bay shop and medical facilities	1,195
South Dakota, Aberdeen—Expand 50-man center to 100-man center	213
Texas, Paris—Expand 50-man center with 1-bay shop to 150-man center with 2-bay shop	386
Utah:	
Ogden—600-man center with 4-bay shop and area maintenance support activity	1,527
Pleasant Grove—Expand 50-man center to 100-man center	249
Provo—Expand 150-man center with 2-bay shop to 200-man center with 2-bay shop	251

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, ARMY RESERVE—Continued

Location, project, and cost	*Thousands*
Virginia:	
Camp A. P. Hill—Annual training facilities	$909
Camp Pickett—Annual training facilities	907
Wisconsin, Camp McCoy—Airfield improvements	348
Aircraft maintenance and storage facility	357
Subtotal	35,900
Minor construction	2,500
Planning and design	2,300
Total	40,700

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVES

Location, project, and cost	*Thousands*
Georgia, NAS Atlanta—Bachelor enlisted quarters	$529
Illinois:	
Peoria—Naval and Marine Corps Reserves center	1,445
Quincy—Naval Reserve addition to existing Army Reserve center	591
Indiana, Evansville—Naval and Marine Corps Reserve center	923
Massachusetts, NAS South Weymouth—Aircraft corrosion control facility	300
Michigan:	
NAF Detroit—Taxiway extension	345
(Selfridge ANG Base)—Ground support equipment shop	173
New York, N&MCRC Brooklyn (Floyd Bennett Field)—Berthing facilities	481
Pennsylvania:	
Allentown—Naval Reserve center	1,138
NAS Willow Grove—Bachelor enlisted quarters	1,214
Warehouse	468
Rhode Island, Providence (Jt. with/Army Res.)—Armed Forces Reserve center	2,039
Texas:	
Austin—Naval and Marine Corps Reserve center	1,058
NAS Dallas—Naval and Marine Corps Reserve center	1,777
Aircraft parking apron	1,982
Maintenance hangar	4,395
Subtotal	18,858
Minor construction	300
Planning and design	1,142
Total	20,300

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Location, project, and cost	*Thousands*
Alabama:	
Dannelly Field—Composite squadron operations facility	$600
Martin ANG Station—Reserve Forces communications/electronics training facility	350
Arkansas:	
Fort Smith—Composite squadron operations facility	527
Little Rock—Avionics shop, Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop	275
Colorado, Greeley ANG Station—Automotive maintenance shop/aerospace ground equipment shop	230
Connecticut, Orange ANG Station—Aerospace ground equipment shop	170
District of Columbia, Andrews AFB (ANG)—Avionics shop	350
Georgia, Dobbins AFB (ANG)—Conversion of hangar	984

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AIR NATIONAL GUARD—Continued

Location, project, and cost

	Thousands
Illinois, Capitol MAP—Composite squadron operations facility	$725
Kansas, McConnell AFB (ANG)—Composite squadron operations facility	610
Minnesota, Duluth ANG Base—Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop	330
Avionics/weapons system shop (addition/alteration)	135
Mississippi:	
Key Field—Reserve Forces communications/electronics training facility	514
Avionics/nondestructive inspection shop	300
Avionics/nondestructive inspection shop	300
Gulfport MAP—Reserve Forces communications/electronics training facility	520
Missouri, Lambert Field (St. Louis)—Avionics/nondestructive inspection shop	350
Nebraska, Lincoln ANG Base—Convert/alter main hangar leanto to avionics shop, general purpose shop, squadron and base operations, and combat operations center	311
Nevada, Reno MAP—Avionics/nondestructive inspection shop	410
New Jersey, McGuire AFB (ANG)—Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop	350
New York, Schenectady Airport—Composite aircraft maintenance facility	636
Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop with propellor shop	290
North Carolina, Douglas MAP—Composite aircraft maintenance facility	800
Taxiway/runway access	400
Oklahoma, Tulsa MAP—Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop	300
Composite maintenance facility	582
Pennsylvania, NAS Willow Grove—Automotive maintenance shop/refueling vehicle shop	352
Rhode Island, North Smithfield ANG Station—Automotive maintenance shop	140
Tennessee, Alcoa ANG Station—Add to and alter reserve forces communications/electronics training facility	605
Texas, Ellington AFB—Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop	307
Automotive maintenance facility	148
Refueler maintenance/POL operations	62
Avionics shop	405
Washington, Spokane—Composite squadron operations facility	675
West Virginia, Kanawha County Airport—Aviation fuel operating storage facility	325
Various locations:	
(5)—Power check pad with suppressor	952
(8)—Aircraft arresting systems (BAK-12/14)	620
Subtotal	16,000
Minor construction	2,000
Planning and design	2,000
Total	20,000

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, AIR FORCE RESERVE

Location, project, and cost

	Thousands
Arizona, Luke AFB—Parachute and dinghy repair shop	$181
Florida, Eglin AFB (Aux No. 3)—Aerospace ground equipment shop	154
Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop	278
Aircraft corrosion control	100
Assault landing strip	450
Georgia, Dobbins AFB—Nondestructive inspection shop	150
Aerospace ground equipment shop	146
Illinois, Chicago—O'Hare IAP—Nondestructive inspection shop	149
Fuel system maintenance dock	939
Indiana, Grissom AFB—Reserve Forces communications/electronics training facility	110

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, AIR FORCE RESERVE—Continued

Location, project, and cost	*Thousands*
Maryland, Andrews AFB—Aerospace ground equipment shop	$174
Michigan, Selfridge ANG Base—After fuel system maintenance dock	185
Composite aircraft maintenance shop	750
Mississippi, Keesler AFB—Maintenance hangar (addition)	375
Missouri, Richards-Gebaur AFB—Alter fuel system maintenance dock	171
Squadron operations	347
New York, Niagara Falls IAP—Alter fuel system maintenance dock	175
Oklahoma, Tinker AFB—Power check pad with suppressors	199
Pennsylvania:	
Greater Pittsburgh IAP—Aerial port training facility	322
Nondestructive inspection shop	145
Aerospace ground equipment shop	205
Parachute and dinghy repair shop	200
Willow Grove ARF—Fuel system maintenance dock	930
Reserve Forces communications/electronics training facility	125
Texas, Ellington AFB—Automotive maintenance facility	832
Extend runway overrun	133
Land fee purchase	100
Composite refueler maintenance and petroleum operations building	248
Aircraft organizational maintenance shop	86
Perpetual restrictive land easement	352
Utah, Hill AFB—Power check pad with suppressor	135
Wisconsin, Gen. Billy Mitchell Field—Nondestructive inspection shop	154
Subtotal	9,000
Minor construction	200
Planning and design	800
Total	10,000

Senator SYMINGTON. May I say that as the Volunteer Army problem becomes increasingly evident, the voluntary military problem, not just Army, I think we are going to have to depend more on the Reserves and the National Guard, and I personally am quite sympathetic with the request to build this up at this time.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HARRINGTON. If I may, sir, I have with me statements of the commanding officers of the five Reserve components. I would like to submit these for the record if the chair will permit.

Senator SYMINGTON. Without objection. We welcome them.

[The statements follow:]

STATEMENT BY MAJOR GENERAL DONALD V. RATTAN, DEPUTY CHIEF, OFFICE OF RESERVE COMPONENTS U.S. ARMY

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee. I will provide some general remarks on the achievements and the stated goals of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve Military Construction Programs.

Major General Francis S. Greenlief, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and Major General J. Milnor Roberts, Chief, Army Reserve, are here and will follow me to discuss the details of their respective programs.

I have been the Deputy Chief of the Army Reserve Components for just over a year. During that period I have had the opportunity of visiting a large number of Army National Guard and Army Reserve units. On the whole I have found these citizen soldiers to be ready, spirited, and dedicated people who want to succeed. That they succeed is of primary importance, for the citizen soldiers of our Reserve Components make up nearly half (44%) of our total Army force.

Facilities do have a significant impact on the effectiveness and readiness of the Reserve Components.

If the facilities are adequate, the troops have a sense of being provided for—of being needed and being appreciated of—and the morale, training and readiness are improved, often in direct ratio to the adequacy of available facilities.

Overcrowded and makeshift facilities contribute to a loss of training time, reduced efficiency, and a concurrent decrease in morale and esprit de corps.

Recognizing this, in 1970, a Reserve Component 10-year, long range construction plan totalling 628 million dollars was approved. The first increment on this program was included in the FY 71 annual budget.

The 10-year plan was designed to provide adequate facilities to the Reserve Components in a sustained, orderly, and economical manner. The plan included both new facilities and renovations or additions to existing facilities. Because of cost escalation, this 10-year program currently is more than $800 million.

The military construction authorization requests being presented today will assist in continuing the progress already made and represent the fourth increment of the 10-year program. The FY 71 to FY 73 increments provided for 365 projects, all of which have been completed or are in varying stages of design, contract award or construction. The authorization requests to be discussed by Generals Greenlief and Roberts total $55.8 million.

Facilities improvements are concentrated in five specific areas to provide—

Storage space and security for the large volume of equipment being issued to Reserve Component units.

Adequate aviation facilities for the greatly expanded air fleet.

Better training areas and facilities.

Intrusion detection devices in all arms rooms.

Modern, adequate armories and centers.

This concludes my formal statement, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned earlier, Generals Greenlief and Roberts are here to present details of their respective programs. I'll be pleased to answer any questions that you may have or provide additional information, if desired.

STATEMENT BY MAJOR GENERAL J. MILNOR ROBERTS, CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

Honorable Chairmen and Members of the Joint Committees: It is a pleasure to appear before you to present the Military Construction, Army Reserve Program for FY-1974.

Readiness programs for the Army Reserve are well underway. Additional important equipment and improved training and supervision are being provided. Another important element to improve readiness is the availability of adequate training facilities and training areas. This Military Construction Authorization provides for construction of such facilities.

Fiscal Year 1974 will be the fourth year of the approved 10-year Program for provision of adequate and proper home-station training centers for the Army Reserve. The actual results of our initial program years FY-71 and FY-72 are for the most part complete. These modern, efficient centers are tangible proof that the emphasis on the Army Reserve is real. More and more units throughout the Nation are receiving improved training in facilities designed for a modern Army Reserve equipped with required quantities of deployable equipment.

Our Construction Program awards rose from $12 million in FY 1971 to over $27 Million in FY 1972 and is approximately $24 Million this year. In addition, $10 Million is now being advertised or negotiated. Another $6 Million is currently ready for advertisement but will require renotification.

The FY 1974 appropriation request includes $35.9 million for major construction, $2.5 million for minor construction and $2.3 million for advanced planning. The FY 1974 authorization request for $35.9 million in major construction includes 49 major projects in 30 states.

The FY 1974 Program is well balanced, combining both home-station and training facilities. It includes 19 new centers, 22 expansions and eight special projects. This actually provides:

4 modern training centers with unit maintenance shops;
5 direct support/general support maintenance shops;
4 medical facility additions;
3 command and control facilities;
4 aviation projects;

4 annual training site improvements; and
2 special training facilities.

These projects and the 60 minor construction projects which we will accomplish will markedly improve our facilities.

I might add that these minor projects are used to expand equipment storage areas to accommodate the major equipment issues.

Another aspect of our Construction Program worth highlighting is our Intrusion Detection Systems. We have installed IDS in all centers with arms storage. This has resulted in a major reduction in forced entry weapons thefts. We are improving the construction of our arms vaults and using acrylics for windows throughout the building. This latter item makes it almost impossible to throw a rock or missile through a window.

Our design effort is well underway with 33 projects currently authorized to proceed to final design, six other projects are ready to be authorized final design, and the remaining 10 are in various stages of pre-design. We have adequate real estate to execute the program, and foresee no major problem areas.

The Justification Data Books which you have been furnished provide detailed information and fully support our Authorization Request. All of these projects are urgently needed for improved training and readiness.

This concludes my statement. I am prepared to answer any questions the Committee may have.

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. FRANCIS S. GREENLIEF, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU, DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: It is a privilege to appear before this distinguished committee to present the fiscal year 1974 military construction, Army National Guard budget request.

Today when our active military forces are being reduced, the readiness posture of the guard has become of even more critical importance. The facilities needed to assemble and administer our guard units, to store weapons, to maintain vehicles and aircraft, and to accomplish our annual and weekend training assume added importance.

As a result of the increased reliance placed on the national guard for the defense of our Nation, our units have, and are still receiving, additional and more modern equipment. In the last three years the value of our equipment inventory doubled and is expected to increase another 50% in the next two years. Our requirements for maintenance and storage facilities for this equipment have increased proportionately. In addition, training requirements for the guard have increased so that our units may attain and maintain a high state of combat readiness. This has created a need for more and better training facilities. Because of these increased facility requirements, our construction backlog has increased from $300 to $354 million.

Today we are requesting an authorization for $29.9 million and appropriations of $35.2 million for the construction of urgently needed facilities. This budget level of $35.2 million is a decrease of $4.8 million over the current year, fiscal year 1973. Reason for this decrease is that in fiscal year 1973 we received additional funds for "people oriented projects" which were not received in fiscal year 1974. With a $354 million known backlog of construction requirements, the fiscal year 1974 budget of $35.2 million would allow us to deplete this backlog in about 10 years. This, however, assumes no escalation in construction costs and that we can foresee all of our requirements for the next 10 years.

The $35.2 million fiscal year 1974 budget plan provides $29.9 million for major construction and $5.3 million for minor construction and planning. The major construction consists of $9.9 million for armories and $20.0 million for non-armory projects.

The justification data books which you have been furnished contain detailed project descriptions which support the construction program. We are proposing 29 armory projects and 50 non-armory projects for a total of 79 projects in 44 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. All of these projects are urgently needed to support improved training and unit readiness.

Our actual obligations for fiscal year 1972 were $27.6 million which exceeded our original obligation target by $4 million. This left us a carry-over of $6.3 million into fiscal year 1973. Our current fiscal year 1973 budget plan of $40 million provides an obligation target of $38.2 million. We expect to reach this target; therefore, we should have a carry-over of $8.1 million into fiscal year 1974. We

plan to obligate $35.7 million during fiscal year 1974 which would then give us 7.6 million to carry into fiscal year 1975. A carry-over of about this size will enable us to distribute our workload throughout the year and in many cases to take advantage of off-season construction prices. Our obligation figures include minor construction and planning funds as well as major construction.

I again wish to express my appreciation for your understanding and continuing support of our efforts to provide adequate facilities for our 400,000-man Army National Guard force.

Sir, this concludes my prepared statement. If there are any questions, I will be pleased to furnish any information that you may require.

STATEMENT OF VICE ADMIRAL DAMON W. COOPER, USN, CHIEF OF NAVAL RESERVE

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee: I am pleased to appear before you today for the purpose of presenting the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve military construction requirements for fiscal year 1974.

The request, totaling $20.3 million of lump sum authority, provides $18.9 million for specific projects and $1.4 million for continuing authority. This is a modest sum when compared to total requirements, yet it is consistent with budget limitations and the Navy's overall priorities. The projects to be accomplished under the lump sum authority are urgently needed to enhance the training and mobilization readiness and the recruiting and retention effort of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.

Currently, there are 364 sites throughout the country supporting the Naval Surface Reserve: the Marine Corps Reserve is co-located with the Navy in 126 of these sites. In addition, the Marine Corps Ground Reserve is located at 44 other sites separate from the Naval Reserve. In fiscal year 1974, there will be 63 reserve force ships located at ports convenient to reserve personnel. Additionally, we operate six Naval Air Stations, one Naval Air Facility and 36 other Naval and Marine Corps Air Reserve sites.

We are continuing to emphasize a cost-effective policy of joint utilization. Of the 451 naval and marine corps reserve sites currently in use, 259, or over 57%, are jointly utilized with one or more other services—and that percentage is increasing annually. In the FY 74 NCNR program before you, two projects are for the construction of naval and marine corps reserve centers, and four are for joint construction of armed forces reserve centers. Eight of the remaining ten projects are on sites which are already jointly utilized, and five of those will directly benefit other services. All the projects are designed to improve personnel support and operating facilities critical to both navy and marine corps mobilization objectives. The projects presented are of definite and continuing importance in building the readiness and responsiveness of our naval and marine corps reserve. The program has been carefully screened and contains only projects of greatest urgency.

The naval reserve has an urgent need for this funding to replace or modernize obsolescent facilities—particularly in view of the increased emphasis on the reserve. We appreciate your past support and earnestly seek it for the urgent projects included in this year's program.

This concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman. I shall be pleased to answer any questions or provide further information as desired.

STATEMENT BY MAJOR GENERAL FRANCIS S. GREENLIEF, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committees: I deeply appreciate these committee's action in adding $5.5 million to our FY 73 Budget. Your timely action has permitted us to provide urgently needed funds to support some of our units which have converted to newer aircraft. Even so, the funding levels available for the past few years have not allowed the Air National Guard to keep pace with its annual requirements.

The Air National Guard Military Construction Appropriation request for fiscal year 1974 totals $20.0. Of this amount, $4.0 million is proposed for planning and minor construction. The remaining $16.0 million is avaliable for the construction of major facilities at both flying and non-flying Air National Guard Bases.

As you are aware, the Air National Guard is undergoing a tremendous modernization program of the flying units with assignment of high performance aircraft and associated support equipment being received from the Air Force. Over seventy percent of our Air National Guard flying units will have converted to later model aircraft by the end of fiscal year 1974. Also, our non-flying units are being expanded and modernized with newer, more powerful radars, more complex communications systems and better support equipment.

This modernization program has, and is, creating extensive requirements for more and more complex support facilities, such as aircraft arresting systems, power check pads with sound suppressors, avionics shops, flight simulator facilities, weapons release shops, bearing inspection shops, nondestruct inspection facilities, reconnaissance photographic laboratories, etc. Almost our entire request is for operational and maintenance type facilities to support the aircraft conversion program and the expansion of the nonflying mission.

To support the aircraft conversions and expanded mission in the operational and maintenance areas, alone, we have identified essential facilities requirements in excess of $100 million. These facilities are required now to enable the converted/new units to achieve a "combat ready" status at the earliest possible date and to maintain this status.

With our requirements far exceeding available funds, we have been forced to limit new facilities to those with the most critical and immediate need.

It is to be noted that a great number of Air National Guard units are at present housed in facilities constructed during or before World War II, and have, or are, rapidly approaching the end of their economical lives. It is estimated that these facilities are deteriorating at the annual rate of $11.0 million. Considering an immediate $54 million deficiency requirement, and a grand total deficiency of approximately $280 million, an annual level-of-effort of approximately $30 million is necessary for the next five years to bring the Air National Guard facilities up to a reasonable level of adequacy.

At this time, the fiscal year 1974 construction program is under design, and can be awarded upon receipt of enabling legislation. Again, this past year, we have had several instances where the states served as the construction agency. Through their services, we were able to incur an average project savings of approximately 15% This savings is primarily the result of reduced design and construction supervision costs, along with making maximum use of local area conditions, materials and labor skills. In light of these construction dollar savings, we plan, where feasible, to increase this method of operation.

Because construction costs have increased significantly during the past years, limitations now in effect are no longer realistic. We feel that these committees should consider increasing the limitation for Reserve Forces Minor Construction, P 341 funds, from $50,000 to $150,000. This compares to a limitation of $300,000 approved for the active forces two years ago.

As the Air National Guard continues in its role as a full partner in the Defense establishment, we will, within the limits of available authorization and funds, provide facilities to support our new complex aircraft and other equipment.

This concludes my presentation to the Committees in support of the Air National Guard Military Construction Program for the fiscal year 1974. My Staff and I are ready to entertain any questions you may have regarding our construction program.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

STATEMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM J. CRANDALL, DEPUTY TO THE CHIEF OF AIR FORCE RESERVE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to meet with you and present our military construction request for Fiscal Year 1974. Our request for new authorization and obligational authority for major construction totals $9 million.

I would like to take a few moments to give you a report on our Fiscal Year 1973 program. Of the eighteen projects in our original Fiscal Year 1973 program, fourteen are under contract. The remaining projects will be awarded over the next few weeks. Our uncommitted balance of Fiscal Year 1973 and prior authorization is $100,000. We consider this a reasonable amount to provide contingencies for on-going projects and future bid openings.

The recently announced Air Force base realignment actions for Westover AFB, Massachusetts have resulted in some adjustments in our Fiscal Year 1973 and Fiscal Year 1974 programs. The planned transfer of Westover AFB to the Air Force Reserve will make additional facilities available for our use. As a result, we have cancelled an Aerial Port Training Facility in our Fiscal Year 1973 program and the Aeromedical Evacuation Training Facility in our Fiscal Year 1974 program for Westover. To provide timely obligation of the Fiscal Year 1973 funds released by the cancellation of the Aerial Port Training Facility, we have moved four alteration projects for which design was well advanced from our Fiscal Year 1974 program to the Fiscal Year 1973 program. The projects involved are the Alter Non-destructive Inspection Shop projects at Minneapolis-St Paul International Airport, Minnesota; Niagara Falls International Airport, New York; Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio, and Willow Grove Air Reserve Facility, Pennsylvania. To fill the void in the tentative Fiscal Year 1974 list, we have added an Assault Landing Strip project for Eglin AFB, Auxiliary Field Number 3, Florida. I have a revised tentative project listing for our Fiscal Year 1974 request which I would like to have inserted in the record.

Our Fiscal Year 1974 request places primary emphasis on maintenance facilities. The revised tentative list includes thirty-two (32) projects at sixteen (16) locations in fifteen (15) states. The projects in this request are primarily for locations which have tactical airlift and tactical fighter missions which have experienced equipment conversions in recent years. One new unit is also involved. This is a C–130 Tactical Airlift unit at Keesler AFB, Mississippi. The detailed justification for each project and manpower statistics for each unit involved are included in the backup books provided to your committee.

Our Fiscal Year 1974 program is requested under the lump sum funding and programing procedures utilized since Fiscal Year 1963. Planning and design actions for our 1974 program are well advanced. Advertising is scheduled for January and February of Calendar Year 1974. My efforts to provide the most economic facilities to enhance the training capability and operational readiness of the Air Force Reserve will continue during Fiscal Year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my general statement in support of the Air Force Reserve Fiscal Year 1974 Military Construction Program. I appreciate the consideration and support which our programs receive from your committee. Do you have any questions?

Senator SYMINGTON. At this point I will submit for the record a statement received from the Natinal Guard Association of the United States.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MAJOR GENERAL HENRY W. MCMILLAN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: The National Guard Association of the United States welcomes the opportunity to file this statement for the consideration of the Senate Armed Services/Appropriations Joint Subcommittee on Military Construction.

The NGAUS and ANG is indebted to this Committee for the $5.5M add-on to the FY '73 MCP which allowed construction of 15 additional projects in ten states.

I realize that this Committee fully recognizes the intense competition within the Department of Defense for Defense dollars and that many agencies are forced by the budgetary process to ask for only those amounts which fall within restrictive guidance given them. It is basically for this reason that the National Guard Association of the United States welcomes this occasion to furnish some thoughts and opinions not bound by the restraints of the budget development process.

While there are many areas in the National Guard prorgam where we would like very much to see additional funding which we feel necessary to assure maximum efficiency, we would like especially to bring to the attention of the Committee the serious funding deficiency in the Air National Guard construction program with emphasis on additional funding needed to modernize Air National Guard facilities to accommodate the modern aircraft which are being assigned to Air National Guard units.

The Air National Guard role in national defense today is even more important than in the past. In certain mission areas it is, and has been, the first line of defense of our Reserve forces, while at the same time playing a vital role in the several States during civil disturbances and disasters.

In this era of competitive military budgets, the National Guard Association of the United States suggests that proper attention and logic be focused on the inadequate facilities on a majority of Air National Guard bases. The Air National Guard, over the years, has fallen behind in construction due to austere funding. The total Air National Guard deficiency in construction is approximately $280 million; yet, only $10.6 million was programmed for FY '72 and only $16.1 million was provided for FY '73. Only $20 million is programmed for FY '74. The $20 million for FY '74 is even misleading; actually, it equates to only $16 million for major construction after planning and minor construction are deducted.

By the end of FY '74, the ANG Force Structure will have changed 70% since 1969. Because only $10.6 million was provided for FY '72 and $16.1 million for FY '73, the backlog continues to grow. Consequently, the Air National Guard flying units are receiving modern equipment such as the A–7 and F–106 without modern facilities needed for operations, training, maintenance, storage, security, ground safety and flying safety. Also, the ANG non-flying units have received new computerized Tactical Control systems which require new maintenance and support facilities.

Many Air National Guard units still have World War II vintage facilities which are deteriorating at a rate of $11.0 million annually. It is estimated that $30 million per year will be required over the next six years to provide adequate facilities.

The final report of an Interservice Audit of Military Construction of Facilities of Reserve and Guard Forces dated 13 April 1973 stated that the Military Construction Program (MCP) for Air National Guard (ANG) has been underfunded in relation to the 10-year program approved by OSD in 1970 to bring the deficiency backlog to a manageable level. Of particular concern was the increase of 12 percent over the backlog concurred in by OSD in 1970.

The constraints placed on the Air National Guard due to lack of construction appropriations cause delays in attaining combat-readiness of units.

The National Guardsman is much better off today in regard to pay but the attractiveness of his job is relative. Today's Air National Guardsmen should not have to train in makeshift facilities.

Specifically, it is our conviction that the related funding in the budget for ANG Construction is not adequate to attain and maintain the posture of military readiness expected of the Air National Guard. We therefore, respectfully request that this Committee act to provide adequate facilities to support our new modern weapons systems.

Thank you for giving the NGAUS the opportunity to file this statement in behalf of the Air National Guard.

Senator SYMINGTON. Are the Army representatives here?

Thank you Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Fliakas, and Mr. Harrington.

General, we are working against time here. Would you be good enough just to supply your statement for the record and let us ask a few questions?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[Statement follows:]

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. KENNETH B. COOPER, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR LOGISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am Major General Kenneth B. Cooper, Director of Installations, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Department of the Army.

It is a privilege to appear before this Committee and to present the Department of the Army's portion of the Military Construction Authorization request.

We have structured our budget to reflect the Army reorganization and realignment actions announced in January and April 1973.

For fiscal year 1974, the Army is requesting $660,139,000 in new authorization for military construction. Also, we are requesting amendments to three prior authorizations, in the amount of $1,186,000.

Of the total request $548,558,000 is for construction with the United States and $108,581,000 is for construction outside the United States, including NATO Infrastructure ($80,000,000) and projects in Europe, Korea, Panama, Puerto Rico, the Marshall Islands, and U.S. Army Security Agency and U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command sites. We have requested $3,000,000 under section 102.

As the core of this year's program, we are continuing to emphasize facilities which benefit the soldier: where he lives, where he plays and where we treat him when he is sick. Over 84 percent of our new authorization request for construction, excluding NATO, is in these categories. I will discuss this in more detail in a moment.

The construction planned for the Army outside of the United States, excluding NATO, is approximately five percent of our program. This overseas program is similar to fiscal year 1973, providing for only a limited number of operational facilities and a few projects in support of troop welfare, all at locations where we expect to stay in our long range planning. Also, as in fiscal year 1973, we are requesting no authorization or funds for construction in the Republic of Vietnam.

Continuing the procedure established in fiscal year 1968, the fiscal year 1974 program contains $80,000,000 to support the United States' share of Infrastructure construction for NATO. This is approximately twelve percent of our total program. We propose to provide detailed support for this request at a later session.

Our fiscal year 1974 request includes $14,094,000 to provide facilities for air and water pollution abatement at various Army installations in the United States. This is lower than in recent years. The fiscal year 1972 and fiscal year 1973 programs were the peak years and provided nearly $131,300,000 to satisfy the requirements of Executive Order 11507 as best we could determine. The fiscal year 1974 program will satisfy newly identified requirements derived from increasingly more stringent standards and accomplish projects deferred from earlier programs for technological reasons. We are beginning to learn the magnitude of the requirements which will result from the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. We feel certain that we will need some sizable dollar amounts for pollution abatement projects in future MCA requests.

We are not requesting any funds for the SAFEGUARD program.

Before discussing the highlights of our program, I would like to call your attention to the following tables which give summaries of the program. Table I shows the distribution of the authorization request of $660,139,000 among major commands in the United States and overseas.

TABLE I—PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY AUTHORIZATION

SECTION 101—INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Command	*Cost*
U.S. Continental Army Command [1]	$413,281,000
First Army	(66,891,000)
Third Army	
Fifth Army	
Sixth Army	
U.S. Army Materiel Command	58,649,000
U.S. Army Security Agency	287,000
U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command	8,226,000
United States Military Academy	30,145,000
U.S. Army Medical Department [2]	1,997,000
Office Chief of Engineers	597,000
Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service	2,113,000
U.S. Army, Alaska	8,344,000
U.S. Army, Hawaii	10,825,000
Various locations, air pollution abatement facilities	7,295,000
Various locations, water pollution abatement facilities	6,799,000
Total inside the United States	548,558,000

[1] Reorganized into Forces Command (FORSCOM) and the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) on 1 July 1973.

[2] The Army Health Services Command was organized, effective 1 April 1973, to command medical field activities.

SECTION 101—OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Command	*Cost*
U.S. Army Forces, Southern Command	$8,095,000
United States Army, Pacific	1,568,000
Puerto Rico	517,000
Kwajalein Missile Range	2,353,000
U.S. Army Security Agency	1,434,000
U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command	2,097,000
U.S. Army, Europe	92,517,000
Germany	(12,517,000)
NATO Infrastructure	(80,000,000)
Total outside United States	108,581,000

OTHER

Section 102 (classified project)	3,000,000
Total new authorization requested	660,139,000

Table II shows the construction categories in which the funds are requested and the percent of the construction dollars in each category. This table illustrates the emphasis being placed on facilities supporting our soldiers.

TABLE II—PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY AUTHORIZATION SUMMARY BY CONSTRUCTION CATEGORIES

	Total	Percent of total excluding NATO
Operational and training facilities	$22,301,000	3.8
Maintenance and production facilities	16,418,000	2.8
Research, development, and test facilities	11,183,000	1.9
Supply facilities	8,101,000	1.4
Hospital and medical facilities	34,977,000	6.0
Administrative facilities	2,835,000	0.5
Housing and community facilities	543,391,000	78.2
(Troop housing)	(405,213,000)	(69.9)
(Community facilities)	(48,178,000)	(8.3)
Utilities and ground improvements	28,227,000	4.9
(Air pollution abatement facilities)	(7,295,000)	(1.3)
(Water pollution abatement facilities)	(6,799,000)	(1.2)
(Other)	(14,133,000)	(2.4)
Real estate	2,706,000	0.5
NATO	80,000,000	
Total new authorization requested	660,139,000	100.0

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

THE ARMY MODERN HOUSING PROGRAM

The priority element of our soldier oriented program this year, as with last year, is that portion directed to bringing our Army housing to adequate and modern standards. We first presented the Army's housing program for the Seventies in the fiscal year 1972 budget. Our program goal is to provide modern housing for all bachelor soldiers and families. We are controlling both the programing and execution phases to assure that we get the right type of housing, in the right place, and at the best design and cost we can manage. Since this presentation covers our general MCA program which provides for the bachelor housing support, my remarks will be directed to that portion of the housing program. Subject to your approval, the family housing portion will be covered within the Department of Defense overall family housing presentation.

BACHELOR HOUSING

The fiscal year 1974 program provides for construction of 24,553 new enlisted barracks spaces and 285 bachelor officer spaces in the United States and overseas. Included in these are 3,935 enlisted and 100 officer spaces for the Women's Army Corps and 380 enlisted spaces programed for semi-permanent construction overseas. In locating this new construction, emphasis has been placed on those troop stations which have the largest deficits in bachelor housing and which are included in the Army's long range planning. We are requesting $242,577,000 for this year's new construction portion of the bachelor housing program.

In our fiscal year 1974 budget request we are asking for $146,311,000 to modernize 46,896 enlisted barracks spaces and 528 officer spaces. Of the barracks spaces, 45,397 are in the United States (including 3,587 for enlisted women) and 1,499 are overseas. All officer spaces are in the United States.

Recent changes in criteria for new construction and modernization have had a great impact on the Army's barrack assets insofar as their classification into "adequate" or "substandard" is concerned. Those we now classify as not meeting current standards may vary from pre-World War I buildings on some of our older posts, to relatively new barracks from our MCA programs of the 1960's. The amount of work required to bring these various buildings to current standards varies widely from a matter of internal partitioning to subdivide the open bays into rooms for one, two or three men to total renovation required for some of the older buildings.

I would like to cite some statistics to illustrate the status in adequately housing all of our soldiers and the size of the task still to be accomplished.

Requirements.—Based on the long-range (FY 1978) strength projection, it is presently estimated that housing will be required for approximately 497,000 soldiers of whom 60,000 will be trainees. It will also be necessary to house an estimated 34,000 bachelor officers.

Assets.—Including construction and modernization in progress or already approved in fiscal year 1973 and earlier programs, the Army has approximately 397,000 permanent barracks spaces and 27,000 bachelor officer spaces world-wide. Both in the United States and overseas we have a wide variety of permanent buildings, semi-permanent, and temporary structures being used for troop housing. As indicated earlier, except for trainee barracks in the United States, recent changes in housing criteria such as air conditioning where required and semi-private or private rooms have caused approximately 40 percent of these existing permanent assets to be classified as inadequate under currently accepted standards.

Deficits.—Comparison of the assets and requirements indicates that a deficit exists of approximately 100,000 enlisted barracks spaces and about 7,000 bachelor officer quarters spaces. This deficit must be met by new construction. Plus, we must continue to modernize those existing permanent assets, over 158,000 spaces, that are below standards.

Current bachelor housing standards provide a significant departure from the open-bay barracks which have been our standard in the past. We are striving for increased privacy, more comfortable living conditions, and improved security for the soldier's personal possessions. For the lower grades (E2–E4) we are building or modernizing to create two or three man rooms at 90 square feet of living space per man. The new construction will provide a bath with each room as will modernization projects wherever practical. The middle grades (E5–E6) will normally have one or two man rooms at 135 square feet of living space per man and the senior grades (E7–E9) will be authorized a private room with 270 square feet of living space and a private bath. Air conditioning, increased lighting and electrical outlets, improved furniture, and secure storage areas are inherent features in our designs.

For lieutenants and warrant officers we are providing 330 square feet of living space consisting of a private combination living/bedroom, bathroom and pullman type kitchen. Captains and above will have a private suite of approximately 460 square feet. The accommodations will consist or a living room, bedroom, bathroom and kitchen.

The Army considers these standards to be both necessary and just not extravagant. They are in keeping with improved living conditions which prevail in the United States today.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Also of importance to the soldier are the community functions related to his and his family's daily needs. Our request for these items is $37,448,000 (exclusive of confinement facilities), which provides for a number of diverse facilities including new commissaries at Forts Campbell, Gordon and Polk, chapel centers at Aberdeen Proving Ground and Redstone Arsenal, automotive self help garages at Forts Gordon and Greely, a physical conditioning facility at Carlisle Barracks, a gymnasium at Fort McClellan, outdoor athletic facilities at Fort Riley, a patient visitor facility at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, service clubs at two locations, a post library and gymnasium addition at White Sands Missile Range, a main post office at Fort Eustis, an NCO Open Mess at Yuma Proving Ground, and a billeting office, an Officers Open Mess, and a Provost Marshal facility at Fort Wainwright.

We are including in our request $12,091,000 to improve the schools for our dependent children in Germany. We plan to build additions at three locations and to construct new facilities at two locations to reduce overcrowding and alleviate substandard conditions. The necessity for improvement of the dependent educational facilities in Germany has been recognized for several years and these projects will continue and expand the Army's efforts to improve the dependent school system.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Our request for $34,977,000 for medical facilities is about 6 percent of our program. The largest single project in this category is a $25,000,000 new hospital at the Military Academy. We have included an addition for the permanent hospital at Fort Lee, new dental clinics at Forts Carson, Lewis and Monmouth, and a combined medical and dental facility at Fort Shafter.

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS EXPANSION PROGRAM

An important segment of our request supports the expansion of the Women's Army Corps which will double the size of the Corps by fiscal year 1978. Over $47,893,000 are allocated to this portion of the fiscal year 1974 MCA program. The key projects expand the housing, training, and administrative facilities at Fort McClellan, the WAC Center. The remaining projects are for housing at various posts, as noted earlier, to provide adequate quarters for the increased WAC population.

AVIATION FACILITIES

This year's request contains eight projects totaling $19,195,000, related to Army aviation activities. These include two projects at Fort Hood, one at Fort Sherman, Canal Zone, and one in Korea, all in support of Army contingency requirements. Helicopter landing facilities are planned for Fort Belvoir and runway improvements are requested for Fort Holabird in the interest of safety maintenance, and operational efficiency. Improvements are also planned for the airfield facilities at Fort Rucker. The third and final phase of the Tactical Airfield Complex at Fort Campbell is included this year and will complete the project started in fiscal year 1972.

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

This year we are requesting $30,145,000 for three projects; the new hospital mentioned earlier, utilities expansion, and barracks modernization. These projects have been recommended for approval by the West Point Planning Advisory Board as being necessary and in consonance with the USMA expansion plan. The Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, made up of four U.S. Senators, four U.S. Representatives and six business leaders, strongly indorsed (with one dissent) the need for prompt construction of the new hospital.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Army's total request in this category is $11,183,000, considerably lower than the $59,872,000 approved in fiscal year 1973 when we were completing the construction of two major laboratories. The Human Factors Engineering Laboratory at Aberdeen Proving Ground, an addition to the explosive laboratory at Picatinny Arsenal, and the KOFA Range improvements (phase I) at Yuma Proving Ground are the major projects of the Research, Development and Testing program this year. There are seven other smaller, but necessary, projects.

CONFINEMENT FACILITIES

The Army is also requesting two new confinement facilities is fiscal year 1974 as a continuation of our long range program for providing modern facilities for confinement of military personnel accused or convicted of violations of military law. This long range program is based on the Army's modified correctional system. We foresee construction requirements extending into fiscal year 1977, at a dollar level approximating that of fiscal year 1974, to provide the necessary facilities support. The new facilities proposed in the fiscal year 1974 MCA program will be located at Forts Leonard Wood and Lee at a cost of $10,730,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION ABATEMENT

In support of the national goal of reducing environmental pollution the Army has included $14,094,000 in the fiscal year 1974 MCA program to improve pollution abatement capabilities at twenty-six installations in twenty-two states. Of the total program cost, $7,295,000 is for air pollution abatement and $6,799,000 for water pollution abatement. Our program includes incinerators for explosives and contaminated waste disposal, facilities for treatment of industrial wastes, precipitators on smokestacks, connections to regional sewage systems, air and water pollution monitoring stations, and the upgrading of existing sewage and water treatment plants to conform to local and Federal standards. These projects have been coordinated with other Federal agencies involved in pollution abatement and are in phase with the environmental pollution control program.

As indicated earlier, several of our projects are based on more rigid standards or on technological advancement in pollution control. We expect future requirements to be generated in a similar manner, particularly as the States begin to implement their programs to achieve the goals established in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

ELECTRICAL SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION

This year we are again requesting funds to modernize the electrical systems on a number of our permanent installations, many of which are now inadequate and approaching unsafe conditions. The continuing rise in the demand for electrical power due to changes in communications, modern weapons, training techniques and living standards, especially the desire for air conditioning, has overtaxed the electrical systems on many Army installations. To rectify this situation approval is requested to upgrade the electrical utilities at three installations in the United States at a cost of $4,079,000. We are again requesting improvement of electrical facilities at various strategic communication sites overseas at a cost of $2,097,000.

KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE

The Kwajalein Missile Range in the Marshall Islands is a national range for testing various types of equipment in the Nation's missile programs. The continuing development of test facilities in this area and the major testing programs under way make it necessary to request improvements of a variety of facilities. We are asking for a total of $2,353,000 for three projects.

SUMMARY

In summary, we have designed the fiscal year 1974 MCA program to enhance the welfare of the soldier by improving our bachelor housing, primary medical care facilities, and community facilities. In addition, the Army is continuing its efforts to control environmental pollution and to improve its operational capability. We have given careful consideration to insuring that the projects requested are located at "hard core" installations where the facilities will be fully utilized.

This concludes my presentation of the Army's fiscal year 1974 Military Construction Authorization request. The detailed project justifications supporting the Army request are contained in the book which has been furnished to the Committee. The projects are arranged in command and station sequence. Proposed amendments to prior authorizations are at the end of the book.

I will be pleased to answer any questions the Committee may have or to see that the answers are provided.

Senator SYMINGTON. First I would like to place in the record, at the request of former Congressman Celler, some correspondence that he has sent to me with respect to the Walter Reed Inn. And, without objection, I will place that in the record and ask you to comment on it.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The correspondence follows:]

WEISMAN, CELLER, SPETT, MODLIN & WERTHEIMER,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1973.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON,
Chairman, Military Construction Authorization Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In an effort to meet the exigencies of the Subcommittee's hearings schedule on S. 1797, a bill authorizing certain construction at military installations, I respectfully request that this letter and enclosures be accepted for consideration by Members of the Subcommittee and for inclusion in the printed hearing record.

Also appended herewith are excerpts from the Report of the House Select Committee on Small Business, "The Impact of Federal Installations on Small Business", (H. Report No. 92-943). The findings, conclusions and recommendations therein underscore the predicament of the owner of the Walter Reed Inn, Washington, D.C., whom we represent, with respect to the proposed construction of a new guest house facility at Walter Reed Medical Center.

We believe that the construction proposed by the Government will work irreparable and unnecessary economic injury to the owner of the Walter Reed Inn. Furthermore, in view of the Inn's proximity to the Medical Center, its history of accommodating those who attend medical or dentistry classes or who visit patients at Walter Reed, the Inn's unused capacity as well as its modern and attractive facilities, a serious question is raised as to whether the additional, costly construction that is proposed is truly in the best interests of the United States.

With every good wish,
Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I had hoped to appear and greet you personally but because I have just returned from abroad, most regrettably, I am unable to be in Washington today. I have asked my colleague, Mr. Benjamin L. Zelenko, to present my statement to you.

I am member of the law firm of Weisman, Celler, Spett, Modlin and Wertheimer with local officers at 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., and want to testify this morning about a project contained in the military construction appropriations request for fiscal year 1974. The project concerns a new 100 unit Patient-Visitor Facility at the Walter Reed Medical Center calling for an appropriation of $1.997 million.

As I understand it, accommodations at the new Patient-Visitor Facility will be available only to next of kin of patients at the Walter Reed General Hospital and to outpatients expected to be treated for a short period of time. The project also contemplates the demolition of an existing visitor facility containing 28 rooms.

We ask you to carefully review the proposed expenditure and determine whether it really is justified as being in the best interests of the United States. We hope that the Subcommittee will have assured itself with respect to the accuracy of the underlying construction costs and inflation estimates, and as to the availability and adequacy of existing nearby facilities.

Today I appear on behalf of the owner and operator of the Walter Reed Inn, located immediately opposite the Walter Reed Medical Center gate at 6825 Georgia Avenue, N.W. The Inn was constructed in 1967 and completed in 1968 and opened its doors in June of that year. It accommodates among others, military personnel attending classes on temporary duty assignment at the Institute of

Pathology and those pursuing dentistry studies at the Medical Center. It also provides rooms at a reduced rate to visitors of patients at the Walter Reed Hospital who are unable to obtain accommodations or who do not wish to stay at the present visitor facility. Thus, the Inn has come to be a dependable, convenient source of up-to-date accommodations for many of the same persons who would be accommodated at the proposed new Visitor Facility.

The Walter Reed Inn is a four-story and basement brick motel containing 54 guest rooms, garage parking for 46 cars and restaurant facilities. We believe that the Inn provides the United States Army with suitable, modern, convenient facilities at a substantially lower cost than that proposed in the current budget for military construction for fiscal year 1974. Furthermore, a purchase or long-term lease of these premises will result in certain definite savings to the Government in view of the numbers of personnel on temporary duty assignment who regularly use the accommodations at the inn. As I understand it, such temporary duty personnel would be ineligible to stay at the proposed new patient-visitor facility.

In an effort to accommodate the interests of the United States Army and the owner and operator of the Inn, we have offered the premises of the Inn for sale or long-term lease to the Government. Conversations on the subject occurred on June 1, 1973, in the offices of Major General Kenneth B. Cooper, Director of Installations, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. At that time we indicated that the construction of the proposed new 100 unit patient-visitor facility on the grounds of the Medical Center would work a severe economic penalty to the commercial operations of the Walter Reed Inn. In the case of the Inn which contains 54 guest rooms, the difference between a profitable and a marginal operation is the occupancy of five to seven rooms a night. Manifestly, the new visitor facility on the grounds of the Medical Center would drain away essential clientele from the Inn and impose irreparable economic injury.

Two thorough appraisals were conducted in January 1971 and contain further detailed descriptions of the facilities and indiciate the market value of the inn at that time at $1.2 million and $1.150 million respectively. Copies of these appraisal reports were furnished the Department of the Army. On June 28, 1973, representatives of the United States Corps of Engineers made an onsite inspection of the premises of the Walter Reed Inn and I am advised that they have now completed their report and appraisal which is being considered, although no final decision has been made.

Mr. Chairman, we are hopeful that our proposal to sell or lease on a long-term basis the facilities of the Walter Reed Inn, located immediately opposite the Georgia Avenue gate of the Medical Center will receive favorable consideration by the Department of the Army and that arrangements mutually satisfactory can be consummated. Because of the pendency of this offer and its relationship to the proposed construction of a patient-visitor facility, we believe that this subcommittee should be fully informed in the premises. Moreover, we ask this subcommittee to defer approval of appropriations for the proposed construction of the new patient-visitor facility at Walter Reed Medical Center until it can determine that the proposed construction is in the best interests of the United States.

I shall be pleased to answer any questions which the subcommittee may have. Thank you for the opportunity to present these comments.

Senator SYMINGTON. He is a respected former Member of Congress. We have some questions here. I have one on that subject.

General Cooper, we understand the Army has under study certain base realinements that, if carried out, would affect certain items in this bill. Are you in a position to comment on this at present?

General COOPER. I can comment to the extent that we are still studying them. The final decisions have not been made. It may affect about 10 percent of the items in the budget.

Senator SYMINGTON. Back to the previous subject. You have in the bill $1,997,000 for a patient-visitor facility for the Walter Reed Hospital. Just what will this facility be used for?

General COOPER. This facility will be used primarily for outpatients that have to come to Walter Reed by referral for treatment or consul-

tation, and also for visitors of seriously ill patients that need to be there during the time of the operation and during the early convalescence. It will replace an existing guesthouse we have which is quite inadequate.

Senator SYMINGTON. Where do the people you have described now find accommodations?

General COOPER. Some of them in the existing guesthouse, sir, and some of them have to go and stay in the nearby motels, including occasionally the Walter Reed Inn, which you referred to earlier.

Senator SYMINGTON. Now we have been informed that the construction of this facility will have a serious effect upon a nearby motel, the Walter Reed Inn and that the owner is willing to sell or lease the motel to the Army in lieu of building the new facility. Can you comment on this?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

The Walter Reed Inn has a total of about 54 rooms, and as such it is not big enough to accomplish the purpose we want. We have been examining the possibility of leasing the Walter Reed Inn to take care of the many people who are there attending courses on temporary duty, and although we have not finished our study, the preliminary indications show that it may be to the best interests of the Army in the saving of TDY pay to lease the Walter Reed Inn.

Whether that is going to be feasible or not remains to be seen.

Senator SYMINGTON. Are we having negotiations about it?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is your comment on the fact that the owner now says it will have a serious effect upon his motel?

General COOPER. He makes that comment on the basis that he now gets some referrals from the existing guesthouse, and that this is the margin between his being solvent, or having a profitable operation, and not. He is afraid that with the bigger what we call the patient-visitor facility, it will put him just below the margin.

We do not believe that is the case, but only time will tell.

We do need a patient-visitor facility which is larger than his motel can provide. We think the better course of action would be to lease the whole facility from him that would accommodate mostly people that are attending courses at Walter Reed on temporary duty, who now usually stay in motels in Silver Spring.

Senator SYMINGTON. Again this year, the bulk of your construction program relates to housing and personnel facilities. Is it possible the Army is overemphasizing this at the expense of operational and training facilities?

General COOPER. No, sir, not at this stage of the game. We have been very far behind in providing adequate bachelor housing for our troops, and this will be a big leg up. We will still have another year or so at approximately the same level.

Senator SYMINGTON. All right, General, you may proceed with your line-items description.

General COOPER. Yes, Senator.

FORT BELVOIR, VA.

Fort Belvoir is located 11 miles southwest of Alexandria, Va. The installation mission is to command, train, and provide logistical sup-

port to engineer troop units and the engineer school; to operate and maintain the U.S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Center; and, to support the Topographic Research and Development Laboratory and Davison Army Airfield. The program is for a helicopter landing facility and parking apron, an enlisted men's barracks without mess for medical personnel and an enlisted men's barracks complex. The request is for $14,403,000.

The helicopter landing facility and parking apron project is to provide Davison Army Airfield with a taxiway, helipad, hoverlane, an approach lighting system, and an additional parking apron for UH–1 and OH-type helicopters. Completion of this project will permit the separation of rotary and fixed wing operations, reduce airfield congestion with the accompanying hazardous conditions and improve the efficiency of mission accomplishment of Davison Army Airfield. Davison Army Airfield is the only Army airfield in the Washington area with helicopter capability for supporting contingency operations under national emergency conditions plus it provides helicopter support to the White House and U.S. Government officials in the Nation's Capital.

Senator SYMINGTON. This is a rather expensive helicopter landing facility you are requesting for Fort Belvoir. I notice that you need space to park some 42 helicopters, and you indicate some support to the White House and other Government officials. Can you give us a little more detail as to what these helicopters are actually used for, and why you need space for parking this many?

General COOPER. There are a total of 92 aircraft, 31 fixed wing and 61 helicopters, stationed at Davison U.S. Army Airfield, as follows:

Organization	Fixed wing				Rotary wing					Total
	T–41	T–42	U–8	U–21	OH–58	UH–1	VH–3	AH–1	CH–47	
MDW	10	8	9	2	7	33				69
Exec flt det						2	2		2	6
164th med det						2				2
30th engr bn						2				2
Night vision lab						5		1		7
District of Columbia National Guard			1		1	4				6
Total	10	8	11	2	8	48	2	1	2	92

The 40 helicopters assigned to MDW have the primary mission to support the evaculation of Washington during a national emergency and to support contingency plans in times of civil disturbance. The 11 U–8 and U–21 fixed wing aircraft provide priority air transportation to Army installations. The primary mission of the 18 T–41 and T–42 aircraft and a secondary mission of all other MDW aircraft is to support the training of assigned operational Army aviators and those attached aviators whose combat readiness flying skills must be maintained. Another secondary mission for assigned helicopters is to provide transportation to DOD officials on a space required basis.

The executive flight detachment with six assigned helicopters, provides dedicated helicopter support for the President, Vice President, and their staffs.

The 164th Medical Detachment and the 30th Engineer Battalion are table of organization and equipment—TOE—units which are stationed at Fort Belvoir. Each unit has assigned helicopters organic to the unit which are required to support their combat mission.

Seven aircraft are assigned to the Aviation Detachment, Night Vision Support Branch, to support the testing of airborne night vision devices.

Six aircraft are assigned to the Headquarters, District of Columbia National Guard to provide support to the adjutant general and his staff.

At present there is suitable parking apron, that is, paved and having proper aircraft tiedowns, for 14 light helicopters. The remainder must be parked in less satisfactory expedient areas. Some deficiencies of these expedient areas are no paving, which generates dust and flying debris—both a detriment to good maintenance practices and a safety hazard; expedient tiedowns; and, less than adequate lighting or lane marking.

The enlisted men's barracks for medical personnel will provide 122 bachelor housing spaces for the DeWitt Army Hospital Medical Detachment and Dental Company. These personnel are now residing in temporary barracks constructed in 1940 that are in poor condition, have never been improved, and have long ago exceeded normal life expectancy. In addition, the present barracks are a considerable distance from the worksite.

The barracks complex will furnish adequate living and support accommodations for 1,054 of the permanent party and student enlisted men stationed at Fort Belvoir. These personnel are now living in substandard World War II mobilization-type buildings. Besides the barracks, the project includes the necessary supporting facilities to provide a completely functional bachelor enlisted housing complex. These include unit administration, equipment storage, battalion headquarters, classrooms, and dining areas. Present support facilities are of the same vintage as the old temporary barracks, are in poor condition and lack adequate plumbing, heating, and lighting.

Senator Symington. You have numerous barracks projects in this year's bill, and I notice you are requesting an increase in unit cost this year from $27 per square foot to $28.50 per square foot. Last year was the first year we permitted you to estimate barracks space on a square foot basis. Barracks have not formerly been priced out by cost per man. This new form of pricing gives you more leeway, and actually considerably increases the cost per man. I am wondering why you found it necessary to ask for an increase in the unit price this year.

Here at Fort Belvoir last year we approved a 1,200-man barracks at a total unit cost of $7,399,000. Yet, this year, you are asking for $8,385,000 for a 1,054-man barracks, which is about a 20-percent increase. I notice this applies in several other instances. What is your explanation for this?

General Cooper. The fiscal year 1972 project costs were estimated using a gross $3,200 per man. In fiscal year 1973 the estimating basis was changed to a unit cost factor based on gross area of barracks space. The fiscal year 1973 project costs were estimated using a statutory limit of $27 per square foot of gross area. The fiscal year 1974 barracks costs were estimated using a proposed statutory limit of $28.50 per square foot of gross area, the increase being to offset inflation. In fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 the living area per individual was based on grade: 90 square feet for grades E2–E4; 135 square feet for grades E5–E6; and 270 square feet for grades E7–E9.

Barracks for trainees, grade E1, are designed at 72 square feet per man on an open-bay concept.

A comparison of the fiscal year 1974 barracks costs, on a per-man basis, with prior year projects reveals apparent significant cost increases. Several factors have contributed to these increases.

Since mid-1970 improved barracks standards have provided increases in the gross and net barracks area per man and improved living conditions. The gross area has expanded by 32 percent and the net living area by 25 percent. Improved living conditions include private or semiprivate rooms with adjoining bathrooms, air conditioning where authorized, carpeting and more modern furniture, and better security for personal possessions. As mentioned earlier, statutory limits for new barracks construction have been increased in response to improved standards and construction cost escalation. Since mid-1970 this cost escalation has been 42 percent. Prior to the fiscal year 1974 MCA program the barracks personnel loading on project documentation has been shown at the maximum capacity as though occupied by soldiers all in grades E2–E4. In actual practice the barracks are occupied somewhat differently, housing a mix of grades based on the space criteria discussed in paragraph 3 above, resulting in fewer soldiers per barracks building. The fiscal year 1974 barracks projects recognize this fact and the project scopes reflect the intended loading as planned by field commanders for those types of units programed to occupy the respective barracks.

The fiscal year 1975 barracks projects also reflect a greater appreciation of the need for ancillary facilities, in particular, small unit administrative and storage areas. The projects include these facilities, where required, planned around the types of units programed to occupy the particular projects.

Prior year barracks projects essentially ignored these associated requirements to the detriment of efficient use of the barracks.

The remaining deficiency in enlisted quarters at Fort Belvoir upon completion of the above barracks projects is 24 percent of the installation requirement.

CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA.

Carlisle Barracks is located at Carlisle, Pa. The mission of this installation is to provide administrative and logistical support for the operation of the Army War College, Army Institute of Advanced Studies, Army Institute of Land Combat, Dunham Army Hospital, and other units and activities. The program provides for a physical conditioning facility for which $2,465,000 is requested.

This project is to assure adequate physical conditioning facilities for the students, staff and faculty, permanent party personnel, and military families at the U.S. Army War College. Physical conditioning activities are now carried out in two widely separated structures. The existing post gymnasium, Thorpe Hall, was constructed in 1889 as part of the Carlisle Indian School and is no longer adequate for present needs. In addition, if plans are approved by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Thorpe Hall will be demolished to provide space for construction of the Gen. Omar Bradley Museum. The second building now in use is a converted World War II-type temporary barracks building which is seriously inadequate and will be de-

molished. Adequate physical conditioning facilities for assigned personnel are necessary since the school environment imposes a need for regular winter indoor exercising to maintain sound physical condition and alertness.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you are asking $2,465,000 for a physical conditioning facility, which I suppose is a new name for a gymnasium. This seems to me to be unduly expensive. Will you explain to us just what this facility consists of, and what it contains.

General COOPER. The Carlisle Barracks gymnasium will serve the U.S. Army War College and will be the focal point for a very comprehensive athletic program for the War College staff and faculty, students, and dependents. Included in the facility will be a basketball floor with running track, a swimming pool, three squash courts and three handball courts, weight rooms and exercise areas, a steamroom, a first aid and rubdown room, an indoor rifle range, and locker rooms for both male and female personnel.

FORT DEVENS, MASS.

Fort Devens is located 2 miles northeast of Ayer, Mass. The mission of the installation is to provide command, training, administrative, and logistical support to Active Army units, annual and weekend active duty training for Reserve units and individuals of the six New England States; and to provide logistical support to the U.S. Army Security Agency Training Center and School, off-post U.S. Army Air Defense Command units. Reserve Centers, Reserve Officers Training Corps units and family housing in the New England States. The requested program is for barracks without dining facilities, for an estimated $2,749,000 to house 350 enlisted women.

This project is to provide adequate permanent quarters for the Women's Army Corps detachment assigned to this installation and to support a new mission requirement for training female personnel for the Army Security Agency. The total of 350 spaces will include 125 spaces for students plus 225 spaces required for personnel assigned to the Fort Devens garrison and hospital unit. Upon completion of the new facility, three temporary buildings will be demolished.

Upon approval of this request the remaining deficiency at Fort Devens in permanent bachelor housing will be 34 percent of the total installation requirement.

FORT DIX, N.J.

Fort Dix is located 18 miles south of Trenton, N.J. The mission of this installation is the operation of a personnel center and to support onpost training of U.S. Army Reserve, National Guard, and Reserve Officer Training Corps. Fort Dix also provides offpost support to Aradcom missile sites, USAR centers, ROTC units and recruiting stations and provides medical care for Fort Dix, McGuire AFB, Lakehurst NAS, and for evacuees. The program provides a project to convert buildings to administrative facilities for which we are requesting $339,000.

The conversion work includes partitions, suspended ceilings, modification to electrical service, lighting and heating system to provide adequate space for an Army Readiness Region Headquarters and an Army Readiness Group Activity to be located at Fort Dix. These are new missions at Fort Dix as a result of the Army reorganization.

CAMP DRUM, N.Y.

Camp Drum is located near Watertown, N.Y. The mission of this installation is to command and to provide administrative, logistical, and training support for all units and activities assigned to Camp Drum for such support. During the annual training periods approximately 105,000 troops per year use these facilities and support. The requested program is for an enlisted men's barracks with dining facilities for an estimated cost of $1,099,000.

This project is to provide adequate housing, dining, and company administrative facilities for troops permanently assigned to Camp Drum. Existing facilities are far below current Army standards. Present billets are 30-year-old temporary-type wooden structures. Plumbing and electrical utilities have long ago exceeded their 5-year design life and are now unreliable and difficult and costly to repair. A complete replacement of heating plants will be required within the next 5 years. Upon completion of the requested project enlisted personnel permanently assigned to Camp Drum will be adequately housed. Four temporary buildings will be demolished to make room for the requested consolidated barracks.

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not question the need for a new barracks for Camp Drum, but your reasoning that men assigned there must walk 100 yards to the mess hall is not very convincing. This does not seem to be a great distance to walk even in inclement weather.

How many men are assigned to this camp during the wintertime, and what are their duties?

General COOPER. There are approximately 650 Regular Army and civilian personnel permanently stationed at Camp Drum. These people constitute the garrison complement responsible for operating, securing, and maintaining the installation. They also support Reserve component training activities that take place throughout the year. The station complement is small and is augmented by additional personnel during the peak months of Reserve training activity.

FORT EUSTIS, VA.

Fort Eustis, Va. is located about 20 miles northwest of Newport News, Va. The installation mission is to organize and train Transportation Corps units and individuals. Tenants include the Transportation School, Transportation Engineering Agency, Aviation Materiel Laboratories, Transportation Agency, and the Computer Systems Command Support Group, Fort Story, Va., a subinstallation, is also supported. The requested program consists of projects for barracks modernization, supply and administrative facilities, a main post office, and alterations to the electrical distribution system for a total estimated cost of $4,782,000.

The barracks modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to provide adequate housing for bachelor enlisted personnel. At the present time, many bachelor enlisted men are still housed in open bay squad rooms which have little privacy and few conveniences. This project will rehabilitate existing squad rooms to provide semiprivate rooms housing 1,040 soldiers. Following completion this project, 50 percent of the existing barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Eustis will meet current housing standards.

The supply and administrative facilities will provide adequate administrative, supply and storage for two transportation companies that will move to this installation from Fort Story as a result of the Army reorganization.

The Main Post Office project will provide a permanent structure to replace the existing temporary type building constructed in 1941. The Post Office workload averages 10,000 pieces daily. The present wooden structure affords insufficient security and fire protection and the parking area is limited to three patron spaces. The usable postal operations area is cramped and normal locker and rest areas for postal personnel are completely lacking.

The requested electrical distribution system alteration project is required to meet the increase in electrical power requirements that has developed over the last 10 years. The local utility company has constructed a new substation of increased capacity to serve the power demands of Fort Eustis and this project will add the Government electrical power facilities needed for its full utilization. Circuit rearrangements to facilitate maintenance, without disruption to dependent agencies, are also to be provided to improve electrical service continuity, reliability, and capacity.

CAMP A. P. HILL, VA.

Camp A. P. Hill is located near Fredericksburg, Va. The mission of this installation is to serve as a maneuver and training area for Reserve, Active Army, other military services and governmental agencies and to provide logistical and administrative support for these activities. The mission also include the provision of repair and utility services to off-post facilities, including U.S. Army Reserve Centers and Recruiting Stations in assigned areas of the State of Virginia. The requested program is for an enlisted men's barracks with dining facilities for a cost of $535,000.

This project is to provide a permanent enlisted men's barracks with dining facilities for the permanent station complement. These troops are now housed in small sheet metal hutments which do not meet recognized criteria for adequate housing. These hutments were erected as expedients and were never intended for permanent housing. Latrine and shower facilities are some distance from the billets. The remaining deficit in adequate bachelor housing upon completion of the requested project is 54 percent of the total requirement at Camp A. P. Hill.

Senator SYMINGTON. Similar to Camp Drum, you are asking for an enlisted men's barracks with a mess. How many of these projects are you asking for Reserve training areas, and what are the duties of the people assigned there?

General COOPER. We are asking for enlisted men's barracks projects, either new construction or modernization, at four installations considered Reserve training areas. These are Camp Drum, Camp A. P. Hill, Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, and Camp Pickett. The barracks requested will be for the Regular Army permanent party. These personnel are the garrison complement who, along with supporting training activities, are responsible for operating, securing, and maintaining the installation.

INDIANTOWN GAP MILITARY RESERVATION, PA.

Indiantown Gap Military Reservation is located near Lebanon, Pa. The mission of this installation is to serve as a training and maneuver area for Active Army and Reserve component units and to provide logistical and administrative support for these activities. The requested program is for an enlisted men's barracks with dining facilities for a cost of $1,657,000.

Ths project will provide housing and dining facilities for 151 permanently assigned enlisted personnel. These personnel now live in substandard frame barracks buildings which cannot be economically upgraded to meet minimum acceptable standards. Upon completion of this project enlisted personnel permanently assigned to the Indiantown Gap Military Reservation will be adequately housed.

FORT KNOX, KY.

Fort Knox is located 30 miles south of Louisville, Ky. The mission of this installation is to provide facilities for the U.S. Army Armor School, U.S. Army Maintenance Board, U.S. Army Armor Board, an ROTC Regional Headquarters, and certain medical research activities. The installation commands, trains, and supports nondivisional armor units and a recruit training center and supports reserve component summer training. The requested program provides for modernization of enlisted men's barracks and administrative facilities for the newly assigned ROTC Regional Headquarters at a total estimated cost of $7,305,000.

The barracks project will upgrade 2,026 barracks spaces to current standards and provide associated improvements to troop administrative, storage and the dining space incorporated in the barracks. At present, many bachelor enlisted men are still housed in open bay squad rooms without privacy and with few conveniences. Replacement of existing squad areas with two to four man rooms providing more privacy, better security for personal property, improved lighting and air conditioning will upgrade the barracks to an acceptable level of troop housing. Upon completion of this project 48 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Knox will meet minimum housing standards. The remaining deficit in adequate bachelor housing is approximately 59 percent of the total requirement at Fort Knox.

The second project will provide administrative families for the Headquarters, ROTC region II, by converting a portion of an existing building. Fort Knox, as with many Army installations, is short suitable administrative space. The ROTC Headquarters is a new mission assigned to Fort Knox under the 1973 Army reorganization.

FORT LEE, VA.

Fort Lee is located 2 miles east of Petersburg, Va. The mission of this installation is to command, train, and support units and activities assigned to the Quartermaster Center, the Quartermaster School, the Army Logistics Management School and other onpost and satellited units and activities. The program provides for additions to Kenner

Army Hospital, barracks for enlisted male and female personnel, a central food preparation facility, bachelor officer quarters, and a confinement facility for a total estimated cost of $22,769,000.

The hospital project is required to improve inadequate outpatient facilities at Kenner Army Hospital. Subsequent to the completion of Kenner Army Hospital in 1961, changes in the technique of delivering health care have led to significant increases in the outpatient workload. The clinical workload has increased from 361 visits per day in fiscal year 1961 to 786 daily visits in fiscal year 1972, an increase of 118 percent. The proposed addition to the clinical operational areas will provide facilities that are either not now available or that are located in substandard World War II mobilization-type buildings. Existing clinical operational areas are over crowded and separated from the hospital by nearly 1 mile which seriously inconveniences patients and staff alike. The temporary hospital buildings now in use have long exceeded their useful life as satisfactory medical treatment facilities. Heating and electrical systems are inadequate and the buildings are in a deteriorated condition. Expansion of the hospital to provide needed capabilities will require alteration of the existing permanent building to accommodate supporting services and clinics not included in the proposed new addition. Ten temporary buildings will be demolished.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are asking for an addition to the Kenner Army Hospital at Fort Lee. When was this hospital originally constructed? I notice that in this instance, and in other similar projects, you indicate that the outpatient workload has increased considerably, resulting in a requirement to expand outpatient facilities. What is this attributable to?

General COOPER. Kenner Army Hospital, Building P–8130, was completed in 1961. The hospital is rated at a 100 bed capacity. The area known as the Kenner Annex consists of typical World War II temporary type wooden structures constructed during early World War II. This annex houses most of the clinics associated with Kenner Hospital and is located nearly 1 mile from the main hospital.

The construction we are requesting in the fiscal year 1974 military construction Army budget request will provide permanent adequate clinic facilities contiguous to the main hospital to replace the inadequate annex facilities. The techniques of delivering health care services have changed significantly in recent years. Advances in medical equipment, medicines, and treatment techniques have shifted much of the health care delivery load from an inpatient to an outpatient basis. Concurrently, as is the case at Fort Lee, the facilities housing many of our clinics at numerous hospitals have simply outlived their economic life and are now extremely expensive and difficult to maintain, are functionally inappropriate under today's standards, and cannot be economically modernized.

The proposal for an additional enlisted men's barracks without mess facilities will provide adequate housing for 422 permanently assigned enlisted personnel, PCS and TDY students who are now occupying temporary substandard buildings.

The project for additional enlisted women's barracks is to increase the adequate housing spaces for Women's Army Corps (WAC) personnel at Fort Lee. WAC personnel are now living in the temporary

substandard facilities. Recent increases in strength authorization will result in a total of 211 WAC personnel living in the inadequate billeting spaces. Four temporary buildings will be demolished in conjunction with this project.

Upon completion of the requested housing projects approximately 62 percent of the bachelor personnel at Fort Lee will be provided adequate quarters.

The project for a central food preparation facility (CFPF) is required to provide a central kitchen, ingredient centers, food storage and distribution facilities plus the modernization of 10 existing permanent messhalls which will be used as dining facilities satellited on the central food preparation facility. This proposed system for preparing food in a central kitchen and serving the food in satellite dining facilities located in the troop housing areas is a major element in the Army's program to improve food service. This CFPF at Fort Lee will be an opreational facility plus it will be the training and doctrinal development center for CFPF management. If this project is not approved the goal to improve food service operations in support of the Army cannot be totally realized, and the use of the less effective facilities and methods with their recognized shortcomings must continue. No buildings will be demolished as a result of this project.

The bachelor officer quarters (BOQ) requested are needed to provide adequate housing for military and civilian students attending the U.S. Army Quartermaster School and the U.S. Army Logistics Management Center, and for some permanently assigned bachelor officers. At present, Fort Lee, has only 64 percent of its BOQ requirements in adequate facilities. The remaining BOQ's available are substandard World War II mobilization type wooden frame buildings. As a consequence, many personnel elect to live off post in hard-to-find, expensive private housing. An onpost adequate BOQ, located near the respective schools, will reduce transportation and traffic problems for the students, provide more efficient group study possibilities, and help alleviate the inequitable bachelor housing situation. If this project is not approved, these personnel will be forced to continue living in substandard bachelor officer quarters or costly off post housing.

The confinement project is required to provide adequate facilities for the custody, control, and correctional treatment of military prisoners in accordance with the Army's new correctional system. It will replace the stockade at Fort Belvoir, Va. The Fort Belvoir facility consists of seven temporary, substandard World War II barracks and one permanent building constructed in 1934. These buildings are wholly inadequate in terms of ability to allow proper control, supervision, and the required segregation of prisoners. The buildings are fire risks, and their age necessitates constant and costly maintenance. The present facilities will accommodate 276 prisoners at 55 SF per man in open-bay billeting. This arrangement is not flexible and presents a severe discipline problem. The proposed Fort Lee project will provide facilities for confinement of military prisoners apprehended in 12 counties of West Virginia, the entire State of Virginia, and from Fort Eustis, Fort Story, Fort Monroe, Camp Pickett, A. P. Hill, and Langley Air Force Base. The confinement facilities at Fort Belvoir will be demolished except for maximum security cells (2,005 SF) which are located in a permanent building. These will be retained as a small installation holding point.

20-507—73——8

FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MD.

Fort George G. Meade is located 18 miles south of Baltimore, Md. The mission of this installation is to train and support strategic Army forces and post troop units; to support Headquarters, 1st U.S. Army, National Security Agency, the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School, Reserve components, and Reserve Officer Training Corps summer training. The program provides barracks modernization for which we are requesting $5,924,000 and a facility for the USMA Preparatory School costing $1,521,000.

The barracks project will provide modernization of 1,918 housing spaces to continue the work of upgrading existing permanent barracks to current standards to provide modern housing for bachelor enlisted personnel. At the present time, many bachelor enlisted men are housed in open-bay squad rooms with little privacy or conveniences. Modernizing the barracks to provide semiprivate rooms, air-conditioning, security of personal possessions, and improved lighting and other convenience will greatly contribute to the health, welfare, and morale of the individual soldier. Upon completion of this project, 56 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Meade will have been upgraded. Fort Meade will still have a deficit in adequate bachelor enlisted housing of 39 percent of the long-range requirement.

The USMA Preparatory School is to be relocated from Fort Belvoir to Fort Meade. The project includes alteration of existing permanent buildings at Fort Meade to provide classrooms, administrative facilities, and athletic team locker rooms. The project also provides for construction of drill and athletic fields.

FORT MONROE, VA

Fort Monroe is located near Hampton, Va. The primary mission of this installation is to serve as a Headquarters, U.S. Continental Army Command Training and Doctrine Command (Tradoc). In addition, this installation provides administrative and logistical support for U.S. Forces Atlantic; U.S. Conarc Support Element; USA Garrison; USA Medical Department Activity; USA Security Agency Detachment; USA Separation Transfer Point; 50th Army Bank; 559th Military Police Company; USA Audiovisual Support Center, and other Army activities located at Fort Monroe. U.S. Conarc has been the administrative and operational headquarters for the Conus Armies and becomes Headquarters, Tradoc, under the 1973 Army reorganization. The program provides barracks modernization for which we are requesting $867,000.

As at many Army installations, this project is required to continue the work of upgrading existing permanent barracks to current standards to provide modern housing for bachelor enlisted personnel. At the present time, many bachelor enlisted men are housed in open-bay squad rooms with no privacy and with few conveniences. Replacing existing squad rooms with two- to four-man rooms and providing new lighting and convenience outlets will convert the barracks into more adequate troop housing and contribute to the health, welfare, and morale of the individual soldier. This project will complete Fort Monroe's requirements for modern housing for bachelor enlisted personnel.

Senator SYMINGTON. Isn't consideration being given to closing this base? If so, shouldn't this project be deferred?

General COOPER. Fort Monroe, along with several Army installations, is being reviewed in our stationing study now underway. We would not want to predetermine the results of this study at this time, but hopefully we will have some firm decisions prior to the committee's final actions on the construction bill.

CAMP PICKETT, VA.

Camp Pickett is located near Petersburg, Va. The mission of this installation is to serve as a maneuver and training area for Reserve components, Active Army units and other military services, and to provide logistical and administrative support for these activities. The mission is also to provide repair and utility services to off post facilities, including U.S. Army Reserve Centers and Recruiting Stations located in assigned areas within Virginia and West Virginia. The program consists of an enlisted men's barracks with dining facilities for which we are requesting $476,000.

This project consists of an enlisted men's barracks and dining facilities for the permanent station complement. The dining area will serve up to 200 permanent party plus temporary duty officers and enlisted men attached for duty. Housing is currently provided in temporary World War II-type buildings constructed in the early 1940's. In the past, dining requirements have been met by utilizing an existing 100-man temporary-type facility during the winter months and opening additional mess buildings during the summer training period. Even with additional mess buildings, these facilities are overcrowded and not adequate to accommodate personnel authorized subsistence support. If this project is not approved, permanent party personnel must continue to utilize inadequate dining facilities and to occupy substandard barracks. The existing buildings will be utilized to house Reserve and National Guard units assigned for short periods for annual training. Upon completion of the requested project, enlisted personnel permanently assigned to Camp Pickett will be adequately housed.

FORT BENNING, GA.

Fort Benning is located at Columbus, Ga. Its mission is to command, train, and provide logistical support for a division, support the infantry school and infantry board, qualify officers and enlisted men in airborne and ranger techniques and to support summer reserve component training. The program consists of a barracks modernization project, a Ranger training complex (located at Eglin Air Force Base), a central food preparation facility, and modifications to the electrical distribution system. The total request is for $15,354,000.

The barracks modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Lack of privacy has long been a source of irritation and dissatisfaction among enlisted personnel and at present many bachelor enlisted men are housed in open bay squad rooms with little privacy and few conveniences. Replacement of existing squad areas with two- to four-man semiprivate rooms having modern conveniences will significantly improve livability of the barracks. Upon completion of

this project 60 percent of the existing barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Benning will meet minimum housing standards.

The project for a Ranger training complex will provide permanent enlisted barracks and bachelor officer quarters for personnel engaged in conducting or undergoing the Ranger course of the infantry school at Eglin Air Force Base. Existing facilities were constructed during World War II as temporary, woodframe buildings and lack adequate heating, lighting, and cooling equipment.

Modification of the electrical distribution system is required to provide two new substations and modernize the system. The additional electrical capacity will furnish adequate power to the growing Fort Benning area which has recorded a 30 percent electrical system load increase in 5 years. This project will complete the third and last increment of a three-part plan for modernizing the 30-year-old electrical distribution system. It will also provide a two-way power supply at 44 kilovolt to the two new substations which in turn will improve reliability for continuous service to all areas of the main post proper and to Lawson Army Airfield. This project will also install mercury vapor type street lighting in some heavily built-up areas of the post now without street lighting. Deferral of this project will result in continued use of circuits without the reliability of alternate service for emergencies, in insufficient power for planned new construction, and large areas will remain without adequate street lighting.

The next project is for a central food preparation facility (CFPF). Similar to the CFPF requested at Fort Lee, this facility will consist of a central kitchen, ingredient centers, food storage and distribution facilities, a pastry kitchen, warewashing facilities, and the modernization of 25 existing permanent type messhalls for use as satellite dining facilities. Troops have long voiced dissatisfaction, either real or imagined, with the quality of food service. The CFPF system, being introduced with this project at Fort Benning and the companion project at Fort Lee, will vastly improve the Army's capability to provide appealing, wholesome meals.

Senator SYMINGTON. $5.3 million seems quite high for a central food preparation facility. Will you describe to us just what such a facility consists of? I don't recall having seen such a project heretofore.

General COOPER. The central food preparation facility (CFPF) is the heart of the Army's new concept designed to improve the overall quality of food service provided to our soldiers. The CFPF requested for Fort Benning is one of two proposed in our fiscal year 1974 budget request. The second facility is planned for Fort Lee. These are the first facilities of this type we have requested and they are the beginning of a program tentatively planned to develop 24 such facilities. Basically the CFPF is where wholesome meals will be prepared on a large volume basis using the latest in modern food processing equipment. The CFPF will support several satellite dining facilities which will have some supplemental modern equipment and offer the food for dining in attractive, familiar surroundings. Examples of the equipment utilized in the CFPF are mechanized vegetable cleaners, continuous belt deep-fat fryers, quick chill and flash-freeze vaults, continuous cookers for pasta and rice, automatic warewashing and sorting equipment, high-speed ovens, laboratory, and insulated equipment for transporting food to the satellite facilities.

FORT BRAGG, N.C.

Fort Bragg is located 10 miles northwest of Fayetteville, N.C. The mission of this installation is to command, train, and support an airborne division and other airborne units, to test airborne equipment and techniques, to support a ROTC regional headquarters and an Army readiness region group, and to support the U.S. Army John F. Kennedy Center for military assistance. The program being presented provides for additional tactical equipment shops and facilities, administrative facilities, enlisted women's barracks with mess facilities, an enlisted men's barracks complex, a service club for enlisted personnel and for modernization of existing enlisted men's barracks. For this program we are requesting $33,471,000.

Tactical equipment shops are required to provide additional organizational level maintenance facilities for the 3,072 wheeled vehicles and 862 portable generators, compressors, and pumps assigned to the XVIII Airborne Corps Artillery, 313th Army Security Agency Battalion, 600th and 612th Quartermaster Companies, and the 35th Signal Group. These organizations occupy a permanent barracks complex completed in February 1971. Their vehicle repair is accomplished in seven temporary shops located at distances varying from 1.9 to 4.7 miles from the new barracks. These existing shops will be supplemented by the two 500-vehicle shops proposed in this project to provide a design support capacity 1,875 vehicles. This increase in capacity will provide but 59 percent of the total Fort Bragg requirement and continued use of the temporary shops will be required to carry out the maintenance support mission. Wide separation of troops from their vehicles and shops will continue to contribute to administrative and transportation problems until the total deficit is overcome.

The project for administrative facilities is required to provide adequate permanent type space for Headquarters, ROTC Region I and for an Army readiness group. These organizations are new missions assigned to Fort Bragg in the 1973 Army reorganization.

The enlisted women's barracks with mess facilities are required to provide adequate quarters for the enlisted women at Fort Bragg. The current strength for enlisted women stationed at Fort Bragg is being increased to 400. Existing barracks are not of a size, appropriately located, or suitable for alteration to provide the necessary enlisted women's billets, administration and mess in one location. The Women's Army Corps company is presently housed in temporary World War II mobilization barracks and must continue to occupy such housing until adequate quarters can be provided. Upon completion of this project, 23 temporary buildings with an aggregate area of 74,329 square feet will be demolished.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you are requesting a barracks with a mess for enlisted women. I notice that you carry as a separate item administration storage space. Why is this not considered a part of the unit cost of the barracks as is done by the other two services?

General COOPER. During the late 1950's, Congress agreed to accept that the statutory limit—unit cost—for barracks would apply only to troop housing, as differentiated from messing, supply, and administration. Troop housing spaces relate to those only in direct support of the living space. These items do include some personal storage and

minor administration space. However, the administration and storage building programed as a separate item supports the entire enlisted women's company composed of its officer and troop unit personnel housed within this project and those offsite, family housing, officer housing, and offsite personnel. Therefore, this building is not considered or programed as part of the statutory limitation—unit cost—of the barracks. This is also the case with the other services. Troop unit administration and storage buildings in all services are programed as separate items.

The modernization of enlisted men's barracks will continue the Army plan to bring existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Lack of privacy has long been a source of irritation and dissatisfaction among bachelor enlisted personnel and many are presently housed in open bay squad rooms without privacy and with few conveniences. Replacement of existing squad areas with two- to four-man rooms providing new lighting and convenience outlets, air conditioning, carpeting, and security for possessions will upgrade the barracks to a more acceptable level of troop housing. Upon completion of this project 48 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Bragg will meet the current housing standards.

The enlisted men's barracks complex is required to provide adequate housing and supporting facilities for bachelor enlisted men of the 1st Corps Support Command. These men are now housed in World War II mobilization-type barracks constructed in 1941. Living conditions afforded by these facilities are far below current standards with a detrimental effect on morale and efficiency. Deferment of this request will necessitate the continued use of substandard facilities.

Upon completion of the housing projects discussed above the remaining deficit in bachelor enlisted housing at Fort Bragg will be 10 percent of the total installation requirement.

The final project is to provide service club facilities for 5,000 men in the permanent barracks area. The only service club now in this area is a 7,750 square foot converted bowling alley which can handle approximately 1,200 men or about 8 percent of the 15,000 troops living nearby. The nearest other clubs are located 1.6 and 2.6 miles away, are located in old World War II temporary-type structures, and are fully utilized by troops living in their immediate area. Counting the temporary assets, Fort Bragg has only 49 percent of its required service club facilities. Consequently, many soldiers are denied opportunity for participation in the social and entertainment activities normally available in a home or civilian community.

FORT CAMPBELL, KY.

Fort Campbell is located 8 miles northwest of Clarksville, Tenn. The mission of this installation is to provide for the support and training of an airmobile division and other nondivisional combat units. This request provides for the third phase of an airfield complex at Campbell Army Airfield. It also includes barracks modernization, an enlisted men's barracks complex, and a commissary. New funding authorization for an estimated cost of $51,881,000 is requested.

The airfield project is the final phase of a three-phase program required to provide adequate aircraft operations and maintenance facil-

ities for the 439 aircraft authorized at Fort Campbell in support of the aviation elements of an airmobile division and other supporting units. Present facilities include those authorized under phase I—MCA fiscal year 1972—for support of 118 aircraft, and those authorized under phase II—MCA fiscal year 1973—for support of an additional 178 helicopters. This project provides parking and maintenance facilities for 143 attack utility helicopters assigned to two divisional assault helicopter battalions and the support company of the aviation group, a control tower, storage facilities for JP–4 fuel and a fire and rescue station needed for the expanded mission and flight operations. Until this project is approved and constructed, available facilities will not adequately support the total complement of 439 helicopters authorized.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you are asking $8.4 million for phase 3 of your tactical airfield complex. Are the first two phases previously authorized completed? It seems to me that you are attempting to place an unusual amount of construction under contract in this area at one time. Do you think that you can get this project under contract during this fiscal year?

General COOPER. The fiscal year 1972 MCA program provided $9,996,000 for construction of airfield facilities—phase 1—at Fort Campbell. The phase 1 items, with one minor exception, were placed under contract in March 1972, and are now 85 percent complete. Completion of the work is scheduled for November 1973.

The fiscal year 1973 MCA program provided $6,948,000 for construction of additional airfield facilities—phase 2—at Fort Campbell. A construction contract for this work was awarded in June 1973. Currently, the contractor is mobilizing equipment and supplies for an August 1973, start. Completion of this project is scheduled for January 1975.

Concerning the possibility of awarding the fiscal year 1974 MCA project—phase 3/$8,420,000—during the current fiscal year, it is anticipated that this project will be ready for bidding by January 1974. It is realized that the large construction program at Fort Campbell will place heavy demands on all available construction crafts within commuting distance of the base; however, it is believed that the contractor effort in this area is sufficient to support the program and that the bidding competition will be adequate.

The barracks modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks similar to modernization projects proposed for several other posts. Upon completion of this project 71 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Campbell will meet current housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

Fort Campbell has a long range requirement to support a combat division and supporting units, with a net barracks requirement of 11,764 spaces. Existing permanent barracks, once modernized plus approved projects will satisfy approximately 69 percent of this requirement. The balance of the troops must occupy World War II mobilization barracks which require excessive maintenance and no longer meet even minimum requirements for standard troop housing. This request for a new 3,300-man barracks complex will greatly reduce the permanent barracks deficit for Fort Campbell, one of the Army's

key division installations. Upon completion of this construction, 155 temporary buildings with a total area of 822,450 square feet will be demolished.

The last item at Fort Campbell is a request for permanent commissary facilities. The existing commissary presently serves over 13,500 military families in the area and operations are carried out under very congested conditions. Dollar volume of sales for the first half of fiscal year 1973 averaged over $975,000 per month. Sales have increased each year since 1966 with fiscal year 1972 showing a 15.3 percent jump over fiscal year 1971. Projections for fiscal year 1974 based on the above factors indicate that sales at the main commissary store will increase to $1,350,000 per month with service to 17,000 families, including retired service personnel. Backup storage space is limited which contributes to double-handling of merchandise and a requirement for additional operating manpower and vehicles. It is not feasible to expand the temporary building now in use as a commissary store due to its location, the age of the building, and its poor physical condition. The main store currently maintains a 54 hour-per-week operating schedule while three annexes are open a total of 98 hours per week. Despite this schedule many authorized military customers are not able to patronize the commissary outlets because of excessive shopping times required, thus sacrificing a privilege which is considered in the establishment of military pay levels. Recent annual cost comparison surveys indicate that personnel shopping at commercial food stores must pay in excess of 30 percent above commissary price levels.

FORT GORDON, GA.

Fort Gordon is located 12 miles southwest of Augusta, Ga. The installation mission is to support the U.S. Army Signal School, a U.S. Army general hospital and assigned strategic Army force units. The program will provide an enlisted men's barracks complex, barracks modernization for enlisted women, a commissary, and an automotive self-help garage. The request is for $23,780,000.

The first project will provide permanent barrack spaces and ancillary support facilities for enlisted personnel assigned to advanced individual training. Personnel now live in temporary mobilization buildings built in 1941 and semipermanent facilities constructed in 1967. These temporary structures require continual maintenance, are expensive to heat and are not air conditioned. Such substandard quarters are not conducive to retention of personnel. The existing deficit at Fort Gordon for permanent bachelor enlisted housing upon completion of this project will be 28.5 percent of the total installation requirement.

The barracks modernization project will continue the work of upgrading existing permanent barracks to current standards for female enlisted personnel. The WAC population at Fort Gordon is being increased due to the expansion of the Women's Corps and the opening up of many additional job categories to women. Upon completion of this project 10 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Gordon will meet minimum housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

The third project is to provide permanent operating facilities for the commissary sales store which has a daily average customer workload during peak periods of over 2,700 people. Average monthly sales of $890,470 for fiscal year 1972 showed a continuing increase in volume, advancing 14 percent over the monthly volume in 1971. Projected monthly sales in fiscal year 1974 will average $1,150,000. The present commissary store is a converted mobilization type warehouse building constructed in 1941. Floor space for sales area is limited and areas for installation of adequate display shelving are not available. Volume quantities of replenishment stock must be transported from remote locations and rehandled. The physical structure of the building has so deteriorated as to preclude the maintenance of food sanitary standards. There were no existing facilities which can satisfy this requirement. Annual projected savings on completion of the project are estimated at $66,000.

The final project is to provide a permanent automotive self-help garage. The existing temporary buildings now in use were constructed in 1942 and are not designed to meet the requirements of an automotive garage. Space and equipment are inadequate and insufficient security exists for vehicles left overnight. Due to the high cost of automobile repairs and maintenance, the auto self-help garage is a very popular, well-used facility and is a valuable asset. This project will provide a modern, well-equipped facility to support the mission of the Army crafts program.

Senator SYMINGTON. $626,000 seems to be an excessive amount for what might be termed a hobby shop. It is noted that this is to be a permanent structure. Cannot prefabricated buildings be used for this purpose in order to have a little money?

General COOPER. The unit is most in line with the approved criteria for this type of structure. Contributing to this unit cost are the many large doors opening to the working stalls and other installed equipment; for example, a compressed air system, exhaust expulsion apparatus, and auto hoists.

The automotive self-help garage is designed for conventional construction; that is, masonry and steel frame, and the design is 100 percent complete. Pre-engineered structures were considered as an alternative design for the facility. A life cycle cost analysis of the alternatives indicated the conventional masonry construction would realize approximately a 15-percent savings over a 15-year life span.

Other considerations influencing the choice of masonry construction were:

(*a*) The automotive self-help garage would be compatible with nearby existing or planned structures of masonry construction.

(*b*) The majority of structures used for similar purposes in the communities near Fort Gordon are of masonry construction. This indicates a viable market source for required materials plus the local construction contractors are experienced in this type of construction thereby creating a competitive atmosphere for procuring this type of structure.

(*c*) A design using the concept of entering all working bays directly from the exterior of the building provides the maximum number of bays within gross space allowances. A key feature of this design is that the side walls consist primarily of large doors

and the more rigid masonry construction is particularly well suited for this design. An alternative concept would be to have a common center aisle for access to the working bays. This design is often used in large commercial garages where an auto being repaired would be moved to several different bays, each equipped only for specialized work. In the auto self-help garage the work is usually less sophisticated and all accomplished in the same bay so the center aisle would consume space better used as working area to accommodate more customers.

FORT JACKSON, S.C.

Fort Jackson is located at Columbia, S.C. The mission of the installation is to command, train, and support an Army training center. It also supports a U.S. Army reception station and reserve components summer training. This project is for construction of an enlisted women's barracks with mess facilities. We are requesting $2,902,000.

This project is to provide a permanent barracks for enlisted women stationed at Fort Jackson. Permanent enlisted women housing facilities are not available at present. To provide a temporary solution, one existing permanent building is being modified to house approximately 244 WAC. This has required displacement of male trainees to World War II-type temporary barracks until the permanent WAC barracks are constructed. Also, until this is completed other enlisted women must continue to occupy temporary buildings which were constructed in 1941 and have had no major renovations or modifications. Accomplishment of this essential housing project will satisfy the housing requirement for enlisted women assigned to Fort Jackson, however an overall Post deficit of more than 10,000 spaces will still exist.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here again you propose an enlisted women's barracks with a mess, at a cost of almost $3 million. It is noted that the barracks and administrative and storage space combined amounts to over $6,100 per man. Isn't this excessive when only 2 years ago there was a limitation of $3,200 per man?

General COOPER. This is explained by the application of the statutory limitation. The troop housing and only those spaces in direct support of the living space are applicable to statutory limitation. This was agreed upon by Congress in the late 1950's. Therefore, this limitation only applies to the barracks. In turn, the barracks have been programed as a separate item differentiated from the administration and supply and the mess facilities. In fiscal year 1974 the proposed statutory limitation is $28.50 per square foot. At 165 gross square feet per man this equates to $4,700 per man. As compared with fiscal year 1972, the statutory limitation was $3,200, at 150 square feet per E–2 to E–4. The increase in statutory limitation is reflected in the programing of adequate space for upper grade enlisted men, the growth of construction costs, and the increased gross area per man to provide the privacy required by our enlisted men. It should be noted that additional barracks area listed on the DD form 1391 is for mechanical utility requirements.

FORT M'CLELLAN, ALA.

Fort McClellan is located 7 miles northeast of Anniston, Ala. The mission of the installation is to support the Women's Army Corps Center and School. The WAC Center and WAC School conduct basic training and officer candidate courses. The installation also supports the 3d Army NCO Academy, the U.S. Army Police School, and Noble Army Hospital.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here at Fort McClelland you are proposing a $19.5 million construction program. Isn't some consideration being given to closing this base? If so, shouldn't this proposed program be deferred?

General COOPER. Fort McClellan is one of the installations being reviewed in the Army's stationing study now in progress. However no decisions have been made at this time. We hope to have made our determinations prior to the committee's final action on the construction bill.

The program is for alterations to training facilities, additions to academic buildings, a gymnasium, alterations and additions to WAC Headquarters, barracks modernization, additional barracks for enlisted women, housing and training facilities for the Women's Army Corps Band, a WAC reception and processing building, WAC bachelor officers quarters and an expansion of utilities capabilities. The request is for $19,505,000.

The first project is required to provide adequate classroom facilities for the Military Police School moving to Fort McClellan under the 1973 Army realinement. Training facilities previously structured to meet the specialized needs of the Army Chemical School will be altered to more standard classrooms.

The second project is to provide academic facilities for three WAC basic training battalions. Present buildings were designed and built in 1954 to accommodate a training strength of approximately 500 women but planned WAC expansion will increase the training strength to 2,430. Thirty-two additional classrooms and two performance training rooms are required to support this additional workload.

The next project will provide a gymnasium for personnel assigned or attached to the WAC Center/School. The existing facility was designed in 1954 to support a total population of 1,060 WAC personnel. Today the average daily population is 2,680 and the indoor physical training program has had to be curtailed contrary to Army policy. Under the WAC expansion program, the average daily basic trainee population will increase significantly and the present gymnasium will no longer support basic training or permanent party requirements. If this building is not constructed, an adequate training program cannot be supported. The existing facility will revert to a badly needed classroom.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here at Fort McClellan you are requesting a gymnasium to serve approximately 3,300 personnel, at a cost of $1,261,000—whereas the one we previously discussed at Carlisle Barracks costs twice as much and serves a far less number of people. What is your explanation for this?

General Cooper. The estimated unit costs for the Carlisle Barracks and Fort McClellan gynasiums are $44.6 per square foot and $35.6 per square foot, respectively. The geographical construction cost index is 19 percent higher in the Carlisle area than at Fort McClellan accounting for approximately 75 percent of the apparent cost difference. The remainder is attributed to differences in the design as dictated by the planned utilization.

The Fort McClellan gymnasium will be designed primarily for female personnel as a training facility used for WAC basic training. As a result, it will be somewhat less sophisticated in features and accommodations than the gymnasium planned for Carlisle Barracks. The Fort McClellan facility will provide a basketball floor, a handball and a squash court, a sauna and a swimming pool. This will provide an indoor exercise area for the WAC training program plus individual and some unit sports competition. There will be only limited accommodations; for example, restrooms, for spectators or male personnel.

As mentioned earlier, the gymnasium planned for Carlisle Barracks will offer a much more comprehensive program to both male and female personnel and it contains several facilities not incorporated in the Fort McClellan gymnasium.

The fourth project is needed to provide adequate administrative space to support the WAC expansion program. The present WAC Headquarters was designed to support an 8-company operation but the planned expansion will require administrative support and auditorium space for 16 companies. The present headquarters building does not provide either the space or the configuration necessary to support operations at this level of activity. The existing auditorium does not have sufficient seating capability for present requirements and with increased trainee loads the auditorium will be even more inadequate. If this project is not approved, prevailing operating constrictions must continue.

The barracks modernization project is required to continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current standards for enlisted female personnel. Upon completion of this project, 80 percent of the existing barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort McClellan will meet current housing standards.

The barracks construction project is required to accommodate an increased number of basic trainees as a result of the WAC expansion. The 10 WAC trainee barracks now available provide a total of 2,150 spaces. Of these, 150 are cadre spaces leaving 2,000 spaces to house trainees. The accelerated WAC expansion program will require the housing of 16 companies with 3,120 billet spaces (2,940 trainees plus 180 cadre), or a deficit of 970 spaces. This project will provide 645 of those spaces. If this project is not approved, new WAC trainees will be required to live in inadequate, semipermanent barracks designed strictly for male personnel and remote to the WAC training area.

The next project is required to provide permanent housing and training facilities for the only all-women's band in the Armed Forces. This band presently works and lives in a building designed for enlisted housing. Band members spend their entire military career at Fort McClellan and are required to live and train in quarters designed to house lower ranking enlisted personnel regardless of their promotions to higher enlisted status. The present building does not provide sep-

arated training rooms. The only areas available for individual or small group training are stairwells, latrines, kitchens, and open cubicles in the living areas which are not acoustically treated. Individual and group training are hampered by the lack of acoustically engineered training areas since intonation, articulation, rhythm, tone and accuracy cannot be detected properly as a result of the intermix of resonance and sound when band members are rehearsing or undergoing proficiency tests.

If this project is not approved, bachelor officers at this station must continue to live in inadequate facilities.

The final project is required to provide for utilities expansion necessitated by planned new construction to support the Women's Army Corps expansion program. This project provides for conversion of 4-kVA lines to 12 kVA to provide adequate electric power to support the proposed construction. Two existing boilerplants, one at 1,200 and one at 600 boiler horsepower (BHP), will be expanded to 1,500 and 1,000 BHP respectively, to provide additional heating capacity and capacity for steam absorption type chillers. Chilled water distribution piping is required to transport chilled water from plants to buildings to support air-condition requirements. Existing systems cannot support the construction planned under the expansion program.

The next project will provide critically needed recruit housing and facilities for processing incoming officer and enlisted personnel for the Women's Army Corps. During the 5-year WAC expansion plan, programed input of enlistees will increase from a current annual level of 6,000 to a total of 12,000. The space presently being used for administrative processing includes the second floor of a building originally designed to provide classrooms and two barracks buildings intended for housing. The location and arrangement of these facilities do not meet minimum requirements for the conduct of tests and initial classification processing. The programed increase will require the release of all classrooms and barracks for use as originally designed and the reception area will be lost. If the requested reception facilities are not constructed, the present facilities will, of necessity, continue to be used; thus, hampering the proper use of existing assets and causing severe inefficiencies in processing incoming WAC personnel.

The next project will provide adequate bachelor officer quarters at this station for both commissioned officer students and permanent party. There are 160 permanent BOQ spaces now available compared to the present bachelor officer population requirement for 410 spaces. Excluding the 160 spaces onpost and 25 adequate spaces off post, the result is a net deficit of 225 spaces required for onpost bachelor officer housing. Present housing needs are met by assigning two officers to each one-man room which requires four officers to use a common bathroom facility. This project will provide 100 bachelor officer quarters against the total requirements.

FORT M'PHERSON, GA.

Fort McPherson is located near Atlanta, Ga. The mission of this installation is to provide support for activities of Headquarters, U.S. Army Forces Command. The requested program consists of a barracks modernization project for an estimated cost of $1,804,000.

This project is to continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Upon completion of this project 100 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort McPherson will meet current housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

Senator SYMINGTON. Aren't you considering closing Fort McPherson, and shouldn't this project be deferred?

General COOKE. Fort McPherson is another of the installations under review in the Army's stationing study now being conducted. We are looking very carefully at single mission, high cost posts. However, to defer the project at this time would be to prejudge the study results. Hopefully, we will have made some firm decisions prior to the final committee action on the construction bill.

FORT RUCKER, ALA.

Fort Rucker is located at Daleville, Ala. The installation mission is support of the Army Aviation Center which trains individual pilots for fixed and rotary wing Army aircraft. The program consists of construction of an enlisted women's barracks, modernization of enlisted men's barracks, and the upgrade of airfield facilities. A total of $3,987,000 is requested for these projects.

The first project will provide WAC billets to house station permanent party WAC's and some WAC students. The WAC's are presently housed in barracks originally designed for male personnel and these buildings do not have required features, such as kitchens and reception rooms. On completion of the new WAC billets, the billets now occupied by WAC's will be returned to the use by male soldiers.

The second project is required to continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. The existing barracks are typical of the old open-bay concept, offering the soldier little privacy or modern conveniences. Upon completion of the project 68 percent of the existing barracks capable of being modernized at Fort Rucker will meet current housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

The third project will provide adequate airfield training facilities to handle the increased flight training mission assigned to Fort Rucker under the 1973 Army realinement. All Army helicopter training will be consolidated at Fort Rucker from Fort Wolters, Tex., and Hunter AAF, Ga.

FORT STEWART, GA.

Fort Stewart is located at Hinesville, Ga. Its mission is to support annual field training for National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve units and to provide armor and artillery ranges for training Active Army and Reserve components. The requested program is for a gas generating plant at an estimated cost of $264,000.

This project is to provide a propane-air gas generating plant to supplement the restricted natural gas supply procured under contract with the Atlanta Gas Light Co., a regulated sole-source supplier. Because of the developing critical nationwide shortage of natural gas available to suppliers, all customers are restricted to current firm con-

tract demands during periods of curtailment. The contract firm gas demand is 300,000 cubic feet per day (CFD). Current conversions of coal-fired facilities to natural gas fuel to comply with air pollution control regulations has increased the total gas requirement to 760,000 cubic feet per day. Negotiations with the gas supplier has resulted in an agreement to make an additional 488,000 cubic feet per day available until October 1974, at which time the contract demand will revert to the current contract firm gas demand of 300,000 cubic feet per day. The proposed propane-air gas generating plant is the most economical means of providing energy for adequate heating during periods of natural gas curtailment.If this project is not approved, it will be necessary to close buildings and operations on a selective basis during periods of natural gas curtailment subsequent to October 1974.

FORT BLISS, TEX.

Fort Bliss is located in El Paso, Tex. The installation mission is to provide facilities and support for the U.S. Army Air Defense Center, U.S. Army Air Defense School, and U.S. Army Air Defense Board. Fort Bliss supports and supervises units in their annual missile firing training and provides logistical support for William Beaumont General Hospital. It also operates an Army air defense training center. The program provides for modernization of both enlisted women's and enlisted men's barracks for a total requested authorization of $6,087,000.

The first project will provide adequate quarters for the enlisted women stationed at Fort Bliss. With the expansion of the Women's Army Corps (WAC) and the opening of many additional job specialties to women in the Army, the WAC population assigned to Fort Bliss and Beaumont Army Hospital is being increased nearly twofold. There are no quarters at Fort Bliss which meet current barracks standards, hence this request for authority to modernize existing buildings.

The second project is also required to continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Fort Bliss has a large number of barracks structures which can be economically and effectively modernized to provide the features desired in barracks for today's Army.

Upon completion of these two projects, 20 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Bliss will meet modern housing standards, providing approximately 25 percent of the Fort Bliss long-range bachelor enlisted housing requirement.

FORT BENJAMIN HARRISON, IND.

Fort Benjamin Harrison is located 14 miles northeast of Indianapolis, Ind. The installation supports the Army Finance Center and School, the Adjutant General School, and the Defense Information School. The program is for an enlisted men's barracks without mess facilities for medical personnel, an enlisted women's barracks without mess facilities, and a project for barracks modernization for a total program request of $3,893,000.

The first project will provide adequate housing for enlisted men assigned to the hospital medical detachment. The new quarters will be

adjacent to the hospital so that medical personnel will be immediately available and the facilities may be used for hospital wards in event of an epidemic or disaster. The medical detachment personnel now live in three temporary-type woodframe structures constructed in 1941 as an integral part of the old World War II mobilization-type hospital that is now obsolete and scheduled for demolition.

The second project is to provide adequate quarters for the enlisted women stationed at Fort Benjamin Harrison. This need is currently being met by use of permanent barracks diverted from use by enlisted men. This housing is not appropriately located, with the WAC's being housed in separated facilities interspered with adjoining male billets creating administrative and command problems. Upon completion of the requested WAC barracks, their present quarters will be modernized and revert to billets for male personnel.

The final project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel.

Upon completion of these three projects, approximately 76 percent of Fort Benjamin Harrison's long-range bachelor enlisted housing requirement will be satisfied.

FORT HOOD, TEX.

Fort Hood is located at Killeen, Tex. The installation mission is the command, training, and logistical support of one armored and one TRICAP division, a corps headquarters, numerous miscellaneous support units, and support of Reserve forces summer training.

The program includes improvements for Gray Army Airfield by installing approach controls, an instrument landing system and strengthening the taxiways and aprons, and modernization of enlisted barracks and bachelor officers quarters for a total program of $15,094,000.

The first project is to upgrade Robert Gray Army Airfield so that missions involving the use of heavy Air Force transport aircraft can be accomplished. The proposed taxiway and apron upgrading is required to support the weight of the heavier C–133, C–141, and C–5 aircraft. The existing fuel dispensing and storage system is inadequate for these large transports, resulting in lengthy ground times which preclude servicing more than one or two aircraft per day. There are a number of Strategic Army Force units at Fort Hood with worldwide deployment missions which require the use of the heavy transport aircraft. Accomplishment of this project will increase the quick reaction flexibility for accomplishment of assigned missions.

The next project, also involving Gray Army Airfield, will provide a radar approach control facility, instrument landing system (ILS), and airfield lighting. The Federal Aviation Agency has delegated responsibility for the Killeen, Tex., control zone—which includes Gray Army Airfield, Hood Army Airfield, and Killeen Municipal Airport—to Fort Hood. There were 170,000 flight operations at these three airfields in 1969, 270,000 in 1970, 300,000 in 1971, 585,000 in 1972, and an estimated 635,000 in 1973. These rapidly increasing traffic volumes cannot be safely handled without the radar facilities covered in this project.

The barracks modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Fort Hood is one of the Army's key installations, being the station for two important combat divisions. The division troops undergo considerable strenuous field training and deserve the modern living conditions approved for today's Army.

The final project will provide air-conditioning for four 30-man permanent bachelor officer quarters constructed in 1956. This improvement will aid in equating accommodations provided by these existing BOQ's and those provided by the 300-man, air-conditioned, high-rise BOQ recently completed at this station. The existing roof-mounted mechanical ventilation system in these buildings has proven unsatisfactory since outside air is drawn into buildings from sun-heated roofs. The influx of hot air, dust, and insects funneled through the buildings creates a very uncomfortable housing situation. On an average of 111 days each year, the temperature exceeds 90° F. and the residual heat absorbed by these buildings throughout the day makes the living conditions extremely uncomfortable. Occupants are denied reasonable conditions for study, work preparation, and adequate rest, thereby adversely affecting their efficiency during duty period.

FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEX.

Fort Sam Houston is located at San Antonio, Tex. This installation provides administrative and logistical support, training areas, and supply and maintenance for Headquarters, 5th U.S. Army, Brooke Army Medical Center, their subordinate activities and units, and other Army activities or units generally located within the 5th U.S. Army area of responsibility.

The program includes enlisted women's barracks modernization, construction of barracks for enlisted personnel, and air-conditioning for bachelor officer quarters, for a total program of $11,738,000.

The first project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for female enlisted personnel. The existing buildings are of the old open-bay configuration, are not air-conditioned, and offer little privacy or conveniences to the occupants. Modernization of the buildings will provide semiprivate rooms and bathrooms, security for personal possessions, air-conditioning, and in general offer a much better living standard.

The next project is to provide adequate permanent facilities for permanent party and student enlisted men and women assigned to Brooke Army Medical Center and the Medical Field Service School (MFSS). These men and women now live in World War II temporary wooden barracks built in 1941, which are all open-bay type, without air-conditioning or even mechanical ventilation. Brooke Army Medical Center WAC personnel totaling 282 will be housed in the enlisted women's barracks, 500 spaces will be assigned to permanent enlisted male personnel from the Medical Company and the Medical Holding Company, Brooke General Hospital; Headquarters Company, Brooke Army Medical Center; and the Medical Field Service School Cadre; and 318 spaces will be assigned to MFSS students.

The final project is to improve existing BOQ buildings, primarily by installing air-conditioning. These permanent buildings have been

well maintained, are structurally sound, and are centrally located. The projected Medical Field Service School Student load, based on present and fiscal year 1973 programed numbers, will require the continued use of these buildings as BOQ spaces. None of these buildings have any type of permanent central air-conditioning or mechanical ventilation. MFSS students that are assigned these non-air-conditioned BOQ's in the summer find it extremely difficult to study in the rooms because of the high temperature and humidity.

FORT POLK, LA.

Fort Polk is located 7 miles south of Leesville, La. The installation mission is to operate an infantry training center of five training brigades and supporting units, a reception station, and to provide administrative and logistical support for all units assigned to the installation. The program requests a barracks complex for enlisted men and women, an elisted men's service club, and a commissary for a total estimate of $29,276,000.

The barracks complex project will provide housing, mess, supply, administration, and support facilities for permanent party enlisted personnel. Existing buildings are of World War II mobilization design and were constructed in 1941. All barracks spaces at Fort Polk are unsatisfactory by current standards. In conjunction with this barracks construction, 158 temporary buildings are scheduled to be demolished. Completion of the requested barracks complex will satisfy the requirements for permanent party bachelor enlisted housing within current programing constraints. There remains an outstanding deficit of nearly 20,000 spaces for trainee housing.

The second project is to provide adequate recreational facilities for enlisted personnel stationed at the South Fort Cantonment area. These troops are predominately basic and advanced trainees who must use post recreational facilities, since most lack private transportation. Present facilities, consisting of one service club and two recreation buildings, are old World War II-type temporary structures constructed in 1942 and renovated to provide service club activities.

The final project is to provide adequate commissary facilities for military personnel and dependents. The present commissary is housed in temporary buildings constructed in 1941 with 19,881 square feet of usable space. An additional 29,000 square feet of floor space is required to provide adequate commissary customer service for the present patron population. Fort Polk is located in an isolated area with limited off post support. Monthly sales have increased from $215,000 in fiscal year 1966 to more than $440,000 in fiscal year 1973. With additional space and consequent better service, sales are estimated to increase to $500,000 to $600,000 per month. The existing commissary will revert to a warehouse upon construction of the new facility.

FORT RILEY, KANS.

Fort Riley is located 4 miles northeast of Junction City, Kans. The mission of this installation is to provide support and services for the First Infantry Division and to support ROTC, Reserve component summer training, and the U.S. Army Correctional Training Facility.

The program will provide barracks modernization, an enlisted men's

barracks complex, support facilities for a barracks complex, and outdoor athletic facilities at Custer Hill for a total request of $34,918,000.

The first project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Fort Riley is one of the Army's key combat division posts. The personnel engage in vigorous combat training and other exercises and should be housed in modern attractive quarters in keeping with the goals of today's Army.

The barracks complex is to provide badly needed permanent barracks and supporting facilities to house elements of the First Infantry Division and nondivisional support troops. These troops now occupy World War II-type temporary wooden structures which lack adequate lighting, heating, cooling, or privacy for the individual.

The next project will provide standard direct-support facilities at Custer Hill for administration, classroom instruction, and supply/storage areas, at brigade and battalion level, for units of the First Infantry Division. Present support facilities do not accommodate the needs of all assigned units and support is provided by diversion of 729 barracks spaces, overcrowding in other facilities, and storage of materiel out of doors. Upon completion of the project the diverted barracks areas will revert to use for troop housing.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are asking $2.6 million for support facilities for enlisted men's barracks complexes. It has been my impression that the support facilities are usually constructed when the barracks are built. What is the problem in this instance?

General COOPER. When we build barracks complexes now we do try to include ancillary support space, gymnasiums, chapels, dispensaries, and branch exchanges. The facilities, primarily unit administrative and storage space, being requested in this project will be in support of barracks areas built during much earlier periods (1880's, 1950's, 1960's) which do not have these associated facilities. The units occupying these barracks areas are now making do by diverting badly needed barracks spaces to administrative use.

The fourth project at Fort Riley is to provide a variety of adequate outdoor athletic facilities for use by men stationed in the Custer Hill area. Primary users of these facilities will be the lower grade enlisted men. The facilities will be a great asset in building and maintaining morale and esprit de corps as well as providing for safe and healthy use of the soldiers' off-duty time. The Custer Hill area has recently more than doubled its capability to house enlisted personnel without a corresponding increase in the number of outdoor athletic facilities. Existing outdoor playing courts and fields consist of one lighted double tennis court and one undersized lighted softball field. Until outdoor athletic facilities are available many soldiers will not be able to participate in organized sports.

FORT SHERIDAN, ILL.

Fort Sheridan is located at Highland Park, Ill. The installation mission is to support U.S. Army Air Defense Command activities; U.S. Army Reserve centers; U.S. Army support detachment, Selfridge Air Force Base, and the U.S. Army Veterinary School. This program requests facilities for the U.S. Army Veterinary School at Fort Sheridan for $762,000.

This project will provide academic facilities for the U.S. Army Veterinary School at Fort Sheridan, Ill. This is the only school which provides instruction for Army Veterinary Corps officers and enlisted men in food inspection. Graduates are responsible for insuring the quality of all food for all U.S. Armed Forces worldwide. The school provides 12 separate programs of instruction with an average student load of 125. The annual student output for the school is 500. In 1972 the school graduated 618 students. Classes are currently conducted in three buildings formerly used as horse barns. All of the buildings are without benefit of interior finishing; two or more classes are, of necessity, conducted in a single large area without partitions or acoustical barriers. Essential, acceptable levels of instruction cannot be attained thus precluding the school's ability to successfully perform its assigned mission. Without this proposed project the school must continue to operate in grossly inadequate facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. I believe this project was denied last year, perhaps because it was not properly described. Just what type of training is given at this school, and does it provide training for the three services, or only for the Army?

General COOPER. The U.S. Army Veterinary School trains only Army personnel.

The Navy and Marine Corps have no veterinary service; however, they both have extensive requirements for veterinary services which are fulfilled by the veterinary services of the Army and the Air Force. The Army accomplishes approximately four-fifths of the Navy requirements for veterinary services and the Air Force accomplishes the remainder.

The mission of the veterinary service is to protect the health of the troops and to safeguard the financial interest of the Government. The veterinary service accomplishes this mission through the following functional areas:

a. Food hygiene and quality assurance;
b. Control of animal diseases transmissible to man;
c. Preventive medicine and public health,
d. Medical care of Government-owned animals;
e. Medical and subsistence research and development.

While the stated mission of the veterinary service has remained virtually unchanged since it was established in 1916, the functional emphasis has been increasing at a rapid rate in the area of medical research and development.

Also, while complete care of all Government-owned animals has been provided since the service was established, the primary species of animals owned by the Government have shifted from equines to laboratory animals and military dogs.

The veterinary service consists of 512 officers, all of whom have degrees as doctors of veterinary medicine. The 243 enlisted animal specialists and 1,022 enlisted food inspection specialists also form an integral part of the veterinary service.

In addition to the functions described above, the veterinary service also supports the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the event an animal disease such as equine encephalomyelitis (VEE) should break out in our domestic animal population. During the past 2 years extensive support was provided the USDA; in 1972, 40 veterinary officers

assisted Federal and State veterinarians in successfully combating Newcastle's disease which threatened to decimate the poultry industry in America.

Both officers and enlisted men of the veterinary service attend courses at the U.S. Army Medical Department Veterinary School as a part of their overall military education.

A degree as a doctor of veterinary medicine is a prerequisite for commissioning in the Veterinary Corps. These officers are already professionally qualified as are physicians, engineers or lawyers who enter the Army. The Army Veterinary School does not teach them to be veterinarians. It does contribute to their education as Army officers and provides them working knowledge in the detailed functions of the Veterinary Corps.

The following are officer courses taught at the Veterinary School:

(*a*) Army Medical Department officer orientation course (Veterinary Corps). Length: 8 weeks.

Scope: To provide commissioned officers a working knowledge in preventive medicine, food hygiene and food technology as they relate to procurements, storage, shipment and issue of food for the Armed Forces both in the United States and overseas.

(*b*) Army Medical Department field grade officer refresher course (Veterinary Corps). Length: 2 weeks.

Scope: Same as orientation course; however, this course provides refresher and updating information.

(*c*) Veterinary officer statistics (Veterinary Corps). Length: 3 weeks.

Scope: Emphasizes statistical procedures employed in research and development activities, particularly those utilizing animals and those statistical principles involved in health and quality subsistence inspection and veterinary public health. Data distribution, significance tests for comparison of population groups, correlative methods, statistical sampling techniques, comparability procedures, quality control, and experimental design receive particular emphasis. Classroom presentations are supplemented by practical exercises.

The following are enlisted courses taught at the Veterinary School:

(*a*) Food inspection procedures, basic. Length: 8 weeks.

Scope: To provide a working knowledge of the fundamentals of food inspection, contract administration, field inspection and surveillance inspection.

(*b*) Food inspection procedures, advanced. Length: 10 weeks.

Scope: Unit and contract administration; fruit and vegetable inspection; surveillance inspection; food inspection of military installations; combat service support; veterinary aspects of CBR operations; dairy and poultry inspections; basic food sciences; veterinary anatomy and physiology; meat technology.

(*c*) Enlisted refresher courses (five in number). Length: 2 weeks.

Scope: Each of the five refresher courses offered provides refresher training in one or two of the subjects listed in the scope of the advance course in subparagraph (*a*) above.

Additionally, special courses are offered as required and programed to veterinary units, officers and enlisted men of the Reserve component.

Veterinary service personnel perform their functions on military installations and also on an area basis, in peacetime and in wartime,

in the United States and in scattered countries of the world wherever Armed Forces personnel are assigned. Congress assigned the basic missions to the Veterinary Corps. Other functions are delegated by the Surgeon General in order to fulfill the mission of the Army Medical Department. The missions and functions of the Veterinary service are properly assigned and cannot be performed by other individuals.

FORT SILL, OKLA.

Fort Sill is located 4 miles north of Lawton, Okla. The installation mission is to command, train, and support artillery and surface-to-surface missile units; to activate and train Straf artillery units; to support the Army Artillery and Missile School, Artillery Advanced Individual Training Center, and Reserve components summer training. The program consists of maintenance evaluation facilities and barracks modernization for a total program cost of $9,447,000.

The first project is to improve and expand the electronic maintenance and test facility to support the newly assigned mission of testing and evaluating direct and general support maintenance on items of electronic equipment. Existing facilities permit only limited test measurements and some equipment has been sent to the field with undetected deficiencies. The improvements will provide adequate electric power, temperature, dust, and humidity controls, a radio frequency interference-free room, and adequate work storage areas. Existing facilities will be retained for use as an operational maintenance and equipment storage building.

The barracks modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. The buildings to be modernized were built in 1954, are not air-conditioned, and provide only large open-bay areas as living space. The proposed modernization will provide quarters for 2,814 enlisted men and will offer security for the soldiers' possessions, private or semiprivate rooms with adjoining bathroom, air-conditioning, and more spacious accommodations.

FORT LEONARD WOOD, MO.

Fort Leonard Wood is located 29 miles southwest of Rolla, Mo. The installation mission is to command and support an Army training center, Engineer, and Army reception station. The installation also trains and supports nondivisional units and supports Reserve components summer training. The proposed program includes a military police barracks with support facilities, an enlisted men's barracks complex, an enlisted women's barracks addition, barracks modernization, and a confinement facility for 250 men for a total request of $44,482,000.

The first project will provide barracks and essential supporting facilities for a military police company with 35 vehicles and a strength of 260 enlisted men. A motor park adjacent to the barracks will assure that vehicle parking and organizational servicing is available at all hours. The buildings presently occupied by this unit are World War II temporary mobilization type structures constructed in 1941.

Construction of an additional 122 housing spaces for enlisted women and expansion of the dining, supply-administration, and classrooms

will provide adequate space for the planned 250 enlisted women strength. The existing permanent barracks will house 103 women. Personnel in excess of that capacity must be housed in remotely located, substandard mobilization-type barracks. This project will permit the balance of the permanent party enlisted women to be adequately housed adjacent to the other WAC personnel assigned to Fort Leonard Wood.

The purpose of the barracks complex for enlisted men is to provide permanent barracks and troop support facilities to house 2,522 personnel.

This project is part of the overall program to provide adequate troop housing facilities to support the long-range strength. Upon completion of the MP barracks, the EW barracks and this barracks complex, Fort Leonard Wood will have 60 percent of the total permanent barracks spaces required. The personnel who will occupy the new facilities are currently housed in substandard World War II-type temporary buildings.

The project for barracks modernization will continue the upgrading existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. The buildings being modernized house trainees and meet most current standards for trainee barracks. Outstanding deficiencies, primarily the lack of air-conditioning, will be corrected by this project. Upon completion of this project, 28 percent of the permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Leonard Wood will be completed. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

The final project will provide adequate facilities for the custody, control, and treatment of military prisoners in accordance with the Army's correction program. Buildings presently occupied are 23 World War II structures which are seriously inadequate in terms of proper control, supervision, and required segregation of the prisoners. This project will provide facilities for confinement of prisoners originating from Fort Leonard Wood, Fort Benjamin Harrison, other adjacent defense installations, and absentees on a geographical area basis.

FORT CARSON, COLO.

Fort Carson is located 7 miles south of Colorado Springs, Colo. The installation mission is to provide facilities and support for the 4th Infantry Division (mechanized) and nondivisional support units. The program includes a 28-chair dental clinic and a barracks modernization project for a total cost of $5,651,000.

The dental clinic project will provide one of four permanent dental clinics required to furnish dental care to personnel of the 4th Infantry Division (mechanized) and other nondivisional units assigned to Fort Carson. Present facilities are housed in two temporary, mobilization-type buildings. These buildings were built in 1942 of frame construction; are not fire-resistive; are drafty, hard to heat; resist establishment of the sanitary conditions required for a medical facility; and require continuous maintenance and repair. Further use of these facilities will result in continued expensive repairs and alterations in an attempt to maintain operation of dental services. Other existing temporary dental clinics will remain in use until additional new facilities can be constructed.

The modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current standards to provide modern housing for bachelor enlisted personnel. The modernization work will eliminate large open-bay areas and gang latrines and will provide more private one- to four-man rooms, new lighting and outlets, air-conditioning, and security for personal possessions. Complete accommodations will house 2,152 enlisted men. Upon completion of this project, 84 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Carson will meet modern housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

HUNTER-LIGGETT MILITARY RESERVATION, CALIF.

The mission of Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, a subinstallation of Fort Ord, is to provide the logistical, and administrative support for training conducted by the U.S. Army Training Center, Fort Ord, Calif. An additional mission is to furnish training areas and other support for the combat development experimentation command, and Reserve and National Guard units during unit field training. This includes the maintenance of ranges and other training facilities as required, policing of the reservation and adequate precautionary measures against the outbreak of forest fires and control thereof. The program proposes an enlisted men's barracks complex at a cost of $7,776,000.

This project will provide troop housing and facilities at Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation (HLMR) to support the overall Fort Ord training and other missions. The proposed facilities will be used by troops of the combat developments experimentation command (CDEC), a tenant agency. Existing facilities are substantially below standards established for troops in the continental United States and have been described as the poorest living quarters provided troops any place in the world, exclusive of an active combat theater. Troop housing consists of light-frame hutments in five separate bivouac areas. Showers, latrines, and washrooms are community-type facilities and some are as far as 1,500 feet from the hutments. These bivouac-type structures are in every respect unsuitable to accommodate personnel during the extended period of occupancy dictated by their assignment.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice you propose semipermanent type barracks here at this reservation. Just what type of work is performed here, and why are the baracks to be semipermanent?

General COOPER. Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation (HLRMR) is a subpost of Fort Ord. It serves as a maneuver and training area for Regular Army, Reserve, and National Guard units. It is also the primary site for operations and test activities of the combat developments experimentation command (CDEC) which is a major testing agency for our force development advances.

Except for the post complement, most personnel engaged in activities at HLMR are in a transient status. They have permanent facilities elsewhere. The prime users of the proposed facilities would be troops supporting CDEC activities, but the barracks would be available for others when not required by CDEC. The purpose for the semipermanent facilities requested is to greatly improve the living

conditions at HLMR in the most economical manner, commensurate with the mission. The existing facilities at HLMR are extremely poor, considered by most who have viewed them as "the worst living conditions the Army has in CONUS."

FORT LEWIS, WASH.

Fort Lewis is located 15 miles east of Olympia, Wash. The installation mission is to support an infantry division, provide training and logistical support for nondivisional units, and to support National Guard and Army Reserve component summer training. The program includes a 28-chair dental clinic, and barracks modernization for a total cost of $8,327,000.

The dental clinic will provide adequate dental facilities for a portion of the troops at Fort Lewis. Serious deficiencies still remain and will be addressed in future programs. Present facilities consist of 36 chairs in permanent buildings and 64 chairs in three temporary buildings. The proposed project will replace a temporary 25-chair clinic which is very inferior by present standards and which is in a building which must be demolished to make way for a new community center now under construction.

The barracks modernization project, as at many of our installations, will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards. The completed project will provide modern housing for 3,014 enlisted men of the 9th Infantry Division. Upon completion of this project, 75 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Lewis will meet minimum housing standards.

FORT MAC ARTHUR, CALIF.

Fort MacArthur is located near San Pedro, Calif. The installation's mission includes providing administrative and logistical support to on-post units, elements of th Army Air Defense Command, and Army Reserve and ROTC activities. The program requested consists of one project for $428,000.

The project requested is for the modernization of barracks for WAC personnel stationed at Fort MacArthur. The building to be modernized was constructed in 1918. Only minimum privacy is offered under present conditions and the other features; for example, heating, lighting, air conditioning, fall far short of current standards.

Senator SYMINGTON. Aren't you considering closing Fort MacArthur? Shouldn't this project be deferred?

General COOPER. Fort MacArthur is a relatively small installation and is one of the Army's posts being reviewed in our ongoing stationing study. However, no firm decisions have been made on the future of Fort MacArthur at this time. Hopefully, we will make these determinations prior to final committee action on the construction bill.

FORT ORD, CALIF.

Fort Ord is located on the northern edge of Seaside, Calif. The installation mission is to command, train, and support an Army training center and nondivisional units and to support the Combat Develop-

ments Experimentation Command at Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, a common specialist school, a reception center and Reserve components summer training. The program consists of an enlisted men's barracks complex and modernization of enlisted women's barracks for a total cost of $9,812,000.

The barracks complex project will provide another increment of the permanent enlisted men's barracks spaces and other troop support facilities required at this installation. Barracks and ancillary facilities presently occupied are World War II temporary mobilization-type buildings constructed in 1941. The advanced deterioration of these mobilization type buildings has reached a state where normal maintenance is no longer practical and an immediate replacement is indicated. Upon completion of this project, the remaining deficit in permanent bachelor enlisted housing on Fort Ord will be 36 percent of the total installation requirement.

The barracks modernization project will provide modern living accommodations for the enlisted WAC personnel stationed at Ford Ord. The buildings to be modernized were constructed in 1952 and do not offer quarters acceptable by modern standards. WAC personnel now live in World War II temporary-type structures which have long ago outlived their useful life. Upon completion of this project, 20 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Ord will meet current housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The Presidio of San Francisco is located at San Francisco, Calif. The mission of this installation is to support Headquarters, 6th, U.S. Army, Letterman General Hospital, Western Medical Institute of Research and 6th Region U.S. Army Air Defense Command. The program consists of an enlisted women's barracks without mess facilities and modernization of enlisted men's barracks for a total cost of $5,751,000.

The enlisted women's barracks project will provide adequate housing for 320 of 645 enlisted women scheduled for this installation. Billeting space is currently met by using eight deteriorated temporary World War II type buildings and by issuance of certificates of nonavailability at an annual cost of over $286,000. Completion of this project will eliminate the requirement for enlisted women to live in the inadequate temporary buildings and in civilian housing costing well in excess of the authorized basic allowance for quarters.

The barracks modernization project will upgrade 15 buildings to provide modern quarters for 969 enlisted men stationed at the Presidio. Modernization will provide more private accommodations with better lighting and other utilities, security for personal possessions, and improved dining facilities. Upon completion of this project, all of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized will meet current housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that in your justification you indicate that 645 enlisted women are scheduled for assignment at this installation. I was under the impression that with the reorganization of the

Army the numbered Army headquarters were to be reduced in size, rather than increased. What is the situation at the 6th Army Headquarters?

General COOPER. What is reflected here is not an increase in the strength at the Presidio of San Francisco, but more specifically, a planned increase in the strength of WAC personnel on duty there within the overall post strength. This is a result of the expansion of the corps and opening up many more job opportunities for our female personnel. There will be WAC's in many of the jobs rather than men.

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD.

Aberdeen Proving Ground is located near Baltimore, Md. Its mission is to serve as Headquarters, U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command, to perform research on propellants and propulsive force systems; terminal effects of warheads; vulnerability of weapons to blast fragments and radiation; human factors engineering; and, dynamic and environmental testing of vehicles and ordnance equipment. The U.S. Army Ordnance School, Land Warfare Laboratory, Research and Development Center and Joint Military Packaging Training Center are located here. The Environmental Hygiene Agency is located at Edgewood Arsenal, a nearby subinstallation. The program consists of human factors engineering laboratory, an enlisted men's barracks, barracks modernization, and a chapel center. The request is for $11,934,000.

The laboratory project will provide the Human Factors Engineering Research Laboratory with specialized laboratory facilities to accomplish its mission as the lead laboratory for human factors engineering in the Army. The project will furnish the temperature and humidity controlled areas for simulation, environmental control, data reduction, and electronics. This laboratory will be performing basic and applied research as they affect the design of Army materiel to include small arms, tactical vehicles, combat vehicles, artillery, communications, and aviation equipment. Existing facilities are not adequate to accommodate experimental mockups for materiel prototype development, complex electronic instrumentation, and the additional operating personnel required.

Senator SYMINGTON. This is a rather expensive facility. Will you describe for us just what type of work will be done in this facility and what you are currently doing for space?

General COOPER. The basic mission of the Human Factors Engineering Laboratory is to conduct research and development on the main component of military systems, and to provide direct design support to all materiel development programs sponsored by the U.S. Army Materiel Command. This design support introduces human performance requirements into the design of Army materiel items to be operated and maintained by human operators, thus obtaining maximum man/machine output. Current projects in which human factors engineering is being applied are the SAM–D missile, the advanced attack helicopter (AAH), the heavy lift helicopter (HLM), the XM–1 tank, new body armor, infantry helmets, long-term continuous soldier performance, and various new small arms concepts.

The facilities, occupied since 1962 by the U.S. Army Human Engineering Laboratory (HEL), Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md., are

composed of a variety of World War II structures including an old frame firehouse, a tire shop, a metal Nike repair shop, a warehouse, five mobile trailers procured approximately 5 years ago, and three additional trailers rented during fiscal year 1973. Although these facilities were converted to usable laboratory and administrative space approximately 12 years ago, they are now no longer economical to keep repaired. Several of the buildings have major deficiencies such as leaking roofs which will need major repair within the next 2 years. In addition to possessing poor quality facilities, the laboratory has increased in strength—because of increased workload—so that the present facilities are completely inadequate for housing 138 personnel presently on the staff. The three additional trailers were rented in fiscal year 1973 to accommodate this increased staff. The present makeshift World War II converted facilities are not conducive to good research and development, which is the only mission of the laboratory. The professional personnel are presently crowded together in small cubicles and available laboratory space is completely inadequate in both quality and quantity.

The new facilities will provide (1) space for the consolidation of personnel and laboratories into one building which will increase work efficiency, (2) additional specialized laboratory space for basic human factors research and simulation studies, (3) space for a library to house approximately 510,000 technical documents, which must be available since the laboratory serves as a DOD-wide data bank and provides analysis services on human factors engineering, (4) space for Army Materiel Command man/machine mockup studies while such materiel is still in the early phases of development, (5) space for training Army Materiel Command design engineers on human factors engineering—a responsibility of the laboratory, (6) appropriate administrative space for approximately 25 more professional engineers and scientists being added to the staff. Present obsolete facilities will be excessed and repair costs appropriately reduced.

The second project is for a permanent barracks for enlisted personnel presently quartered in substandard facilities including unimproved mobilization barracks built in 1941.

A project is proposed to modernize nine existing barracks buildings to provide modern accommodations for 1,940 enlisted men. The present buildings do not offer adequate quarters under current standards and should be upgraded, both to improve living conditions for the enlisted troops and to make maximum use of existing assets.

This chapel center project will provide a portion of the requirements for chapels and the total requirement for religious educational facilities to serve approximately 16,000 active military personnel and their dependents. There are no permanent chapel facilities at Aberdeen. The six World War II buildings now in use are austere, deteriorated, and the appointments leave much to be desired.

AERONAUTICAL MAINTENANCE CENTER, TEX.

The Aeronautical Maintenance Center is located 10 miles south of Corpus Christi, Tex. The mission of this installation is to perform aircraft depot maintenance and support functions, provide aeronautical depot on-the-job training (military), maintain mobilization readiness and prepositioned depot stocks, provide engineering services for

AVSCOM, and support U.S. Army Materiel Group No. 1. The program provides for upgrading turbine engine test cells and a supply, operations, and storage building. The request is for $6,284,000.

A turbine engine test cell facility will be upgraded to feature a test cell management-maintenance and ADP center, standardized instrumentation, an engine quick-disconnect mounting system, and computerized open-loop data acquisition and logging system. This facility will improve service reliability of engines, reduce cost of testing, increase test capability from 2,750 to 6,000 horsepower, and provide performance data for engineering analyses and maintenance data to improve engine overhaul procedures. The overhaul and testing of turbine engines (including Navy and Air Force) at 1,600,000 manhours per year comprises the major workload at this center, and this timely modernization will result in quality improvement and reduced operation costs. An estimated saving of $376,000 per year will result from the construction.

The second project will provide an efficient, modern aircraft parts supply operation and storage facility. Receiving, shipping, packaging, crating, and preservation of mission and national inventory control point materiel will be consolidated for efficiency and economy and an environmentally controlled storage will be provided for high-cost aeronautical components. The value of planned storage in the building is $150 million. Existing facilities are seven widely scattered World War II structures that lack environmental control, surface water runoff protection, loading docks, and mechanical material handling and storage systems. Two of the seven buildings are remotely located facilities leased at a cost of $92,000 per year and lack adequate lighting, storm and fire protection. Two buildings totaling 107,346 square feet will be demolished, the two leased facilities will be returned to the owner, and the remaining three structures will be retained for slow-moving item storage. This project will result in estimated operational savings of $848,057 per year.

Senator SYMINGTON. $5.2 million seems to be an unusually large amount to provide for a supply operation and storage building. Why is such a facility needed at this time? Is this the principal center for maintenance of helicopters?

General COOPER. The U.S. Army Aeronautical Depot Maintenance Center (Aradmac) is the Army's principal center for aeronautical maintenance. The Aradmac mission is to completely rebuild, test, store, and place back into the supply system damaged and "worn out" aeronautical equipment for Army (and some Air Force and Navy) aircraft including aircraft frames, engines, transmissions, avionics, electrical and hydraulic components, and structural components.

The facilities now utilized for supply and storage operations at Aradmac are seriously inadequate. Portions of the operation are widely separated (14 miles), existing buildings are functionally inadequate since they have no suitable loading docks and building configurations preclude use of efficient materials handling equipment, there is no environmental control which is required for many of the expensive components in storage, and the structures are old, difficult, and expensive to maintain and cannot be economically renovated. The requested facility will consolidate the shipping, receiving, packaging and crating, and preservation activities in one location to effect efficiency, economy, and adequate support for the depot overhaul maintenance operation.

It will also provide environmentally controlled storage space for the national inventory control point (NICP) stocks and for depot property and material inducted for overhaul/storage/distribution by Aradmac.

ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT, ALA.

Anniston Army Depot is located 10 miles west of Anniston, Ala. The mission of this installation is to receive, store, and ship general supplies and ammunition, strategic and critical materials, and civil defense shelter supplies; to perform depot maintenance of general supplies, ammunition and assigned missile systems; to operate an area support secondary reference calibration facility (except nucleonics); to provide area support secondary reference transfer calibration teams for six Southeastern States and to perform production fueling of the Lance missile. The program is for a repair and processing vehicle facility for $3,745,000.

This project will provide improved facilities for repair and processing of heavy combat vehicles and artillery. Work is now done in scattered, substandard facilities which are overcrowded and inhibit engineered shop flow to obtain optimum utilization of personnel or equipment. Recent operations in these congested facilities are hazardous and inflexible because of insufficient operational and holding areas and workload accomplishment is adversely affected by weather. The project will result in demolition of loading docks and 14,485 square feet of semipermanent buildings. In addition, 47,225 square feet of shop area will revert to other uses. The completed project will produce estimated personnel savings of $4,616,525 during its economic life.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you outline for us what type of work is done at the Anniston Army Depot, and why this expensive facility is needed at this time?

General COOPER. Anniston Army Depot is our lead depot for the repair and overhaul of heavy combat vehicles—tanks, armored personnel carriers, artillery. The mission spans the entire cycle through receipt, overhaul, storage, and reissue. This work is now being done in overcrowded, scattered, substantard facilities that do not permit efficient operations or optimum utilization of personnel or equipment.

ARMY MATERIAL AND MECHANICS RESEARCH CENTER, MASS.

The Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center is located at Watertown, Mass. Its mission is to execute the AMC research and development program in structural materials and mechanics, conduct technological programs in structural materials and in mechanics as used in Army materiel, coordinate the AMC armor materials program; manage the testing technology portion of the AMC quality assurance and the DOD standardization programs and to provide technical surveillance over the AMC testing training program. The proposed project is for a dynamic deformation of materials laboratory for $325,000.

This project will provide laboratory facilities for the test and evaluation of materials subjected to varying dynamic loads and environmental conditions. This test and evaluation program is essential for the development of: lightweight materials for aircraft; improved armor materials for hardening the antiballistic missiles to survive

in nuclear environments, and to resist critical damage from dust erosion and blast loads. This laboratory is unique to both Government and industry in its techniques of evaluating new materials in the simulated systems environment without lengthy and expensive trial and error system testing. Using existing theoretical support, the proposed laboratory will also pursue and experimentally verify new concepts for materials system vulnerability.

ATLANTA ARMY DEPOT, GA.

Atlanta Army Depot is located in Atlanta, Ga. Upon termination of depot operations, part of the real property comprising Atlanta Army Depot will be retained as a subinstallation of Fort McPherson, Ga. The mission of this subinstallation will be to furnish administrative, logistical, and facilities support to staff elements and units of Headquarters, Forces Command; to other Army, DOD and Agency for International Development tenants; to the Reserve components; and to the Army and Air Force Exchange Service and other activities. The program provides for security fencing for an estimated cost of $119,000.

The security fencing is required to provide an adequate security fence network around the portion of this installation that is to be retained for Army use following phaseout of depot activities and the excessing of surplus property. Major facilities located in the retained area include a sensitive worldwide military command and control system communication terminal and computer complex, Army and Air Force exchange service warehouses containing valuable merchandise and a troop training area with ammunition bunkers and a firing range that must be secured against unauthorized entry.

FRANKFORD ARSENAL, PA.

Frankford Arsenal is located at Philadelphia, Pa. The mission of this installation is the development, procurement, production, and supply of fire control systems, small arms ammunitions, cartridge activated and propellant actuated devices and to conduct research on optical material, metallurgy of nonferrous and reactive metals, degradation, corrosion, and mycological effects on materiels, synthetic lubrication, small Army propellants, and laser countermeasures. The program consists of barracks modernization, for $73,000.

The barracks modernization project will provide modern quarters for the small enlisted complements assigned to Frankford Arsenal. The project is similar to other barracks modernization projects in that it makes maximum use of existing structures to provide living accommodations upgraded to current standards. This project will satisfy Frankford Arsenal's requirement for bachelor enlisted housing.

MEMPHIS DEFENSE DEPOT, TENN.

The Memphis Defense Depot is one of seven principal distribution depots in the Defense Supply Agency integrated wholesale distribution system. It's mission is the receipt, storage, maintenance, inventory, and issue of clothing textiles, fuel, general supplies, construction supplies, industrial supplies, subsistence, and medical commodities. The

depot is responsible for providing these items to U.S. military activities—the south central region, comprising Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee, and the Caribbean area including South America. The program requests a medical equipment maintenance facility at an estimated cost of $456,000.

This project is required to provide a medical equipment maintenance facility at Memphis Defense Depot to replace the existing maintenance facility at Atlanta Army Depot due to the phaseout of depot activities at the latter installation in accordance with the Army reorganization plan. The medical equipment maintenance operation provides direct, general and depot level maintenance, field maintenance and technical assistance for Army medical facilities in 31 States, supports the Defense Supply Agency (DSA), provides certain services to the Air Force and the Navy on a worldwide basis through interservice agreements, and provides maintenance, repair and calibration of medical equipment for the Army Reserve and National Guard. The Memphis Defense Depot site will result in a facility centrally located within the geographical area served by this maintenance activity. The proposed project will provide the minimum necessary facility to meet the mission requirements. Shop equipment and tools used in the existing operation will be moved and used in the Memphis facility.

FORT MONMOUTH, N.J.

Fort Monmouth is located at Red Bank, N.J. The mission of this installation is to support the U.S. Army Electronic Command which performs research, development, procurement and production of electronics materiel. The installation also supports the U.S. Army Satellite Communications Agency, U.S. Army Combat Developments Command Communications and Electronics Agency, Tri-Service Tactical Communications Agency, and the U.S. Army Communications System Agency. The program will provide a Research and Development electronic equipment installation facility, a 32-chair dental clinic, barracks modernization, alteration to classrooms to provide language laboratories, conversion of a classroom building to administrative space and the conversion of a barracks building to administrative space. The total program request is $12,286,000.

The R. & D. facility will meet present and foreseen future requirements to install all types of communications and electronic equipments, radar sets, infrared and other surveillance and detection devices, electronic warfare equipments and special selected equipments in tactical vehicles such as tanks, personnel carriers, vans, trailers, military shelters, tactical trucks and self-propelled guns and other specialized military systems. Equipment installations to permit helicopters to fly under all weather conditions, to communicate, to detect enemy concentrations and equipment and to direct interdictory fire will also be accomplished by this facility. The system installations are accomplished on a quick reaction basis which may be for test and evaluation for later tactical use or to meet an immediate field requirement. This facility will allow continuous equipment installation work on large systems without the delays now encountered through inclement weather. Work must be accomplished near the U.S. Army Electronics Command (USAECOM) Laboratories to efficiency use the engineering, scientific and technical personnel who are familiar with the specialized systems and are available at the laboratories.

The dental clinic project is to provide dental facilities to replace those now located in a converted wooden mobilization-type barracks. Installation of essential new equipment in old buildings to meet the requirements of modern dental practice is difficult and costly, and results in little improvement in the physical plant and no improvement in clinic design. The new clinic will permit full realization of the advances in dental care methods and procedures developed in recent years.

The barracks modernization project will upgrade existing barracks to modern standards for both permanent party personnel and language students. Ten buildings will be modernized to provide adequate quarters for 1,889 personnel. The buildings are configured to now outdated standards. Modernization will greatly improve individual privacy, security, utilities, latrine facilities, administrative space, and the dining areas.

Under the 1973 Army reorganization the east coast branch of the Defense Language Institute is being relocated to Fort Monmouth. No facilities exist at Fort Monmouth which fully satisfy the unique requirements for language instruction. The proposed project will convert existing classrooms to language laboratories through the installation of soundproof study booths, audio equipment, effective heating and air-conditioning systems, expanded utilities—particularly electrical, and an intercom system and closed circuit TV outlets.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that these facilities are necessary due to the move of the language school from the Washington area to Fort Monmouth. How does this school tie in with the language school at the Presidio, Monterey, Calif.?

I believe at one time you had four or five language schools. Are they now consolidated into two locations, namely Fort Monmouth and Monterey? There has been some complaints in the past when the move of this school from the Washington area was considered to the effect that it might be better conducted here. Is there any merit to this argument?

General COOPER. The language school now in Anacostia, and planned for relocation to Fort Monmouth, is the east coast branch of the Defense Language Institute (DLI). The west coast branch of DLI is located in Monterey, Calif.

At the present, DLI headquarters and the east coast branch are located in Anacostia. These activities will relocate to Fort Monmouth. The DLI Systems Development Agency, located in Monterey, and the English language branch, located at Lackland Air Field in Texas, will both also relocate to Fort Monmouth. The west coast branch will remain in Monterey. DLI did have a Southwest branch at Fort Bliss during the peak of the Vietnam conflict but this branch was disestablished in June 1973.

The primary advantages for keeping a branch of DLI in Washington are the convenient access to foreign embassies and close working relationship with the Foreign Service Institute. However, the lack of adequate facilities for the academic and administrative functions, plus the lack of housing for the students are very serious drawbacks which outweigh the advantages just mentioned. The needed facilities will be available at Fort Monmouth.

Also as result of the Army realignment/reorganization, Headquarters Electronics Command (ECOM) will relocate to Fort Monmouth

from Philadelphia. As with many Army installations Fort Monmouth is short of adequate administrative space. Two projects are proposed for converting existing structures from their present use to administrative facilites. The resulting administrative space will accommodate the incoming headquarters elements plus permit the consolidation of other ECOM elements now at Fort Monmouth but occupying old World War II temporary-type structures or renting facilities off post.

NATICK LABORATORIES, MASS.

The Natick Laboratories are located at Natick, Mass. The mission of this installation is to create through research and development, prototypes in the commodity areas of textiles, clothing, footwear, organic materials, subsistence, containers, food service equipment, field support equipment, tentage and equipage and air delivery equipment, to provide technical support in the commodity areas above, and to carry out the standardization program so that new item procurements may be accomplished expeditiously and economically. The program for $466,000 provides for an addition to an enlisted men's barracks, with dining facilities.

The proposed project is required to provide additional barracks spaces and modernized dining facilities for the enlisted complement stationed at Natick Laboratories. This project will complete the bachelor enlisted housing requirement at Natick Laboratories.

PICATINNY ARSENAL, N.J.

The Picatinny Arsenal is located 4 miles northeast of Dover, N.J. The mission of this facility is to serve as a field installations of the U.S. Army Munitions Command with national mission responsibilities including development and industrial engineering and support mission responsibilities for preproduction and maintenance engineering with respect to ammunition, pyrotechnics, and nuclear artillery and munitions including demolition types. The program provides for an addition to the explosives laboratory and barracks modernization for a total request of $2,915,000.

The additional laboratory space is required to consolidate the Army's explosives program at Picatinny Arsenal and to provide the necessary laboratory space for basic and applied research on hazardous materials. The consolidation of the Army explosives program at Picatinny Arsenal has resulted in dangerous overcrowding in the present inadequate facilities. The construction will provide the facilities for the installation of special purpose equipment presently on hand. Existing buildings are required and will remain in use for explosive research.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you explain in a little more detail what type of work is performed at this explosive laboratory? I know that you do have a pyrotechnic hazard engineering program in operation at the NASA Mississippi Test Facility. Are you doing similar work here at Picatinny?

General COOPER. The proposed construction will provide the facilities necessary for a vital part of the Army explosive research program utilizing solid-state physics and applied physics to improve perform-

ance and reliability and safety of munitions. The planned work will include improvements in explosive train initiation methods; basic research on energy level structure and energy transfer mechanisms in explosives coupled with charged transport measurements to discover and develop methods for direct electronic initiation of explosives with greater reliability, safety and efficency; experiments to understand and control sensitivity; development of improved models for initiation and detonation phenomenon by study of high pressure effects on optical and electronic properties of explosives and by shock tube combined with spectroscopy and high-speed photography; work on fuel air explosives which have improved effectiveness against certain targets; study of coupling of detonation to their surroundings to increase the utilized fraction of available energy.

No pyrotechnic hazard engineering is being performed at this laboratory.

The barracks modernization project will upgrade one building to provide modern living quarters for enlisted men stationed at Picatinny Arsenal. The existing building does not have adequate heating or lighting, suitable bathroom facilities or offer privacy to the occupants. Completion of this project will satisfy Picatinny Arsenal's requirement for bachelor enlisted housing.

PINE BLUFF ARSENAL, ARK.

The Pine Bluff Arsenal is located at Pine Bluff, Ark. and provides facility space for the Directorate of Chemical Operations; Directorate of Biological Operations and the Directorate of Engineering and Technology. The mission of the arsenal is to manufacture, store, renovate, demilitarize and distribute chemical agents and munitions, and to develop processes for manufacturing chemicals. This budget requests $294,000 for an enlisted men's barracks, without mess facilities, at the arsenal.

The 36 EM barrack spaces and associated facilities to be supported will provide troop living quarters that meet current housing standards specified in DOD criteria. Existing accommodations are two-story, wood-frame (original construction 1942) open bay and dormitory room type barracks with central latrine facilities. These old buildings are difficult and expensive to maintain plus they fall far below the approved housing standards. Completion of the project will satisfy the installation's bachelor housing requirement.

REDSTONE ARSENAL, ALA.

Redstone Arsenal is located at Huntsville, Ala. and provides facilities for the headquarters of the U.S. Army Missile Command and the Munitions and Missile Training Center and School. The installation is the Army's principal commodity center for rockets, guided missiles, and related systems and equipment. This program requests $4,971,000 for barracks modernization and a chapel center.

The first project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. This modernization project will upgrade 10 buildings to provide modern quarters for 990 enlisted men. The buildings concerned were built during the 1955–60 period and provide large open-bay living areas

and are not air-conditioned. Modernization will provide one- to three-man rooms, air-conditioning, improved latrine facilities, better security for personal possessions, and improved dining facilities. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

Additional chapel and religious education needs at Redstone Arsenal are required for the approximately 9,000 military personnel and their dependents. The existing 300-seat chapel is used to its maximum capacity with seven services conducted Sundays from 0730 to 2030 hours. Present attendence is heavy in services and requires that chairs be placed in aisles, and standing is permitted in an attempt to accommodate patrons. Occasionally, personnel are turned away. Religious educational needs are only partially met through use of wooden World War II buildings located at a two miles distance from the existing chapel. These old buildings have a dingy appearance and present serious space, safety, and fire problems. These factors discourage competent lay workers from offering their services, create hardships upon all who attend, and discourage many from attending. These deficiencies emphasize the inability of present chapel facilities to support the post mission and to meet existing personnel needs.

SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT, CALIF.

Sacramento Army Depot is located at Sacramento, Calif. The mission of this installation is to store, repair, and overhaul military hardware. Our requested program of $412,000 is for barracks modernization.

This project will modernize an existing barracks building constructed in 1957. The completed project will provide modern quarters for 111 enlisted men stationed at Sacramento Army Depot and will complete the depot's requirement for bachelor enlisted housing. The existing accommodations are open-bay offering little privacy, have inadequate lighting and convenience outlets, have gang latrines, and improper heating and ventilating systems.

SAVANNA ARMY DEPOT, ILL.

Savanna Army Depot, Ill., is located on the Illinois River near Clinton, Iowa. The mission of this installation is the receipt, storage, renovation, and demilitarization of conventional and guided missile ammunition components and special weapons material and to train personnel in ammunition surveillance and maintenace. The program covers enlisted men's barracks with mess facilities, bachelor officers quarters and security lighting for a total request of $2,746,000.

The barracks project is to provide suitable housing for assigned enlisted men. Existing temporary facilities are limited and each bay is occupied by up to 12 men without benefit of cubicles or partitions. Since these men perform shift work in the special weapons exclusion area personnel are sleeping at all hours of the day and normal daytime activities disrupt sleep with resultant effects on efficiency.

The second project, a BOQ, will provide a portion of needed housing for the military, civilian and foreign national personnel attending the AMC Ammunition School. The ammunition school conducts basic and refresher training to support storage, issue, receipt, mainte-

nance, test, inspection malfunction investigation and demilitarization of ammunition which includes conventional ammunition, nuclear weapons, large rockets, guided missiles, and chemical munitions. Other important training offered involves transportation of ammunition and other hazardous materiel, nuclear and chemical accident incident controls, and fire fighting techniques involving all types of ammunition. This project will enable the ammunition school to train additional students in these skills and assist in overcoming the present critical shortage of trained civilian ammunition technicians and managers. A savings of $362,000 per year will be realized upon completion of the facility. The existing 96 substandard bachelor officer quarters will be retained and utilized until additional permanent housing can be programed to provide the remaining required spaces.

The lighting project is to provide increased security within a special weapons exclusion area. Security requirements dictate that the entrance of all structures in which special weapons are located shall be lighted with an intensity of not less than 1 footcandle. Magazines without lighting above each door opening are presently being used under a temporary waiver to security regulations. These entrances become vulnerable points of penetration at night and undetected movements of personnel or equipment within the storage area could result in a serious break in our national security. Burial of the primary electrical line will aid in the prevention of its destruction by both natural and subversive means. This project will substantially improve protection of the special weapons area and eliminate the necessity for operation under waiver.

SIERRA ARMY DEPOT, CALIF.

Sierra Army Depot is located 36 miles southeast of Susanville, Calif., and 60 miles north of Reno, Nev. The mission of this installation is to receive, store, maintain, renovate, and distribute ammunition and components and general supplies; receive, store, and maintain special weapons material: and restoration of conventional guided missile and special weapons ammunition. The program requests a security lighting project for $380,000.

This project is to provide increased security of classified material located within the directorate for special weapons (DSW) restricted areas. This project will provide protective lighting at entrance control points on igloos located in DSW exclusion area 1 and on the buildings located to exclusion area 2. Present structures are being used without this protective lighting under authority of temporary waiver and in the interim additional security forces have been assigned to insure adequate protection. Assignment of these additional forces has substantially increased the cost and complexities of providing a secure area for classified material stored at this depot.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE BASE, N. MEX.

White Sands Missile Range is located 28 miles northeast of Las Cruces, N. Mex. This installation is a national range with a mission to test and evaluate missile and rocket systems and related material. It supports all range users to include systems contractors. The program includes construction of a multitarget launch complex, a SAM–

D remote area test facility, barracks modernization, a post library, an addition to the gymnasium, water wells, and land acquisition. The request is for $4,771,000.

The first project is to provide White Sands with the capability to prepare up to four target missiles for flight and launching simultaneously. It will provide a launch area which meets safety criteria. The new launch complex will provide use of a northernly flight azimuth oriented to take full advantage of the width and depth of the national range and restricted air space and will eliminate serious flight safety hazards connected with use of the present launch area. The project will provide minimum facilities required for target missile contractors to operate with maximum efficiency and minimum lost time. This project will support all missile development programs at White Sands Missile Range that require target missiles during their development and engineering phases. In addition it will provide a minimum multilaunch capability required for two specific research and development programs which are scheduled for this phase of development for the fiscal year 1976 and subsequent fiscal year time frames. A second phase of this project may be required by fiscal year 1976 or later depending upon project requirements. Nine small metal buildings now used at the present target missile launch area will be relocated and utilized for the support of instrumentation stations.

The second project is to provide the minimum essential uprange facilities for tactical testing of the surface-to-air missile development (SAM–D) weapons system. The system, which is an area air defense system with a secondary surface-to-surface role, is being designed to replace the current Nike Hercules and Hawk system in the field Army. Uprange launch sites are required to evaluate the mobility and performance of the weapon system against air and ground targets under various terrain conditions in a tactical configuration scheduled to start in fiscal year 1975. Completion of this project will assure timely collection of test and evaluation data on the SAM–D system under tactical conditions in accordance with the development schedule.

The next project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Four existing structures will be modernized to provide quarters for 486 enlisted men. These buildings are of the open-bay concept and are far below current standards desired for individual privacy, heating, ventilating and lighting, and bathroom facilities. Upon completion of this project, all of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at White Sands Missile Range will meet minimum housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

The post library project will provide a permanent facility for a departmentalized library operation with space for shelving, administration, and audiovisual area, quiet rooms, music appreciation rooms, and storage and reading purposes. The post library has occupied 4,500 square feet of the existing education center building and expansion is not feasible without adversely affecting the education program. The project will provide a permanent facility for expansion of the library operation into the welfare, recreation, and morale Army-wide library program needed in this isolated area. Space now used by the library will revert to use by the post education center.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that part of your explanation for a new library is that if it is not provided it will have an effect on the education program. Can you explain that a little more clearly. Is this some kind of a technical training program, and is this a technical library, or simply a post library for the use of the military and their dependents?

General COOPER. The impact on the education program would be more physical than intellectual. At present the post library occupies a portion of the education center building. Both the education program and the library are in need of expansion, consequently, joint occupancy of the education center is no longer practical. If the requested new library is not approved to allow relocation from the education center, the education activities will not have any space available to accommodate their expansion. This ultimately will hinder the overall execution of the education program.

The education program is similar to that carried on at almost all Army installations. It is a formal program, providing both on duty and off duty opportunities for our soldiers to further their formal education.

The library is basically a typical post lending library for use by the military and their dependents. However, it is somewhat atypical in that it does house a more technical selection than might be found at other posts due to the interest generated in the post population by the testing and engineering activities conducted at White Sands.

The fifth item is to provide military personnel and their dependents at White Sands missile range with an indoor, year-around handball court and squash court, and a ladies' shower room at the existing post gymnasium. This project is needed to give WSMR a complete and well-rounded sports program to include handball and squash as well as to provide complete latrine and showers for enlisted women and female military dependents in the post gymnasium. On post facilities are important since WSMR is located some 30 miles from the nearest civilian community. Facilities that improve wholesome recreation possibilities for young military personnel will improve physical fitness and assist in maintenance of morale. There are no facilities to be disposed of as a result of this project.

A key project at WSMR is that of acquisition of fee title to 71,159 acres of privately owned real estate and title to 126 mining claims, all located within the boundaries of White Sands Missile Range (WSMR). This request is phase I of a two-phase plan to acquire all private estates and State-owned land and improvements thereon located within the boundaries of WSMR. Phase II of this plan, to be included in a future year program, will acquire the State-owned lands. The cost of these State lands is to be determined following negotiations between State and Federal representatives. An estimated $10 million of Government construction improvements such as roads, buildings, instrumentation sites, communications systems, and power lines, are located on the State and privately owned lands. Accomplishment of phase I would eliminate rentals of almost $80,000 per year and phase II about $237,000, for a total of approximately $317,000 per year. Additionally, future restoration costs estimated at $700,000 would be eliminated. Founds for relocation costs, as provided for

under the provisions of Public Law 91-646 are not required for this project.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are proposing to spend $2.7 million for land acquisition at this vast reservation, and to extinguish mining claims. What is this total program going to cost, and why is it necessary? I recall that some time ago a bill was proposed to buy up certain lands and pay for grazing rights on Federal lands at this base. Is such a procedure involved in this proposed purchase?

General COOPER. The land acquisition program at White Sands missile range is expected to cost a total of $7,500,000 for which we plan to request the balance of $4,800,000 in the fiscal year 1975 military construction program. Since the military requirement for these States and privately owned land areas is indefinite and long term, it is appropriate to acquire the fee and to extinguish all mining claims. Public Law 91-511, section 104, October 26, 1970, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to acquire State- and privately-owned lands, and estates in land, and improvements thereon, located within the boundaries of White Sands missile range. No funds were appropriated, however. To the extent that such State-owned lands can be traded for Government-owned land located outside the boundaries of White Sands missile range, such action will be taken.

The final project is to provide additional water wells to insure an adequate potable water supply for the WSMR by replacing existing capacity that will be lost due to water well deterioration. Although the peak usage is kept to a minimum by a water conservation program, the computed daily demand by fiscal year is 5.9 million gallons per day (MGD). There are nine production wells in use currently with a capacity of 5.5 mgd. This project is included in the fiscal year 1974 MCA program to assure continuation of an adequate potable water supply at this vital testing range. There would be no disposal action as a result of this project.

YUMA PROVING GROUND, ARIZ.

The last installation in the Army Materiel Command program, Yuma Proving Ground, is located 32 miles northeast of Yuma, Ariz. The installation mission is to perform engineering and service tests of research and development projects; to conduct surveillance and acceptance tests on production material; and to support other research and development activities. The program provides the first phase of construction of KOFA range improvements, for enlisted men's barracks without mess facilities, an NCO open mess and expansion of the electrical distribution systems. The total request is for $6,472,000.

The KOFA range project will provide facilities for artillery weapons and associated ammunition testing over the next 15 years. The artillery firing range front extends over 9,000 meters. At present, the northern end of the firing front is dedicated to special test facilities such as mortar positions, armor plate range and acceptance related tests. These facilities severely limit the locations for artillery testing. At the southern end, 2,500 meters of firing front are not usable because of safety distance limitations to inhabited buildings. This project will realine the southern front to accommodate five long range artillery weapon positions. Projectile impacts must now be observed from towers at great distances from points of impact. This results in frequent test

interruption for impact point certification and, in the case of functioning and range table firing, results in questionable data. The impact shelters will permit much closer observation while insuring personnel safety and greatly improving the data acquisition capability. The soft impact area will facilitate recovery of projectile components to assess the effects of firing. If this project is not approved Yuma Proving Ground will be unable to improve and expand its capability to meet the existing and future artillery test and evaluation requirements. Approval of this project will result in the demolition of two temporary buildings totaling 874 square feet.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is meant by KOFA, and what will be the cost of this total program?

General COOPER. KOFA is an acronym that stands for "King of Arizona," being taken from a mine that existed in the early Western days in the area of Yuma Proving Grounds. Over the years, common usage of the acronym have caused the name of the range to be known as KOFA range.

The estimated total cost of planned KOFA range improvements is $6.6 million. The overall project is planned for accomplishment in two phases.

Phase I, estimated at $2.7 million, is included in the fiscal year 1974 military construction, Army (MCA) budget request. This phase includes construction of 5 gun positions, 21 artillery impact observation shelters (bombproof), and a soft impact area.

Phase II, estimated at $3.9 million, is now being studied within the Army staff for possible inclusion in the fiscal year 1975 MCA request. This phase consists of paving and other improvements to 34.2 miles of range roads.

The next project is required to provide adequate bachelor housing and mess facilities for assigned troops not eligible for family quarters. The troops that cannot be accommodated in the permanent barracks are housed in temporary barracks, constructed in 1952 and 1953. If this item is not provided enlisted personnel will continue to be housed in inadequate temporary barracks. The temporary barracks will be retained for use by TDY personnel. Those not required for this purpose will be diverted to office space, thus reducing the deficit in that functional area.

The third project is required to provide adequate dining facilities and space for recreational activities for noncommissioned officers assigned to Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The present NCO open mess is housed in a temporary building, which because of interior arrangement can only provide marginal service and activities to accommodate the patrons. The new facility will provide pleasant surroundings and adequate facilities for use by noncommissioned officers and their authorized guests, thus enhancing military career attractiveness. Since YPG is 26 miles from the nearest town, adequate on post recreational facilities become even more important.

The final project is to furnish electrical power to artillery firing range areas, to provide additional electrical power to the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) and to improve reliability by adding a second source of electrical supply to this isolated installation. A scheduled increase in testing of long range tube and self-propelled artillery will substantially increase requirements for acquisition of more accurate ballistic data at down range sites by electro/optical instruments. Port-

able generators now in use are not desirable due to voltage and frequency fluctuations which disable and damage delicate instruments and introduce errors into the data. Generator failures in the past have resulted in loss of vital communications, have halted tests with resultant data loss, increased costs, and decreased productivity. A source of reliable power is urgently needed to permit synchronized operation of the testing instrumentation. The load on the main transformer station has reached rated capacity and planned power requirement increases will add at least 1,350 kva. within the next 3 years. Additional capacity is essential to meet this load. Operational reliability will be increased by the addition of a second source of power to the installation.

VINT HILL FARMS STATION, VA.

Vint Hill Farms Station is located 10 miles east of Warrenton, Va. This is a U.S. Army Security Agency installation engaged in communications intelligence activities.

The program is for storm drainage facilities for $287,000.

This project is required to provide adequate storm drainage protection for this installation. Storm drains, curbs, and gutters exist on only a portion of the post and consequently roads, shoulders, grounds, and some buildings located in the unprotected area are subject to deterioration from storm water runoff. This results in excessive maintenance costs and unsafe conditions for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Existing facilities will continue in use in conjunction with proposed construction.

FORT HUACHUCA, ARIZ.

Fort Huachuca is located 41 miles east of Bisbee, Ariz., and is the headquarters of the U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command (USASTRATCOM). This command is the principal manager for the Army's portion of the Defense Communications System (DCS). The command also provides engineering, installation, and technical support services for non-DCS communications systems and logistics and administrative support to the Intelligence School. The program provides improvements at Libby Army Airfield, electronic test equipment facilities, enlisted (medical) barracks without mess facilities and barracks modernization for a total cost of $6,832,000.

The first project is to provide for a safe 24-hour operation of Libby Army Airfield which supports the activities at Fort Huachuca and U.S. Forest Service firefighting equipment. The existing 21-year-old taxiway is underdesigned for the wheel loads of today's aircraft and requires continual maintenance due to repeated overloading. The parking area which handles approximately 70 percent of the assigned aircraft is temporary pavement of sealed gravel. The gravel is easily dislodged, is subject to erosion, and when blown around by operating aircraft causes a serious hazard to personnel, aircraft, electronic equipment and ground handling vehicles. Taxiways running west from the hangars and north from the security ramp are without lighting facilities and represent a serious deficiency in the night flying capabilities needed for full operations.

The second project is to provide additional integrated secure floor space for electronic testing equipment activities in the test and evaluation center. A continued expansion of center operations in the pro-

vision of detailed evaluation and report services has been met by the crowding of additional equipment into existing center space and the leasing of another 3,000 square feet of commercial modular-type structures at a cost of $15,000 per year. Additional equipment operations to meet projected workloads cannot be accommodated in available facilities. Further crowding or adjustment within the existing facility is not feasible and will impair mission effectiveness.

The next project will provide housing adjacent to the hospital for enlisted men and women assigned to the medical detachment and hospital. These personnel now live in substandard barracks over one mile from the hospital and the dining facilities. This separation works a hardship on the people, who must work irregular hours and are subject to immediate call during emergencies, plus detracts from the efficiency of hospital operations. The billets now occupied by medical personnel will be utilized by troops assigned to other units.

The barracks modernization project will improve 6 buildings to provide modern quarters for 1,208 enlisted men and women. Improvements will include providing better lighting and electrical service outlets, effective heating and ventilating systems, more individual privacy and security for personal possessions.

FORT RITCHIE, MD.

Fort Ritchie is located 8 miles southeast of Waynesboro, Pa. The installation mission is to support the Alternate Joint Command Center. The program consists of barracks modernization for $1,394,000.

This project will modernize four buildings to provide adequate, modern quarters for 483 enlisted men. The billets are now configured in open-bay squad rooms with community latrines, poor heating and ventilating systems, and inadequate lighting. Modernization of the buildings will improve personal privacy, install effective heating and ventilating systems, provide security for personal items, and improve latrine facilities.

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT, N.Y.

The U.S. Military Academy is located 10 miles south of Newburgh, N.Y. The mission of the Academy is to instruct and train the Corps of Cadets, the members of which will be the future officers of the Regular Army Establishment. The program consists of a new hospital, barracks modernization and utilities extension. The authorization requested for this program is $30,145,000.

The first project is for the construction of a new hospital at USMA to replace the existing facility. The present hospital, developed piecemeal since 1923, cannot provide the required medical support to the expanded Corps of Cadets and other supported units and activities. Daily hospital clinic visits have increased 39 percent since 1962, much of the hospital equipment is inadequate by present-day standards, and the present structure is functionally inappropriate for current health care delivery. Additionally, the existing facility is located in the center of West Point, adjacent to the post headquarters, cadet barracks, a family housing apartment complex, and an academic building now under construction. Parking is virtually nonexistent, traffic is congested and the hospital emergency and service entrance can accommodate only

one vehicle at a time with no turnaround capability. Further, the existing structure should be freed to accommodate other activities now housed in temporary, inadequate facilities and planned in the USMA master plan to eventually occupy this building.

Senator SYMINGTON. I'd like a rather complete justification for this hospital. It seems to be entirely too expensive, and amounts to about $250,000 a bed. I think this far exceeds the cost of the new hospital proposed for Walter Reed Medical Center.

I understand that the board of overseers for construction at West Point is not in agreement on where the new hospital should be located. Will you explain the background of this?

General COOPER. The requirement for a new hospital is derived from two considerations.

(*a*) First, the present hospital is outmoded and inadequate. It was built incrementally and modified over a period of years, it is inadequate for serving supported strengths, and is located in a highly congested and noisy area with extremely limited access other than on foot. This condition limits its usefulness to a significant portion of the population served.

(1) The last major expansion of the hospital was in 1943, and since that time a portion of the hospital has been razed to make room for the construction of the new south barracks in fiscal year 1958. The hospital is no longer functionally appropriate to deliver health care in accordance with modern standards.

(2) The new hospital facility was programed in the West Point expansion program to be ready along with barracks and other essential facilities at critical stages of the expansion of the Corps of Cadets. Based on anticipated early phasing of the hospital, much essential maintenance (particularly in the field of utilities) was deferred and modernization of clinical and other hospital features kept to a minimum. As a result, the Military Academy is providing medical service under difficult conditions in an inadequate facility.

(3) The hospital is located in the busiest part of West Point, across Thayer Road from post headquarters and a major academic building. To one side of the hospital are a cadet reception hall and part of the cadet store; on the other side is an apartment type family housing unit; to the rear is a cadet barracks. Two academic buildings, the remaining cadet barracks, and the cadet mess facility (Washington Hall) are in the immediate vicinity.

(4) Vehicular access to the hospital is limited to one road, and hospital parking for patients and other users is literally nonexistent; the nearest parking being, at times, as much as three-quarters of a mile distant.

(*b*) The second consideration is that the present hospital structure is urgently required to meet other USMA expansion requirements.

(1) The original plan for expansion (Gray Book) for the U.S. Military Academy included, as a fundamental requirement, the construction of a new hospital removed from the immediate cadet area. Early programing for the hospital was provided to free the existing building for other uses critical to the phased expansion of the Cadet Corps and the expanding staff and faculty.

(2) Construction planning and programing assumed eventual availability on a timely basis of the present hospital for other purposes.

Based on this consideration, modification of the post headquarters (fiscal year 1965) did not provide space increases for expanding activities located there since planning provided for use of the present hospital structure for relocation of certain headquarters activities. Likewise, Washington Hall barracks complex, fiscal year 1965, did not provide space for the cadet store as it is programed to relocate to the hospital structure.

(3) The delay in building a new hospital has caused several activities, scheduled to relocate to the old hospital building, to operate in temporary locations at greatly reduced efficiency.

(*c*) The relocation of the hospital was the second priority project in the overall expansion plan. The project was originally authorized by Congress in fiscal year 1966, however, due to several circumstances new congressional authorization is required. The planned relocation of the hospital has significantly affected other planning. Other construction to date, including roads, parking, utilities, academic building, has been based on the assumption that the hospital would be relocated.

Since a new hospital was planned the existing structure has received little more than breakdown maintenance since 1965, as noted above. Building systems requiring the expenditure of substantial funds, if the structure is continued in use as a hospital for any extended period, include the high pressure steam system, electrical service and branch wiring, both hot and cold water systems; the central dictation, nurses call, personnel paging and telephone systems require replacement; three building elevators require replacement; existing piecemeal air-conditioning requires major expansion and rehabilitation.

Overall, the actual building configuration is a limiting factor in accommodating the increasing staff, treating an increased number of patients, and providing the medical services that are required. Space deficiencies of the present structure are best illustrated by some specific examples:

(*a*) The cadet sick call area is so limited that the line of waiting cadets frequently extends out of the sick call area, past the pharmacy, radiology clinic, and administrative area to the main entrance to the hospital.

(*b*) The pharmacy occupies a space one-quarter the area needed to meet operation requirements.

(*c*) One of the three authorized optometrists must work in a partitioned portion of the waiting room and perform a part of the examination in a corridor.

(*d*) The medical-surgical clinic does not have sufficient space to assign an examining room to each physician. For efficient utilization, each physician should have two examining rooms.

(*e*) The emergency area is cramped. There is only one emergency treatment room available for multiple patients.

(*f*) The laboratory must leave valuable equipment, that is in constant use, in areas outside of the laboratory proper.

(*g*) The existing area for medical supplies is so limited that hospital linens are processed in an area that cannot be secured resulting in a lack of control and contributing to a high loss rate.

(*h*) The large wards are inefficient resulting in an uneconomical percentage of utilization of bed spaces.

(*i*) The intensive care and postoperative recovery room are improvised and the latter must be approached from the surgical suite by negotiating a steep ramp. There is no economical method of improving this condition without major rehabilitation.

(*j*) The area for inpatient pediatrics is so limited that the care of children must be combined with adults in an undesirable manner.

Hospital equipment replacement in the existing structure has been kept to a minimum since it was anticipated that a new hospital would be constructed. Failure to provide a new facility in the near future would require a major expenditure for new equipment for which procurement was deferred during the past 7 years. It is doubtful that the type and amount of equipment could be properly accommodated in the existing building.

The estimated cost of the hospital is $25 million, a point that has raised considerable question. Improvements in the state of the art of medical care facilities in the past 2 years have resulted in increases in costs because of upgraded standards for electrical, mechanical, environmental, and fire protection systems which have been incorporated in the West Point design. For example, new standards adopted by the Veterans' Administration, HEW, and the American Society of Heating, Ventilation & Refrigeration Engineers have brought about better, but more expensive systems for temperature and humidity control, air-conditioning, and filtration. Also, new NFPA fire codes have required such things as higher fire ratings for walls and doorways along the major paths of egress from the building. In addition, recent developments in diagnostic and therapeutic equipment, as well as new codes and standards, have placed greater demands on the quantity and reliability of electrical service, its flexibility, and the number of service terminals required.

Historically, construction costs at West Point have been very expensive. Several prime and subcontractors who have recently bid on projects at West Point were contacted informally and questioned with regard to the magnitude of risk and contingency factors that they had applied to their bids. From the responses given, we have concluded that contractors add a factor of 50 percent to all labor costs at West Point as compared to similar projects in other areas. The following are reasons they gave for the higher contingency costs they add to West Point projects:

(*a*) Travel allowances for mechanical trades and other transportation charges.

(*b*) Adequate finishing trades are not indigenous to the area.

(*c*) Requirements to maintain utilities are more restrictive than at other bases.

(*d*) Soil conditions at West Point have a built-in element of risk.

(*e*) Lost time due to functional requirements of West Point as a national attraction for visiting dignitaries of high ranks and for large numbers of tourists.

(*f*) Unsubstantiated claims inferring noncompetitive bidding practices by some contractors and local unions.

We are taking positive steps to insure that the cost of the hospital, and other construction at West Point, is as reasonable as possible. Some of these actions are:

(*a*) Avoiding monumental construction.

(*b*) Developing designs which eliminate or minimize labor intensive-type construction.

(*c*) Extensive site and foundation examinations to eliminate unexpected problems.

(*d*) Careful siting of projects to minimize extensive and expensive rock excavation.

(*e*) Packaging construction contracts to generate maximum bid competition.

(*f*) Intensive design review and value engineering throughout the design period. In the case of the new hospital, a construction oriented architecture-engineering firm experienced in the New York area has been hired to assist in this detailed design review to help maximize cost reductions.

An alternative to a new hospital would be to renovate and modernize the existing facility. This alternative has been investigated and the results further support constructing a new facility. The estimated space requirements under modern criteria are just over 157,000 square feet. The present hospital can only provide just over 93,000 gross square feet of usable space. An ancillary clinic building would also be required to provide the remaining area. Engineering estimates for renovating the existing structure and providing an additional clinic building are approximately $21 million. Also, facilities, estimated to cost approximately $3.6 million, would be required to house those activities which are now programed to move into the old hospital building upon completion of a new hospital. Further significant considerations are the serious degradation of medical service during the renovation—apt to extend over several years—and the fact that the resulting facility would still be located in a very congested area with very limited access to the users.

Considerable discussion has ensued on the siting of the new hospital proposed for the USMA. A new hospital has been planned for West Point since the 1960's at a location known as the Washington Gate site. In late 1971 an architecture-engineering firm, The Architects Collaborative (TAC), was retained to study and make recommendations on the overall master plan for West Point. On January 1972, TAC made a presentation to the USMA Planning Advisory Board recommending that the hospital be located in the Stony Lonesome area rather than Washington Gate, although recognizing that the Washington Gate area was an acceptable alternative. By a vote of 6 to 1, with one abstention, the Board accepted the TAC recommendation. Subsequent staffing and study within the Army resulted in general disagreement with the Board's position. Reasons for disagreement were that: there were no overriding factors favoring Stony Lonesome over Washington Gate—to the contrary some factors not included in the TAC study favored Washington Gate, for example, construction difficulties and costs and other planned utilization of the Stony Lonesome area; a change in the location would delay construction for a year and incur additional engineering and design costs plus a year's inflation; the Stony Lonesome site is more remote from the center of population, particularly the cadets; and, it was challenged that a functionally acceptable structure could be erected in the Stony Lonesome area that would also satisfy environmental considerations of the West Point scene. In May 1972, the Chief of

Staff, Army, requested the Planning Advisory Board to reconsider its position. By a vote of 5 to 5 the Board failed to reverse its earlier recommendation. After considering all factors, the Secretary of the Army approved the Washington Gate site for the new hospital in June 1972.

The barracks modernization project will upgrade nine existing buildings to provide modern quarters for 575 enlisted men in Army units stationed at the USMA. Open-bay areas will be eliminated to provide semiprivate rooms, latrine facilities will be improved, utilities will be upgraded, and facilities for securing personal possessions will be improved. Upon completion of the project, 100 percent of the permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at West Point will meet current standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not question the need for barracks modernization here at the Academy, and I know that this is a high cost area. But, I notice your unit cost of $22.40 per square foot proposed for Fort Richardson, Alaska, which is shown on page 237. Can you compare these two programs, since obviously Alaska is a high cost area?

General COOPER. The barracks modernization project for Fort Richardson includes one building of 93,454 square foot floor area built in 1949. The barracks modernization project for USMA includes seven buildings; two were built in 1908, one each built in 1935, 1939, and 1942, and two were built in 1943. The seven buildings range in size from 5,400 square foot floor area to 27,500 square foot floor area. The greater amount of labor and materials per square foot for modernizing these smaller and older buildings at USMA more than makes up the difference in the geographical area cost factors of 1.7 for Fort Richardson and 1.3 for USMA.

The final project is to provide adequate utilities to the proposed hospital site in the Washington gate area of the post. The academy expansion and modernization plan provides for consolidation of certain activities in the Washington gate area to relieve traffic congestion and minimize heavy vehicle operation in the main post area. This project will extend communications service to the area, upgrade primary electrical service to the Washington gate area to serve the new hospital project. Extension of the water, sewer, and steam distribution lines, and the heating plant expansion are also required to support the new hospital building.

WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND MARYLAND

Walter Reed Army Medical Center is located in Washington, D.C. The mission of this center is to provide medical treatment for members of the armed services and their dependents, to engage in medical research and development, and to support all medical center activities. The program provides a patient visitor facility. The request is for $1,997,000.

The patient visitor project is to provide a facility to house the next of kin of seriously ill patients and to house outpatients visiting Walter Reed for special treatment or diagnostic testing. Many of the

referred patients are in the seriously ill or very seriously ill category, and this project will provide short-term housing for immediate family members of these patients who come to Washington fom all parts of the country to visit their loved ones. The present facility is always full, with 79 beds in 28 rooms and assignments must be made on a bed rather than a room basis, which is a most unacceptable practice. The proposed facility will support the new 1,280-bed Walter Reed General Hospital currently under construction. Cafeteria facilities are included in the new facility to accommodate the occupants. The facility will be available only to the next of kin of seriously ill patients and referred outpatients who will be at WRGH for a short period of time.

Senator SYMINGTON. What will this facility be used for? Is it in the nature of a guesthouse to accommodate visitors?

General COOPER. The patient visitor facility will provide accommodations for the next of kin of seriously ill patients and to house outpatients referred to Walter Reed General Hospital from other stations for special treatment or diagnostic testing. This facility will only be available for these people.

COLD REGIONS LABORATORY, N.H.

The Cold Regions Laboratory is located 8 miles from Lebanon, N.H. The mission of this installation is to conduct basic and applied research and scientific and engineering investigations pertaining to operations in cold environments, methods and techniques of using various energy forms and systems to obtain information about surface and subsurface features, and to perform environmental and such other research in support of mission activities. The program consists of a logistics and storage facility at an estimated cost of $597,000.

This project is required to provide a storage facility for the logistics support of the laboratory. The majority of the items stored are special project and prototype equipment specially manufactured for use on particular projects. Loss of this equipment through fire or other causes would result in a slowdown or discontinuance of projects involved. Also stored is historical data, including project statistics, notes and charts which have been acquired over a period of several years and most are irreplaceable. Loss of this data would seriously impair the preparation of research reports and technical publications which are the main end products of the laboratory.

Storage is now provided in the basement of a leased, converted textile mill located in Lebanon, N.H., 8 miles from the laboratory. This building is a potential fire hazard and security risk.

If this project is not approved, the distant and unsafe storage space must continue in use as no other adequate space is available to satisfy this requirement within commuting area.

OAKLAND ARMY BASE, CALIF.

The Oakland Army Base is located in Oakland, Calif. The mission of this installation is to provide for traffic management, ocean terminal operations and related transportation services of cargo and personnel; train related military units, military personnel and civilians as assigned; and to provide administrative and logistical support to tenant and satellite agencies. The program consists of modernizing enlisted

women's barracks and security lighting. The request for this program is $485,000.

The first item, a barracks modernization project, is to upgrade existing permanent barracks to provide modern quarters for female enlisted personnel. WAC personnel assigned to Oakland now are living in substandard World War II-type temporary structures or must live off post in expensive rental housing. The building to be modernized is configured for male occupancy to outdated standards, having open bay squad bays and community latrines. Modernization will provide improved privacy, greater security for personal possessions and improved bathroom facilities. Completion of this project will provide for the total enlisted WAC housing requirement at Oakland Army Base.

The security lighting project is to provide physical security measures and safeguards to adequately protect Government property, cargo awaiting processing, and personnel employed at this installation. Raising the perimeter and area lighting to 0.3 footcandle will provide sufficient illumination during the hours of darkness for visual and for low-light-level television camera surveillance. Three television cameras are presently installed externally and permit surveillance of the warehouses and perimeter fencing but are usable only during daylight hours since these TV cameras require 2 footcandle illumination for operation. The cost of providing 2 footcandle illumination over the entire installation is far greater than provision of 0.3 footcandle illumination and use of low-light-level television cameras. This project supports present policies for tightening security of transportation terminal facilities to prevent gross pilferage and loss of intransit cargos.

MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL, SUNNY POINT, N.C.

Military Ocean Terminal, Sunny Point, is located at Wilmington, N.C. The mission of this installation is to receive, handle, load and ship outbound and retrograde ammunition, explosives and other DOD cargo. The program is for a container transfer and marshaling facility for $1,628,000.

This project will provide facilities for the containerized shipping mission at Sunny Point. This port will be the only Army containerized ammunition facility in the continental United States (CONUS). It now handles approximately 55 percent of all munitions shipped from CONUS. Existing conventional break-bulk methods of shipping munitions require costly amounts of dunnage lumber and stevedore labor which can be greatly reduced by using the containerized shipping methods planned for Sunny Point. These savings will be particularly significant during high volume shipping during war time.

FORT GREELY, ALASKA

Fort Greely is located at Fairbanks, Alaska. Its mission is to provide command, control, administration and logistical support to the U.S. Army Arctic Test Center, Northern Warfare Training Center, and such other units and activities as may be directed, and to maintain Allen Army Airfield and hangar. The program is for enlisted men's barracks, without mess facilities, and for an eight stall automotive self-help garage. The total request is for $3,489,000.

The barracks project will provide housing for 182 enlisted men. The existing temporary wood frame barracks and quonset huts built in the late forties have deteriorated beyond economical repair and are inadequate especially during winter months when temperatures of −30° to −60° F., along with winds of 25–26 knots, are very common. These existing barracks are used for personnel attending courses of the Northern Warfare Training Center and observers and temporary duty troops assigned to Arctic Test Center activities. These activities—testing of equipment, clothing and materials, and training of personnel under arctic conditions—reach their peak during severe winter conditions. To assure continued progress in these activities, with sufficient numbers of personnel, it has on occasion been necessary to billet personnel in the already crowded existing permanent barracks. This overcrowding is not desirable and this project will assist in alleviating these conditions.

The automotive self-help garage will provide an eight stall automotive shop, which will replace temporary World War II type wood framed—4,758 square feet—structures. The need for a suitable facility is twofold at Fort Greely. First, the isolated location of Fort Greely and the absence of commercial facilities magnifies the requirement to the point where this facility is the only means of maintaining private vehicles in safe and dependable condition in this arctic environment. The only dependable commercal facilities are in Fairbanks—110 miles away—are limited, and costs are prohibitive. Secondly, this facility will greatly improve the tour of duty at this isolated installation by providing a place for the soldiers to pursue a gratifying hobby. Recreational facilities normally available in a community surrounding most installations are completely lacking at Fort Greely and the harsh environment makes outside activities unattractive and hazardous.

Senator Symington. $81.50 a square foot for a permanent auto hobby shop seems to be quite exorbitant. Why cannot some type of prefabricated metal building be used in lieu of permanent construction?

General Cooper. The unit cost authorized for an auto hobby shop with a spray booth is approximately $37 per square foot. Because of the extreme climate and remote location, the location adjustment factor for Fort Greely is 2.2 times the unit cost thus accounting for the $81.50 per square foot construction cost. Unit costs and adjustment factors are given in AR 415–17, "Empirical Cost Estimates for Military Construction and Cost Adjustment Factors," which is based upon actual construction cost and is updated on a regular basis.

A prefabricated metal building was not chosen in lieu of permanent construction because concrete block is readily available whereas preengineered structures must be shipped to the site. A study of a similar project at Fort Richardson, Alaska, indicates that the initial construction cost is approximately equal for the two building types after including the shipping cost for the preengineered structure. In addition, the climate prohibits the use of a standard prefabricated metal structure without extensive modifications. The necessary modifications include structural and architectural changes to meet local wind and snow requirements, addition of acceptable insulation and vapor barriers, elimination of through-metal connections, and replacement of standard exterior components such as doors and windows. Furthermore, recent life cycle cost studies indicate that the average

preengineered building has higher maintenance cost and shorter lifespan than conventionally constructed buildings.

FORT RICHARDSON, ALASKA

Fort Richardson is located 7 miles northeast of Anchorage, Alaska. The mission of this installation is to support all U.S. Army operations in Alaska including special requirements for supply and maintenance facilities for both Reserve components and CONUS-based Active Army units receiving tactical training in Alaska. The installation also provides ground and surface-to-air defenses for Elmendorf Air Base. The program provides for barracks modernization for $2,140,000.

The barracks project will modernize two existing buildings constructed in 1951 to now outdated standards. The completed project will provide modern quarters for 270 enlisted men and will bring Fort Richardson to approximately 68 percent of their long range bachelor enlisted housing requirement. The situation at Fort Richardson is somewhat unique in that the long, harsh winters with weather that often precludes any outdoor activities makes it even more imperative that the Army provide comfortable, modern living accommodations for the soldiers.

FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

Fort Wainwright is located at Fairbanks, Alaska. The mission of this installation is to provide ground defense for the Wainwright-Fairbanks-Eielson Air Force Base complex. Also supports a U.S. Army hospital, a reinforced infantry battalion, and other nondivisional type units. Army activities at Fort Wainwright are being consolidated to the South Post. The program provides for bachelor officer quarters modernization and relocation of activities to South Post for a total estimated cost of $2,715,000.

The bachelor officer quarters modernization project will provide adequate bachelor officer quarters on the South Post to replace existing quarters being used on the North Post area of Fort Wainwright and is part of a plan to move all activities to the South Post area.

The relocation of activities to South Post will provide adequate facilities for activities now located on the North Post. These activities include an officers open mess, a billeting office, a provost marshal facility and a post headquarters.

SCHOFIELD BARRACKS MILITARY RESERVATION, HAWAII

Schofield Barracks Military Reservation is located 17 miles northwest of Honolulu, Hawaii. The mission of this installation is to command, train, and provide logistical support for an infantry division. It is also the headquarters for U.S. Army Hawaii and operates the USARHAW supply and maintenance center and the USARHAW personnel center. The program includes barracks modernization and a consolidated mess hall. The total request is for $9,592,000.

The barracks project will modernize 12 existing buildings to provide modern quarters for 1,809 enlisted men. The existing buildings are structurally sound but are configured to now outdated living standards. The large open bay squad rooms will be remodeled to provide semiprivate rooms, latrine facilities will be improved, air-conditioning will be installed, and the heating and lighting upgraded.

The second project is required to provide a modern consolidated dining facility for all personnel living in Quads, I, J, and K, Schofield Barracks. This project will replace the six active and three standby reserve dining facilities presently scheduled for renovation and reconstruction to unit administrative, gamerooms, or storage space under the barracks modernization programs in fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974. Construction of this project will insure adequate troop dining facilities, while providing excellent food, less food waste, and lower equipment replacement and food costs. The items of equipment presently in the nine existing dining facilities will be either used in the new facility or salvaged as their condition warrants.

FORT SHAFTER, HAWAII

Fort Shafter is located 3 miles northwest of Honolulu, Hawaii. The mission of the installation is to support Headquarters, U.S. Army Pacific. Support facilities and family housing are located there. The program will provide a medical/dental clinic for $1,233,000.

This project is to provide a new medical/dental clinic to replace an inadequate facility which is a partially converted guardhouse. Although the present facility has been utilized as a dispensary for several years, the building has never been converted to a properly functioning medical clinic necessary to provide complete preventive dentistry care to eligible military personnel and dependents. The dental facility at Tripler Army Medical Center is overtaxed in providing normal patient care and cannot accommodate additional load. The requested dental facility will contain a 12-chair dental clinic. It is considered more economical to construct a new combined medical and dental facility than to convert the present facility to an adequate dispensary and then either add or construct a separate dental clinic. The medical clinic has an average of 52 visits per day. Physical examinations for the military staff at Fort Shafter and a drug screening program will also be accomplished here.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS—AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

This project will provide air pollution control and abatement measures at installations in compliance with Federal, State, and local air pollution control regulations and Executive Order 11507—February 4, 1970. The total request in $7,295,000. The work includes various types of air pollution abatement measures such as fly ash separators, fume abatement systems, stack gas monitors, fuel conversion, air monitoring stations, and construction of incinerators. Type and scope of work varies because of the many different kinds and sizes of equipment and the specific pollution problem to be resolved, but corrective actions proposed are based on a determination of the most economical means of satisfying controlling criteria.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that several of these air pollution abatement projects are planned which are contractor operated. Why are military construction funds utilized for this purpose when most of the construction performed at these contractor operated plants come from PEMA funds?

General COOPER. These projects are included in the MCA budget rather than in the procurement of equipment and missiles, Army (PEMA) request based on an Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) memorandum, subject: Military Construction and Family Housing Construction—Program/Budget Estimates, dated July 5, 1968. This memorandum directs that pollution control projects for industrial-type activities will be proposed for financing under military construction appropriations. This position has been confirmed during the annual budget reviews.

In practice, those projects that are conceived to correct existing pollution problems, for example, smoke stack emissions, are funded by the MCA appropriation. Those projects actually related to the industrial production line or are incidental to plant modernization are funded by the PEMA appropriation. Since fiscal year 1968 approximately $9 million have been authorized in PEMA budgets for pollution abatement projects.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS—WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

This program will provide water pollution control and abatement measures at various installations in compliance with Federal, State and local water pollution control regulations and with Executive Order 11507—February 4, 1970—for $6,799,000. Work consists of the construction of new, and expansion and upgrading of existing sanitary and industrial waste systems, the construction of dikes around storage tanks and the installation of sand traps and oil separators in shops and vehicle wash racks. Type and scope of work varies depending upon the existing system, but the corrective actions proposed are based on the least costly means of meeting controlling criteria. When local conditions permit advantageous accomplishment of any portion of a project by connection to or use of a public system, the public system will be used.

PANAMA AREA, CANAL ZONE

Army installations in the Canal Zone are located near the Pacific and Atlantic entrances to the Panama Canal. Missions of these installations are to train military units and to provide ground and air defense of the Panama Canal. The program consists of barracks modernization in the Canal Zone and improvements to Fort Sherman Army Airfield for a total of $8,095,000.

The barracks project will modernize existing buildings located at Fort Clayton, Fort Kobbee, and Fort Gulick in the Canal Zone. The completed project will provide modern quarters for 1,439 enlisted men. This project is required to provide modern living accommodations meeting current standards. Modernization will provide semiprivate rooms, improved latrine facilities, air-conditioning, and improved security for personal possessions.

The improvements to the Fort Sherman Army Airfield will establish a capability at this field to accept medium cargo/troop aircraft on a routine basis. Presently, landings of these aircraft—C–123, C–130—can be made only under emergency conditions.

EIGHTH U.S. ARMY, KOREA

The 8th U.S. Army is located in Korea. Its mission is to suport the United Nations Command, to command and support the U.S. Forces, Korea, and units of the 8th U.S. Army. The program provides for the construction of an ALOC Airfield and for POL Terminal Facilities at Pohang, Korea, for a total of $1,568,000.

The ALOC Airfield is an important link in the network of logistical airfields sited throughout Korea to supplement the ground lines of communication.

The POL terminal facilities will provide a deep water mooring system capable of accepting T–5 tankers (250,000 bbl.). This will make the Trans Korea pipeline system more responsive and economical.

FORT BUCHANAN, P.R.

Fort Buchanan is located at San Juan, P.R. The installation mission is to provide administrative and logistical support for all active and reserve Army elements, to other services located in Puerto Rico and to furnish community and welfare type services to retired military personnel. The program is for barracks modernization for $517,000.

The barracks modernization project is required to upgrade existing substandard barracks to meet current standards for today's Army. The building to be modernized is still arranged in open bay squad rooms, is not air-conditioned and offers little security for personal possessions. To the extent possible semiprivate rooms will be constructed, the structure will be air-conditioned, utilities will be increased and improved, latrine facilities will be improved and secure areas for personal possessions provided.

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not question the need for barracks improvements here at Fort Buchanan in San Juan, but I wonder if any consideration has been given to moving the Army activities out of Fort Buchanan to the Ramey Air Force Base, which is being closed. There are many fine facilities at Ramey, including barracks, family housing, commissaries, et cetera. From your description of the mission at Fort Buchanan, it would seem that the type of work being performed there could be performed just as well at the Ramey Air Force Base.

General COOPER. The Army has reviewed its facilities requirements and holdings to include Fort Buchanan, to determine whether or not it would be appropriate to acquire some of the facilities which will be made available at Ramey AFB. Since most Army activities in Puerto Rico involve Reserve, National Guard, and ROTC officers they can best be performed by conducting them in the Metropolitan San Juan area. The travel and communications times to Ramey AFB are such that it would neither be economical nor conducive to mission effectiveness to transfer all or any Army activities from Fort Buchanan to Ramey AFB. The Army has, however, requested use of a small area (to include six buildings located thereon) at Ramey AFB to relocate the 770th Military Police Company of the Puerto Rico National Guard, now housed in an inadequate, privately-owned facility at Aguadilla, P.R.

It should also be noted that the Army is taking steps to obtain certain excess facilities at the San Juan Naval Station to permit the Puerto Rican National Guard to occupy better, consolidated facilities.

NATIONAL MISSILE RANGE, KWAJALEIN, MARSHALL ISLANDS

The National Missile Range, Kwajalein, is located at Kwajalein Atoll 2,100 miles west of Hawaii. The mission of this installation is to support research, development, and test programs for missile systems for all services. The installation also supports programs conducted by NASA. The program consists of additions to instrumentation and technical support facilities, Ennylabegan power addition, and electrical system feeder upgrading for a total of $2,353,000.

The first project is to provide adequate facilities to house radars and other electronic equipment which support research and development programs for missile and radar systems. The Air Force Minuteman, the Navy Poseidon, the Army Sprint and Spartan, and the various Advanced Ballistic Missile Defense Agency programs all use these range facilities to obtain information vital to the success of their weapons systems. Minor additions to existing buildings at Eniwetok are for the hydroacoustics impact timing system (HITS). Ballistic camera electronic equipment will be installed on Legan, Omelek, and Gagan Islands and a new building will be constructed on Illeginni for a ballistic camera installation. In 1968 the telemetry building on Ennylabegan was expanded to 3,200 square feet to house four antenna systems, and two additional systems, a computer, and ancillary equipment were added later. An additional 1,200 square feet of space will permit analysis of data during missions, additional data processing equipment, and allow for calibration and repair.

The second project will furnish reliable electrical power to facilities on the island of Ennylabegan necessary for support of the missile research and development programs. The receiver equipment is located on this island and reception of all incoming radio communication signals depends upon efficient operation of this equipment. Recent installation of two radomes to support the new telemetry antenna systems and the planned addition to the telemetry building will severely overtax the existing power distribution system. This project will meet the increasing power demands, upgrade existing electrical distribution systems, and decrease equipment downtime and maintenance costs.

The final project is to furnish reliable power to the research and development and range support facilities necessary in support of the Safeguard, the Advanced Ballistics Missile Defense Agency (ABMDA), and other range users' programs. This project will provide increased capacity to meet the increasing power demand and provide for future growth, upgrade the existing electrical feeder system, and will decrease the time required to correct power failures that deadline technical range equipment. The major portion of the present distribution system was installed in 1960 and 1961; however, a small portion is approximately 10 years older. Existing loads on several feeders are reaching the rated capacity of the lines and have affected the reliability of equipment during range missions as power outages increase. The upgrading will enable the system to furnish reliable electric service under routine maintenance conditions.

U.S. ARMY SECURITY AGENCY, OVERSEAS, VARIOUS LOCATIONS

This program is for various overseas locations operated by the U.S. Army Security Agency. Mission of the sites is to engage in communications and intelligence activities. The project consists of one enlisted men's barracks, without mess facilities, at location 276 for $1,434,000.

This project is to provide adequate troop housing for the enlisted men at this isolated location. Present housing needs are being met by double bunking in overcrowded rooms. This project is essential to alleviate present overcrowded conditions, and will enhance the health, welfare, and morale of the men. Assignment to this station entails an unaccompanied tour with no off-post facilities available and the nature of the mission dictates that personnel strength be housed on the station. The nearest city accessible to the personnel of this station offers little recreation, and public relations are best maintained by permitting limited visits to the city as local nationals are generally unaccustomed to the Western way of life.

U.S. ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND, OVERSEAS

The U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command provides and operates communications facilities worldwide. The program will upgrade power at eight communications stations located in four countries for $2,097,000.

This project is for power improvements at strategic Army communications stations within the defense communications system (DCS). It provides for new generators to include associated switchgear and ancillary equipment, construction of new and/or modification of existing power equipment buildings, and for upgrade of primary and secondary distribution systems. This project is a part of a systematic effort to accomplish the Army's portion of the Defense Communications Agency (DCA) Military Department worldwide electric power improvement program. Its objective is to achieve within the Army portion of the defense communications system (DCS) an absolute minimum of communication interruptions caused by electrical power failure. To achieve this objective, primary and auxiliary power facilities, as well as electrical distribution systems, are to be upgraded to insure adequate continuous electrical power at selected Army defense communications system (DCS) facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. It seems like every year we have a substantial sum in the bill for the purpose of upgrading power at various locations. Just how important is this? Have you had many power outages under your present setup?

General COOPER. This project is quite important. The eight locations cited in the project are Army communications stations within the defense communications system (DCS). The DCS stations in Germany are all high priority stations within the European wideband communications system (EWCS). The stations at Juzon Mountain and Grass Mountain, Taiwan, and Fort Buckner, Okinawa, are all important tropospheric and microwave links in the integrated communications systems, Far East (ICS–FE). Failure to provide ade-

quate and reliable electrical power for these sites could cause serious degradation of communications vital to the national command authority and/or the DOD command and control communications network.

Electrical power failure continues to be a major cause of communications outages at many of these DCS facilities. A significant fact is that the primary power is furnished by a foreign country. This power is not as operationally reliable as in the United States nor is the ultimate control in U.S. hands. The project requested will provide emergency or standby power where it does not exist, will upgrade heavily taxed distribution systems and gear, and replace outdated equipment.

U.S. ARMY, EUROPE

GERMANY, VARIOUS

This request is for a group of six items at various locations in the Federal Republic of Germany. The missions of the installations are in support of the U.S. Army, Europe. The program consists of enlisted men's barracks and two projects for improvements to dependent schools for a total request of $12,517,000.

The first project is to provide a new troop barracks at Pruem Post, Germany. Pruem Post is a small isolated installation near the Germany-Belgium-Luxembourg border. Because of the prevalent inclement weather and lack of recreational facilities, the need for adequate living accommodations becomes even more imperative. Currently, personnel are billeted in temporary theater of operations-type barracks that were constructed in 1952. The barracks have only large open bay living areas and seriously inadequate latrine facilities. They have undergone serious deterioration in the last 20 years. Investigations in 1971 revealed structural failure of the roof and wall supporting systems of several buildings. Due to the age of the buildings, an increased rate of deterioration can be expected within the immediate future. They are difficult to heat and remain drafty during the cold season each year. All of these factors contribute to the poor living conditions at Pruem Post and have generated a very serious morale problem among the troops stationed there. The Army barracks at this site will be replaced in two increments with this being the initial phase. Seven temporary theater of operations barracks with a total area of 19,330 SF will be demolished upon completion of this project. This project is not within the established NATO infrastructure category for common funding.

The second project requests $4,937,000 to provide new dependent school facilities at two locations—an elementary school in Baumholder and a middle school in Mannheim. In both cases the existing schools are seriously overcrowded and lack proper educational facilities. Many classes are now held in makeshift classrooms including basements of private quarters. The proposed projects will alleviate the crowded condition and provide functionally adequate educational facilities.

The final project requested for our forces in Germany is also for facilities for dependent schools. This project will provide additions to existing schools at three locations—Nuremberg, Fulda, and Wurzburg. Similar to Baumholder and Mannheim, these three dependent school areas have experienced a significant enrollment increase which

must be absorbed in already inadequate facilities. The plight of our overseas dependent schools has been known for some time but suffered in the competition for limited construction dollars. The Army is now attempting to accomplish the badly needed corrections. The proposed projects will provide additional classrooms for the schools in the three locations which will alleviate crowded conditions and replace other functionally inadequate facilities now used.

Senator SYMINGTON. This seems to be quite a lot of money you are proposing to spend on upgrading dependent schools at various locations. Has consideration been given to using prefabricated structures for additional classrooms? I know the Air Force has done this in the Frankfurt area.

General COOPER. We have given thought to using prefabricated structures, that is, akin to the metal "Butler" type buildings. In fact in some areas we have utilized these buildings as an interim remedy to space problems. They have not been particularly satisfactory from a cost, maintenance, or functional standpoint. We are using preengineered structures of a different sort, for example, utilizing precast concrete sections. Our construction designs and contracts are being developed to provide for the maximum flexibility in construction. This allows the prospective contractors to bid on a variety of preengineered options, utilizing materials, and construction techniques commonly employed in Europe. This has proven very competitive and gives us better overall structures.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS (NATO INFRASTRUCTURE)

This is required to meet the estimated U.S. share of the multinational NATO common funded infrastructure program. The funds will be used to meet U.S. obligations during the fiscal year 1974 time frame as projects in established categories are approved for funding by the NATO Payments and Progress Committee. Such projects are from a backlog of construction requirements previously approved in SACEUR and SACLANT annual programs. The request for fiscal year 1974 takes into account unused authorization and funds as well as recoupments received from projects previously prefinanced by the United States and now considered eligible for common funding.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that you are asking $80 million in new authorization and only $60 million in new funding for NATO infrastructure for fiscal year 1974. Why the difference between the funding and the authority you are requesting?

Last year you were given $58 million in new authority. Why is the substantial increase to $80 million necessary this year? Do these figures take into consideration the devaluation of the dollar? I have in mind that a few months ago you sent through a request to use emergency authority to make up a deficit created by the devaluation of the dollar.

General COOPER. Your question has three separate but related parts. I shall endeavor to answer them in the order in which they were asked:

1. The requirement for $80 million in new authorization, as compared to $60 million in new funding, stems from the fact that although the U.S. share of NATO infrastructure is a single line item in the military construction, Army appropriation, it differs from all other line items in that it is a continuing program—not a complete one-time

project. A carryover of unobligated authorization from one fiscal year to the next is therefore required to permit the United States to continue participation in NATO, pending enactment of authorization for the new fiscal year.

In recent years authorization has not been enacted until 3 to 5 months after the fiscal year has begun. Our unobligated authorization carryover at end fiscal year 1968 was $29 million; fiscal year 1969, $40 million; fiscal year 1970, $62 million; and fiscal year 1971, $47 million. As a result of congressional reductions of Department of Defense fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972 authorization requests, our carryover from fiscal year 1972 to fiscal year 1973 was reduced to $18 million. The reduction in total authorization available to us in fiscal year 1973 reduced our ability to cope with unanticipated unbudgeted fiscal year 1973 costs of $43 million stemming from devaluation in the U.S. dollar. Accordingly, we deferred $12 million of high priority fiscal year 1973 requirements to early fiscal year 1974 and requested fiscal year 1973 reprograming of $20.65 million into NATO infrastructure. Late deferrals provided a $1.7 million carryover of unobligated authorization into fiscal year 1974 to enable us to meet payroll and other nondeferable costs pending resolution authority. The requirement for a carryover of unobligated authorization from one fiscal year to the next is developed more fully in a paper we are submitting for the record.

The requested carryover of $20 million in unobligated authorization from fiscal year 1974 to fiscal year 1975 approximates 25–30 percent (3 months) of our estimated fiscal year 1975 requirement, based on the February 12, 1973, devalued dollar. It is a minimum requirement which contemplates that the Congress will enact fiscal year 1975 authorization within 3 months after the start of fiscal year 1975, that construction costs will remain stable, and the value of the dollar will recover to the February 12, 1973, official value level.

2. The fiscal year 1974 request for $80 million new authorization, as compared to $58 million for fiscal year 1973, is required to:

(a) Provide for a $20 million carryover of unobligated authorization into fiscal year 1974 to permit continued participation in NATO pending enactment of new year authorization. As previously outlined, the fiscal year 1973 carryover to fiscal year 1974 is $1.7 million, leaving a carryover shortage of $18.3 million.

(b) Provide support of the NATO 1970–1974 level of program (Slice XXI–XXV) in keeping with previous U.S. sponsorship and commitments. This includes provision for the cost of recent dollar devaluations.

3. In response to your question regarding the cost of the devaluations of the dollar, I will insert two tables in the record—the first shows details of dollar devaluation costs in fiscal year 1973–1974; the second shows the impact on our fiscal year 1973–1974 authorization and fund requirements. Highlights of these tables include the following:

(*a*) The total cost of U.S. dollar devaluations in fiscal year 1973–1974 as related to the U.S. share of the NATO infrastructure program is $63 million. Fiscal year 1973 costs are $43 million, none of which was provided for in the Department of Defense fiscal year 1973 budget. Fiscal year 1974 costs are estimated at $20 million, of which only $5 million is included in our fiscal year 1974 budget.

(*b*) We have endeavored to provide for the unbudgeted fiscal year 1973 cost of $43 million as follows:

	Millions
Cancellation and deobligation of projects	$10.35
Reprograming requested May 7, 1973. HAC has approved; SAC has not yet acted	20.65
Projects deferred to early fiscal year 1974	12.000
Total/Unbudgeted fiscal year 1973 costs	43.000

(*c*) Assuming SAC approves Secretary of Defense May 7, 1973, request to reprogram $20.65 million additional funds into NATO infrastructure to partially provide for the $43 million unbudgeted fiscal year 1973 cost of devaluaton, revised fiscal year 1974 authorization and funding requirements are as listed below. The increased requirements are caused entirely by the devaluation of the dollar.

(1) $19.3 million additional new obligation authority (NOA) is required over and above the $40 million NOA requested in Department of Defense fiscal year 1974 budget. The revised fiscal year 1974 NOA requirement is therefore $59.3 million.

(2) The revised fiscal year 1974 total obligation authority (TOA) requirement is $85.3 million ($60 million Department of Defense budget plus $19.3 million additional NOA requirement, plus $6 million additional estimated fiscal year 1974 recoupments).

(3) The revised fiscal year 1974 authorization is $105.3 million ($80 million Department of Defense budget plus $19.3 million additional NOA requirement, plus $6 million additional estimated fiscal year 1974 recoupments).

COST OF U.S. DOLLAR DEVALUATION, FISCAL YEAR 1973–74—U.S. SHARE OF NATO INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM (MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY)

	Fiscal years—		
	1973–74 (total)	1973	1974
COST OF DEVALUATION			
May 8, 1972, revaluation of NATO IAU (reflecting Dec. 18, 1971, dollar devaluation)	$25.000	$20.000	$5.000
Feb. 12, 1973, devaluation dollar	31.000	23.000	8.000
Difference, Feb. 12, 1973 dollar versus current market dollar	7.000	0	7.000
Total, fiscal year 1973–74 cost devaluation	63.000	43.000	20.000
FUND REQUIREMENT			
Included in budget	−5.000	0	−5.000
Not inclubud in budget	58.000	43.000	15.000
Carryover from fiscal year 1973 appropriation	−1.700	0	−1.700
Additional estimated recoupments	−6.000	0	−6.000
Total unbudgeted cost of devaluation	50.300	43.000	7.300
Projects canceled and deobligated	−10.350	−10.350	0
Projects deferred fiscal year 1973 to fiscal year 1974	0	−12.000	+12.000
Fiscal year 1973 reprograming requested [1]	[1] 20.650	[1] −20.650	0
Subtotal	(−31.000)	(−43.000)	(+12.000)
Total unbudgeted, if fiscal year 1973 reprograming approved	19.300	0	19.300
Add fiscal year 1974 funds required, if fiscal year 1973 reprograming not approved	+20.650	0	+20.650
Total unbudgeted, if fiscal year 1973 reprograming not approved	39.950	0	39.950

[1] Request approved by chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives. Senate has not yet acted on request.

NATO Infrastructure Procedures for Obligating and Expending U.S. Share of Costs

BACKGROUND

"Infrastructure" is the NATO term for facilities necessary for the deployment and operation of NATO military forces, including U.S. forces committed to NATO. It includes airfields, communications, POL, Naval bases, radar installations and other military operational facilities.

Common financing of Infrastructure is based on a cost sharing plan covering several (usually five) years, drawn up and agreed to by NATO countries. The most recent agreement was signed in February 1970, and covered annual increments (slices) XXI through XXV (1970–1974). This agreement established a program of $753.1 million, of which the U.S. share (29.67%) was $223.4 million. This cost will be increased as a result of the most recent dollar devaluation.

Annually, the NATO Military Commanders recommend construction or modernization of projects essential for the support of military forces committed to NATO. After review, selected projects together constitute the yearly program, or annual Slice, which is formally approved by the NATO Council/Defense Planning Committee (the highest political bodies of NATO). Each such slice must, when added to previous slice approvals, be within the multi-year cost ceiling.

In effect, the U.S. commitment to NATO Infrastructure occurs at the time of approval of the long-term program, and is reaffirmed in terms of specific projects at the time of approval of the annual slice program.

After approval of projects in an annual slice, full responsibility for project implementation is assumed by the applicable host country, which starts preparatory work; siting, preliminary estimates, plans and specifications. Individual projects are then submitted with supporting details to the NATO Payments and Progress (P&P) Committee. Based upon prior screening by the NATO Technical staff, the NATO P&P Committee must be satisfied that the project retains its military requirements, conforms to NATO criteria, is reasonable in cost, and is eligible for common funding under NATO Infrastructure rules. In addition, beginning with Slice XXI (1970), the NATO P&P Committee reviews the status of preparatory work to insure that the project can be contracted for within the next twelve months. This pre-requisite to P&P Committee approval has significantly reduced the lagtime between approval of an annual program (Slice) and contracting/obligating and has improved DoD capability for forecasting annual fund requirements. Once the project is approved by the NATO P&P Committee, the host nation may proceed with actual construction.

The NATO P&P Committee meets each week throughout the year to review and approve urgent and incremental Infrastructure project requests.

U.S. CONCURRENCE IN A NATO P&P COMMITTEE FUND AUTHORIZATION IS SIMULTANEOUSLY A FUND OBLIGATION FOR THE U.S.

To prepare a budget request for the Congress, the U.S. representative must forecast the anticipated P&P Committee authorizations for the year in question, weighing various factors, including predicting when a host country will acquire the necessary real estate, provide local utilities, and prepare plans for submittal to P&P Committee. There are other variables which make it difficult to forecast the specific projects which will receive P&P Committee approval (and U.S. obligation) during a given fiscal year or to forecast with precision the resultant annual fund requirement. As a result, the Congress has requested and receives each quarter a listing of specific projects approved by the P&P Committee during the previous calendar quarter.

Upon approval of a given project by the P&P Committee an obligation reflecting the U.S. share of the cost of that project is recorded, based on the official

value of the dollar in relationship to the NATO IAU (International Accounting Unit) as of that point in time. Obligations are subsequently adjusted to reflect:

(1) Actual construction costs in the same manner as regular U.S. military construction projects.

(2) Changes in the official value of the dollar. Adjustment must be made to all unliquidated obligations to reflect the change in the relationship of the dollar to the IAU as of the date the U.S. Treasury officially notifies the IMF (International Monetary Fund) of the change in official dollar value. Subsequently, all new obligations must likewise reflect this change in value.

(3) The difference between the amount actually expended in the market place to liquidate a given obligation and the amount recorded for that obligation.

The history of the value of the dollar in relationship to the NATO IAU is as follows (expressed in terms of number of dollars required to equal one IAU):

Effective dates	Amount	Percent of dollar devaluation (since previous devaluation)	Cumulative percent devaluation (new value verses $2.80)
Official value of the dollar in relationship to the NATO IAU (applies to all unliquidated obligations):			
Inception NATO—May 8, 1972	2.80		
May 8, 1972 to Feb. 12, 1973	3.04	8.57	8.57
Feb. 12, 1973 to current	3.38	11.1	20.7
Approximate current value of the dollar in the marketplace (applies to to expenditures only): Current and assumed average for fiscal year 1974	3.72	10.0	32.9

APPLICATION TO FISCAL YEAR 1973–74—IN KEEPING WITH THE ABOVE

(1) The DOD FY 1973 budget was based on the value of the official dollar, in relationship to the IAU, as of December 1971 ($2.80 to the IAU). As of 8 May 1972 unliquidated obligations (in excess of $150 million) were increased by 8.57% to reflect the new official rate of $3.04 to the IAU and all subsequent obligations were recorded at the $3.04 rate.

(2) The DOD FY 1974 budget, prepared in December 1972, is based on $3.04 to the IAU. Unliquidated obligations (in excess of $150 million) will be increased by an additional 11.1% to reflect the 12 February 1973 devaluation of the dollar immediately following passage of the applicable Public Law by the Congress (House-Senate conferees have agreed on a bill), approval by the President, and notification to IMF by the U.S. Treasury.

(3) Expenditures have been, and will be, made based on the value of the dollar in the market place as of the time the expenditure is made.

(4) Expenditures are currently made at the approximate rate of $3.72 to the IAU, whereas obligations are currently recorded at the rate of $3.04 to the IAU. As current expenditures are made, a concurrent increase in the applicable recorded obligation by the 22.3% is therefore required.

The DOD FY 1974 budget request submitted to Congress in January 1974 provides for $80 million in authorizations, $60 million in total obligations authority (TOA) and $40 million in new obligation authority (NOA).

Only $5 million of the $63 million cost of dollar devaluations applicable to the U.S. share of the NATO Infrastructure Program were included in DOD FY 1973 and 1974 budget estimates. Assuming approval of DOD's request of 7 May 1973 to reprogram an additional $20.650 million into NATO Infrastructure, revised FY 1974 requirements are $105.3 million authorizations, $85.3 TOA and $59.3 NOA.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, FISCAL YEAR 1973–74

	1973	1974
AUTHORIZATION		
Carryover from PY	18.2	[1] 22.3
Authorization/President's budget	58.0	80.0
Subtotal	76.2	102.3
Fiscal year 1973 reprogram request	[1] 20.6	
Total authorization available	96.8	102.3
Obligations/requirement:		
Estimated obligations fiscal year 1973	74.5	
President's budget		60.0
Fiscal year 1973 cost Feb. 12, 1973, devaluation		[1] 20.6
Subtotal		80.6
Fiscal year 1974 cost Feb. 12, 1973, devaluation		8.0
Fiscal year 1973 projects deferred to fiscal year 1974		12.0
Fiscal year 1974 cost, difference Feb. 12, 1973, dollars versus current dollars		[2] 7.0
Subtotal, added requirement		27.0
Total obligations/requirement	74.5	[2] 107.6
Available for carryover/shortage	[1] 22.3	[3] —5.3
Added authorization requirement (including $20,000,000 carryover)	0	[2] 25.3
FUNDING		
Carryover from PY	14.2	1.7
NOA/President's budget	38.0	40.0
Recoupments	24.0	26.0
Subtotal	76.2	67.7
Fiscal year 1973 reprogram request	(4)	[1] 20.6
Total funds available	[4] 76.2	88.3
Obligations/requirement (as above)	74.5	[2] 107.6
Available for carryover/shortage	[4] 1.7	—19.3
Added fund requirement		19.3

[1] Approval of the Chairmen, HAC and SAC was requested by letter May 7, 1973, to reprogram $20,650,000 from Safeguard to NATO infrastructure to partially cover fiscal year 1973 cost ($23,000,000) of Feb. 12, 1973, dollar devaluation. Concurrently, chairmen, HASC and SASC were advised that SecDef intended to utilize the provisions of sec. 703 to provide a like amount of additional authorization for Infrastructure. As of July 25, 1973 neither HASC or SASC has expressed disapproval; HAC has approved reprograming of funds but SAC has not yet acted. Accordingly, this table reflects the requested $20,650,000,000 additional authorization as available in fiscal year 1973 and assumes early fiscal year 1974 SAC approval to fund reprograming. Failure to obtain approval of fiscal year 1973 funds reprograming will increase fiscal year 1974 requirement for TOA and NOA by $20,650,000,000 above requirements shown hereon.

[2] Assumes that the average market value of the fiscal year 1974 dollar will approximate the value of current dollars (i.e. approximately 10 percent below the Feb. 12, 1973, official rate). Fiscal year 1974 expenditures are estimated as $70,000,000,000 at the Feb. 12, 1973 official rate. Table reflects additional fiscal year 1974 cost of $7,000,000 (10 percent of $70,000,000,000) to cover the difference between the official Feb. 12, 1973 dollar value versus the current market value.

[3] A carryover of unobligated authorization to the ensuing fiscal year is required to permit the United States to continue participation in NATO, pending enactment of the ensuing years military construction authorization. This table provides for a carryover into fiscal year 1975 of $20,000,000 unused authorization (approximately 25 to 30 percent of estimated total fiscal year 1975 authorization requirement, based on current market value of the dollar).

[4] Excludes requested $20,650,000,000 fiscal year 1973 reprograming (see footnote 1). Although the $20,650,000 has been apportioned to DOD by OMB (and will therefore be shown as available as of June 30, 1973, on DOD status of funds report), obligations can not be incurred until and unless reprograming is approved by Chairman SAC.

Statement by Mr. J. T. Loveland, U.S. Mission NATO

Fiscal Year 1974 Infrastructure Hearings

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before your Committee to support the proposals of the Department of Defense for an authorization of $80 million and an appropriation of $40 million for Fiscal Year 1974 as the U.S. share of the common funded NATO Infrastructure Program. Since fiscal year 1968, the U.S. contribution to the NATO Infrastructure Program has been funded under Authorizations and Appropriations for Military Construction Army. This program provides the facilities necessary to support NATO military forces and which are intended for common use or have a high degree of common interest. The term covers such varied items as air fields, air defense facilities, communications, missile sites, war headquarters, nuclear storage sites, pipelines, and POL depots. It does not normally cover general purpose depots, troop billets, and other logistics support facilities closely related to national standards and practices, although a one-

time exception has been made to fund such facilities from this program as reimbursement for certain of the U.S. costs for relocation from France. I will discuss this in more detail later.

The NATO commonly funded Infrastructure Program was inaugurated by the North Atlantic Council in 1951 as a follow-on to a similar program begun in 1950 by the Western European Union countries. The NATO Infrastructure program has been a most successful common endeavor, and has been credited with fostering a large part of the cohesion among the Allies. Essential military facilities costing about $3.4 billion have been completed, and facilities worth another $1.0 billion are under construction or programed. The program has given NATO a network of modern airfields, an efficient system of POL distribution and storage, common communications without which the NATO command structure could not function, essential air defense warning installations, and air and naval nagivational aids. By jointly financing these and other types of facilities designed to enhance the effectiveness of NATO forces, NATO nations have demonstrated in a most realistic way their determination to provide for the common defense.

Now that the program has provided most of the basic facilities required in the common defense, its character is gradually changing. The requirement for major air and naval installations has given way to the new requirement for modernization and expansion of existing basic facilities. Airfields must be improved so that they can support today's more complex aircraft. The POL system should be modified to ensure its ability to function in an emergency independently of that part of the system located in France. Progress in communications technology has resulted in dramatic changes. The NATO Satellite Communications system (SATCOM) is based on the U.S. interim defense communication satellite system. Replacement satellites (SATCOM Phase III) are programmed and funded for launch in 1975. Another example is the semi-automation and integration of NATO's early warning system to provide a control and reporting system for the air defense of Allied Command Europe. Finally, in order to make the program fully responsive to the needs of the NATO "flexible response" strategy and associated force planning, we are providing facilities to support reinforcement on the flanks, improved air defense, and conventional capabilities for NATO air forces.

The new orientation of the program is providing a large proportion of the facilities needed by U.S. forces. In particular, it supports controlled humidity storage which maintains in good condition equipment of our dual-based forces. The program also includes aircraft survival measures which were implemented by the U.S. Air Force, with the approval of Congress, on a "pre-financed" basis in order to ensure early construction.

The 1973 NATO program includes a second phase of the air weapons training facility in the Mediterranean which replaces the facility lost in Libya. It also contains vital facilities for the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean.

We have previously announced that we had made great strides in maximizing U.S. benefits from the program. The major single benefit has come from our success in persuading our Allies to share up to about $100 million of our costs in relocating our forces from France. In effect, the Defense Planning Committee (the North Atlantic Council less France) agreed in 1969 to cost-share, under certain conditions, up to that amount if our military services can provide and justify sufficient fund requests. As reported to you previously, NATO has agreed to continue the agreement thru end of calendar year 1973 by providing funds "a priori". This permits us to use NATO money to implement construction rather than spend U.S. funds which have to be recouped after projects are completed. NATO's final installment has now been made available in Slice XXIII and U.S. services are using this money as fast as possible.

In response to U.S. requirements, NATO has agreed to automatic deletion procedures to reduce or avoid future backlogs of Infrastructure projects. These procedures apply to Slice XXI, approved in 1971, and subsequent annual slice programs. We have told you that similar procedures are being developed for application to Slices XX and prior. In fact, we expect within two or three years, to have virtually closed out all slice programs prior to Slice XXI. In this connection we have made major strides this year. Some urgency in these efforts has resulted because inflation in Europe has rendered available infrastructure funds insufficient to pay for all of the projects programmed in early years. Our Allies have endorsed the U.S. position that new funds will not be added to old Infrastructure slice programs. Thus, projects must compete for available programmed funds within each slice, or drop out of the program when funds allocated for that slice are gone.

In 1970 the NATO Defense Planning Committee approved the financing of a five-year Infrastructure program for the years 1970–1974 (Slices XXI through XXV), and agreed that the ceiling be set at $700 million (though the U.S. and some other countries believed it should be $840 million). The agreement provided that NATO Military Commanders would program those urgent military requirements which could be accomplished within the ceiling and report back the financial condition after programming of Slice XXIV in 1973. The ceiling of $700 million included relocation costs from France for U.S. and Canadian forces. The cost sharing formula (U.S. share 29.67 percent) remains unchanged, but the recent devaluations of the dollar will result in a higher U.S. dollar cost.

There are two factors which serve to reduce our share of this total amount of money used in the Infrastructure Program. First, in 1970, the Euro-Group (NATO less France, Portugal, U.S., Iceland, and Canada) offered an additional $420 million (closer to $450 million in devalued dollars) over a five year period to the Infrastructure Program as part of the European Defense Improvement Program (EDIP) to permit urgent implementation of the NATO aircraft shelter program. This permitted early recoupment of U.S. prefinancing funds spent on this program and relieved the pressure on programmed Infrastructure money to allow funding of additional NATO Integrated Communications System (NICS) projects. When the EDIP contribution is considered, the effective U.S. share reduces to approximately 18–20 percent.

The second factor is that host nations provide the land, access roads, and utility connections for each NATO Infrastructure project. These host nation contributions are estimated to average about 13 percent of costs paid by NATO common funding. If these costs were added to the total, the U.S. contribution would drop another 3 to 4 percent.

We have also taken steps to maximize U.S. industrial participation in the Infrastructure program. During our negotiations concerning the NATO Integrated Communications System (NICS), when our Allies insisted on a sharing of the production, we insisted on modifying the NATO rule which allowed host nations to include taxes and customs, in their comparison of bids (even though NATO did not have to pay these levels), thus favorizing local or regional firms. The final agreement gave us satisfaction on the taxes and customs issues and guaranteed that 38 percent of the production would be carried out by U.S. contractors, with a possibility of as much as 58 percent, depending on the competitive strength of U.S. industry. Recent dollar devaluations will help maximize U.S. industry's participation. Secretary Laird also told his DPC colleagues that he expected the new policy on bid comparison to be extended to the remainder of the Infrastructure program. Negotiations are now underway and we expect success shortly.

We continue to enjoy a greater benefit from this NATO program than could be expected from the size of our contribution. If we exclude facilities which are used in common by all nations—facilities which would in any case have required common funding—we have had significant success in convincing NATO that US projects are worthwhile. In 1968 we informed you that Slice XVIII included US projects in the amount of 40 percent of all projects for use by national forces. In Slice XIX this percentage rose to 47 percent for Slice XX to 55 percent; for Slice XXI, 68 percent; for Slice XXII, 58 percent; and 59 percent for Slice XXIII. In the six annual programs, therefore, well over 50 percent of all national user projects were programmed for benefit of US forces, but our formal contribution remains at 29.7 percent of the entire program. It is apparent, therefore, that we have a distinct financial interest in the continuing success of the NATO Infrastructure Program. As long as we can fit our national programs into the available common funds, the US will benefit directly from this NATO effort. In addition, Secretary Laird proposed last December a new category of Infrastructure projects in support of "stationed forces". We are exploring with the US military authorities the best way to take advantage of such a new category. We would hope to expand it to include many of the items such as warehouses and other logistic support facilities which are now ineligible for NATO funds.

A word about the prospects for the Infrastructure Program in the remainder of this decade is in order. As a result of inflation, an insufficient initial allocation of money, the need for more sophisticated equipments, and various delays in production and construction, none of the funds approved in February 1970 for the 1970–1974 period remain for Slice XXV (1974). To prevent a hiatus in the Infrastructure program, additional funds (estimated at $180 million, of which the US share is 29.6 percent or $53 million) are required for Slice XXV to meet the most urgent military requirements. On 17 November 1972, Secretary Laird

advised the Chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees that we would support an increase in the current five year program (Slices XXI–XXV) to Slice XXV. The NATO Defense Ministers agreed to the US position at their December 1972 meeting. In addition, the Ministers agreed in principle to a continuation of the program in the period 1975–79 and instructed the NATO Military Authorities and the Defense Planning Committee to work out the details. The DPC in Permanent Session is working out necessary financial arrangements and will report back to NATO Ministers in June 1973.

I should like now to describe briefly, first, the NATO system for processing Infrastructure projects, and second, how the US Mission to NATO (USNATO) arrived at its estimate for US obligations for Infrastructure.

Each year the Major NATO Commanders draw up a list of construction or modernization projects which they consider essential for the support of their forces. These projects are reviewed by all participating nations within the NATO Military Committee, the NATO Infrastructure Committee, and finally within the Defense Planning Committee (which is the North Atlantic Council without France). The projects finally selected make up the yearly Infrastructure Program or Slice. In the US, each proposed annual slice is reviewed thoroughly within the Executive Branch, starting with the interested US subordinate military commands and continuing through the US Commander in Chief, Europe, and the Commander in Chief, Atlantic, to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Military Departments, the Department of State, and all interested offices within the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The final NATO slice is really an approved list of military construction requirements and nothing more. After slice approval, the host country in which a project is to be built takes full responsibility for the work. It must obtain the necessary land (at its own expense), plan uitlities connections and access roads (which it later builds at its own expense), prepare engineering plans and specifications, and develop cost estimates. When all is ready, the host country submits the project with all supporting data to the NATO Payments and Progrses Committee for construction authorization and fund commitment. Before agreeing, the Payments and Progress (P&P) Committee satisfies itself that the project still represents a valid military requirement, conforms to NATO criteria, is reasonable in cost, and is in other respects eligible under NATO Infrastructure rules.

When the P&P Committee authorizes construction of an Infrastructure project, the US obligates funds from its annual appropriation for its share of that project. Let me explain briefly how we estimate our costs for FY 1974. The estimate is completed largely by the USNATO staff in Brussels because it has daily contact with our Allies on Infrastructure matters. The staff is the US agency closest to the plans and progress of the various "host" countries.

Last September, USNATO made a careful review of the NATO Infrastructure project backlog—that is, of all projects included in previously approved annual slices which had not yet been authorized by the P&P Committee for actual construction. The basic records—that is, the host country semiannual reports—were checked. Information was collated for all locations by project category and by cost sharing agreement, on the amount of money already atuhorized by the P&P Committee and on the amount of money remaining to be authorized. This initial step thus provided a firm base from which to start. To this project backlog USNATO then added its estimate of the contents of the subsequent slices which would require funding during fiscal year 1974. For example, Slice XXIII was approved by NATO in February 1973, and Slice XXIV is scheduled for approval this summer. From this total of project backlog plus planned projects for fiscal year 1974, USNATO then subtracted the amount of those projects which it estimated would be given funding authorization by the P&P Committee before the beginning of FY 1974, that is, before 1 July 1973. This may be shown in tabular form as follows:

(1) As of 30 June 1972, value of projects in Slices II through XXII yet to be authorized by the NATO P&P Committee totaled $440 million.

(2) Add value of projects in Slice XXIII, approved in February 1973 $187 million.

(3) Deduct estimated P&P Committee authorizations during fiscal year 1973 $307 million.

(4) Total value of work to be funded as of 1 July 73 $320 million.

(5) To this we must add Slice XXIV, scheduled for approval in the summer of 1973 $184 million.

USNATO then applied country planning factors such as economic conditions, availability of contractor effort and pace at which Ministry of Defense construction personnel are expected to process fund requests. From this calculus, we estimate the fund requests to be approved within NATO in fiscal year 1974.

In defense of our entire request I should like to submit the following facts. In 1971, in recognition of a substantial carryover in both authorization and appropriation from fiscal year 1971, DoD requested for fiscal year 1972 only $20 million of both authorization and new obligation authority to satisfy the estimated requirement for $55 million of US obligations to the NATO Infrastructure program. Congress further cut these figures to $15 million in authorization and $14 million in appropriation. We have been able to live, precariously, within those figures only because some $30 million of US obligations for NATO communications were slipped into fiscal year 1973. That slippage constituted a mortgage against our fiscal year 1973 funds, and we find ourselves in a position where without special additional authorization, we would have to call a halt to all future NATO fund authorizations until our fiscal year 1974 authorization has been passed by Congress. Since we have already two phases of commitment against the approved projects involved, such a delay caused by unilateral US considerations would have major political repercussions. In addition, as a result of the 12 February 1973 devaluation of the dollar, an additional $23 million will be required in fiscal year 1973. When considered in terms of the two separate dollar devaluations in a period of 14 months (December 1971 and February 1973), the effect has been to increase US Infrastructure requirements by $42 million. This problem has been compounded by the increasing cost of construction in Europe, approximating the 8–10 percent annual increase in construction costs in the US. Steps are being taken to utilize authorizations contained in earlier Military Construction authorizations acts, and to reprogram available Military Construction, Army funds to meet this increased NATO Infrastructure requirement in fiscal year 1973. We urge you, therefore, not to reduce either the authorization of $80 million nor the appropriation of $40 million for fiscal year 1974.

Even with the granting of our full request we expect to be some $14 million short in new obligation authority in fiscal year 1974 because of dollar devaluation, European inflation, and certain projects which have had to slip from fiscal year 1973 because of lack of US funds.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, General. I appreciate your courtesy in coming this morning.

Admiral Marschall, will you be good enough to come around.

It is nice to see you again, sir.

TITLE II

GLYNCO, GA.

Admiral, first there are some questions with respect to the closing of the base at Glynco, Ga., that Senator Nunn asked me to submit to you, and I will submit these questions to you for the record.

Senator NUNN. In April the closing of the NAS Glynco, Ga., was announced. The training load, as I understand it, is to be distributed between the Naval Air Stations at Memphis, Tenn.; Dam Neck, Va., and Pensacola, Fla. Why were these particular installations selected?

Admiral MARSCHALL. In keeping with the aim of the Chief of Naval Training to improve training efficiency by reducing duplication of training resources, the training workload at NAS Glynco was distributed to locations where similar training is being conducted. The air traffic control training will be relocated to NAS Memphis where other air-related training is ongoing. The combat information center training will be relocated to the Fleet Combat Directions Systems Training Center, Dam Neck, where other command and control training is being conducted and the Navy flight officer training will be

moved and consolidated with the existing flight officer training at NAS Pensacola.

Senator NUNN. How much new construction requirements will be generated by this move? I know in this year's bill you are asking for $10.436 million at Dam Neck and Memphis alone. Will there be more?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir, the two projects in the fiscal year 1974 program for Dam Neck and Memphis are all that is required to facilitate the relocation from NAS Glynco.

Senator NUNN. In your justification to this committee on the closing of Glynco, you give as part of your reasoning that from fiscal year 1973 through fiscal year 1978, construction costs of $11,607,000 will be avoided. How can you consider this a savings when you are requesting almost this much for Dam Neck and Memphis this year?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The cost of $11,609,000 was not intended to portray a position of positive net savings but only a total of the construction that was planned for Glynco that will now be avoided. With further study of the realinement actions, this number has been revised to $9,109,000 of known construction avoided with an additional unknown savings to be obtained from contract closeout settlements. The total of construction required to facilitate the realinement actions, including fiscal year 1975, is $10,437,000. This is for the two projects at Dam Neck and Memphis which as you mentioned are in the fiscal year 1974 program.

Senator NUNN. During the past 5 or 6 years you have requested construction authority in excess of $10.5 million for Glynco, and about $6.9 of this was in the past 2 years. Much of this is in various stages of completion. Was there not any coordination between those responsible for construction requirements and the base closure planners?

It seems to me if there had been, some of this waste might have been avoided.

Admiral MARSCHALL. The development of the base realinement plans and the execution of the ongoing construction programs were coordinated to the extent possible. When it became known that the Naval Air Station, Glynco, was being considered for closure, no new construction contracts were awarded. For instance, the fiscal year 1973 project for modernization of the bachelor enlisted quarters, $1,213,000, was not awarded. The projects that had been awarded and were under construction could have been halted, however, this would have resulted in costly claims from the contractors for damages and delay of work. This was not considered practical since there was no assurance that NAS, Glynco, would be closed until the final approval was given. Consequently, no active contracts were altered pending approval of the Shore Establishment realinement proposals.

Senator NUNN. Just what is the status of the construction at Glynco? Will the construction underway be completed, or simply abandoned? If the latter is true, will this not result in considerable contractor claims?

Admiral MARSCHALL. With the exception of the fiscal year 1972 military construction projects which were underway, one-family housing project, and one fiscal year 1973 project which was deferred, all other authorized military construction projects had been completed prior to the realinement decision.

The dispensary/dental clinic construction contract was almost complete with no savings to be gained by termination of the contract. The

contract will be completed but no medical equipment will be installed.

The projects to construct a bachelor officers' quarters and to modernize a bachelor enlisted quarters were approximately 60 percent complete. It has been decided to close out the contracts after the construction has reached a stage where the buildings are closed in sufficiently to protect against weather damage. This will protect the Navy's existing investment. The closeout of the contracts will most probably be done by a bilateral deductive change order which should negate any contractor claims. The savings to be realized by these deductive change orders is presently indeterminate.

The family housing construction contract was basically complete with no worthwhile opportunity for savings.

Senator NUNN. There are over 300 units of family housing at Glynco, with another 130 units under construction which were authorized as late as fiscal year 1972. Will these units be completed?

Won't this move generate a need for more family housing at Dam Neck, Memphis, and Pensacola?

Admiral MARSCHALL. As mentioned, the 130 units of family housing were basically complete at the time of the shore establishment realinement decision. The only construction that remained was some street paving and the installation of some minor kitchen appliances. It was decided to complete the construction and occupy the housing units until the time of base closure.

This relocation will not generate a need for more family housing at either NAS, Memphis, or NAS, Pensacola, where surplus housing presently exists. The relocation to FCDSTC, Dam Neck, will increase the existing deficit of family housing in the Norfolk area by approximately 3½ percent.

Senator NUNN. How did you arrive at an annual savings of $9.260 million resulting from the closure of Glynco NAS?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The estimated annual savings is composed of the salaries of military and civilian positions that will be eliminated and other operating and maintenance costs that will be saved. For NAS Glynco it is estimated that 661 military and 308 civilian positions will be eliminated. This results in an estimated savings of $5,571,000 of military pay and $3,689,000 of civilian pay and other O. & M.N. costs. This data is based upon the number of personnel on board as of June 30, 1972.

Senator NUNN. I notice that you claim there will be a savings of 661 military personnel. Is it not true that these personnel will simply be transferred elsewhere, and are not an actual reduction in personnel or personnel costs?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The 661 military personnel represent positions that are actually being eliminated and not transferred elsewhere. A total of 1,828 other military positions are being transferred.

Senator NUNN. If NAS Glynco had to be closed, could not this training be moved to some bases where existing facilities could be used, thus avoiding expensive new construction?

Admiral MARSCHALL. As I mentioned earlier, in order to improve training effectiveness and avoid the needless duplication of training resources, every effort is being made to consolidate similar kinds of training at one location. In this case, the advantages of relocating training facilities to other activities where similar training is on going

outweighed the consideration of availability of existing facilities. As it turned out, however, the relocation of the naval flight officer training to NAS Pensacola will be accommodated by existing facilities at Pensacola and new facilities are required only at Dam Neck and Memphis.

Senator SYMINGTON. Have you a statement that you would like to make?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you be good enough, because of the time aspect, to supply it for the record?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I will supply it for the record.

[Statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE COMMANDER, NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND, REAR ADM. A. R. MARSCHALL, CEC, USN

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: I am Rear Admiral A. R. Marschall, commander of the naval facilities engineering command. I consider it an honor and privilege to present the Navy's fiscal year 1974 military construction authorization program.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

The original new authorization request has 630.1 million dollars. This was revised by our letter of July 17, 1973 to 626.8 million dollars with the difference being made up by the addition of three amendments to prior authorization.

PRESENTATION OF REQUIREMENTS

I will depart from the procedure used in presenting the program for the last couple of years. The comparative analyses by categories of facilities and naval districts are included at the end of my statement for insertion into the record, if desired. I would like to comment on the important elements of this program and relate these elements to other Navy budgets examined by members of the committee.

I will discuss military construction projects associated with:
Strategic force (which is primarily Trident);
An all-volunteer force;
Major weapons systems;
Pollution abatement;
New technology; and
Training facilities.

STRATEGIC FORCES

Under Strategic Forces approximately 19 percent of this year's program or 118.3 million dollars has been allocated to initiate construction of a Trident refit complex and facilities for flight testing the Trident missile. The facilities requested this year are essential for meeting the initial operational capability date of late calendar year 1978 for this weapons system.

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

Projects that will assist the Navy in achieving an all-volunteer force are projects in the categories of bachelor housing, community support facilities (which are clubs, exchanges, commissary stores, and recreational facilities), medical facilities, and cold iron facilities. Cold iron facilities are shoreside utilities which enable a ship in port to shut down its boiler plant and electrical generation equipment. Projects associated with an all-volunteer force constitute 29 percent of the program.

BACHELOR HOUSING

Taking each of the programs related to an all-volunteer force in order, this year's bachelor housing program requests 80 million dollars for providing bachelor housing. The emphasis placed on bachelor housing the last couple of years still exists, with bachelor housing constituting 13 percent of this year's program.

This year's program will provide 5,378 new spaces for the Navy and 3,990 new spaces for the Marine Corps. For the Navy the program will also provide 103 new bachelor officer spaces and the modernization of 2,719 bachelor enlisted and 126 bachelor officer spaces.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT FACILITIES

Community support facilities—Navy exchanges, commissaries, and clubs—provide some benefits traditional with service life. Facilities for recreation and welfare are necessary to provide stimulating leisure activities for Navy personnel comparable to those of their civilian contemporaries. These facilities have received a minimum of authorization the last several years. The request for community support facilities is 12 million dollars, or 2 percent of this year's request.

MEDICAL PROGRAM

The medical program requested this year represents a significant increase over the program authorized last year. It has long been recognized that one of the major benefits of military service is complete medical care. There is a recognition within the Defense Department of a serious need to upgrade medical facilities so that the delivery of medical care will be improved. The quality of medical care has always remained high, but the delivery of medical care has left something to be desired for the last several years. Some of the inefficiencies in our preesnt health care system stem from the inadequate facilities in which many of our physicians and dentists are required to practice their profession. Medical facilities that are undesirable from a professional standpoint have an adverse effect on medical officer retention. This year's program of 65.3 million dollars is 10.4 percent of the program.

COLD IRON PROGRAM

The cold iron program is directed toward reducing watch standing requirements when a ship is in port and thereby maximizing the amount of time a ship's personnel may spend with their families. The proviison of utilities from the shore also provides benefits in shipboard equipment maintenance and fleet readiness. Last year 23 million dollars was authorized for fourteen projects. This year's program requests 26 million dollars for six pier and berthing wharf utilities projects, one berthing pier project, and one project for expansion of a steam distribution system.

MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Requested for major weapons systems this year is 8 million dollars, excluding Trident. The major weapons systems supported by projects in this year's program are the F–14 supersonic jet carrier based fighter aircraft, the A–7E attack aircraft, and the Mark 48 torpedo. This year's request for major weapons systems is slightly less than the 11 million dollars authorized last year. This element is significantly larger than last year when Trident faciilties are included.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

This year's request for 92.3 million dollars continues an aggressive program initiated by the Navy in 1968 to abate air and water pollution at naval and Marine Corps installations. The Congress has given strong support to our requests and authorized, through FY 1973, 204 million dollars for pollution abatement facilities. The breakdown between air and water pollution abatement facilities is 53 and 151 million dollars, respectively. One unique facility this year is the provision of a facility to dispose of unserviceable ammunition that may no longer be disposed of by deep water dumping.

In looking ahead, we expect over the next few years to construct additional facilities to transfer ship wastes ashore. Based on technology now in the research and development stage, facilities will be required to control smoke and gases from jet engine test cells. Additional air, water, and for the first time noise pollution control facilities will be required to meet standards now being established under the "best practicable" and "best available" technology requirements of federal pollution control acts. In summary, we have made considerable progress with our pollution abatement programs, but we also expect a significant pollution abatement program for the next several years.

NEW TECHNOLOGY

For the element new technology, this year's program requests 23 million dollars for research, development, test, and evaluation facilities associated with underwater acoustic surveillance, communications, manned underwater systems, and coastal region warfare. This excludes 4 million dollars of RDT&E facilities associated with the Trident missile, since all Trident facilities are included under the strategic forces element. The request for new technology facilities is 4 percent of the total program request.

TRAINING FACILITIES

The Navy operates one of the largest school systems in the country. Since trained personnel are the Navy's greatest asset, the Navy is actively seeking ways to strengthen, modernize, and vitalize its training programs. Eight percent of this year's program is devoted to Naval and Marine Corps training facilities with the majority of the training program directed toward applied instruction facilities.

In the field of academic training, facilities are requested for conducting tactical command and direction systems training at two installations. At the Naval Academy the construction proposed will modernize, in consonance with the master plan, an existing building to provide classrooms, laboratories, and simulation training spaces for weapons and systems engineering courses.

SUMMARY

This year's program provides facilities for those elements with the greatest need. The projects are required this year to satisfy new and current missions and to provide facilities to modernize the shore establishment. We appreciate the past support of the committee and earnestly seek it for this year's program.

Next, with the committee's concurrence, I'll proceed with a brief description of the program modifications requested by our letter of July 17, 1973.

[A summary of the changes follows:]

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation/project	From	To	Change
NEW AUTHORIZATION, TITLE II (INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)			
1st Naval District:			
Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H.: Additional crane rail system	0	2,817	2,817
6th Naval District:			
Naval Hospital, Orlando, Fla.: Hospital replacement	22,312	20,981	1,331
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Fla.: Systems development and test facility	2,100	2,300	200
Naval Aerospace Regional Medical Center, Pensacola, Fla.: Medical/dental support facilities	0	1,084	1,084
11th Naval District:			
Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.: Applied instruction building	1,123	1,542	419
12th Naval District:			
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, Calif.: Operational trainer building addition	0	430	430
Various locations (inside the United States), Trident facilities: Trident support complex and flight test facilities (phase I)	125,223	118,320	(6,903)
Net, title II new authorization changes	150,758	147,474	(3,284)

	Authorization cost	Current working estimate	Change
AMENDMENTS TO PRIOR AUTHORIZATION			
Fiscal year 1971 authorization law:			
Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va.: Sewage treatment system	530	779	249
Fiscal year 1972 authorization law:			
Naval Air Station, Meridian, Miss.: Installation total [1]	3,266	3,895	593
Fiscal year 1973 authorization law:			
Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.: Bomb-loading plant modernization	5,946	8,388	2,442
Total amendment changes	9,742	13,026	3,284

[1] An amendment is needed primarily because of the escalation of the bachelor enlisted quarters (BEQ) project. Since there is a more urgent requirement for the bachelor enlisted quarters than the enlisted men's (EM) club, it was decided to proceed with the bachelor enlisted quarters construction and defer enlisted men's club construction until enactment of the fiscal year 1974 authorization and appropriation laws.

A book containing the program modifications has been provided for each member of the committee. By the change requested, two projects will be reduced. The projects are the hospital replacement project at the naval hospital, Orlando, Florida and the various locations, Trident facilities project.

A recent reevaluation of bed requirements at the naval hospital, Orlando, reveals that the number of beds may be reduced from 310 to 235. This reduction is feasible by the removal of the fifth floor of the hospital and will result in a cost reduction of $1,331,000.

For the Trident facilities project, a reduction of $6,903,000 is feasible because land acquisition requirements are smaller than were originally anticipated.

An equal dollar substitution was made for these reductions by increasing the scope and cost of two FY 1974 projects, the addition of three other projects and a request for appropriations for amendments to three prior year projects. I am prepared to provide a short description of each new or changed project or I can place in the record a short description of each new or changed project.

A new project for an additional crane rail system in the amount of 2 million 817 thousand dollars is requested at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. This project will provide a 20-foot gauge crane rail system to permit the use of portal cranes being transferred from the Boston Naval Shipyard.

A hospital replacement project at the naval hospital, Orlando, in the amount of 20 million 981 thousand dollars is requested. I discussed this previously under the reductions. The hospital replacement project of 235 beds is needed to replace an existing facility which is structurally and functionally inadequate, with open bay wards and unreliable utilities.

A 200 thousand dollar increase was requested for the systems development and test facility at the naval coastal systems laboratory, Panama City, Florida. This increase was requested to provide a parking and testing apron for conducting Navy trials on two air cushion amphibious landing craft. This is a new requirement levied on this activity and the total cost for the project is 2 millon 300 thousand dollars.

Another new project in the amount of 1 million 84 thousand dollars is requested for medical and dental support facilities at the naval aerospace regional medical center, Pensacola, Florida. This project will construct a new dental clinic and modernize the existing dispensary at the naval communications training center (Corry Field), Pensacola. These facilities will be utilized for active duty dispensary and dental service and allow the vacated spaces in the naval hospital, Pensacola to be used for a newly developed family practice residency program.

For the applied instruction buildings project at the Naval Air Station, Miramar, an increase in the cost of $419,000 was requested. This change alters the original project to provide additions to two buildings and alterations to three buildings instead of the construction of a new facility. This project is required to support the relocation of airborne early warning squadrons from the naval air station, North Island, under the shore establishment realignment program. The revised cost of the project is 1 million 542 thousand dollars.

A new project for 430 thousand dollars was requested for an operational trainer building addition at the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California. This facility addition will house two P–3C operational flight trainers. The trainers, which are on order, will be able to provide for the first time coupled-mode training by simulation instead of the more costly and hazardous in-flight training.

TRIDENT FACILITIES—UNITED STATES

For Trident facilities the original program requested 125 million 223 thousand dollars for establishment of the Trident weapons system support facilities.

Under the program change, the project was reduced by 6 million 903 thousand dollars. A more detailed land use study identified smaller land acquisition requirements than were originally anticipated. The estimated cost for the land is 5 million dollars.

Under the various locations, Trident facilities project we are, therefore, requesting at two sites 118 million 320 thousand dollars for Trident facilities construction.

SUPPORT COMPLEX FACILITIES—BANGOR, WASH.

Within the total are facilities at the Trident support site, Bangor, Washington, with an estimated cost of 83 million dollars. One requirement at Bangor is the acquisition of at most 150 acres of land to assure that the necessary explosive safety zone arcs are within government owned land. This year's project includes a covered explosive handling pier which is essential to the deployment of the weapons system and a refit pier to provide logical sequencing of construction. A weapon/navigation training building is included to permit early crew training by naval personnel at naval facilities. This will enable the navy to eliminate the more costly contractor factory crew training for all crews except those of the lead ship. The other facilities requested will initiate road and utilities construction required to assure timely utilization of Trident support facilities.

MISSILE FLIGHT TEST FACILITIES

At the Air Force Eastern Test Range, Cape Kennedy, Florida, we are requesting 35 million dollars for missile flight test facilities. The facilities to be provided are a wharf and dredging, alterations to a launch complex, missile checkout buildings, guidance and telemetry building and a lifting device proofing building. These facilities will support an initial flight test of the Trident I missile in late calendar year 1975.

AMENDMENTS

The remaining changes are for three amendments to prior year programs.

Under Public Law 91–511 (FY 1971) a 249 thousand dollar amendment is required for the sewage treatment system project at the Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Virginia. This amendment is required to correct a failure which was caused by unforeseen subsurface soil conditions in the dike of the finishing pond. Although the amendment is 47 percent of the original authorization, this type of change of this magnitude will occur occasionally even with the best design and engineering practices.

A 593 thousand dollar amendment is required for the installation total of the Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi under Public Law 92–145 (FY 1972). The amendment is required to permit award of the enlisted men's club project authorized at 714 thousand dollars. The FY 1972 bachelor enlisted quarters project generated the need for the amendment. Since the relative need is greatest for the bachelor enlisted quarters, a decision was made to proceed with the bachelor enlisted quarters, and to defer the enlisted men's club project and seek an amendment this year. The amendment which is 18 percent of the authorization total for the installation resulted from unanticipated labor and material cost increases.

For FY 1973, Public Law 92-545, an amendment of 2 million 442 thousand dollars is requested for the bomb loading plant modernization project at the Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Oklahoma. This amendment, which is 47 percent of the original authorization, is required to provide construction in accordance with new safety criteria promulgated by the Armed Services Explosive Safety Board for Structures Housing the Manufacture and/or Handling of Explosives.

PROJECT REQUIREMENT CHANGES

In addition to the above program changes, there are several projects with changes in the requirement or in the need for the project. I'll provide a brief explanation of the change for each of these projects.

PHILADELPHIA NAVAL SHIPYARD, PA.

At the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, the requirement for the electronics equipment facility project with a cost of $735,000 was generated by the closure of the Boston Naval Shipyard and the need to perform the restoration and refit of selected electronics components for all East Coast Naval Shipyards at some other location. A recent check of the electromagnetic environment and the underwater noise level at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard disclosed that the background levels are not suitable for this facility and that it will be necessary to relocate the project to the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD, VALLEJO, CALIF.

The electronic shop alterations project at $200,000 was requested at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard to provide facilities to accommodate the expanded workload created by the planned closure of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. A recent evaluation of the workload to be relocated disclosed that new facilities would not be required, therefore this project may be deleted from this year's program.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS INSIDE THE U.S. WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

Under the water pollution abatement facilities project, a reduction may be made in the scope and cost of the municipal sewer connection facility at the Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii. A recent examination of this project disclosed that a need exists this year to connect only the housing areas to the sewage system. The design and construction of the new city/county treatment plant has been delayed so that it will be practical to place the major portion of this project in the FY 1975 military construction program. This will permit a reduction in the family cost of $5,868,000 and leave a balance of $550,000 for connecting the housing areas.

AMENDMENTS, NAVAL ORDNANCE LABORATORY, WHITE OAK, MD.

A $448,000 amendment was requested to the FY 1967 program, Public Law 89-568, for the hypervelocity wind tunnel project at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland. A recent evaluation of the project discloses that the amendment is no longer required.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement on program modifications. With your permission, we would like to have General Jannell present his statement, and then respond to questions of the committee.

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTS OF FISCAL YEAR 1974 AND FISCAL YEAR 1973 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS (AUTHORIZATION)

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Fiscal year 1974 request	Percent	Fiscal year 1973 authorization	Percent	Percent change
Strategic Forces:					
Trident [1]	$118,320	18.9			
Other	177				
Subtotal, Strategic Forces	118,497	18.9			+18.9
All-Volunteer Force:					
Bachelor housing [2]	79,880	12.7	$112,233	21.8	
Community support facilities [3]	12,307	2.0	13,973	2.7	
Medical facilities	65,028	10.4	42,440	8.2	
Cold-iron facilities	25,873	4.1	23,471	4.6	
Subtotal, All-Volunteer Force	183,088	29.2	192,117	37.3	−8.1
Major weapons systems:					
F–14 fighter aircraft	3,386	.5	726	.1	
A–7E attack aircraft	1,933	.3			
S–3A antisubmarine warfare aircraft			4,136	.8	
K 48 torpedo	1,327	.2	1,064	.2	
SSN 688 nuclear attack submarine			5,032	1.0	
Airborne mine countermeasures	1,321	.2			
Subtotal, major weapons systems	7,967	1.3	10,958	2.1	−.8
Pollution abatement:					
Air	27,636	4.4	24,194	4.7	
Water	64,675	10.3	51,216	9.9	
Subtotal, pollution abatement	92,311	14.7	75,410	14.6	+.1
New technology: [4]					
Research development					
Test and evaluation facilities					
Acoustic surveillance	4,340	.7			
Communication systems	4,198	.7	140		
Manned underwater systems	7,735	1.2	4,500	.9	
Coastal region warfare	2,300	.4	500	.1	
Aircraft			4,033	.8	
Other	4,655	.7	2,695	.5	
Subtotal, new technology	23,228	3.7	11,868	2.3	+1.4
Training facilities:					
Academic instruction	6,024	1.0	17,792	3.4	
Applied instruction:					
Aviation	16,271	2.6	16,008	3.1	
Ships	16,018	2.6	6,008	1.2	
Ordnance	2,470	.4			
Electronic warfare	3,982	.6	4,998	1.0	
Marine Corps	2,992	.5			
Operational trainer facilities, aviation	3,803	.6			
Other training facilities, Marine Corps	544	.1			
Subtotal, training facilities	52,104	8.3	44,816	8.7	−.4
Subtotal, above elements	477,195	76.1	335,169	65.0	+11.1
Other operational and logistic support facilities	149,647	23.9	180,498	35.0	−11.1
Total, new authority	626,842	100.0	515,667	100.0	

[1] Excludes $10,800,000 of planning and design funds.
[2] Excludes Naval Home, $9,444,000.
[3] Excludes employees parking structure, NAS, New Orleans, $2,323,000.
[4] Excludes R.D.T. & E. facilities for Trident and amendments, $6,239,000.

AUTHORIZATION SUMMARY BY NAVAL DISTRICT

[In thousands of dollars]

Naval district	Fiscal year— 1974	1973
Inside the United States:		
1st Naval district	3,184	21,340
3d Naval District	12,695	8,375
4th Naval District	1,130	4,388
Naval District, Washington, D.C.	25,043	15,000
5th Naval District	50,358	22,426
6th Naval District	85,643	77,791
8th Naval District	23,181	19,068
9th Naval District	19,908	5,255
11th Naval District	42,632	42,789
12th Naval District	23,001	40,225
13th Naval District	11,073	16,537
14th Naval District	15,694	19,484
Marine Corps	58,000	101,462
Various locations:		
Trident facilities	118,320	0
Pollution abatement:		
Air	27,636	25,194
Water	60,680	55,016
Total inside the United States	578,178	474,450
Outside the United States:		
10th Naval District	4,096	3,221
15th Naval District	0	5,699
Atlantic Ocean area	17,478	0
European area	8,192	15,188
Indian Ocean area	0	6,100
Pacific Ocean area	14,903	9,809
Various locations (pollution abatement):		
Air	0	0
Water	3,995	1,200
Total outside the United States	48,664	41,217
Classified programs	0	0
General support programs	626,842	515,667

FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—AUTHORIZATION SUMMARY, BY FACILITIES CATEGORIES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Description	Fiscal year 1974 authorization request				Fiscal year 1973 authorization			
	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Percent	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Percent
Operational	$71,938	$333	$72,271	11.5	$49,319	$2,983	$52,302	10.2
Training	48,568	3,536	52,104	8.3	42,993	0	42,993	8.3
Maintenance production	120,460	3,317	123,777	19.8	49,921	10,210	60,131	11.7
R.D.T. & E	27,033	0	27,033	4.3	7,368	0	7,368	1.4
Supply	1,299	747	2,046	.3	7,578	1,778	9,356	1.8
Medical	61,203	3,825	65,028	10.4	41,180	1,260	42,440	8.2
Administrative	12,439	5,204	17,643	2.8	5,085	1,122	6,207	1.2
Housing and community	76,418	27,536	103,954	16.6	81,169	41,093	122,262	23.7
Housing	(63,893)	(25,431)	(89,324)	(14.3)	(72,045)	(40,188)	(122,233)	(21.7)
Comm. supp	(12,525)	(2,105)	(14,630)	(2.3)	(9,124)	(905)	(10,029)	(2.0)
Utilities	53,729	9,711	63,440	10.1	37,480	2,637	40,117	7.8
Pollution abatement	[1] 92,311		92,311	14.7	[2] 81,410		81,410	15.8
Air	(27,636)		(27,636)	(4.4)	(25,194)		(25,194)	(4.9)
Water	(64,675)		(64,675)	(10.3)	(56,216)		(56,216)	(10.9)
Real estate	3,444	3,791	7,235	1.2	10,702	40,379	51,081	9.1
Total	568,842	58,000	626,842	100.0	414,205	101,462	515,667	100.0

[1] Includes $7,080,000 pollution abatement for the Marine Corps.
[2] Includes $5,484,000 pollution abatement for the Marine Corps.

Note: Figures in parentheses do not add.

Narrative Category Analysis Authorization

OPERATIONAL FACILITIES, $72,271,000

This category represents 11.5 percent of the authorization request. It contains projects for essential aviation, communications, and waterfront operational facilities. Included are three Marine Corps projects that will provide airfield approach lighting, aircraft corrosion control facilities, and a telephone cable. Major Navy airfield projects include a runway and taxiway overlay at Naval Station, Adak, Alaska; a taxiway overlay at Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California; and an aircraft parking apron at Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece. Included in the communications area are: a satellite communications terminal at the Naval Communication Station, Wahiawa, Hawaii which will expand the existing capacity to allow for additional Communications Satellite equipment; and a communication facility with a classified mission at Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina. Other operational facilities include berthing piers at Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, and Naval Station, San Diego, California, and a wharf and dredging facilities for the TRIDENT project. Two projects will provide modernization of VLF antennas at Naval Communication Stations, Cheltenham, Maryland, and Wahiawa, Hawaii.

TRAINING FACILITIES, $52,104,000

Training facilities included in this construction program cover a wide range of naval training activities for officer and enlisted personnel. The majority of the training program will provide applied instruction facilities; in the aviation field major projects include new flight simulators to be provided at the Naval Air Stations, Memphis, Tennessee, and Miramar, California. These new flight simulators with 6 degrees of freedom and visual motion integration will enable some of the flight hours of the jet pilot training syllabus to be transferred to the simulators with a resultant increase in safety. In addition, an applied instruction building will be provided at the Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, and an aircraft systems training buildings project will be provided at Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia.

For Shipboard personnel the training program will provide facilities for: (1) annual training of about 3,000 technicians and operating personnel who will be deployed aboard nuclear powered vessels; (2) facilities for expanding by 350 students annually the training facilities available for basic electricity and electronics training, which is a prerequisite course for training in 17 percent of the Navy rates; (3) machinist mate and boilerman training on the high pressure (1,200 PSI) propulsion plants going into the newer fleet ships. Specific major applied instruction facilities to be provided include an applied SONAR instruction building at Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia; a nuclear power training building and a basic electricity and electronics training building at Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida; and a machinist/boilerman instruction building at Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, and applied instruction buildings at Marine Corps Base, Twenty-Nine Palms, California.

In the ordnance area a training building at the Nuclear Weapons Training Group, Norfolk, Virginia, is requested to provide facilities for nuclear weapons orientation training annually of 3,800 officer and enlisted personnel of the Atlantic Fleet. In the electronic warfare area, an electronics warfare training building at Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, is requested for conducting annually advanced training for 700 electronic warfare technicians, 150 naval flight officers and electronic warfare officers, and 400 aviation electronic warfare equipment maintenance specialists. Electronic warfare is the reception of electronic signals to identify and locate enemy weapon systems; the transmission of electronic signals to decoy, deceive, or make ineffective enemy electronically controlled weapons; and the development of countermeasures, including tactics to defeat enemy measures to counter our electronically controlled weapon systems. There is a serious shortage of personnel with electronic warfare training, which makes this project very important to the Navy.

The second major area of training facilities is the academic instruction facilities. Included under this heading are the Maury Hall Rehabilitation project at Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, and the academic instruction building at Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, San Diego, California. The Marine Corps also has a project to provide combat training ranges at Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California. The training category represents 8.3 percent of the authorization request.

MAINTENANCE AND PRODUCTION, $123,777,000

The maintenance and production category represents 19.8 percent of the authorization request. The projects will provide support to aircraft-oriented engine and avionics maintenance activities, mine assembly and torpedo overhaul shops, as well as shops to support maintenance of station facilities. The major portion of this category is for the refit facilities of the TRIDENT submarine weapons system. Two shipyard modernization projects will provide a service group building at Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, and a machine shop at Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, Naval Air Rework Facilities projects are the avionics building environmental control at Naval Air Station, Alameda, California; an aircraft final finish facility at Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida; and the maintenance hangar addition at Naval Air Station, North Island, California. Other projects include the integrated avionics shop at Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California; the mine assembly shop at Naval Magazine, Guam; the torpedo overhaul shop at Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia; the air/underwater weapons compound at Naval Air Station, Bermuda; a helicopter maintenance facility at Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida; and five Marine Corps projects which will provide a hangar addition, automotive shops, a parachute and survival equipment shop, an avionics shop, and a hangar modification.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, $27,033,000

These projects represent an investment in our future security. This segment of our construction request, representing 4.3 percent of the total request, will provide the buildings, laboratories, and specialized test structures that are required in the conduct of a quality research and development program. The major laboratory projects are the electronics development and test laboratory at Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, California, and Phase II of the environmental health effects laboratory at Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland. The electronics development and test laboratory at San Diego is needed for effective development and "try-before-buy" performance testing of electronic command control, communications, and surveillance systems for the new guided missile frigates, destroyers, amphibious assault ships, and TRIDENT submarine. In the field of manned underwater systems, this year's program requests facilities to perform experimentation with animals to a 3,300 foot depth so that operational human diving depths may be lowered from 1,500 feet to 2,000 feet and beyond. The environmental health effects laboratory at the Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, will provide the facility for this experimentation. The laboratory will also provide facilities for personnel engaged in seeking a solution to medical problems associated with the inhalation of toxic vapors and the absorption of toxic compounds in weapon systems atmospheres. The toxic vapors or compounds are those associated with existing processes such as fueling missiles and torpedoes of the Polaris/Poseidon submarine fleet.

A facility for testing and evaluating airborne electronic equipment and systems is requested for the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland.

To advance basic research in underwater surveillance, an acoustic research facility has been requested for the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C. Undersea surveillance research has the objective of increasing the Navy's capability for acoustic surveillance of submarines. This research is directed toward techniques utilizing large, high power, low frequency acoustic energy sources and large receiver arrays. The basic research findings of the Naval Research Laboratory will be used by personnel of the New London Laboratory of the Naval Underwater Systems Center. The new engineering building requested at New London is needed for personnel engaged in the research and development of sonar systems and improved, underwater acoustic sensors for anti-submarine warfare ships. Sonar, which is an acronym for sound, navigation, and ranging, is the underwater equivalent of radar. The development of prototypes of acoustic energy transmitting and receiving (transducer) components will also be per-

formed in the engineering building. A transducer is a device for converting electric energy into sound (projector) or sound into electricity (receiver or hydrophone). Some sonars use the same transducer for generating and receiving sound. Other RDT&E to be performed in the engineering building is in the fields of the generation of spurious signals and electromagnetic silencing of jamming systems. The acoustic RDT&E to be performed in both facilities should find direct application in the TRIDENT weapon system.

At the Navy Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, an experimental diving facility is requested that will utilize the results of the basic research completed at the environmental health effects laboratory in testing and evaluating diving schedules, excursion diving, crew training, and underwater salvage operations. The experimental diving facility is a logical adjunct to the ocean simulation facility authorized in FY 1969 to provide a facility for development, test, and evaluation of the man/equipment interface in and on excursions from manned diving systems to depths of 2,200 feet.

In the coastal region warefare field, a systems development and test facility is requested for coastal technology and amphibious operations research: such as the development and testing of vehicles, sensors, and other equipment utilized in riverine operations and inshore underseas warfare; and research, development, and support of Marine Corps investigations of countermeasures for land mines, sensor equipment, and overland mobility equipment.

There is one project at the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, for an integrated electromagnetic test and analysis laboratory. This laboratory will provide facilities to conduct basic research required to develop and evaluate countermeasures against threat weapons systems such as the anti-ship cruise missile.

SUPPLY FACILITIES $2,046,000

Supply and storage facilities include two projects for warehouses and one Marine Corps project for a cold storage and ready issue warehouse. These three projects represent 0.3 percent of the total request.

MEDICAL FACILITIES $65,028,000

This year's program, representing 10.4 percent of the total authorization program, accelerates the replacement of World War II and other substandard medical facilities. This is a significant increase over prior year programs and will result in major improvements in the delivery of medical facilities. This is a significant increase over prior year programs and will result in major improvements in the delivery of medical care to Navy and Marine Corps personnel and their dependents. A new hospital is requested at Orlando, Florida, where the existing facilities are overcrowded, substandard, and incapable of providing the required medical services. Other projects in this category include modernizing hospitals at Great Lakes, Illinois, and Oakland, California, and Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida. Medical/dental clinics will be provided at Naval Air Stations, Chase Field and Kingsville, Texas; Meridian, Mississippi; Whiting Field, Florida; and at the Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia. At the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, two projects will provide a dispensary/dental processing facility and a dispensary/dental clinic. In this category there is one Marine Corps project for a dispensary at Marine Corps Recruiting Depot, San Diego, California. The improved delivery of medical care expected when these facilities are completed should make a significant contribution toward the goal of obtaining an all-volunteer force.

ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES $17,643,000

The projects in this category represent 2.8 percent of the total program request. One project will provide facilities for the relocation of the Military Sealift Command to Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey, from the Brooklyn Army Terminal. An administrative complex requested at the Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, will provide administrative space for relocating the Armed Forces Entrance Examining Station from leased space in downtown New Orelans and for consolidation at one location the Naval Reserve Manpower Center, Personnel Management Information Center, and Enlisted Personnel Distribution Office. An administrative building is also requested for the Naval Technical Training Center, Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, and for the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia.

20-507—73——13

TROOP HOUSING $89,324,000

Significant emphasis is again being placed this year on bachelor housing and messing facilities for improving the living environment for Navy and Marine Corps personnel. This year's program will provide 9,368 new spaces and will modernize 2,719 spaces for bachelor enlisted personnel. For bachelor officers, this year's program will provide 103 new spaces and the modernization of 128 spaces. The provision of modern facilities, which compare favorably with similar civilian community facilities, is considered to be a key factor in improving moral and retention of skilled personnel. This category represents 14.3 percent of the total authorization request. The Marine Corps lays great stress on the provision of modern functional quarters for their personnel with 47 percent of their portion of the authorization program devoted to bachelor housing and messing facilities.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES $14,630,000

Community facilities are requested in order to provide for the welfare and morale of Naval personnel and their dependents, both in the United States and overseas. This category includes facilities for a dependent school addition, exchanges, commissaries, gymnasiums, theaters, and EM/CPO and officers clubs. Including two Marine Corps projects, this category constitutes 2.3 percent of the program.

UTILITIES AND GROUND IMPROVEMENTS $63,440,000

This category makes up 10.1 percent of the total request and includes projects to install the necessary utility support for existing and programmed construction. Many systems are operating under full or overtaxed capacities and will be upgraded. A significant portion of the utility projects, approximately 43 percent, is devoted to the Navy's "Cold Iron" program which allows ships to shut down their shipboard equipment while in port, thus allowing more time for equipment maintenance and giving more opportunities for shore leave for ships' personnel. Approximately 17 percent or $9.7 million of the Marine Corps program is assigned to utilities improvements.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT, AIR AND WATER $92,311,000

The Navy is continuing its emphasis on Pollution Abatement by allocating 14.7 percent of the authorization request for these facilities.

For air pollution abatement the Navy has programed 27.6 million dollars for eighteen facilities at Naval and Marine Corps installations. Eight facilities costing approximately 18 million dollars are for control of the particulate and chemical fume emissions produced in the industrial operation of coating metal surfaces. Three facilities will improve boiler plant emissions through fuel conversions. Rounding out the air pollution abatement facilities are four facilities to improve air emissions, two pipe insulation working facilities, and smoke abatement facilities for a fire fighting school.

For water pollution abatement, funding is requested in the amount of 64.7 million dollars for forty-five facilities at Naval and Marine Corps installations. A major portion of this request is for construction of pier sewers for collection of sanitary wastes from ships in port. In this, the second year of a five-year program for constructing disposal ashore facilities, there are thirteen facilities costing approximately 34 million dollars. The pier sewers are planned to coincide with scheduled ship alterations. There are eight facilities for handling of fuels and collection, treatment, and disposal of oils and oily waste products from ships and shore installations. There are three municipal sewer connections, eleven improvements to sewer systems and treatment plants, seven facilities for collection and treatment of industrial wastes, and two facilities for treatment of filter backwash water at Naval water treatment plants.

REAL ESTATE $7,235,000

Authorization is being requested for four real estate acquisitions. These acquisitions will provide the land necessary to prevent urban encroachment.

AMENDMENTS $5,718,000

This year's program originally requested two amendments totaling $2,434,000. Under the program change three additional amendments were requested in the amount of $3,284,000. The new amendment total is five amendments with a total

cost of $5,718,000, which is less than one percent of this year's new authorization request.

Under the original program a $448,000 amendment was requested to the FY 1967 Program, Public Law 89–568, for the Hypervelocity Wind Tunnel project at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland. A recent evaluation of the project discloses that the amendment is no longer required.

At the Navy Mine Defense Laboratory a $1,986,000 amendment is requested to Public Law 90–408 (FY 1969) for the Deep Ocean Engineering Pressure Facility project. This amendment is required to complete the final contract, provide for the required material certification, and to pay approved contractor claims.

Under the program change amendments are required to the FY 1971, FY 1972, and FY 1973 Military Construction Acts.

Under Public Law 91–511 (FY 1971) a $249,000 amendment is required for the Sewage Treatment System project at the Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Virginia. This amendment is required to correct a failure which was caused by unforeseen sub-surface soil conditions in the dike of the finishing pond.

For FY 1972, Public Law 92–145, a $593,000 amendment is required for the installation total of the Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi. The amendment is required to permit award of the Enlisted Men's Club project authorized at $714,000. The FY 1972 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters project generated the need for the amendment. Since the relative need is greatest for the bachelor enlisted quarters, a decision was made to proceed with the bachelor enlisted quarters and to defer the Enlisted Men's Club project and seek an amendment this year.

For FY 1973, Public Law 92–545, an amendment of $2,442,000 is requested for the bomb loading plant modernization project of the Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Oklahoma. This amendment is required to provide construction in accordance with new safety criteria promulgated by the Armed Services Explosive Safety Board for structures housing the manufacture and/or handling of explosives.

STATEMENT OF THE ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER GENERAL, MARINE CORPS (FACILITIES AND SERVICES) BRIG. GEN. M. T. JANNELL, USMC

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen. It is my pleasure to again have the opportunity to present the Marine Corps Military construction program. This year's authorization request reflects our continuing major effort to provide new and improved personnel support facilities. In addition, authorization to construct operational, utility and combat training oriented facilities is requested. The Marine Corps authorization request for FY 1974 military construction totals $58,000,000. Exclusive of our aforementioned request is $7,550,000 for pollution abatement projects at Marine Corps installations.

In addition to the appropriation dollars requested, the Marine Corps requests $3,156,000 authorization only, for the acquisition of interests in lands contiguous to the Marine Corps air station, Yuma, Arizona, to be accomplished through exchange of excess Department of Defense Real Estate. The acquisition would provide encroachment protection of the air station which would assure unimpaired mission accomplishment, in addition to protecting the potential homeowner against overflight hazards and high noise levels.

The backbone of our $58,000,000 request before this committee is concentrated in our concern to satisfy deficiencies in bachelor enlisted quarters and other personnel support facilities. The remainder will provide certain urgent operational facilities essential to our readiness posture. Our personnel support projects represent 54 percent of this $58 million. $25.4 million will provide room configured housing facilities and three modern messhalls for our bachelor enlisted marines. Additionally, $5.9 million is requested for a gymnasium, commissary, and a dispensary, which will provide needed recreational and personnel welfare facilities.

The Marine Corps has dedicated a major portion of its construction efforts to bachelor housing facilities, for the past five fiscal years. We are convinced that the provision of modern and reasonably comfortable living accommodations for our bachelor marines is in the best interest of both the marine and the corps. In view of this conviction, we will continue to place personnel support projects to the foreground until we feel we have provided a reasonably sound functional physical plant for the needs of our men and women.

With the exclusion of the aforementioned $3.2 million request for acquisition of interests in lands at Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, the remaining $23.5 million authorization request provides $2.7 million for utilities; $.7 million

for cold storage warehouse; $1.7 million for roads and vehicle maintenance facilities; $.6 million for real estate necessary for ordnance storage; $3.5 million for a combat training complex and applied instruction facilities, and $5.2 million for facilities in support of transfer of the inventory control point activity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia.

Gentlemen, that summarizes our program by facility category, which we believe to be a well balanced program. I shall attempt to answer any questions you may have.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

I have just a couple of queries here that I would like to ask.

TRIDENT

Admiral Marschall, the Navy is asking for $118.320 million for the Trident support complex and flight test facilities for fiscal year 1974. Outline for us just what this will provide.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. I have an outline of Trident here.

There is a land acquisition item which is needed for explosive safety distances. And here is a training facility——

Senator SYMINGTON. How much is needed for that portion?

Admiral MARSCHALL. $5 million, sir.

The facilities which we are requesting are the following, sir:

A covered explosive handling pier, for $21.295 million;

A refit pier and slip, for $14.793 million;

A first increment of utilities for $16.827 million;

A land acquisition of 136 acres, which I mentioned, at $5.1 million;

Site improvement, $13.469 million;

A weapons navigation training building for $11.392 million; and

A warehouse for $294,000.

Senator SYMINGTON. Is this all at Bangor, Washington?

Admiral MARSCHALL. All at Bangor, Washington.

At the flight test facility at Cape Kennedy, we are asking for a wharf and dredging at $31.345 million; missile checkout building——

Senator SYMINGTON. What is that for, the Trident?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you need to start that work this early?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, we do.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There are explosive safety distances involved down there with the new missile which we will test in the Poseidon boat. The channel is very narrow, and we are beginning to get encroachment from the outside.

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, if the Poseidon will take that missile, why do you not make this a part of your Poseidon cost, especially since there has been so much criticism of the Trident cost?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Because in reality, Mr. Chairman, it is for the Trident eventually. The total facilities here are geared to Trident.

Senator SYMINGTON. And that means you do not plan to retrofit any of the ULMS I missile in the Poseidon?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, we do; we do plan to retrofit some, but for testing only at this time.

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not follow you on that entirely, but we will skim it.

What is the total cost of the Trident base?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Trident base will be approximately $550 million, sir; $543.3 million is the figure.

Senator SYMINGTON. Last year it was going to cost considerably more than that. Why the heavy reduction?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We were able, during the last year, to cut down on certain ancillary features we feel the current program is really the hardcore. We eliminated depot level submarine maintenance at the support complex site and transferred that to the existing shipyards. We reduced facility support levels from 15 to 10 ships, which is now our plan. A reduction of land has had a major impact.

Senator SYMINGTON. And you are here today telling us that, to the best of the Navy's knowledge, the total cost of this base included in the Trident program is $543 million, is that correct?

Admiral MARSCHALL. If the program were to go as we have outlined it, yes, sir, this is to the best of our knowledge.

If we were to have a postponement of some of the facilities, there would naturally be some cost escalation.

Senator SYMINGTON. Like what?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think, Mr. Chairman, that were we to cut the figure now, we would probably add substantially to the program.

Senator SYMINGTON. If you cut what figure now?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Excuse me.

The price would get up to about $560 million, based on escalation, if we had substantial deferrals from the fiscal year 1974 MILCON program.

We did not include family housing in this $543.3 million total because that is a separate item entirely. We have never considered the family housing as part of the Trident.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you need family housing?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We will need family housing.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much do you think you will need?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We probably will need something on the order of 1,400 units, phased in over several year periods.

Senator SYMINGTON. And how much money is that in total, 275 times 1,400?

Captain REED. It would be roughly about $4.7 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, captain.

To the best of your knowledge, these are all the expenses involved in the construction for the Trident base?

Admiral MARSCHALL. To the best of our knowledge, yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And your estimate is—you see, last year the outlook was around a billion dollars, so you have now cut it in half. We do not quite understand that, especially since all the costs have been going up in practically everything.

Admiral MARSCHALL. When you are able to cut functions, you can cut costs. As I say, we did cut several functions out of what we wanted originally.

Senator SYMINGTON. But what you are really doing—I cannot believe the Navy would be that far off in 12 months on an estimate of a base for any thing. And so what you are really doing is transferring some of the functions to other bases, are you not?

Admiral MARSCHALL. What we are doing is just that, Mr. Chairman, we are transferring this depot level maintenance to the shipyard.

Senator SYMINGTON. But you will have the additional cost in that shipyard, will you not?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. This is in the existing shipyard at Puget Sound. And we will not need the facilities over at Bangor. It was the result of a good inward look by the Navy.

Senator SYMINGTON. You see, I am not criticizing at all, but on record you are going to have to stay on standby, and, as you know, the Trident has been the subject of tremendous discussion. The only committee that has ever studied it in any real detail in the Senate is the subcommittee which unanimously recommended against it last year and was overruled, and unanimously recommended against it this year, and it was overruled by the full committee.

So you are going to have a floor fight on this, you will have it this year, and every year for some years to come, in my opinion.

Therefore, I think it is very important that we get the cost of the base, an accurate figure, at this time; otherwise it will come back and haunt you. Last year it was $1 billion, and this year it is $500 million.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. I am fully aware of the way that developed. Naturally, when one group of people requests something that it feels is highly desirable, they become strong advocates. And it was a process of whipping the advocates, so to speak within the Navy.

The reduction was not imposed on us from outside at all, it was a very, very hard inside-the-Navy look, to ascertain just what it was we needed, a bare bones approach.

Senator SYMINGTON. Actually, that is close to $2 billion, because at that time you figured you needed two bases, one in the Atlantic and one in the Pacific; am I correct?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, at the time I participated in this, there was the thought of only one at this time, and probably one at some future date, far down in the future.

Senator SYMINGTON. But now the testimony, as I understand it, is that you do not need a base in the Atlantic.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We do not need a base in the Atlantic at this time, no, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. We understand that the testimony of Admiral Lyon was that even if you went to 20 Tridents you would only need the one base.

Admiral MARSCHALL. If we went to 20 Tridents, we could accommodate the 20 Tridents at this particular base in Bangor.

Senator SYMINGTON. So there is no idea of a Trident base in the Atlantic?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Not at this time, yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. But you are not going to build more than 20 Tridents? You can only build 29 under the Moscow agreements.

Admiral MARSCHALL. All I am saying, sir, is that in the near future we have no intention of going anywhere but Bangor.

Senator SYMINGTON. And how long would you call the foreseeable future?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I certainly would anticipate within the next 20 years but that is an opinion.

Senator SYMINGTON. I am just thinking out loud.

If you get a development of 710 launchers, and 24 launches per Trident, if you had 20, which was a figure discussed in another hearing you, would have to scrap a lot of your present Polaris and Poseidon, because you could only have 14 American submarines.

Admiral MARSCHALL. At the time the Trident boat would come into the fleet until the present schedule, and should the SALT Agreements remain as they are, we would have to begin removing certain Polaris boats from the fleet. They would be reaching a 20-year life at that time.

Senator SYMINGTON. That is right. What worries me perhaps more than the cost is from the standpoint of my concept about submarines.

I do not think there has been a Member of the Congress more pro-submarines than I am, but the new Yankee class Soviet submarine has 12 launchers, and they are allowed 62 submarines maximum, or 950 launchers depending on how they want to do it.

It is hard for me to justify the rationale for the Trident, because what do you want, more submarines with less launchers, or more launchers and less submarines? To me it infringes on the whole concept of the submarine, which was dispersion, maximum dispersion. I would think the more submarines you had, the better off you would be from the standpoint of your deterrent capacity.

Admiral MARSCHALL. As you are aware sir, I am a civil engineer, not a submariner. But I am fully aware that the submariners have made a very detailed study of the optimum boat, and they came to the conclusion that the one they are going after is the one that they want from a deterrent standpoint and for cost effectiveness.

Senator SYMINGTON. I am aware of that, and I only mentioned it because it was only recently that I had heard that even if we only had 20 Tridents, according to the Navy, the testimony was that they would all be at Bangor. And my idea of defense had to do something with the idea of considering it important to defend the sealanes between here and Europe because of our troops in Europe after M plus a certain date needing reinforcement across the sealanes. Now to the next item.

WHITING FIELD, FLA.

Congressman Sikes has asked that there be included in the military construction bill $1.4 million for Whiting Field, Fla., to provide outlying fields for helicopter training and $831,000 for a petty officers' club at the Naval Communications Training Center, Fla.

Will you comment on these projects and tell us when they might ordinarily be included in the Navy construction program?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The item at Whiting Field, $1.4 million, I think was programed in 1976.

This petty officers' mess at $831,000 was in the out years, in the unprogramed years, but it is still a part of our overall plan.

Senator SYMINGTON. Please continue with your line items.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The program request at unclassified installations inside the United States totals $578,178,000.

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL AIR STATION, BRUNSWICK, MAINE

We are requesting $135,000 at the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine. This station supports land-based patrol squadrons equipped with P–3 aircraft engaged in all weather antisubmarine warfare operations. This project, which is the only project requested this year at the station, will provide a facility for training flight crews in the directional Jezebel sonobouy system.

This project is not a requirement of the shore establishment realinement since the realinement of Atlantic Fleet Patrol squadrons basing has been implemented, but these facilities are needed to relocate directional sonobouy trainer devices from the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, to Brunswick.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, WINTER HARBOR, MAINE

At the Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, we are requesting $232,000 for a theater project. The activity is part of the high-frequency direction finder network and performs an antisubmarine warfare support mission vital to the security of the Nation. The theater project will provide a facility for movie, theatrical, and lecture presentations. There are no other indoor or outdoor theaters available within 50 miles of the base; and current use of the gymnasium for such purposes conflict with physical fitness programs and station athetic events.

PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD, PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

Under the program change a request of July 17, 1973, an additional crane rail system project in the amount of $2,817,000 was requested. The facilities to be provided by this project will permit the transfer of a portal crane from the Boston Naval Shipyard and improve significantly productivity of this shipyard.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, NEW LONDON, CONN.

We are requesting $6,158,000 for two projects at the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn. The base maintains and operates shore facilities to support two attack submarine squadrons, a submarine development group, and two deployed Polaris-Poseidon submarine squadrons.

For bachelor enlisted quarters modernization project that will rehabilitate five barracks and provide modern living quarters for 1,322 men, we are requesting $3,372,000.

The electrical tie and distribution line project, at $2,786,000, will provide facilities to meet increasing demand resulting from facilities expansion and a need to provide shore power to modern nuclear submarines.

NAVAL UNDERWATER SYSTEMS CENTER, NEW LONDON LABORATORY, NEW LONDON, CONN.

The request for the naval underwater systems center, New London Laboratory, New London, Conn., is $3,600,000. This laboratory is the principal Navy research, development, test, and evaluation center for underwater weapons systems.

The engineering building project, at $3,600,000, will provide space for engineering and scientific personnel engaged in the research and development of SONAR systems and improved under water acoustic sensors for antisubmarine warfare ships.

MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL, BAYONNE, N.J.

For one project at the Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, N.J., we are requesting $1,806,000. This activity provides effective and economical sea transportation in the Atlantic area for personnel and cargoes of the Department of Defense and other Government agencies. The headquarters of the Military Sealift Command is presently located at the Brooklyn Army Terminal, which is scheduled for closure. The Military Sealift Command/Atlantic Relocation project will convert existing space to accommodate the facilities to be relocated from the Military Ocean Terminal, Brooklyn.

NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

We are requesting $1,131,000 for two projects at the naval support activity, Brooklyn, N.Y. This activity maintains and operates facilities to provide services and material in support of operating forces in the New York area including port services, communications, medical care, receiving and shipping, and personnel support services.

The relocate telephone switchboard project at $75,000 will relocate the telephone switchboard equipment from the Naval Station to the Naval Annex as the existing facilities used to house this equipment will be excessed.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project at $1,056,000 will modernize existing spaces to provide modern living quarters for 225 men.

Senator SYMINGTON. I understand these two projects, totaling $1,131,000, originally requested for the naval support activity, Brooklyn, are no longer needed, and may be deleted. Do you have any other projects in this category? If so, I wish you would submit a list of them for the record.

Admiral MARSCHALL. The project for relocation of the telephone switchboard for $75,000 is no longer required. The bachelor enlisted quarters modernization project for $1,056,000 is still required but at the reduced scope of $612,000. This reflects a reduction in scope from 225 men to 150 men.

Information on other projects in the program which may be eliminated, reduced, or modified in some way was provided in Rear Admiral Marschall's supplementary statement concerning program modifications. On addition is the dispensary project for $641,000 at the naval security group activity, Skaggs Island, Calif. It has been determined that this replacement project may be deferred to a later year because regionalization of Navy medical facilities in that area is a relatively

recent action. It is considered desirable to defer replacement of the Skaggs Island facility until the results of medical regionalization have been fully evaluated. It is anticipated that within 10 to 12 months sufficient data will be available upon which to base a reexamination of medical needs of Skaggs Island.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

PHILADELPHIA NAVAL SHIPYARD, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

At the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa., we originally requested $915,000 for two projects. This shipyard repairs and overhauls surface ships and diesel submarines.

A request of $735,000 was to provide additional facilities required to perform the restoration and refit of selected electronics components—sensors and transducers—for all east coast naval shipyards, and fleet components previously performed at the Boston Naval Shipyard. A recent check of the electromagnetic environment and underwater noise level at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard disclosed that the background levels are not suitable for this facility. It will, therefore, be necessary to relocate the electronics equipment facility project to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H.

The computer support facility project, in the amount of $180,000, will provide facilities to relocate the Navships Computer Applications Support Development Office to this yard from the Boston Naval Shipyard.

NAVAL AIR DEVELOPMENT CENTER, WARMINISTER, PA.

We are requesting $125,000 for the Naval Air Development Center, Warminister, Pa. This center conducts research, design, development, test, and evaluation of aeronautical systems and components and performs research and development in aviation medicine.

The primary substation expansion project will expand the existing primary system to meet normal power usage growth and planned facilities construction and improvements.

NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON, D.C.

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

For the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C. where research and development in the physical sciences and related fields directed toward new and improved materials, equipment, techniques, and systems, is conducted, we are requesting $5,395,000.

The acoustic research facility project, at $740,000, will provide laboratory shop and office space for personnel engaged in advancing basic research in underwater surveillance.

The Integrated Electromagnetic Test and Analysis Laboratory project will provide facilities to conduct basic research required to develop and evaluate countermeasures against threat weapons systems such as the antiship cruise missile. The project cost is $4,655,000.

Senator SYMINGTON. Over the past several years we have authorized a considerable amount of money for the modernization of the Naval Research Laboratory. Is this project a continuation of that

program, and just what kind of work will be performed in this facility?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This project is a continuation of the program to modernize the facilities at the Naval Research Laboratory. We propose to alter some warehouse space that we have cleared out and consolidate existing similar functions into a single building. This will alleviate crowded conditions for the functions to be moved to the warehouse, permit us to shift some other functions to the vacated areas and provide properly configured space for the specialized use we require and do not now have. The proposed facility will enable us to assemble and check out very extensive instrumentation which we must use to measure characteristics of the ocean, particularly sound. We need an essentially clean room facility to handle precision instrumentation which we encapsulate. Also we must have an extensive test facility to run life cycle testing to assure our equipment will work when we install it on the ocean bottom for a major experiment.

NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

For the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., we are requesting $4,334,000. The Academy prepares young men to be professional officers in the naval services.

The Maury Hall rehabilitation project will correct existing deficiencies in classrooms, laboratories, and training facilities needed for the expanded program of the weapons and systems engineering department.

Senator SYMINGTON. $4.3 million is a very sizable amount you are requesting for the rehabilitation of this building. Just what do you propose to do here and why is it necessary?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Virtually all of the inside of the building will be torn out and rebuilt to provide modern laboratory, classroom, and administrative space. This modernization will support new elective courses in systems engineering, such as system simulation, hydrid computer technology, and systems engineering analysis and control procedures. In the weapons systems field, new research programs and new applications of computer techniques will also be housed in the rehabilitated spaces.

Senator SYMINGTON. As I recall, when you renovated Sampson Hall some years ago, you had rather substantial overruns, apparently because your original estimates were inadequate. I hope this does not occur again in this instance if the project is approved.

Admiral MARSCHALL. The estimated cost for the work has been very carefully engineered, and we are reasonably confident that we won't have problems with overruns. Our cost estimate for this project is the result of a detailed program cost estimate which included an economic analysis to select the recommended solution.

NAVAL STATION, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

We are requesting $1,080,000 at the naval station, Annapolis, Md. This station support the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md. The bulkhead replacement project at the naval station, Annapolis, Md., will replace a damaged bulkhead and associated facilities used to protect

and maintain 150 various types of small craft used for training at the Academy.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you explain in a little more detail why this project is necessary. I note that you indicate small craft are assigned to the Naval Academy. What are these small craft used for? Are they actually used for training, or are they recreation craft?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This bulkhead has got to be replaced to prevent further undermining which is endangering the adjacent building foundation and subsurface utilities. Normal tide and current action continuously erode the bulkhead, but in the event of a major storm, such as Hurricane Agnes last year, the entire bulkhead would most likely be completely destroyed.

The small craft at the naval station consist of 15 yard patrol craft, 2 LCM's, one 60-ton floating crane, and various sailing craft which are used for midshipman training. The remaining craft are utility barges and lighters used in station operations, and miscellaneous recreational yachts and sailing craft.

NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER, BETHESDA, MD.

We are requesting $3,310,000 for two projects at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. At the medical center, one project for a Navy exchange retail store will replace the existing store with a modern convenient facility at a cost of $1,764,000.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you propose to build a new Navy exchange retail store. Why is this necessary at this time? It has been my impression that these stores are generally built by the exchange systems out of nonappropriated funds. Why is this not true in this instance?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Navy exchange qualifies for construction under the military construction program because the existing exchange facility will be destroyed to permit new construction for the redevelopment of the National Naval Medical Center. The construction of a new exchange facility is necessary at this time to afford site clearance for the orderly phasing of the redevelopment program.

At the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., we are requesting $1,546,000 for the roads project. This project will provide the new roadways required to streamline ingress and egress to the center from Jones Bridge Road.

Senator SYMINGTON. In your justification for additional roads you indicated that the modernization of the National Naval Medical Center required new right-of-ways, et cetera. This would indicate that you intend to modernize this medical center. Just what are your plans in this regard?

Admiral MARSCHALL. A modernization program for the National Naval Medical Center has been planned. The program will be undertaken by phasing so that medical service to authorized beneficiaries and residency training programs may continue during the construction.

The modernization plan includes: a new 650-acute-care-bed hospital; adjacent parking structures; a Navy Exchange; a warehouse; and a public works shop. The phasing is scheduled to begin in fiscal year 1975 with final completion in 1980.

NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, BETHESDA, MD.

We are requesting $6,372,000 at the Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, Md. This project will provide a facility to perform experimentation with animals to a 3,300-foot depth so that operational human diving depths may be lowered from 1,500 feet to 2,000 feet and beyond.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice from your justification we have previously authorized $4½ million for this project, and you are now asking for an additional $6.3 million. Is this in the nature of an overrun since the previous authorization, and has phase I been started?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The amount requested for phase II is not in the nature of an overrun. The use of phased construction was envisioned at the time of phase I formulation in fiscal year 1972. Phase I has been started and provided for the procurement of long leadtime equipment and material items.

NAVAL COMMUNICATION STATION, CHELTENHAM, MD.

For one project at the Naval Communication Station, Cheltenham, Md., we are requesting $1,300,000. This station provides very low frequency broadcasts to submerged submarines operating in the Atlantic area. This project will correct deficiencies in the antenna system, that causes the current to arc over to the ground, thus drawing excessive current which could damage the transmitters. A reduction in operating power to prevent the arcing to ground lowers the signal strength to an unacceptable level.

NAVAL ORDNANCE STATION, INDIAN HEAD, MD.

At the Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Md., $1,528,000 is requested for one project. The fire protection system modifications project will increase the capacity of the system and will provide treatment facilities to reduce the corrosiveness and turbidity of the water.

NAVAL AIR TEST CENTER, PATUXENT RIVER, MD.

At the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md., we are requesting $1,240,000 for two projects. This center tests and evaluates aircraft and weapons systems, components, and related equipment for fleet use and supports two research squadrons, the test pilot school, and a naval hospital.

An electromagnetic propagation facility project, with a cost of $680,000, will provide facilities for conducting electromagnetic propagation studies on avionics systems.

The electrical distribution system project will correct current deficiencies which resulted in 79 power outages over the last couple years and provide additional transformer capacity to meet the power demand of new testing equipment and facilities. The project cost is $560,000.

NAVAL HOSPITAL, QUANTICO, VA.

We are requesting $484,000 for one project at the Naval Hospital, Quantico, Va. This hospital provides general clinical and hospitaliza-

tion services for active duty Navy and Marine Corps personnel and their dependents. This project will provide air-conditioning and a centralized special care unit to provide adequate, basic clinical facilities for intensive and coronary care patients.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

FLEET COMBAT DIRECTION SYSTEMS TRAINING CENTER, DAM NECK, VA.

At the Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Dam Neck, Va., we are requesting $6,531,000 for two projects. This center provides naval warfare training for fleet personnel to develop and perfect their skills by the actual operation of tactical command direction systems in a realistic warfare environment.

The authorization request for the applied instruction building project is $5,959,000. The applied instruction building project will provide facilities to support combat information center training to be relocated from the Naval Air Station, Glynco, Ga.

Senator SYMINGTON. This building is going to cost almost $6 million, and apparently is a requirement generated by closing the Naval Air Station, Glynco, Ga. Why was it necessary to transfer this training to Dam Neck, rather than some location where you had existing facilities?

Admiral MARSCHALL. To get the greatest benefit Navywide from our limited training resources in the areas of staff and administrative personnel, and sophisticated training equipment, we are trying to consolidate and colocate like kinds of training at one location. In this case, the combat information center training and carrier air traffic control training are being relocated to Dam Neck from Glynco, because similar command and control training is now being conducted at Dam Neck.

The academic training building project request is in the amount of $572,000. The academic training building project will provide instruction space to support courses whose applied training is being conducted in a nearby multipurpose building. Several new areas of training coupled with projected increases in student loading requires the provision of additional academic training space.

NAVAL AMPHIBIOUS BASE, LITTLE CREEK, VA.

We are requesting $3,350,000 for the Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Va. This base supports the Headquarters, Atlantic Fleet Amphibious Force, Amphibious School, Inshore Warfare Command, and is the homeport of 35 Atlantic Fleet ships.

The electronics building project, at $139,000, will provide an electronics maintenance shop to furnish communication support to harbor control, security, training, and administrative functions.

The dispensary and dental clinic project will provide a new clinic to replace the existing inadequately sized, dilapidated, and poorly located facility. The project cost is $3,211,000.

NAVAL AIR STATION, NORFOLK, VA.

At the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., we are requesting $2,525,000. This station supports 11 fleet air squadrons, Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk, Reserve squadrons, and an overseas air passenger and cargo terminal.

The helicopter maintenance hangar project will provide hangar space for onboard helicopter units and the 37 additional fleet support and LAMPS squadrons helicopters to be transferred to the station from the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N.J. The 37 helicopters represent a correction from the 20 helicopters shown on the project justification document.

Senator SYMINGTON. This appears to be another project requested because of base closures. Where are the 20 additional helicopters to be assigned here coming from, and why was this location selected?

Admiral MARSHALL. We are transferring the new LAMPS helicopter squadrons HSL 30 and 32 to NAS Norfolk from NAS Lakehurst. Actually, 37 helicopters will be moved in to Norfolk. NAS Norfolk was selected because many of the ships to which the LAMPS detachments are assigned are going to be homeported at Norfolk. Also, NAS Norfolk is somewhat less crowded than NAS Cecil Field which is being assigned the S–3A jet aircraft in addition to its present aircraft support load. Also, NAS Jacksonville is being heavily uploaded by the base realinements. NAS Key West and NAS Brunswick were considered to be too far away from the ships resulting in logistics problems.

NAVAL STATION, NORFOLK, VA.

We are requesting $18,493,000 for seven projects at the Naval Station, Norfolk, Va. This station provides logistic support for 25 or more naval commands, including 5th Naval District Headquarters and Commanders, Cruiser-Destroyer Force and Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet. This station currently serves as homeport for 80 ships of the Atlantic Fleet and, as a part of the shore establishment reduction and realinement, will have another 20 ships assigned.

The amount of $9,624,000 is requested for the berthing pier project which will provide a pier with "cold iron" utilities to accommodate large fleet ships which cannot presently be berthed because of a shortage of berthing space.

Senator SYMINGTON. As long as you have been in business in the Norfolk area, I would have thought that you had all manner of piers already in existence. Why is this expensive pier now needed?

Admiral MARSHALL. A deficiency in berthing space alongside piers has always existed at Naval Station, Norfolk. For this reason the station has required offshore moorings in Hampton Roads. Despite a reduction in numbers of ships in the Navy, the deficiency continues, as newer and much larger ships join the modern fleet. For example, our new destroyers are 560 feet long, whereas the old ships going out are only 375 feet long. The LHA's which resemble aircraft carriers in size are also coming in. Depending on the type of combat

ships homeported at Norfolk, approximately 55 ships can be berthed alongside piers. The smallest number of naval ships assigned in recent years is 81, which does not include harbor craft or merchant shipping. Due to the recent realinement of shore facilities, 18 additional combat ships will be assigned from Naval Station, Newport. The current berthing problems, considering all the pertinent factors such as deployment, nesting, of small ships, availability of utilities, depth of water, etc. indicates the addition of one pier will relieve but not solve the need for new pier space.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice in your justification you state that it will be used in part for transient and merchant ships. Will you explain this, particularly as it relates to merchant ships?

Admiral MARSHALL. The Naval Supply Center normally uses 2 berths alongside piers three and four for merchant shipping. These piers are equipped with transit sheds and railroad tracks required to handle cargo. The Naval Supply Center operation, the largest such center in the Navy, is such that commercial ships call routinely delivering or transshipping Navy purchases or cargo.

The relocate fleet landing project with a cost of $803,000 will free pier 2 berthing space and provide a more sheltered basin for fleet landing facilities.

The pier 2 dredging project will lower the water depth along the inboard berth of the southside of pier 2 from 20 to 35 feet and will provide an additional 800 feet of berthing for large modern vessels. The project cost is $314,000.

The enlisted men's dining facility modernization project at $1,435,000, will modernize the existing main mess hall to feed 1,958 men per meal and consolidate into approximately one-third of the present area, thereby making 55,000 square feet of space available for other uses.

The pier utilities project will provide "cold iron" utilities to the nuclear submarine pier. The request for this project is $1,435,000.

The vehicle parking area project will install paving, drainage, sidewalks, and lighting for parking at the destroyer-submarine berthing area. The additional ships to be homeported at this installation will greatly increase the requirement for parking areas. The project cost is $310,000.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice from your justification that this parking lot appears to be strictly for the convenience of personnel assigned aboard ship while they are in port. Do you strongly feel that the expenditure of $310,000 for this purpose is justified?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Parking conditions adjacent to berths along this section of the waterfront are totally unsatisfactory. Approximately 6,700 afloat personnel are being transferred from Newport and will be assigned to this area of the waterfront. Parking conditions will become more critical, urgently requiring immediate relief. The parking area will provide space for approximately 1,500 automobiles.

Senator SYMINGTON. What do these people do with their cars when their ship is not in port?

Admiral MARSCHALL. When ships are deployed, the automobiles belonging to married crewmen will normally be parked at their residence. Unmarried personnel live on their ships and their cars are parked here at all times, whether their ship is in port or not.

The amount of $3,950,000 is requested for the fleet sonar school-applied instruction building project. This project will provide instructional and administrative space for the fleet sonar school to be relocated from Key West, Fla.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here is another facility the need for which is generated by the base closure program. Apparently, in this instance, the relocation of sonar training from Key West, Fla., to Norfolk. Is this going to complete the job, or will there be a followon?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This project won't complete the job. In the fiscal year 1975 program we're going to need a followon project for an additional 34,000 square feet at an estimated cost of about $1.5 million.

NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, NORFOLK, VA.

We are requesting $567,000 for one project at the Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Va. This center provides utilities to facilities located within the Sewells Point naval complex and to the fleet berthed at the Naval Station, Norfolk.

The electrical distribution system project will extend existing electrical distribution lines and provide additional capacity to satisfy increased power demands of new modern production equipment, larger modern fleet ships, and new facilities.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS TRAINING GROUP, NORFOLK, VA.

At the Nuclear Weapons Training Group, Norfolk, Va., we are requesting $2,470,000. This Nuclear Weapons Training Group provides nuclear warfare employment training and nuclear weapons technical training for key officers and enlisted men serving in billets related to the nuclear warfare capability of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet.

The nuclear training building project will provide classrooms and other spaces required for the training of officers and enlisted personnel in nuclear weapons orientation, employment, planning, workloads, and supply.

NAVAL AIR STATION, OCEANA, VA.

We are requesting $3,962,000 at the Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va. This air station is a master jet station, the homeport for all Atlantic Fleet medium attack and fighter squadrons and the Atlantic Fleet introduction site for the F–14 weapons system. It supports three carrier air wings comprised of 11 fighter and 8 medium attack squadrons that deploy in rotation on Atlantic Fleet carriers.

The aircraft systems training buildings project, at $3,386,000, will provide a maintenance training facility and an addition to the flight training buildings. These training buildings will house equipment to be utilized in training pilots and ground crew maintenance personnel on the systems of the F–14 aircraft to be assigned to the station early in 1974.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that these buildings are required for the training of pilots and ground crews in the various systems peculiar to the F–14 aircraft. Isn't this training given somewhere else? If so, why do you need such a facility at Oceana?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We originally planned for F–14 maintenance training to be provided at NAS Miramar for both Atlantic and Pacific Fleet personnel. As the number of F–14 aircraft to be purchased became firmer and as peripheral factors such as availability of devices for refresher training at NAS Miramar, per diem rates, and morale effects of separation from family were considered, it became apparent that the maintenance training should also be provided at NAS Oceana.

The F–14 maintenance training is divided into 16 unique F–14 courses ranging from an 8-week familiarization course to a 26-week weapons system specialist course, with an average length of 13 weeks. Our policy is not to pay permanent change of station relocation costs more than once per fiscal year. Consequently, Altantic Fleet student personnel would have to be detailed to NAS Miramar on temporary duty and paid an appropriate per diem allowance. With the shortage of BEQ spaces at NAS Miramar, we would have to pay the $25 per day per diem rate and round-trip transportation of approximately $330. Based on the 13-week course length, these per diem and travel costs total $2,600 per student. With an estimated annual student load of 460 personnel, the cost would total $1,200,000 annually. In addition to this annual personnel cost, the establishment of a maintenance training capability at NAS Oceana permits the reduction of NAS Miramar fiscal year 1973 MCON training building project P–159 from 39,161 SF and $1,710,000 to 5,161 SF and $306,000.

An economic analysis indicates a present value cost differential of approximately $7 million in favor of establishing the NAS Oceana maintenance facility.

The amount of $576,000 is requested for the utilities project which will expand the existing systems to service major facilities currently funded or planned for early funding. The existing system is currently fully utilized and fire protection is inadequate.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that you have included in your utilities item a highway intersection modification in the amount of $86,000. Is this intersection modification on base and why was it included under utilities?

Admiral MARSCHALL The highway intersection modification included as part of this project will eliminate alinement deficiencies on the entrance road. Since this road is located within the boundaries of the base, it is not eligible for financing from Defense access road funds and is properly included in this project. The category code system is used for classifying real property of the Navy and this project falls within facility class 800, "Utilities and Ground Improvements." This category includes electricity, heat, sewage and waste, water, roads, streets, sidewalks, fencing, and other miscellaneous utility and ground improvement projects.

NORFOLK NAVAL SHIPYARD, PORTSMOUTH, VA.

At the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va., we are requesting $11,113,000. The shipyard performs conversions, overhaul, repair, alterations, and outfitting on nuclear and conventional surface ships and modern attach submarines, including air and antiair warfare systems, antisubmarine, and submarine warfare systems.

The machine ship project, with a cost of $4,066,000, will alter and install an addition to the inside machine shop to provide consolidated ef-

ficient work spaces for the overhaul and repair functions performed in the mechanical ships.

Senator SYMINGTON. I assume this is part of your shipyard modernization, but it is an expensive project. Since the work proposed to be performed is now being performed, why could not this project be deferred a year?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The machine ship project for Norfolk is part of the shipyard modernization program. The requirement to modernize the naval shipyards results from congressional hearings and a mandate that the yards be modernized so that they could operate more efficiently with a consequent savings of operational funds. The shortage of fleet operational funds has recently been discussed in congressional hearings by the Chief of Naval Operations. This is the first project for the Norfolk Naval Shipyard that is justified entirely upon economics. All previous industrial projects have been justified on the basis of being mandatory to meet workload commitments. The objective of this project is to cut the unit cost of production for all of the work that processes through the machine shop. Deferral of this project for an additional year will have the compound effect of denying the Navy of 1 year's savings in operating funds and extending the accomplishment of the modernization program objectives 1 additional year.

The bachelors enlisted quarters project, will provide 516 men with modern living spaces that meet current habitability standards. The amount requested for this project is $2,624,000.

The enlisted men's dining facility project, at $1,111,000, will provide a new consolidated messing facility and replace existing temporary World War II deteriorated facilities.

The utilities improvements project, will upgrade existing utilities systems to provide the capacity needed for effective overhaul and repair of ships. The project cost is $3,332,000.

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, YORKTOWN, VA.

We are requesting $1,327,000 for one project at the Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Va. This station receives, stores, overhauls, and tests mines, torpedoes, advanced underseas weapons, and guided missiles. The station is the designated overhaul point for repair and retrofit of the TALOS missile and missile component repair.

The torpedo overhaul shop project is in direct support of the new MK–48 torpedo weapons system. Production of these torpedoes is now underway, and quantities will be issued to submarines based at Norfolk; however, as the quantities in the fleet build up, the additional four lines provided by this facility will be needed by 1975. These torpedoes require recurring maintenance checkouts at 4- to 6-month intervals.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL AIR STATION, CECIL FIELD, FLA.

We are requesting $3,743,000 for the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla. This station supports all light attack aircraft squadrons of the Naval Air Force, Atlantic Fleet. A new mission assigned under the "Shore establishment realinement" is the support of all Atlantic Fleet

carrier capable, antisubmarine warfare (ASW) squadrons—excluding helicopters.

The amount of $791,000 is requested for the weapons system training facility project which will provide housing for operational flight and weapons systems trainers. Trainers for S–3A aircraft cannot be located in existing spaces as they are being fully utilized for A–7 attack weapons training.

For the intermediate maintenance facility project $2,845,000 is requested to provide a maintenance facility principally for airborne electronics equipment of the S–3A aircraft. The addition of 60 S–3A aircraft being relocated from other bases creates a requirement for an increase in maintenance space.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice this requirement is generated because of the assigning of an additional 60 antisubmarine warfare aircraft to this station. Where are these aircraft coming from?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Upon closure of NAS Quonset Point, the carrier capable ASW squadrons there will move to NAS Cecil Field. These squadrons are now using the S–2 propeller aircraft. The squadrons will begin transitioning to the new, jet-powered carrier ASW aircraft, the S–3A, in early 1975, shortly after the move to Cecil Field is accomplished. Eventually the squadrons will be equipped with 60 S–3A's.

The Naval Regional Medical Center Jacksonville Dispensary Addition project will provide general and specialized clinical services for active duty personnel, dependents, and other authorized persons in the Jacksonville area. This project will construct an addition to the existing dispensary at NAS, Cecil Field, some 15 miles west of the Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, to enable it to effectively serve the current outpatient workload. The project cost is $107,000.

NAVAL AIR STATION, ELLYSON FIELD, FLA.

A request of $75,000 is made for one project at the Naval Air Station, Ellyson Field, Fla. This station supports the Navy's flight training program administrated by the Naval Air Training Command.

The electrical distribution system improvements project will provide additional power distribution lines to correct critically overloaded feeders and prevent power outages.

NAVAL AIR STATION, JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

We are requesting $13,766,000 for the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla. This station provides support for aircraft squadrons engaged in all weather, antisubmarine operations and logistic support for the naval air rework facility and a Navy air maintenance training detachment.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living spaces for 228 men who are members of the six helicopter squadrons being transferred to this station. There are no adequate existing facilities to house these men. The project cost is $1,494,000.

The bachelor officer's quarters modernization project, at $850,000, will modernize existing spaces and provide new living spaces for 96 men who are members of the six helicopter squadrons being transferred

to this station. Existing spaces are substandard and require air conditioning and fire protection systems.

The land acquisition project will acquire 365 acres of land to preclude imminent airfield encroachment with the attendant safety and community relations problems. Recent appraisals for this project indicate that the authorization request of $2,200,000 is low, and that the authorization needed is $2,800,000. Since appropriations have not been requested for this project based on an exchange of excess lands, it is requested that the authorization for this project be increased to $2,800,000. The modified total for the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, would be with this change $14,366,000.

Senator SYMINGTON. I understand that you are asking for authority only to acquire this land near the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, to protect your approach zone from encroachment. Just what land do you propose to exchange for this property?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Government surplus lands to be used in the land exchange are three parcels of Navy land that have been declared excess and have been reported to the General Services Administration.

These parcels are: 71.5 acres—a noncontiguous unimproved portion—of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Jacksonville, Fla., 68.7 acres—an unimproved portion—of the Navy fuel depot, Jacksonville, Fla.; and 1.8 acres of land and improvements which comprised the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Jacksonville, Fla.

The amount of $6,925,000 is requested for the naval air rework facility-aircraft final finish facility project which will provide spaces for painting and corrosion protection of aircraft. Existing facilities have no provisions for maintaining the required temperature and humidity control.

Senator SYMINGTON. Almost $7 million seems like a great deal of money for what amounts to an aircraft paint shop. What generates this requirement at this time, and what have you been doing in the past?

Admiral MARSCHALL. At present, as in the past, the finishing operation is being done in a converted seaplane hangar. We need a new finishing facility because the existing inadequate ventilation system is in violation of new standards set forth in the Occupational Safety and Health Act. Our employees are subjected to hazards from new, highly toxic, polyurethane paint material. Cases of hospitalization have occured and the local union has made strong complaints. Also, vapors from the hangar contain pollutants which violate the Florida clean air requirements.

In addition to the present operation being hazardous to human health, the operation in the hangar is inefficient. Temperature and humidity conditions are not controllable resulting in inferior spray painting and a waste of time and materials. In addition, the present operation requires excessive moving of aircraft, overtime shifts, and delays in returning aircraft to the fleet.

The naval air rework facility-utilities project, at $2,297,000, will provide additional essential utilities required to accommodate current production and plant facility expansion.

NAVAL HOSPITAL, ORLANDO, FLA.

For the naval hospital, Orlando, Fla., we are requesting $20,981,000. The naval hospital provides inpatient and outpatient care to eligible personnel in the Orlando area.

The original project requested 310 beds.

A recent reevaluation of bed requirements at the naval hospital, Orlando, reveals that the number of beds may be reduced to 235. This reduction is feasible by the removal of the fifth floor of the hospital and will result in a cost reduction of $1,331,000. Under the program change request letter of July 17, 1973, this project was reduced from $22,312,000 to the current request of $20,981,000.

Senator SYMINGTON. I understand this hospital is proposed to replace the old Air Force hospital built about 1943 and that rather than the 310-bed hospital as you show in your justification, you propose to reduce it to 235-bed hospital at a cost of $20,981,000, just about $1,331,000 less than you are proposing here. Is this correct?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The statement is correct.

Senator SYMINGTON. This does not seem like a very substantial reduction considering that you are reducing the bed capacity by 75. Who will use this hospital? Don't you have another hospital at the recruit training center in Orlando, which is the principal Navy activity there?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The cost reduction may appear disproportionate to the number of beds being reduced. This is due to the fact that the deleted beds constitute a nursing unit which is a relatively inexpensive, unsophisticated area of the hospital. The very expensive areas, such as radiology, operating rooms, intensive care units, et cetera, must remain in and are responsible for the largest share of the cost of a hospital. This hospital will be used by all active duty personnel in the area, their dependents, and then all other eligible beneficiaries as availability of services dictates. There is no other hospital at the recruit training center in Orlando, but there is a dispensary dedicated primarily to the treatment of short-term illnesses in the recruit population. The principal Navy activity in Orlando is the recruit training center.

NAVAL TRAINING CENTER, ORLANDO, FLA.

A request of $7,383,000 is made for the naval training center, Orlando, Fla. This center provides basic indoctrination for recruit training and advanced and specialized training for enlisted and officer personnel of the regular Navy and Naval Reserve.

The dental clinic project for the administrative command will provide a new facility to replace a grossly undersized clinic used by service school students. The project cost is $1,481,000.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that you have a very substantial dental clinic for the use of the recruits at this training center, and I wonder why an additional clinic is needed for the administrative command. It would seem to me these people could be taken care of in the recruiting clinic.

Admiral MARSCHALL. The existing dental clinic in the recruit area is used exclusively for treating recruits undergoing training and is fully utilized for this purpose.

The proposed new dental clinic will provide dental support for all other permanent active duty personnel, with the exception of the naval hospital, and also the ever-increasing number of students assigned to the service school command.

The facility will also provide clinical space for dental residents attached to the naval hospital for administrative purposes, but who will work in the dental clinic due to unavailability of adequate spaces in the hospital. The new hospital will contain minimal dental spaces required to treat hospital inpatients and staff only.

For the service school commands, we are requesting authorization for two training building projects. A request of $4,628,000 is requested for the nuclear power training building project which will provide a facility to train an average on-board student load of 1,885 enlisted men and 240 officers and provide space for 176 staff personnel.

Senator SYMINGTON. If this project is approved, will it be the only place the Navy gives training in nuclear powered vessels, and will it replace the training now given at Bainbridge, Md., and Mare Island, Calif.?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This project will accommodate the relocation of nuclear power training from Bainbridge. Next year we will need a similar project to complete the consolidation by moving the Mare Island nuclear power training to Orlando.

The basic electricity and electronics training building project, with a cost of $1,274,000, will provide the additional training spaces required to accommodate the increased number of students being required to take this training. Existing capacity at Great Lakes and San Diego is inadequate to meet this requirement.

Senator SYMINGTON. This project was denied last year, as I recall, principally because this training is given at both Great Lakes and San Diego. Does not this same situation exist, and why do you insist on a third training school of this nature?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Despite last year's denial of this project, we still strongly feel that it makes good sense to have this kind of training at each of our three training centers. Of the 66 rates in the Navy, basic electricity and electronics is a prerequisite for 16 of them, about 25 percent. The location of this training near each recruit training center provides an effective screening device so that students don't have to travel between the recruit training center and his first technical training school. Only those students who show an aptitude for follow-on courses are ordered to additional training.

NAVAL COASTAL SYSTEMS LABORATORY, PANAMA CITY, FLA.

We are requesting $3,663,000 for the Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Fla. This laboratory is the principal Navy R.D.T. & E. center for application of science and technology to coastal region military operations. This includes R.D.T. & E. responsibility for Navy diving, swimming, and undersea salvage operations.

Senator SYMINGTON. Just what kind of work is performed at this installation? I note that during the 90th Congress we authorized $7.4 million for a deep ocean engineering pressure building, and you are now asking almost a $2 million increase. Will you explain the need for this?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The laboratory at Panama City is the principal Navy R.D.T. & E. center for the application of science and technology associated with military operations carried out primarily in the coastal region and performs investigations in related fields of science and technology. Some of the laboratory's functions are coastal and riverine surveillance and interdiction, harbor, bridge, riverine and swimmer defense, counterinsurgency systems, underwater ordnance countermeasure, shallow water oceanography, naval swimmer/diver support systems and salvage support.

The cost increase is due to a combination of factors. The requirement to provide material certification for hyperbaric facilities did not become known until after the project was funded. Material certification is basically a format procedure for insuring that a deep pressure system meets material and procedural standards of adequacy. It includes technical review of documentation, detailed quality control during construction, testing procedures for hardware and system development of operating and maintenance manuals, simulated test dives and other costs not associated with normal military construction. In addition, due to the sophisticated and essentially research nature of the project, the original cost estimated was inadequate to meet design requirements. It was necessary to develop the cost estimate without benefit of an engineering and feasibility study or a complete program cost estimate.

The experimental diving facility, with a cost of $1,363,000, will provide laboratory space and recompression chambers required by the relocation of the Navy experimental diving unit from the Washington, D.C. Navy Yard. Existing available space is substandard and inadequate.

The request for the systems development and test facility is $2,300,000 which includes the $200,000 increase requested under the program change request letter of July 17, 1973.

The systems development and test facility will provide a building needed for the development and testing of large systems and components used to support military operations in coastal environments. The increase was requested to provide a parking and testing apron for conducting Navy trials on two air cushion amphibious landing craft, which is a new requirement levied on this activity.

NAVAL AEROSPACE REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER, PENSACOLA, FLA.

A request of $1,084,000 is made for the one project at the Naval Aerospace Regional Medical Center, Pensacola, Fla. This project, which was added by the program change letter of July 17, 1973, will construct a new dental clinic and modernize the existing dispensary at the Naval Communications Training Center (Corry Field), Pensacola. These facilities will be utilized for active duty dispensary and dental service and allow the vacated spaces in the Naval Hospital, Pensacola, to be used for a newly developed family practice residency program.

NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLA.

We are requesting $2,699,000 for the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla. This station supports Naval Training Command, Naval Air Training Command, Naval Aviation School Command, Training

Squadrons Four, and Ten and Twenty-Nine, Training Aircraft Carrier (U.S.S. *Lexington*), and the Naval Air Rework Facility.

The air operations building addition project will provide facilities to house additional air traffic control radar equipment. Presently, these activities are in crowded, inadequate space with no room for radar air traffic control equipment which is to be added to the complex. The project cost is $199,000.

The operations flight trainer building project, with a cost of $791,000, will provide space to house two operational flight trainers and related equipment for jet pilot training.

The naval aviation museum supporting facilities will provide the support (all utilities, roads, and parking) facilities required by the construction of the new museum. The project cost is $299,000.

Senator SYMINGTON. Now, I am sure this museum is a nice thing to have, but it certainly is not an official function of the Navy, and I wonder why you are proposing to spend appropriated funds for supporting facilities in regard to it?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Naval Museum at Pensacola is indeed a very important function of the Navy Air Training Command. It is the respository of important memorabilia depicting the heritage and tradition of naval air and space exploits. One of the first things they do with a prospective naval aviator when he reports to Pensacola is to take him on a conducted tour of the Air Museum. The new museum building will be constructed on Navy land with the use of private contributions; but when completed, it will be donated to the Navy for operation and maintenance. Because of the obvious benefit to the tradition and heritage of Navy air, both for training and for public relations, it was agreed in the original proposal for the new museum that the Navy would provide the necessary supporting facilities.

The entrance and arterial roads project will improve on station roads in phase with off-station highway programs. The request for this project is $1,410,000.

NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING CENTER, PENSACOLA, FLA.

We are requesting $9,859,000 for the Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Fla. This center provides training for officers and enlisted men of the Navy to prepare them as technicians and operators of various cryptologic and electronic warfare equipment and systems.

The Electrical Warfare Training Building project will provide training space for advanced electronics warfare and naval flight officers. Training is now conducted in limited space diverted from other training. The project cost is $3,982,000.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project, with a cost of $5,877,000, will provide modern living spaces for 1,200 men.

NAVAL AIR STATION, WHITING FIELD, FLA.

We are requesting $2,186,000 for one project at the naval air station, Whiting Field, Fla. This station supports the basic propeller and helicopter flight training operations of the Naval Air Training Command.

The dispensary and dental clinic project will replace the existing clinic and provide facilities needed for improving the delivery of dental services.

NAVAL HOME, GULFPORT, MISS.

We are requesting $9,444,000 at the Navy Home, Gulfport, Miss. This home will provide a residence for old, disabled Navy and Marine Corps personnel.

The new naval home (phase II) project will provide a new home for 600 residents to replace the existing inadequate facility currently located in Philadelphia, Pa.

NAVAL AIR STATION, MERIDIAN, MISS.

We are requesting $4,532,000 for the naval air station, Meridian, Miss. This station supports the jet aircraft pilot training program of the training command.

The flight training device building addition project will provide an addition to the flight training building for new flight simulator equipment having six degrees of freedom. Existing space cannot accommodate this equipment. The project cost is $525,000.

The dispensary and dental clinic project at $2,500,000 will replace the existing clinic which is undersized and functionally inadequate.

The administration building project will construct a facility in the schools complex for 114 supporting personnel charged with administering the several schools at the station. The request for this project is $675,000.

The amount of $832,000 is requested for the training center-gymnasium project which will provide a new facility. With the increased baseloading imposed by the schools complex, the existing gymnasium is too small to support the physical education program.

CHARLESTON NAVAL SHIPYARD, CHARLESTON, S.C.

The amount of $252,000 is requested for one project at the Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S.C. This shipyard repairs, overhauls, alters, and converts small surface ships and conventional and nuclear attack and fleet ballistic missile nuclear submarines.

The addition and dispensary project will provide facilities to house a photo dosimeter, laboratory, and records facility utilized in the radiological exposure safety program.

NAVAL STATION, CHARLESTON, S.C.

The amount of $1,498,000 is requested for two projects at the naval station, Charleston, S.C. This station provides logistic support to 26 commands and activities, including commander mine warfare, submarine flotilla six, cruiser-destroyer flotilla six, and service forces, Atlantic, and serves as homeport for approximately 70 ships.

At $1,321,000, the communication facility project will provide a transmitter building and antenna to replace existing facilities built in 1941.

The amount of $177,000 is requested for the Poseidon submarine deployed crew storage project which will provide an environmentally

controlled storage area for personal effects of crewmakers of deployed nuclear submarines. Presently, there are no comparable military or civilian facilities available, and personal effects must either be sent home or possibly be damaged by mildew and rot while stored in the present spaces.

NAVAL AIR STATION, MEMPHIS, TENN.

The amount of $4,478,000 is requested for one project at the naval air station, Memphis, Tenn. This station supports operations, activities, and units of the Naval Training Command.

The Applied Instruction Building project will provide a facility to conduct air traffic control and ground control approach training courses being relocated from the naval air station, Glynco, Ga.

Senator SYMINGTON. This requirement is generated by the closing of the naval air station, Glynco, Ga. It seems to me this air traffic control training might be performed most anywhere you may have had existing facilities. What was the compelling reason to transfer it to Memphis, resulting in this $4½ million expenditure?

Admiral MARSCHALL. In order to consolidate like kinds of training and avoid duplication of training resources, the air traffic control and ground control approach training at Glynco will be relocated to Memphis, where we already have similar air-related technical training ongoing.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL HOSPITAL, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The amount of $3,386,000 is requested for one project at the Naval Hospital, New Orleans. This hospital provides inpatient and outpatient clinic care and general hospitalization services to eligible personnel in the New Orleans area.

The nursing unit addition project will provide an addition of 150 beds to increase the capacity of the 100-bed hospital authorized in fiscal year 1973. Increased Navy personnel loading in the area require this addition.

Senator SYMINGTON. This project I do not understand. Only last year we gave you $11.6 million for the construction of a 100-bed hospital here in New Orleans. Now you are requesting almost $3.4 million for the addition of a 150-bed nursing unit. Didn't you know what you needed when last year's request was made?

Admiral MARSCHALL. An on-site survey by representatives of the Department of Defense (DOD) and Bureau of Medicine and Surgery (BUMED) concluded that a 100-bed naval hospital would be sufficient, provided that the U.S. Public Health Service (USPHS) Hospital, New Orleans, would remain operational. Should the latter close, it was the consensus that an additional 150 beds would be needed at the naval hospital.

A memorandum from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Environment) to the Office of Management and Budget, dated November 4, 1971, is quoted in part, ". . . to the uncertainty of the future of the USPHS Hospital . . . we are instructing the Navy to design the hospital so that it may readily receive a major addition at a future date. . . ."

In April 1973, it was announced that the USPHS Hospital, New Orleans, would terminate admitting patients as of July 1, 1973. Consequently, the Navy introduced a 150-bed addition into the 1974 military construction program.

Subsequent to the latter action, there has been at least a temporary stay to the closure of inpatient care at the USPHS hospital, New Orleans.

NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The amount of $13,880,000 is requested for four projects at the naval support activity, New Orleans. This activity provides logistic support to the Commandant, 8th Naval District, and more than 19 tenant activities, including the Naval Hospital and precommissioning crews for destroyer escorts under construction.

For the administrative complex project $8,490,000 is requested to provide facilities for consolidation of the following organizations in New Orleans: personnel management information center, Naval Reserve personnel center, and enlisted personnel distribution offices.

Senator SYMINGTON. I cannot understand why all this administrative space is needed in New Orleans at this time. Would you tell us just what this will be used for?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Because of its central location, New Orleans has been selected as the site for the consolidation of functions presently scattered along both coasts. Although the advantages of this arrangement are not readily adaptable to an economic cost analysis, the long range benefits in improved planning coordination will produce significant operational and economic benefits for the Navy.

Consolidations at New Orleans include:

1. The Marine Air Wing presently located at NAS Glenview, Ill. will be colocated with the Chief of Naval Reserves.

2. The personnel management information centers presently located at Bainbridge, Md., Norfolk, Va., and San Diego, Calif. will be consolidated and headquartered in New Orleans.

3. The Naval Reserve personnel centers presently located in Washington, D.C., Bainbridge, Md., and Omaha, Nebr., will be consolidated and located in New Orleans, and

4. The enlisted personnel distribution offices presently located in Washington, D.C., Norfolk, Va., and San Diego, Calif. will be consolidated and located in New Orleans. This will increase the population by approximately 1,600 personnel.

The amount of $1,288,000 is requested for the Armed Force exam and entrance station to convert existing warehouse space to administrative space for offices that will move from downtown New Orleans.

For the bachelor enlisted quarters with mess project, $1,799,000 is requested to provide modern living quarters with mess for 211 men who are currently living in inadequate World War II temporary barracks.

The employees parking building project, at $2,323,000, will provide parking spaces to accommodate the personnel being relocated to the activity under the administrative complex project and the Armed Forces exam and entrance station project.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you propose to spend $2.3 million for an employees parking building, I suppose in support of the $8½ million administration complex we discussed earlier. It seems to be an un-

conscionable amount to spend for a parking lot, particularly since there has been considerable agitation to require Government employees to pay for their parking. Why cannot they find their own parking facilities in this area?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The personnel loading on the east bank, NSA New Orleans, will be increased from the present 652 personnel to 1,954. Presently only 422 parking spaces are available and there is no land for additional spots. The surrounding area does not have any off-station parking because the neighborhood was planned prior to the recognition of the great use of automobiles and today's standard of living. Therefore, the only feasible alternative is to convert one of the existing structures in parking spaces.

NAVAL AIR STATION, CHASE FIELD, TEX.

The amount of $2,875,000 is requested for two projects at the Naval Air Station, Chase Field, Tex. This station supports the jet pilot training program of the naval training command.

For the flight training device building project, $575,000 is requested to provide space to house new flight simulator equipment have 6 degrees of freedom. Existing facilities cannot accommodate the new equipment.

A request of $2,300,000 is made for the dispensary and dental clinic project which will replace the existing facility which is housed in a temporary, deteriorated wood structure, that is overcrowded, functionally inadequate, and poorly located near a runway and taxiway.

NAVAL AIR STATION, KINGSVILLE, TEX.

The amount of $3,040,000 is requested for two projects at the Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Tex. This station supports jet pilot training programs of the Naval Training Command.

The flight training device building project, at $986,000 will provide space to house new flight simulator equipment having 6 degrees of freedom. Existing facilities are located in a World War II, wooden, temporary structure with poor insulation and are in a deteriorated condition.

A request of $2,054,000 is made for the dispensary and dental clinic project, which will replace a World War II facility with a modern clinic needed to provide proper medical support to eligible personnel.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL COMPLEX, GREAT LAKES, ILL.

The amount of $19,908,000 is requested for five projects at the naval complex, Great Lakes. The naval hospital provides general clinical and hospitalization service for eligible personnel in the Great Lakes area.

At the naval hospital, $2,800,000 is requested for the naval hospital—hospital modernization and upgrade project which will modernize and upgrade existing hospital utilities to meet current National Fire Protection Association regulations. This will be achieved by providing an emergency generator system, grounding circuits, and an alternate primary service feeder.

The amount of $4,259,000 is requested for the naval training center—administrative command—dispensary and dental clinic project. The training center provides basic recruit training for enlisted personnel and primary, advanced, and specialized training for officer and enlisted personnel. The dispensary and dental clinic project will provide a consolidated medical care facility to replace the existing dispersed, deteriorated World War II facilities at the naval training center.

The amount of $1,923,000 is requested for the naval training center—recruit training command—medical/dental processing facility project which will replace a facility which is substandard, a temporary structure with poor heating and sanitary facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here at Great Lakes you are requesting three medical facilities, as reflected on pages 154, 155, and 156, of your justification books that will cost almost $9 million. Two of them relate to dental facilities. Isn't there some way that these facilities can be combined at least in part, in order to save a few dollars?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The proposed medical/dental processing facility will replace a World War II temporary wood-frame structure that has deteriorated over the past 30 years and has become functionally inadequate for the mass processing of all personnel entering recruit training at Great Lakes. This facility is where the recruits receive their initial Navy processing, including physical and dental examinations. The processing is primarily administrative in nature and is set up to handle large masses of people in a relatively short period of time. The functions performed by the recruit processing facility and the dispensary/dental clinic are quite diverse, one being a screening process while the other offers a complete, full range of dental treatment in a clinical environment. However, in order to avoid needless duplication, common support functions—such as supply, repair, et cetera—have been incorporated into the proposed dispensary and dental clinic to service both dental facilities.

The amount of $6,166,000 is requested for the naval training center—service school command—machines/boilerman instruction building project. This project will provide classroom space for providing training associated with 1,200 p.s.i. propulsion plants.

A request of $4,760,000 is made for the naval training center—service school command—bachelor enlisted quarters project to provide modern living quarters for 876 men currently living in overcrowded quarters.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER, CHINA LAKE, CALIF.

The amount of $3,163,000 is requested for two projects at the Naval Weapons Center, China Lake. This center conducts a program of warfare analysis, research, development, test, evaluation, systems integration, and fleet engineering support in naval weapons systems, principally for air warfare, and conducts investigations in related fields of science and technology.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project, at $2,946,000, will provide modern living spaces for 406 men.

A request of $217,000 is made for the electrical distribution system improvements project. This project will provide improvements to the systems and supplement existing feeders and transformer capacity to relieve current overloading of these systems.

LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The amount of $6,808,000 is requested for one project at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard. This shipyard provides overhaul, repair, and conversion of all types of surface ships up to carrier size but primarily antisubmarine and antiaircraft types. This shipyard also provides homeport logistic support for the majority of Pacific Fleet ships.

The service group building project will replace and modernize the woodworking shop, paint shop, riggers shop, and temporary services shop.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you propose to spend almost $7 million in modernization at Long Beach Naval Shipyard but, on the other hand, you are transferring many functions out of Long Beach under the base realinement program, which makes one wonder just how permanent this shipyard is. Will you comment on this please?

Admiral MARSHALL. The Chief of Naval Operations provided the following guidance to Navships regarding the need for and location of naval shipyards:

> In the long term, fleet requirements will be best served by a complex of naval shipyards proximate to fleet homeports and/or operating areas. The capabilities and capacities of these naval shipyards should be adequate to handle the projected demands and industrial services that will be placed on them by the fleet. Consideration should be given to structuring a naval shipyard complex so that each shipyard's capabilities and capacity are in relation to its future workload based on projections of the future size and composition of the fleet as well as its location.

The Long Beach Naval Shipyard fulfills CNO's operational requirements for a shipyard proximate to homeport and operational areas. The ships that are currently homeported in San Diego and Long Beach, as well as those using the southern California operational areas, look to Long Beach for industrial services. The transfer of functions out of the Long Beach area will have no effect on the shipyard's workload. In fact, the effect of the entire base closure package will serve to increase the Long Beach Naval Shipyard's workload. Long Beach's location, capabilities, and capacity justify the permanency of this shipyard.

NAVAL HOSPITAL, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The amount of $878,000 is requested for one project at the naval hospital, Long Beach. This hospital provides medical and hospitalization services for eligible personnel in the Long Beach area.

The bachelor enlisted quarters addition project will provide modern living quarters for 128 men and relieve the overcrowding of the existing facility.

NAVAL AIR STATION, MIRAMAR, CALIF.

The amount of $1,873,000 is requested for two projects at the Naval Air Station, Miramar. This master jet air station supports all Navy West Coast F–4 and F–8 fleet fighter squadrons, a photo squadron, and a reserve squadron consisting of the E–2 airborne early warning aircraft.

For the applied instruction building project, an increase in the cost of $419,000 was requested under the program change to make the project cost $1,542,000.

This change alters the original project to provide additions to two buildings and alterations to three buildings instead of the construction of a new facility. This project is required to support the relocation of airborne early warning squadrons from the Naval Air Station, North Island, under the shore establishmnet realinement program.

Introduction of the E–2B airborne early warning aircraft into fleet squadrons will begin next fiscal year; therefore, adequate operational and tactics training facilities are urgently needed.

A request of $331,000 is made for the avionics shop addition project which will provide a facility for intermediate level maintenance of the airborne early warning aircraft.

NAVAL AIR STATION, NORTH ISLAND, CALIF.

The amount of $2,415,000 is requested for the four projects at the Naval Air Station, North Island. This station is the Seaport Industrial Air Station for the San Diego area naval complex. It supports fleet antisubmarine warfare and utility squadrons. The station has been designated the West Coast site and homeport for the new S–3A weapon system beginning in 1974. This station also supports the naval air rework facility.

For the applied instruction building project, $476,000 is requested to provide an addition to the existing training building for a light airborne multipurpose system (LAMPS) operational flight trainer and modifications to the existing building to accommodate helicopter operational and maintenance trainers.

The amount of $1,185,000 is requested for the transbay water/sewer-lines project which will remove old lines and replace the waterlines with new lines located at a greater depth to allow for dredging of the harbor.

The amount of $754,000 is requested for the naval air rework facility-maintenance hangar addition project which will provide an addition to the E–2 rework hangar to accommodate the increased workload which has been generated by the move of complex electronic systems installed in the E–2 aircraft. With the transfer of all helicopter activities from the Naval Air Station, Imperial Beach, the station will become the homeport for all West Coast rotary wing aircraft squadrons.

FLEET COMBAT DIRECTION SYSTEMS TRAINING CENTER, PACIFIC, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The amount of $1,118,000 is requested for one project at the Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Pacific, San Diego. This center provides antiwar warfare training for fleet personnel to develop and perfect their skills by the actual operation of tactical command and direction systems in a realistic warfare environment.

The academic instruction building project will provide classrooms and related spaces to support 6 new courses and the installation of new systems and equipment for 13 existing courses.

NAVAL ELECTRONICS LABORATORY CENTER, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The amount of $3,518,000 is requested for one project at the Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego. This laboratory is the principal Navy R.D.T. & E. Center for electronics technology and command, control, and communications concepts and systems.

The Electronics Development and Test Laboratory project will provide the first increment of a controlled electronic environment with electromagnetic shielding for integration and testing of command, control and communications and surveillance systems. This facility is required for try-before-buy performance testing by early 1976 of electronic systems for new construction DLG's, DD's, LHA's Ocean Surveillance Information System, Integrated Combat Systems and Antisubmarine Warfare Command, Control and Communications System.

Senator SYMINGTON. I note that this is the first increment in the amount of $3½ million, and I understand that there will be a following increment totaling around $5 million, which makes for a most expensive structure. I also note that the DOD has no such facility at the present time. What kind of work is proposed to be performed here, and what do you do now, since you have no such facility?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The proposed facility would house the elements of a Naval ship command and control capability and is intended to enhance the center's efforts in integration of all the command support equipment aboard our vessels to help attack the problems of shortness of time available to a ship commander in the current military world. The design of the facility centers around the construction of a large shielded enclosure for the testing of complete integrated command, control and communications systems.

The function was previously performed in several separate locations consisting of several spaces in a general laboratory and office building, converted space in two coastal gun batteries, converted World War II barracks, trailers, and in the surplus carrier, *Bunker Hill*, which is currently being sold for scrap and no longer available to the Naval Electronics Laboratory Center.

NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The amount of $11,996,000 is requested for two projects at the Naval Station, San Diego. This station provides homeport facilities for ships of the Pacific Fleet, personnel services, berthing, harbor services, and other logistic support.

A request of $10 million is made for the berthing pier project which will provide additional berthing space required to accommodate ships being relocated from the Naval Station, Long Beach.

Senator SYMINGTON. This requirement results from the closure of the Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif. If these ships had to be moved from Long Beach, isn't there some place they could have been moved to without spending $10 million for a new pier?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The ships from Long Beach are being transferred to Pearl Harbor, Bremerton, San Francisco and San Diego.

Deep draft piers at the stations receiving the ships have been exhausted. In Pearl Harbor, where six ships are being sent, all piers will be occupied excepting Ford Island. Ford Island cannot be used for homeporting because of extreme logistic problems involved in transportation to the island, as there is no bridge. A bridge would cost $9,547,000 and several millions more would have to be spent for pier utilities and other support. At San Francisco we are not only using all pier space available for carriers in Alameda, but all deep draft piers are to be used at Alameda, Oakland and Mare Island, as well as Concord. Considering the number of large vessels relocated from Long Beach, it is necessary to build one new pier at one of the naval installations. Because of superior logistics and training facilities, San Diego was selected as the best site for the new pier for deep draft ships.

The amount of $1,996,000 is requested for the pier utilities project which will provide "cold iron" utilities and structural repairs to pier 5. Existing utility systems do not have the capacity required to allow ships to go "cold iron."

NAVAL TRAINING CENTER, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The amount of $2,994,000 is requested for one project at the Naval Training Center, San Diego. This center provides basic recruit, primary, advanced, and specialized training for Navy officer and enlisted personnel.

The Administrative Command—bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living quarters for 504 men currently living in crowded, open bay barracks constructed in 1923.

NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The amount of $2,471,000 is requested for one project at the Navy Public Works Center, San Diego. This center provides public works, public utilities, housing, transportation support, engineering services, and other logistic support to eight major naval activities in the San Diego area.

The naval station—steam distribution project will provide steam distribution lines to berthing piers. The existing lines are inadequate and deteriorated.

NAVY SUBMARINE SUPPORT FACILITY, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The amount of $3,920,000 is requested for two projects at the Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego. This facility is the homeport of all west coast submarines. The only other base in the Pacific is at Pearl Harbor. This facility supports two submarine squardons, two submarine tenders and the deep submergence program.

$2,667,000 is requested for the bachelor enlisted quarters project to provide modern living quarters for 468 men, currently living in eight wood-frame, substandard, open bay barracks.

The pier utilities project, with a cost of $1,253,000, will provide "cold iron" utilities to two piers used by submarine tenders and attack submarines.

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, SEAL BEACH, CALIF.

The amount of $1,528,000 is requested for two projects at the Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Calif. This station receives, renovates, maintains, stores, and issues ammunition, explosives, expendable ordnance items, and provides logistics support for surface- and air-launched guided missiles.

The bachelor enlisted quarters with mess project will provide messing and modern living quarters for 90 men currently living in substandard, inadequate quarters with unreliable utilities. The project cost is $721,000.

The Fallbrook Annex, bachelor enlisted quarters with mess project, with a cost of $807,000, will provide messing and modern living quarters for 82 men currently living in temporary barracks buildings.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA, CALIF.

The amount of $5,236,000 is requested for two projects at the Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif. This seaport industrial station provides waterfront facilities for the homeport of refrigerated cargo ships and aircraft carriers. A tenant, the naval air rework facility, is the major overhaul point for A–3 and P–3 aircraft.

The pier utilities project with a cost of $3,827,000 will provide the final segment of a program to supply all berthing piers with complete utilities from shore facilities, including steam and compressed air to pier 2, wharf 2, and pier 3. New systems for the distribution of potable water, steam, compressed air, fuel and fire protection, flushing and cooling water will also be provided.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you propose to spend $3.8 million for pier utilities. My recollection is that you will make some substantial reductions at Alameda, due to the base realinement program. In light of this, why is this project necessary?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The aviation activities at NAS, Alameda, are being reduced, with squadrons being transferred to NAS, Lenmoore, Calif., and NAS, Moffett Field, Calif. Alameda will continue to be the homeport for two aircraft carriers, three stores ships, plus four additional auxiliary ships being relocated from Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif. The $3.8 million cold iron project and the ship wastewater collection ashore project in the pollution abatement program are required to support these ships.

The amount of $1,409,000 is requested for the naval air rework facility, avionics building environmental control project, to provide environmental control and modifications to existing avionics work spaces to permt accurate rework of sensitive electronic navigational and communication equipment of aircraft.

NAVAL AIR STATION, LEMOORE, CALIF.

The amount of $3,266,000 is requested for two projects at the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif. This all-weather master jet air station is the west coast homeport for fleet A–4 and A–7 attack squadrons,

three carrier replacement air groups, three carrier air wings, and two tactical electronic warfare squadrons.

The amount of $1,933,000 is requested for the integrated avionics shop project which will provide a maintenance facility for avionics equipment. Work is presently performed in five separated buildings providing only 40 percent of the required work area. The lighting and means of controlling dust in the existing building fall short of the standard needed for performing work on sensitive electronic navigation and communication equipment.

A request of $1,333,000 is made for the dental clinic project which will provide a new larger facility in the operational area and convert existing space in the hospital to hospital usage.

NAVAL AIR STATION, MOFFETT FIELD, CALIF.

The amount of $5,695,000 is requested for six projects at the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, Calif. The station is the primary west coast antisubmarine warfare patrol base air station.

The amount of $2,115,000 is requested for the taxiway overlay project which will provide a taxiway and holding area of sufficient strength to support current operations. Overloading has resulted in cracked corners of slabs, spalling at joints, rutting, and general breaking up of the pavement.

The aircraft parking apron project, at $750,000, will provide adequate parking space for the relocation of fleet operational squadrons from the Naval Air Station, Alameda. The project will provide parking space for nine patrol or reconnaissance aircraft.

The amount of $300,000 is requested for the fuel storage project which will upgrade the existing direct fueling system to achieve a design flow rate of 600 gallons per minute and modify the system to provide recirculation, thereby making provision for cleaning the fuel of water, impurities, and contaminators.

Under the program change letter of July 17, 1973, a new project for $430,000 was requested for an operational trainer building addition. This facility addition, within a hangar, will house two P–3C operational flight trainers. The trainers which are on order, will be able to provide for the first time coupled-mode training by simulation instead of the more costly and hazardous in-flight training.

The avionics shop project, with a cost of $1,600,000 will provide a maintenance facility for avionics equipment. Work is currently being conducted in inadequately sized wooden World War II facilities with no environmental controls.

The bachelor enlisted quarters modernization project will provide 72 adequate spaces for personnel of reconnaissance/cargo squadrons being relocated from Naval Air Station, Alameda. The project cost is $500,000.

NAVAL HOSPITAL, OAKLAND, CALIF.

The amount of $5,839,000 is requested for three projects at the Naval Hospital, Oakland, Calif. The hospital provides inpatient and outpatient care to eligible personnel in the San Francisco area.

The warehouse facility project, at $768,000 will construct facilities for general organizational storage of medical supplies.

The amount of $4,260,000 is requested for the hospital alterations project which will provide increased electrical power, air-conditioning of all patient care areas, and a new entrance drive to the hospital building.

Senator SYMINGTON. This hospital is relatively new and I thought one of your most modern. Yet, you are proposing to spend over $4 million for alterations and you state that the existing electrical substation within the hospital is considered unsafe due to utility piping overhead. How can this be in a modern hospital that was only completed a few years ago?

Admiral MARSCHALL. While it is true that the electrical substation is considered unsafe because of its location under utility piping, there are two other major considerations which account for the greater part of the money requested for alterations.

The Naval Hospital, Oakland, was completed in 1968 and consequently was designed under criteria which existed in 1964. Since that time, the DOD criteria have changed to include air-conditioning of the entire hospital vis-a-vis isolated segments of the hospital. The project will include air-conditioning of the entire hospital.

Another major consideration is the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards which have been promulgated since 1964. These standards are quite extensive and strict, which will necessitate consideration to all of our existing hospitals.

The Enlisted Men's/Chief Petty Officers' Club project, at $811,000, will replace existing temporary constructions that is remote from the new hospital and bachelor enlisted quarters.

HUNTER'S POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The amount of $250,000 is requested for one project at the Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif. The shipyard is scheduled to be closed and placed in a caretaker status with the exception of drydock No. 4 which will be retained to provide drydocking facilities for the emergency repair to aircraft carriers.

The drydock support facility project will provide the necessary shop facilities to support drydocking of carriers in drydock No. 4.

Senator SYMINGTON. I cannot comprehend the need for this project at this shipyard which you are closing. There must be some facility that could be used in support at the drydock you propose to keep there.

Admiral MARSCHALL. This project provides the minimum modification to two existing buildings to provide the composite industrial facility required to support the emergency drydocking and repair of aircraft carriers. There is no existing building that can be used just as it is since each was designed, constructed, and outfitted for one specific purpose. The requirement is to provide a facility that will serve a number of purposes in a consolidated fashion. Therefore, it will be necessary to remove some equipments from those buildings and to relocate to and install in those buildings some other equipments. This necessary equipment relocation and installation requires foundation construction and utilities connections. In addition, it will be necessary to overhaul the drydock dewatering pumps and, finally, to install a security fence around the drydock and its support areas.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, SKAGGS ISLAND, CALIF.

The amount of $641,000 is requested for one project at the naval security group activity, Skaggs Island, Calif. The naval security group activity provides rapid communications for the defense of the United States.

The dispensary and dental clinic project will replace the existing facilities which are substandard wooden structures, overcrowded, and a fire hazard. A recent evaluation of the requirement for this project indicated that this facility may be deferred.

MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD, VALLEJO, CALIF.

The amount of $2,074,000 is requested for two projects at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif. This shipyard performs work in connection with alterations, drydockings, and outfitting of ships and craft and refueling of nuclear submarines and surface craft other than carriers. In addition, this yard services submarine warfare systems, both nuclear attack and Polaris.

The electronic shop alterations project at $200,000 was requested to provide facilities to accommodate an expected increase in workload created by the planned closure of the Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard. A recent evaluation of the workload to be relocated disclosed that new facilities would not be required, therefore this project is withdrawn from this year's program.

The amount of $1,874,000 is requested for the electrical distribution system improvements project which will improve the existing system by partially replacing obsolete equipment and worn cable and will install a new control system. The existing system is unreliable and of insufficient capacity. The requirement for this project is independent of the requirement for the electronic shop alterations project.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL COMPLEX, ADAK, ALASKA

The amount of $8,773,000 is requested for three projects at the naval complex, Adak, Alaska. This complex provides a strategically located installation for the deployment of P–3 antisubmarine warfare aircraft and for operating communication facilities that support naval operating forces.

The amount of $2,695,000 is requested for the naval communication station-bachelor enlisted quarters project which will provide modern living spaces for 136 men currently living in overcrowded, substandard quarters.

The amount of $4,158,000 is requested for the naval station runway and taxiway overlay project which will upgrade existing pavements to sustain modern P–3 ASW patrol aircraft. The existing pavements constructed in 1944 are not capable of sustaining the current load of operational aircraft without suffering damage and continuing deterioration.

The Navy commissary store-commissary project, with a cost of $1,920,000, will provide a new facility to replace a substandard, struc-

turally deteriorated facility which is too small to adequately serve the families of the naval complex, Adak.

PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD, BREMERTON, WASH.

The amount of $2,300,000 is requested for two projects at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard. This shipyard provides surface ship new construction and overhaul of all types of ships including aircrafct carriers, frigates, and submarines.

The amount of $1,954,000 is requested for the electrical distribution system project which will upgrade and replace the antiquated and undersized existing system.

The crane track connection project at $346,000 will provide a transfer track between two drydocks to permit the efficient and economical use of portable cranes which presently cannot move freely from point to point in the yard.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL AIR STATION, BARBERS POINT, HAWAII

The amount of $4,306,000 is requested for one project at the Naval Air Station, Barbers Point. This station is the primary support and patrol station for the Hawaiian Sea Frontier. The station supports transient and carrier groups, fleet composite squadrons, tactical support squadrons, and five antisubmarine warfare patrol squadrons.

The dispensary and dental clinic project will replace the existing functionally inadequate and rundown facility.

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, OAHU, HAWAII

The amount of $457,000 is requested for one project at the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii. This depot maintains, stores, and issues basic and war reserve ammunition stocks for the Pacific Fleet, operates a weapons evaluation and engineering facility, and supports explosives ordnance disposal in the Pacific.

The Waikele branch-perimeter fence and security culverts project will improve and complete existing security features which currently provide only one-half of the fencing and culverts needed. Presently, trespassers can still gain access to the base undetected.

Senator SYMINGTON. Is this ammunition depot in joint use by the Army, Navy, and Air Force?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The ammunition depot is used principally by the Navy although some storage is provided to the Army.

Senator SYMINGTON. There has been some question about the closing of the quality evaluation engineering laboratory at one of the ammunition depots in Hawaii. Is that involved here?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The quality evaluation engineering laboratory location does not affect the requirement for the perimeter fence and functions will be relocated from CONUS activities; however, this requirement for the perimeter fence and security culverts project.

NAVAL STATION, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

The amount of $4,060,000 is requested for three projects at the Naval Station, Pearl Harbor. This station provides logistics support to the Commander in Chief, Pacific; Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet; a shipyard; ammunition depot; supply center; and other Fleet support activities.

The enlisted men's dining facility project, with a cost of $1,345,000, will provide a new mess hall to replace an existing deteriorated, wooden building which is poorly located.

The amount of $1,870,000 is requested for the Ford Island evaluation center project which will expand the evaluation center on Ford Island to accommodate new equipment that will increase the capability of the anti-submarine-warfare system.

We are requesting $845,000 for the naval preventive medicine unit No. 6 preventive medicine unit project which will provided a permanent, consolidated facility to replace old, inefficient, and poorly located facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. Just what is this facility and what kind of work is performed: With the several medical facilities in the Pearl Harbor area, isn't there some space where this work can be performed without providing additional space?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This facility is basically a laboratory which performs many functions related to the prevention of disease and disability in the Pacific Fleet. It would be most detrimental to incorporate the preventive medicine unit into an existing medical treatment facility for many reasons, but several of the more obvious ones are as follows:

(a) The Navy environmental and preventive medicine unit No. 6 (EPMU) works with extremely hazardous organisms (rabies, virus, tuberculosis bacilli, and so forth, which require specifically designed rooms and special handling. To physically locate this in an existing medical treatment facility would pose a formidable risk of contamination of hospital spaces with great risk to patients and staff.

(b) The EPMU entomology section maintains live colonies of mosquitoes, cockroaches, ticks, and so forth, for scientific purposes. These are disease carriers (vectors) which should be physically separated from patients.

(c) The EPMU must work with toxic pesticides, some of which are of a residual nature and consequently must be kept out of treatment facilities.

(*d*) The industrial hygiene department works with noxious and dangerous chemicals. While safety precautions are taken, the possibility of risk to patients, staff, and visitors through faulty ventilation, improper storage, accidental spillage, et cetera, is real unless the EPMU is physically separated from patient areas.

NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

The amount of $2,562,000 is requested for two projects at the Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. This base is the mid-Pacific intermediate level logistic support base for two squadrons of nuclear attack submarines.

The BEQ and mess modernization project, with a cost of $2,013,000, will modernize a quarters and mess for 474 men, currently using a structure which lacks proper ventilation and electrical facilities.

The BOQ and mess modernization project will modernize existing quarters and mess for 20 officers currently living in inadequate, substandard quarters. The project cost is $549,000.

NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

The amount of $1,985,000 is requested for two projects at the Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. The public works center provides shore utilities for the operating forces of the Navy located at the Pearl Harbor naval complex.

The additional utilities berthing wharves project, with a cost of $1,863,000, will provide electrical power to five berthing piers. This will allow the ships to go "cold iron."

The amount of $122,000 is requested for the Ford Island electrical distribution system improvement project which will upgrade the existing system to a capacity sufficient to meet the island's increasing power demands.

NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS STATION, HONOLULU, HAWAII

The amount of $2,324,000 is requested for three projects at the Naval Communications Station, Honolulu, Hawaii. This activity provides fleet broadcasts, tactical ship-to-ship and point-to-point communications in support of the defense communications system in the Hawaiian area.

The satellite communications terminal project with a cost of $1,006,000 will provide facilities for the programed phase II satellite communication system. Additional space is required to house the required equipment as the phase I system does not have the capacity or flexibility to accommodate the more advanced equipment of phase II.

We are requesting $468,000 for the bachelor enlisted quarters project which will provide modern living quarters for 44 men currently living in overcrowded, substandard quarters.

The amount of $850,000 is requested for the NRS Lualualei VLF antenna modification project. This project will correct existing deficiencies in the system which cause the current to arc to ground. Exessive current results which could damage the transmitters. A reduction in operating power, to avoid the grounding, results in a lowering of signal strength to an unacceptable level.

NAVAL DISTRICT WASHINGTON, D.C.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, QUANTICO, VA.

The amount of $831,000 is requested for this station that provides aircrew housing and direct helicopter support for the U.S. executive helicopter fleet.

One project totaling $831,000 will provide this station with a hangar to house the new VH–53 executive fleet helicopters.

MARINE CORPS DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION COMMAND, QUANTICO, VA.

The amount of $1,541,000 is requested for one project at this activity which conducts the officer candidate school, platoon leader classes, and provides the basic and advanced training for all commissioned officers of the Marine Corps and personnel of other services, as assigned.

The enlisted men's dining facility project will provide this command with a dining facility for 2,000 men.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you propose to provide an enlisted men's mess hall, yet there are three existing galleys and mess decks in the existing barracks. What will these old facilities be used for if this new one is approved?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The dining areas will be converted to rooms and/or lounges during renovation of the BEQ's. This is planned to be accomplished through a BEQ modernization project P–076 which is programed for fiscal year 1975.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE, N.C.

The amount of $8,902,000 is requested for three projects at this activity which is the training base for the Marine division assigned to the east coast and conducts specialized schools and individual combat training.

The parachute and survival equipment shop, with a cost of $555,000, will provide facilities to perform maintenance, packing, and storage for over 680 personnel parachutes.

The amount of $7,168,000 is requested for the bachelor enlisted quarters project that will provide new modern living accommodations for 1,260 men.

Senator SYMINGTON. I note that this project will provide for four 3-story and one 2-story bachelor enlisted quarters, to accommodate 1,260 men. What is the reason for constructing several buildings: Wouldn't it be cheaper to provide one large barracks building?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Construction savings resulting from reduced requirements for roofing, site work, and foundation area are offset by increased costs for stronger foundations and structure as well as additional requirements, such as elevators, not normally required for 2- or 3-story buildings. Accordingly, the cost per square foot in high-rise construction is not necessarily at a lesser amount than the same type of facility in a 2- or 3-story configuration. The savings normally associated with multistory construction are primarily involved with land, which is not a factor in this project.

For the central heating plant expansion project, $1,179,000 is requested to construct an addition to the central heating plant to house a 100,000 pounds-per-hour, oil-fired steam boiler.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, CHERRY POINT, N.C.

The amount of $1,821,000 is requested for one project for this station which supports the operation of the Second Marine Air Wing and the naval air rework facility.

The steam plant improvements project will construct new boilers in the existing central heating plant to provide adequate steam during maximum demand periods.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (HELICOPTER), NEW RIVER, N.C.

The amount of $3,245,000 is requested for two projects at this station which supports the operations of all Marine Corps East Coast helicopter squadrons.

The avionics shop project with a cost of $470,000 will provide an avionics maintenance facility to support approximately 114 rotary wing aircraft of one Marine aircraft group.

$2,775,000 is requested for the utilities expansion project which will expand and modernize the steam sewage control and electrical utilities services.

FLEET MARINE FORCE, ATLANTIC, NORFOLK, VA.

The amount of $686,000 is requested for two projects to be located at Camp Elmore. The Headquarters Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic, manages the operations, training, administration and logistics of assigned ground and aviation forces within the Atlantic Fleet Command structure.

The enlisted men's dining facility project, with a cost of $374,000, will provide a 250–350 man messhall of permanent construction sited at the Fleet Marine Force Atlantic area.

For the road improvements project $312,000 is requested to provide required improvement and expansion to the limited existing road network.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER, ALBANY, GA.

The amount of $5,204,000 is requested for this center which serves as the Marine Corps East Coast supply center, conducts such schools as directed, operates the central repair shop for overhaul and repair of operational and combat equipment, and operates the Marine Corps unified material management system.

The one project, the administration building, will provide adequate space to house administration functions being relocated from the Marine Corps supply activity, Philadelphia, Pa.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you propose to spend over $5 million for an administration building, made necessary by the move of certain functions from Philadelphia to Albany, Ga. Can you tell us just what was moved from Philadelphia to Albany, Ga., and what the estimated savings is as a result of this move?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Marine Corps supply activity will relocate from Philadelphia, Pa., to Albany, Ga. The major function of this activity is management of the inventory control point for the Marine Corps supply system. Yearly savings of $2.6 million will be realized by personnel reductions in overhead type employees,

such as administrative and security. A one-time construction cost avoidance at Philadelphia of $4.9 million, is offset by a new construction expenditure of $5.2 million at Albany. There will be a one-time expenditure of $5.9 million for costs of hiring and training new personnel; for the relocation of those personnel desiring to transfer; and to move certain items of equipment.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, BEAUFORT, S.C.

The amount of $126,000 is requested for this jet air station which supports three fighter squadrons, three attack squadrons, and three aviation support squadrons.

The one project for an aircraft corrosion control facility will provide a facility for the removal of certain dirt and grime deposits from approximately 106 assigned aircraft.

MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT, PARRIS ISLAND, S.C.

The amount of $2,580,000 is requested for one project at this depot which provides for reception and recruit training of enlisted personnel upon their first entry into the Marine Corps; provides schools to train enlisted personnel as sergeant majors, administrative chiefs, recruiters, drill instructors and field musics; conducts reserve training, rifle marksmanship training for Marine officers and enlisted personnel in the Southeastern area, and for personnel of other services, as requested.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, YUMA, ARIZ.

The amount of $4,790,000 is requested for three projects at this air station which provides the primary aerial weapons training base for west coast Navy and Marine Corps fighter/attack squadrons.

The commissary project, with a cost of $999,000 will provide a new facility to serve active duty personnel assigned to the air station and Yuma Proving Grounds.

Senator SYMINGTON. I don't doubt the need for a commissary here at Yuma, but I am interested in what the overall cost will be. Just what type of built-in equipment will be included in this $1 million you are proposing to spend and how much operation and maintenance funds will be used for auxiliary equipment of various types?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The types of built-in equipment to be funded with construction funds as part of the $999,000 cost estimate for the Yuma commissary are as follows:

> Burglar alarm system; drinking fountain; fire alarm system; fire sprinkler system; floor safe; fly fans; heating/air-conditioning system; temperature rise alarm system; intercommunication system; mechanical ventilators; and telephone service.

Operation and maintenance funds in the amount of $30,405 for procurement of auxiliary equipment and $5,000 for equipment relocation are required.

For a land acquisition project $635,000 is requested that will acquire 129 acres to be utilized for the siting of an aircraft guided missile facility.

A second land acquisition project with an authorization requirement of $3,156,000 will acquire restrictive land easements on the periphery of this vital air station to protect against horizontal and vertical encroachment and sound pollution. This project will be accomplished by exchange of other Federal lands.

Senator SYMINGTON. This is quite a large reservation. According to the justification it consists of 2,237 acres owned in fee and another 1,700 acres of easements. Then, on the following page, you are asking for authority to acquire another 14,000 acres to prevent encroachment. Isn't there some place to locate the weapons facility without acquiring an additional 129 acres of land?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The requirement for providing space for explosive safety distance to accommodate the ordnance facility programed for fiscal year 1975 cannot be met within the land currently owned by the Marine Corps at Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma. The request for 14,000 acres to prevent encroachment would not allow the Marine Corps to occupy or build upon that acreage, if granted, but would, rather, preclude certain developments not compatible with the military and commercial air operations.

MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER, BARSTOW, CALIF.

The amount of $3,802,000 is requested for two projects at this supply center which serves as the Marine Corps west coast supply center for all west coast and WESTPAC activities, and operates a central repair shop for overhaul and repair of Marine Corps operational and combat equipment.

The sum of $976,000 is requested for the automotive vehicle shops project that will provide a permanent, consolidated, centralized, vehicle maintenance facility in the NEBO/YERMO areas.

The heating plant and distribution system project with a cost of $2,826,000 will provide a central heating plant and installation of a hot water distribution system in the NEBO area.

MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP PENDLETON, CALIF.

The amount of $10,920,000 is requested for eight projects at this activity which is the training base for a reinforced Marine division assigned to the west coast and conducts specialized schools and individual combat training.

The combat-training project, with a cost of $544,000, will provide modern and improved combat-training facilities at seven locations.

A total of $425,000 is requested for the area lighting systems project which will provide modern and uniform lighting on main streets and in congested personnel areas.

In the Chappo area, two projects are requested.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project at $6,285,000 will provide new billeting spaces for 1,110 men, that meet today's habitability standards.

Requested is $704,000 for the messhall modernization project which will renovate the existing Chappo area messhall for 3,129 men.

In the Horno area, two projects are requested, for a bachelor enlisted quarters and a gymnasium, with a cost of $1,649,000 and $1,106,000, respectively.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide billeting spaces for 288 men and one company office.

The gymnasium project will provide a facility for conducting physical conditioning, sports, and recreation programs.

In the San Onofre area, a telephone cable project with a cost of $99,000 is requested to provide additional telephone communications to the operations areas and an additional trunking route to the Camp Pendleton Headquarters area.

The remaining project for Camp Pendleton is an approach lighting project with a cost of $108,000 at the Marine Corps auxiliary land field. The project will equip the airfield with 1,500 feet of high intensity centerline approach lighting for all-weather instrument approaches.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, EL TORO, CALIF.

The amount of $747,000 is requested for one project at this air station which provides support for all Fleet Marine Force deployable tactical jet squadrons on the west coast.

The only project, a cold storage and ready issue warehouse project, will provide a facility to store and refrigerate perishable items.

MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The amount of $3,825,000 is requested for one project at this depot which provides the reception and recruit training of enlisted personnel upon their first entry into the Marine Corps. The depot also conducts schools to train enlisted men for duty with ships' detachments, as drill instructors and as field musics musicians.

The dispensary project will provide 75 beds for medical care to the recruits and permanent party personnel.

MARINE CORPS BASE, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIF.

The amount of $2,992,000 is requested for one project at this base which provides housing, training facilities, logistical support, and certain administration support for Fleet Marine Force units. The base also conducts training and provides logistic support to other Marine Corps activities.

The applied instruction buildings project will provide instructional spaces for the schools Company, Communications Electronics Battalion, and an applied instruction laboratory for training personnel in the air controller occupational specialty field.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, KANEOHE BAY, OAHU, HAWAII

The amount of $5,988,000 is requested for three projects at this air station which supports the operations of the 1st Marine Brigade consisting of one Marine regiment and one Marine air group (composite).

Requested is $485,000 for the aircraft hangar improvements project for improvements to offices and shops in three hangars.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project with a cost of $5,130,000 will provide new, modern living spaces for 756 E–2 through E–4 personnel.

A request of $373,000 is made for the project for a connecting road to interstate highway that will provide a new road to the station from Interstate H–3 Highway.

Senator SYMINGTON. Is this proposed connecting road on base? I am wondering why it isn't budgeted for out of access road funds, rather than military construction funds?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The proposed connecting road is entirely located within the station boundaries, and therefore, in accordance with the policy and procedure memorandum issued by the Department of Transportation, is not eligible for financing with defense access-roads funds.

TRIDENT FACILITIES—INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

For Trident facilities, the original program requested $125,223,000 for establishment of the Trident weapons system support facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. It is my understanding that you wish to reduce the land acquisition here by about $6,903,000, for a new total of $118,320,000, due to a reduced requirement for real estate acquisition. Is this true?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes; we have been able to reduce the requirement for real estate to $5.1 million. This figure is included in the total fiscal year 1974 military construction request of $118,320,000.

Under the various locations, Trident facilities project we are, therefore, requesting at two sites $118,320,000 for Trident facilities construction.

SUPPORT COMPLEX FACILITIES, BANGOR WASH.

Within the total are facilities at the Trident support site, Bangor, with an estimated cost of $83,170,000. One requirement at Bangor is the acquisition of at most 150 acres of land to assure that the necessary explosive safety zone arcs are within Government owned land. This year's project includes a covered explosive handling pier which is essential to the deployment of the weapons system and a refit pier to provide logical sequencing of construction. A weapon/navigation train-building is included to permit early crew training by naval personnel at naval facilities. This will enable the Navy to eliminate the most costly contractor factory crew training for all crews except those of the lead ship. The other facilities requested will initiate road and utilities construction required to assure timely utilization of Trident support facilities.

MISSILE FLIGHT TEST FACILITIES

At the Air Force Eastern Test Range, Cape Kennedy, Fla., we are requesting $35,150,000 for missile flight test facilities. The facilities to be provided are a wharf and dredging, alterations to a launch complex, missile checkout buildings, guidance and telemetry building and a lifting device proofing building. These facilities will support an initial flight test of the Trident I missile in late calendar year 1975.

Explosive quantity safety distance requirements preclude the use of existing waterfront facilities for the Trident missile. A new wharf; with associated dredging for a turning basin, located a safe distance away is required. The wharf and turning basin are the high-cost facilities at Cape Kennedy, with an approximate cost of $30 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is your estimate for the total cost of this base upon completion, as compared to the figures you gave us last

year? My recollection is that you estimated it would cost around $1 billion, and I understand your estimate now is considerably lower.

Admiral MARSCHALL. The current estimate for the total cost of construction of the Trident support complex is $543.3 million. The reduction from the approximately 1 billion figure provided last year is the result of:

The elimination of depot level submarine maintenance at the Trident support complex site and the transfer of this support to shipyards.

The reduction of the military manning level by the transfer of some functions to civilian personnel with a resultant reduction in personnel support facilities requirements.

The reduction of the facility support level from 15 to 10 ships lowered the facilities requirements.

A reexamination of a requirement for concurrent high explosive operations and reductions in some of the explosive safety factors internal to the base permitted a reduction in the land required at the Bangor support complex.

A more detailed examination of the facilities cost for the Bangor site vice the use of an estimate that would approximate the costs at any one of four candidate sites.

Senator SYMINGTON. We refused to authorize the funds for the program last year because we felt it was premature, yet you have substantially reduced your cost estimates. I assume, therefore, that this delay proved beneficial to the taxpayer. Would you comment on that?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The reduction in the cost estimate is based on a reduction in the scope of facilities required to provide support to the Trident system as discussed in the previous question. This change will result in the expenditure of less military construction funds by the Government.

Senator SYMINGTON. If your request is approved, do you anticipate having this money placed under contract within fiscal year 1974?

Admiral MARSCHALL. If the request is approved, we anticipate having all fiscal year 1974 MCON facilities under contract prior to the receipt of fiscal year 1975 MCON funds.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT—INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The amount of $88,316,000 is requested for the Pollution Abatement program at various naval installations inside the United States. The program provides various naval and Marine Corps installations with pollution control facilities to achieve compliance with directives concerning the environment.

For the Air Pollution Abatement Facilities project we are requesting $27,636,000 for 18 facilities, at naval and Marine Corps installations. Eight facilities costing approximately $18 million are for control of the particulate and chemical fume emissions produced in the industrial operation of coating metal surfaces. Three facilities will improve boiler plant emissions through fuel conversions. Rounding out the air pollution abatement facilities are four facilites to improve air emissions, two pipe insulation working facilities, and smoke abatement facilities for a fire fighting school.

For the Water Pollution Abatement Facilities project the amount of $60,680,000 is requested for 42 facilities at naval and Marine Corps

installations. A major portion of this request is for construction of pier sewers for collection of sanitary wastes from ships in port. In this, the second year of a 5-year program for construction of disposal ashore facilities, there are 13 facilities costing approximately $34 million. The pier sewers are planned to coincide with scheduled ship collection, treatment, and disposal of oils and oily waste products from ships and shore installations. There are three municipal sewer connections, improvements to sewer systems and treatment plants, seven facilities for treatment of industrial wastes, and one facility for treatment of filter backwash at a naval water treatment plant.

Senator SYMINGTON. I understand that the municipal sewer connection project you have for Barbers Point Naval Air Station may be decreased from $6.3 million to $500,000, due to a delay in completing the municipal sewer plant. If there has been a delay, why are any funds necessary this year?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The project, as originally conceived, would connect Navy facilities at Barbers Point and Iroquois Point to the new Honolulu municipal collection systems and treatment plant to be constructed by the city and county of Honolulu. Recent information reveals that design and subsequent construction of the new City/County treatment plant has been delayed to the point that construction is not expected to be completed before July 1976. The major portion of this project which serves the Iroquois Point Housing and Puuloa area, however, should be authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1974. This portion of the project, estimated to cost $500,000 will provide improvements to an existing treatment plant in the area to allow it to function on an interim basis until the city/county plant is constructed, as well as construct the interceptor and associated lift stations and appurtenances which will ultimately convey the wastes from this area to the new plant.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The program of unclassified installations outside the United States totals $48,664,000.

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL COMPLEX, PUERTO RICO

The amount of $2,951,000 is requested for three projects at the naval complex, Puerto Rico. This station supports ships and aircraft of the Atlantic Fleet conducting air, surface, underwater, and amphibious training operations on the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range.

A sum of $1,442,000 is requested for the Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads—enlisted men's dining facility project which will provide a new messing facility to replace an obsolete, deteriorated World War II mess hall.

The naval security group activity, Sabana Seca—enlisted men's dining facility improvements project, at $265,000 will modernize the existing 30-year old, overcrowded, deteriorated and obsolete facility.

The land acquisition project in the amount of $1,244,000 is requested to acquire 1,700 acres of land needed for a protective buffer zone, 1 mile in radius, for receiving antenna.

Senator SYMINGTON. This security group activity has been located at Sabana Seca for quite some time. Will you explain to us why you find it necessary to acquire additional land, and what does the encroachment amount to at this point? Since you are asking for authorization only, I assume that you propose a land swap. What land do we have available to exchange under this procedure?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The facilities on this station are sensitive receiving antennas that require an electromagnetically quiet area within a radius of 5,720 feet. When the site was selected in 1949, the area surrounding the station was undeveloped and free of any adverse radio noise.

Development in recent years indicates that the character of the neighborhood will change. This easement to be acquired will control impending development so that the operational efficiency of the facility will not be degraded. The easement will restrict the density of residential units to single dwellings with a maximum of one house per every 5 acres and preclude the use of industrial or other activity that would generate electronic radio noise such as arch welding. During the last 8 years, land in the vicinity has been drained and reclaimed with substantial development. The development trend around the city of San Juan is toward the west in the direction of the receiver station. The present noise level is approaching the maximum 2 micro volts per meter which is the existing criteria for this type of operation. The land is presently vacant and undeveloped. If permanent restrictions are not acquired soon, we may be forced to acquire improvements at a much higher cost.

This acquisition authorization is coincident with our disposal of real property in connection with the disestablishment of the Naval Station at San Juan. It is contemplated that the easement interest will be acquired from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in a trade-off—exchange—for some of the naval station lands at San Juan on an equal value basis.

THE WEST INDIES

NAVAL FACILITY, GRAND TURK

The amount of $1,145,000 is requested for one project at the naval facility, Grand Turk. This facility performs classified oceanographic research.

The electric power and waterplant project will replace obsolete generators and an obsolete World War II desalination plant with an efficient combined electric power and water plant.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

NAVAL AIR STATION, BERMUDA

The amount of $3,010,000 is requested for two projects at this air station, which is an Atlantic Fleet All-Weather ASW Patrol Air Station.

The amount of $1,725,000 is requested for the air/underwater weapons compound project that will provide an ordnance compound and magazines for P–3 aircraft armaments. The alert squadron deployed continuously to Bermuda must be able to launch fully armed

aircraft within 1 hour of an alarm. Present storage magazines are located at the old Navy annex, some 23 miles west of the NAS, necessitating a difficult and hazardous 1-hour haul over winding and narrow Bermuda roads. The few magazines which the Navy "inherited" from the Air Force at Kindley are small and not suited for modern Navy ordnance items.

The power/waterplant expansion project at $1,285,000 will provide additional water production and electrical power capacity to meet programed increases in demand. The existing water production equipment is obsolete and nonrepairable and the electrical system will be overloaded this coming year.

NAVAL COMPLEX, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

The amount of $8,376,000 is requested for three projects at the naval complex, Guantanamo Bay. The naval hospital provides general clinical and hospitalization services to eligible personnel on the naval base.

Senator SYMINGTON. This is a substantial amount you are requesting for Guantanamo. What is the situation so far as our tenure on this base is concerned now?

Admiral MARSHALL. The duration of the occupancy agreement is indefinite, and may be terminated only upon mutual consent by both countries.

The naval hospital air-conditioning project, at $633,000, will modernize and partially replace the existing air-conditioning system to relieve patient discomfort caused by high humidity and temperatures.

The amount of $7,158,000 is requested for the naval station electric generator plant project which will provide a new turbine, boiler, and salt water conversion unit to increase power production to meet anticipated power demand and to increase water production to eliminate the problem of water rationing.

The naval station electrical substation project, with a cost of $58,000, will increase power production to meet anticipated growth and to relieve current overloading of the existing system during the summer months of peak loading.

NAVAL STATION, KEFLAVIK, ICELAND

The amount of $6,092,000 is requested for two projects at this station which supports Navy antisubmarine warfare patrol squadron units, USAF aircraft and weapons stations, and a USAF fighter interceptor squadron.

The amount of $2,834,000 is requested for the bachelor enlisted quarters project which will provide living quarters for 288 men currently living in inadequate, overcrowded facilities. There are no local community facilities available for bachelor personnel. This project will relieve a critical bachelor enlisted housing deficit at this isolated location.

The bachelor officers' quarters project, with a cost of $3,258,000, will provide modern living quarters for 103 men.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here on the Naval Station, Keflavik, you are proposing to spend over $6 million for bachelor housing. Just how permanent is our tenure in Iceland? I note that there is still some prop-

aganda in the papers which would indicate the Icelanders would like to see us out of Keflavik. Have our relationships improved any in recent months?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Government of Iceland notified the United States on June 25, 1973, that Iceland was invoking article VII of the 1951 Bilateral Defense Agreement, thereby setting in motion a review of the necessity for U.S. forces being present in Iceland. Under terms of the agreement, both parties must negotiate to resolve the article VII review issue for a 6-month period. If no resolution is reached after 6 months, a further 1 year's notice can be served by either party of the intent to end the defense agreement.

Following an initial NATO review to confirm the requirement for a continued NATO force presence in Iceland, the United States and Iceland will undertake bilateral negotiations on the article VII issue at an early date. These bilateral negotiations will hopefully lead to a satisfactory resolution within the 6-month negotiating period, and the continuance in effect of the defense agreement, amended as the negotiations may prescribe.

The tenure situation should be fairly well resolved by the end of this year, before any construction work is started on the two bachelor projects the Navy is requesting. Should the tenure issue be resolved favorably and the defense agreement continue in effect, the Navy would be in a position to move rapidly to construction on these urgently needed projects for our bachelors assigned to this remote base.

EUROPEAN AREA

CRETE, GREECE

The amount of $4,153,000 is requested for four projects at the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete. The Naval Detachment, Souda Bay is strategically located in the Eastern Mediterranean and provides facilities for shore and carrier based patrol, logistics, and combat aircraft operating in support of the 6th Fleet.

The aircraft parking apron project, with a cost of $2,666,000, will provide the apron space required for five P–3 patrol planes and for transient carrier based aircraft that will use the base as part of the increased antisubmarine warfare mission. No existing adequate facilities are available.

Senator SYMINGTON. I note you point out that this facility is needed to conduct present proposed new missions commensurate with the fiscal year 1973 Milcon program. Just what new missions are proposed for this base? Is this in any way connected with the homeporting of the carrier task force in Athens? If this project is approved, who will be the construction agency? If my information is correct, some months ago the Greek Air Force was insisting that they act as the construction agency. Has this matter been cleared up?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The expanded mission at Souda Bay involves both logistics support to the 6th Fleet and support of P–3, land-based ASW aircraft. The logistics mission involves movement of air cargo and passengers into the Eastern Mediterranean from the air logistics main terminal at Sigonella.

The new missions are not connected with homeporting of a carrier task force at Athens. However, with a carrier homeported in Athens, and undergoing periodic maintenance in the Athens area, the excellent, existing air training facilities at Souda Bay would be more frequently used by carrier aircraft. An agreement, Technical Arrangements for the Construction of Facilities, Souda Bay, Crete, was signed on July 5, 1973. Based on this agreement, the Army Corps of Engineers will be the construction agency.

The amount of $554,000 is requested for the air passenger/cargo terminal project which will provide a facility for processing aircargo and fleet personnel moved into this area of operations. Operations are increasing which make the present hangar space being used unsatisfactory.

Senator SYMINGTON. I know that Souda Bay is a very austere base, and has little facility for processing aircargo and fleet personnel; but, I notice that you indicate this requirement is in part based upon the expanding logistics mission. Will you explain this?

On page 133 you are asking for a general warehouse at this same base. I wonder if consideration has been given to combining the warehouse with this terminal building?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The expanded mission at Souda Bay involves both logistics support to the 6th Fleet and support of P–3, land-based ASW aircraft. The logistics mission involves movement of aircargo and passengers into the Eastern Mediterranean from the air logistics main terminal at Sigonella. The Navy's fleet support squadron VR–24 would be used for airlifts from Sigonella to Souda Bay, and, in some cases, onward from Souda Bay direct to carriers at sea using carrier-on-board delivery aircraft. Since Souda Bay affords a good harbor for 6th Fleet ships, much of the aircargo and personnel moving to the fleet can be transferred directly from the logistics facilities at the airfield to the ships in the nearby harbor.

The general warehouse is being located in a common use hardstand area with the air passenger and cargo terminal. This is separated from the hangar area by personnel support and shop facilities. Due to functional differences and space limitations on the hardstand, undesirable congestion would result by combining the general warehouse with the terminal building. This was considered, but resulted in using only one side of the hardstand area, increasing both truck and aircraft traffic problems.

A request of $531,000 is made for the general warehouse project which will provide a facility to accommodate increased logistics support. Existing facilities are limited and inadequate.

The amount of $402,000 is requested for the enlisted men's club project which will support the increased personnel loading that is part of the additional mission assigned to this base. Existing facilities are inadequate to meet the demand.

NAVAL AIR FACILITY, SIGONELLA, SICILY, ITALY

The amount of $3,086,000 is requested for six projects at the Naval Air Facility, Sigonella. The naval air facility supports shore and carrier based patrol and logistics aircraft operating throughout the Mediterranean area and ASW surveillance and airlift missions in

support of the 6th Fleet. Carrier-based aircraft also utilize NAF Sigonella for training exercises, operational diverts and for carrier-on-board delivery (COD) replenishment. The mission of this vital central Mediterranean base is being expanded to include homeporting of a logistics squadron and the activation of a military airlift command terminal.

The amount of $328,000 is requested for the photographic building project which will provide a photographic laboratory to support the increased level of aerial photo missions and will replace the existing facility which is too small, substandard and unsafe.

Senator SYMINGTON. I understand that the increased activity at this base makes a new photo lab quite necessary, but I am wondering why you indicate at page 139 that this is considered only partially eligible for NATO infrastructure common funding in that the NATO criteria precludes inclusion of the complete project in the infrastructure. Will you explain this please?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The photo laboratory increases the level of support for aerial photo missions, type of processing and upgrades the volume of operation, which cannot be provided by the existing photo facilities. Only to the extent that common use photo requirements are involved will this project be acceptable for NATO prefinancing. The portion for sole U.S. use will not be funded by NATO. The NATO portion is currently included in slice 23 which is expected to pay for approximately one-half of the total cost of the project.

The amount of $81,000 is requested for the public works shop stores project which will accommodate increased station requirements. The existing facilities do not provide adequate space.

The gymnasium project, at $484,000, will provide a recreation facility at the airfield area where, presently, no recreational facilities exist. The nearest facilities are 10 miles away.

The amount of $443,000 is requested for the officers' club project which will provide a facility to accommodate increased personnel loading. The existing facility is too small to accommodate the loading and will be modified to provide living quarters. No offbase recreational facilities exist.

A request of $324,000 is made for the chief petty officers' club project which will replace the existing facility in the airfield area and will provide a similar facility in the administrative area 10 miles away. The existing facility is too small to accommodate the increased personnel loading, and no facilities exist in the administrative area. No community facilities are available.

The utility systems improvements project, at $1,426,000, will provide utilities to the administrative area. Existing utilities are inadequate to provide service to existing facilities and those approved to support the new base mission.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, EDZELL, SCOTLAND

The amount of $868,000 is requested for one project at the naval security group activity, Edzell. This activity is part of the high-frequency direction finder network and performs an antisubmarine warfare support mission vital to the security of the Nation.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living space for 115 men currently living in overcrowded, inadequate spaces. Community housing is not available.

NAVAL STATION, ROTA, SPAIN

The amount of $85,000 is requested for one project at the naval station, Rota. This station provides facilities, services, and material support for the operation and maintenance of naval weapons and aircraft, including Polaris replenishment.

The Tactical Support Center project will provide a facility to link the P–3 ASW aircraft and shore operations.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS STATION HAROLD E. HOLT, EXMOUTH, AUSTRALIA

The amount of $1,192,000 is requested for one project at the Naval Communication Station Harold E. Holt. This station provides fleet broadcasts, tactical ship-to-shore and point-to-point communications, and supports naval security group operations and the defense communications system.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living spaces for 86 men currently living in overcrowded barracks.

NAVAL COMPLEX, GUAM

The amount of $10,988,000 is requested for 12 projects at the naval complex, Guam, Mariana Islands. This station is a major support activity for fleet and transient aircraft. It supports two fleet air reconnaissance squadrons and an antisubmarine warfare patrol squadron; $309,000 is requested for the naval air station, Agana—transmitter building project which will provide a facility to house new communication equipment and a maintenance shop. Increased air operations require additional space to house communications systems. The existing space is too small to accommodate the additional equipment.

The Naval Air Station, Agana—airfield lighting emergency generator project at $79,000 will provide a building and generator equipment to provide emergency power to airfield lighting and navigational aids. The existing portable generator is old, of insufficient capacity, unreliable and could endanger aircraft operation when used.

The amount of $177,000 is requested for the naval hospital modernization of intensive care unit project. The hospital provides general clinical and hospitalization services to eligible personnel on the island of Guam. This project will modernize the existing facility to provide an adequate, basic clinic for intensive and coronary care patients who currently must use only marginal facilities.

The amount of $3,229,000 is requested for the naval magazine, mine assembly facility project. The naval magazine stores a pre-positioned reserve stock of all types of ammunition. The mine assembly facility will provide a mine assembly, maintenance and inert part storage compound for processing a large percentage of the mines in the Pacific

area. At present there are no facilities for maintaining, testing and assembling mines. They must be worked in other ammunition shops that are not properly built with regard to explosive hazard criteria and they are processed to the detriment of the work normally accomplished in these other shops.

Senator SYMINGTON. As I recall, this item was denied last year, due to its relatively low priority. I know the details are classified, but where does this stand on your priority list now? Do you consider this an urgent requirement?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This project is priority 1 this year. The requirement is urgent, effecting not only the preparation of mines, but also maintenance of other ammunition at Guam, since the mines are now tested, calibrated, and prepared for laying in facilities that are needed for other purposes. The entire production and maintenance at the naval magazine is unsatisfactory because of the lack of this facility.

Senator SYMINGTON. On the following page you are requesting a rocket maintenance and assembly facility for this base. Is there any way these two facilities can be combined so as to save a little money?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There is no relationship between the mine and missile work. Different crews are employed with different training and capability. No production or maintenance facilities would be common between the two operations. A major advantage in separation of the functions is safety in the event of an explosion. If both facilities are contiguous mine personnel would be endangered by a missile explosion and vice versa; $241,000 is requested for the naval magazine, rocket maintenance and assembly facility projeect to provide an operational facility for the maintenance, inspection and assembly of antisubmarine and submarine-launched rockets. There is not existing facility and no existing facilities can be converted for these functions.

A request of $288,000 is made for the naval magazine—bachelor enlisted quarters modernization project which will provide modern living spaces for 41 men currently living in substandard barracks.

The naval magazine—security control facilities project which will provide security fencing around the weapons storage area. The project cost is $1,094,000.

The amount of $167,000 is requested for the naval station—collimation tower project which will provide a facility to periodically calibrate shipboard radar and weapons systems. No such facility exists within 3,000 miles of this base, and ships are required to travel 6,000 miles to have these tests performed.

The naval station—theater project, with a cost of $1,480,000 will provide a 1,000-seat facility and will replace several outdoor theaters where programs are continually interrupted by winds, aircraft noise, and insects. Existing civilian facilities are remote.

The naval station wharf utilities project, at $2,782,000, will provide "cold iron" utilities to support ships berthed at this station.

The amount of $725,000 is requested for the Navy Public Works Center, finegayan telephone exchange project which will provide a facility to house a new 1,000-line dial control office. Increasing demand for telephone service requires the expansion of existing facilities which are not large enough to accommodate any additional equipment.

The Navy Public Works Center water system improvements project at $417,000 will increase the production of treated water and will improve the existing distribution system to accommodate increasing user demands.

NAVAL COMPLEX, SUBIC BAY, REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

The amount of $2,723,000 is requested for four projects at the naval complex, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines.

The naval air station provides primary support in the Philippines area for air operations of the seventh fleet and the first Marine air wing.

The amount of $161,000 is requested for the Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, tactical support center project which will provide facilities to link the P-3C ASW aircraft with shore operations.

The naval station provides port facilities and logistics support to ships operating in the western Pacific Ocean.

The amount of $1,411,000 is requested for the naval station, bachelor enlisted quarters modernization project to provide modern living space for 705 men currently living in open bay, dormitory type structures.

The naval station dependent school expansion project at $1,034,000 will provide additional facilities to accommodate the large number of school-age dependent children in the area.

The Navy Public Works Center provides public works, utilities, housing and other support to operating forces, dependent activities and other commands.

The amount of $117,000 is requested for the Navy Public Works Center berthing utilities improvements project which will replace exposed electrical pier connections with modern connections to eliminate safety hazards.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT—OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The amount of $3,995,000 is requested for a water pollution abatement project at various naval installations, outside the United States. The project provides two naval installations with pollution control facilities to achieve compliance with directives concerning the environment. These facilities are a sewage treatment plant expansion at the Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P.R. and ship wastewater collection ashore and waterplant backwash control facilities at the Navy Public Works Center, Guam.

AMENDMENTS TO PRIOR YEAR PROGRAMS

This year's program originally requested two amendments totaling $2,434,000. Under the program change three additional amendments were requested in the amount of $3,284,000. The new amendment total was five amendments with a total cost of $5,718,000, which is less than 1 percent of this year's new authorization request.

A $448,000 amendment was requested to the fiscal year 1967 program, Public Law 89-568, for the hypervelocity wind tunnel project at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md. A recent evaluation of the project discloses that the amendment is no longer required. The

current amendment request is four amendments, with a total cost of $5,270,000.

A $1,986,000 amendment is requested to Public Law 90–408 (fiscal year 1969) for the deep ocean engineering pressure facility project at the Navy Mine Defense Laboratory (Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory), Panama City, Fla. This amendment is required to complete the final contract, provide for the required material certification and to pay approved contractor claims.

Under Public Law 91–511 (fiscal year 1971) a $249,000 amendment is required for the sewage treatment system project at the Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va. This amendment is required to correct a failure which was caused by unforeseen subsurface soil conditions in the dike of the finishing pond.

A $593,000 amendment is required for the installation total of the Naval Air Station, Meridian, Miss., under Public Law 92–145, fiscal year 1972.

The amendment is required to permit award of the Enlisted Men's Club project authorized at $714,000. The fiscal year 1972 bachelor enlisted quarters project generated the need for the amendment. Since the relative need is greatest for the bachelor enlisted quarters, a decision was made to proceed with the bachelor enlisted quarters, and to defer the Enlisted Men's Club project and seek an amendment this year.

For fiscal year 1973, Public Law 92–545, an amendment of $2,442,000 is requested for the bomb loading plant modernization project at the Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla. This amendment is required to provide construction in accordance with new safety criteria promulgated by the Armed Services Explosive Safety Board for structures housing the manufacture and/or handling of explosives.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, Admiral.

We do appreciate your courtesy in coming. It is nice to see you.

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is nice to be with you, sir.

TITLE III

Senator SYMINGTON. Next we have the Air Force.

General Reilly, do you have a statement?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, I do.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you be good enough to place it in the record?

General REILLY. I would be pleased to.

[Statement follows:]

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. M. R. REILLY, DIRECTOR OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, U.S. AIR FORCE

STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittees, it is a pleasure to appear before you again. We are here today to present the Air Force Fiscal Year 1974 Military Construction Authorization Program.

The primary objective of this program is to support the force and deployment goals presented to the Congress in the Air Force Chief of Staff's Posture Statement. The bill now before your committees requests authorization for projects valued at $409,451,000 for the Air Force, with major subdivisions as follows:

Regular military construction	$303,200,000
Military family housing	81,251,000
Guard/Reserve construction	25,000,000
Total	409,451,000

My comments today concern the $303.2 million of projects for the regular military construction program since it is my understanding that family housing and reserve forces construction will be the subject of separate hearings.

The major share of our request is for construction within the United States. Only about 10% of the program is for construction overseas. Again, our program does not include construction in Southeast Asia.

LONG RANGE PLANNING

Our program is keyed to the support of our most pressing force and mission requirements projected over the next five years. It is balanced to meet the critical facility needs of new missions, and to give even greater emphasis to the modernization and upgrading of our vast inventory of existing facilities. As in the past, we have looked in depth at our total long range requirements, using professional engineering and economic evaluations in concert with time phasing of operational needs to arrive at a realistic and responsive program of facilities support. The projects in the Fiscal Year 1974 request now before you have undergone extensive review and represent our highest priority requirements for authorization.

NEW MISSION REQUIREMENTS

Our program includes approximately $35 million to support new missions. The most significant project in this category, $13.5 million, will provide the first increment of operational and maintenance facilities for the Advanced Airborne Command Post at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. These facilities are required to support the military version of the Boeing 747 aircraft, designated the E–4A, which is now under procurement and modification for the National Military Command System.

SUPPORT OF CONTINUING MISSIONS

The major portion of our authorization request is in support of currently assigned and continuing missions. I mentioned earlier that we are giving added emphasis to facility modernization. Consistent with that objective, we are requesting some $192 million, or roughly 60 percent of the program, for facility modernization. This is to be compared with $110 million, or about 40 percent of last year's program. The projects comprising this portion of the program will be fully substantiated as the committee chooses to review our program. However, I would like to highlight just a few of the requirements at this time.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

This year marks the beginning of the Air Force's part of the Department of Defense five year Health Facilities Modernization Program, which has been initiated to accelerate the construction of necessary new medical facilities and modernization of existing hospitals to provide modern and efficient medical care. Our request is for 12 projects totalling $36.7 million. This amount is more than double the amount requested last year. We anticipate equally large portions of our total program to be devoted to this category in the next few years.

PERSONNEL SUPPORT

Our deep concern for our people is expressed in the fact that 22.5 percent of the request now before you is for direct support of our personnel, exclusive of medical facilities. As our medical program is oriented to health care, our bachelor and community support facilities are oriented toward improved living conditions and on base support. To this end, we are requesting authorization of $39.7 million for construction of 4,768 new dormitory spaces and 60 new bachelor officer accommodations, and for improvement of 4,757 existing dormitory spaces. In addition, we are requesting $28.4 million for on base personnel support facilities such as commissaries, gymnasiums, chapels and open messes.

LOGISTICAL DEPOT PLANT MODERNIZATION

The authorization request now before the Committee includes $31.4 million for the third increment of our five year phased program to modernize facilities

at our prime logistical depots. The objectives of this depot plant modernization program are to carry out our vast weapons systems logistical mission with greater efficiency, more responsive to the world-wide needs of our operating forces, and to do the job at less cost. These objectives are being met through sound investments in modern, functional facilities and state-of-the-art equipment. We are most grateful for the support these Committees have given to the Air Force in authorizing over $85 million for this important program in fiscal year 1974 and 1973.

AIR FORCE ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE CENTER

To accommodate our centralized AF accounting and pay functions, we are requesting a modern, properly configured, noncombustible $20 million facility at Lowry AFB, Colorado. At present, this important activity, with more than 3,000 people assigned, is being conducted in a congested section of Denver, Colorado, in old wood frame buildings which were constructed as warehouses more than 30 years ago for a useful life of not more than 15 years. These buildings are structurally unsound, highly combustible, functionally and environmentally inadequate, and do not afford the required security. Further, these old facilities cannot be economically upgraded to the required standards. Construction of the new facility will result in increased productivity, lower support and operating costs, and improved service with enhanced security and fire protection.

COST SAVINGS

As stated earlier, economic evaluations have played an important part in the selection process for each item in this program. Acceptable alternatives have been reviewed for new construction to determine optimum combinations of siting, materials and construction methods. Decisions to alter and upgrade existing facilities versus replacement have been based primarily on economic considerations. Projects included in this program will permit us to continue our phased plan to remove old and obsolete facilities from our inventory. Most of these wood frame facilities were constructed over 30 years ago with a design life of five years. They are now functionally inadequate and require constant and expensive maintenance for continued use. We are making good progress in this regard. In the last three years alone, we have disposed of over 5,000 obsolete structures containing over 14 million square feet of floor space.

EARLY CONTRACT AWARD

We have further intensified our efforts for early award of contracts for approved construction. The objective has been to provide the Air Force with these needed facilities at the earliest date. Over half of our 1973 program was under contract by the end of Fiscal Year 1973. We expect this to grow to 85 percent by the end of the first quarter of Fiscal Year 1974, and by the end of Calendar Year 1973 virtually all of our 1973 program will be under contract.

COST ESTIMATES AND DESIGN STATUS

In preparing our program, we seek to refine our cost estimates on individual projects to a careful projection of actual contract costs. This entails as much advanced individual project engineering as practicable, a sounding on inflationary trends and anticipated market conditions, and an analysis of our most recent bidding experience. We have taken this same approach for the last several years. Actual bidding experience versus our estimates has shown it to be a sound approach. Planning of the Fiscal Year 1974 program is well advanced and we have a high degree of confidence in the estimates now before the committees.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

In keeping with national environmental protection policies, we are continuing our program which was started several years ago for abating pollution at our Air Force installations. Included in this year's program is a request for $9.8 million for projects to assure compliance with current air and water quality standards.

With respect to present standards, we have essentially achieved the goals established in the mid 1960's, as reflected in this year's request which is considerably less than that requested in recent year programs.

However, we must anticipate much larger environmental construction programs in the future as more stringent quality standards being promulgated under recent legislation, such as the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 and the 1972 Water Pollution Control Act, become effective.

We assure the Committees that we will continue to play a leadership role in environmental restoration and protection.

AIR BASE—COMMUNITY LAND USE PLANNING

Consistent with long range planning, discussed earlier, we are continuing to pursue the air installations compatible use zone concept presented last year. At that time, we oriented the program toward three bases involving 20,000 acres. This year, we are extending the concept to 13 additional bases involving over 78,000 acres. Also, we are extending our efforts to a much broader application of land use planning. This occurs as we determine the full impact of recent and proposed legislation on environmental protection and land use policies.

When our air bases were sited years ago, we selected areas considerably removed from urban development where noise levels and accident potentials were not a problem to adjacent communities. We were pretty much of an island to ourselves. Now, as urban development has evolved in our direction, we must discard our insular thinking and consider our air base as part of a larger community. We must plan on-base land use and influence off base land use as a single concept.

Our primary efforts in obtaining compatible land use in the vicinity of our air bases continues to be directed toward encouraging local communities to enact suitable zoning ordinances. We have had generally favorable reaction to this approach with last year's program, and expect zoning ordinances to be enacted soon at the bases listed in our Fiscal Year 1973 program.

In essence, our land use program is oriented toward optimum use of the land in the area where our bases are located. Our perimeter fences confine only the area under our direct control. Our planning reaches out into the adjacent community.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we wish to assure you and the Committees that this program represents our very best construction proposal for Fiscal Year 1974. The construction program has been carefully designed to support new and continuing missions within the confines of a limited budget. Capital investments are proposed only for those installations programmed to remain in the inventory for the foreseeable future. Attached to the printed copies of my statement are narrative descriptions of the entire program broken out by category of facilities, by command totals, and by mission elements supported.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to appear before these committees. We are now ready to present our program and to respond to your questions.

Table I.—Department of the Air Force fiscal year 1974 Military Construction Authorization Program for the Active Forces

Section 301—Command	
Inside the United States:	*In thousands*
Aerospace defense command	$8,794
Air Force communications service	3,963
Air Force logistics command	61,325
Air Force systems command	9,062
Air training command	56,282
Air university	5,462
Alaskan air command	8,658
Headquarters command, USAF	18,435
Military airlift command	12,416
Pacific air forces	7,331
Strategic air command	25,738
Tactical air command	17,703
U.S. Air Force Academy	645
Pollution abatement	9,070
Air installation compatible use zones	25,909
Total	270,793

Outside the United States:	
Aerospace defense command	1,355
Pacific air forces	11,788
U.S. air forces in Europe	15,925
U.S. air forces southern command	1,038
U.S. Air Force security service	221
Pollution abatement	750
Worldwide communications	330
Total	31,407
Classified (section 302): Radar support facility—various worldwide	1,000
Total	1,000
Total authorization program	303,200

TABLE II.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM—ACTIVE FORCES

SUMMARY BY PROGRAM ELEMENT

	Amount (millions)	Percent of total
Strategic forces	$44.8	14.8
General purpose forces	62.2	20.5
Intelligence and communications	32.1	10.6
Airlift and sealift	14.1	4.6
Research and development	16.6	5.5
Central supply and maintenance	37.2	12.3
Training, medical, and other general personnel activities	71.6	23.6
Administration and associated activities	24.6	8.1
Total	303.2	100.0

TABLE III.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM, ACTIVE FORCES

PROGRAM BY CONSTRUCTION CATEGORIES

	Amount (millions)	Percent of total
Operational	$52.6	17.3
Training	7.8	2.6
Maintenance	36.9	12.1
Research, development, and test	10.0	3.3
Supply	11.7	3.9
Hospital and medical	36.7	12.1
Administration	31.2	10.3
Bachelor housing	39.7	13.1
Community	28.4	9.4
Utilities	21.9	7.2
Real estate	26.3	8.7
Total	303.2	100.0

NARRATIVE CATEGORY ANALYSIS

Operational facilities—$52.6 million

This category represents 17.3 percent of the appropriation request. It contains such essential items as airfield pavements, aircraft fueling support facilities, flight operations buildings, communications facilities, and navigational aids. Important items in this category are the second increment of the technical intelligence operations facility for $11.0 million at Wright-Patterson AFB; special aircraft support facilities at Andrews AFB for $13.5 million; a station composite support facility at Cape Newenham AFS, Alaska, for $5.4 million; and an air freight terminal complex at Hicham AFB for $4.5 million.

Training facilities—$7.8 million

Training facilities included in this construction program cover a range of Air Force training activities such as training for pilots, aircrews, and base maintenance personnel. Major projects are: Flight simulator training facility at Reese AFB, Texas, for $2.8 million, a base maintenance training facility at Sheppard AFB, Texas, for $2.8 million; and a flight simulator training facility at Luke AFB, Arizona, for $.9 million.

Maintenance facilities—$36.9 million

The maintenance category represents 12.1 percent of our request. It contains facilities to support aircraft and engine maintenance activities, special purpose shops, as well as shops to support maintenance of base facilities. Also included in this category are ten projects totaling $22.0 million for modernization of Air Force Logistics Command's depot facilities. This category also provides various maintenance and storage facilities for short-range attack missiles at two locations for $1.0 million.

Research, development, test and evaluation—$10.0 million

A vigorous R&D program is an investment in our future security. This segment of our construction request provides the buildings, laboratories, and specialized test structures that are required in the conduct of a quality R&D program. An aircraft fuels and lubricants laboratory for $4.9 million; alteration of an aircraft engine components research facility for $1.9 million; and a minor alteration and expansion of the human impact lab are located at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio. Other major projects are a weapons guidance test facility at Holloman AFB for $0.9 million and alteration of a rocket propulsion research laboratory at Edwards AFB for $0.9 million.

Supply facilities—$11.7 million

The major portion of this category is for 2 projects totaling $5.9 million for modernizing Air Force Logistics Command depot facilities.

Other supply facilities include ammunition storage facilities at two PACAF locations, diesel fuel storage for remote sites in Alaska, a ballistic missile processing facility at Hill AFB, Utah, for $3.0 million and a base supply facility at Reese AFB, Texas, for $1.0 million.

Medical facilities—$36.7 million

This year's program is directed toward expansion and alteration and replacement of hospital facilities to provide proper clinical and dental care. Composite medical facility projects are included for: Richards-Gebaur AFB, Missouri, at $3.8 million; Tinker AFB, Oklahoma, at $3.9 million; Maxwell AFB, Alabama, at $4.9 million; Francis E. Warren AFB, Wyoming, at $5.8 million; Laughlin AFB, Texas, at $4.6 million; and Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, at $5.5 million. Also included are 2 aeromedical staging facilities; one at Scott AFB, Illinois, for $2.0 million and the other at Andrews AFB, Maryland, for $1.7 million. A dispensary at Lackland AFB, Texas, for $0.5 million and at Keesler AFB, Mississippi, for $1.6 million, Barksdale AFB, Louisiana, for $1.2 million, and Shaw AFB, South Carolina, for $1.1 million, are also included in the medical program.

Administrative facilities—$31.2 million

The most significant item in this category is the construction of an Air Force accounting and finance center at Lowry AFB, Colorado, for $20.4 million.

In our continuing objective to house management and administrative personnel in facilities that will enable them to achieve maximum productivity, we are requesting modern efficient base personnel offices at Nellis AFB, Nevada, for $1.9 and at Mather AFB, California, for $1.7 million.

Other significant administrative facilities included in this category are: an armament development test center headquarters facility at Eglin AFB, Florida, for $4.0 million and a data processing facility at Randolph AFB, Texas, for $1.5 million.

Community facilities—$28.4 million

Community facilities are requested in order to provide for the welfare and morale of our military personnel and dependents, both in the United States and overseas. This category included projects for religious activities, commissioned, noncommissioned officers' and airmen open messes, a base post office, and recreational facilities. It also includes commissaries in the amount of $7.4 million at

three locations in the United States where existing facilities are grossly inadequate and three dependent schools at overseas locations for $7.4 million.

Bachelor housing—$39.7 million

The provision of suitable living quarters for our bachelor enlisted and officer personnel is viewed as a priority objective by the Air Force. This year $39.7 million, or 13.1 percent of our request, is for the construction of 4,768 new dormitory spaces at a cost of $25.7 million, and 60 new officers' quarters at a cost of $1.2 million. We are modernizing 4,757 existing dormitory spaces for $11.3 million. Included in this program are a student housing composite building at one of our major technical training centers, Keesler AFB, Mississippi, for $5.1 million and a composite recruit training and housing facility at Lackland AFB, Texas, for $5.1 million, and each proposing housing for 1,000 men. Buildings of these types provided in earlier programs have proven to be extremely effective. This is a continuation of a phased program to replace the old World War II barracks with modern composite structures.

This category of projects also includes air conditioning for airmen dining halls at Lackland AFB, Texas, for $1.0 million, and a new dining hall for airmen at Webb AFB, Texas, for $0.6 million.

Utilities—$21.9 million

Our utility package includes pollution abatement projects as well as projects to install the necessary utility support for existing and programmed construction. This year's increment of projects for air pollution abatement is $3.7 million; and for water polluation abatement is $6.1 million.

Real estate—$26.3 million

The first item in this category is for $25.9 million requested for acquisition of restrictive easements to protect our bases from encroachment by incompatible land use. The other item for acquisition of 187 acres of land at Tinker AFB for $.4 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. We have several questions here we would like to ask you.

MARCH AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

General Reilly, Senator Tunney has been in touch with me concerning the need for a new headquarters building for the 15th Air Force at the March Air Force Base.

What is the situation here; what will it cost, and when might it ordinarily appear in an Air Force program?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we have had a very serious problem in headquarters for many years. They have been using the remnants of old World War II hospitals for a major portion of this activity. And we do have a new modern command post facility, but the remainder of the headquarters is in this old hospital complex.

We are planning now, sir, for this to be in our fiscal year 1975 program. I think the cost will be—I do not have it exactly, but I would assume about a million dollars.

Senator SYMINGTON. Two million?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. That is my estimate, and I will correct it for the record.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you think it is a worthy project?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, I certainly do.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

[Statement by Senator Tunney follows:]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN V. TUNNEY

Mr. Chairman: I wish to support the authorization of funds for construction of a new 15th Air Force Headquarters at March Air Force Base in Riverside, California.

The 15th Air Force (Commanded by Lt. Gen. William F. Pitts) is an integral part of the Strategic Air Command. Although headquartered at March AFB, California, there are four divisions throughout the West Coast, including, the 12th Strategic Missile Division at Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona, the 14th Air Division at Beale AFB, California, the 4th Strategic Missile Division at F. E. Warren AFB, Wyoming and the 47th Air Division at Fairchild AFB, Washington.

In August 1972, I had the pleasure and honor of touring the 15th Air Force Headquarters and meeting the then new Commander, General Pitts. At that time, I became aware of certain deficiencies in the general structures housing the headquarters and for your viewing I have enclosed some pictures that graphically illustrate the deterioration of these World War II era buildings, as a part of this presentation.

Mr. Chairman, this construction project will combine into a single facility numerous command and staff activities of Fifteenth Air Force located at March Air Force Base. These activities are presently housed in twenty-six deteriorated World War II wood frame buildings which are widely separated. This separation results in inefficiency and a significant loss in man-hours during consideration and discussion of classified matter and various staff actions. The twenty-six existing substandard buildings will be disposed of upon completion of this project.

The estimated cost of the Department of the Air Force is set at $2,500,000. The quantitative data in square footage is as follows:

	Square feet
Total requirements	89,205
Existing-substandard	107,223
Existing-adequate	27,055
Deficiency	62,150

The efficiency of an Armed Forces and their efforts to provide adequate defenses necessitate consideration of this authorization during your current deliberations. Adequate facilities are essential to maintain satisfactory levels of performance at March Air Force Base.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to provide information on this matter for your consideration.

TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.

Senator SYMINGTON. Congressman Sikes has asked that consideration be given to including in the bill a new gymnasium for the Tyndall Air Force Base at a cost of $820,000. Will you comment on the need for such a facility, and when it might be programed?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

The present gymnasium is one of World War II vintage, a wood frame, a deteriorated facility, and very substandard. At the present time we hope to incorporate this gymnasium in our P–5 program. That has been our plan.

AICUZ

Senator SYMINGTON. This year you are asking $25.909 million to acquire land, or interest in lands, for the protection of some air bases from encroachment. Last year we gave you $12 million for this purpose, which you have not used. In light of this, do you not think this year's request can be substantially reduced?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, in the program of last year, with three bases, we have been very successful in achieving our objectives through the use of local zoning ordinances, that is, the communities have more or less solved the problem to us, requiring us not to have interest in the land or exchange.

For our 1974 program, over 78,000 acres, we have included the authorization request, principally because we are required to exchange land.

I must acqnowledge that, based upon our experience with the 1973 program, possibly we are requesting too much authorization at this time. We will continue to attempt to work out our arrangements through the efforts of the communities.

Senator SYMINGTON. Now, as a favor to us—because this money situation is getting to be something—would you talk to Secretary McLucas, General Brown, and see if we cannot cut that request?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

We have authorized only $2 million in appropriation against that.

Senator SYMINGTON. Only $2 million against the $12 million authorization?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. General, please continue now and present your line items.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND (ZONE OF INTERIOR)

The primary mission of the Aerospace Defense Command (ADC) is to discharge Air Force responsibilities for the defense of the United States against aerospace attack. This program requests $8,794,000 for eight projects in support of ADC host responsibilities at two Air Force locations. Additionally, section 302 of the program includes $1 million for radar support facilities at various worldwide installations. The total ADC construction program is $9,794,000.

PETERSON FIELD, COLO.

The first installation to be considered in the Areospace Defense Command (ADC) program is Peterson Field, headquarters of ADC and the North American Air Defense Command, located 6 miles east of Colorado Springs, Colo. The military construction program contains a request for $7,843,000, consisting of six projects.

Senator SYMINGTON. When do you expect to complete the move of Ent Air Force Base to Peterson Field?

General REILLY. Approval, funding, and construction of facilities requested in the fiscal year 1974 military construction program (MCP), plus those now planned for the fiscal year 1975 MCP, will allow Air Force to vacate Ent AFB by June 30, 1976.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much property have we vacated thus far in downtown Colorado Springs?

General REILLY. The Air Force has not vacated any property in downtown Colorado Springs. However, completion of facilities requested in the fiscal year 1974 MCP will allow relinquishment of 12.28 acres of Ent AFB.

The first item, a base facilities maintenance complex of 69,080 square feet, is reuired to replace widely dispersed substandard structures that provide severely limited space.

The second item provides living quarters for 180 female enlisted personnel. Peterson Field has no dormitories to adequately house WAF airmen presently billeted at Ent AFB.

The third item is for a commissary of 73,500 square feet. Commissary activities are located in old, substandard facilities that are function-

ally inadequate and provide cumbersome, limited arrangements for customer service.

The fourth item requested is for an NCO open mess of 27,800 square feet. Substandard structures presently utilized, designed for a 10-year service life, have been in use for 22 years. The already overtaxed Peterson Field facilities will be totally inadequate upon consolidation of Ent AFB activities at Peterson Field.

The fifth item is for a post office of 7,020 square feet. Postal Services are housed in antiquated substandard facilities approximately one-third the base requirement for present and projected mail traffic.

The last item is for utilities in the amount of $1,027,000 to support the above-mentioned projects.

TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE

Tyndall Air Force Base, the second base to be considered in the Aerospace Defense Command program, is located 7 miles southeast of Panama City, Fla. Primary mission activities include combat crew training, an Aerospace Defense Weapons Center, aircraft control and warning radar, and the Air Force Civil Engineering Center.

The requested program of $951,000 provides the following two items:

The first item is a weapons and release system shop at 5,520 square feet. This function presently occupies a building that cannot be economically adapted to fully satisfy the requirements of an up-to-date weapons release systems shop. The following contribute to the unsuitability of the present facility: Necessary equipment cannot be installed, doors are too small to admit items for maintenance, and inadequate ventilation.

The second project is a theater consisting of 10,900 square feet. An existing, 29-year-old structure presently houses the theater function. Acoustical treatment, soundtrack delivery, and seating are inadequate, detracting from the enjoyment expected by patrons. Other deficiencies include insufficient parking, poor environmental control, and a mini concesion area. To obtain similar entertainment off base requires an approximately 30-mile round trip.

Senator SYMINGTON. Just how important is it to provide a new theater at this base at the present time? Couldn't this money be better used for something else?

General REILLY. The Tyndall Base theater is a 1943 temporary wood frame structure which, in spite of continuous maintenance, has deteriorated to the point that it must be replaced. The nearest theater to Tyndall is in Panama City which is a 30-mile round trip from the base housing area. In addition to motion picture entertainment, the theater serves as a place for commander's calls, mass personnel briefings, and live entertainment. The availability of an adequate, accessible theater is considered to be a significant factor in maintaining the morale of our people at a high level. The return on the investment, while not specifically measurable in dollars and cents, will be increased productivity and improved motivation for all assigned personnel.

Senator SYMINGTON. I have received a request from Congressman Sikes to include in the bill a new gymnasium for the Tyndall AFB, at a cost of $820,000. What is the situation regarding the gymnasium

for Tyndall? Is it a valid requirement, and when might it ordinarily appear in the Air Force program?

General REILLY. The existing gymnasium at Tyndall is a deteriorated temporary wood frame facility built in 1943. It contains only one basketball floor, two handball courts, a small weight room, and two inadequate shower rooms. The basketball floor is seriously warped at the ends, and the subflooring is deteriorated. The equipment from the exercise room had to be moved from the second floor because of the deteriorated condition of the floor joists. In order to conduct an effective athletic and physical conditioning program, additional basketball practice areas, handball courts, a larger physical conditioning room, a steam room, and improved locker and shower facilities are needed. A new gymnasium was originally considered a candidate for fiscal year 1976 MCP; however, in a survey of the facility subsequent to the development of the fiscal year 1974 military construction program, it was determined that the building was so deteriorated that it should be replaced at the earliest date.

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

The mission of the Air Force Communications Services (AFCS) is to engineer, program for or provide, install, operate, maintain, and manage communications electronics for the Air Force and for other agencies as directed by the Chief of Staff, USAF.

This program request includes $3,963,000 in support of AFCS host responsibilities, plus $330,000 in worldwide communications for technical control facilities at various worldwide locations. Total construction requested in this program for AFCS is $4,293,000.

RICHARDS GEBAUR AIR FORCE BASE, MO.

Richards Gebaur AFB, Air Force Communications Service (AFCS) headquarters, is located 16 miles south of Kansas City, Mo. In addition to communications service headquarters, Richards Gebaur supports a Reserve tactical airlift wing, an air navigational facilities checking squadron (AFCS), and an electronics engineering group (AFCS). The military construction program requests $3,963,000 for two projects as follows:

The first project is a 6,680 square foot addition to a communications and electronics shop. Present housing is improperly configured to support effective, efficient accomplishment of required tasks. Increased workload, nearly tripled, results in unacceptable delay or deferment of planned evaluation and testing.

The second project, "Add to and alter composite medical facility," has a scope of 64,000 square feet. Outpatient loads have increased more than 100 percent since occupation of the present composite medical facility. Medical needs of the military community exceed the capability of the existing building resulting in overcrowding and delays in medical service.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

The mission of the Air Force Logistics Command is to provide an adequate and efficient system of procurement, production, surveillance, maintenance, and supply for the U.S. Air Force and train specialized

units for accomplishment of logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters. This program contains a request for $61,325,000 which provides facilities at six locations where Air Force Logistics Command is the host command. Of this amount $40,191,000 is for items to support the Air Force Logistics Command and $21,134,000 to support the Air Force Systems Command at Hill AFB, Utah, and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH

The first location, Hill Air Force Base, is 7 miles south of Ogden, Utah, and is headquarters for the Ogden Air Materiel Area. In addition the base supports a helicopter combat crew training unit for Military Airlift Command, a reserve tactical fighter group mission, and an Air Force Systems Command test squadron. The total program being requested is $11,968,000 consisting of five items including one item of $3,000,000 for Air Force Systems Command as follows:

The first project provides for the construction of an addition to the existing aircraft operational apron serving the air freight terminal. The existing apron does not provide sufficient space to accommodate the large, modern cargo aircraft.

The second project provides for the construction of a 280,213 sq. ft. depot landing gear overhaul facility. Presently, overhaul is being accomplished in scattered and temporary facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. This is a very expensive facility you are requesting here. I assume that this type of work is presently being performed, and I am wondering what the need for a new facility is at that time?

General REILLY. Work is presently being performed primarily in five scattered facilities, several other small facilities, and outside. Work can more effectively and economically be accomplished in the proposed facility which will enhance worker productivity, reduce flow times and increase the quality and reliability of weapon systems through work performed.

Direct quantifiable annual savings to be obtained include: (1) work can be accomplished with 80 fewer personnel, saving $1,175,000, (2) procurement costs due to reduced repair cycle time will be reduced $72,500, (3) maintenance and repair of facilities reduced $21,000, and (4) transportation costs reduced $23,000. In addition to annual savings, nearly $3 million can be cost avoided. These quantifiable benefits will amortize the project in 5½ years.

In addition to the above, the following are examples of nonquantified benefits which will be obtained:

1. 48,450 sq. ft. of structurally sound space now used as a machine shop which will go into the proposed facility will become available to centralize and properly house sheet metal activities. Since the sheet metal shops are overcrowded and scattered throughout the maintenance complex, this is a worthwhile project in itself; yet, no benefits were claimed in the sheet metal area.

2. A 29,500 sq. ft. structurally sound facility will become available to provide a very adequate general training lab, a base life support shop, and an areospace ground equipment shop. These activities are currently scattered through nine substandard facilities which will be disposed of upon completion of the project. The proper housing of

these activities will provide significant benefits which were not calculated or claimed.

3. Foundry, cleaning and welding activities will be accomplished in accordance with the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 and pollution standards.

4. The risk from fire and personal injuries will be substantially reduced.

5. The use of modern mechanized handling systems will considerably reduce damage compared to the present forklift truck and manual methods. In the absence of historical data, this was not quantified.

6. Material in process is now temporarily stored outside exposed to weather deterioration. The cost of removing snow and possible corrosion was not calculated.

7. The working environment will be considerably improved through exhaust systems, fume scrubbers, pollution control equipment, lighting, and related work area consolidations. This will likely produce less absenteeism, better supervision, improved attitudes, reduced rehired and retraining costs, and better communication between support shops. As a result, the quality of work performed will increase with an attendant increase in reliability of weapons systems and mean time between failures. These benefits, although unquantified, present tremendous potential savings to the Government.

The proposed project is needed then to accomplish work more economically and more effectively.

The third project will construct Minuteman ballistic missile processing support facilities totaling 87,600 square feet for Air Force Systerms Command. Existing facilities are saturated and storage of additional units cannot be accomplished without new facilities.

Senator Symington. I notice you state in your justification that additional space is required to allow the Minuteman force modernization to progress at an economical and responsive pace. Will you explain what you mean by this?

General Reilly. The economical pace relates to the production of Minuteman III missiles. This rate is greater than the responsive rate at which the missiles can be strategically deployed. Accordingly, there is a need for storage space for the missiles as they leave the production line. The alternate of reducing the produtcion rate would cause cost increases far in excess of the construction of the storage facility.

The storage facility will also accommodate those Minuteman I and II missiles from their silo launchers so that silo upgrade work may be accomplished again at an economic and responsive pace.

Finally there will be an ultimate requirement for missiles in excess of the silo inventory. These spare missiles must be stored in the proposed facility until needed to replace missiles consumed in test firings or otherwise removed from the strategic force. The only alternative to this storage would be the expensive process of keeping the production line open to produce missiles as required.

The fourth project will provide alternate electric power supply, air-conditioning, and associated utilities to support operation of advanced logistics system computer equipment.

The last project provides an addition to an existing depot central heating plant. Due to limited supply of natural gas, primary heat

loads must be assumed by a large central plant which can use oil as a substitute fuel, and which can be altered to increase steam generating capacity.

KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

The second base is Kelly Air Force Base, located 6 miles southwest of San Antonio, Tex. The base supports the San Antonio Air Materiel Area Headquarters, Air Force Environmental Laboratory, Headquarters of the USAF Security Service, a Reserve tactical airlift wing, and an Air National Guard tactical fighter group. The total program being requested contains $6,101,000 for four projects.

The first project provides an addition to, and air conditioning of, the aircraft engine fuel system control overhaul and test facility. Existing facilities are too small to handle the heavy workload and do not have environmental control to assure quality controlled production.

The second project will construct a 39,900 square feet new depot precision measure equipment facility. Existing facilities make effective use of space difficult and in some cases impossible.

The third project provides for construction of a new 25,500 square foot facility in which to store hazardous materials. Present facilities are a substandard building and an open area approximately 1.5 miles away.

The last project will provide alternate electric power supply, air-conditioning, and associated utilities to support operation of advanced logistics system computer equipment.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you always provide standby power at your computer centers?

General REILLY. Standby power is supplied at our computer sites where the criticality of the mission or other circumstance warrants the additional protection. The concentration of Air Force logistics support in six large third generation real time, on-line computer systems, instead of the approximately 90 second generation batch processors in AFLC today, will greatly increase the impact of power outages and fluctuations. As knowledge has accrued during the advanced logistic system development process, the extent and nature of this impact has become increasingly evident.

Simply stated, computer downtime will stop logistics processes during the period of the outage and during the period of time required for recovery and restart. In general, power failure will cause the logistic system to be seriously degraded and certain key actions will cease completely for the period of the outage, plus time will be required, to restore temperature and humidity control, stabilize speeds of rotating components, complete system recovery and restart, and eliminate transaction backlogs. Because of the on-line relationship of the computers at each of the six sites, and the interdependence of the ALS processes among the sites, total AFLC support is degraded when the computer at one site is inoperative. Based on the interdependence of the logistics process and the computer, a standby power and back up air-conditioning system is essential to continued logistic support of the Air Force mission.

MC CLELLAN AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

The third base in the Air Force Logistics Command program is McClellan Air Force Base, located 7 miles northeast of Sacramento, Calif. The primary mission of this base is to support the Sacramento Air Materiel Area Headquarters. It also supports an Aerospace Defense Command airborne early warning control wing; a Military Airlift Command weather reconnaissance wing; and a Reserve tactical airlift group. The total program requested at this location amounts to $3,171,000 and consists of the following three projects.

The first project will construct a single facility for two radio aids to air navigation. Existing TACAN must be relocated due to high radio-frequency interference and there are no existing VOR facilities.

The second project provides for the construction of a new 65,000 square foot weapons system components plating and metal processing shop. Existing plating shop is too small and does not have an effective exhaust system to remove toxic fumes.

The last item will provide alternate electric power supply, air-conditioning, and associated utilities to support operation of an advanced logistics system computer equipment.

ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GA.

The fifth of the Air Force Logistics Command bases being considered is Robins Air Force Base, located 18 miles south of Macon, Ga. The principal mission of this base is to support the headquarters of the Warner Robins Air Materiel Area. It also supports a heavy bombardment wing of the Strategic Air Command; the headquarters of the Air Force Reserve Command; and a mobile communications group of the Air Force Communications Service. This request is for six projects amounting to $4,868,000.

The first project provides an aircraft run-up facility for F–15 aircraft complete with supporting facilities and foundations for the installation of sound suppression equipment. There are no facilities at this base for this type aircraft.

The second project will provide an addition to and alteration of the existing aircraft protective coating facility. Painting cannot be accomplished in present facility 28 percent of the time due to temperature and humidity tolerances being exceeded.

The third project will add to and alter interior of maintenance hangars. Adequate space and appurtenances are required to provide a central utility system to which aircraft may be connected for overhaul rather than using many pieces of AGE equipment which are noisy, produce noxious fumes, and take up needed space.

The fourth project alters an existing materials analysis facility to provide adequate size, proper functional configuration, and environmental control. Workloads have doubled since 1961.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is the purpose of this facility, and what type of materials are analyzed here?

General REILLY. This facility is needed to provide industrial analysis for the maintenance, supply and procurement activities at this depot. It is needed to properly analyze aircraft fuel, engine oil, paint, paint remover, sealants, adhesives, resins, plating solutions, and other chemicals and materials procured or used at Robins Air Force Base.

It will also be used for the reclamation of mercury, nondestructive/failure testing of airframe structural components, testing for corrosion control methods, certifying welders, and prototyping industrial processes for repair activities at this depot. Activities are now being marginally accomplished in a warehouse which cannot properly function as an analysis facility. This project is to provide those alterations needed to adequately accommodate this important test work.

The fifth project alters the interior of an existing depot aircraft overhaul facility. Wooden structures have been erected within the aircraft overhaul and modification facility and must be removed to provide adequate flow lines.

The last item will provide alternate electric power supply, air-conditioning, and associated utilities to support operation of advanced logistics system computer equipment.

TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLA.

The fifth base is Tinker Air Force Base, located 8 miles southeast of Oklahoma City, Okla. The primary mission of this base is to support the Headquarters of the Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area. It also supports a Reserve Tactical Fighter Group, Communications Computer Program Center, and a Mobile Communications Group of the Air Force Communications Service. This request is for seven projects amounting to $15,666,000.

The first project provides for the construction of a depot facility 72,000 square feet, for overhauling and testing aircraft electric system components. Now utilizing a portion of a depot maintenance hangar, this function has an excessively high rejection rate of close tolerance parts because of contamination. Contamination is inevitable considering the inadequate environmental control system. Machine tool vibration transmitted by unstable floors makes accurate machine setups difficult to achieve and maintain further contributing to facility unsuitability.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice in your justification for this rather expensive structure you indicate that 11 percent of the system components overhauled in this facility do not pass final inspection because of contaminants. Can you give us some idea what this amounts to dollarwise?

General REILLY. The dollar value of the 11 percent or approximately 500 units which must be reprocessed each year due to contaminates is approximately $5 million. These contaminates can be eliminated if a proper facility with environmental controls is provided as proposed by this project. The yearly cost of materials needed for reprocessing due to contaminates is $200,000. This also could be avoided with the proposed facility. In addition, the project will save over $400,000 per year in personnel costs and allow a one-time reduction in new procurement of over $4.5 million.

Items being overhauled and tested are called constant speed drives. This is a very sensitive device which converts mechanical power from the aircraft engine—which varies for each portion of the flight—into constant speed power for driving aircraft alternators. The alternators provide stable 400-cycle electrical power needed for aircraft systems; such as; radars, computers, electronic countermeasures, cameras, sensors, navigation, communication, et cetera.

The constant speed drive is complex and sensitive. It normally uses an electrical speed-governing device to change a variable speed input—from the aircraft engine—into a constant speed output—for driving the alternator—through the use of planetary gear systems and variable displacement hydraulic motors and pumps. Contaminates disrupt the precision operation of these devices preventing them from performing within allowable tolerances.

Contaminates and vibrations cannot be controlled within the existing facility; the configuration prevents efficient flow and testing cannot be automated. These deficiencies will be eliminated by the proposed project.

The second item alters an existing building to provide an adequate depot facility for precision measurement equipment. Alteration will reconfigure the building for optimum workflow and add adequate environmental control so that equipment calibration and certification can proceed without inordinate delays.

The third project is for construction of a logistical materials storage facility of 360,000 square feet; 23 buildings presently house this activity of which 4 are considered adequate. Deterioration characterize the 17 inadequate substandard facilities, some in danger of structural failure. Proper location and configuration will measurably increase the efficiency of this activity.

Senator SYMINGTON. Is this expensive facility a warehouse or is it a freight terminal? I am of the impression that you have a completely modern freight terminal already at this depot. It is noted that you indicate the remaining deficiencies will be satisfied with future programs. What will this amount to?

General REILLY. The airfreight terminal at Tinker Air Force Base is modern and will not be directly affected by this project. The project will provide 360,000 square feet of covered storage space in one modern efficient facility for material now stored outside and in seven deteriorated inefficient buildings. The seven buildings are inadequate because: (1) they are failing physically and represent risks to personnel and materials; (2) configuration is poor in that there are seven buildings, ceiling heights are low—13 feet—columns are spaced too closely—16 feet by 33 feet—and mechanized systems cannot be used—$440 million in material is handled each year—(3) floor slabs have cracked and settled contributing to handling and storage problems; and (4) lack of environmental control contributes to material deterioration.

Currently, storage is being accomplished in 19 substandard facilities—2,834,782 square feet—4 adequate facilities—82,696 square feet—and 172,000 square yards of outside space. The total requirement is for 3,416,406 square feet of covered space. The remaining deficiency of 2,973,710 square feet could be corrected by future MCP requests and would cost approximately $14 million.

The fourth project provides for addition to, and alteration of, an existing composite medical facility. Current medical needs greatly exceed the facility capability. The existing building designed and constructed to support a community with only 15 percent of the present patient loans forced expansion into substandard, inadequate, and old, deteriorated, temporary frame structures. Sill overcrowding and treatment delays prevail.

The fifth item is for standby utility capability, electric power, and air-conditioning in support of the advanced logistics system computer equipment. Present service cannot insure continuous reliable operation in the event of outages. Increased capacity will permit shutdown of primary systems for maintenance and repair without interrupting computer operations.

The sixth project provides for upgrading and expansion of the base electrical distribution system. Currently the electrical distribution system is operating at maximum capacity. Projected service demands cannot be accommodated with the existing system nor is there alternative service available in cases of component failure.

The last project is for authorization only and provides for the exchange of Government-owned land of equal value for fee title to approximately 187 acres of land adjacent to this base, and will be used for training purposes.

Senator SYMINGTON. I assume that this is an even exchange of lands, and that no funding will be necessary. Is this correct?

General REILLY. Yes. This exchange is a value-for-value exchange and no funds will be involved.

WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

The last Air Force Logistics Command location to be considered is Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, located 5 miles northeast of Dayton, Ohio. The primary mission of this base is to support the headquarters of the Air Force Logistics Command. It also supports the Aeronautical System Division of the Air Force Systems Command; the Air Force Institute of Technology, Air University; a Strategic Air Command heavy bombardment wing; and the Air Force Systems Command Foreign Technology Division. This request for six projects for $19,511,000 includes four projects for the Air Force Systems Command for $18,134,000.

The first project provides construction of 242,870 square feet as the second and final phase of the technical intelligence operations facility. Currently, the Foreign Technology Division is housed in nine overcrowded buildings of which seven are substandard. These structures are widely dispersed making efficient accomplishment of this vital task more difficult.

The second item is for alteration of an existing facility to provide an aircraft engine component research facility. Currently, the Aeropropulsion Laboratory has no facility to conduct compressor research.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that you state in your justification that the Air Force aeropropulsion laboratory does not have a facility to conduct compressor research. Where is such research now conducted? Does this duplicate anything you do at the AEDC Tullahoma?

General REILLY. The real-time transient compressor research capability which the proposed project will provide is unique and does not exist in the free world. Presently only steady-state compressor research can be conducted in facilities that are located at most turbine engine manufacturer's plants, NASA/Lewis, and AEDC.

There is no duplication between the proposed compressor research facility and existing test capability at AEDC. The proposed facility

will be located at the Air Force aeropropulsion laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, because the mission of conducting compressor research is assigned to this laboratory and we will be able to use existing drive stand equipment and buildings worth over $12 million.

The third construction project provides an aircraft fuels and lubricants laboratory of 68,250 square feet. Research is now fragmented throughout widely dispersed and inadequate facilities. Most cannot meet safety criteria and have inadequate environmental control.

The fourth project adds to and alters an existing human impact laboratory to house new test equipment. Alteration will encompass 4,570 square feet; the addition will be 4,920 square feet. The existing human impact facility can perform research in only the vertical plane. This construction adds space for installation of equipment which will permit proper horizontal testing.

The fifth item is for construction of a 194 MN airmen dormitory. Forty percent of the assigned must now live in substandard, wood frame, over 30-year-old dormitories designed for a 10-year life expectancy. These structures are without wall or ceiling insulation, have inadequate lighting and environmental control, and provide poorly configured living areas.

The last project requested is for utilities support of advanced logistics system computer equipment. Present commercial power is not adequate to assure continuous operation. This project will provide adequate electrical and air-conditioning services to insure continuing operation should commercial power fail or should it require shutdown for maintenance and/or repair.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The next major command to be considered is the Air Force Systems Command whose mission is to advance aerospace technology, adopt it into operational aerospace systems, and acquire qualitatively superior aerospace systems and materiel needed to accomplish the Air Force mission.

The construction program at bases with Air Force Systems Command as host amounts to $9,062,000. Of this amount, $8,207,000 is for items to support the Air Force Systems Command mission and $855,000 is in support of the Tactical Air Command on Eglin Auxiliary Airfield No. 9.

Similarly, presentations of the Air Force Logistics Command, Strategic Air Command, and the Tactical Air Command include $22,646,000 for the Air Force Systems Command. The total construction program in the United States in support of the Air Force Systems Command is $30,853,000.

EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

The first base to be considered is Edwards AFB, located about 3 miles northeast of Lancaster, Calif., and about 65 miles north northeast of Los Angeles, Calif. The planned use of this base is in support of the Air Force Flight Test Center, the Air Force Rocket Propulsion Laboratory, a headquarters command aerospace technical development and training group, and miscellaneous research and test

programs for the Army, Navy, and NASA. The requested program totals $889,000 for one project.

Construction is requested for alteration of an existing rocket propulsion laboratory to provide adequate environmental control. Alteration of air-conditioning, heating, and ventilation systems will provide necessary control for toxic chemical fume hoods, test cells, data processing center, and sensitive equipment as well as decontamination of toxic exhaust air. Today's deficiencies result from deterioration, increased environmental control requirements imposed by mission changes and increased toxicity of today's propellants.

EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.

The next base to be considered is Eglin Air Force Base, located 6 miles northeast of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., and includes auxiliary No. 9 airfield of the Eglin complex. The mission of Eglin main base is in support of a Tactical Air Command tactical fighter wing; Military Airlift Command aerospace rescue and recovery wing; an armament development test center, and the Air Force's Armament Laboratory. At auxiliary No. 9 there is a special operations force under the jurisdiction of the Tactical Air Command and an Aerospace Defense Command aerospace defense squadron. The program requested for these two locations amounts to $7,039,000 and consists of seven items. The two items on Eglin No. 9 are in support of the Tactical Air Command.

The first is for an aircraft engine shop with a scope of 37,800 square feet. These facilities are currently utilized for this function, two are structurally sound, but total only one-third the required space, while the third is over 30 years old and is beyond economical alteration and rehabilitation. Aircraft engine disassembly and inspection must be performed under proper controlled environmental conditions and must have special facilities for engine maintenance activities.

Item 2 provides for construction of aircraft corrosion control facility with a scope of 2,995 square feet. The existing 50-square-foot substandard washrack will not allow use of required chemicals, does not provide premanent compressed air supply, and is severely space limited. The warm, humid climate and salt air make proper corrosion control a prime concern at this location (auxiliary airfield No. 9).

Item 3 will provide a 2,724-square-foot armament ballistics test facility. There is no existing facility for testing of high explosive and incendiary projectiles.

Item 4 provides construction of three new data collection theodolite stations and alteration of one existing station. This project is the fourth and final increment required to provide 35 theodolite stations on this base.

Item 5 is for an armament development test center management facility of 146,000 square feet. This activity currently occupies 31 substandard structures that cannot be economically upgraded. Efficient and effective mission accomplishment is difficult if not impossible in the existing widely separated inadequate facilities.

Item 6 is for a new airmen open mess of 16,000 square feet. The currently used facility, with a 10-year design life, but in use for 30 years, is structurally marginal and requires excessive maintenance.

The new construction will provide an adequate, permanent, social, and recreational facility which is essential to motivation and long-term retention of an effective professional enlisted force.

The last item provides for addition to and alteration of the existing NCO open mess facility on auxiliary airfield No. 9, presently housed in less than 50 percent of the required space. This project will provide an adequate facility for essential NCO recreation, relaxation, and social activities.

Senator SYMINGTON. How many NCO clubs are there located on the Eglin complex, and how many noncommissioned officers are assigned to this auxiliary field No. 8?

General REILLY. There are two NCO open messes, one on the main base at Eglin, and one on Eglin Auxiliary No. 9. The two clubs serve two different populations. The main base NCO supports the NCO's assigned to the Air Force Armament Development Test Center, the 33d Tactical Fighter Wing, and other units assigned to the main installation. Eglin Auxiliary No. 9 is located 25 miles west of the main base and it supports the 2,423 NCO's assigned to the 1st Special Operations Wing and associated units located at that installation.

LAURENCE G. HANSCOM FIELD, MASS.

The last Systems Command base to be considered is Laurence G. Hanscom Field, located 3 miles northwest of Waltham, Mass. Base missions include support of electronics systems division and Air force Cambridge Research Laboratory. One item for $480,000 is requested for this base.

The one item provides for addition to and alteration of onbase roads. One of the existing major entry points must be closed because of national park development adjacent to the installation. Safe and efficient redistribution of base traffic necessitates construction of a properly designed road network.

Senator SYMINGTON. I understand that this project could be deleted since the National Park Service has fallen behind in their plans?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. The requirement for this project is directly related to the National Park Service's plan to close the egress road serving the southern part of the base. Their construction slippage will permit us to defer this project.

SATELLITE CONTROL FACILITIES—VARIOUS

The last two items to be considered in the Air Force Systems Command program support the satellite control facilities program in the United States. These facilities consist of tracking stations strategically located so that they can track, monitor, collect data, and provide input to satellites in equatorial and polar orbits. The program requested amounts to $654,000 and consists of two items at two locations.

The first item provides for construction of a foundation for support of a communications antenna at Sunnyvale, Calif. Installation of new antenna would provide the capability to accommodate increased volume and complexity of communications to and from military satellites.

Item No. 2 is for construction of a 5,600 square foot automotive maintenance facility at Kodiak, Alaska. No adequate facilities exist

for vehicle maintenance at this location. Large vehicles cannot be accommodated by existing structures requiring open-door maintenance in a harsh environment.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The mission of the Air Training Command is to provide flying training leading to an aeronautical rating; air crew training; basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty; basic military training; mobile training, and such other training as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

Construction projects totaling $56,282,000 are requested by this program for 11 bases where Air Training Command is host. Of the total $35,932,000 supports the air training command mission with the remainder, $20,350,000, for the Air Force Accounting and Finance Center at Lowry Air Force Base, Colo.

KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISS.

The first base is Keesler Air Force Base, located 1 mile west of Biloxi, Miss. This base supports a technical training center; and electronic installation group under control of the Air Force Communications Service; a tactical airlift group (Reserve); an aerial cartographic/geodetic squadron; and a weather reconnaissance squadron. The program requests $8,786,000 for the following four items:

The first item is to alter aircraft operational apron to accommodate a newly assigned heavier aircraft. The existing aircraft apron is extensively cracked, spalled, and generally deteriorated creating a hazard to aircraft, and associated equipment. This project will provide adequate paved surfaces.

The second item is to add to and alter maintenance hangars to provide two covered maintenance spaces and one combined corrosion control/fuel cell space. Existing hangars will not accommodate the newly assigned large aircraft.

The third item provides for addition to and alteration of the existing dental clinic. Dental services are performed in three widely dispersed clinics with approximately one-half the space required to provide an effective dental program.

The fourth project will construct a 1,000 MN composite airmen dormitory. Approximately 25 percent of the airmen assigned are housed in substandard, 30-year-old, structures designed for less than a 10-year service life. This project will provide adequate quarters for nearly all assigned airmen now in unsuitable housing. It will also result in disposal of 37 antiquated buildings.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is the status of the runway construction that was approved at Keesler Air Force Base last year?

General REILLY. The project was approved in the amount of $2,778,000. Bids on the project were opened on July 26, 1973. Only two bids were received, both from very reputable firms, but both considerably over the approved amount. The project cost, based on the low bid, would be $3,932,000. Even giving full consideration to the cost flexibility in law, we cannot award the project at that amount. We, and our construction agent have reevaluated the project, and the bids received. We plant to readvertise the project, providing for acceptable

deductives, but our recent analysis shows that bids will probably come under at about the same level as currently in hand. Should this occur, deficiency authorization legislation will be required to allow award. An increase of $1,200,000 in the fiscal year 1973 authorization for Keesler is an indicated need.

LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

The next base to be considered in the Air Training Command's program is Lackland Air Force Base, located 8 miles southwest of San Antonio, Tex. Missions supported include a Basic Military Training Center, Wilford Hall Hospital, Air Force Special Treatment Center, School of Applied Aerospace Science, and School of Military Science (airmen/officer). The program requested here is for $6,509,000 for the following three items:

The first project will provide alteration of an existing dining hall, 11,400 square feet, to provide a dispensary. The present facility consists of a small first-aid station in a headquarters building. Inadequate space, poor configuration, no dental treatment rooms, and increased patient loads contribute to degraded medical service.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why is a new dispensary necessary at this base when there is a large hospital located on the base?

General REILLY. An aid station presently serves the student population of 850 and the faculty at the Lackland (Medina) Training Annex. It is located in the rear of a headquarters building, and its functional and physical configuration cannot be expanded to adequately support the projected increase in medical services required by the consolidation of T–41 aircraft flying training in the School of Military Science (officers) at Medina using the nearby flying facilities at Hondo. This was previously accomplished at the nine undergraduate pilot training bases until April 1973. At the completion of the consolidation in July 1973, the daily student strength averaged 1,100, in addition to the faculty and support personnel assigned.

The new mission requires that complete aeromedical services be provided to the personnel at Medina. This includes extensive physical examinations which provide early identification of individuals not physically qualified or mentally motivated for flying training. Locating a small, but adequate aeromedical/outpatient medical facility at the Medina training annex, rather than at the Wilford Hall USAF Medical Center on the main base 3 miles away, also permits daily personal contact between the four flight surgeons and the students, both in the classroom and in all other phases of their training. This contact will lead to early identification of possible SIE (self-initiated elimination) and MOA (manifestation of apprehension) cases. This is critical to the elimination of the problem students before they proceed well into their training, thereby avoiding a significant waste of time, money, and manpower.

Another factor is the positive benefit, in terms of reduced student and faculty schedule hours lost, which are chargeable to medical/dental appointments. This can be achieved with locating an adequate dispensary at Medina.

The second item will provide a 1,000 MN composite living quarters. Thirty percent of the assigned airmen are housed in substandard quarters. Twenty- to 30-year-old structures, designed for less than 10-

year service life, have inadequate lighting, environmental control, and other creature comforts considered minimum by present standards.

Senator SYMINGTON. How many of these facilities do you now have in the inventory, and how are they working out; since, as I recall, this is a relatively new concept?

General REILLY. We currently have 10 composite dormitory-dining hall-training facilities in the inventory at the Air Force Military Training Center, Lackland. The first of these facilities was authorized in the fiscal year 1961 MCP. The concept has been refined in subsequent programs and has proved to be an effective and economical way to house, feed, and supervise the large numbers of newly enlisted students who are trained at Lackland.

The last project provides air-conditioning and other alterations to three airmen dining halls. Dining halls are hot, noisy, and uncomfortable with an interior arrangement, lighting, and decor that are inferior to commercial dining facility standards.

LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

The next base for consideration is Laughlin Air Force Base, sited 7 miles east of Del Rio, Tex., where the primary mission is the Undergraduate Pilot Training School. The requested program at this base amounts to $4,635,000 for construction of a composite medical facility. Medical needs of the military community exceed the capability of existing facilities. Five individual structures now house the medical function. These are combustible frame structures that are professionally obsolete and functionally inadequate.

LOWRY AIR FORCE BASE, COLO.

Lowry Air Force Base, located 1 mile southeast of Denver, Colo., has a technical training center as its primary mission. The program for this base contains a request for $21,610,000 for two projects as follows:

The first item is for Air Force Accounting and Finance Center with a scope of 601,375 square feet. Currently the center is in old, deteriorated buildings located in a congested area of Denver. Type of construction, building age, inadequate fire protection, limited security, and separated locations severely limit the entire function.

The last item will provide construction of an airmen open mess with a scope of 26,300 square feet. Airmen open mess activities are currently housed in an over 30-year-old structure, designed for less than a 10-year service life. Substandard and nonfunctional facilities make it an impossibility to provide adequate club services.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would like to have a rather complete justification for this expensive structure. What kind of facility are you now located in, etc.?

General REILLY. The Air Force Accounting and Finance Center, and its tenants, are presently located in a GSA owned and controlled facility at 3800 York Street in Denver, Colo. The facility was built by the War Department in 1942 as warehousing for an Army medical supply depot. The facility is in a highly congested area and is bordered by industrial complexes and residential areas.

Two large warehouse buildings house the major portion of the center's functions. The buildings are of wood frame construction and were built for a useful life of not more than 15 years. The wood portions of the buildings are splitting from drying conditions over the past 31 years, weakening the supporting structures and rendering the buildings structurally unsound. The buildings are highly combustible and fire protection of the facility, a sprinkler system, is totally inadequate. When the warehouse buildings were modified for administrative use, the sprinkler heads were not lowered and the sprinklers are physically located between the false ceilings and roofs.

The original design of the facility limits expansion possibilities and imposes limitations upon their utilization for administrative functions. The result is extremely congested working conditions, substandard lighting and heating, inadequate security for sensitive pay and accounting operations and excessive maintenance costs. Additional space is used at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal to meet the total requirements of the AFAFC.

While the Air Force currently pays no rental charge for the use of the facilities, GSA will commence charges for space and services on July 1, 1974. GSA has advised that the charge for these facilities will be $3.7 million per annum.

Four alternatives were considered to overcome the deficiencies and limitations mentioned. These were:

(*a*) Renovate the existing facility.
(*b*) Construct a new facility on Lowry AFB.
(*c*) Relocate to an existing facility on an Air Force base.
(*d*) Lease a facility in the Denver area.

The first alternative—renovate the existing facility—would provide an improved operating site through correction of some of the existing deficiencies. However, it would not overcome deficiencies which are beyond correction such as lack of land for expansion and basic structural limitations, with the attendant undesirable working conditions. GSA has provided an estimate of $9.13 million to bring the facility to acceptable standards. Capital investment of this magnitude for a 31-year-old facility with an inherent lack of utility would clearly not be in the best interests of the Government. Consideration must also be given to savings the U.S. Government would realize should GSA dispose of the facilities through sale.

The second alternative to construct a new facility on Lowry AFB would provide the Air Force with a modern, efficient administrative building, functionally designed to provide the most effective operating environment for now and the foreseeable future. Reduced manpower requirements, lower operating and support costs, increased productivity, and a high level of security and fire protection will accrue from this relocation. Furthermore, detailed economic analysis has proven that this is the most cost effective of the four alternatives considered.

The third alternative involved studies over the past several years on relocation of the Center to several other locations. These studies assumed the existence of an adequately sized facility and therefore, only considered those costs for modification, to relocate personnel, recruiting and training costs, severance payments, and the adverse impact of the disruption to pay and accounting services for all Air Force personnel and their dependents. One-time costs for this alternative are in excess of $21 million.

Finally, lease of a facility in the Denver area is not considered a viable alternative in light of costs near $5 million annually.

It will be noted that three of the four alternatives call for continuing operations in the Denver area. The most critical factor militating against moving AFAFC and its tenants from the Denver area is the certain loss of approximately 60 percent of the highly skilled and experienced technical and professional personnel. The 3,100-person work force is highlighted by the fact that two-thirds of the civilians are female employees, serving in clerical positions. The vast majority of the females provide a secondary income source to their families. It is a certainty this group would be lost if the complex were moved. A move outside the Denver area would also involve a costly hiring overlap, a time consuming and costly recruiting and training program, and degradation of pay service which would be virtually irreparable to the Air Force.

In light of the foregoing, the conclusion has been reached that it is more cost effective and more practical from a personnel utilization standpoint to relocate to Lowry AFB rather than to consider a geographical relocation.

The last item will provide construction of an airmen open mess with a scope of 26,300 sq. ft. Airmen open mess activities are currently housed in an over 30-year-old structure, designed for less than a 10-year service life. Substandard and nonfunctional facilities make it an impossibility to provide adequate club services.

MATHER AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

The next base is Mather Air Force Base, located 12 miles east-northeast of Sacramento, Calif., where the primary mission is navigator training school. Also supported is a heavy bombardment wing under control of the Strategic Air Command. The requested program at this base is $1,993,000 involving construction of the following two items:

The first project provides for the construction of a 2,884 square foot radar flight control center. Flight control is now performed from an outdated mobile facility, which cannot be modified to accept modern equipment. Existing facility restrictions include: operating space too small, high noise levels in operating area, inadequate environmental control, and equipment limitations.

The second project will provide for the construction of a new 50,200 square foot base personnel office. Personnel office activities are housed in widely separated wood frame structures beyond economical restoration to functional use.

RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Randolph Air Force Base, located 15 miles northeast of San Antonio, Tex., supports Headquarters Air Training Command, Instrument Flight Training Center, Pilot Instructor School, Military Personnel Center (HQ USAF), and Recruiting Service. The program requests $1,463,000 for a 30,000 square foot data processing facility. Data processing functions are currently performed in two poorly configured, inadequately sized buildings. Lack of storage space, improper

functional layout, poor environmental control, and dispersed functional components make accomplishment of data processing activities most difficult.

REESE AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

The seventh of the 11 bases to be considered is Reese Air Force Base, located 6 miles west of Lubbock, Tex. This base supports an undergraduate pilot training school. The program requested for this base amounts to $4,211,000 to construct three items.

The first item provides for the construction of radar flight control center with a scope of 2,884 square feet. A mobile facility currently houses the radar flight control function. The mobile facility, outdated, inadequate, and substandard, cannot be modified to accept modern equipment.

The second item provides for construction of a 64,240 square foot flight simulator training facility. There are no existing facilities which are available to house new simulators required for undergraduate pilot training.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you are asking $2.8 million for a flight simulator training facility. Is this a new program you are entering into, and will other training bases require this type of simulator? If so, how extensive is the program, and what will the overall cost be?

Do you actually have these simulators at the present time? If not, when will they be acquired?

General REILLY. The instrument flight simulator training facility requested for Reese is the first of eight such facilities which will support the undergraduate pilot training (UPT) program. This new program will permit us to substitute simulator hours for all flying-hours in the instrument phase of training except for proficiency validation sorties. As a result of this change we will be able to transfer the substituted flying hours to other essential phases of training such as formation flying and low-level navigation. By this means we will increase the quality of our pilots and better prepare them to transition into the high performance operational aircraft. Four simulator complexes will be installed at each of the eight UPT bases and two complexes will be installed at the pilot instructor training base. Each simulator complex is composed of four cockpits mounted on motion bases tied into a single digital computer and two instructor stations. A total of 34 complexes will be procured at a cost of $177.9 million. New facility requirements will cost another $25.5 million.

None of the simulators have been procured yet. A request for $5.5 million is included in the fiscal year 1974 procurement bill. Funding for the remaining simulators will be over the next 4 years as follows:

FUNDING, BY FISCAL YEAR

[In milions of dollars]

	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	Total
Equipment	5.5	36.9	39.9	40.3	42.5	12.8	177.9
Facilities	3.0	4.5	6.0	6.0	6.0	.....	25.5
Total	8.5	41.4	45.9	46.3	48.5	12.8	203.2

The last item is for the construction of a 56,945 square foot base supply facility. Base supply now utilizes a building over 30 years old so deteriorated that it is considered a safety hazard with special precautions required during high winds.

SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Sheppard Air Force Base is located 3 miles north of Wichita Falls, Tex. The base is host to the German Air Force undergraduate pilot training; military assistance program undergraduate pilot training; Technical Training Center; and Health Care Science School. The requested program at this base is for $2,753,000 for the construction of a base maintenance training facility with a scope of 81,500 square feet. Training for certain of the trades must be conducted in inadequate substandard facilities. These facilities are too small, poorly configured, poorly lighted, widely separated, and lacking in environmental controls.

VANCE AIR FORCE BASE, OKLA.

The next installation, Vance Air Force Base, is located 3 miles south southwest of Enid, Okla. Base support of an Undergraduate Pilot Training School is its primary mission. One project for $371,000 is requested in this program.

The project, 18,625 square yards of new taxiway, provides direct access from the aircraft parking apron to the center runway. Existing conditions present a serious flight hazard since aircraft taxiing to or from the center runway must use an extension of the inside runway delaying traffic on both runways until the mobile controller can determine that safe spacing exists.

WEBB AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

The 10th installation, Webb Air Force Base, is situated 2 miles southwest of Big Springs, Tex. Webb's primary mission is support of an undergraduate pilot training school. Three projects totaling $3,154,000 are requested in support of the Webb mission.

Item 1 is for a 1,700 square feet base cold-storage facility. Presently the cold-storage function occupies a substandard structure, designed for less than a 10-year life, over 20 years old. Obsolete equipment excessively difficult to maintain, poor location, and deteriorated insulation qualities recommend replacement.

The second item, a 504 MN airman dormitory, will provide proper accommodations for single airmen residing on base. Airmen are now housed in substandard wood frame structures long past design life expectancy. These old structures have no wall and ceiling insulation, are inadequately lighted, are without environmental control, and furnish unsuitable living arrangements.

The last item is an airmen dining hall with a scope of 8,370 square feet. An old combustible frame structure, deteriorated beyond economical repair, currently in use, has an antiquated evaporative cooling system unable to cope with prevailing summer temperatures. Noise, deteriorated condition, and unattractive appearance offer decidely inferior dining accommodations.

WILLIAMS AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZ.

The last base to be considered in the Air Traning Command's program is Williams Air Force Base, located 13 miles southeast of Mesa, Ariz. The base supports an undergraduate pilot training school and combat crew training squadron under the military assistance program. The program requested at this base amounts to $797,000, involving two construction projects.

The first item provides an aircraft fuel systems maintenance facility. A fuel systems dock is required for effective inspection, maintenance, and repair of all components associated with the use and containment of fuels. Existing facilities cannot be economically modified to afford the required degree of safety.

The second item is to add to and alter the chapel center to replace two substandard buildings. The adequately sized, functionally arranged and environmentally regulated facilities are needed to provide a consolidated chapel center where group instruction can be provided military personnel.

AIR UNIVERSITY, ALA.

The Air University is located on Maxwell Air Force Base at Montgomery, Ala. Its mission is to prepare officers for command and staff duties of Air Force units. The assigned activities include Headquarters Air University, Air War College, Air Command and Staff College, Squadron Officers School, and a Tactical Airlift Group (Reserve).

This program contains a request for $5,462,000 for construction in support of the Air University mission.

MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALA

Maxwell Air Force Base, headquarters of the Air University, is located 4 miles west of Montgomery, Ala. Nearby Gunter Air Force Base is considered as part of the Maxwell complex for programing purposes.

The military construction program presented is for $5,462,000 consisting of two projects, as follows:

Item No. 1 is to add to and alter an NCO academic facility with a scope of 25,800 sq². NCO academic classes, which began January 1973, are housed in inadequate, improvised interim facilities. These temporary widely dispersed quarters make efficient management and effective control of academic operations very difficult.

Senator SYMINGTON. I note that this proposed facility is to be used by the new NCO school which was only established in January of this year. Don't you think it would be well to wait a while to see exactly what your needs are going to be?

General REILLY. Although the Senior NCO Academy is a new school, the basic educational concepts which have been applied so successfully by Air University to the officer professional military education schools have been used in developing its curriculum. We know what our educational objectives are, and as a result of the vast background of experience and expertise gained by the Air University over the past 25 years, we know how to achieve them. We also know what we need to get the job done.

In order to get the school into operation as soon as possible, temporary facilities were pressed into use. All buildings occupied by the NCO Academy are World War II vintage with the exception of the major academic facility which the current project proposes to add to. This building was formerly a service club built in 1965. Renovations were made using minor construction funds to reconfigure it for academic use. The remaining buildings have had only minor improvements to permit them to be used as counseling rooms, seminar rooms, a library, and school administrative offices.

The second item is for addition to and alteration of a composite medical facility with a scope of 85,000 sq². This regional hospital services three Air Force bases. Increased patient workload has rendered the existing facility incapable of meeting the community health care needs. With maximum utilization of the existing building, plus expansion into five substandard buildings, overcrowding and delayed medical service prevails.

Senator SYMINGTON. Isn't this a relatively new hospital here at Maxwell? How do you account for the increase in workload necessitating this alteration?

General REILLY. The Maxwell composite medical facility was completed in 1964. The hospital has a constructed capacity for approximately 140,000 outpatient visits per year, and our present outpatient workload has increased to over 227,000 visits (fiscal year 1972) which, in turn, has generated increased utilization of our ancillary services such as X-ray, pharmacy, and laboratory. The patient treatment philosophy with emphasis on outpatient care is consistent with the standard of practice in the civilian medical community. This early identification and treatment of diseases on an outpatient basis has been made possible by remarkable advances in pharmacology and in the diagnostic and treatment capabilities of medicine, by better public health measures, by developments in early ambulation following surgery, and by public awareness and education. These measures have increased outpatient visits as is evident at the USAF Regional Hospital, Maxwell. The workload statistics collected by the Air Force continue to demonstrate this shift in the health care delivery system.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The Alaskan Air Command provides combat ready forces, defense weapons system, aircraft control and warning elements, and air defense forces within Alaska for employment under the operational control of Command, Alaska Norad/Conad region. It also provides logistical support for the Strategic Air Command, the Military Airlift Command, the Command of the Alaskan Sea Frontier, and the U.S. Army. This program provides $8,658,000 at five locations.

EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA

The first Alaskan Air Command base is Eielson Air Force Base located 26 miles southeast of Fairbanks, Alaska. This base supports a weather reconnaissance detachment of the Military Airlift Command, (rotational); two strategic reconnaissance squadrons (one is rotational); and an air refueling squadron (rotational) of the Strategic Air Command; a tactical air support squadron; and a tactical fighter

squadron (forward alert). Project requested in this program is for an aircraft flight operations and control costing $1,557,000. Improper location of the existing control tower contributes a safety hazard because of restricted visibility. Base flight operations must now function in an overcrowded, ill-configured structure making it difficult to achieve proper performance.

CAPE NEWENHAM AIR FORCE STATION, ALASKA

The second Alaskan Air Command installation is Cape Newenham Air Force Station located 460 miles west of Anchorage, Alaska. Cape Newenham's primary mission is aircraft control and warning. One project with a $5,403,000 total is requested by this program.

The requested construction is the first of two phases to provide a new composite support facility. Phase 1 is for 39,055 square feet. Existing facilities are deteriorated and substandard, having been utilized long beyond their design life expectancy. The severe environment multiplies the difficulties of operation from these widely dispersed facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice this is the first of a two-phase program to upgrade this entire station. Having in mind that you have discontinued some of these aircraft control and warning sites in various places, I wonder about the permanence of this one?

General REILLY. Cape Newenham Air Force Station—site F–5—is one of 13 aircraft control and warning sites in Alaska. The 794th aircraft control and warning squadron and detachment 9 of the 1931st Communications Group are currently located there. They are programed by the USAF to remain there indefinitely.

INDIAN MOUNTAIN AIR FORCE STATION, ALASKA

The third location is Indian Mountain Air Force Station located 195 miles northwest of Fairbanks, Alaska. The primary mission of this station is aircraft control and warning. The total program requested amounts to $397,000 and consists of one project.

This project provides a 10,000-barrel diesel fuel storage facility. Currently 40 percent of the fuel storage capability consists of eight rubber bladder fuel cells. Temporary rubber containers present a serious hazard potential. Previous leaks have caused contamination of the water supply well and loss of 45,000 gallons of diesel fuel.

SHEMYA AIR FORCE STATION, ALASKA

The fourth location under Alaskan Air Command is Shemya Air Force Station, located 1,500 miles west of Anchorage, Alaska, at the end of the Aleutian Chain. It supports a security squadron under the Air Force Security Service Command; a strategic reconnaissance detachment under Strategic Air Command; and a Surveillance Squadron under the Aerospace Defense Command. A total of $956,000 is requested for this station consisting of an alteration to the existing electric powerplant. The existing powerplant, consisting of nine generators, is the only power source for this remote island installation. Three of these generators are 15 years old and becoming obsolete, another three require modification to improve reliability and develop their rated capacity. As currently configured, the plant does not have

sufficient capacity and reliability to permit scheduled inspection and maintenance.

SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION, ALASKA

The last Alaskan Air Command installation is Sparrevohn Air Force Station located 195 miles west of Anchorage, Alaska. The primary mission of the station is aircraft control and warning. This program requests $345,000 in support construction for Sparrevohn.

Construction requested is for a 10,000 BL diesel fuel storage facility. Approximately 47 percent of the current storage capacity is temporary rubber bladder fuel cells. Storage in rubber containers constitutes a serious hazard and contamination potential.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

The mission of the Headquarters Command is to provide proficiency flying, training, and support of the U.S. Air Force personnel in the Washington area. Specifically, this command provides administrative and logistical support for units assigned directly to Headquarters U.S. Air Force, for those Air Force units stationed within the Washington area where inherent organizational structure does not permit other support, and such other missions as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

The construction program at bases where Headquarters Command is host amounts to $18,435,000. Of this amount $18,139,000 is for items to support the Headquarters Command mission and $296,000 is in support of the Military Airlift Command.

ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE

Andrews Air Force Base is located 11 miles southeast of Washington, D.C. This base supports the Headquarters of Air Force Systems Command; Airborne Command Control Squadron; Helicopter Squadron; Military Airlift Special Mission Wing under control of Military Airlift Command, Reserve Tactical Airlift Wing; and Air National Guard Tactical Fighter Wing. The total program requested for Andrews Air Force Base amounts to $16,935,000 and consists of the following four items:

The first item is special aircraft support facilities to support the Advanced Airborne Command Post (AABNCP). Andrews AFB does not have adequate existing assets to properly accommodate the new aircraft to be used by the AABNCP mission. This phase I increment of special operational and maintenance support facilities will provide hangar, pavement and taxiways, operations and alert facility, fuel system, and support construction.

Senator SYMINGTON. I note this is the first increment of a facility to house and maintain advanced Airborne Command Post aircraft. What will the total project cost; how many of these planes will be at Andrews; and when do you expect the first one to be assigned there?

General REILLY. The total cost of the military construction at Andrews AFB to house and maintain the Advanced Airborne Command Post is projected to be $19.9 million. Three aircraft will normally be based at Andrews. The first aircraft will arrive at Andrews in 1974.

The second item is an addition/alteration to the air passenger terminal in support of the Military Airlift Command. This project will provide efficient areas for indoor baggage claim, U.S. customs control, immunization and quarantine, administrative space, and traffic control.

The third item is a new 75-bed aeromedical staging facility. This project provides transient bed accommodations for more than 1,000 patients per month who are being transferred by air between, to, and from medical facilities of the Armed Forces.

Senator SYMINGTON. Please explain just what this facility will consist of, what it will be used for, and why couldn't the regular hospital be used for this type of patient?

General REILLY. The Andrews aeromedical staging facility (ASF) will consist of facilities to accommodate 75 patients, and will include bedrooms, welfare and recreation areas, support functions, patient management and administration, and ambulance bus loading capabilities. An ASF is a unit capable of providing the medical support necessary for patients traveling in the DOD/AF aeromedical evacuation system. Andrews AFB is one of the routine overnight points in the aeromedical evacuation system.

An ASF is a unit operating aeromedical staging beds located on or in the vicinity of an enplaning or deplaning Air Force base. It provides reception, administration, processing, ground transportation, feeding and medical care for patients entering, en route in or leaving the aeromedical evacuation system. These units are normally located at an Air Force base having a USAF medical center which has a relatively frequent and regular requirement to provide such functions.

An ASF is a unit separately organized, but attached to a parent medical activity for administrative and logistical support. ASF's are internally organized into major sections. The first, flight administration and support, is further subdivided into subsections—materiel, training, food service, medical resource management, transportation and housekeeping. The second major section, patient control and care, is further subdivided into en route patient supportive activities. These consist of patient administration, patient movement control, patient care and treatment, and professional services.

The clinical supervision of patient staging actvities is the responsibility of the aerospace medical service of the parent medical unit. The physicians assigned to this service are responsible for arranging medical consultation for transient patients requiring specialized care and for medical coverage at all times. Each patient in the ASF is seen by a physician at least once per 24 hours and normally patient requiring a physician's services are not taken to the parent hospital unless their condition warrants such transfer.

An ASF is a unique function apart from the regular hospital operations for the following reasons:

1. An ASF facilitates the centralization of a sizable number of patients entering, transmitting overnight or leaving the aeromedical evacuation system.

2. An ASF precludes the unnecessary utilization of hospital beds of the parent medical unit whose operations are geared for providing acute and definitive care.

3. An ASF precludes the scattering of a sizable number of patients identified for aeromedical evacuation throughout the hospital.

4. An ASF provides for more efficient, orderly and responsive administrative and clinical processing and preparation of patients peculiar to aeromedical evacuation movement and flight medicine requirements.

5. An ASF facilitates a smoother, easier and efficient handling of patients to and from the aeromedical evacuation aircraft without disrupting the parent medical unit's normal operations.

6. An ASF is designed to provide easy access for bus-ambulances, and to facilitate efficient on-and-off loading of litter and ambulatory patients.

The last item is expansion and upgrading of base utility systems including electrical distribution and water supply. Current and future demands created by fiscal year 1974 and future military construction programs for utilities exceed the capacity of these systems as now configured.

BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The next base for consideration is Bolling Air Force Base, located within the Washington, D.C. area. The principal mission of the base includes the Headquarters Air Force Command; U.S. Air Force Band; and support for Air Force Headquarters. The program requested for this base amounts to $1,500,000 for the construction of one project.

The item is to expand the base utilities. Utility mains must be extended into the new community area being constructed in the undeveloped area of the base. Also new base road networks are required to provide proper access to military construction and family housing projects approved in the fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1972 military construction programs.

Senator SYMINGTON. I don't question the need to expand the utility system at this base if previously authorized construction is ever built. I understand that projects are being held in abeyance, including some family housing, due to the interference of the National Capital Planning Commission. Would you tell us the status of this situation, and I'd like to know how much additional money these projects will cost because of the cost escalation due to the lack of approval by the NCPC?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, your understanding is correct. Projects have been both delayed and held in abeyance, including family housing because of the actions, or lack of action on the part of the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC).

In the fiscal year 1972 and 1973 construction laws, the Congress appropriated $33.9 million to the Air Force and the Navy for construction at the Bolling/Anacostia. That includes 1,055 units of family housing, 800 for Air Force and 255 for Navy at a cost of $25.9 million. The balance of the funds appropriated, $8.0 million were for five Air Force projects.

We estimate that the potential additive costs to the $33.9 million combined fiscal year 1972–73 programs because of NCPC reviews and delays is about $2.6 million. Of this amount, $0.8 million is specifically

identified now and represents the complete redesign of some projects, additional design and additional site work to meet NCPC guidance. The balance, $1.8 million is the general nationwide construction cost index escalation which has occurred at the rate of three quarter percent per month during the period November 1, 1972, to the present. Had Bolling AFB not been under the jurisdiction of the NCPC, we estimate that the fiscal year 1972 family housing would have gone under contract in November 1972 and the fiscal year 1973 family housing in March 1973. Because of extensive design comments, the 1,055 units of family housing will not be ready to advertise for bids until the end of this year. The same situation is true for other projects at Bolling. Only one, a fiscal year 1972 utilities project has been awarded. Final NCPC approval of the other three fiscal year 1972 projects was not received until June 28, 1973. One is now advertised, the other two will be advertised shortly. The single fiscal year 1974 project is undergoing additioanl siting and design revision to meet NCPC comments, and consequently has not been approved by the NCPC.

At the June 28, 1973, meeting, the NCPC was to have acted on a comprehensive land use plan for the entire Bolling/Anacostia tract. However, they finally deferred any action on the area north of the main entrance to Bolling AFB. This constitutes about one half of the area covered by the master plan. Their decision to defer action is to be in effect until either the Congress acts on a bill (H.R. 8201) introduced by the delegate from District of Columbia to the Congress, or the adjournment of the 93d Congress, whichever comes first. Since the site plan for the 1,055 units of family housing straddles the NCPC dividing line, it means the NCPC will not act on our request for approval of the housing project (approximately $26 million) when submitted until one of the two conditions stated above occur. If the adjournment of Congress governs, then even greater potential costs are possible, or the whole project would require reauthorization/appropriation in a future program.

A parallel action, not to be confused with the NCPC delays, is a complaint filed by local citizen groups that questions the validity of certain actions by the Council on Environmental Quality, and decision of the NCPC on the Bolling/Anacostia tract that flow from the CEQ action. We expect this separate issue to be decided on its merits in the courts.

In summary, the NCPC jurisdiction over the military construction on the Bolling/Anacostia tract has caused both delay in the construction of needed facilities and has increased the cost of those facilities when they are finally constructed.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

The mission of the Military Airlift Command (MAC) is to maintain the military airlift system in the constant state of readiness necessary for performance of all airlift tasks and emergency operations assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. MAC supervises and operates the Air Weather Service, the Aerospace Audio Visual Service, the Air Rescue and Recovery Service, an aeromedical evacuation system, and military airlift wings. This program involves 14 projects at 6 locations where MAC is host and contains a request for $12,416,000 for support of the MAC mission.

An additional $296,000 is included for the Military Airlift Command in the Headquarters Command program. The total construction program to support the Military Airlift Command amounts to $12,712,000.

ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLA.

The first base for consideration under the Military Airlift Command is Altus Air Force Base, located 3 miles northeast of Altus, Okla. Its planned mission is for support of a military airlift wing, heavy air refueling squadron under Strategic Air Command, and a mobile communications group under control of the Air Force Communications Service Command. The program requested at this base amounts to $1,770,000 and involves the construction of four items.

The first item is the construction of a base flight operations facility which will allow orderly flight planning, provide adequate weather services, and permit effective control of all flight operations in an adequate sized facility. A 20-year-old substandard, temporary building will be replaced.

The second item is a new aircraft maintenance shop. Existing aircraft maintenance activities are housed in five separate structures, three of these are substandard and cannot adequately support this function. This facility will provide required ceiling heights and environmental, safety, and functionally configured work areas associated with large transport and refueler aircraft.

The third item is a new aircraft engine shop. The existing inadequate engine shop is structurally sound but too small. Sixty-six items of high value aerospace ground equipment are stored outside, exposed to the elements of weather. The new facility will provide sufficient space to process engines and related handling equipment, and to allow safe functional flow of work.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that you state that aircraft engine shop activities are being performed in a building which is structurally sound, but is too small. Can't the existing building be enlarged rather than building a new one?

General REILLY. The existing building cannot be enlarged without violating fire prevention criteria. The close proximity of buildings adjacent to the existing engine facility and firefighting equipment access considerations preclude expansion. In this particular case, the provision of a separate building within 150 feet of the existing facility will not significantly degrade efficient operations.

The last item is a new base library to support base educational and recreational programs assisting in creative use of leisure time. This facility will replace a small, functionally inadequate, substandard structure of temporary construction.

DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DEL.

The next installation is Dover Air Force Base, located 4 miles southeast of Dover, Del. This base supports a military airlift wing and a Reserve-associate military airlift group. The total program requested is for $3,387,000 and consists of the following two items:

The first item is a 26,200 square foot base facilities maintenance complex. The base facilities maintenance support functions are accom-

plished in 10 widely separated buildings, 4 of which are beyond economical repair. The new shops provide space required for overhaul, repair, fabrication, work control, and work force dispatching of trade skills associated with activities of the base engineer.

The last item is to construct airmen dormitories. Approximately 33 percent of the assigned airmen are housed in substandard wood-frame dormitories. These facilities will provide sufficient space, environmental comfort, and the degree of privacy necessary for the proper rest, relaxation, and individual well-being.

MCGUIRE AIR FORCE BASE, N.J.

The third base under Military Airlift Command for consideration is McGuire Air Force Base, located 12 miles south-southeast of Trenton, N.J. This base supports a military airlift wing; Air National Guard tactical fighter wing; a military airlift wing under Reserve-associate; and the headquarters of the 21st Air Force. The program requested at this base is for $1,860,000 for construction of the following four items:

The first item is a new aircraft navigation and landing facility. The existing tactical air navigation (TACAN) and omnidirectional range (VOR) are sited in separate locations too far apart to provide the element of common source required for efficient air operations. The new facility provides collocation and will improve air space operations.

The second item is an aircraft flight control facility. The existing facility is inadequate and located where visual monitoring of airfield traffic is difficult. The new facility, properly located, will provide sufficient height and equipment space to allow precise, effective, and safe control of all aircraft flights.

The third item is an aerospace ground equipment shop. The existing shops are located in four obsolete substandard and functionally inadequate nose docks located 1.5 miles from the area of use. The new facility will provide adequate space, properly heated and ventilated to insure equipment availability for mission support.

The last item is to air-condition base personnel office. This geographical location experiences high temperatures. It is standard practice to air-condition facilities in this area of the United States. The air-conditioned facility will permit the consolidated base personnel office to function effectively and efficiently.

NORTON AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

The next base is Norton Air Force Base, located 3 miles east of San Bernardino, Calif. This base supports a military airlift wing; a military airlift group (Reserve-assoicate); the aerospace audiovisual service; the Air Force auditor general group; and the Air Force inspection and safety center. This program contains one project totaling $1,283,000.

This item is to construct a new NCO open mess. The NCO open mess is now housed in a deteriorated substandard building. When completed, the new open mess will provide an essential place of recreation and relaxation, and a principal dining facility for NCO's.

SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILL.

The next to the last base to be considered is Scott Air Force Base, located 8 miles east southeast of Belleville, Ill. Its assigned mission is the support of an aeromedical airlift wing; aeromedical airlift group (Reserve-associate); Headquarters Military Airlift Command; headquarters of aerospace rescue and recovery service; and air weather service. The program contains a request for $3,092,000 involving two items:

The first item is the construction of a 100-bed aeromedical staging facility. The existing facility is a temporary prefabricated, modular, relocatable structure which will be returned to storage for contingency use. The new facility will provide bed accommodations for patients being transferred by air between medical facilities of the Armed Forces.

The last item is the construction of a new gymnasium to add to an inadequately sized facility which provides less than 50 percent of the requirement. When constructed the new gymnasium will accommodate comprehensive and balanced program for recreational sports, athletic training, and physical fitness.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will this facility replace the one you now have, or will you continue to use the old gymnasium?

General REILLY. The present gymnasium will be retained after the new facility is built. Under the current DOD criteria, Scott, with a military population of 4,608, is authorized two gymnasiums. The existing facility which was built in 1939 is a sound, permanent building, however, it is just too small to support the athletic and physical conditioning programs conducted on the base. The additional gym will permit more people to participate in intermural athletics and physical fitness activities, and will result in the improved morale and better physical condition of assigned personnel.

TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

The last installation in the Military Airlift Command program is Travis Air Force Base, located 6 miles east of Fairfield, Calif. The mission of this base is to support a numbered Air Force Headquarters, a military airlift wing, as well as an air refueling squadron under Strategic Air Command, and a military airlift wing (Reserve-associate). The request for this base is $1,024,000 involving the provision of one item.

The item is the construction of an aircraft hydrant refueling system. A major portion of the cargo aircraft parking apron does not have hydrant fueling capacity. The new system will be capable of servicing present-day large cargo aircraft to meet mission requirements.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES—ZONE OF INTERIOR

This mission of the Pacific Air Forces is to conduct, control, and coordinate offensive and defensive air operations in accordance with tasks assigned by the Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Command. As a major air command, it provides administrative and logistical support

for Air Force units in the Pacific Command geographical area of responsibility. The requested program for the Pacific Air Forces, Zone of Interior totals $7,331,000 and is for Hickam Air Force Base.

HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII

Hickam Air Force Base, 6 miles west of Honolulu, Hawaii, is headquarters for the Pacific Air Forces. Its mission is support of the Pacific Air Forces Headquarters, a military airlift support wing under military airlift command, airborne command control squadron, systems test group under the Air Force Systems Command, and an Air National Guard fighter squadron. The requested program for $7,331,000 involves the construction of two items.

The first item, the air freight terminal complex will provide a replacement for the existing facility which is poorly configured, too small, inefficient, and incapable of accommodating the standard materials handling systems. In addition, the current location is isolated from the airfield and sterilizes many acres of valuable land.

Senator SYMINGTON. Isn't the present air freight terminal at Hickam relatively new? I am wondering if this is something you really need at this time?

General REILLY. The existing air freight terminal was constructed in 1965 and the functional layout was predicated on the then prevalent scheme for manual processing of freight.

In the ensuing years, two factors have assumed major proportions: First, effective use of the runway system by military and civilian aircraft required the relocation of aircraft movement lanes and parking aprons to reduce ground travel to a minimum; the focal area is now in the vicinity of the air passenger terminal which was provided in the fiscal year 1971 MCP. The proposed air freight terminal will be in this area and will concentrate air transport operations to a defined area on Hickam AFB. Together with this centralization of air transport activity, the new freight terminal will be configured to use mechanized equipment that is associated with the most advanced concepts for handling air freight.

The second factor is that this concentration of aircraft movement and parking will make possible the more orderly progression and development within the existing base boundary. This realinement will greatly improve usage of the existing land area.

Therefore, the new facility will be sited to provide these operational benefits. Further, additional benefits will be realized by using the existing structure to satisfy space requirements for after-duty education and recreational activities, which are currently inadequately housed. This action will preclude new construction for these programs which are basically aimed at providing wholesome outlets for our younger men.

The other item is for the construction of a new 73,500 square foot commissary which is required to replace the existing five substandard, 30-year old, separated building now being used.

Senator SYMINGTON. This is one of the three commissaries you have in the bill this year. The total project cost in this instance is $2,868,000. Just what does this include in the way of built-in or collateral equipment?

General REILLY. This project includes as built-in or collateral equipment; ventilating equipment, a meat rail; hot water heaters, a cardboard baler, built-in refrigerator, sinks and fire prevention and warning systems.

The project cost does not include operating equipment, such as, checkout stands, shelving, and refrigerated and non-refrigerated display cases. This type equipment is procured with surcharge funds paid by the commissary patrons.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) is to organize, train, equip, administer, prepare, and maintain a bomber and tanker force in a state of readiness capable of conducting intensive and conclusive worldwide aerial bombardment against enemies of the United States.

This program requests $25,738,000 for construction of facilities at 16 bases where the Strategic Air Command is the host command plus a "various" project for aircraft instrument landing facilities at 18 SAC bases and short range attack missile (SRAM) facilities at 2 bases. Of this amount $24,788,000 is for items to support the Strategic Air Command mission; the balance of $950,000 consists of $220,000 in support of AFSC and $730,000 in support of TAC. The presentations of other commands do not include requests in support of the Strategic Air Command.

BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LA.

The first Strategic Air Command base to be considered is Barksdale Air Force Base, located 3 miles east of Shreveport, La. The mission of this base is to support a strategic heavy bombardment wing, a special operations group (Reserve), a combat evaluation group, and the 2d Air Force Headquarters.

The program for this base contains a request for $1,743,000 for two projects. The first—a dental clinic of sufficient size and functional configuration to adequately serve assigned military personnel. The existing facility is poorly configured and contains less than half the space needed to provide an effective dental health care program.

The second project will provide air-conditioning for the existing base headquarters buildings. This base experiences high temperatures and humidity during most of the year causing uncomfortable, unhealthy, and sometimes unbearable working conditions.

BLYTHEVILLE AIR FORCE BASE, ARK.

The next base to be considered is Blytheville Air Force Base, located 4 miles northwest of Blytheville, Ark., and 65 miles north of Memphis, Tenn. The mission of this base is to support a strategic heavy bombardment wing.

The program requests $140,000 for one project. This project will provide a security police facility from which to control and manage the security force on this base. Security police are now crowded into two substandard temporary structures which have deteriorated be-

23-751 O - 73 - 19

yond economical repair and which contain less than half the required space needed to properly perform security activities.

DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZ.

The third SAC base to be considered is Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, located 4 miles southeast of Tucson, Ariz. The mission of Davis-Monthan is for support of a strategic missile wing (Titan II), a strategic reconnaissance wing, a tactical fighter wing, a military aircraft storage and disposition center under control of the Air Force logistics Command and a strategic missile division headquarters.

The program requested for this base consists of one item—a refueling vehicle maintenance facility at an estimated cost of $232,000. This facility is needed to replace a substandard temporary wood-frame storage and office structure which has deteriorated beyond economical repair. It will also provide shop space for servicing refueling vehicles. Currently all work is performed in the open.

DYESS AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Dyess Air Force Base is 2 miles southwest of Abilene, Tex. The mission of this base is to support a strategic heavy bombardment wing and a tactical airlift wing belonging to the Tactical Air Command.

The program for this base consists of one project—a paved runway for short takeoff and landing training operations for use by the Tactical Air Command. Currently the takeoff and landing training is being conducted on an unpaved earth strip which is unusable during rainy weather. This project, costing an estimated $730,000, will also provide a connecting taxiway, overruns, and a permanent lighting system for nighttime operations.

ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE, S. DAK.

Ellsworth Air Force Base is 7 miles northeast of Rapid City, S. Dak. This installation is used to support a strategic heavy bombardment wing, a strategic missile wing (Minuteman), and an airborne command and control squadron. This program requested at this base is for $514,000 and consists of one item.

This project will provide a communications and electronics shop which will house all the functions now being performed in six substandard structures. Five of these buildings are unsatisfactory for maintenance of delicate electronic equipment due to lack of proper temperature, humidity, and dust control. It is important that the missile communications system have an effective electronic equipment maintenance program.

FRANCIS E. WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYO.

The next base to be considered is Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, located 1 mile west of Cheyenne, Wyo. The planned mission here is for a strategic missile wing (Minuteman).

The program requested is for $5,834,000 for the construction of a composite medical facility. This facility will have 40 beds, 15 dental treatment rooms, outpatient clinics, and support areas. Existing fa-

cilities consist of seven old buildings. The main hospital is an obsolete structure over 85 years old. These buildings are functionally inadequate, the rooms are crowded, utilities are unsatisfactory, and the sanitary, fire protection, and safety systems are well below existing standards.

GRISSOM AIR FORCE BASE, IND.

The next installation is Grissom Air Force Base, located 2 miles west of Bunker Hill, Ind., and 9 miles south of Peru, Ind. The planned use of this base is for a strategic air refueling wing, an airborne command and control squadron, and support for an Air Force Reserve special operations wing. The program requests $3,100,000 for altering and installing air-conditioning in 11 existing substandard airmen dormitories. Alterations are required in order to upgrade these structures so that they will provide sufficient space, environmental comfort, and the degree of privacy necessary for proper rest, relaxation, and individual well-being for bachelor airmen on this base.

KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE, MICH.

The next installation is Kincheloe AFB, located 3 miles north, northeast of Kinross, Mich. The planned use of this base is in support of a strategic heavy bombardment wing. The total program requested is for $2,430,000 and consists of the following three items:

The first item will provide additions and alterations to the base communications center required to house new digital subscriber-terminal equipment and associated cryptologic equipment to provide more rapid reliable access to the Defense Communications System.

The second item will provide a radar flight control center. To accomplish precise, effective, and safe control of all aircraft movement a permanent radar flight control center is required. The existing mobile facility is limited in range and coverage. It jeopardizes flying safety and detracts from mission effectiveness.

The third item will provide for the construction of three dormitories having a total capacity of 250 men. Approximately 45 percent of the assigned airmen are living in substandard buildings. Modern, properly furnished living quarters which will attract and retain competent and highly skilled professional airmen are essential for maintaining an effective all-volunteer Air Force.

MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONT.

The next base to be considered is Malmstrom Air Force Base, located 5 miles east of Great Falls, Mont. Its principal mission is to support a strategic missile wing (Minuteman) and an aerospace defense command defense system evaluation squadron.

One million five hundred seven thousand dollars is requested for construction of two items, as follows:

Item one will accomplish alteration of an existing missile maintenance facility. The activity is housed in a structurally sound building that lacks the supporting appurtenances to function effectively and safely. Alteration will upgrade the electrical system, add exhaust and fire protection systems, and upgrade the heating system.

The second item will provide a 160-man dormitory for single airmen. Assigned airmen are being housed in old, deteriorated facilities that lack adequate wall or ceiling insulation, have poor environmental control, and are not configured to provide suitable privacy and living conditions by today's standards.

M'CONNELL AIR FORCE BASE, KANS.

The 10th installation is McConnell Air Force Base, located 5 miles south, southeast of Wichita, Kans. McConnell supports a missile wing, and air refueling squadron, and a tactical fighter training group under the Air National Guard. One construction project for $1,042,000 is requested in support of the base mission.

The one item requested provides for construction of a combined corrosion control and fuel cell repair facility of 30,300 square feet. These activities are being accomplished on open ramps. Corrosion control in winter ranges from severely hampered to impossible. Isolated fuel cell repair activities, using mobile purge equipment results in delays, inefficiencies, and increased workloads.

OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, NEBR.

The 11th location to be considered is Offutt Air Force Base, located 8 miles south, southeast of Omaha, Nebr. The planned use of this base is in support of a strategic reconnaissance wing, airborne command and control squadron, headquarters for the Strategic Air Command, an aerospace reconnaissance technical wing, and a military airlift command weather wing. The program requested for this installation is for $617,000 and consists of one item. This project is for installation of 2,000 linear feet of runway approach lighting. Lighting will help alleviate the hazardous flying conditions while landing during periods of darkness and reduced visibility.

PEASE AIR FORCE BASE, N.H.

Pease Air Force Base is located 3 miles west northwest of Portsmouth, N.H. The base mission is support of a medium bombardment wing, an Air National Guard tactical airlift squadron, and an air rescue and recovery squadron under the Military Airlift Command. Support construction requested by this program is for two projects totaling $526,000.

Item one is for alteration of an existing hangar to provide an aircraft corrosion control facility. Currently the function is accomplished in an area without adequate ventilation and isolation; it does not have safe and efficient access platforms, office space, supplies, and tool storage is not contiguous, and utility support is substandard.

The last item provides alteration of the base electrical power substation. Currently the substation is obsolete, unreliable, overloaded, and a maintenance nightmare. Projected increases in power demand can only compound an already severe problem.

PLATTSBURGH AIR FORCE BASE, N.Y.

The 13th installation is Plattsburgh Air Force Base, located 2 miles southwest of Plattsburgh, N.Y. Plattsburgh supports a medium

bombardment wing. One project for $286,000 is requested in support of the base mission.

Requested construction provides alteration of a maintenance hangar to accommodate an aircraft corrosion control activity. Structure currently utilized is too low and too small resulting in a portion of large aircraft outside the building. Inclement weather renders effective work on exposed portions of the aircraft impossible.

Senator SYMINGTON. There are five of these projects in this year's program. Just what type of work is performed in these facilities?

General REILLY. These facilities will be used to control corrosion in assigned aircraft, missiles, and ground support equipment. Corrosion is one of the most serious and expensive problems the Air Force has in the maintenance of weapons systems. Major efforts to control corrosion are underway in systems design, material fabrication and protective coating applications. Nevertheless, a primary method of corrosion control is the daily care which is devoted to a weapon during its service life. That is, cleaning, detection of the onset, and early treatment which can be effectively performed only by base level maintenance. Treatment entails removal of corrosion by mechanical or chemical means and the application of protective coatings on an as needed basis.

Corrosion control action on a B–52 or KC–135 requires 2–3 days working on a two-shift schedule. In mild corrosive zones treatment is required every 120 days, in moderate zones every 90 days, and in severe zones every 60 days.

To properly treat corrosion, hot water, electrical power, compressed air and cleaning solvent tanks are required. Shelter is needed to prevent drying of detergents and chemicals prior to completion of their activity in hot weather and to permit washing and treatment in freezing weather. Ventilation is required to protect personnel and control drying. Collection, treatment and disposal devices for oils, alkalies, salts, hydroxides and other residues of the corrosion control process are needed to meet antipollution standards.

VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

The next base is Vandenberg Air Force Base, located about 8 miles northwest of Lompoc, Calif., and about 130 miles northwest of Los Angeles, Calif. The planned use of this installation includes support for a Strategic Aerospace Division headquarters, a Missile Combat Crew Training Squadron, a Strategic Missile Evaluation Squadron, and the Air Force Systems Command's Space and Missile Test Center. The program requested is for $220,000 and provides for the construction of one project for Air Force Systems Command. This project is for protective structures and stable platforms to permanently house cine-sextant optical trackers. Currently no structures exist to house this function.

WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MO.

The next installation considered is Whiteman Air Force Base located 25 miles west of Sedalia, Mo. This installation supports a strategic missile wing (Minuteman). This program requests $3,892,000 for two projects.

Item one is for a new communications and electronics shop with a scope of 10,560 SF. Inadequate facilities, poor environmental con-

trol, deterioration, separated locations, and crowding makes efficient, competent maintenance of the missile communications system difficult.

The second item is for alteration of 13 existing airmen dormitories to add air-conditioning and reconfigurations which will provide modern, well-appointed living quarters for 1,045 men. Existing substandard dormitories have inadequate latrine facilities, poor environmental controls, and poorly configured living areas.

WURTSMITH AIR FORCE BASE, MICH.

The last major installation to be considered under the Strategic Air Command's program is Wurtsmith Air Force Base, located 3 miles northwest of Oscoda, Mich. Its planned use is in support of a strategic heavy bombardment wing and a strategic air division headquarters. The program requested here amounts to $616,000 for two items.

Item 1 is for alteration of an existing hangar to provide an aircraft corrosion control facility. Presently the function is accomplished in a facility without safe, efficient access platforms and without proper ventilation and support utilities.

Item 2 provides for addition to and alteration of the existing chapel center. Present facilities can accommodate less than 25 percent of the education program needs. The small program, in being, must be accomplished on a split shift schedule with group activities and special programs strictly limited.

SAC VARIOUS

The SAC various program consists of two items totaling $2,309,000.

The first item, in the amount of $1,321,000, will provide aircraft instrument landing facilities on 18 selected SAC bases. Each of the 18 bases has an outdated instrument landing system which is frequently inoperative due to maintenance and logistical support problems associated with the obsolete equipment. This necessitates diverting aircraft to other bases at additional costs and inconvenience.

The second item in the amount of $988,000 will provide short range attack missile (SRAM) facilities on two B–52 bases in support of the newly developed SRAM. These facilities consisting of a missile assembly shop and igloos are required to provide adequate space in which to receive, inspect, assemble, check out, and store components and fully assembled missiles. This item completes the multiyear phased program for providing SRAM facilities on selected bomber bases.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The Tactical Air Command participates in tactical aid operations employing air operations and airpower independently, or in coordination with ground or naval forces, to gain and maintain air superiority; to prevent movement of enemy forces; to seek out and destroy these forces and their supporting installations; and to assist ground or naval forces in obtaining their immediate operational objectives.

The mission of this command is to organize, equip, train, administer, and operate the assigned or attached forces and participate in prompt and sustained tactical air operations. The commander, Tactical Air Command, is charged with two missions. He is a major air commander

under the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, and concurrently is a component commander under the commander in chief, U.S. Readiness Command (REDCOM).

The construction program at bases where the Tactical Air Command is host amounts to $17,703,000 for both operational and support type facilities. Of this amount, $16,411,000 is for items to support the Tactical Air Command mission, and $1,292,000 is in support of the Air Force Systems Command mission. An additional $1,585,000 for Tactical Air Command is included in the program of the Air Force Systems Command and the Strategic Air Command. The grand total construction program to support Tactical Air Command amounts to $17,996,000.

BERGSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

The first location to be considered in the Tactical Air Command program is Bergstrom Air Force Base, located 5 miles southeast of Austin, Tex. The 12th Air Force Headquarters is located on this base, along with a tactical reconnaissance wing and a tactical control group. The requested program for one item amounts to $2,273,000.

The item is a new commissary. The existing commissary is located in five inadequate buildings, three of which are substandard, deteriorated buildings. The new facility will provide 81,000 ft² for foodstuff sales, efficient storage, and low facility maintenance costs.

CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, N. MEX.

Cannon Air Force Base, the next installation to be considered, is located 7 miles west-southwest of Clovis, N. Mex. Its mission is to support an air division headquarters, a tactical fighter wing, and a tactical control squadron. The program at this base amounts to $162,000 for one item.

The item is "Aircraft maintenance area lighting." Since approximately 35 percent of the F–111 maintenance is performed at night, permanent lighting of optimum intensity and proper area coverage is required.

ENGLAND AIR FORCE BASE, LA.

England Air Force Base, located 5 miles west of Alexandria, La., supports a tactical fighter wing. The requested program for this base consists of one item amounting to $183,000.

The item provides additions to squadron flight operation facilities. Enlargement of two of the existing facilities is essential to consolidate each squadron's activities under one roof. These additions will provide adequate facilities for effective and efficient accomplishment of squadron flight operations.

HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, N. MEX.

The next location is Holloman Air Force Base, located 6 miles west-southwest of Alamogordo, N. Mex. The base supports a tactical fighter wing and a test group under the tenant jurisdiction of the Air Force Systems Command. The program at this base contains four items for $2,432,000. Two items for $1,292,000 are for the Air Force Systems Command's Test Group.

The first item is to construct two aircraft weapons arming disarming pads. All arming/disarming of aircraft weapons is currently being performed on active taxiways. This project will provide two hard-surfaced pads adjacent to the existing main taxiway at the south end of the primary runway.

Senator SYMINGTON. You have been operating out of this base for several years, and I wonder what change now brings on this requirement?

General REILLY. There has been no particular change in conditions within the last several years. This is a longstanding deficiency which has not been corrected due to funding constraints in past programs. The project will allow for safer arming/disarming operations and decrease delays due to aircraft blocking taxiway while being armed/disarmed.

The second items is for 3,000 linear feet of runway lighting. Currently approach lighting is not provided for the crosswind runway. This lighting will provide visual reference during periods of darkness and reduced flight visibility.

The third item is a new 14,400 square feet radar image test facility in support of Air Force System Command. An enclosed facility to store classified and unclassified test items and equipment used in measurement of radar cross sections is required in the testing area. Currently special equipment must be transported 20 miles across dirt roads into the testing area.

The last item also in support of the Air Force System Command is the construction of a 16,200 square feet weapons guidance test facility. The existing facility limits the scope of current testing due to inadequate configured space and environmental control. The new facility will provide for testing and evaluating weapons guidance systems and their components.

LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VA.

Langley Air Force Base, located 5 miles north of Hampton, Va., is headquarters for the Tactical Air Command. The base also supports a Tactical Airlift Wing; an Aerospace Defense Command Fighter Interceptor Squadron; and the Cinclant Airborne Command Post. The program includes two items amounting to $503,000 as follows:

The first item is a new radar flight control center. The existing area search radar has a limited range and coverage resulting in inadequate overall air traffic control. This project will provide a facility where precise, effective, and safe control of all aircraft can be exercised.

The last item is for interior alterations of the existing command administrative facility. The existing building is structurally sound but is not functionally configured. This project will provide functionally designed and adequate environmentally controlled administrative space.

Senator SYMINGTON. Apparently this request is to alter space now occupied by the base dental clinic, which will become available upon completion of a new dental clinic. When will the new dental clinic be completed?

General REILLY. The new dental clinic was authorized and appropriated in the fiscal year 1973 MCP. Construction of the facility began in April 1973 with completion scheduled in March 1974.

LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARK.

Little Rock Air Force Base located 12 miles northeast of Little Rock, Ark., supports a Tactical Airlift Wing, a Tactical Airlift Training Squadron, a Strategic Missile Wing (Titan II), and an Air National Guard Tactical Reconnaissance Squadron. The total program being requested is $1,165,000 for one project to construct aircraft maintenance docks. There are an insufficient number of existing adequate facilities available to support this function. The requested project provides the facilities to support quality, effective, and safe maintenance of medium-sized aircraft.

LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZ.

Luke Air Force Base, located 5 miles southwest of Sun City, Ariz., supports a Tactical Fighter Training Wing, German Air Force Combat Crew Training, Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron (Reserve), 26th Air Division Headquarters of the Aerospace Defense Command, and a SAGE direction center (Aerospace Defense Command). There is a requirement for $2,986,000 to construct the following four items:

The first item is an aircraft run-up facility. Existing runup facilities cannot accommodate a newly assigned aircraft. The new facility is required for aircraft engine runup to full power maintenance checkouts.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are asking several projects for this base this year, based upon a third type of aircraft program for this base. What type of aircraft will this be, and when will it actually be located on the base?

General REILLY. This facility is for F–15 aircraft which will be assigned here for crew training. The first F–15 aircraft for training is scheduled to arrive at Luke AFB during the third quarter of fiscal year 1975.

The second item is a new flight simulator training facility. Facility space is not available to accommodate the new simulators and associated supports.

The third item is an aircraft field training facility. No existing space is available to accommodate the field training activities for the new fighter aircraft. The facility will support onsite training of personnel in operation and maintenance of the new aircraft.

The last item is for officers quarters for student bachelor officers. Seven deteriorated combustible frame quarters will be replaced by quarters conducive to effective study, proper rest, and individual well being.

MAC DILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.

MacDill Air Force Base, located 1 mile southwest of Tampa, Fla., is the Joint Command Headquarters (U.S. Readiness Command) and supports a tactical fighter wing, a tactical control squadron, com-

bat support group, and a communications group. There is a requirement for $2,657,000 to construct the following four items:

The first item is for a new radar flight control center which is currently located in a mobile facility. This facility will support the accomplishment of precise, effective, and safe control of all aircraft movements and accommodate sensitive radar and communication equipment.

The second item is to construct an aircraft tactical air control facility. These functions are now housed in five scattered inadequate temporary buildings. The new facility is essential for continuous training, administrative support, and storing of associated equipment.

The third item is a range composite support facility to support the Avon Park Air Force bombing, gunnery, and electronic warfare range. The existing dormitory and dining hall are grossly inadequate.

The last item is a new gymnasium to replace an existing facility constructed in 1942. The project will accommodate comprehensive and balanced programs for recreational sports, athletic training, and physical fitness.

MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE, IDAHO

Mountain Home Air Force Base is located approximately 11 miles southwest of Mountain Home, Idaho, and 43 miles south southwest of Boise, Idaho. Its mission is to support a tactical fighter wing and a detachment of a Strategic Air Command heavy bombardment wing.

One project amounting to $253,000 will provide a precision measurement equipment facility. The precision measurement functions are house in a temporary frame building. The new facility will have environmental controls required for regulation of temperature, humidity, and dust.

NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEV.

Nellis Air Force Base, located 8 miles northeast of Las Vegas, Nev., supports the Tactical Fighter Weapons Center, a fighter weapons wing, and a tactical fighter wing. The program requested amounts to $2,588,000 for the following two projects:

The first item is an addition to aircraft operational apron and is required to accommodate an increase in assigned aircraft as well as mission-oriented transient aircraft.

The last item is to contruct a base personnel office. These administration functions are now housed in five separate, scattered, temporary frame buildings. This centrally located, adequately sized facility will provide a single point of service for all assigned personnel.

SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, S.C.

The last Tactical Air Command base to be considered is Shaw Air Force Base, located 8 miles west northwest of Sumter, S.C. This base supports a tactical reconnaissance wing, a tactical control group, and the 9th Air Force Headquarters. Three projects, totaling $2,501,000 are included in this program.

The first item is to construct a communications transmitter/receiver facility. The function is located in two substandard, temporary struc-

tures. The new facility will have the proper temperature, humidity, and dust control required for reliable equipment operation.

The second item is a new dental clinic. The existing facility is inadequate and professionally obsolete. The new facility will be of sufficient size and efficient functional configuration to serve the dental needs of assigned military personnel.

The last item is an officer open mess. The existing facility is a 30-year old building of temporary construction. The new facility will be suitable for the recreation, relaxation, and social activities of officers, their families, and guests.

U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLO.

The U.S. Air Force Academy is located 10 miles north of Colorado Springs, Colo. Its mission is to provide instruction and experience to each cadet so that he graduates with the knowledge and character essential to leadership and the motivation to become a career officer in the U.S. Air Force. A 4-year college level course of study in academics, physical education, and military leadership provides the cadet a basis for continued development throughout a lifetime of service to his country.

Requested in the Air Force Academy construction program are two projects totaling $645,000. The first item is for additions and alteration to the telephone exchange facility, at a scope of 10,159 SF. Existing telephone equipment is not capable of adequately supporting Academy telephone users. Lack of envirmonmental control causes equipment failure and difficult working conditions. The new space will also allow installation of additional equipment required for modernization.

The second project is an addition to two existing electric substations. Presently two transformers supply the cadet area. Neither transformer is capable of assuming the total load necessitating maintenance performance at night or weekends. Load forecasts indicate overload of the system by 1975.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT—ZONE OF INTERIOR

The pollution abatement program amounts to $9,070,000 at various location in the Zone of Interior, of which $3,689,000 is for air pollution abatement with the remainder of $5,381,000 for water pollution abatement.

The air pollution abatement program, consisting of modification of a central heating plant and alteration of fuel storage facilities to control vapor emission, is required to comply with Federal, State, and local air pollution regulations at six Air Force installations in the United States.

The water pollution abatement program at 13 Air Force installations in the Zone of Interior includes provisions for water pollution abatement through the construction of collection and treatment facilities for industrial and sanitary wastes and upgrading of existing facilities. The program is required to comply with Federal, State, and local water pollution regulations.

AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONES (AICUZ)—ZONE OF INTERIOR

Protective zones must be established adjacent to selected air installations to prevent encroachment by residential and commercial developments into hazardous and high aircraft-noise areas.

This item involves acquisition of real estate interests in fee and restrictive easements to establish necessary protective air installation compatible use zones at the 13 following Air Force bases:

Base	Scope (acres)	Amount
Luke AFB, Ariz	8,400	$4,609,000
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho	1,160	300,000
Grissom AFB, Ind	7,390	2,900,000
Andrews AFB, Md	300	2,000,000
Wurtsmith AFB, Mich	7,600	4,000,000
Columbus AFB, Miss	7,400	1,900,000
Nellis AFB, Nev	5,410	4,800,000
Cannon AFB, N. Mex	11,200	1,500,000
Holloman AFB, N. Mex	2,345	200,000
Grand Forks AFB, N. Dak	5,900	600,000
Minot AFB, N. Dak	6,770	500,000
Ellsworth AFB, S. Dak	8,050	1,900,000
Laughlin AFB, Tex	6,680	700,000
Total	78,605	25,909,000

The total fiscal year 1974 authorization requested is $25,909,000, of which $2 million will be included in the appropriation request.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are asking almost $26 million to acquire land for the air installation compatible use zones, and we gave you $12 million for this purpose last year. I understand that you are not asking funding for this, and hope to obtain such property as is needed through exchange or through the zoning process. Of the $12 million in authority given you last year, how much have you actually used? Can't this figure be reduced substantially if you are given general authority to use last year's authorization for some of these projects proposed in this year's bill?

General REILLY. No portion of the authorization or appropriation for the fiscal year 1973 MCP air installation compatible use zone (AICUZ) program has been used to date. The primary thrust of the program is to obtain the necessary protection of our bases through zoning and land exchanges. An active zoning program is underway at the three bases in the fiscal year 1973 MCP; namely, Williams AFB, Ariz.; Altus AFB, Okla.; and Tinker AFB, Okla. Land exchange program for those areas not covered in zoning will be initiated. Appropriated funds will be used to complement the zoning and exchange actions in order to complete the protective zones around Air Force bases. For instance, some AICUZ easements may have to be acquired at the ends of the runways at Williams AFB, Ariz. Part of the $2 million fiscal year 1973 MCP appropriation will be used for this purpose. The proposed fiscal year 1974 MCP for 13 additional bases has a similar $2 million appropriation item with $25,900,000 authorization.

We could accept a lump sum reduction against the total authorization request, provided the individual base acreage scopes are not reduced. This type of reduction would not impair the effectiveness of the program, nor its execution.

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND (OVERSEAS)

The Aerospace Defense Command primary mission is to discharge Air Force responsibilities for the defense of the United States against an aerospace attack. Construction requested totals $1,355,000 for three projects at one location.

KEFLAVIK NAVAL STATION, ICELAND

Keflavik Naval Station, Iceland, has as its primary mission an air defense squadron and Air Forces defense of Iceland. The $1,355,000 request is for construction of three facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. I question the advisability of additional construction for Iceland at this time. What is our relationship with the Iceland Government? Don't we have to reach a new agreement with them pretty soon?

General REILLY. The base in Iceland is valuable to NATO, to the United States, and to Iceland. We should keep the projects in the fiscal year 1974 MILCON program; however, construction will not be initiated until we are assured that we will not be forced to leave Iceland. There is no established date for the completion of negotiations; however, we anticipate a successful resolution of the problem within the next few months.

The first item is an aircraft maintenance shop consisting of 2,500 square feet. Organizational maintenance activities are being accomplished in a badly deteriorated flight-line facility and three trailer vans. Proper maintenance is difficult and hazardous in the inadequately sized and unheated structures. Severe environmental conditions compound the inefficiencies and delays caused by inadequate facilities.

The second item provides a weapons and release systems shop of 5,520 square feet. Currently the activity is housed in a loaned Navy hangar. Leaking roof and walls, inadequate and undependable heating, and no water or toilet accommodations make this already condemned structure totally unsuitable.

The last project is for a parachute and dinghy shop with 4,642 square feet. This function is now housing in a condemned hangar that is beyond economic repair. There is no chute drying tower, inadequate environmental control, leaking roof and walls, rendering it impossible to properly maintain this vital life-saving equipment.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES (OVERSEAS)

The mission of the Pacific Air Forces is to conduct, control, and coordinate offensive and defensive air operations in accordance with tasks assigned by the Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Command. As a major air command, it provides administrative and logistical support for Air Force units in the Pacific Command geographical area of responsibility. The program to improve the combat readiness and capabilities to support advanced aerospace and defensive systems for the Pacific Air Forces Command outside the United States totals $11,788,000 comprising operational and support type facilities at five bases. The communications operations facility addition ($417,000) at Osan, included in this total, is a tenant item for the U.S. Air Forces security service.

CLARK AIR BASE, PHILIPPINES

Clark Air Base is located 55 miles north northwest of Manila, Philippines. This base supports the 13th Air Force Headquarters; a tactical fighter squadron; an aerospace rescue and recovery squadron under control of Military Airlift Command; and a facility checking squadron for Air Force communications service. The program for this base amounts to $4,427,000 for the construction of three items.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are proposing to spend $4½ million for new construction here at Clark Field. What is the status of our base agreement with the Philippine Government at this time?

General REILLY. U.S. rights to Clark AB are governed by the terms of the 1947 United States-Philippine Bases Agreement which, as currently amended, extends our base rights until 1991. Technical working groups met during 1971 to consider proposals for modifications in the United States-Philippine Bases Agreement. These talks were suspended during February 1972. The Philippine Government has now requested that these talks be reopened in the context of discussions concerning a broad range of bilateral issues including: military assistance, trade, investment, and other economic questions.

The fire station is required to replace a 25-year-old crash/rescue station that is too small, poorly configured, and has only 3 stalls when 11 are needed. Currently eight vehicles are parked outside without protection from sun, rain, and dust.

The air-conditioning of the airmen dormitories is required because of sustained high humidity, and temperature which make adequate rest and relaxation difficult to obtain, particularly for those on night shift.

The noncommissioned officers open mess is currently operating in 10 circa 1946 quonset huts which are of inadequate size, have a nonfunctional layout, and cannot adequately serve the patrons.

KUNSAN AIR BASE, KOREA

Kunsan Air Base is located on the southwest coast of Korea, on the Yellow Sea, approximately 9 miles southwest of the port city of Kunsan. This base supports a tactical fighter wing.

The program request for this base totals $1,838,000 for construction of 406 airmen dormitory spaces.

The project is required to relieve overcrowded conditions. Currently 60 to 80 airmen are forced to live in each dormitory that is adequate for only 48 men.

MISAWA AIR BASE, JAPAN

Misawa Air Base is located 350 miles northeast of Tokyo, Japan. The supports a security wing. This project request is for a 10,000 SF addition to the communications operations facility ($417,000).

This project is required to provide a secure environmentally controlled area, to accommodate new electronic equipment, to provide operations and maintenance space, and to eliminate congestion.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is the reason for this requirement at this time? I was of the impression that some functions had been moved out of this air base.

General Reilly. Until several years ago Misawa AB supported an operational F–4 wing as well as a large cryptologic complex. Although the F–4 wing was relocated to Korea in early 1971, the closure of other cryptologic sites in Japan resulted in the transfer of additional cryptologic responsibilities to Misawa in the same time frame. The installation is now performing functions which were assigned to the other locations, thereby exceeding the capacity of the existing communications/operations facility. Construction of the addition will eliminate the congestion and high noise level stemming from the increase in personnel, equipment, and mission workload.

OSAN AIR BASE, KOREA

Osan Air Base, located 35 miles south of Seoul, Korea. This base supports a tactical fighter squadron; a tactical air support squadron; a military airlift support squadron; and an air division. The program for this base amounts to $4,162,000 to provide 464 airmen dormitory spaces ($2,085,000) and alterations to an additional 1,104 existing airmen dormitory spaces to provide adequate enlisted personnel living facilities. Currently structurally sound facilities are overloaded to twice their capacity and do not have adequate toilet facilities.

Senator Symington. I certainly don't doubt the need for this project, but I am curious as to what you are doing for dormitory space at the present time in this rather isolated location? I notice your total requirements amount to 4,110 spaces, yet you only have 2,900 existing spaces. Where do these men now live?

General Reilly. The number of dormitory spaces available at Osan is based on the DOD adequacy standard of 90 square feet per man. In order to accommodate all assigned personnel we have been forced to crowd them into the existing space so that each man has only about 65 square feet of living space.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS—KOREA

Project is for construction of ammunition storage facilities at various locations in Korea at a cost of $944,000.

U.S. AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The mission of the U.S. Air Force in Europe is to conduct, control, and coordinate offensive and defensive air operations in accordance with tasks assigned by the Commander-in-Chief, United States European Command. It also fulfills responsibilities assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in areas not included in either the NATO or the U.S. Commanders-in-Chief, European area of responsibility. This program contains a request for $15,925,000 for facilities in support of USAFE missions.

The requested program provides facilities at three bases in Germany, amounting to $5,646,000; two installations in the United Kingdom totaling $9,479,000; and the balance of $800,000 is needed to support requirements at Incirlik, Turkey.

BITBURG AIR BASE, GERMANY

Bitburg Air Base is located 2 miles southeast of Bitburg, Germany. The base supports a tactical fighter wing. The program request of $3,936,000 is to provide an 85,690 SF dependent school.

This school is required to relieve overcrowding in the existing substandard, makeshift facilities. All existing classrooms are crowded to capacity. In addition to a high school facility, the basements of eight family housing units have been converted to classrooms and two temporarily combustible frame structures have been modified for use. Present laboratories, counseling, and physical education facilities are barely marginal and do not adequately provide for current and future requirements.

Senator SYMINGTON. What type of building are you proposing for this school? Is it something that could be moved elsewhere if the troop strength for Germany should be reduced? My same question would apply to the dependent's school you are requesting for Sembach Air Base on page 275.

General REILLY. This school, as well as the Sembach and Upper Heyford schools, is being designed for European modular construction. This prefabricated building concept does provide a degree of relocatability and would permit us to move the facility elsewhere with minimum refurbishment.

RAMSTEIN AIR BASE, GERMANY

Ramstein Air Base is located 2 miles northeast of Landstuhl, Germany. The base supports the headquarters of the U.S. Air Force in Europe, a tactical fighter wing, a special operations squadron, and a military airlift support squadron. The program consists of a project at a cost of $465,000 to provide taxiway shoulder stabilization. Currently the taxiway does not have paved shoulders. Serious foreign object damage hazards occur because loose materials and debris from the unpaved shoulders are being blown onto the taxiways and into following aircraft. Grass cover adjacent to the taxiways cannot be effectively maintained due to engine blasts.

SEMBACH AIR BASE, GERMANY

Sembach Air Base is located 1 mile south-southeast of Sembach, Germany. The base is the headquarters for the 17th Air Force, U.S. Air Force in Europe, and a tactical control wing. The program request of $1,245,000 is to provide a 28,400-square-foot dependent school. The existing inadequate facility has no auditorium, lunch room, cafeteria, and no indoor or outdoor recreation facilities. Classrooms are separated in several different buildings, are poorly lighted, and have inadequate ventilation.

MILDENHALL ROYAL AIR FORCE, ENGLAND

Mildenhall Royal Air Force Base is located 10 miles northeast of Newmarket, England. The abse supports the 3d Air Force Headquarters, a tactical airlift wing, a rotational tactical airlift squadron, a rotational refueling squadron, a rotational strategic reconnaissance squadron, and a military airlift support squadron. The program request, $768,000, is to provide for alterations to seven existing airmen dormi-

tories to provide adequate living facilities. Currently one-fourth of the assigned airmen are in substandard but structurally sound dormitories. Existing open bay dormitories must be improved to provide adequate living conditions.

UPPER HEYFORD ROYAL AIR FORCE, ENGLAND

Upper Heyford Royal Air Force Base is located 14 miles north of Oxford, England. The base supports a tactical fighter wing. The program request contains $8,711,000 to provide a 3,600-square-foot aircraft refueling support facility, $166,000; a 97,000-square-foot composite medical facility, $5,525,000; a 60,000-square-foot dependent school, $2,190,000; and a 21,000-square-foot gymnasium, $830,000.

The requirements for these projects are as follows:

The aircraft refueling support is required to replace three 30-year-old, deteriorated facilities. Lack of this project will cause continued inefficient operations due to separation of activities and fire potential because of hazards that currently exist.

The composite medical facility is required to replace a circa 1924 bomb shelter and numerous functionally obsolete, interconnected buildings which cannot be improved to provide needed hospital services.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice you state this requirement is necessary to enable the hospital to carry out its new mission as one of the two U.S. hospitals in the United Kingdom. Do you not now have a hospital in London and why is this new one necessary

General REILLY. The Air Force hospital at South Ruislip, England, was reduced to a dispensary operation on June 30, 1972, and was later closed on October 31, 1972, with the reduction of USAF presence in the London area.

The USAF has principal responsibility for delivery of health care to all U.S. military assigned in the United Kingdom, and two hospitals are needed to support the total numbers and distribution of this population. A pattern of patient support has developed into two distinct areas, whereby the Upper Heyford hospital will serve 40 percent and the Lakenheath hospital will serve 60 percent of the total eligible patients in the United Kingdom.

The present Upper Heyford facility was originally built in 1925 as a cement bomb shelter. This structure was connected by narrow corridor additions to nearby brick buildings.

It gradually assumed its present octopus-like shape in the late 1940's. With this structure, and supported by medical administrative activities in nearby detached buildings, it now functions as a small, overcrowded Air Force 10-bed medical facility. This fiscal year 1974 MCP project proposes to enlarge the size of medical activities at RAF Upper Heyford to meet the needs of its base community and other geographically close U.S. installations previously served by the hospital at South Ruislip.

The existing high school is in a World War II POW compound consisting of 24 interconnected old barracks. Overcrowded, undersized classrooms, lack of adequate laboratory, shop, music and business education rooms make the existing facility inadequate.

The existing gymnasium is in half of a World War II hangar, remote from dormitories and the base school, in a congested industrial

23-751 O - 73 - 20

area, is drafty, difficult to heat, and inadequate to meet recreational requirements.

INCIRLIK AIR BASE, TURKEY

Incirlik Air Base is located 10 miles east of Adana in south-central Turkey. The base supports a tactical group and a rotational tactical fighter squadron. This program request amounts to $800,000 for construction of a 150-man airmen dormitory. The existing dormitory space can only accommodate two-thirds of the assigned airmen. The resultant overcrowding in existing facilities is detrimental to privacy, well-being, and good health.

SOUTHERN COMMAND

The Southern Command provides combat ready forces in support of U.S. policies in Latin America. In addition the command cooperates with, advises, assists, and trains Latin American Air Forces to promote and advance Western Hemisphere solidarity. This program requests $1,038,000 for construction at one location in support of the command mission.

HOWARD AIR FORCE BASE, C.Z.

Howard Air Force Base is located 4 miles southwest of Balboa, C.Z. Howard missions include support of a special operations group, and a weather reconnaissance squadron (rotational) under the Military Airlift Command. Construction requested is for two projects totaling $1,038,000.

Item 1 is for alteration of administrative facilities totaling 107,500 square feet. Present facilities are substandard and poorly configured for efficient operations.

The last item provides for air-conditioning of the chapel center. Environmental control currently consists of ceiling fans and screened windows. High humidity and temperatures experienced at this location results in severe personnel discomfort as well as accelerated deterioration of furnishings and equipment.

U.S. AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE, OVERSEAS

The mission of the U.S. Air Force Security Service is to provide communications security services. The construction program at bases where this command is host amounts to $221,000 for one project. An additional $417,000 is programed for Pacific Air Forces Command. The total construction program to support U.S. Air Force Security Service amounts to $638,000.

The item is an addition to Communications Operations Facility at Iraklion Air Station, Greece. The existing facility is inadequate with excessively high noise levels and provides only 80 percent of the required floor area. This project will adequately house the communications, operations, and maintenance activities of this vital security service function.

Senator SYMINGTON. If this project is approved, who will act as the construction agency? I understand that within the past year the

Greek Air Force, as the construction agency for the Greek military, was insisting on supervising certain Navy construction proposals for Crete. Are you familiar with this, and has the problem been cleared up.

General Reilly. The Mediterranean Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, is the Air Force's design and construction agent for Iraklion. The Mediterranean division deals directly with Greek contractors on all projects where NATO funding or prefinancing is not involved. While the U.S. Air Force does obtain administrative approval from the Government of Greece prior to beginning any new construction, this is routine with all NATO country projects.

The Hellenic Air Force Command (HAFC) acting as agent for the Government of Greece, has entered into an agreement with the Mediterranean division and the U.S. Navy, whereby HAFC will handle certain aspects of the Souda Bay Airfield, Crete (U.S. Navy), construction. In return for these services, the agreement, dated April 11, 1973, requires that the Navy pay a 3-percent (of the contract amount) maximum administrative fee to HAFC. A follow-on July 5, 1973, agreement, technical arrangements for the construction of facilities at Souda Bay, Crete, delineates the specific areas of responsibility assigned to HAFC, the Mediterranean division, and the U.S. Navy. This procedure is essentially the same as with construction of projects in any European country where NATO common funding is involved.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT—OVERSEAS

The overseas pollution abatement program amounts to $750,000 for two water pollution abatement projects.

The two projects are for sewage collection and disposal facilities at Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, for a cost of $400,000, and at Canton Auxiliary Airfield, Phoenix Islands, for a cost of $350,000.

WORLDWIDE COMMUNICATIONS

The command, control, and communications program of $330,000 is for technical control facilities expansion. These facilities provide space for installation of Air Force Communications Service equipment necessary to monitor and correct technical transmission problems associated with messages, data, and voice traffic during transmission. Centralized control of communication maintenance and signal traffic routing is needed to assure continued availability of adequate and reliable communication service and equipment.

RADAR SYSTEM

The radar support facilities program consists of one item for $1 million. This program will provide facilities to support a phased array radar system to detect sea-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM) in the event of an attack on the continental United States.

Senator Symington. Thank you. We appreciate your coming up here.

General Reilly. Thank you, sir. It is always a pleasure.

Senator Symington. The hearing is adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 12:25 p.m., the committee adjourned, subject to call.]

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1973

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a.m., in room S–126, the Capitol, Hon. Richard S. Schweiker presiding.

Present: Senators Schweiker and Bellmon.

NONDEPARTMENTAL WITNESSES

TRANSFER OF MARINE CORPS SUPPLY ACTIVITY IN PHILADELPHIA, PA.

STATEMENT OF ROYAL SIMS, NATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

ACCOMPANIED BY:

DENNIS GARRISON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

FORREST SELLERS, PRESIDENT, LOCAL 89, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

JUSTIFICATION FOR ADMINISTRATION BUILDING AT ALBANY, GA.

Senator SCHWEIKER. The Military Construction Appropriations subcommittee will please come to order.

I do apologize for coming in at this late time. Senator Bellmon and I are on the full committee of which this is a subcommittee. The full committee meeting is next door trying to report out another bill and they need a quorum as well as a couple of votes, so that is why we are late in starting.

The purpose of this hearing is to examine the justification for an appropriation of $5.2 million for an administrative building at Albany, Ga., to facilitate the transfer of the Marine Corps Supply Activity in Philadelphia to Albany. This appropriation is one of a number of issues in this year's Military Construction Appropriations bill, which is a sensitive issue affecting jobs. These, of course, are the current series of base closings.

Although every Government agency is responsible to the taxpayer to be efficient and economical with the use of his dollars—and we often criticize Federal agencies for being wasteful—in cases of major impact like Rhode Island or Philadelphia, we have got to make sure that all of the important costs and benefits are cranked into the cal-

culations. It may not be enough, for example, for the Department of Defense to show a saving, if HEW and the Department of Labor must pick up substantial costs resulting from a particular installation closing if employees are forced on welfare or require job retraining.

Second, to what extent should the Federal Government try to take into account human costs in such decisions? Unlike private industry, Government is not in the business of making a profit, and, therefore, should probably try to give some consideration to other goals, such as the raft of urban problems that could be worsened by a decision to close or move a major facility.

This is a complex question, and I think it is important that we get a clear picture of how these decisions are made and what factors are considered.

PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF PHILADELPHIA ACTIVITIES

The Department of Defense has proposed to consolidate the activities in Philadelphia by transferring them to Albany, Ga., at a proposed saving of $2.6 million annually. However, in order to do this, DOD plans to reduce its civilian manpower in Philadelphia by 184 positions and its military personnel by 50. This is in addition to a total reduction of 205 military and 2,894 civilian positions in the proposed transfer or abolition of other DOD facilities in Philadelphia. Regrettably, we will not have an opportunity to examine these reductions in this hearing. However, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, I will continue to examine these proposals very carefully.

IMPACT ON PHILADELPHIA AREA OF BASE CLOSINGS

The Philadelphia area impact from this round of base closings is approximately a loss of 8,000 jobs. Most of these are civilian jobs and most are being transferred to other areas. The immediate impact will be on those whose jobs are abolished and on those who cannot or choose not to transfer.

The indirect impact from those who are transferred is the loss of payroll. This, of course, impacts on the entire Philadelphia area economy, and if one estimates an average annual salary per position of $8,000 or $10,000, the annual payroll loss may come to $60 or $80 million.

Today we will conduct the first of two hearings on this proposal. Mr. Belinger is director of the Philadelphia Department of Commerce. Mr. Royal Sims and Mr. Forrest Sellers, representing the American Federation of Government Employees, are among the Philadelphia community who are most intimately familiar with the impact of these decisions, and have been working hardest to soften the blow. We will receive their statements outlining the problem, and in a subsequent hearing we will hear from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, who will address the following aspects of the problem with particular attention to the testimony we will receive today.

ASPECTS OF BASE CLOSINGS

1. An explanation of how this decision was made, what factors were considered, and which were judged to be most important.

2. The economic calculations that were made; detailed explanation of what is going to be built in Albany, Ga.; a breakdown of the estimated costs; a detailed explanation of the nearly $5 million in "construction avoidance" in Philadelphia which is claimed as a saving; an assessment of how firm the projected costs really are; and any other cost information which it is felt the committee may find useful on this matter.

3. What assistance, specific and in detail, has already been provided or will be provided, both to affected individuals and to areas economically impacted by such decisions?

4. Last, what recommendations, if any, can be made for either new legislation or new administrative capabilities which could ease the pain caused by the Federal Government lurching around the country like this with its installations and facilities.

JUSTIFICATION

Justification material for the project will be placed in the record at this point.

[The justification follows:]

Justification

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
3 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER

5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION	6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	9. STATE/COUNTRY
$ 5,204,000	P.L. -	610.10	7 28 96 M	ALBANY, GEORGIA

10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION	11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE
$ 5,204,000	-	P-900	ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION

a. PERMANENT	X
b. SEMI-PERMANENT	
c. TEMPORARY	

15. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY

a. NO. OF BLDGS 2 | b. NO. OF STORIES 2 | c. LENGTH IRREG | d. WIDTH IRREG

e. DESIGN CAPACITY - | f. GROSS AREA 172,700 SF

g. COOLING AIR COND CAP. 575 TN COST ($ 839,500)

16. TYPE OF WORK

a. NEW FACILITY	X
b. ADDITION	
c. ALTERATION	
d. CONVERSION	X
e. OTHER (Specify)	

17. REPLACEMENT

18. TYPE OF DESIGN

a. STANDARD DESIGN	X
b. SPECIAL DESIGN	

c. DRAWING NO. -

19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

Construct administration building

Convert existing administrative floor space for increased ADP requirements

Utility connections

SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES

20. PRIMARY FACILITY	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST ($000)
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING	SF	172,700	$ 27.80	$ 4,800
a.		( )		( )
CONVERT FLOORSPACE FOR ADP	SF	(4,300)	40.00	(172)
c.		( )		( )
d.		( )		( )
21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES				$ 232
a. UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(120)
b. PARKING AREA	SY	23,000	4.00	(92)
c. SITE IMPROVEMENT	LS	-	-	(20)
d.				( )
e.				( )
f.				( )
g.				( )
h.				( )
i.				( )
j.				( )
22. TOTAL PROJECT COST				$ 5,204

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT

23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M SQUARE FEET)

a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT	328,302	
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD	(124,644)	
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE	16,885	
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY	0	
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (c + d)	16,885	
	AUTHORIZED	FUNDED
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	0	
g. INCLUDED IN FY - PROGRAM	0	0
h. DEFICIENCY (a - e - f - g)	311,417	311,417

24. RELATED PROJECTS -

25. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT

MISSION AND PROJECT: This Supply Center serves as the Marine Corps East Coast Supply Center, conducts such schools as directed, operates the Central Repair Shop for overhaul and repair of operational and combat equipment, and operates the Marine Corps Unified Material Management System. This project will provide adequate space to house administrative functions.

REQUIREMENT: Provide an administrative facility to house the functions associated with the Marine Corps Unified Material Management System.

CURRENT SITUATION: The closure of Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, requires relocation of critical inventory control functions to the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany. Insufficient administrative space exists at Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany to meet the requirements of the Marine Corps Unified Material Management System.

IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany will not be able to carry out its newly assigned mission.

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1391 REPLACES (17-71)

PREPARED STATEMENT

Senator SCHWEIKER. At this point I would like to ask Senator Bellmon of Oklahoma if he has any opening comment.

Senator BELLMON. No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Then we will proceed to hear from Royal Sims, national vice president of the American Federation of Government Employees; and Forrest Sellers, president of local 89 of the American Federation of Government Employees.

Mr. SIMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Royal Sims, national vice president of the third district of the American Federation of Government Employees. I am accompanied this morning by Mr. Forrest Sellers, who is the president of the local 89 at the installation in question. To my right is the executive vice president, Mr. Dennis Garrison.

I ask permission to have my prepared statement placed in the record.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Without objection, your statement will be placed in the record at this point.

[The statement follows:]

I am Royal L. Sims, National Vice President, Third District, American Federation of Government Employees; I am accompanied this morning by Mr. Forrest Sellers, the President of American Federation of Government Employees Local 89, which directly speaks for the civilian Federal employees directly affected by the issue you are deliberating today.

We are most grateful to the Subcommittee for the opportunity to appear before you in opposition to the proposed transfer of the Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, to the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia. In presenting our opposition, we are speaking, in the first instance, on behalf of the civilian employees of the Philadelphia Marine Corps Supply Activity, whom we represent both through our American Federation of Government Employees Local 89 and through our AFGE Third National District. Additionally, we are speaking as taxpayers who are concerned about the expenditure of Federal tax revenues for a transfer which is both unwarranted and unjustifiable. Finally, we speak for those residents of Philadelphia and its suburbs, who will suffer serious economic and social consequences as a result of this unnecessary and imprudent action by the Marine Corps.

The principal argument proferred by the Marine Corps for this questionable undertaking is budgetary. Among the arguments which have been developed in support of this action, it is alleged that by 1978, that is, five years from now, the cumulative savings resulting from this action will overtake the additional costs of transferring this facility. In other words, the Marine Corps concedes that for the next five budgetary years, the U.S. government will have to spend more for these services by the transfer to Albany, Georgia, than maintaining the facility at Philadelphia.

What are the other risks of undertaking this transfer? In a letter to Mr. Forrest W. Sellers, July 19, 1973, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics) Jack L. Bowers conceded that there are serious risks to the national security involved. He stated:

> "It has always been recognized that in accomplishing this consolidation a risk of temporary degradation of supply support

> to the Fleet Marine Forces could be encountered. During the Southeast Asia conflict, this risk was unacceptable. Now, with the culmination of the conflict and the drastic realignment of operating forces, it is mandatory that the costs to maintain the Marine Corps support establishment be reduced."

I believe anyone reading the papers today must realize that the world situation is potentially just as explosive now as it has been in the past several years during the Southeast Asian conflict. Our nation is already concerned about the oil fuels shortage; we are already threatened with rationing of heating oils and gasoline. The conflict in the Middle East has already resulted in major naval forces realignments and alerts. It is an imprudent and irresponsible act, therefore, to experiment with transferring such an essential and efficient facility as the Marine Corps Supply Activity on the hypothesis that five years later there may be, perhaps, some savings in budgetary costs.

Assistant Secretary Bowers concedes further difficulties which have not been properly reflected in the planning estimates---costs of recruiting employees. He wrote as follows to Mr. Sellers:

> The Marine Corps realizes that it may not be an easy task to recruit and train people to replace those current employees who choose not to exercise their right to transfer with their functions to the consolidated activity at Albany. However, it is believed that this difficulty will be minimized by the long lead time allowed for recruiting and training; i.e., from the present to January 1976 and the availability of required skills through the Department of Defense Priority Placement Program. In this regard, the Marine Corps is currently developing a time-phased plan for the consolidation of the Marine Corps Supply Activity at Albany. Requirements for recruiting and training will be an integral part of this plan.

But Assistant Secretary Bowers makes no provision for such contingencies as the current conflict in the Middle East. The availability of civilian employees is much, much greater in such a large community as Philadelphia, a major international seaport and airport as well as a major industrial and commercial center, than in Albany, Georgia. But what would happen if the Marine Corps Supply Activity would have to expand rapidly, as it was required to do so during the height of the Southeast Asia conflict. In brief, we believe that Philadelphia can afford a much better employee environment both during periods of rapid expansion and during periods of de-employment than a small community such as Albany, Georgia.

The foregoing considerations apply to the basic problem, seen from the standpoint of the national interest. As taxpayers and citizens we are concerned with that issue. We are also concerned with the issue of the impact of this action on the human beings directly affected--residents and citizens of Philadelphia and its environs.

According to the Marine Corps, on December 4, 1972, there were 1,132 employees of the installation. It is claimed that, after transfer to Albany, Georgia, and consolidation, there will be a need for only 948 of these employees, with 184 positions being reduced. Let us take these figures at face value, even though there are many reasons to believe they are inaccurate and overstate the reductions in force that will take place solely because of the geographical transfer of the activity.

Taken at face value, 948 employees are confronted today with serious problems of livelihood, uprooting, and expenses incidental to transfer. To what end? Supposedly, because five years from now the transfer allegedly will begin to save the United States money.

Moreover, the greater part of these savings comes from the alleged reduction in personnel costs arising from the firing of 184 employees. These are hypothetical savings, reflecting only alleged presumptive payroll costs. They leave out of account the costs of recruiting of new personnel; their training; travel and per diem for training and orientation; problems arising if the facility suddenly has to expand to meet a national emergency; and the host of other contingent costs, both in dollars and in human welfare, following such a transfer.

The transfer of this facility can be defended only if one takes a short-sighted and narrow view of costs. Even then, it can be scarcely justified, except by taking the further risk of assuming that the Supply Activity will be faced only with a diminishing program, based on demobilizing the American military forces. It can be defended only if one takes a naive attitude that we have the end of all crises in the world and from now on the future is only one of coasting along.

Who is to pay the price for this attitude? First, the American people and taxpayer. Secondly, immediately and personally, the 184 employees who will be reduced in force and the 948 other employees who will be faced with problems just as great, perhaps greater, than those who were fired. These 948 employees must fact the fact of being uprooted, dislocated, removed from the community where they now live and integrated nto a community much smaller and less able to provide them with housing, schools, and other facilities available in Philadelphia.

In short, it is not 184 employees who are being reduced in force. There are 948 other employees who will have the order and rhythm of their homes and families disrupted, solely to carry out the alleged, unproven saving of money five years from today. The social costs are alienation, poor education, family disruption, reduced efficiency of the work force. In short, the costs are much greater to the United States than any potential savings, five years hence, which the Marine Corps can allege.

For these reasons, we earnestly ask your Committee to deny the Marine Corps the funds, which were generated out of the taxes of the American people, including the taxes of these employees, to carry ou this imprudent and unwise experiment in budgetary planning. The American people can use those $5.2 million to better advantage. Put them into schools; put them into social security benefits for the aged; put them into urban renewal; put them into cleaning up our air and water. Do not waste them on an unnecessary transfer of any activity which may not save any money in the future despite allegations of economy and will divert funds today from an efficient, proven facility.

Our nation must preserve its human, natural and fiscal resources. We cannot afford to squander any of these as we have done in the past. For this reason, we urge that the Marine Corps Supply Activity remain in Philadelphia, both in the national interest and in the interest of the community which has supplied its personnel for many years and which has built up a viable resource around it for our nation.

IMPACT OF TRANSFER ON HUMAN ELEMENT

Mr. SELLERS. Mr. Chairman, members of the Military Construction Subcommittee, distinguished guests, I am Forrest W. Sellers, president, Local 89, American Federation of Government Employees which represents the civilian employees of the Marine Corps Supply Activity under the provisions of E.O. 11491. On behalf of these employees I should like to submit to you testimony which analyzes the alleged savings the Marine Corps claims will arise from this transfer. As you will recognize from this analysis, these savings are illusory and are predicated on assumptions which are invalid.

Mr. Sims has already indicated to you some of the considerations, including national security, why this transfer should not be authorized. Besides challenging the costs figures, I shall concentrate my summary on the impact this transfer will have on human beings.

"COST AVOIDANCE" FIGURE

The $4.9 million "cost avoidance" figure includes the following: (1) $191,000 for a standby generator for Data Processing equipment; (2) $67,000 for a sprinkler system; (3) $4.66 million for air-conditioning various buildings.

It appears questionable that $4.9 million could be legitimately claimed as a cost avoidance when $4.6 million for air-conditioning has never been incorporated into the military construction budget. Only funds for a sprinkler system and a standby generator are incorporated into the budget. One wonders if the air-conditioning would ever have been assigned high enough priority to be incorporated in the military construction budget if the cost avoidance factor would not have been conducive to the proposed relocation.

CONDITION OF MCSA BUILDINGS

The Department of the Navy stated MCSA is old and in need of a modernization program. In 1965 MCSA said the Philadelphia building is structurally sound and sufficient. The aforementioned statement was made in a letter written by General Butcher, Commanding General of the MCA, and is contained in the Congressional Record in 1965.

Second, extensive modernization has been made to MCSA since that time. The modernization included but is not limited to: installation of new elevators, new lighting, tile flooring, new roofing, and new windows; painting and pointing of various buildings, relocation and renovation of bathrooms, and other modernizations.

Third, Inspectors of the North Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, and Headquarters, Marine Corps make periodic inspection of the buildings at MCSA. I am advised that the 1972 report of NFEC listed only two principal items: The installation of the standby generator for data processing equipment and installation of a sprinkler system. As stated in the above paragraph, the projected cost to install these two items is only $258,000.

OFFICE CLOSINGS DUE TO LACK OF AIR-CONDITIONING

It is noted that Marine Corps Headquarters used as a justification for not effecting the program request for air-conditioning the fact that there were higher Marine Corps priorities stemming from operational requirements and personnel facility requirements associated with Zero Draft/Project Volunteer. It should be noted, of course, that no attempt to justify the expenditure of more than $5.2 million for construction in Albany, Ga., the Department of the Navy uses this as cost avoidance.

The Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy has stated that activities are curtailed or completely closed down during the summer months because of the lack of air-conditioning in most areas. It should be noted that the times it has been necessary for employees to go home because of humidity/heat were relatively few, and at no time is the activity completely closed down due to lack of air-conditioning in the building. However, I am advised that the conditions in Albany, Ga., in the nontemperature-controlled warehouses and in the nonoffice space in the repair division make it necessary that the employees be allowed to go home at various times because the temperature/humidity reaches a high proportion.

It has also been stated by the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy that the efficiency of the employees drops during periods of high heat and humidity because of the lack of air-conditioning. It is noteworthy that MCSA was given an award for efficient operation by Headquarters Unit from the Secretary of the Navy for exceptional meritorious achievement. This in itself shows the efficiency of the employees has remained high.

COST FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW BUILDING, $5.2 MILLION

Based on our research the figure of $5.2 million to construct a building in Albany, Ga., is exceedingly low. If the building is constructed in 1974 or 1975, we project that figure could go as high as $8 million.

OPERATIONAL COSTS

In reference to overall costs of operations in Philadelphia there has already been a sizable drop in cost as a result of the reduction in workload because of the cessation of hostilities in the Southeast Asia area; 14 civilian billets and 6 military billets have already been eliminated at a cost of $10,500 each and this will amount to more than $210,000. An additional 20 military billets are scheduled to be eliminated during the next 2 years. We anticipate there will be additional billets in the Philadelphia employment as a result of new program changes that will be eliminated and this will increase this figure to over $500,000.

Headquarters Marine Corps are saying they will reduce 234 billets in order to save $2.6 million per year in Albany, Ga. We are saying here 20 of these billets they have planned to reduce have already been reduced in Philadelphia. This change will not be realized when they go to Albany, Ga.

IMPACT ON EMPLOYEES FROM RELOCATING ACTIVITY

Mr. Chairman, we would be remiss if we did not bring up the most important project in running this operation and that is the people. Here we have some 1,100 employees well-trained, well-equipped to meet all of the operational needs. Some have worked in this one building for more than 30 years. The tremendous impact which will occur on the lives of these people by relocating this activity unnecessarily to Albany, Ga., should not be expected by those who have contributed dedicated, unselfish service to the U.S. Government in carrying out its mission. Sufficient employees will not be able to be secured in Albany to carry on this function and even if they could secure employees, it will take a considerable number of months to train them to work efficiently.

HOUSING COSTS IN ALBANY MARKET

The average grade of the civilian employees at MCSA is 7.94 and as such they could not afford a three-bedroom house in Albany as such a house in the spring of 1973 was selling between $29,000 and $35,000. It is noted that 70 percent of MCSA employees are GS–9 and below and couldn't afford to purchase such a house. In fact, Mr. Chairman, there is insufficient low-income housing to meet the needs. Although the average earnings are $10,000, I would like to bring to your attention some statistics in terms of lower grade employees:

Grade	Number of people	Salary
GS–2	25	$5,432
GS–3	68	6,128
GS–4	97	6,882
GS–5	107	7,694
GS–6	38	8,572
GS–7	112	9,520
GS–8	3	10,528
GS–9	242	11,046

As you can see, more than 70 percent of our employees earn less than $11,000. In order to buy a $29,000 or $35,000 house, this figure is insufficient. These employees could not purchase a $29,000 to $35,000 house in Albany, Ga.

It appears as a result of conditions that will exist there so far as living, some 800 of the 1,118 employees on the rolls will not be able to transfer. Therefore, it will cost the U.S. Government multiple hundreds of thousands of dollars in severance pay. When we add to that early retirement, the cost will run in the millions. None of this shows up in the budget project submitted by the Marine Corps, even though these are real costs which the American taxpayer will have to bear.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I have with me today the executive vice president, Mr. Dennis Garrison. Mr. Weber was scheduled to be with us. Because of urgent business he could not come and Mr. Garrison has come in his place. I would like to have Mr. Garrison make a brief statement.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Go ahead, Mr. Garrison. We are glad to have you with us this morning.

SUPPORT FOR MAINTAINING PHILADELPHIA SITE

Mr. GARRISON. Thank you, Senator.

Speaking for our headquarters of the American Federation of Government Employees, we too are concerned about the welfare of the employees, about the hardship cases, and about the reduction in force. Certainly we are concerned about the effect on the community and as taxpayers on the economy and efficiency of the operation. I would say as a whole that we do agree with the statements that Mr. Sims has made and certainly we would like to see action from your committee to maintain the operation in Philadelphia.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, we deeply appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you. If I might leave one last statement, it is that the Federal employees who help our Government in administering its programs and carrying out its mission is indeed the most important product. It is high time that in our planning and in our consideration of relocating activities that this should play an important role in that final decision.

I believe that you will find in our overall presentation that the cost savings which the Department claims they will have will not come up to that at all. At the same time it will have a tremendous adverse effect upon the lives of thousands of people. I want to thank you on behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees for the opportunity to appear before you.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Let me say that I appreciate your appearance and testimony here. I would like to ask you and your associates a few questions. You can designate anyone to answer as you see fit.

COST OF NEW HOUSING TO TRANSFERRED EMPLOYEES

I think one of the factors that has been completely overlooked by the Government is the cost to the people involved. You both have touched on it in your statements. I think one of the aspects I would like to get into is that with the tremendous inflation in housing prices, a person who owns a house in the Philadelphia area, who then must relocate and obviously take out a new mortgage at an inflated price, is going to pay through the nose. The same kind of house he purchased in Philadelphia, even if it was in another part of Philadelphia instead of Georgia, will cost x percent more.

Immediately you are putting a tremendous burden on the individual person, whether he is renting or whether he owns his home, because his housing costs are going to appreciate tremendously. Nowhere in the arithmetic of the Government is this figure taken into account, I guess, on the assumption that the individual has to pay. By the same token, this is one of the spinoffs of moves like this that really play havoc with the people involved. I would think that just escalation of housing costs, whether a higher priced mortgage or higher rents, would be a serious blow to the economics of each family. This is aside from the fact, as you point out, that low-income housing is not available to any extent in Albany, Ga.

Would you like to comment on that?

Mr. SIMS. I would very much because what this is going do to our employees is push them into poverty. This country is trying to get

everybody out of poverty. They can't live in the houses that will probably be available at this extremely high cost. Whereas in Philadelphia, as you point out, every employee who works in the Marine Corps is now in a decent home, lives decently because many of them bought them 20 and 30 years ago when the costs were low. No one today, working for the Government, can hardly purchase a house at the high interest rate that is required.

One significant point, of course, is that if another activity wanted to move to Philadelphia, we have a program there now where we have houses for them, you pay $1 for the house, build it up and move in and stay 5 years and it is yours. There is no such plan as that in Albany, Ga.

I agree with your analysis very much that we could not possibly live there as we are living now. It would be impossible in Albany, Ga. They don't have them in the first place and the few they do have would be upward of $20,000, $25,000, $35,000.

AIR-CONDITIONING INSTALLATION COST SAVINGS

Senator SCHWEIKER. Mr. Sellers, you touched on the air-conditioning situation at the supply activity. You indicated that the Defense Department states it will cost more to air-condition the Philadelphia facility than the Georgia facility where, apparently, air-conditioning will not have to be installed. How long have you folks been asking for air-conditioning?

I know you folks have fought for air-conditioning for a number of years.

Mr. SELLERS. I understand the original request was made before I was born. The activity made a request approximately a decade ago, 1966. The original request for air-conditioning was made for more than 25 years. At no time has this been included in the military construction budget. The Marine Corps stated in one of their letters to me that over these years it was never given a high enough priority to go into the military construction budget.

Now we are proposed to be moved to Albany, Ga., it has attained a high enough priority to be included in the military construction budget so that it can be used as a cost avoidance to offset the cost of the move to Albany in my opinion.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Off and on for over 20 years, you and your people have made a point of air-conditioning, but no one thought enough about it to include it in any military authorization request to the Congress of the United States, is that right?

Mr. SELLERS. That is correct.

Senator SCHWEIKER. All of a sudden, like a miracle, we find that installing air-conditioning for you is the big reason for the move. I think that is rather ironic. I think the record should show that this is a rather tenuous point on which to justify a transfer. The air-conditioning situation, as you point out, is a substantial part of the cost difference in the military construction aspects. I don't know what Jimmy the Greek would say about the odds but if it has not been installed in the past 25 years, I think the odds of installing it in the next 25 years would be like the odds of installing it in the last 25 years.

Here is a real-life justification for the transfer.

PAST EMPLOYEE AWARDS

Mr. SIMS. It is significant, Senator, that during the period of no air-conditioning it did not affect the effectiveness of the operation. The people worked just as hard as those who had air-conditioning. They have gotten several commendations for meeting deadlines, targets, and that sort of thing.

Mr. SELLERS. We also received an official citation from the Secretary of the Navy because of this.

COST OF SEVERANCE PAY

Senator SCHWEIKER. You mentioned severance pay. Mr. Sellers, in your remarks. I wonder if you want to elaborate on the cost of severance pay.

Mr. SELLERS. The cost of severance pay could go up to 1 year's salary for each employee who is not eligible to retire in the event that it becomes necessary for him to retire in case he does not relocate to Albany, Ga., if this should come about. We hope this won't come about. Severance pay is based on the number of years of service of the employee and his age. Many of the employees could qualify for the maximum severance pay of 1 year's salary.

The average salary would be about $10,000. It would be at least $10,000 for a number of employees who could qualify for the maximum. For some people who would qualify it would be about $20,000 or even more, depending on the grade of the employee.

Senator SCHWEIKER. The reason I ask this is that I finally achieved some detailed breakdown of the cost estimates of how this saving occurs. Now I see in the letter I just received this week (which I have been looking for for several months), an allocation of severance pay in the DOD cost estimates of $708,000 for fiscal year 1976.

I just wondered if you could provide me with any information either now or later, as to how accurate a figure that might or might not be based on past experience. They are cranking that figure into this estimate. Up to now I had not seen that figure and had not had any word at all in terms of what they balanced it off against.

Mr. SIMS. I think they are cranking that out of their heads because they cannot give you an accurate figure because they don't know the number of people who are going to refuse to go. They could not possibly know that at this point. I think that cost figure is out of proportion because it could not possibly be accurate at all.

Mr. SELLERS. We have not even received the figure yet from the Department of the Navy.

Senator SCHWEIKER. I will be glad to give you a copy of this and have your further comments for the record on these figures. I would have given it sooner, but I think it just came in yesterday.

Mr. SIMS. We will be glad to comment.

LETTER FROM HON. JOHN W. WARNER, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Senator SCHWEIKER. I would like to enter into the record this letter from the Secretary of the Navy with these breakdowns.

[The letter follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20350

October 2, 1973

The Honorable Richard S. Schweiker
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Schweiker:

When I wrote to you on September 10, I indicated that additional information, including a summary of economic justification as pertains to the relocation of the Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, would be provided at a later date. This information has now been compiled and is forwarded herewith.

It is a pleasure to be of assistance, and I hope that the enclosed information and that provided in my previous letter will be satisfactory for your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

John W. Warner
Secretary of the Navy

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION CONCERNING THE RELOCATION OF THE MARINE CORPS SUPPLY ACTIVITY, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

Fiscal Year	Item	Costs (Millions)		Savings (Millions)		Note
		Military Construction	Other	Military Construction	Other	
1974	Military Construction for Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia	$5.2	$	$	$	1
1975	Military Construction for Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania			2.3		2
1976	Military Construction for Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia:			1.1		2
	Dual Staffing for Training		3.1			3
	Personnel Reduction				1.2	5
	Relocation of People and Equipment		2.6			4
1977	Military Construction for Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia:			.6		2
	Caretaker Status at Philadelphia		.1			6
	Personnel Reduction				2.6	5
1978	Military Construction for Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia:			.9		2
	Personnel Reduction				2.6	5
	Subtotals	$5.2	$5.8	$4.9	$6.4	
	TOTALS		$11.0		$11.3	

Enclosure (1)

NOTES

1. A building to house approximately 1,200 people will be required. Using the standard Department of Defense space and construction criteria, the cost for this was estimated at $4,800,000. Another $400,000 will be required for parking areas, utilities, and modification of the existing automated data processing facility. All other supporting facilities at the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, are adequate without modification. Cost estimates are detailed as follows:

Administration building: 172,000 square feet @ $27.90 per square foot	$4,800,000
Convert existing floor space for automated data processing functions: 4,300 square feet @ $40 per square foot	172,000
Parking for administrative building and electrical, heat, plumbing, and telephone hookups	232,000
Total Construction Cost for New Facility	$5,204,000

2. Improvements in the facilities at Philadelphia had been requested by that command and have been carried at Headquarters Marine Corps as a programed requirement. The current 4-year program is as follows:

Fiscal Year 1975. Alterations, emergency generator, first increment air-conditioning, and sprinkler system	$2,303,000
Fiscal Year 1976. Second increment air-conditioning	1,115,000
Fiscal Year 1977. Third increment air-conditioning	574,000
Fiscal Year 1978. Fourth increment air-conditioning	932,000
Total Programed Military Construction for Philadelphia Facility	$4,924,000

3. Projection of costs of training to replace skills of personnel not desiring to relocate are reflected in the following. This cost is essential to ensure continuity of operations and no serious degradation of support to the Fleet Marine Forces. (613 congressional report refers.)

Fiscal Year 1976

Dual staffing for training	$2,045,000
Temporary additional duty	1,025,000
Total Cost of Training	$3,070,000

"Dual staffing" means the hiring of new personnel for employment at the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, while the present civilian personnel who elect not to relocate from Philadelphia are still employed. The temporary additional duty costs will allow those new personnel hired to train in their jobs at Philadelphia.

4. Costs for the relocation of personnel and equipment are as follows. This display of costs reflects updated planning as of June 1973. It reflects a change from previous information, wherein these relocation costs previously were split between fiscal years 1975 and 1976. Also, estimates of costs associated with severance pay, automated data processing rental, and overtime during the physical move have been developed and included.

Fiscal Year 1976

Relocation of civilian personnel and costs for overtime required during the relocation phase	$1,180,000
Severance (reduction in force) pay for civilians choosing not to relocate	708,000
Maintenance of real property (Philadelphia)	180,000
Transportation costs incidental to relocation	24,000
4th Marine Corps District relocation	8,000
Automated data processing costs--includes equipment disconnects at Philadelphia and reconnects at Albany, 2-month equipment rental during relocation of Philadelphia equipment to Albany, and contract services to include keypunch services during relocation and consumable supplies	461,000
Total Cost for Relocation of Personnel and Equipment	$2,561,000

5. Real savings realized from personnel reductions through amalgamation of the Philadelphia functions with those of the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, will amount to $1.2 million the first year of the relocation and $2.6 million each year thereafter. Functions to be combined include procurement, comptrollership, management engineering, military personnel administration, civilian personnel offices, and automated data processing.

6. These costs are incidental to maintaining the Philadelphia facility in a caretaker status until it is accepted by the General Services Administration for disposal/use by other Government agencies.

RATIONALE FOR NORTH AND NORTHEAST BASE CLOSINGS

Senator SCHWEIKER. What do you think the reason is in terms of the rationale for the large number of base closings in the North and Northeast and subsequent construction in the South? Do you have any ideas as to why the Northeast bases are hit so hard while the other regions of the country seem to benefit so much?

Mr. SIMS. I could give you some reasons, but I don't——

Senator SCHWEIKER. You can give them off the record or on the record.

Mr. SIMS. Yes, I don't think they should be on the record if I did. Mr. Chairman, I have not been able to find the real logic behind the Defense Department hitting Pennsylvania so hard in cutbacks and closedowns and relocations. We just can't understand it.

In the early stages we were 18 percent higher than any other area in the country. Of course, the last change dealing with the closing of the Boston Navy Shipyard has had some effect on our 18 percent. We have not been able to figure out that we live in an area where we have been able to give good service, many of the items that are used at the Marine Corps are purchased right in Philadelphia; when we talk about having to ship them from Philadelphia to Albany, we can't see the rationale behind that.

POSSIBILITY OF ALBANY TO PHILADELPHIA ALTERNATIVE

Senator SCHWEIKER. What about the other way of handling this problem? What possibilities would there be of actually moving the Albany, Ga., operation into Philadelphia? How could the Philadelphia base handle it and have your people considered this aspect at all?

Mr. SIMS. We have considered that. I think it was something like 2 or 3 years ago we suggested that we would be able to provide the services of any other place in the country. Let me hasten to say that I don't want to go on record as saying move the group from Albany, Ga., to Philadelphia. I am simply saying leave the ones in Philadelphia in Philadelphia.

AIR-CONDITIONED INSTALLATIONS COMPLETED

Senator SCHWEIKER. How much air-conditioning has already been done, if any, in the areas that we are talking about?

Mr. SELLERS. In Philadelphia?

Senator SCHWEIKER. Has air-conditioning been temporarily or partially installed at the Marine Corps Supply Activity in Philadelphia?

Mr. SELLERS. Forty percent of the base in Philadelphia is air-conditioned. This includes all your high-priced employees, all your colonels, generals, GS–14's, GS–15's. Your higher priced employees are working in air-conditioned offices. The 2's and 3's are not.

Senator SCHWEIKER. So, you are estimating about 40 percent are covered?

Mr. SELLERS. That's right. The Marine Corps analysis which we have right here shows that.

ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO EMPLOYEES

Senator SCHWEIKER. Do you have any information about economic adjustment assistance that would be provided to the affected employees? In other words, have you gotten any economic adjustment assistance estimates yet as to what would be available to your people? I don't know that you have. I know there is a provision ultimately that it will be available. The point is that it probably is not far enough along.

Mr. SIMS. No one has provided it.

Mr. SELLERS. It would not be available to the employees individually. It would be available to the area. The employees affected would not receive the money directly.

Senator SCHWEIKER. It would not go to the employees, but to the affected area?

Mr. SELLERS. That's right.

Senator SCHWEIKER. This would not help your people at all?

Mr. SIMS. No, sir.

FUTURE CONSTRUCTION INCREASES DUE TO INFLATION

Senator SCHWEIKER. I want to make that point clear. The other is that you mentioned in your testimony an $8 million estimate for the construction of the proposed $5 million expenditure in Albany. I wonder if you want to elaborate or get more specific.

Mr. SIMS. We use that cost figure, Senator, because the estimate was made 2 years ago and the construction costs, the material costs have gone up exceedingly high. By 1975 or 1974 when this reconstruction money would be made available, we contend, based on some estimate that we have received, that this could go up as high as $8 million. I think a colossal example of cost escalation over the years is our Rayburn Building, how that kept going up and how they kept coming back for more. I think this is what you will find in the construction of buildings.

Senator SCHWEIKER. I think with the cost of construction and inflation problems today this is pretty much par for the course for any building. When were those estimates first made?

Mr. SELLERS. They were made a couple years ago. I understand they were updated last year. The Marine Corps claimed they were updated last year. As you also know, the original plans do not contain all the facilities they want. Somehow when they start building, near the end of the plans they discovered they have left certain things out they should actually have. These cost overruns will contribute greatly to this estimate of $8 million.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA FROM NAVY DEPARTMENT

Senator SCHWEIKER. I also would like to put in the record, to make this as complete as possible for the first phase of the hearings, the military construction project data from the Navy Department, so that we have this as a base for discussion. I understand that we will give you a copy of this today, along with the letter of the Secretary of the Navy with the cost justification breakdown and you will respond to that.

I will keep the record open for any pertinent information you want to supply, either to refute, contradict or supplement the information the Navy has given us, as well as anything else you feel is pertinent to this area.

Mr. SIMS. We thank you very much. I understand that our entire testimony will be made a part of the record.

Senator SCHWEIKER. That is right. Thank you very much for coming today. Certainly we appreciate it.

TRANSFER OF MARINE CORPS SUPPLY ACTIVITY IN PHILADELPHIA, PA.

STATEMENT OF HARRY BELINGER, CITY REPRESENTATIVE AND DIRECTOR, PHILADELPHIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

DISADVANTAGES IN FACILITY RELOCATION

The next witness is Harry Belinger, city representative and director of the Philadelphia Department of Commerce.

We welcome you today. We appreciate your coming.

Mr. BELINGER. I apologize for my voice. I have a strep throat. It is so important I wanted to be here. I would like also, if I may, to have you ask some of the questions you asked Mr. Sims. I will have more freedom in answering them. I will try to avoid repetition. I understand the purpose of this hearing is to answer a basic question.

Will there be a substantial savings to the Marine Corps if this facility is relocated in Albany, Ga? I will give you a one-word answer for that, no!

Another question implicit is will it hurt Philadelphia? Again to give you a one-word answer, it is "yes." There was some mention here earlier about the air-conditioning and savings there. It was also mentioned about the cost of this building, $5.25 million.

Mr. Sims mentioned 50 percent overrun on the cost of a building today, particularly when constructed by a Government agency, whether it be Federal, State or city, which is conservative. I don't know whether this figure for construction of that building 2 years hence is $1,976,000, but I am quite confident in saying they will not build that for $5.2 million.

The whole question of saving. I don't know if you are familiar with the facility on Broad Street. It is an old building, but it is in excellent condition.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Yes, I have been through it. In fact, 40 percent is already air-conditioned.

Mr. BELINGER. They use this figure about air-conditioning which they have been requesting for 25 years and been denied as a factor. They are talking about central air-conditioning. There is a cheaper way to do that. It does not have to be that if they wish to air-condition the building.

Senator SCHWEIKER. The 40 percent, is that centralized?

Mr. BELINGER. No, it is units.

Senator SCHWEIKER. So it would not be necessary to spend as much as has been allocated if they didn't get central air-conditioning?

Mr. BELINGER. It was just an estimate in 1968. I think the estimate was really framed more to substantiate the argument for a move to Albany than to actually air-condition the building in the most eco-

nomic and efficient way. In any event, they say the basic reason for moving is consolidation, economy, efficiency. Being part of government at least on the city level, I am all in favor of consolidation for economy and efficiency if it is real.

Now moving this facility to Georgia, they already have a facility down there and they have a considerable number of vacancies that they have difficulty filling. Economists will talk to you about the mobility of labor. The problem with the economists and the problem with the Military who make these decisions, they think they are dealing with checkers. But they are dealing with people.

The people sitting here, most of them have lived and worked in Philadelphia all their lives. It is not only a job. It is a part of the way of life. They just don't pick up their roots and move to Albany, Ga., or move to Lakehurst, N.J., or Monmouth, N.J., because the general decides this is more economical. It just does not work.

If you take a look at the history of the shipyard, moving shipyards around, opening up new ones, the shipyard worker is a man steeped in tradition. He does not pick up and move. The reason I mention this is because this is part of an overall argument we are having with the Federal Government about closing facilities. They are not interchangeable parts. We are talking about people who are interested in their neighborhoods or interested in their city or interested in their children growing up in the city they want to live in.

LACK OF SUFFICIENT FACILITIES IN ALBANY TO HANDLE LARGE INFLUX OF PEOPLE

There is another very important factor here that has not to my knowledge been mentioned and that is the city of Albany, Ga. In all due respect if you move from a city like Philadelphia to a city like Albany, Ga., there are certain definite losses. If I can quote from a report my office made on this question:

> In some respects an aspect which contributes to be most important is the lack of educational, cultural, residential, and health facilities in Albany, Ga., which would be needed to serve an influx of a thousand highly skilled technical employees. To be more specific, there are only two small hospitals in that area, inadequate for present needs. With regard to private schools, there are only two primary Catholic schools, no Catholic high school and no Hebrew school. The public schools are considered inadequate.
>
> Of the two colleges in Albany, Ga., one is a 2-year college and the other a 4-year college. Neither is accredited. The recreational facilities are less than limited. Residential housing for 1,000 families is for all practical purposes nonexistent. Construction will have to be started anew and to the best of our knowledge no such plan is nearing implementation since in any case it would have to be done by private means.

AREA OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Again we get to one of these very basic considerations. The people are given an opportunity to transfer. The opportunity is offered by people who know that they are not going to accept this. Now the mayor was down here a few months ago. At that meeting we were arguing with the generals and admirals and a whole host of military brass about the transfer of this unit, about the electronic command unit from Rittenhouse Square and from the Naval Air Engineering Center.

We mentioned to one of the generals a certain sense of social responsibility, if you will. They said, "That is not really our business." I am really here to ask whose business is it if it is not the Federal Government's? It cannot only be the State and the city. As I say, we are talking about people. Some of the people in this room, I am sure, have plans to send their children to college in Philadelphia. Their plans will go right out the window if they lose that job simply because they are not transferring to Albany, Ga., the alternative means or employment will probably be at lesser salary, not that their salaries were that great. They would not have the seniority. They would have their economic underpinning cut out.

Senator SCHWEIKER. The Philadelphia Community College is an accredited institution.

Mr. BELINGER. Plus the fact that Philadelphia has 33 colleges and universities in the area, more than any city in the entire world. To go to an area where they have only two, with all due respect to Albany, Ga., this kind of move would be a disservice to the people of Albany. Their facilities are already overtaxed. They can't supply the jobs that are there now.

What can they do with another 700 or 800? I say we are dealing with a giant shell game here. We can fully appreciate, certainly the mayor and the people in the city can fully appreciate, the need to cut down on Federal expenditures since the end of the Vietnam war. We can appreciate that.

Please be frank with us, don't tell us this is economy when obviously it is not. Don't tell me these people are being offered a job in Albany when they know they cannot accept it. Many of the people here—I just forget the phrase—some sort of economic help, what we are really talking about is unemployment compensation and eventually welfare. I don't think people who have given 25 to 30 years of their lives to an organization should end up facing welfare. I just cannot fathom that. If this were a private business and operating for purely private motives, I think we would be in a much better position to argue the economics of staying.

You asked Mr. Sims about the possibility of moving that facility here and he said that he is concerned with keeping the facility in Philadelphia. I too am concerned with keeping the facility in Philadelphia. If the Marine Corps thought they could consolidate and reach these desired economies in Philadelphia, I would be very happy to accommodate them in whatever way I could. That happens to be my area of concentration, industrial development in the city.

PHILADELPHIA AREA JOB STATUS

To get back to the basic question, would the city of Philadelphia? We have here, counting the military, 1,500 jobs and a payroll in the magnitude of $22 million a year. With the Naval Air Engineering Center at the navy yard, which is being transferred to Lakehurst, we have another 2,200 jobs and a payroll in the magnitude of $28 million a year.

For the U.S. Army Electrical Command, which is at Rittenhouse Square and being located in Monmouth, N.J., we have 2,500 employees and $35 million a year payroll. Now we are talking about 6,200 jobs, $85 million a year being pumped into the economy of Philadelphia. That is an economic bomb, if you will, being dropped on one city.

SOCIAL ADVANTAGES OF RETAINING FACILITY IN PHILADELPHIA

In all of this, particularly at this time where civil rights were fought for in the fifties and sixties and great personal sacrifices were made in a year of great turmoil, tremendous strides have been made in the matter of civil rights, what good are civil rights without jobs? A great many of the people here are minorities, primarily black, who cannot move to Albany, Ga., and who cannot move to Lakehurst, N.J., or Monmouth, N.J., simply because the housing is not there if they desired to go.

We cannot talk, on the one hand about increasing civil liberties and, on the other hand, taking away the economic base on which these liberties are enjoyed. There has to be some squaring things with reality here.

There has also been a question about this $5 million building, alleged $5 million building in Albany, Ga. Has the money been allocated for the construction of that yet?

Senator SCHWEIKER. This is what this appropriation hearing is all about. This subcommittee is in charge of appropriating money for military construction throughout the country. The document that I submitted for the record a moment ago is the request from the administration to appropriate that money. The money has not yet been appropriated.

Mr. BELINGER. I am sorry that the TV reporter who stopped me in the hallway did not get me after this hearing because he said to me, "You people, the mayor, yourself, come down from Philadelphia a number of times in the last 18 months trying to save these jobs. Do you really think there is any hope?"

My answer to him at this point was that somebody has to try. We just cannot quit. Six thousand two hundred people being thrown out of work. If this money has not been appropriated, there really is hope because they can't build the building if they don't have the money. I humbly suggest that we can save the Marine Corps money by keeping this unit in Philadelphia. If they want to talk about consolidation, I will be very happy to sit down with them and talk with them about that.

Please, Mayor Rizzo, the people of Philadelphia, the people in this room do not want you to appropriate that money.

STATUS OF FUNDING FOR NEW FACILITY

Senator SCHWEIKER. The status is that the appropriation bill has come over from the House with this item in it. It is now before this committee to decide whether or not that item will be included or deleted. The money has not been appropriated and will not be appropriated unless it is included and unless it passes and is signed into law by the President.

So, to answer your question specifically, no, the money has not been appropriated. Therefore, construction cannot begin. I think you make a very good point about the tremendous personal impact these transfers have which the Defense Department does not look at, unfortunately. The housing impact was touched on by the last three witnesses. It is not on anybody's cost estimates, but it is a tremendous hardship and loss to the homeowner, who has to pay higher rent or who has to take out a new mortgage and finance a new home at inflated dollars.

You have rightfully pointed out the educational deprivation. These people are going from a larger area with many facilities, to a smaller area not equipped to handle a big influx.

HIDDEN COST RESULTING FROM MOVE

I think these are factors which, unfortunately, the Defense Department does not consider. They look at the dollars and cents in the Department of Defense facilities. They don't figure the unemployment compensation, insurance, the welfare checks and other things that will come about if people don't want to pull up their home ties and deep roots and move. These, unfortunately are the hidden costs that aren't calculated. It is tragic that when we make a move of this kind the Defense Department does not put down an old balance sheet, including a bottom line, instead of just costs that affect their Department.

Is there anything else, Mr. Belinger, on behalf of Mayor Rizzo you would like to say? You have very well summed up the problem as you see it. You have been very helpful to the committee.

Mr. BELINGER. No, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify. The real missing factor is the hidden costs and the people who will pay those costs are represented in this room. Unfortunately they are not a party to these deliberations. In all fairness to the Defense Department they have to operate within their budget and maybe there is an allowance for hidden costs, but I humbly submit there should be. We cannot operate with complete ignorance, complete lack of concern for these costs because they are very real.

If you put a man out of work who is on the verge of sending his son to college, it is quite possible that son will not get to college. What does that do to the future generations, that son's earning power? You not only hurt the man, you hurt the son and his son's family. What we have here is a real economic change that I just cannot see justified.

The action today is in the city. As I mentioned earlier, I am very much involved in industrial development in the city. The tide is turning. They have more factories and facilities than they can supply in the cities, whether it is Philadelphia, Chicago, New York, or San Francisco. We have the labor supply. But we must have the facilities. It does not belong in a rural area that can't supply the labor.

AVAILABILITY OF PERSONNEL IN ALBANY JOB MARKET

Any type of personnel that this center will need is available in Philadelphia. They are not available in Albany, Ga. It would be impossible to recruit people in Albany, Ga., certainly hiring trained technical people. The mobility that the economists are talking about is great in the higher paid. In the lower areas it is not existent for most people.

We are talking about people. That is all I have to say. Please consider the people.

DEMONSTRATION OF SUPPORT AGAINST MOVE

Senator SCHWEIKER. I think the record should also show that our room has been emptied and filled twice with people waiting to come

into the hearing. In fairness to the people involved I should put in the record Royal Sims made it very clear that we could have filled an auditorium if we had one available for these hearings. That is how much the human being has been affected and feels strongly about this move.

As many people may know, the Senate auditorium has been taken over by the Watergate Committee, so we don't have an auditorium available any more. It is very hard to get any space. There is no doubt in my mind that we would have filled the Senate auditorium or caucus room if it had been available because of the hundreds of people who wanted to come to show their protest.

I think this is the best we could do in terms of space. In fairness to Mr. Sims, I wanted the record to show that there would have been many more people here if they had had a place to sit.

Thank you very much, Mr. Belinger. We certainly appreciate your coming down on behalf of Mayor Rizzo. I think you have mentioned some very salient points.

Mr. BELINGER. Thank you, sir.

Senator SCHWEIKER. We have another item on the agenda. The people who are here from the Marine supply activity are free to stay or leave as they see fit. We are going into another phase.

Construction of Access Roads to Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Miss.

STATEMENT OF JERRY O'KEEFE, MAYOR, CITY OF BILOXI, MISS.

INTRODUCTION OF ASSOCIATES

We will now hear from Mayor Jerry O'Keefe, city of Biloxi, Miss., who will make a statement on the need for access roads at Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Miss.

Mayor O'Keefe, you may read your statement and also introduce your associates in the room.

Mayor O'Keefe. I have on my left here Mr. Gerald Blessey, my administrative assistant, and Perry Ransom, our engineer. I would like to make the following statement.

IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESS ROADS

Keesler Air Force Base and the city of Biloxi, Miss., share a problem which can be solved only by the Department of Defense. The access roads to Keesler must be improved because they are woefully inadequate for Keesler traffic, are excessively dangerous to airmen and civilians alike, and are inadequate as evacuation routes in the event of a natural disaster, such as Hurricane Camille. This is the fourth time in 10 years that Keesler officials have recommended these improvements.

TRAFFIC CAPACITY

Keesler Air Force Base and its annexes are situated entirely within the city limits of Biloxi, which is a peninsula on the Mississippi Sound.

The average 24-hour traffic volume through Keesler's nine gates is 43,500 vehicles. Gate 7, which empties onto the Pass Road, hosts a volume of 12,000 vehicles each 24 hours. There are 40,000 automobiles registered on the base.

As you can see on the map of Biloxi and vicinity, a major portion of the land west of Keesler's main base is composed of Keesler annexes. Feeding into the Pass Road there are 582 military family housing units plus annex No. 1, which houses electronic equipment. It is estimated that 80–90 percent of the Rodenburg Avenue traffic is military-oriented.

EXPLANATION OF MAP

Senator Schweiker. Now will you explain the map?

Mayor O'Keefe. The blue is Keesler Field itself. The Annex No. 1 is the farthest to the west, the blue there. The access road we are speaking of is marked there in red. Gate 7 is at the east terminal of that red point right there.

Senator Schweiker. The other roads marked in red, too, are they the same?

23-751 O - 73 - 22

Mayor O'KEEFE. They are access roads on the east side of Keesler Field.

Senator SCHWEIKER. On the west side here, is that included in your presentation, too?

Mayor O'KEEFE. Yes, sir.

Senator SCHWEIKER. What is the yellow road?

Mayor O'KEEFE. The north-south is the I–110 which will connect Biloxi's peninsula to Interstate 10, which runs east and west across the United States from Jacksonville, Fla., to Los Angeles, and it is coming across these three counties in South Mississippi.

Senator SCHWEIKER. The green is what?

Mayor O'KEEFE. The green is the balance of the roads, the Pass Road and another access route that is going to be funded through other than local funds. In other words, we are going to four-lane that part shown in green through our own capacity.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Now just point out the city limits to me on the map.

Mayor O'KEEFE. The city limits go from the east end of the peninsula to the end of the map on the west.

Senator SCHWEIKER. So, the base makes up what percent of your land roughly in the city?

Mayor O'KEEFE. It is probably about 20 percent. We are located on a peninsula. After the Hurricane Camille, as the statement will show, there was no way out of here at all except coming out west, out of gate 7, down this way and to the north, to evacuate personnel and civilians as well out of that peninsula which was so damaged by the hurricane.

Now we are proposing that these access routes and roads be improved so as to move traffic out more safely and more readily than has been available previously.

Senator SCHWEIKER. You may proceed with your statement. I just wanted to understand the map.

TRAFFIC DANGER

Mayor O'KEEFE. Of all access roads only Division Street presently has four lanes. Accident data for these access roads disclosed that in 1972 there were 836 accidents, causing $327,000 in vehicular damage, 123 bodily injuries and 4 fatalities. In 1971 there were 860 accidents, $347,000 in vehicular damage, 155 injuries and 3 deaths.

EVACUATION DEFICIENCIES

In the event of a natural disaster, timely evacuation of Keesler personnel, dependents and equipment is difficult. In 1969, when Hurricane Camille struck, all access roads were closed except for Pass Road. The Biloxi Peninsula aggravates this problem because bridges are usually closed to traffic first, leaving only the western evacuation routes which are at such times saturated with the civilian population as well. See map of Biloxi and vicinity.

COST OF RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

Engineers for Keesler and the city of Biloxi estimate that the total cost of the recommended improvements, including right-of-way acquisition, would be as follows:

Part I. Pass Road, that is going west on the Pass Road	$2,022,400
Part II. Rodenburg Avenue and portion of White Avenue	377,410
Part III. Roads on east edge of Keesler, connecting Keesler to the I–110 interchange	1,000,000
Total	3,399,810

LOCAL AND STATE PARTICIPATION

These cost requirements are beyond the capabilities of the city of Biloxi for the foreseeable future. The city does offer to pay 10 percent of the total cost. Also, the city believes that right-of-way acquisition would be less costly if executed by the city. The city is willing and able to act as agent for design and administrative supervision of the contracts for the project. Administration by the city, rather than the State Highway Department, would achieve faster results, because the State highway department is over-burdened with a new State highway program.

CITY AND STATE EFFORTS TO RELIEVE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS

However, the city and State of Mississippi have made and are making sizeable efforts to relieve the traffic problems affecting Keesler Air Force Base as well as the civilian community:

A. The city of Biloxi has budgeted $642,301 of its current year's budget to widen Pass Road to four lanes for approximately 1 mile on the western end of Pass Road. That is this part in green. This represents over 75 percent of the total capital improvements of the city of this year. During the following fiscal year, the city plans to continue the widening of the western portion of Pass Road up to Jim Money Road, which is the western end of the access road for which we are asking assistance.

B. The State of Mississippi has contracted for immediate overlaying of U.S. Highway 90, which services many Keesler personnel, particularly through the White Avenue Main Gate. Now they are presently working on this Beach Drive.

C. The city of Biloxi pledges to complete the four-laning and straightening of White Avenue, which is the access link between Highway 90 and Keesler's Main Gate.

D. The State of Mississippi has designated part of its interstate highway allocation for I–110, which will link I–10 and U.S. Highway 90 through the city of Biloxi. The recommended improvements to the Division Street and Bay View access roads would greatly facilitate the use of I–110 by Keesler personnel, particularly those that live north of the Bay of Biloxi. Likewise, these access roads are the essential link for Keesler to use I–110 as another evacuation route.

E. The city of Biloxi has budgeted $100,000 during the current year as seed money for the Mississippi Coast Transportation Authority to provide a mass transit system which will service Kessler. However, the

reduction in vehicular traffic as a result of this mass transit system will be offset by anticipated increased population in the Biloxi vicinity, which increased in population 14 percent between 1970 and 1972.

CONCLUSION

Keesler Air Force Base and the city of Biloxi need $3,059,829 in Department of Defense funds to make essential improvements to access roads for Keesler Air Force Base.

We have our exhibits here to indicate where these roads would be improved. We thank you for the opportunity, Senator, to make our statement here this morning. We will be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

[The exhibits and maps were furnished and inserted in the subcommittee files.]

LOCAL CONTROL OF CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Senator SCHWEIKER. Mayor, can the city of Biloxi oversee the construction of these roads or will the Highway Department of the State of Mississippi have to supervise the construction?

Mayor O'KEEFE. We feel that we could better handle it on a local basis, Senator, because we have the engineering knowhow and we feel, No. 1, we could acquire the rights of way, if we do it on a local basis, much more economically than could be done through either the State highway department or the Department of Defense.

We feel that by handling it locally we can do it more expeditiously because the State highway department is really overburdened and behind now and they don't really have the staff. They are far understaffed and way behind in their scheduling in doing the job that they have already set out to do.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Very well, Mayor O'Keefe, we appreciate your testimony today. It is something we will take into consideration. Thank you very much for being here.

Mayor O'KEEFE. Thank you very much, Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Construction of Access Roads to Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Miss.

STATEMENT OF HARRY RIETMAN, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, U.S. AIR FORCE

ACCOMPANIED BY:

JOHN LEE, DIRECTORATE OF THE AIR FORCE BUDGET, U.S. AIR FORCE

ALAN DOWD, MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT, AND TERMINAL SERVICE (MTMTS), DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

INTRODUCTION OF ASSOCIATES

Senator Schweiker. We will now hear from Mr. Harry Rietman, Associate Director, Directorate of Civil Engineering, U.S. Air Force, who will explain the position of the Air Force on these access roads at Biloxi, Miss.

Mr. Rietman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Schweiker. Will you identify your associates?

Mr. Rietman. Mr. Chairman, I have with me on my right Mr. John Lee, Air Force Directorate of Budget. I have with me also Mr. Alan Dowd from the Department of the Army, Military Traffic Management and Terminal Services.

AIR FORCE SUPPORT OF PROJECT

Keesler Air Force Base and Biloxi have very close and friendly relationships. Our people have worked with them in the development of the project that the mayor described to you this morning. Consequently I can say without qualification that the Air Force fully supports the figures and the situation that the mayor has depicted.

We see a great need for this project. We are prepared if this money is provided by the Congress to expedite the allocation of those funds through the normal channels to the city for the execution of the work.

Senator Schweiker. Now did the Defense Department include these funds in their budget request to Congress?

Mr. Rietman. No, sir; they did not. The traffic study by the MTMTS was completed in June 1972. Based on that study and the necessary engineering development work they had to do after that was complete, there was not time to get this into our 1974 budget that came up to Congress the first part of this year. Therefore, we could not put it in, and the earliest budget that we could get it in would be 1975, which will come up next January.

Since the city has moved so rapidly in completing their design work and have started some initial phases of the route acquisition, we feel that consideration of this project at this time is very well warranted.

Senator SCHWEIKER. You are saying that the Department does favor it and was planning to request it in next year's budget?

Mr. RIETMAN. The Air Force was planning to request this in its next budget.

OMB REVIEW

Senator SCHWEIKER. Do you have a review of OMB on it?

Mr. RIETMAN. No, sir; we do not.

Senator SCHWEIKER. They are not the easiest thing to get through these days.

Mr. RIETMAN. It has not been presented to them, sir.

Senator SCHWEIKER. It still is not the easiest thing to get through, whether presented or not?

Mr. RIETMAN. That is correct.

Senator SCHWEIKER. How do we know that it will be spent if it is appropriated? That seems to be the name of the game around here. It is good to know the Office of the Secretary's position on it, I think that is important. I gather at this point you are not able to give us any assurance that if we do appropriate, that it will be spent and not impounded.

Mr. RIETMAN. No more so than our best efforts to get the money through and apportioned to the service and gotten to the city for construction.

Senator SCHWEIKER. We appreciate your coming here and stating your position. If there is nothing further we will need, before we close the record on it, we may well request it.

Mr. RIETMAN. Thank, you sir.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator SCHWEIKER. I just want to say that the Military Construction Subcommittee will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 12 noon, Tuesday, October 9, the subcommittee was recessed to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1973

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:08 a.m., in room S–126, the Capitol, Hon. Richard S. Schweiker presiding.

Present: Senators Mansfield, Schweiker, Bellmon and Young.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF THE MARINE CORPS SUPPLY ACTIVITY FROM PHILADELPHIA TO ALBANY, GA.

NONDEPARTMENTAL WITNESSES

SUBCOMMITTEE PROCEDURE

Senator SCHWEIKER. The subcommittee will be in order.

Today we begin the second round of hearings by the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee on the proposed transfer of the Marine Corps Supply Activity from Philadelphia to Albany, Ga.

On October 9, the subcommittee focused on the effect this move will have on the present employees of the Supply Activity in Philadelphia, receiving testimony from Harry Belinger, Director of the Philadelphia Department of Commerce, and Mr. Royal Sims and Mr. Forrest Sellers who represented the American Federation of Government Employees.

LIST OF WITNESSES TO APPEAR

In the hearings this morning we will receive testimony from my distinguished congressional colleagues from Georgia, Senator Talmadge, Senator Nunn, and Congressman Mathis who will provide information on this move from the perspective of their constituents from Albany, Ga. We will also hear from Mr. Arthur I. Mendolia, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics; Mr. Thomas P. Ruane, Director of Program Development, Office of Economic Adjustment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense; and Maj. Gen. Harry C. Olson, Deputy Chief of Staff for Installations and Logistics, Headquarters Marine Corps.

ASPECTS OF PROBLEM

As I stated on October 9, I am particularly interested in the following aspects of the problem, to which I hope the Defense Department witnesses will address themselves:

1. An explanation of how this decision was made, what factors were considered, and which were judged to be most important.

2. The economic calculations that were made—a detailed explanation of what is going to be built in Albany, Ga.; a breakdown of the estimated costs; a detailed explanation of the nearly $5 million in construction avoidance in Philadelphia which is claimed as a savings; an assessment of how firm the projected costs really are; and any other cost information which it is felt the committee may find useful on this matter.

3. What assistance, specific and in detail, has already been provided or will be provided, both to affected individuals and to areas economically impacted by such decisions?

4. Last, what recommendations, if any, can be made for either new legislation or new administrative capabilities which could ease the pain caused by the Federal Government lurching around the country like this with its installations and facilities.

STATEMENT OF HON. DAWSON MATHIS, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM GEORGIA

PREPARED STATEMENT

At this point I would like to call on the Congressman from Georgia, Congressman Mathis.

Will you please come forward.

Glad to have you with us here this morning. You may proceed.

Mr. MATHIS. Thank you, Senator.

I would like at this point in the interest of time, if it would be acceptable, to submit for the record my entire testimony.

Senator SCHWEIKER. It will be included without objection.

So ordered.

[The statement follows:]

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today, not only to defend the merits of the Defense Department's proposal to transfer the Marine Corps Supply facility from Philadelphia to Albany, but also to refute the charges made against the city of Albany by a witness from Philadelphia when he appeared before this Subcommittee on October 9.

As we all know, the decision to functionally relocate the Marine Corps Supply Activity in Philadelphia was prompted by the need to reduce support establishment requirements commensurate with reductions in force strength. The relocation of the supply activity will enable the Marine Corps to consolidate identical support-type functions which are currently being independently performed at Philadelphia and the Marine Corps Supply Center in Albany. Functional consolidation, to be effected in the fields of automatic data processing, comptrollership, civilian and military personnel administration, procurement and personnel services, will permit the reduction of 234 billets (184 civilians and 50 military). This reduction will result in annual savings in operating costs of $2.6 million.

The move to Albany, Georgia, will enable the Marine Corps to avoid major costs associated with maintaining the habitability of the seventy-year-old building complex at Philadelphia. This cost avoidance is explained below.

Actual maintenance costs in the five fiscal years ending in 1973 totaled almost $1.9 million. These actual costs, which represent 50 percent of the buildings' acquisition cost, represent only part of the continuing and immediate maintenance requirements. Additional requirements, which total $871 thousand, have not been funded by the Marine Corps pending the final approval of the new construction at Albany which will permit relocation of the supply activity.

Major military construction costs of $4.9 million will be avoided. These costs are required for the installation of safety and productivity-

related equipment for sprinkler systems, power generation and air conditioning.

The consolidation of functions at Albany will enhance the Marine Corps' capability to improve the morale in the all-volunteer services environment. Currently, the majority of the Marines stationed at Philadelphia subsist on the local economy. A significant feature of the planned move is the Marine Corps takeover of 630 Capehart houses from the Naval Air Station, Albany. Thus, all eligible enlisted and officer personnel will be afforded the much desired opportunity to occupy substantial benefits to lower graded Marines in terms of nearby recreation, exchange and commissary privileges. I might add also that the Capehart units are among the best, if not the best, facilities anywhere.

The functional consolidation of two major elements of the Marine Corps' distribution system will provide for greater efficiency and economy in accomplishing the Marine Corps supply mission. Over and above easily quantified personnel savings are as yet undefined savings in: costs associated with travel between the Philadelphia activity and Albany; the reduction data transmission (AUTODIN, AUTOVON) requirements; and, most important, the expense benefit realized by collocation of inventory management and storage and traffic functions.

$4.9 million "cost avoidance" figure: Is this an accurate projection? The Philadelphia witnesses stated that the cost of air conditioning the Philadelphia facility should not be included as a cost avoidance item since the Marine Corps has never approved the request for air conditioning. Let's place this conclusion into its proper perspective.

The major portion of this is for complete air conditioning of the Philadelphia building. The program has not been effected up to now because of higher Marine Corps priorities stemming from operational requirements and personnel facility requirements associated with the

all-volunteer services. The fact remains, however, that if the supply activity stays in its present location, this improvement and others must be made. The original buildings were built in 1907-1908 with additions to the complex in 1918, 1920, 1931, 1941, 1943 and 1945. The major portion of the complex was built as a clothing factory; a function which has not been performed within the Marine Corps since the early sixties. The complex of buildings cannot in its present state be considered an efficient facility for the functions of the supply activity. The expenses involved in a major modernization program in order to achieve optimum efficiency would be prohibitive.

While it is true that 40 percent of the office/conference room space is currently air conditioned, it is also true that 73 percent of all civilian employees work in spaces which are not air conditioned. This past summer over 3200 productive man hours were lost because employees were sent home during periods of high temperature and humidity.

The general condition of the facility, including the lack of air conditioning, has been of major concern to the Marine Corps during recent years for a number of reasons. For instance, during the next ten years, over 55 percent of the Philadelphia employees will be eligible for retirement. To replace them, the Marine Corps must be able to attract like numbers of young people with high potential. This places the Marine Corps in direct competition with industry and other governmental agencies--city, state and federal. In this day and age, the Marine Corps must be able to offer clean, comfortable facilities in order to compete for the new breed of individual coming into today's labor market.

In summary, while the air conditioning and other modernization efforts have in the past been preempted by higher priority projects, the current situation cannot be allowed to continue. If the activity is to remain in its current location, the Marine Corps must certainly request funds from the Congress to accomplish a major modification program.

These and many more facts concerning the actual relocation have already been, or will be, submitted for the Subcommittee's record, and I will not reiterate these points at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I can't blame the people in Philadelphia who resent this transfer, because Senator Nunn, Senator Talmadge and I strongly protested the closure of the Naval Air Station in Albany. Even though I protested the closure, I never resorted to making derogatory statements about the city of Key West, Florida, where most of the facility was being transferred. By the same token, I do not desire to get into a public argument with the city of Philadelphia over the merits of the two cities, but I would like to answer allegations made about my hometown by an earlier witness.

The Philadelphia witness stated that neither of the two colleges in Albany were accredited. I will simply answer this by stating that both colleges are fully accredited and are under the University of Georgia system. Also, within a hundred mile area of Albany, we have both Mercer University and Wesleyan College in Macon, Georgia Southwestern College at Americus, and Valdosta State College in Valdosta.

Contrary also to the testimony on the public schools, the Dougherty system is proving daily that it is more than capably fulfilling its role preparing its students and is extremely proud of the merit scholars attending the system. I would also say that the pupil-teacher ratio of 23-1 at the elementary level and 25-1 at the high school level exemplifies the efficiency of the system.

Another disparagement cast on Albany was the lack of adequate housing. I mentioned earlier in my testimony that the military housing would more than handle the Marine Corps population transferring to Albany. From the civilian standpoint, the Albany Planning Department has just completed a housing survey and there are approximately 400 single family units on the market at the present time. There are

approximately 525 units now vacant or in the final stages of construction. Permits for 1,109 apartment units have been issued in 1973 through September.

While Albany cannot boast of the liberty bell and Independence Hall, the area does abound in cultural and recreational facilities. The cultural features include the Albany Jr. Museum, Haley Art Gallery, Albany Little Theatre, Community Concert Association, Albany Symphony Orchestra, and many others.

For recreation, Albany, Georgia, is the center of numerous recreational activities. Within one hour's driving range are numerous lakes and resorts that offer swimming, boating, fishing, picnicing and family recreational activities.

The Municipal Recreation Department of the city of Albany offers a wide variety of activities for all ages. There are 11 lighted athletic fields for softball, baseball, and football. Over 65 adult softball teams enjoy softball, 28 sandlot baseball teams, 30 little league teams, as well as pony league and colt league teams. Over 40 teams participate in the midget football program. High school baseball and American Legion as well as adult baseball teams give a well rounded baseball program.

The City Parks offer over 200 acres of parks and playgrounds with picnic shelters and all types of playground equipment available. The largest and most modern zoo south of Atlanta is located in the city at Tift Park. Visitors from all over the Southeast throng this park to see the attractions of the zoo.

A million dollar YMCA with indoor pool, health club, physical rooms and gym offers a complete family type program with tremendous participation. The Boys Club with an olympic size pool, library, and complete gym facilities offers a complete program the year round. Eight lighted tennis courts, a municipal stadium seating over 11,000, 11 gymnasiums for basketball and indoor activities give Albany a well-rounded

indoor program. Five motion picture theatres, two drive-in theatres, 6 golf courses, 2 modern bowling alleys and 3 swimming pools are located in the Albany city limits.

The entire Albany area is a haven for the hunter and the fisherman. Quail, duck, turkey, dove, rabbit and deer are in abundance. Albany is the home of the Southern Field trials, and some of the finest dogs in the world are raised in Albany.

Albany is a very friendly city and likes to play and enjoy its leisure time, and the Albany Recreation program is slanted toward the entire family and offers recreational opportunities for all ages.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that Major General Roy Gulick, Major General Robert Fairburn, and Brigadier General Alvin Sanders are former commanding generals of the United States Marine Corps Supply Center who decided to retire in the city of Albany. I am sure these gentlemen would welcome an opportunity to express to the members of your Subcommittee their feelings about Albany and Dougherty County. In addition, there are thousands of retired enlisted and officer personnel who have chosen to reside in the Dougherty County area, and I am sure they share the feelings of the retired generals about the city of Albany.

Thank you.

OPPOSITION TO CLOSURE OF ALBANY NAVAL AIR STATION

Mr. MATHIS. The first four pages of my testimony deal primarily with the cost factors involved which I am sure this committee has heard from previous witnesses or from witnesses who are coming today. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to begin my testimony on page 5 of the statement which has been distributed to the members of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot blame the people in Philadelphia who resent this transfer because Senator Nunn, Senator Talmadge, and I strongly protested the closure of the Naval Air Station in Albany.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. We appreciate your protest.

Mr. MATHIS. Even though I protested the closure, I never resorted to making derogatory statements about the city of Key West, Fla., where most of the facility was being transferred. By the same token, I do not desire to get into a public argument with the city of Philadelphia over the merits of the two cities, but I would, if I might, like to answer allegations made about my hometown by an earlier witness before the subcommittee.

STATUS OF ALBANY AREA COLLEGES

The Philadelphia witness stated that neither of the two colleges in Albany were accredited. I will simply answer this by stating that both colleges are fully accredited and are under the University of Georgia system. Also, within a hundred mile area of Albany we have both Mercer University and Wesleyan College in Macon, Ga., Southwestern College at Americus and Valdosta State College in Valdosta, which are all accredited.

STATUS OF ALBANY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Contrary also to the testimony on the public schools, the Dougherty system is proving daily that it is more than capably fulfilling its role preparing its students and is extremely proud of the merit scholars attending the system. I would also say that the pupil-teacher ratio of 23–1 at the elementary level and 25–1 at the high school level exemplifies the efficiency of the system.

AVAILABILITY OF HOUSING

Another disparagement cast on Albany was the lack of adequate housing. I mentioned earlier in my testimony that the military housing would more than handle the Marine Corps population transferring to Albany. From the civilian standpoint, the Albany Planning Department has just completed a housing survey and there are approximately 400 single family units on the market at the present time. There are approximately 525 units now vacant or in the final stages of construction. Permits for 1,109 apartment units have been issued in 1973 through September.

CULTURAL AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Mr. Chairman, while Albany cannot boast of the Liberty Bell and Independence Hall, the area does abound in cultural and recreational

facilities. The cultural features include the Albany Jr. Museum, Haley Art Gallery, Albany Little Theater, Community Concert Association, Albany Symphony Orchestra, and many others.

For recreation, Albany, Ga., is the center of numerous recreational activities. Within 1 hour's driving range are numerous lakes and resorts that offer swimming, boating, fishing, picnicking, and family recreational activities.

The Municipal Recreation Department of the city of Albany offers a wide variety of activities for all ages. There are 11 lighted athletic fields for softball, baseball, and football. Over 65 adult softball, teams enjoy softball, 28 sandlot baseball teams, 30 little league teams, as well as pony league and colt league teams. Over 40 teams participate in the midget football program. High school baseball and American Legion as well as adult baseball teams give a well-rounded baseball program.

The city parks offer over 200 acres of parks and playgrounds with picnic shelters and all types of playground equipment available. The largest and most modern zoo south of Atlanta is located in the city at Tift Park. Visitors from all over the Southeast come to this park to see the attractions of the zoo.

A million dollar YMCA with indoor pool, health club, physical rooms and gym offers a complete family-type program with tremendous participation. The Boys Club with an olympic-size pool, library and complete gym facilities offers a complete program the year round. Eight lighted tennis courts, a municipal stadium seating over 11,000, 11 gymnasiums for basketball and indoor activities give Albany, I think, a well-rounded indoor program. Five motion picture theaters, two drive-in theaters, six golf courses, two modern bowling alleys, and three swimming pools are located in the Albany city limits.

The entire Albany area is a haven as well for the hunter and the fisherman. Quail, duck, turkey, dove, rabbit and deer are in abundance. Albany is the home of the southern field trials, and some of the finest dogs in the world are raised in Albany or nearby.

Albany is a very friendly city and likes to play and enjoy its leisure time, and the Albany recreation program is slanted toward the entire family and offers recreational opportunities for all ages.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that Maj. Gen. Roy Gulick, Maj. Gen. Robert Fairburn, and Brig. Gen. Alvin Sanders are former commanding generals of the U.S. Marine Corps Supply Center who decided to retire in the city of Albany. I am sure these gentlemen would welcome an opportunity to express to the members of your subcommittee their feelings about Albany and Dougherty County. In addition, there are thousands of retired enlisted and officer personnel who have chosen to reside in the Dougherty County area, and I feel sure they share the feelings of the retired generals about the city of Albany.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to present the testimony.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Let me say you are a very able defender of Albany.

Mr. MATHIS. Thank you, sir.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Senator Bellmon, do you have any questions?

Senator BELLMON. No, sir.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Senator Young?

Senator YOUNG. No questions.

Senator SCHWEIKER. All right.

Thank you very much, Congressman. We appreciate your attendance here today.

Mr. MATHIS. Thank you.

Department of Defense

STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR I. MENDOLIA, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS)

ACCOMPANIED BY:

MAJ. GEN. HARRY C. OLSON, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MARINE CORPS

THOMAS P. RUANE, DIRECTOR, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

INTRODUCTION OF ASSOCIATES

Senator Schweiker. At this time we will call as our next witness the Honorable Arthur I. Mendolia, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics).

Will you introduce your associates, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Mendolia. My associates are General Olson of the Marine Corps and Mr. Ruane of my Office of Economic Adjustment.

Senator Schweiker. Glad to see you.

FUNDING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING

Mr. Mendolia. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is my pleasure this morning to testify on behalf of the Marine Corps' requirement for military construction funds for the erection of an administrative building at the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Ga.

My statement will address the following points:

First, a decision of the factors which led to the decision to relocate the Marine Corps Supply Activity from Philadelphia to Albany, Ga.

Second, information relating to the costs and savings associated with the move to Albany.

Third, a discussion of the assistance which is and will be provided to individuals and the Philadelphia community.

Finally, I will comment on other concerns that have been expressed to this committee with respect to this move.

DECISION ON RELOCATION OF SUPPLY ACTIVITY

The decision to relocate the supply activity from Philadelphia was prompted by the need to retrench in line with overall adjustments throughout the Department of Defense; in essence to save money by reducing our overhead so that defense missions can continue to be performed within available resources. Factors that went into the decision included logistics readiness and continuity of operations.

These are primary concerns that cannot be sacrificed for the sake of economy. We are satisfied that neither readiness nor the ability of the Marine Corps to continue operations will be jeopardized. Yet the relocation will produce significant economies as I will discuss later.

We considered the ability of the Albany area to accommodate the increased numbers of people both civilian and military. The impact of the move on people was an important consideration.

There will be no disruption of mobilization support capability during the move. Normal operations will be continued. Upon completion of the move we are confident that the collocation of material management with storage and traffic functions at MCSC, Albany, will improve capabilities to meet mobilization requirements and increase efficiency of peacetime support operations.

I will cover the economic considerations in more detail as I address costs and the specific issue raised previously before this committee.

AVAILABILITY OF EFFECTIVE WORK FORCE

The continued availability of an effective work force is of primary importance in order to sustain operations during a move of this magnitude. This is a valid but wholly surmountable consideration. Realistically, as you and we are both aware, a large number of our current employees will choose not to relocate regardless of our best efforts to encourage them to do so. This is not uncommon. We are geared in the Department of Defense to hire and train individuals to perform a broad range of functions.

AREA HOUSING CONCERN

The ability of the Albany metropolitan area to accommodate all civilian families that may move into the area is not a problem. As you recall, on April 17, the closure of Naval Air Station, Albany was announced. This closure alone will place at least 1,000 housing units on the market, and we expect these to cover the broad spectrum of incomes. Our review of educational and other community services reveals that the relocation will place no stress on existing facilities in the Albany area.

One-time costs associated with the move to Albany total $11 million. Included in this total is $5.2 million for construction, which is a capital investment. The balance of $5.6 million is a one-time cost for relocating personnel and equipment for training new personnel.

COST OF IMPROVEMENTS IN EXISTING FACILITY

Offsetting this is a one-time cost avoidance of $4.9 million for improvements that would have been required at the Philadelphia facility had we stayed there. Added to this is a recurring annual savings of $2.6 million through personnel reductions. This means that the total cost of the move, which will commence in fiscal year 1975, will be completely amortized by the end of fiscal year 1978. I want to emphasize that the $2.6 million in savings is an annual recurring savings that continues indefinitely.

EFFECT ON EMPLOYEES OF FACILITY MOVE

The move to Albany will affect approximately 430 Marines and 1,100 civilian employees. Prior testimony before this committee focused on the impact of this move on our civilian employees. These people are faced with a decision. They can choose to transfer to Albany, in which case they will receive significant financial assistance including a Government-paid house-hunting visit, allowance for movement of their families and household goods, and reimbursement for certain expenses associated with purchase of housing.

Almost 25 percent of our current work force will be eligible for retirement with full benefits. We expect that many would choose to do so in any event. Another 25 percent of our employees will be eligible for retirement on reduced benefits. Some will choose this option.

For the remainder of our employees who choose not to relocate for one reason or another, we will do everything possible to help them obtain new employment, either elsewhere in Government service or with private enterprise. As a matter of interest, since the April 17 announcement, 41 employees have transferred to other Federal agencies in the Philadelphia area.

COMMITTEE ACTIONS IN ASSISTING DEFENSE-IMPACTED COMMUNITIES

I believe the committee is aware of the activities of the Defense Office of Economic Adjustment and the President's Inter-Agency Economic Adjustment Committee in assisting defense-impacted communities. For the record I would like to provide copies of the following:

A 1972 Economic Adjustment Committee Report to the President;

A 1973 Economic Adjustment Committee Report to the Congress; and

A brochure explaining the Economic Adjustment Committee's function.

[The above material has been inserted in the subcommittee files.]

RESULTS OF DEFENSE PROGRAM CHANGES

Mr. MENDOLIA. These documents indicate that 81,000 new private-sector jobs were created to replace the 79,000 defense jobs lost in communities affected by defense program changes between 1969 and 1972. Specific to this is the case of Middletown Air Material Area, which included the Marietta Storage Annex, Mr. Chairman, in the State of Pennsylvania.

These activities which were closed in 1968 employed 10,800 civilians. Through the efforts of the Defense Office of Economic Adjustment, local officials, private enterprise and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the facilities now employ approximately 5,200 persons with an additional 2,000 students. In addition, the Harrisburg Chamber of Commerce estimates it has attracted 7,000 to 8,000 new jobs to this area as a result of the new economic development capability created for the Harrisburg area. I regret that it is too early to know the results of current economic adjustment efforts to assist communities affected by

the April 17 announcement and discussed in our July report to the Congress.

ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

Earlier this year the President asked the Secretary of Defense to strengthen economic adjustment activities. He also directed each member of the Inter-Agency Economic Adjustment Committee to strengthen his agency's participation. The significant resulting actions are discussed in detail on pages 6, 7, and 8 of the 1973 report to the Congress which is furnished for the record. From this you will see that our efforts are continuous.

Experience has shown that prompt action is the single most important ingredient in a successful effort to minimize the impact of change on a community. The very first requirement is for community leaders to understand the need and accept the challenge to organize, plan and carry out a vigorous adjustment effort. Essentially, this is a task of persuasion and encouragement. Although we are usually successful in this effort, it is interesting to note that there are exceptions when local leaders feel Federal assistance is not required. In the case of Philadelphia, Mayor Rizzo has recently requested assistance for the city of Philadelphia under the President's Economic Adjustment program.

FEDERAL RESOURCES FOR INITIAL PLANNING EFFORTS

The second critical requirement is the need for Federal resources for initial planning efforts to assess local conditions and determine the course of action appropriate to the circumstances. In this regard, no two communities are identical. On pages 11 and 12 of the July report to the Congress, we noted the need to expedite the normally time-consuming process by which Federal funds can be made available for these vital planning efforts. While some timely funding action has been achieved, it would be misleading to suggest that further improvement is not needed.

To an extent, the situation has been complicated by changes that are being considered in the way Federal funds are provided in States. As I have noted, however, the need in the defense realinement situation is for prompt funding actions. This suggests the need for a readily available source of funds for these disaster situations.

Based on past experience, neither existing grant programs nor revenue-sharing programs are particularly suited for the prompt response that would be most helpful in community economic adjustment projects. Accordingly, we are trying to work out some proposal for Congress' consideration that would enable us to meet this early need while at the same time preserving our ability to make maximum use of those Federal resource programs which can and should be applied over the long term to strengthen the local economy and expand job opportunities in affected communities.

SPECIFIC POINTS IN RESPONSE TO CONCERNS EXPRESSED AT PREVIOUS HEARINGS

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the following points in specific response to the concerns expressed to this committee during prior hearings:

The $4.9 million cost avoidance is accurate. The major portion of this would have been for complete air conditioning of the Philadelphia buildings. We haven't done this in the past simply because we have had higher priority claims on available resources. The fact remains, however, that if the Marine Corps Supply Activity had stayed in Philadelphia, this improvement and others would have to have been made. The original buildings were built in 1907 with the last addition in 1945. This complex of buildings cannot in its present state be considered an efficient facility for the current functions of the supply activity. The expenditure of almost $5 million to accomplish required improvements to the aging Philadelphia complex simply could not be justified.

The cost of $5.2 million for construction at the new site is accurate. Construction costs are in 1974 dollars and computed in accordance with Department of Defense cost guidance. The estimate is a projection based on building cost experience and takes into account inflationary trends for the specific location. Additionally, our projected annual savings of $2.6 million in operational costs are accurate. The reduction of 234 spaces (50 military and 184 civilians) are specifically the result of the consolidation of support functions that could not be achieved without this consolidation of the two activities at a single location.

As I have mentioned earlier I have with me Maj. Gen. Harry C. Olson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Installations and Logistics, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, and Mr. Thomas P. Ruane, Director for Program Development in our Office of Economic Adjustment. Mr. Chairman, General Olson, Mr. Ruane, and I will be available to answer your questions and we would be pleased to provide such additional information as you request.

Thank you.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you.

I see our leader has come in.

Senator Mansfield, do you have any questions?

Senator MANSFIELD. No.

Stay where you are, Senator.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Senator Bellmon.

Senator BELLMON. Yes, just a few questions.

SAVINGS AS RESULT OF PERSONNEL REDUCTION

In your statement, Mr. Mendolia, you mentioned there is a $2.6 million in annual savings and you referred to the fact that that comes about partially because of the reduction in personnel.

Mr. MENDOLIA. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. Couldn't this be accomplished in Philadelphia?

Mr. MENDOLIA. No, sir. The reduction comes about by the consolidation of the overhead function by putting it at one site.

Senator BELLMON. It is not now in one site.

Mr. MENDOLIA. No, it is not. We have a Marine supply center at Albany, Ga., and a supply management operation in Philadelphia.

Senator BELLMON. Does this figure of $2.6 million savings include the increased costs of earlier retirements that you mentioned?

Mr. MENDOLIA. No, sir, it does not.

Senator BELLMON. In other words——

Mr. MENDOLIA. That is a continuing savings as a result of eliminating 184 civilian places.

Senator BELLMON. Of those 184 people most of them will go on retirement.

Mr. MENDOLIA. I would think so because 50 percent of the force is eligible for full or actuarially reduced retirement.

Senator BELLMON. What will be the cost to the Government of the retirement benefits that those people will receive?

Mr. MENDOLIA. General Olson, do you have a list made up?

General OLSON. I think we have that.

Severance or reduction in force pay for civilians choosing not to relocate would be $708,000.

Senator BELLMON. Severance and what other?

General OLSON. Reduction in force pay for civilians choosing not to relocate in Philadelphia. It would be $708,000.

ANNUAL COST IN BENEFITS OF RETIRED PERSONNEL

Senator BELLMON. What is the annual cost in retirement benefits to those 184 people?

General OLSON. I don't believe I have that information but I can get it for you, sir.

[The material follows:]

The assumption that there is a direct correlation between the 184 positions to be saved as a result of the relocation and the number of retirements is incorrect. In all probability, the Marine Corps will be able to attrite or reassign incumbents in these positions so that by the end of calendar year 1975, the positions will be unencumbered and simply disappear. In this way, no individuals will be directly affected by the reduction of 184 civilian positions.

Retirements will occur across the entire spectrum of the workforce and must be addressed separately. Comments in response to Senator Schweiker's request in this area are provided on page 392.

ANNUAL SAVINGS RESULTING FROM RETIREMENTS

Senator BELLMON. Those figures would be deducted from the $2.6 million annual saving.

General OLSON. Well, the way this amortizes out, by 1978 we have a straight $2.6 million savings as all these other factors of changeover have been taken up or assumed in this period, have been amortized, so we have a straight $2.6 million saving from 1978 on.

Senator BELLMON. But you still have 184 people who are being paid retirement benefits who otherwise would have been on the payroll.

General OLSON. Well, of course, sir, this is their option at any time they are eligible.

Senator BELLMON. I am trying to get at the point there is not a $2.6 million saving to the Government. If you are going to take 184 people off the payroll and put on retirement benefits, it is still going to cost money to keep their retirement benefits paid, isn't that right?

Senator SCHWEIKER. In other words you are estimating that 25 percent of the people will retire, yet you have not figured the retirement costs and what this will cost the Federal Government. I think it is a very excellent question.

Why you would consider the 25 percent forced retirements as part of the package and say it is a $2.6 million saving is kidding ourselves. How much would that amount to? I think we would like to have the figures on that.

Excuse me.

Senator BELLMON. That is the only point I was trying to make.

That is all the questions I have. I believe we do need those figures.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Yes. Could we have the figures for the record? It is just ridiculous to say you have a $2.6 million savings when you are forcing people to retire.

[The figures referred to above can be found on page 392 of the record.]

AIR-CONDITIONING COSTS IN CURRENT FACILITY

Senator SCHWEIKER. Another figure I would like to get into is the air-conditioning situation. You are using that as half the justification for the saving you are making.

First, I wonder if you could explain the difference between the $4.9 million used in your statement and the 6-year dollar limitation applied by the Defense Department from fiscal years 1974 to 1979 for Facility Planning and Programing for Philadelphia of $2 million.

On a 5-year projected basis your own group allocated only $2 million for the cost of air-conditioning and yet you are now saying it is going to cost $4.9 million. This information was contained in Guidance for Facility Planning and Programing dated August 1972, so as recently as August this whole air-conditioning program was going to cost $2 million by your own figures. Now you are saying it is going to cost $4.9 million. I would like to hear the reasons.

Mr. MENDOLIA. As I think we pointed out in the statement, we have said that air-conditioning has long been required. On the basis of the priorities that have been established in the Corps, they have not been able to fund the air-conditioning. As to the situation that might prevail in the future, it would affect the ability of the Marine Corps activity in Philadelphia to retain and recruit competent people. Our feeling would be that the building would have to be air-conditioned.

As you lose about 50 percent of your employees over the next 10 years you have to recruit them in competition with other Federal agencies in the Philadelphia area. We think that competition would not be very successful without facility improvements.

Senator SCHWEIKER. What was the $2 million for?

General OLSON. The total price for the air-conditioning runs up to $4.9 million plus the sprinkler system that is involved in this particular renovation. I think I can speak with reasonable experience in

this area. When I came back from Vietnam, I was assigned to the Marine Corps Supply Activity and at that time initiated a $200,000 program to try to upgrade some of the Corps' facilities that we had.

CONDITION OF BUILDING

This used to be a clothing factory. The Marine Corps used to manufacture all its tenting and clothing. We converted this to an ICP and as such we never had the money or never had the capability of going ahead to modernize the building.

I will give you a typical example of what I am talking about. During the period that I was there we had flush toilets in which the tank was located up on the ceiling with the long chain that we had about 20 or 30 years ago. You pull that in order to make the toilet operate. That is the type of antiquated problems that we face.

I can say that during my tour I made a definite effort to improve these facilities, and I think that there are constituents here from Philadelphia who would back up my statement in this area. This particular facility in my opinion has really outlived its useful life considering its initial construction period back in 1904, the different levels that are involved in the building. I have pictures here to describe certain construction characteristics which are present in the building today if the Congressmen would like to observe those.

FUNDING ALLOCATION OF CORPS

Senator SCHWEIKER. Well, I am at a loss, General, to get the answer to my question. Here is a 20-page document from the Commandant of the Marine Corps dated August 3, 1972, which makes a 5-year projection with a 6-year dollar control figure on the presumption we are operating before they allocate $2 million. Either air-conditioning was not important enough to even project in the picture or it could be done for a lot less than $4.9 million. I am just trying to figure out which it was. I mean these are your figures, they are not mine; I didn't invent them. Have you shifted gears and why?

General OLSON. We had approximately $40 million.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Somebody must have figured out that figure somehow.

General OLSON. We had approximately $40 million in the Marine Corps to allocate for the various functions and at that point in time we figured that the proportionate share that we could allocate to Philadelphia would be approximately $2 million for this particular plant and that is where the figure was generated.

Senator SCHWEIKER. The $4.9 million, is that for central air-conditioning?

General OLSON. That is for the complete central air-conditioning doing away with the window air-conditioning that we have now.

WINDOW AIR-CONDITIONING UNITS

Senator SCHWEIKER. That brings be to my next point. The supply activity is now 40 percent air-conditioned by window units. If you really talk about saving money, it would probably be a lot cheaper

using air-conditioning window units to fill out the remaining 60 percent. Then you could use that cost figure instead of the cost figure for ripping out and throwing away the present 40 percent. Why didn't you use that alternative? Maybe that was the $2 million you fellows had in the first figure.

Mr. MENDOLIA. I would point this out, Mr. Chairman. I think that no matter how we determine what the cost of the air-conditioning is, the fact remains that the $2.6 million savings will only be obtained by the consolidation. So, even if you were to assume that the $4.9 million would never be spent, the return on the new money would still be recaptured in less than 5 years. So, I would make it as a premise, that it is still a desirable objective for the Government to make that consolidation.

SAVINGS AS RESULT OF RETIREMENT

Senator SCHWEIKER. Let's follow that presumption. By your own statement, that presumption is inaccurate. You say here:

> Almost 25 percent of our current work force will be eligible for retirement at full benefits. We expect they would choose to do so in any event. Another 25 percent will be eligible for reduced benefits.

Therefore, you cannot say you are saving $2.6 million. By your own admission, 25 percent of the present employees will be forced to retire. The Government pays that out of some of our appropriations, one way or another. I think you have to say it is a $2.6 million saving, less the forced retirements, and then, maybe, you can say you have a saving. But you have not figured that.

I cannot agree with your second assumption because I think that is as unrealistic as the first assumption. How can you say that is not going to cost the Government x amount of dollars?

Mr. MENDOLIA. The pension costs will remain the same if we do this or not.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Not if they don't retire.

Mr. MENDOLIA. 25 percent of them are eligible to retire and we would replace those people at Philadelphia if we were to stay there to perform the function. What we are saying is that by consolidating the function at one location we can eliminate 184 civilian positions. I don't think it is appropriate to bring in the pension costs because that would be borne whether we make the move or not. This is not an appropriate deduction from the saving. That $2.6 million will continue. If you added the pension cost literally, say if you look 10 years off, you would offset all the savings because 50 percent of the people would be on pension.

Senator SCHWEIKER. At some point in time, yes. But certainly your own words indicate that some are going to retire early. That is going to cost the Government more money, eventually after 3 or 5 years. You are presuming that we are going to start saving money in a few years, and I am just pointing out I am not sure.

This is a debatable point.

Mr. MENDOLIA. We said that to make the move would cost $5.2 million for construction funds and $5.8 million for relocation expenses and retraining for a total of $11 million. We are saying that we can

recapture that money in about 2½ years. Even if you assume that the air-conditioning funds were never spent in Philadelphia, we can recapture the whole $11 million in less than 5 years which I think anyone would say was a pretty good investment. It is required, as I see it, in the Department of Defense because we are literally having to operate on less constant dollars each year. We have to make moves that enable us to preserve force structure and to modernize weapons. This is one of those things we have to do to accomplish this.

General Olson. Senator, I might add that since this intended relocation was announced we have lost 41 people who have transferred to other Government activities within the civil service structure leaving Philadelphia and therefore it would not be a proper assumption to say all of these people are going to actually accept retirement. They will be on civil service rolls but they will be working in other areas.

Senator Schweiker. It was your statement I picked up, not my statement.

Mr. Mendolia. Literally, our experience is that we cannot predict what decisions individuals will make. We can look at the roll and say that 25 percent are eligible to retire. Whether they opt to retire is probably a matter of the job market in Philadelphia and, what they choose to do. If they choose to retire, that is their decision. We will not really know that until we are in the last phases of the shutdown which would not be until the early part of 1976.

Mr. Ruane. Mr. Chairman, we do have some information based on January to date in terms of the base closures and reassignments that took place throughout the country. Some 32 percent of the people that were affected by these actions have retired. So, if you were to look at the 50-percent figure, just the experience in the past 9 months has shown that it has been certainly below 50 percent. This is not to say that 32 percent of the workers in Philadelphia will retire, but this is factual experience.

Senator Schweiker. My point was how much does that cost the Government a year and why don't you figure it? I accept your figure. I think it is probably a little more realistic than the figures provided in your statement. I think, however, that unless you put that on the balance sheet, it is unfair to say you are going to save $2.6 million each year when you are actually forcing people to take an early retirement with the Government paying x percentage for the retirement program. 50 percent or more will be paid by the Government, a direct cost to the taxpayers. Eventually it wipes itself out, but I think it is unfair to say it is a recurrent saving.

DILLARD STUDY

I now have a question about the Dillard study. I would like to know, Mr. Secretary, whether you are familiar with the Dillard study of 1970–71. Did it make any recommendations with regard to moving the Supply Activity from Philadelphia to Albany and did it recommend the closing of the Supply Activity?

Mr. Mendolia. I am not familiar with that study.

General Olson. This study did evaluate the complete requirement for relocation and it was looked at and reviewed during the most

recent study which we made and in which we came up with this particular decision.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Well, did the Dillard study specifically recommend a move to Albany, Ga?

General OLSON. It listed a number of alternatives which did not make an affirmative decision.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Would you supply a copy of the Dillard study for insertion in the subcommittee files so that we may have a copy for reference?

Mr. MENDOLIA. Certainly.

[A copy of the Dillard study was subsequently supplied to the subcommittee for use in its files.]

[NOTE.—The Dillard study was prepared during 1970 as an internal study within the Supply Department, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps. The report was never approved by the Quartermaster General or any other Marine Corps official and therefore may not in any way be construed as an officially approved or sanctioned document representing official Marine Corps or Department of Defense positions.]

DESCRIPTION OF ALBANY FACILITY

Senator SCHWEIKER. I think the fact that the Government made a previous study not recommending what you are recommending now is a very significant point. I think the Congress should know why the study did not recommend a move to Albany, Ga., what the cost factors were, and why it wasn't found feasible at that time.

General OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I might add here for information that in 1952 the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, was constructed from the ground up for the purpose for which it serves. In other words, in the military sometimes it is unique that we actually build something and use it for the purpose for which it was intended.

If you ever visit Albany to see this particular facility, I think you would be amazed at the effective and efficient type of construction that was used in its mission of accomplishment. Within that particular ball park there was actually at that time in 1952 an area earmarked with the utilities underground, electrical facilities into where a future inventory control point for the Marine Corps would be located. Since 1952 this thing has been under constant reevaluation. I can produce the maps or the charts which show that this was in the planning stages but the opportunity or the requirement to effect this particular change had never materialized.

Now if I may go back, Mr. Chairman, to your previous remark and be more direct in my answer to your question, when you look at the Dillard study you will see that in the final conclusions that it was never officially accepted by the Commandant of the Marine Corps and endorsed as an accepted study.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Who made it if the Commandant didn't accept it?

General OLSON. It was made within the Supply Department or under the Quartermaster General's cognizance who I think was General Chip or General Robinson at that time. Studies can be made at lower echelons of organization within the Marine Corps, but until

these particular studies have been signed off and approved by the Commandant, their official status is negative as far as any positive actions indicated or inferred.

COMMANDANT RECOMMENDATION FOR FACILITY

Senator SCHWEIKER. My obvious question here is this 20-page memorandum from the Commandant, who recommended only $2 million for facility improvement at the location in Philadelphia for a 6-year period. It just seems to me he had to take presumption of the Dillard study as a basis for making such a recommendation, or he would not have had the $2 million figure, but rather the $4.9 million figure we have today.

I am not so sure there is not some relationship here. Where is the $2 million figure and what does it mean? Give me some substantiation to show me I am wrong, that the Commandant based it on some recommendation; that is, the Dillard study.

What does the $2 million figure mean? I still have not heard the answer to that. If you say he did not use the Dillard study, what did he use? Here is an official order by the Commandant of the Marine Corps which is official and which is a decision which accepts some presumption. If there is some other information you have on the $2 million, I would be glad to have it.

General OLSON. Mr. Chairman, in the budget process it is necessary to make planning factors in which the field commands can evaluate their urgent requirements. As such, this planning data must be put out to the field so that they can time their budget submissions, and this is essentially what this was.

Now whether these things fall out or stand in the Milcon budget as it is processed through the committee depends upon really the urgency of need and the importance that the Commandant places on these particular installations proposed for inclusion in the Milcon budget. So therefore if there is a higher priority, and each post and station is required to submit their No. 1, 2, and 3 priorities, and these priorities are then meshed at the CMC level and a judgment factor is injected and the Commandant is given a basis for decision, obviously the air-conditioning element that was put forth at this particular time did not stand the test of being of high enough priority to get the allocation funds required to install that.

Senator SCHWEIKER. And apparently it didn't stand a test in the Dillard study either. That is my point.

General OLSON. I would say again the Dillard study was never officially approved by the Commandant and it was generated by the Quartermaster General with the staff support essentially being accomplished by the supply department.

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL MILITARY STAFF

Senator SCHWEIKER. Genneral, I would like to ask you, has the Marine Corps requested or will it request augmentation of military personnel in key civilian positions in this transfer operation to the Albany post—additional military staff?

General Olson. You are familiar with the fact that we do effect an actual reduction in civilian and military billets. During the transition period we have a factor in here which shows that we have a dual staffing requirement; that is, we must maintain the shop at Philadelphia during the process that we are reestablishing and putting into business those phases of the operation which can be effectively and efficiently transferred during this interim period. This is all figured in the costing factors which Secretary Mendolia mentioned at the $11 million figure and each offsetting each other.

Senator Schweiker. Do you have the number of new slots in there, too? I know you have the net in there.

General Olson. Well, the net reduction was previously discussed by Secretary Mendolia stating that, for example, those common support areas such as Civil Service Administration or the Civilian Personnel Office or the Comptroller's facility, the joint utilization of data processing facilities, maintenance facilities which are common—these are the support-type functions which support the $2.6 million reduction which we say we will save starting in 1978.

We are not talking about any of the technical functions being eliminated that are being performed currently by the inventory control point, they are still valid and they have a real requirement. We are only talking about economies affected by consolidating these support functions which I mentioned.

PERSONNEL REQUEST AND OFFSETTING SAVINGS

Senator Schweiker. Will you supply for the record if you have not already, the new military positions that will be needed, as well as the offsetting savings? In other words, I have here a sheet that says eight majors, six officers, four supply officers——

General Olson. Mr. Chairman, I can explain this on the basis of the augmentation staffing during the transition period that will be required in order to have a continuity of operations at Philadelphia and also to establish a base from which we can operate down in Albany. Obviously we cannot direct civilian personnel who are employed by the Marine Corps to move. This is their option, they can accept or decline. But we can direct Marines to augment or pick up and move and fill this gap.

This is part of our interim plan, to fill these areas or voids which will be present because we will not have the civilians that will transfer in toto during this interim period. That is why I mentioned that augmentation and I will be glad to give you a listing of the military that is involved in that.

Senator Schweiker. All right.

[The material follows:]

No new, permanent military positions will be required. There will be a requirement for the temporary augmentation, within current Marine Corps resources, of military skills during the transition period.

Some military augmentation will occur to replace civilians who elect to transfer to other government agencies in Philadelphia prior to the time the activity is completely relocated.

PERSONNEL CUTBACK AND STEPUP

Senator SCHWEIKER. Now you talk about a reduction of 234 positions. There is also, I believe, an estimate that 537 technical people will be needed by 1976. Is this accurate? Why the cutback and then the stepup?

Mr. MENDOLIA. My understanding is to replace people whom we would expect to retire. In other words, half of the force is eligible to retire in the next 10 years.

Senator SCHWEIKER. This is replacement and not new slots?

Mr. MENDOLIA. Yes, sir.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Are they all replacements or are they new people based on some expansion?

Mr. MENDOLIA. There is no expansion. There are projections that are based on having 184 fewer people at Albany than there are now at Philadelphia. Now what we will have to do is hire people either to replace those which choose not to come down there or to replace retirees.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Can you give us some details of the 537; where the figure comes from and what costs, either training or otherwise, might be needed there?

Mr. MENDOLIA. Well, the training cost is the $5.9 million.

Senator SCHWEIKER. That would include this 537?

General OLSON. Yes.

Senator SCHWEIKER. All right.

NONDEPARTMENTAL WITNESSES

STATEMENT OF HON. SAM NUNN, U.S. SENATOR FROM GEORGIA

RELOCATION OF SUPPLY CORPS ACTIVITY

Senator SCHWEIKER. I see Senator Nunn has come in so why don't we just interrupt.

Senator, would you like to make a statement?

Senator NUNN. I would like to make a statement, Mr. Chairman. I am going to submit some exhibits for the record and I won't take a lot of the committee's time.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Proceed.

Senator NUNN. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and discuss the proposed relocation of the Marine Corps Supply Activity from Philadelphia, Pa., to Albany, Ga. My appearance arises out of testimony taken by the Military Construction Subcommittee on Tuesday, October 9, 1973, concerning this proposed relocation.

This testimony, offered by concerned citizens from Philadelphia, addressed the relocation from two standpoints: (1) Was Albany, Ga., a desirable location for the facility when compared to Philadelphia? In this particular area the witnesses attacked Albany, Ga., both as to its desirability for the Supply Activity and as to its desirability as a home for employees; and (2) Would a savings really be effectuated by the relocation to Albany? In this area the witnesses attacked the economics of the move, as determined by the Marine Corps.

EFFECT OF BASE CLOSINGS ON GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to say I understand and sympathize with the concern expressed by the Philadelphians. Certainly the prospect of losing jobs and payrolls is not pleasant. Indeed, Georgia has been more adversely affected by such actions than Pennsylvania and it has been traumatic. Base relocations have cost Georgia the Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah, Ga.; the Naval Air Station in Albany, Ga.; and the Glynco Naval Air Station in Brunswick, Ga. These closures have cost Georgia 5,497 military positions and 1,088 civilian positions. The relocation of the Supply Activity will increase personnel at that facility by only 381 military positions and 948 civilian positions.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are losing in the neighborhood of 5,116 military and 140 civilian positions. When you take it overall, it has been a very severe year for our State.

I just want to make it clear in the beginning, I am in sympathy with those who are being uprooted, moving, losing their job. At this point I want to make that clear. I have been through it myself and I know

23-751 O - 73 - 24

how hard it is on not only the citizens themselves, but on the economy of the area and most of all on the employees and their families.

I would like to say, though, when we look in terms of base closures we have, I think, a duty to really rise above and look above regional interests. We must assist the military to cut costs where possible. We cannot afford the luxury of maintaining facilities for a wartime military establishment when that establishment has now been drastically reduced.

Mr. Chairman, I know you realize we cut in the Senate version of the Military Procurement Authorization bill about 156,000 military personnel. That was reduced in the conference committee to somewhere in the neighborhood of 40,000, so there is an overall rather drastic cut in the military personnel throughout the United States.

LETTER CONCERNING ALBANY FACILITIES

The aspersions cast by the Philadelphia witnesses on the education system, the health delivery system, the recreational resources, the housing situation, and the job market in Albany, Ga., have been thoroughly and completely refuted in my letter of October 12, 1973, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, without reading it I will simply attach it.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Without objection, the letter and your statement will be inserted in the record at this point.

[The letter and statement follow:]

October 12, 1973

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On Tuesday, October 9th, Honorable Richard Schweiker chaired Appropriations Subcommittee hearings on military construction. One of the matters taken up involved $5.2 million to relocate the operation of the Marine Corps Supply Activity from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to Albany, Georgia.

During the course of that hearing certain witnesses testified as to the economics of the move and the desirability of Albany, Georgia as a location for the facility.

I understand and sympathize with the concern of these witnesses in seeking to retain the Philadelphia facility. All Senators adversely affected by the base closures would prefer that the changes not take place. For example, in my own state of Georgia, the Army has closed the Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah, Georgia and the Navy is closing the Albany Naval Air Station at Albany, Georgia and the Glynco Naval Air Station in Brunswick, Georgia.

As a result of these actions, Georgia will lose a total of 5,497 military positions and 1,088 civilian positions. The relocation of the Supply Activity from Philadelphia to Albany will increase personnel by only 381 military positions and 948 civilian positions. Georgia will suffer a net loss of 5,116 military positions and a net decrease of 140 civilian positions. I speak with personal experience when I say I share these witnesses' concern.

I do not feel, however, that I can allow the aspersions cast on Albany, Georgia or the allegations as to the adverse economics of the move to remain unchallenged.

It is totally incorrect to state, as witnesses did, that neither the four-year nor two-year colleges in the Albany area is accredited. Both the Albany State College (four-year) and the Albany Junior College (two-year) are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities. Both are part of the University System of Georgia. In addition, Albany has a fully accredited Vocational-Technical School and a Technical High School.

Contrary to testimony received, the public schools of Albany are viable institutions fulfilling their college preparatory roles quite capably. School officials are proud of the high number of merit scholars attending Albany public schools. They are also proud of the very low pupil/teacher ratio; 23 to 1 at the elementary level; 25 to 1 at the high school level.

Health facilities available can only categorize Albany as a regional medical center. The 450 bed Phoebe Putney Hospital is a modern facility offering a full range of medical services. Currently this facility is operating at 65 percent occupancy. Albany boasts the fully equipped 220 bed Palmyro Hospital which is operating at 80 percent capacity. Also, there is a 36 bed facility at the Naval Air Station which can be expanded to 70 beds. In addition, officials in Albany have established one of the finest Emergency Medical Services Systems in the state.

Albany, Georgia has more than adequate housing available for the new families moving to Albany. There are currently 400 single family units available; 525 apartments; and 900 units at the Naval Air Station. Six-Hundred-thirty of the NAS units are allocated for the Marine Corps, leaving 270 units for civilian use.

Albany is proud of its record of attracting and holding highly skilled labor. Firestone, DuPont, and Rockwell International are just three of the well-known national firms that have located in Albany in recent years. There have been no complaints from these employers concerning any difficulty in recruiting skilled personnel.

Finally, Albany has long been considered a hunting and fishing paradise. Former President Eisenhower was a frequent visitor to the area during his Presidency, hosting many hunting expeditions. Recreation facilities abound but one of the notable new additions now being developed is a 430 acre park which will be the home of a nature zoo featuring animals from all over the world.

I would also point out the following plus (+) economic factors as to the relocation of the Supply Activity.

The decision to functionally relocate the Marine Corps Supply Activity in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania was prompted by the need to reduce support establishment requirements commensurate with reductions in force strength. The relocation of the Supply Activity will enable the Marine Corps to consolidate identical support-type functions which are currently being independently performed at Philadelphia and the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia. Functional consolidation, to be effected in the fields of automatic data processing, comptrollership, civilian and military personnel administration, procurement and personnel services, will permit the reduction of 234 billets (184 civilians and 50 military). This reduction will result in annual savings in operating costs of $2.6 million.

The move to Albany, Georgia will enable the Marine Corps to avoid major costs associated with maintaining the habitability of the seventy-year old building complex at Philadelphia. This cost avoidance is explained below.

Actual maintenance costs in the five fiscal years ending in 1973 totaled almost $1.9 million. These actual costs, which represent 50 percent of the buildings' acquisition cost, represent only part of the continuing and immediate maintenance requirements. Additional requirements, which total $871,000, have not been funded by the Marine Corps pending the final approval of the new construction at Albany which will permit relocation of the Supply Activity.

Major military construction costs of $4.9 million will be avoided. These costs are required for the installation of safety and productivity-related equipment for sprinkler systems, power generation and air conditioning.

The consolidation of functions at Albany, Georgia will enhance the Marine Corps' capability to improve the morale in the all-volunteer services environment. Currently, the majority of the Marines stationed at Philadelphia subsist on the local economy. A significant feature of the planned move, as previously mentioned, is the Marine Corps takeover of 630 Capehart houses from the Naval Air Station, Albany. Thus, all eligible enlisted and officer personnel will be afforded the much-desired opportunity to occupy government quarters and to utilize the nearby recreation, exchange and commissary privileges.

The functional consolidation of two major elements of the Marine Corps' distribution system will provide for greater efficiency and economy in accomplishing the Marine Corps supply mission. Over and above easily quantified personnel savings are as yet undefined savings in: costs associated with travel between the Philadelphia Activity and Albany; the reduction data transmission (AUTODIN, AUTOVON) requirements; and, most important, the expense benefit realized by collocation of inventory management and storage and traffic functions.

In accordance with our recent conversation, I respectfully request an opportunity to appear before the Committee in person, or by a written statement, to fully rebut the above-mentioned allegations.

I would add that I have discussed this matter with Senator Talmadge and he concurs in the comments contained herein. It is my further understanding that he also plans to address the Subcommittee on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Sam Nunn

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SAM NUNN
REGARDING THE PROPOSED RELOCATION OF
THE MARINE CORPS SUPPLY ACTIVITY FROM
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA TO ALBANY, GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman and Distinguished Members of the Appropriations Committee:

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and discuss the proposed relocation of the Marine Corps Supply Activity from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to Albany, Georgia. My appearance arises out of testimony taken by the Military Construction Subcommittee on Tuesday, October 9, 1973 concerning this proposed relocation.

This testimony, offered by concerned citizens from Philadelphia, addressed the relocation from two standpoints: (1) Was Albany, Georgia a desirable location for the facility when compared to Philadelphia? In this area the witnesses attacked Albany, Georgia both as to its desirability for the Supply Activity and as to its desirability as a home for employees; and (2) Would a savings really be effectuated by the relocation to Albany? In this area the witnesses attacked the economics of the move, as determined by the Marine Corps.

I understand and sympathize with the concern expressed by the Philadelphians. Certainly the prospect of losing jobs and payrolls is not pleasant. Indeed, Georgia has been more adversely affected by such actions than Pennsylvania. Base relocations have cost Georgia the Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah, Georgia; the Naval Air Station in Albany, Georgia; and the Glynco Naval Air Station in Brunswick, Georgia. These closures have cost Georgia 5,497 military positions and 1,088 civilian positions. The relocation of the Supply Activity will increase personnel at that facility by only 381 military positions and 948 civilian positions.

I am sure that all Senators adversely affected by base closures and relocations would prefer that the same not take place. However, in this era of competing demands for federal dollars, we must look above regional interests: We must assist the military to cut costs where possible. We cannot afford the luxury of maintaining facilities for a war-time military establishment when that establishment has now been drastically reduced.

The aspersions cast by the Philadelphia witnesses on the education system, the health delivery system, the recreational resources, the housing situation and the job market in Albany, Georgia have been thoroughly and completely refuted in my letter of October 12, 1973, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "B". Accordingly, I do not feel it necessary to repeat them. To me the two criteria appropriate in Congressional review of base closures and relocations are:

(1) Will the move adversely affect our national security?

(2) Will the move result in a savings of federal dollars?

Our concern with the relocation of the Supply Activity should relate primarily to the questions of whether or not the relocation will result in a savings of federal dollars, and whether or not such a move will improve the efficiency of the Marine Corps Supply System.

The Philadelphia Supply Activity complex was originally constructed in 1907-1908. Additions were made in 1918, 1920, 1931, 1941, 1943 and 1945. Thus, the newest addition is twenty-eight years old.

In their testimony the Philadelphia witnesses stated that the cost of air conditioning the Philadelphia facility should not properly be included as a cost avoidance item since the Marine Corps has never approved the Philadelphia request for air conditioning. In the same breath they say that 40% of the Philadelphia facility is already air conditioned. In reply the Marine Corps states that, although 40% of the office/conference room space is air conditioned, 73% of the civilian employees work in non-air conditioned locations. In the past summer, this resulted in 3,200 productive man-hours lost because employees were sent home during periods of high temperature and humidity.

It is apparent, therefore, that should the Marines stay in Philadelphia, their stated intention of air conditioning the facility should be given full credence by this Committee. Likewise, the savings realized by moving to Albany, and not air conditioning the Philadelphia facility, constitute a legitimate element of cost avoidance in the amount of $4,924,000 (including other avoided projects).

It appears as if the main element of savings will be in payroll--the $2.6 million saved annually through the elimination of 184 civilian and 50 military billets. This savings is not seriously disputed by the Philadelphians. Furthermore, even should this Committee not consider the air conditioning cost avoidance, the Marine Corps will still realize this tremendous annual savings.

Finally, the Philadelphians dispute the computations, as determined by the Marine Corps, to construct the new administration building at the Albany Marine Corps Supply Center. They allege, without factual basis, that the $5.2 million cost will really be 60% higher--$8 million. This increase will be brought about by unidentified and unsubstantiated cost overruns and increased construction costs. In support of this allegation, they claim that it is not possible to

construct a federal structure without cost overruns. This allegation is too vague for serious consideration. Indeed, the same argument could be applied to renovation and modernization of the Philadelphia facility. No--we must presume that the Marine computations have a factual basis; and, as such, are entitled to due consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one last statement on the anticipated move. Citizens of the Albany area are justifiably proud of their reputation of full cooperation with the Marine Corps. I am certain that new residents will be warmly welcomed by the citizenry and that the spirit of cooperation which has characterized the military-civilian association in the past will continue to be evident as the planned move evolves. I am hopeful that the Marine Corps Supply Center at Albany will continue to play a meaningful and vital role in the future of the Marine Corps Supply Activity.

APPROPRIATE CRITERIA IN CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

Senator NUNN. Accordingly, I don't think it is necessary to repeat that.

To me the two criteria appropriate in congressional review of base closures and relocations are:

(1) Will the move adversely affect our national security?

(2) Will the move result in a savings of Federal dollars?

Those are the two criteria that in the final analysis I think we have to decide this matter on.

Our concern with the relocation of the Supply Activity should relate primarily to the questions of whether or not the relocation will result in a savings of Federal dollars, and whether or not such a move will improve the efficiency of the Marine Corps Supply System.

The Philadelphia Supply Activity complex was originally constructed in 1907–08. Additions were made in 1918, 1920, 1931, 1941, 1943, and 1945. According to my understanding, the newest addition is 28 years old.

AIR-CONDITIONING COSTS

In their testimony the Philadelphia witnesses stated that the cost of air-conditioning the Philadelphia facility should not properly be included as a cost avoidance item since the Marine Corps has never approved the Philadelphia request for air-conditioning. In the same breath they say that 40 percent of the Philadelphia facility is already air-conditioned. In reply the Marine Corps states that, although 40 percent of the office/conference room space is air-conditioned, approximately 73 percent of the civilian employees work in non-air-conditioned locations. In the past summer this resulted in 3,200 productive man-hours lost because employees were sent home during periods of high temperature and humidity.

It is apparent, therefore, that should the Marines stay in Philadelphia their stated intention of air-conditioning the facility should be given full credence by this committee. Likewise, the savings realized by moving to Albany, and not air-conditioning the Philadelphia facility, constitute a legitimate element of cost avoidance in the amount of $4,924,000 (including other avoided projects).

PAYROLL SAVINGS

It appears as if the main element of savings will be in payroll—the $2.6 million saved annually through the elimination of 184 civilian and 50 military billets. This savings, according to my understanding, is not seriously disputed by the Philadelphians. Furthermore, even should this committee not consider the air-conditioning cost avoidance, the Marine Corps will still realize this tremendous annual savings that recurs every year.

NEW BUILDING CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Finally, the Philadelphians dispute the computations, as determined by the Marine Corps, to construct the new administration building at

the Albany Marine Corps Supply Center. They allege, without factual basis, that the $5.2 million cost will really be 60 percent higher—$8 million. This increase will be brought about by unidentified and unsubstantiated cost overruns and increased construction costs. In support of this allegation they claim that it is not possible to construct a Federal structure without cost overruns. This allegation is too vague for serious consideration. Indeed, the same argument could be applied to renovation and modernization of the Philadelphia facility. No, we must presume that the Marine computations have a factual basis and, as such, are entitled to due consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one last statement on the anticipated move. Citizens of the Albany area are justifiably proud of their reputation of full cooperation with the Marine Corps. I am certain that new residents will be warmly welcomed by the citizenry and that the spirit of cooperation which has characterized the military-civilian association in the past will continue to be evident as the planned move evolves. I am hopeful that the Marine Corps Supply Center at Albany will continue to play a meaningful and vital role in the future of the Marine Corps Supply Activity.

COST BREAKDOWN FOR RELOCATION

In conclusion, I am attaching as Exhibit A a complete cost breakdown for the relocation, the net effect of which establishes increased efficiency and savings.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[Exhibit A follows:]

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION CONCERNING THE RELOCATION OF THE MARINE CORPS SUPPLY ACTIVITY, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

Fiscal Year	Item	Costs (Millions)		Savings (Millions)		Note
		Military Construction	Other	Military Construction	Other	
1974	Military Construction for Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia	$5.2	$	$	$	1
1975	Military Construction for Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania			2.3		2
1976	Military Construction for Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia:			1.1		2
	Dual Staffing for Training		3.1			3
	Personnel Reduction				1.2	5
	Relocation of People and Equipment		2.6			4
1977	Military Construction for Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia:			.6		2
	Caretaker Status at Philadelphia		.1			6
	Personnel Reduction				2.6	5
1978	Military Construction for Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia:			.9		2
	Personnel Reduction				2.6	5
	Subtotals	$5.2	$5.8	$4.9	$6.4	
	TOTALS		$11.0		$11.3	

Enclosure (1)

EXHIBIT A

NOTES

1. A building to house approximately 1,200 people will be required. Using the standard Department of Defense space and construction criteria, the cost for this was estimated at $4,800,000. Another $400,000 will be required for parking areas, utilities, and modification of the existing automated data processing facility. All other supporting facilities at the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, are adequate without modification. Cost estimates are detailed as follows:

Administration building: 172,000 square feet @ $27.90 per square foot	$4,800,000
Convert existing floor space for automated data processing functions: 4,300 square feet @ $40 per square foot	172,000
Parking for administrative building and electrical, heat, plumbing, and telephone hookups	232,000
Total Construction Cost for New Facility	$5,204,000

2. Improvements in the facilities at Philadelphia had been requested by that command and have been carried at Headquarters Marine Corps as a programed requirement. The current 4-year program is as follows:

Fiscal Year 1975. Alterations, emergency generator, first increment air-conditioning, and sprinkler system	$2,303,000
Fiscal Year 1976. Second increment air-conditioning	1,115,000
Fiscal Year 1977. Third increment air-conditioning	574,000
Fiscal Year 1978. Fourth increment air-conditioning	932,000
Total Programed Military Construction for Philadelphia Facility	$4,924,000

3. Projection of costs of training to replace skills of personnel not desiring to relocate are reflected in the following. This cost is essential to ensure continuity of operations and no serious degradation of support to the Fleet Marine Forces. (613 congressional report refers.)

Fiscal Year 1976

Dual staffing for training	$2,045,000
Temporary additional duty	1,025,000
Total Cost of Training	$3,070,000

"Dual staffing" means the hiring of new personnel for employment at the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, while the present civilian personnel who elect not to relocate from Philadelphia are still employed. The temporary additional duty costs will allow those new personnel hired to train in their jobs at Philadelphia.

4. Costs for the relocation of personnel and equipment are as follows. This display of costs reflects updated planning as of June 1973. It reflects a change from previous information, wherein these relocation costs previously were split between fiscal years 1975 and 1976. Also, estimates of costs associated with severance pay, automated data processing rental, and overtime during the physical move have been developed and included.

Fiscal Year 1976

Relocation of civilian personnel and costs for overtime required during the relocation phase	$1,180,000
Severance (reduction in force) pay for civilians choosing not to relocate	708,000
Maintenance of real property (Philadelphia)	180,000
Transportation costs incidental to relocation	24,000
4th Marine Corps District relocation	8,000
Automated data processing costs--includes equipment disconnects at Philadelphia and reconnects at Albany, 2-month equipment rental during relocation of Philadelphia equipment to Albany, and contract services to include keypunch services during relocation and consumable supplies	461,000
Total Cost for Relocation of Personnel and Equipment	$2,561,000

5. Real savings realized from personnel reductions through amalgamation of the Philadelphia functions with those of the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, will amount to $1.2 million the first year of the relocation and $2.6 million each year thereafter. Functions to be combined include procurement, comptrollership, management engineering, military personnel administration, civilian personnel offices, and automated data processing.

6. These costs are incidental to maintaining the Philadelphia facility in a caretaker status until it is accepted by the General Services Administration for disposal/use by other Government agencies.

EXHIBIT B

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

October 12, 1973

Honorable Mike Mansfield
Chairman
Senate Appropriations Subcommittee
on Military Construction

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On Tuesday, October 9th, Honorable Richard Schweiker chaired Appropriations Subcommittee hearings on military construction. One of the matters taken up involved $5.2 million to relocate the operation of the Marine Corps Supply Activity from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to Albany, Georgia.

During the course of that hearing certain witnesses testified as to the economics of the move and the desirability of Albany, Georgia as a location for the facility.

I understand and sympathize with the concern of these witnesses in seeking to retain the Philadelphia facility. All Senators adversely affected by the base closures would prefer that the changes not take place. For example, in my own state of Georgia, the Army has closed the Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah, Georgia and the Navy is closing the Albany Naval Air Station at Albany, Georgia and the Glynco Naval Air Station in Brunswick, Georgia.

As a result of these actions, Georgia will lose a total of 5,497 military positions and 1,088 civilian positions. The relocation of the Supply Activity from Philadelphia to Albany will increase personnel by only 381 military positions and 948 civilian positions. Georgia will suffer a net loss of 5,116 military positions and a net decrease of 140 civilian positions. I speak with personal experience when I say I share these witnesses' concern.

I do not feel, however, that I can allow the aspersions cast on Albany, Georgia or the allegations as to the adverse economics of the move to remain unchallenged.

It is totally incorrect to state, as witnesses did, that neither the four-year nor two-year colleges

in the Albany area is accredited. Both the Albany State College (four-year) and the Albany Junior College (two-year) are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities. Both are part of the University System of Georgia. In addition, Albany has a fully accredited Vocational-Technical School and a Technical High School.

Contrary to testimony received, the public schools of Albany are viable institutions fulfilling their college preparatory roles quite capably. School officials are proud of the high number of merit scholars attending Albany public schools. They are also proud of the very low pupil/teacher ratio; 23 to 1 at the elementary level; 25 to 1 at the high school level.

Health facilities available can only categorize Albany as a regional medical center. The 450 bed Phoebe Putney Hospital is a modern facility offering a full range of medical services. Currently this facility is operating at 65 percent occupancy. Albany boasts the fully equipped 220 bed Palmyro Hospital which is operating at 80 percent capacity. Also, there is a 36 bed facility at the Naval Air Station which can be expanded to 70 beds. In addition, officials in Albany have established one of the finest Emergency Medical Services Systems in the state.

Albany, Georgia has more than adequate housing available for the new families moving to Albany. There are currently 400 single family units available; 525 apartments; and 900 units at the Naval Air Station. Six-hundred-thirty of the NAS units are allocated for the Marine Corps, leaving 270 units for civilian use.

Albany is proud of its record of attracting and holding highly skilled labor. Firestone, DuPont, and Rockwell International are just three of the well-known national firms that have located in Albany in recent years. There have been no complaints from these employers concerning any difficulty in recruiting skilled personnel.

Finally, Albany has long been considered a hunting and fishing paradise. Former President Eisenhower was a frequent visitor to the area during his Presidency, hosting many hunting expeditions. Recreation facilities abound but one of the notable new additions now being developed is a 430 acre park which will be the home of a nature zoo featuring animals from all over the world.

I would also point out the following plus (+) economic factors as to the relocation of the Supply Activity.

The decision to functionally relocate the Marine Corps Supply Activity in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

was prompted by the need to reduce support establishment requirements commensurate with reductions in force strength. The relocation of the Supply Activity will enable the Marine Corps to consolidate identical support-type functions which are currently being independently performed at Philadelphia and the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia. Functional consolidation, to be effected in the fields of automatic data processing, comptrollership, civilian and military personnel administration, procurement and personnel services, will permit the reduction of 234 billets (184 civilians and 50 military). This reduction will result in annual savings in operating costs of $2.6 million.

The move to Albany, Georgia will enable the Marine Corps to avoid major costs associated with maintaining the habitability of the seventy-year old building complex at Philadelphia. This cost avoidance is explained below.

Actual maintenance costs in the five fiscal years ending in 1973 totaled almost $1.9 million. These actual costs, which represent 50 percent of the buildings' acquisition cost, represent only part of the continuing and immediate maintenance requirements. Additional requirements, which total $871,000, have not been funded by the Marine Corps pending the final approval of the new construction at Albany which will permit relocation of the Supply Activity.

Major military construction costs of $4.9 million will be avoided. These costs are required for the installation of safety and productivity-related equipment for sprinkler systems, power generation and air conditioning.

The consolidation of functions at Albany, Georgia will enhance the Marine Corps' capability to improve the morale in the all-volunteer services environment. Currently, the majority of the Marines stationed at Philadelphia subsist on the local economy. A significant feature of the planned move, as previously mentioned, is the Marine Corps takeover of 630 Capehart houses from the Naval Air Station, Albany. Thus, all eligible enlisted and officer personnel will be afforded the much-desired opportunity to occupy government quarters and to utilize the nearby recreation, exchange and commissary privileges.

The functional consolidation of two major elements of the Marine Corps' distribution system will provide for greater efficiency and economy in accomplishing the Marine Corps supply mission. Over and above easily quantified personnel savings are as yet undefined savings in: costs associated with travel between the

Philadelphia Activity and Albany; the reduction data transmission (AUTODIN, AUTOVON) requirements; and, most important, the expense benefit realized by collocation of inventory management and storage and traffic functions.

In accordance with our recent conversation, I respectfully request an opportunity to appear before the Committee in person, or by a written statement, to fully rebut the above-mentioned allegations.

I would add that I have discussed this matter with Senator Talmadge and he concurs in the comments contained herein. It is my further understanding that he also plans to address the Subcommittee on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Sam Nunn

LETTER AND PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, U.S. SENATOR FROM GEORGIA

Senator NUNN. I would like to close by saying that Senator Talmadge concurs in these remarks and I concur in the remarks that he is going to submit for the record, and he has authorized me to submit a letter and statement for the record with the approval of the committee.

Senator SCHWEIKER. We will include his remarks in the record as well as your complete statement.

[The letter and statement follow:]

United States Senate
COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

October 19, 1973

The Honorable Mike Mansfield
Chairman
Subcommittee on Military Construction
Senate Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

My purpose in writing is to endorse the proposed functional relocation of the Marine Supply Activity from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Albany, Georgia, and to urge sufficient appropriations to accomplish this relocation.

I understand that at a hearing recently conducted by the Subcommittee on Military Construction, some of those who oppose this move disparaged the City of Albany and the State of Georgia. I have had an opportunity to review the remarks made by certain witnesses at that hearing and am amazed that responsible people would make such unfounded allegations.

The City of Albany and the educational, recreational, and cultural opportunities it offers need no defense. However, it may be helpful to you and your colleagues to have accurate, factual information on those matters. Therefore, I would be deeply grateful for the opportunity to appear before your Subcommittee for this purpose. My colleague, Senator Sam Nunn, who has already written a lengthy letter to you on this subject, joins me in this request.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

Herman E. Talmadge

STATEMENT OF U. S. SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your Subcommittee with regard to the relocation of the U. S. Marine Corps Supply Activity from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Albany, Georgia.

Those of us who are familiar with the situation have been appalled at the rash of sweeping allegations and unfounded, totally incorrect assumptions in testimony recently presented to the Subcommittee. Moreover, there was a deplorable, undisguised downgrading of the State of Georgia in general, and the City of Albany in particular.

This attack on Albany was not only regrettable, it was without basis. To set the record straight, the Subcommittee will be furnished a mass of facts and figures, not only on the question of relocation, but also on the City of Albany. This will enable you to judge the case on its merits and, consequently, I do not intend to dwell on this subject. There were, however, several comments made before the Committee which require closer examination. For example, unfair and inaccurate allegations were made that Albany lacks sufficient housing. The facts are that Albany presents services and programs in every important area that are adequate to the needs of citizens, and these services and programs are unmatched by most cities of comparable size in the nation.

Albany and Dougherty County constitute one of the fastest growing and most progressive parts of the entire State of Georgia. The City itself has doubled in size since 1950, and now has a population of 90,000. Growth has been orderly, and the municipal and county governments have responded well

to increased demand for services that naturally comes with rapidly growing population.

Significant sums are devoted to police and fire protection, and Albany boasts an overall crime rate far below the national average -- and certainly its streets are far safer than those in most of our nation's huge metropolitan areas.

In Albany, 12,500 persons own and live in homes with a median value of $16,200. In addition, almost 13,000 units are available for rental. Mortagage loan closings are steadily setting new records, and several hundred more housing starts are in the planning stages.

Contrary to earlier testimony, education opportunities abound in Albany, ranging from excellent grade schools, a highly sophisticated vocational-technical training center, and on through quality institutions of higher learning. A wide scope of college instruction is readily available, in both four-year and two-year institutions. Further, several other major universities are within easy driving distance.

Albany is a regional health center, with medical care being given a very high priority by the city and county governments.

In short, I know of no reason for the State of Georgia or the City of Albany to apologize for its local government or for the excellent services it offers to its people. To the contrary, the citizens of Albany have every right to be very proud of their city, and Marines and other service personnel who have served there regard the area as an excellent place to live and work and rear a family.

I can understand the concern of Philadelphians over the loss of the Marine Corps Supply Activity. The State of Georgia has also suffered military base closings and relocations, having lost three major installations in the past nine months alone.

However, Mr. Chairman, once inaccurate allegations have been rejected and emotional misstatements have been set aside, there are two fundamental points that have to be considered in this matter:

(1) Is the move sound militarily, and

(2) Is it sound economically?

Insofar as the Marine Corps is concerned, there can be no question about the soundness of this move from a military standpoint. Relocation of the Philadelphia activity to the supply center at Albany will create a supply readiness that has been unknown in the past. It will eliminate costly and time consuming duplication of services. As a matter of fact, such a relocation and centralization move to Albany has been considered in the past, and I am surprised that it has taken so long to finally reach the point of making this move.

From the standpoint of economics, 234 billets currently filled at Philadelphia duplicate positions functioning at Albany where they function more efficiently because the central supply center computers are located in Albany. This move would eliminate those billets, resulting in a $2.6 million savings annually.

The 60-year old, outmoded building in Philadelphia is too small for efficient operation; it lacks adequate air conditioning for over 70 per cent of its employees. It has been estimated that to correct this situation and bring the Philadelphia facility up to standard and up to an efficient peak of productivity would cost approximately $4.9 million.

Furthermore, the Department of the Navy has pointed out that the relocation of the function at Philadelphia to the supply center at Albany would result in a total savings of $1.2 million the first year of the move, and $2.6 million each year thereafter.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that military and civilian personnel who are to be relocated will find a sincere welcome and a spirit of hospitality in the City of Albany. Speaking from a personal standpoint, I am amazed that there would be such a protest. Every national poll that I see shows that an overwhelming majority of people are anxious to leave crime ridden, conjested metropolitan areas, many of which have not only become unliveable but ungovernable. Surveys indicate without a doubt that most people today prefer to reside in small towns and medium sized cities which retain the quality of life that is so important to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to say that Albany has that quality. I am certain that Philadelphians will find Albany a wonderful place to live and work. Moreover, the overall military and economic benefits to be gained strongly compel this move.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Senator SCHWEIKER. I appreciate your very able statement and the articulate way in which you and Congressman Mathis have extended the welcome mat from Albany and pointed out its assets.

I do see a little note in the St. Louis paper that "We are contemplating placing 3,900 jobs to the Hunter Army Airfield in Georgia," so you do have a few other things coming along.

Senator NUNN. Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am not going to fight that move although it is a long way from being certain. I do very much appreciate also the chairman and what he is doing for his area and his State. I have followed it, I know he has been very vigorous in this. I don't know what the final outcome will be but I believe you exemplify what a U.S. Senator should do in representing his area and I truly respect your position.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you. I feel the same way about your position. Thank you very much.

Senator NUNN. Yes, sir.

LETTER FROM HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA

Senator SCHWEIKER. I will insert into the record at this point a letter received by Congressman Harold T. Johnson concerning two California projects.

[The letter follows:]

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 25, 1973.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: The fiscal year 1974 Military Construction Program as presented by the Department of Defense contains a project for the construction of an aircraft depot Weapons System Component Plating Shop at McClellan Air Force Base, California, at a cost of $2,480,000, and the construction of a security lighting system at Sierra Army Depot, California, at a cost of $380,000. These projects have been included in the Senate version of the authorization bill, but deleted from the House version.

The second increment of an overhaul facility at McClellan is proposed for inclusion in FY 1975 MCP and, like the first increment in the FY 1973 MCP, it provides general purpose shop space which is relatively simple to construct. As such, it is scheduled to be completed about 18 months after approval, or approximately in August 1976. The first and second increment of the depot aircraft overhaul facility and the plating shop will be physically connected and will form a highly efficient repair complex.

The plating shop is a highly complex facility which will require the installation of $1 million in sophisticated plating and material handling equipment after construction is complete. Construction and equipment installation time will allow this facility to become operational, if approved in the FY 1974 MCP, in the same time frame as the full depot aircraft overhaul facility about March 1976. Therefore, the requirement for the plating shop in the FY 1974 MCP time period remains valid.

Of special note is the fact that of the five Air Material Areas in the United States, McClellan is the only one without a new and updated plating shop.

The facility will be used for the restoration of a variety of military equipment by building up worn surfaces thus providing hardened wearing surfaces which will protect the metal from corrosion. It is a vital part of an effective and economical overhaul operation. Human safety and health requirements are not being met now because noise, dust, and acid fumes cannot be controlled. The result of insufficient working space and unsafe conditions is a decrease in the quality of the work being done. A new plating shop is essential, and would provide a tangible savings of $325,000 per year. On the other hand, the cost of upgrading the present facility is estimated at $5 million.

The construction of an adequate security lighting system at Sierra Army Depot also deserves your close attention. This project is required to augment the capability of the Depot's security force to safeguard classified material located within the Directorate for Special Weapons' restricted areas. Present structures are being used without protective lighting under authority of a temporary waiver granted by Headquarters, Department of the Army. In the interim, additional security forces have been assigned to provide adequate protection. The assignment of these additional forces has substantially increased the cost and complexities of providing a secure area for classified material stored at this depot.

I would very much appreciate your assistance in retaining these projects in the conference version of the 1974 Military Construction Authorization program.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR I. MENDOLIA, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS)

ACCOMPANIED BY:

MAJ. GEN. HARRY C. OLSON, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MARINE CORPS

THOMAS P. RUANE, DIRECTOR, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

RETIREMENT PROBLEMS

Senator SCHWEIKER. I think we left this one hanging in the air. Mr. Secretary, would you provide us with some kind of a ballpark estimate of the retirement problem and other problems. In view of the 32 percent retirement figure cited from previous experience, I think it would be good if you could give us an inside and outside picture and also what it will cost us. I realize this is a guesstimate. But I think that by giving a minimum and maximum, you can at least delineate the problem in such a way so we can look at the cost figures for whatever the value may be. That would be helpful.

Mr. MENDOLIA. We would be glad to supply that.

[The material follows:]

In Mr. Mendolia's statement he mentioned that twenty-five percent of the current Philadelphia workforce would be eligible for early retirement at reduced benefits by the end of calendar year 1975. This does not mean that these individuals will, in fact, choose the option of early retirement. "Forced retirement" is a misnomer. This is an individual and voluntary decision that most people will elect only if it fits their personal plans and desires. We expect that most individuals who elect not to move will be placed with other government agencies, or private industry, in the Philadelphia area through the DOD Priority Placement System and the efforts of the Office of Economic Adjustment in cooperation with local and state officials.

As stated previously, pension costs should not be brought into the decision. They will be incurred in any event.

The above notwithstanding, Senator Schweiker asked for "an inside and outside" picture of the financial aspects of early retirements. Without agreeing to the logic of applying retirement costs to the equation, the following hypothetical case is furnished in response to the Senator's request.

Three hundred sixteen individuals will be eligible for early retirement options by the end of calendar year 1975. Applying the thirty-two percent figure cited by Mr. Ruane as DOD experience indicating the magnitude of decisions for retirement, one hundred people will elect to retire early at reduced benefits.

Then following are annuity computations for a hypothetical employee, indicating first, total annuity payments if he elects early retirement at age fifty with twenty years of service, and second, what his total annuity payments would have been if he had continued to work for another ten years and retired at age sixty with thirty years of service. This will indicate the outside figure. The inside figure would be a lower net total annuity payment in the case of early retirement if minimum average high three salary values were used in the formula.

CASE #1 - EARLY RETIREMENT, age 50, 20 years service

High 3 Average Annual Pay	$10,000
ANNUITY FORMULA:	
1.5% of 10,000 (or $150) x 5 yrs	750
1.75% of 10,000 (or $175) x 5 yrs	875
2.00% of 10,000 (or $200) x 10 yrs	2,000
Annual Annuity	$3,625
(Assume life expectancy at 70 years of age--	$3,625
	20 yrs
	$72,500)

CASE #2 - FULL RETIREMENT, age 60, 30 years service

High 3 years average annual pay	$12,000*

*High 3 average increased by average ingrade step increases.

ANNUITY FORMULA:

1.5% of 12,000 (or $180) x 5 yrs	$ 900
1.75% of 12,000 (or $210) x 5 yrs	1,050
2.00% of 12,000 (or $240) x 20 yrs	4,800
Annual Annuity	$ 6,750
(Assume life expectancy at 70 years of age--	6,750
	10
	$67,500)

DIFFERENCE

Early retirement receives total	$72,500
Full retirement receives total	$67,500
Difference*	$ 5,000

The early retiree would receive a total of $5,000 more than the normal retiree during retirement. This multiplied by the 101 (32% of 316 eligibles) totals $505,000 as an outside figure. Therefore, even if the logic of applying retirement costs was accepted, the effect would be to extend the amortization period by only two to three months.

*This difference is reduced still further by the following factors.

1. Contributions of the individual to his annuity (7% of salary) during his working years.

2. Employees hired to replace retiring employees start at lower grades and at first salary step.

REVERSE CONSOLIDATION OF MOVE

Senator SCHWEIKER. One question I think Senator Bellmon touched on and I did not follow up. What consideration was given to the reverse consolidation of the move? If any were given, why was it rejected?

General, you might have mentioned this before.

General OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I assume you are referring to moving the functions from Albany up to some other location.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Yes.

General OLSON. First of all that would entail a $100 million cost to re-establish the facilities which we have at Albany. Albany is one of our remote storage activities and in that activity we maintain the material that is required for military readiness and mobilization for contingency planned deployment for all forces east of the Mississippi River. The only way I could describe this to you, Mr. Chairman, is that you would have to see this facility as I have previously described this being designed from the ground up for the purpose for which it is used. I think that the price of constructing new facilities to meet this material and operational requirement would preclude any other consideration at this time.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Let me ask the question another way. What will happen to the area from which these jobs are being transferred? Will they be abandoned?

General OLSON. You mean will the facility in Philadelphia be abandoned?

Senator SCHWEIKER. Yes. What is your plan?

FOURTH MARINE CORPS RESERVE AND RECRUITING DISTRICT

General OLSON. Our plan at this particular time is to return the entire facility to the General Services Administration as a building which is excess to Marine Corps needs. Now the ultimate disposition is beyond the scope of the Marine Corps to determine. We will displace the Marine Corps recruiting district in the Philadelphia area. It will stay in the Philadelphia area. I really don't know at this point in time exactly where that will be located. It could be at the Fourth Naval District Command area or it could be located in another GSA building in the city of Philadelphia or a rental space. This has not been determined at this time.

Senator SCHWEIKER. What activity is that?

General OLSON. This is the Fourth Marine Corps Reserve and Recruiting District.

Mr. MENDOLIA. A hundred people involved, approximately.

General OLSON. An $8,000 cost would be involved in that relocation.

Senator SCHWEIKER. What capital assets are you abandoning in Philadelphia? In other words, what kind of on-the-book value assets do you have for the facilities that you are abandoning?

Mr. MENDOLIA. Land cost is $576,000 and investment since acquisition of the land is approximately $3,800,000.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Are these depreciated costs or are these actual?

Mr. MENDOLIA. Those are actual costs.

Senator SCHWEIKER. What is the total again?

Mr. MENDOLIA. The total is just a shade under $4,400,000. In other words, the land cost $576,000 and improvements $3,787,000 for a total of $4,363,000. We would expect, and we don't have an estimate, that the 4.5 acres of ground would constitute a valuable piece of property for the Government which would obviously be disposed of at some point in time by GSA. We don't have a current estimate as to the value of the property on Broad Street.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF FORREST SELLERS

Senator SCHWEIKER. I have a supplemental statement by Forrest Sellers, president of Local 89, American Federation of Government Employees, to our subcommittee that he would like to submit for the record. I am including that in the record today. He raises some additional information on the issues involved on which you may wish to comment.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF
FORREST SELLERS, PRESIDENT, LOCAL 89
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

I am Forrest Sellers, President, Local 89, American Federation of Government Employees, which represents the civilian employees of the Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, under the provisions of Executive Order 11491.

I am most grateful to the Subcommitee for the opportunity of appearing before you on October 9, 1973 to express my opposition to the proposed transfer of the Marine Corps Supply Activity to the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia. I submit the following statement to you primarily to provide (1) written responses to questions regarding my statement of October 9th, (2) additions to comment upon data made available to me at and after the hearing of October 9th and (3) amplification of several of my remarks. Secondly, for purposes of simplicity and convenience, I have incorporated into this statement the substance of my previous statement. My sentiments, therefore, can be secured solely by reviewing this statement. I respectfully request that this statement be inserted into the record of these hearings.

On behalf of the employees at the Marine Corps Supply Activity I should like to submit to you testimony which analyzes the alleged cost and the alleged savings the Department of the Defense (DoD) claims will arise from the proposed relocation. As you will recognize from this analysis (1) the alleged savings have decreased significantly, (2) the alleged costs have increased significantly and (3) several assertions of DoD are in error.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST, UP, UPI

The Fact Sheet which DoD distributed to interested Congressmen/individuals lists under "Funding Impact" cost of 5.2 million dollars in military construction (MILCON) funds required to relocate the Marine Corps Supply Activity. The Hon. Jack L. Bowers, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installation and Logistics, in an enclosure to a letter written on 29 June 1973

to Mr. Royal L. Sims, National Vice-President of the Americal Federation of Government Employees, listed costs of 9,748,000 dollars to relocate the Marine Corps Supply Activity. The total estimated cost consisted of 5,204,000 dollars in MILCON funds and 4,544,000 dollars in Operations and Maintenance, Marine Corps (O&M,MC) funds. A preliminary report of a Marine Corps Task Group dated 22 June 1973 listed under Section IV total O&M,MC costs of 5,719,000 dollars - $1,175,000 more than listed in Assistant Secretary Bowers' letter of June 29th. The Hon. John W. Warner, Secretary of the Navy, in his letter of October 2, 1973 to Senator Richard S. Schweiker listed total estimated cost to relocate the Marine Corps Supply Activity as 11.0 million dollars. The cost consisted of 5.2 million dollars in MILCON funds and 5.8 million dollars in O&M,MC funds. The report of the Marine Corps Task Group and Secretary Warner's letter show, therefore, that (1) cost as listed by DoD officials in the Fact Sheet has increased 5,719,000 dollars and (2) cost as listed by DoD officials in Assistant Secretary Bowers' letter of 29 June has increased 1,175,000 dollars.

ARE DoD ESTIMATES OF TOTAL COST COMPLETE?

Notwithstanding the fact that DoD estimates of total cost have increased a minimum of 1,175,000 dollars, it appears that several indirect costs to the Federal government and to the taxpayers have been excluded from the cost estimates. Where in the estimates are the costs to the Federal government resulting from the early retirement of employees who would not transfer if the relocation is consummated? Where in the estimates are the costs to the Federal government for economic adjustment assistance rendered to the adversely affected community by the President's Inter-Agency Economic Adjustment Committee? Where in the estimates are the costs to the Federal government for displaced employees who would be eligible for unemployment benefits? Where in the estimates are costs to the Federal Government to retrain employees who will be placed in new occupations in other agencies in the government?

5.2 MILLION DOLLARS COST FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW BUILDING: IS THIS ACCURATE?

The Marine Corps estimates that the cost to construct the proposed building at Albany will be 5,204,000 dollars. Several knowledgeable persons have advised me that the estimate is exceedingly low. First of all, I have been advised that labor and material in the construction industry are increasing a minimum of eight to ten percent per year. Assuming that the Marine Corps' estimate of 5,204,000 dollars is accurate, the cost to construct the proposed building in 1974 considering labor and material increases would be between $5,620,320 and $5,724,400. If the proposed building was constructed in 1975, the cost would be between $6,036,640 and $6,244,800.

Secondly, I have been advised that it appears the cost estimate does not contain any allowances for probable cost over-runs, modifications and other contingencies. I was advised, further, that considering cost over-runs, modifications and contingencies, the cost of the building might go as high as 8,000,000 dollars.

WHAT IS THE TRUE COST OF THE PROPOSED RELOCATION?

Why was not the total estimated cost of 11.0 million dollars contained in Secretary Warner's letter not contained in the Fact Sheet which was initially distributed to interested congressmen and individuals? Why have several indirect costs to the Federal government been excluded from the cost estimates? DoD has increased the cost estimates by a minimum of 1,175,000 dollars. Will DoD increase the cost estimates again? What is the true cost of the proposed relocation?

ESTIMATED SAVINGS DOWN

DoD officials have stated in a number of letters and documents that the proposed relocation would result in estimated annual savings of 2,610,000 dollars.

The Installation Facility Data, attached as an enclosure to Assistant Secretary Bowers' letter of June 29th, shows that 804,000 dollars of the alleged savings would result from a reduction in military pay, and the remaining 1,806,000

dollars of the alleged savings would result from a reduction in civilian pay/other O&M, MC areas. Secretary Warner shows in his aforementioned letter that the alleged savings would result solely from reductions in personnel. Sources of the alleged savings as depicted in the two preceding references are not in agreement. One wonders, therefore, how reliable are the estimates of alleged savings. Secondly, the civilian and military billets alleged to be eliminated have not been identified by DoD officials. I have been advised, moreover, that the Table of Organization (T/O), which would reflect reductions resulting from the proposed relocation has not been completed to date.

Thirdly, the Fact Sheet cites that the alleged personnel savings are predicated upon the following reductions in the T/O in effect on December 4, 1972: civilian billets being reduced from 1132 to 948 and military billets being reduced from 431 to 381. Fourteen civilian and six military billets have been eliminated already. This reduction - resulting in estimated savings of 210,000 dollars - is documented in the Civilian-Military Complement Record of the Marine Corps Supply Activity. An additional twenty military billets are scheduled to be eliminated in the Data Processing Division of the Marine Corps Supply Activity during the next two years. These reductions of 40 billets would result in total estimated savings of 420,000 dollars. It is to be emphasized that this savings of 420,000 dollars would occur before the time of the proposed relocation and is not related in any way to the proposed relocation. These savings would reduce the alleged savings resulting from the proposed relocation.

Fourthly, a preliminary report of an on-site manpower survey team from Headquarters, Marine Corps recommended several months ago that thirty-one civilian and military billets in addition to the forty civilian and military billets cited in the above paragraph be eliminated. If the latter mentioned thirty-one billets are eliminated, DoD alleged savings of 2,610,000 dollars resulting from the proposed relocation would be reduced by 745,500 dollars.

Finally, it is anticipated that there will be additional personnel reductions at the Marine Corps Supply Activity not related to the proposed relocation because of reduction in workload due to the cessation of hostilities in the Southeast Asia area.

$4.9 MILLION "COST AVOIDANCE" FIGURE: IS THIS A LEGITIMATE CLAIM?

DoD Officials stated in a number of letters and documents that military construction at the Marine Corps Supply Activity totaling 4,924,000 dollars could be avoided if the proposed relocation is accomplished. The 4.9 million dollar "cost avoidance" figure includes the following items:

a. 191,000 dollars for a standby generator for data processing equipment.

b. 176,000 dollars for a sprinkler system. The original estimated cost of this project was 67,000 dollars.

c. 4.6 million dollars for air conditioning various buildings. Mr. Witt stated in his letter of June 12, 1973 to Senator Schweiker that air conditioning of the Marine Corps Supply Activity "has not been effected up to now because of higher Marine Corps priorities stemming from operational requirements and personnel facility requirements associated with Zero Draft/Project Volunteer".

It is questionable that 4.9 million dollars could be legitimately claimed as a cost avoidance when 4.6 million dollars for air conditioning has never been incorporated into the military construction budget. Only funds for a sprinkler system and a standby generator have ever been incorporated into the budget. One wonders if the air conditioning would ever have been assigned high enough priority to be incorporated in the military construction budget if the cost avoidance factor would not have been conducive to the proposed relocation.

Secondly, enclosure (2) to the Commandant of the Marine Corps letter of August 3, 1972 (Subj: Guidance for Facility Planning and Programming) stated that the six-year dollar limitation for military construction at the Marine Corps Supply Activity for Fiscal Years 1974 thru 1979 would be $2.0 million.

The aforementioned limitation renders it impossible to install air conditioning at the Marine Corps Supply Activity during the six-year period. The Director of MCSA Office of Supporting Services letter of 13 September 1972 to MCSA Chief of Staff collaborated the situation.

The Hon. Edward J. Sheridan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, stated in his letter of 14 June 1973 to Senator Richard S. Schweiker that the Marine Corps Supply Activity is old and desparately in need of a major modernization program.

Marine Corps Major General J. O. Butcher, Commanding General of the Marine Corps Supply Activity in 1965, stated in a letter that "the present permanent buildings at 1100 South Broad Street (Marine Corps Supply Activity) are structurally sound and are sufficient for orderly satisfaction of all anticipated requirements with remaining space still available for possible additional expansion."

The opinion expressed by General Butcher was subsequently incorporated into the Congressional Record.

Secondly, extensive modernization has been made to MCSA since that time. The modernization included but is not limited to: installation of new elevators, new lighting, tile flooring, new roofing, and new windows; painting and pointing of various buildings, relocation and renovation of bathrooms, and other modernization.

Thirdly, Inspectors of the Northern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, and Headquarters, Marine Corps make periodic inspection of the buildings at MCSA. I am advised that the 1972 report of NFEC listed only two principal items: the installation of the standby generator for data processing equipment and installation of a sprinkler system. As stated in the above paragraph, the projected cost to install these two items is only 367,000 dollars.

Fourthly, if General Butcher's statements were accurate, it must be concluded that the buildings at MCSA are structurally sound and sufficient today because the buildings are in better condition today than they were in 1965.

HEAT/HUMIDITY DOES NOT COMPLETELY CLOSE DOWN MCSA

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Sheridan in his aforementioned letter stated also that many of the supply operations at the Marine Corps Supply Activity are curtailed or completely closed down during the summer months because of the lack of air conditioning in most of the Office spaces.

It should be noted that the times it has been necessary for employees to be released early because of the heat/humidity have been relatively few and at no time has the Activity been completely closed down due to lack of air conditioning in the buildings. Approximately 40 percent of the office/conference room spaces at the Marine Corps Supply Activity are air conditioned. Air conditioned spaces include the following offices: The Commanding General, the Chief of Staff, the Deputy Chief of Staff, all division directors, and various other offices in each division. Persons in air conditioned spaces are not released early due to heat/humidity - only persons in non-air conditioned space are released. Thus, at no time is the entire Activity completely closed down due to heat/humidity.

Secondly, when management deems it prudent to release employees in non-air conditioned spaces, divisions normally retain one or more key employees in each branch - including persons in non-air conditioned space - to process emergency/priority work.

EMPLOYEES AT MCSA ARE EFFICIENT

Former Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy Hugh Witt stated in his letter of 12 June 1973 to Senator Schweiker that the efficiency of the employees drops during periods of high heat and humidity because of the lack of air conditioning. It is noteworthy that the Marine Corps Supply Activity was awarded a unit citation from the Secretary of the Navy on June 15, 1968 for "Exceptionally meritorious achievement in the performance of outstanding service in carrying out assigned duties...". The award substantiates that the efficiency of the employees at the Marine Corps Supply Activity is high.

ARE SUFFICIENTLY TRAINED PERSONNEL AVAILABLE IN ALBANY?

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Edward J. Sheridan in his letter of 14 June to Senator Richard S. Schweiker stated the possible loss of specific talents possessed by employees who cannot relocate was recognized as a major problem in the relocation.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bowers stated in his letter of 19 July 1973 to me:

The Marine Corps realizes that it may not be an easy task to recruit and train people to replace those current employees who choose not to exercise their right to transfer with their function...

A Marine Corps Task Group in a preliminary report of June 22, 1972 stated "Certain critical functions most seriously effected by the non-relocation of key civilian personnel require augmentation by military personnel in order to ensure a reasonable degree of continuity."

Why is the military augmentation required if there are sufficiently trained personnel in Albany?

In the event that the proposed relocation is consummated, who will staff the positions if it becomes necessary to pull out the military personnel in an emergency?

Is it not true also that a number of previous Marine Corps studies - including the Dillard Study of 1970-71 - recommended against the proposed relocation because of the lack of sufficiently trained personnel?

IS THERE ENOUGH LOW INCOME HOUSING IN ALBANY?

Former Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy Witt stated also in his letter of June 12th, that the cost of three bedroom homes in Albany in the Spring of 1973 ranged between $29,000 and $35,000. As shown below, more than 70 percent of the employees at the Marine Corps Supply Activity are GS-9 (or equivalent) and below:

Grade	No. of People*	Salary
GS-2	25	$5,682
GS-3	68	6,408
GS-4	97	7,198
GS-5	107	8,055
GS-6	38	8,977
GS-7	112	9,969
GS-8	3	11,029
GS-9	242	12,167
Wage Grade	69	-

*Employees on board as of 30 May 1973

These 771 employees normally would not secure or support a $29,000 to $35,000 mortgage based upon their income. Mr. Witt stated also that the cost of four bedroom homes in Albany in the Spring of 1973 ranged between $35,000 and $42,000. Four bedroom homes would, therefore, be limited to the select group of employees equivalent to GS-12 and above. Most of MCSA employees who lack sufficient income to purchase a $29,000 to $42,000 home in Albany now live in decent adequate row/semi-detached homes in Philadelphia and vicinity ranging between $12,000 and $22,000.

EMPLOYEES - WHAT HAPPENS TO THEM?

Mr. Chairman, we would be remiss if we did not bring up the most important project in running this operation, and that is the people. Here we have some 1100 employees well trained, well equipped to meet all of the operational needs. Some have worked in this one building for more than 30 years. The tremendous impact which will occur on the lives of these people by relocating this activity unnecessarily to Albany, Georgia should not be expected by those who have contributed dedicated, unselfish service to the United States Government in carrying out its mission.

In closing, I wish to reiterate that it is apparent that the rationale advanced by DoD officials to support the proposed relocation contains a number of defects. The major defect is that alleged savings of 2,610,000 dollars have decreased significantly, while total estimated cost has increased significantly.

Another major defect is that several costs have been excluded from the estimates. A third major defect is that there are official documents to prove that the alleged cost avoidance of 4,924,000 dollars is invalid because Headquarters, Marine Corps was not going to allocate MCSA sufficient funds during Fiscal Years 1974 thru 1979 to air condition the buildings. A fourth major defect is that it is questionable that adequately trained civilian personnel are available to staff the proposed transferred positions.

I wish to emphasize that the above-mentioned statements are not made to be critical of any individual or agency, and identification of individuals and/or various agencies was for purpose of required documentation. I served as a Budget Analyst and a Budget/Accounting Analyst for the Federal government for eight years, and I know the difficulty in compiling meaningful estimates three years in advance. In my opinion, however, it would not be prudent or in the best interest of the Federal government, the taxpayers or MCSA employees to recommend appropriation of the 5.2 million dollars based upon data presented by DoD to date. I respectfully request, therefore, that you, the members of the Military Construction Subcommittee, recommend disapproval of the proposed appropriation.

LETTER FROM HON. HUGH SCOTT AND INFORMATION SHEET ON ALBANY

Senator SCHWEIKER. I would like at this time to have made a part of the record a letter from Senator Hugh Scott, requesting a delay in appropriation of the construction funds.

I have also an information sheet on Albany which I will make a part of the record at this time.

[The material follows:]

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

November 1, 1973

Honorable Richard S. Schweiker
Ranking Minority Member
Senate Appropriations Committee
on Military Construction
Suite 1235, Dirksen Senate
Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dick:

I am writing to let you know of my concern for the proposed appropriation of $5.2 million to relocate the Marine Corps supply activity from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to Albany, Georgia.

As you know, the $5.2 million is needed to construct administrative facilities to adequately house Marine Corps supply activity personnel to be moved to Albany, Georgia. Reliable witnesses have appeared before your Committee to refute the overall estimates of cost and savings attributed to the move as presented to your Committee by the Department of Navy. This testimony shows the overall cost to the government, maintenance, construction, relocation, etc., will be less if the facility remains in Philadelphia.

Specifically, the $5.2 million cost of the needed renovation at Albany, Georgia, could go as high as $8 million when the construction is completed in 1974-75. Also, the Department of the Navy does estimate it will save $4.9 million in "cost avoidance" by moving the supply operation. $4.6 million of this estimate is for air conditioning--a cost never incorporated into the military construction budget.

Therefore, in view of the above, and other questions raised in the testimony, I respectfully request that the $5.2 million not be appropriated until it is clearly shown to be in the best interest of the Government.

With kind regard,

Sincerely,

Hugh Scott
United States Senator

Albany Visit by MCSA Employees

1. The following information is provided to acquaint MCSA employees with as much information as was possible to obtain during the recent trip from 14-16 May 1973. It should clearly be pointed out that due to the very limited amount of time which was available the information presented represents only a cursory review of the city and its facilities.

2. It is strongly recommended that any employee contemplating the move to make a personal trip to the city of Albany for at least a week to ten days in order to determine if it satisfies the needs of each employee, since needs are a personal matter and can only be determined by the individual involved.

3. The following general questions were presented to both the private sector (natives of Albany) and to representatives from the city which briefed the group as a whole. Where answers from the two segments differ they will be so identified (i.e., * = Black Private Sector # = City Representatives/MCSC Representatives).

a. School Facilities

(1) Are they integrated? (Elementary, Junior High, High).

Answer: * # - Yes - However, schools in black neighborhoods are predominately black (i.e., Monroe High @ 98%). The overall student population in Albany is 60% white and 40% black. Accordingly, in each school the teacher ratio is 60% white and 40% black (as directed by court order). Those schools outside of the black community have a lower persentage of black students, but are integrated. The "Integration" in the white communities is accomplished through busing.

(2) What type of schools programs are available? (Classes for the slow - average or above average student in reading, math, science, etc.?

Answer: # - There are various programs available in the general school curriculum for students in advanced studies (i.e., Biology) and to students who avail themselves of the programs.

Answer: * - These programs are only available in selected schools and in Catholic School. Not all schools in the predominately black areas have them.

(3) General information on schools presented by Mr. Paul Robertson, Superintendent of Schools:

(a) Student population = 22,536

1 24 Elementary Schools (1-6), approximately 12,000.

2 8 Junior High's (7-9),approximately 5,000

3 4 High Schools (10-12), approximately 4,000.

Approximately 8500 students bused to achieved integration.

NOTE: * Since integration schools have regressed in the quality of education due to white/black teachers being transferred into formally all black/white schools, complaints have been prevalent from both white and black parents.

(b) The Board of Education is made up of seven (7) members, as follows:

1 Two black members.

2 5 white members (1) being Jewish.

(c) Albany has one (1) area vocational school and 2 night school programs.

(d) There are various adult education courses available in some schools.

(e) Programs are available for the educable metally retarded child and trainable mentally retarded child. There is in service training for teachers.

(f) Effective with the fall of 1973 school year, Albany will implement a quarterly system. (Additional information is available with the Relocation Officer.)

(g) There are special classes for Blind/ Deaf/Hard to handle students (disciplinary problems).

(h) The Albany School System has no kindergarten. This can only be obtained through local private schools.

(i) Question: What percentage of Albany's High School graduates go on to higher education?

Answer: # - 55% go on to college or trade schools, etc.

(j) Where do Albany's students rank within the national norm?

Answer: # - Below the national norm, however, they do rank above the norm for the State of Georgia.

(k) Do you have a Get Set Program?

Answer: # - Yes. Title I money is used to assist Monroe High School students and other schools where needed to attempt to raisethe level of education for needy students.

(l) The current teacher/pupil ratio is 24:1 (#).

(m) Albany teachers are not unionized.

(n) The tuition rates for Catholic School and more detailed information is available with the Relocation Officer. That data was considered too detailed to include in this report. It should be noted there is only one (1) Catholic School and there is currently a waiting list to get in. The school only goes to the eighth grade and there is no Catholic High School.

(o) There are two colleges within Albany, Albany State which is predominately black and Albany Junior College (additional information is available in the Relocation Office).

(p) There are no Quaker or Hebrew schools in Albany.

b. Churches

(1) What churches are available to blacks in and around the Albany area?

Answer: # - Churches of all faiths. However, the black citizens primarily go to churches within the black community, but have been known to worship in churches outside of the black community.

(2) Are the churches segregated?

Answer: * - In general no, however, there is very little integration in the Methodist and Baptist churches.

c. Medical Facilities

(1) There are two major hospitals, a 450 bed Phoebe Putney Memorial hospital and a 250 bed private hospital.

(2) There is a general shortage of physicians in the Albany area in both the black and white sections. Currently, some of the white doctors are starting to break down and treat black citizens. Within the black community there are: three (3) physicians, (1) Surgeon, (1) General Practitioner, (1) Gynecologist plus 2 more gynecologist and (1) Neurologist will be arriving in the summer of 1973; currently there are (3) black dentists or will be by summer of 1973.

d. Social Environment

(1) What type of general social life is available?

Answer: * - Generally through church organizations and a few private organizations, primarily through personal contacts. To date, there are no black members in the local country clubs.

(2) Are there open bowling alleys?

Answer: * - There are two alleys in town, however, since a civil suit was brought against one, the black community patronizes only one of the two, primarily to avoid trouble. The one patronized is integrated.

(3) Theatres - There is one little theatre in town which puts on four productions a year and it is open.

(4) Movies - 4 to 5.

(5) Shopping Centers - There are four major shopping centers which are all open and several have black clerks.

(6) Are blacks permitted in the local Masonic Temples?

Answer: * - Not in the white temple, they have their own.

(7) Are there any concert/choral groups that play professionally outside of church organizations?

Answer: * - There are choral/concert groups but they are related to churches or the Albany State College.

(8) What is the general reaction to mixed marriages? (Interracial)

Answer: # - According to the representative from the police force, allegedly, there have been no cases of physical harassment.

* - According to the private sector there are quite a few in the area and recently (within the last several years) there's been no problems.

(9) Are there open tennis courts?

(a) The only public tennis courts are at the Junior College, two high schools and Albany State. These facilities are used by both blacks and whites.

(b) There's a push to improve this condition by local citizen groups.

(10) Are there beaches/lakes/swimming pools etc. available?

Answer: *

(a) No beaches - some state parks (i.e., Chehaw).

(b) All city pools were basically closed after the big push on civil rights and the facilities turned over to various private boys clubs.

(c) The local boys club and YMCA are integrated. The YMCA facilities are utilized by woman.

(d) There is some integration in sports (i.e., baseball/football).

(e) Swimming pools - There are no city pools open to blacks. The blacks use the facilities at Albany State or MCSC Albany.

(11) Jobs for young people - economic opportunities in general.

Answer: * - Generally good for those who avail themselves. Most employers are equal opportunity employers with starting rates for some production type jobs from @ 3.45 an hr. to 6.65 an hr. after completing various training programs. There is some speculation that I.E. DuPont is considering moving into Albany which will further increase job opportunities. (Additional data on social and economic statistics are available within the Relocation Office).

(12) Is there Juvenile Delinquency?

Answer: # * - Yes.

(13) Are there drug problems?

Answer: # - Yes. However, it is no more of a problem than with other cities and there are drug abuse programs.

* - The drug problem is more concentrated within the white sector than the black sector, according to a member of the drug abuse program.

---

(14) Are Jewish social activities related to the synagogue?

Answer: - Yes, plus other organizations.

(15) Are Jewish people concentrated in any given area?

Answer: - No - Jewish people live in all areas of Albany and the surrounding area.

(16) The Jewish Synagogue had a permanent resident rabbi, however, he recently resigned and will be replaced.

(17) There is a considerable amount of intermarriage between members of the Jewish faith and persons of the non-jewish faith.

(18) Albany has no Jewish kosher meat markets nor do the shopping centers carry what is considered to be typical jewish delicacies.

(19) There is no restrictions to persons of the Jewish faith in private country clubs, however, they do need sponsors which seems to present no problem.

(20) As a general rule, there has been no harassment of jewish families moving into various communities.

(21) Albany's current population is about 95,000 with approximately 38% being black.

e. Transportation

(1) Transportation is generally poor. To commute to MCSC Albany one would need a car since public transportation to and from MCSC Albany is not available.

f. Police Force

(1) There is a 153 man police force, all of which have had some college courses or are attending college or have degrees. This is coincidental since a college degree is not required as a prerequisite for joining the force. There are also four women on the force, two are white and two are black.

(2) There are a total of 31 black officers on the force.

g. City Government

(1) The Mayor of Albany is a catholic. There are no women in the city government. There are no blacks in elective offices in the city government nor do blacks serve as department heads in any of the various departments. There are some blacks in various appointed positions.

h. Housing

(1) The housing referral office at MCSC Albany has a list of all realtors and rental agencies, efficiencies, apartments and mobile home parks, churches, organizations and associations which are suppose to be open to all military and DOD personnel, regardless of race, creed and color. This listing is available in the Relocation Office.

(2) What is the availability of housing either new or old in the following price range?

(a) $10,000 - $15,000

Answer - Virtually none.

(b) $15,000 - $20,000
Answer - Limited amount.

(c) $20,000 - $25,000
Answer - Adequate.

(d) $25,000 - $30,000
Answer - Adequate.

(e) $30,000 - Up
Answer - Constant construction going on.

(3) Is the housing in question (2) above available both within Albany as well as outside of Albany within a 20 mile radius of the City or the Marine Corps Supply Center?

Answer - For 1b, c, d and e - primarily outside of Albany - 2-10 miles outside of downtown Albany.

(4) Is the housing available within the price ranges above integrated or segregated?

Answer: * #

(a) Basically, you can find integrated housing in areas up to $30,000, as well as segregated housing in those same price ranges.

(b) Albany does not have an "Open Housing" law or ordinance, however, according to both black and white realtors anyone can buy into any area you desire.

(c) * In talking to the private sector, there are still those areas which are restricted and various techniques are used to keep blacks out. However, these are primarily the exclusive areas. ($40,000 and up).

(5) What type of financing is available to purchase houses in the above price ranges?

(a) FHA.

(b) VA.

(c) Conventional Loans.

Answer:

1 The type of financing varies according to the area and type of home being purchased.

2 There is some FHA/VA mortgages available at the prevailing rate of 7 1/2 and 7% respectively.

3 For most new construction the prevailing interest rate is as follows:

a 95% mortgage = 8 1/4% interest rate.

b 90% mortgage = 8% interest rate.

c 80% mortgage = 8% interest rate.

4 Current assessment is 40% of market value. Market value is determined by taking the sale price minus a $2000 Georgia Homesteader's deduction and 40% of the remaining balance.

5 Taxes are equal to .033 mills of the assessed value.

6 What housing is available on a rental basis either for apartments or homes and what is the average rental costs?

Answer:

a There are virtually no homes available for rental according to two brokers visited.

b Apartments are constantly being built and range from $135.00 up, for many there is a waiting list. However, most brokers indicated there would be building for several years. (NOTE: Some pamphlets are available in the relocation office for review).

i. Freedom of Movement

(1) Are there any restrictions relative to the general movement of blacks? Are they free to come and go wherever they please, whenever they please?

Answer: * - According to the private sector and as experienced by some of the members of the team, there seems to be no general problem in this area.

j. Dougherty County

All of the above comments/findings only relate to the Albany area and within Dougherty County since the team did not visit beyond these bounds, conditions outside of Dougherty County still prevail to a great extent as they did many years ago.

k. Taxes

There's a Georgia State income state tax, based on your net salary on a sliding percentage basis (See Relocation Office for additional data).

23-751 O - 73 - 27

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN TOWER, U.S. SENATOR FROM TEXAS

Senator SCHWEIKER. I would also like to include at this point in the record a letter and a statement from Senator Tower concerning the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory that was established at Brooks Air Force Base in San Antonio, Tex.

[The letter and statement follow:]

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

October 24, 1973

The Honorable Mike Mansfield, Chairman
Subcommittee on Military Construction
of the Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mike:

Last year, the Air Force submitted a request for $3.057 million in the Fiscal Year 1973 Military Construction Program for construction of the Human Resources Research Facility, Brooks Air Force Base, Texas. Although the Senate approved the authorization and appropriations requests for the Facility, funding for it was deleted in Conference. In view of the support this project received from the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate last year, therefore, I am surprised and deeply concerned that there is no request for funds for the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory in the FY 74 Military Construction Appropriations program.

The Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFHRL) was originally established at Brooks AFB, Texas, in 1968. This particular project which the Congress authorized last year, as you know, is designed to house scientific, technical, and the support personnel who together comprise the professional staff of that Human Resources Laboratory. Since its mission is to ensure the maximum and effective use of the Air Force's military manpower resources, the AFHRL is engaged in ongoing programs that are designed to improve all elements of the total Air Force personnel system.

In the absence of a military draft environment, the mission of the AFHRL is to maintain and constantly improve the performance of the active duty member. As a result of a zero draft, moreover, that mission is more challenging and critical today than ever before. Consequently, if the Congress expects the Air

Force to recruit and retain qualified and dedicated officers and enlisted men and women, the Congress must provide the Air Force with the means of achieving this objective. In short, the Air Force must be able to compete for the commitments and the services of intelligent and able individuals. I respectfully request the Committee, therefore, to restore funds in the FY 1974 Military Construction Appropriations bill for construction of this $3.057 million facility.

In view of my personal interest in this project, I am also submitting the enclosed state for the Committee's consideration.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

John

John Tower

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN TOWER

In the Military Construction Program for Fiscal Year 1973, the Air Force requested authorization for construction of a new Human Resources Research Facility. Although the Congress approved the authorization request of $3,057,000 million, the funds provided by the Appropriations Committee, and subsequently approved by the Senate, were deleted from the FY 1973 Military Construction Appropriations bill in Conference. In view of the continuing Air Force requirement for this project, the following information is respectfully submitted for the Committee's consideration.

Under the conceptual guidance that was provided in the 1967 Report of the USAF Scientific Advisory Board, the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFHRL) was established at Brooks AFB, San Antonio, Texas. This Air Force report clearly

stressed the importance of having Human Resources Research and Development activities collocated with the users of its specialized products. In San Antonio, the Military Personnel Center, the Air Training Command Headquarters, and the USAF Recruiting Service--each having a very significant requirement for R&D results--already were located at Randolph AFB, Texas. In carrying out the recommendations of the 1967 Report, therefore, the AFHRL was also located in San Antonio.

The mission of the AFHRL, and its scientific, technical, and support personnel, includes research involving the selection, classification, evaluation, training, assignment, motivation, promotion, and retention of active duty Air Force personnel. At a time when the All-Volunteer Force is being called upon to meet our country's national security needs, it is the responsibility of the AFHRL Research and Development Program to achieve new breakthroughs in manpower development, personnel training, and career management.

The AFHRL R&D Program's objectives require that the results of its efforts be valid, timely, useable, and economical. In striving to meet these objectives, it has been necessary to continually refine the research process. In doing so, this has enabled research to take into account such factors as changes in policies, the quantity and quality of existing manpower resources, and unforeseen contingencies. To be effective, therefore, the research effort must keep pace with changes as they occur, and that is a continuing and dynamic process.

The construction of the Air Force Human Resources Research Facility at Brooks AFB will provide a total of 73,640 square feet of space. It is designed to house more than two hundred staff and support personnel, high capacity computers, and other related equipment. The design for the Facility has been totally completed, and the Air Force will construct it if the funds are added to the FY 1974 Military Construction Appropriations bill.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Senator SCHWEIKER. I will include in the record at this point a series of questions asked by Senator Tower, with replies by General Reilly, concerning the Human Resource Laboratory.

[The questions and answers follows:]

Q. Mr. Chairman, I would like to develop a matter for the record concerning a Human Resource Laboratory for Brooks AFB. As you know this project was previously submitted by the Air Force in the fiscal year 1973 MCP. In response, the Congress authorized the project, the Senate appropriated it but it failed to pass the House and the subsequent Appropriations Conference. In view of the earlier Air Force request and the support provided by this committee and the Congress, I am surprised and concerned that the FY 1974 program does not contain a request for appropriations for the Human Resources Laboratory. Gen. Reilly does the requirement for this project still exist?

A. Yes, Mr. Tower, it does. It is of paramount importance that the Air Force develop a stronger R. & D. laboratory posture to cope with the modern problems of the Air Force system. Significant break-throughs have been achieved by the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, (AFHRL) which have already resulted in millions of dollars savings and will continue to pay off. Additional improvements can be accomplished by developing better procedures for personnel recruitment, training, classification, assignments, utilization, evaluation, motivation, promotion and retention of Air Force personnel. The need for improved personnel procedures is magnified in view of the objective to achieve an "all-volunteer force." A key to achieving a stronger Air Force posture is the research to be done in a modern AFHRL laboratory and to do this a 73,640 SF facility at a cost of $3,057,000 is required at Brooks AFB.

Q. Gen. Reilly can you advise me why then this project is not included in this years programs?

A. At the time the FY 1974 MCP was in its final stage of development, a location other than Brooks was being considered and as a result the project was not included in the FY 74 MCP. We subsequently determined that Brooks continues to be the most feasible location and then requested OSD to submit the project to Congress for inclusion in the Air Force 1974 Military Construction Appropriation Request. OSD determined not to submit the project to Congress for the FY 1974 MCP.

Q. What are your plans concerning this project now?

A. We are proposing to include the project in the FY 1975 MCP. This however, would delay the availability of it, and also increase its costs.

Q. What is the status of design for this project?

A. The project is 100% designed.

Q. General Reilly, if Congress should deem it appropriate to add funds for this project to the FY 74 Military Construction Appropriation Bill, would the Air Force build the facility?

A. Yes.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator SCHWEIKER. All right. There being no further business, the subcommittee will recess, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 11:14 a.m., Tuesday, October 30, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1973

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., in room S–126, the Capitol, Hon. Henry Bellmon presiding.

Present: Senators Bellmon and Mansfield.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. K. B. COOPER, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR LOGISTICS.

ACCOMPANIED BY:

MAJ. GEN. K. A. KJELLSTROM, DIRECTOR OF ARMY BUDGET
ALAN M. CARTON, CHIEF, PROGRAM, PLANNING, AND CIVIL PREPAREDNESS BRANCH, DIRECTORATE OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUBCOMMITTEE PROCEDURE

Senator BELLMON. In the absence of Senator Mansfield, I will call the subcommittee hearings to order.

Today will finish the hearings of the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the subcommittee will be covering only those construction items not covered in the joint hearings before the Subcommittees on Military Construction of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, which were held on August 6, 1973. The statements that the armed services have can be inserted in the record and summarized.

The joint conference on the military construction authorization bill has not resolved the differences in the military construction authorization bill and the House Military Construction Appropriations Committee has not released a bill of this date.

However, we intend to finish our hearings today and any reclama statements that the services or the Department of Defense may have can be inserted in the record at a later date.

The record will be kept open until the reclama statements are received.

The first witness will be General Cooper from the Army.

Welcome to the committee and if you have a statement, we will be glad to hear it.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. KENNETH B. COOPER

General COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I am Maj. Gen. Kenneth B. Cooper, Director of Installations, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, U.S. Army. It is a privilege to appear before this com-

mittee and present the Department of the Army's portion of the military construction appropriation request.

BUDGET REQUEST

The President's budget for fiscal year 1974 military construction, Army, is $706,900,000 total obligational authority, TOA, and $664,900,000 new obligational authority, NOA.

Adjustments to these totals are still in a state of flux. Congressional action, as you mentioned in your opening statement, sir; in the Armed Services Committee is not yet completed but has resulted in a net reduction of slightly less than $30 million. There are also nearly $73 million in projects still subject to joint authorization conference action. Additionally, the House Appropriations Committee has not completed its markup so we are unaware of the impact on our request.

Included in our request is $54 million for minor construction, planning and design which are authorized under continuing legislation; $14,075,000 for three projects authorized in a prior year but not funded; and, $4,735,000 to permit successful accomplishment of six projects previously approved. These items were not covered in the joint hearings.

A $2,500,000 increase in the minor construction request and three of the six deficiency items mentioned were not included in our original request but have been recognized or are being considered by other congressional committees. I can discuss these in detail later as added items.

BUDGET AMENDMENT

The amendment to the budget submitted by the President on September 21, 1973, unfortunately arrived at Congress too late to be considered by the authorization committees. Within that amendment, we requested an additional $25,300,000 total obligational authority and $4,300,000 NOA for NATO infrastructure.

These increases were necessitated by recent dollar devaluations. Our NATO obligations must be met so, in absence of approval of the amendment, we must find other means of coping with the increased requirement.

I might add, sir, in this late arrival there was a separate request that the Army had as part of the family housing program, which is a Department of Defense appropriation. We requested $31.1 million for operations and maintenance. This $31.1 million is a large portion of our total family housing operation and maintenance funding requirement. We hope there is some way of appropriating that money even though normally it would be authorized as part of the family housing program. Operations and maintenance funds for family housing are requested only in the family housing budget and not in any other program.

I believe we are going to have a separate Defense family housing discussion today, but I did want to mention this particular problem to you and your committee because it will cause us a great deal of difficulty. We will spread the shortage throughout the world, but the net effect is a 10-percent reduction in funds that we will have to operate and maintain family housing.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

As the core of this year's program, we are continuing to emphasize facilities which benefit the soldier: Where he lives, where he plays, and where we treat him when he is sick.

Over 84 percent of our original request for construction excluding NATO infrastructure and general authorization, is in these categories.

TROOP HOUSING

The fiscal year 1974 bachelor housing program is approximately 68 percent of our total budget request. That housing is primarily barracks. This is one of the peak years in our housing program of the seventies.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

This year marks the first increment of our accelerated medical facilities improvement program. Medical facilities constitute 8 percent of the total budget request. We also have a significant design effort underway which will surface as medical projects in a later program.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

An important segment of our program is the continuation of our efforts in pollution abatement. Facilities requested make up approximately 2 percent of our total budget which is lower than in recent years. And you may remember, Mr. Chairman, we had to program everything in accordance with an Executive order by December 1972. The reason the program went down is those earlier programs satisfied the major requirements as best we could determine.

This year's program responds primarily to requirements generated by increasingly more stringent standards and accomplishes projects deferred from earlier programs for technological reasons. In some cases we didn't know how to design something to comply with the standards, so the delay.

We anticipate that we will need some sizable dollar amounts for pollution abatement projects in future MCA programs as the requirements from the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 become known, and as people define what they mean by zero pollutant discharge, and the best available and best practical means of accomplishing that.

OVERSEAS CONSTRUCTION

The construction planned for outside of the United States, excluding NATO, constitutes approximately 5 percent of our program. This request provides for only a limited number of operational facilities and a few projects in support of troop welfare, all at locations where we expect to stay in our long-range planning.

A major item in our overseas request is the $60 million for NATO infrastructure. As in fiscal year 1973, we are requesting no funds for construction in the Republic of Vietnam.

SUMMARY

In summary, we have designed the fiscal year 1974 MCA program to enhance the welfare of the soldier by improving our bachelor housing, primary medical care facilities, and community facilities. In addition, we are continuing our efforts to control environmental pollution and to improve the Army's operational capability.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my presentation of the Army's fiscal year 1974 military construction appropriation request. The detailed project justifications have been furnished previously to the committee.

Additionally, we have prepared a separate book, a small book I have here, dealing specifically with previously authorized projects, general authorization requirements, and those projects added by Congress.

Those items for which new authorization was requested were considered in the joint hearing held by this committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I will be pleased to answer any questions the committee may have or to see that the answers are provided.

PROGRAM JUSTIFICATION—NATO INFRASTRUCTURE

Senator BELLMON. General, I have a couple of questions I would like to have you answer.

I noticed that you refer in two places to NATO infrastructure. I am sure that term has a meaning to you, but can you be a little more precise, what are you talking about?

General COOPER. The NATO infrastructure was started when NATO was started and we are now up to what we call Slice XXV.

This is a joint effort of the NATO countries to build facilities for common use, primarily operational support facilities. In order to qualify for NATO infrastructure funding, a project has to be something used normally by more than one country and satisfy certain criteria. Am I giving you too much detail?

Senator BELLMON. I understand we will take it up later.

General COOPER. That is right. But just to answer a part of the other question, the United States originally put in a greater percentage than we do now. We put it now slightly less than 30 percent of the total. That gives you an idea. It will be used for airfields, for example, used by more than one country. But the warehouses or other facilities supporting only U.S. troops are normally supported by the United States in the regular military construction programs.

FAMILY HOUSING

Senator BELLMON. Also you made reference in your statement to the need for family housing and the authorization has not been made by Congress.

General COOPER. As for family housing there is kind of a quirk in that the operations and maintenance funds are authorized and separately appropriated as part of the family housing request rather than as part of the much larger Army operations and maintenance budget. That means we don't have any flexibility in moving funds around within that account to meet unexpected requirements.

The devaluation occurred some time ago, although the budget amendment was just sent to Congress on September 21, 1973, by the President. We were not able to present our amendment to the authorization committees until after the Armed Services Committees had already completed their hearings. That has put us in a bind for both the family housing operations and maintenance increased requirements which occur mostly in Germany—$29 million of the $31.1 million is needed in Germany—and also for the NATO infrastructure.

That is not a fault of Congress but it is a fault of us in not submitting it somewhat earlier. We are trying to work with the House Appropriations Committee to see if some provision can be made to take care of this support for family housing so that the troops don't suffer.

These are the people that will suffer if we don't get the funds for the people living in the family housing.

In Germany we are in poorer shape in terms of housing troops or housing families than we are any place else.

It is strictly a question of being short of funds because of the dollar devaluation.

General KJELLSTROM. This is current operating expenses as opposed to long-range construction expenses. The $31 million represents more than 10 percent of our total program of $286 million which is before the Congress.

That is the impact of currency revaluation primarily in Germany.

General COOPER. It is to pay for heating, electricity, and normal maintenance. The reason these funds are peculiar is that they are specifically authorized for family housing which is not the case for other operations and maintenance funds.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Senator BELLMON. I notice you refer to a sharp reduction in funding for pollution abatement then you explain that you are not quite sure of what the interpretation of the act is going to require. Is it likely you will be back to Congress for an increase in this control?

General COOPER. That is correct.

General KJELLSTROM. In a subsequent year's budget.

General COOPER. By Executive Order 11507, we are required to fund or ask for funds for all known pollution control projects and that had to be done by December 31, 1972. We tried to comply but subsequent to that Executive order new requirements have developed.

Senator BELLMON. What this means is that the fairly high-level pollution abatement control funding which you had in the past has now gone down sharply but it is going to rise?

General COOPER. That is right.

Senator BELLMON. Let's get to some specifics.

WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

On page 1 of the booklet you have given us, justification data, you have an item for a parking facility. It is $10,800,000 and could you give us something on that?

General COOPER. This was authorized as part of the overall Walter Reed Hospital project. We didn't need the funds right away so the

funds for this portion of the project were not appropriated in fiscal year 1972 with the main hospital.

Now, we have reached the point where we need to let the contract for this parking garage. The parking out there is very restricted and this will be underground parking. Land is somewhat limited, taken up primarily by the hospital. That is the reason they are putting parking underground. This project we are discussing today is really a request for funds as part of the overall project which was previously authorized.

BAYONNE MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL

Senator BELLMON. On page 3, there is an item of $3,200,000 for administrative facilities in New Jersey, and can you explain this terminal item?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. We have people in what we call our Eastern Area MTMTS, Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service, in very, very poor facilities in Brooklyn. For many years we have been trying to get out of those conditions and over to Bayonne.

The buildings are falling down although we had fixed them so they wouldn't injure anybody.

This project was previously authorized in fiscal 1973, but now we need the funds. Funds were not appropriated primarily because some Congressmen objected to it. They objected to the fact we are going to move the people from Brooklyn to Bayonne. Although we think the need for the Brooklyn terminal no longer exists, they objected to the transfer. But we need to move those people out of that Brooklyn Army Terminal and if we can't get the funds to move them to Bayonne, we will have to lease some other space because it is a very, very poor facility at Brooklyn.

I don't know if Mr. Rexroad has been there or not. We no longer need the main terminal. A portion of it is used by the U.S. Post Office and there are plans within New York to develop this area.

We have this big area we don't need. We are trying to move the administrative facilities over to Bayonne where we already operate our own terminal for general cargo on the east coast.

We also have an ammunition terminal at Sunny Point, N.C.

Senator BELLMON. Do congressional objections still exist or have they been cleared up?

General KJELLSTROM. They have subsided and are becoming more low key. I think we have most of the objections taken care of, most of them are being overcome.

General COOPER. When we testified before the last House Appropriations Committee hearings they didn't raise any particular questions this year.

FORT BENNING, GEORGIA

Senator BELLMON. On page 8, military construction at Fort Benning, Ga., extension of the Lindsay Street Parkway.

Can you give us a little feeling of what it is all about?

General COOPER. This is a deficiency authorization for $528,000 to take care of a condition that occurred during construction of the project. Most of it is built except in one place where we had an earth slide, a bad slide that maybe should have been predicted. They cut back the banks at what now has proven to be too steep of a slope. Later on there

was failure of the banks which collapsed over the roadway. We don't have the funds to take care of that portion where we had this bad slide.

This is a specific deficiency appropriation request so we can complete the project. Right now we have the road finished on both sides of the slide area but there is a stretch in there you can go over only in a jeep so it has not really been opened. The rest of the parkway is not really usable unless we accomplish this portion.

Senator BELLMON. Is this construction being handled by a civilian contractor?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. Essentially all of our construction is handled by civilian contractors.

Senator BELLMON. The contractor is not responsible for the slide?

General COOPER. Not in this case. We always investigate and if it is something the contractor does wrong, we make them pay for it. They have to post a performance bond. But in this case it is not the contractor's fault.

Senator BELLMON. There was a performance bond?

General COOPER. Yes, on the overall project, but that is exercised only if he fails to do what his contract calls for.

Senator BELLMON. Was the fault in the design?

General COOPER. I think the fault was either in the design or in not anticipating—they may not have done enough core samplings along the side of the hill. It is not unusual in Georgia to have something like this happen.

Senator BELLMON. I used to be in the construction business in a small way and when one of my projects fell apart, I had to pick up the tab.

General COOPER. That is right, but if it is not included in the design specifications the responsibility is ours. For example, in dredging, if we told the contractor he would be dredging mud and then if he runs into rock, he has a reasonable basis to come back and ask that we give him the money to make up the difference. This is a comparable case where, at least in the design, we did not predict the contractor would have to cut back as far so it wouldn't slide.

It is just a matter of slope. Our design of the slope was too steep and in this particular area the condition existed so that we did get this slide.

Senator BELLMON. You feel it will take a half million dollars to make a correction, is that right?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. The contract has roughly 550,000 cubic yards of dirt?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. Do you expect to pay a dollar a yard to have the dirt removed?

Mr. CARTON. I think it is more than just the dirt actually. We anticipate the actual cost to be about 80 cents a yard for excavation, sir, but additional work would have to be done to make the whole road usable so we have a deficiency of $528,000.

Senator BELLMON. Then what about the rest of it?

Mr. CARTON. That is included in the rest of it. We had sufficient funds to build a road until we hit the clay-shale formation. We had asked the contractor to lay the road back on a one-to-three slope however the

ground will not stand on a one-to-three slope but has to be laid back on a one-to-ten slope.

Senator BELLMON. Do you let another contract to use this dirt or negotiate with the contractor?

Mr. CARTON. In this particular case, because of the delay in time in getting the funds for additional work, we may have to let a separate contract to finish the job so the original contractor can be released and paid off, otherwise we could run into costs for lengthy extension.

I don't think it has been determined. It will depend on when we can get the funds.

It could be done in a separate contract relatively easily. We know what we have to do in a new job.

Senator BELLMON. It seems you will be in trouble if you don't have competitive bids again.

General COOPER. For a change after completion of the rest of the road, we would normally try for new competitive bids. However, I have not spoken to the contracting officer lately. I know one original plan was to complete the old contract and have new competitive bids.

ENGINEERING COORDINATION

Senator BELLMON. From experience, let me ask you a question. Will you be able to avoid "mistakes" in the future?

General COOPER. We should have known enough not to do it in this case, but there will arise certain conditions in some places so that things like this may occur again.

You can't do a complete exploration of all of the cuts and fills ahead of time. It would cost too much in the design work, so it is hard to say that we will never be back for another deficiency of this kind.

I think in this case we certainly will have learned something in the area, particularly if we extend this project. We will spend more design money to be sure this case does not exist. Even if we had not made the mistake in the original estimate, we would have had to add the price for this work. We would have had a much higher original cost because we would have planned to excavate that much more dirt.

Senator BELLMON. Has there ever been any thought given to utilizing local highway departments in assisting in military highway construction in this country? If you have a highway project, do you go out on your own or do you work with the local highway people?

I would imagine the Georgia Highway Department would have known you would encounter some such problems because they had dealings with this over the years and I am saying this because as a Governor I am sure we had in my own State competent highway people.

"GEORGIA STATE ONE"

General COOPER. In cases like this, I am sure we consulted with them, but I don't know in fact. I can find out to what extent we consulted with the State of Georgia. This road is called Georgia State One, so it is inconceivable that we would have built it without coordinating to some degree with the Georgia State highway people before we let the contract. But whether we discussed this particular design, I don't know.

[The information follows:]

LINDSAY CREEK PARKWAY—FORT BENNING, GEORGIA

The Savannah Engineer District coordinates closely with the Georgia Highway Department, especially in connection with civil works projects. The District did not consult with the Georgia Highway Department specifically on the Lindsay Creek Parkway project because the District was quite familiar with the situation and had a great deal of experience and expertise on construction at Fort Benning. It was recognized that the terrain and soil conditions were not particularly well suited for construction of a 4-lane divided highway; however, as a by-pass highway, the roadway had to be located in the general area selected. Because of the adverse soil conditions, the District made a number of design changes, such as changing the slope and moving the road alignment laterally by approximately 100 yards, to minimize the risk of an earth slide. Despite these precautions, the upper slope of the cut did not stabilize, as expected, and a slide occurred. This soil problem is not uncommon in this area. The Highway Department has also experienced similar slides in building its roads.

CONSTRUCTION COORDINATION

Senator BELLMON. Is that part of the Georgia State highway system?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. When a road goes through a reservation it is built by the military, not by the local highway or State highway department even when it is part of the State highway system?

General COOPER. That is correct, once it is on the post. Although when it is part of an overall project we would have an arrangement with the public authorities. But this extension to Lindsay Creek Parkway is all on the post and that is the reason we built it.

We do not build State highways but we give the funds to the highway people and let them build it. This is an unusual situation in terms of construction.

FORT RICHARDSON, ALASKA

Senator BELLMON. On page 9 you have a request for another deficiency authorization at Fort Richardson in Alaska for an amount of $300,000.

Could you give us a little further explanation?

General COOPER. Yes. Basically, what happened is we entered into a fixed-price arrangement with the State or really with the Greater Anchorage Area Borough that we would pay a portion and they would pay a portion. What happened was later their total costs went up.

In theory we could have said, "Sorry, we agreed on a fixed-price basis and you are going to have to take the rest out of your hide."

We think it would be unfair to the State because it was not malfeasance on their part, but a question of a cost increase greater than anticipated. This amount requested is our fair share of the increase.

Senator BELLMON. $300,000, does it go to the contractor who already has the contract for the work?

General COOPER. The $300,000 goes to the Greater Anchorage Borough and I am not sure what portion of that actually goes to the contractor.

Senator BELLMON. Do you know if there will be another competitive contract let? I am thinking of a C5A situation where a company has a contract and we wind up giving more money for a job he is already contracted to do.

Mr. CARTON. Sir, this job is complete and the Borough of Anchorage has, from its own funds, advanced the money to pay for the work.

Senator BELLMON. This will go into the treasury of the city of Anchorage?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. We are paying them back. We don't have to do it legally but morally we think it would be an unfair arrangement otherwise.

Senator BELLMON. Do you happen to know why the increase in cost occurred?

General COOPER. I don't know the details. I think it was primarily an increase because of inflation in costs.

SEWAGE PROJECT DEFICIENCY

Senator BELLMON. Could you furnish us with more particulars as to why the increase in cost occurred?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

SEWAGE PROJECT DEFICIENCY—FORT RICHARDSON, ALASKA

A delay of about 2 years (from fall of 1967 to fall of 1969) was experienced by the Greater Anchorage Area Borough (GAAB) because of law suits by citizens groups in opposition to the General Obligation Bond Issue proposed for funding of the sewage system.

The government did not obligate the money ($1,020,927) until September of 1969. Construction was started in 1970 and finished the end of 1972 (about 3 years). Increases in construction costs and spiraling bond interest rates resulted in increases in funds requested by GAAB.

BACHELOR HOUSING CRITERIA—PROPOSED CHANGE

Senator BELLMON. General, I would like to ask you a few questions.

The House military construction authorization bill contains a new criteria for barracks which have an impact on design costs on these barracks. What problems do you foresee or does the Army foresee if this criteria is sustained in conference?

General COOPER. A very grave problem. A change in criteria will cost us about $7.2 million more to build barracks that are of lesser standards. This primarily is because we have to go through a complete redesign of the program, redesign of the barracks. Also we are already building barracks in the Army program authorized and funded in 1973 of the same type we asked for in 1974. You realize that when we think a program project is firm, we start the design so when the funds are authorized and appropriated we can start construction.

The House-proposed change will delay getting the barracks by 8 months and it would cost us more money.

Really, if we complied with the program we would have to come back and ask you for a deficiency authorization and appropriation of $7.2 million to build a lesser quality barracks.

That is the reason it does not make much sense to us without being disrespectful to the Armed Services Committee.

Senator BELLMON. Lesser quality in terms of what?

General Cooper. In terms you would have four men to a room as opposed to three men to a room for the lower ranks from E–1 through E–4. Based on experience we already have in talking with the troops the thing that is most important in their minds is privacy.

There is some limit you have to reach and three men per room is what the basic criteria of the Department of Defense has specified.

Also a very important consideration is it would be kind of a backward step in the terms of the All-Volunteer Army because we told the soldiers, "We are going to build you new barracks. They are not there yet but this is the type of barracks we are building." Suddenly Congress turns around and says, "We made a mistake last year telling you to build three men to a room, you are going to go back and build four men to a room." The vast majority of the barracks in the program are for the lower ranking enlisted men.

ADDITIONAL COSTS

Senator Bellmon. Does the Congress think it would save you money to go from four to three?

General Cooper. Yes, sir, and it would save a small amount of money if we started from the beginning. If we had started designing with four men to a room it is hard to say the world would come to an end if we had four men to a room as opposed to three.

I think it was part of a reaction on the part of people on the subcommittee. It was a different subcommittee in the House Armed Services Committee that heard the bill this year than last year. We had not been through the details with them and I think there was a feeling we were spending too much money to get the All-Volunteer Army although the barracks criteria applied to all of the services. The impact on the Navy is about $3 million in the 1974 program.

So, it is hard to say why the House proposed the change. We think it is wrong, as I mentioned, because it would cost more money, it would delay our getting the barracks and would be a step backward in terms of what we are providing to the young soldier.

This is important to the young soldier. Leadership is more important, but having good barracks is very important. All of the services agree on that.

Senator Bellmon. And the savings, the benefits, financial benefits, if any, you feel are not significant?

General Cooper. Well, in the 1974 program they are definitely not. Definitely the cost would outstrip any savings and we have to redesign. We would have to throw away the current design.

Senator Bellmon. If it is done it should be after you finish the project for which the designs have been completed.

General Cooper. That is correct, that makes more sense. In the 1975 program we would still argue we want the same basic design, though, because of our feelings about privacy and the flexibility of the present design.

BACHELOR ENLISTED HOUSING CRITERIA CHANGE

Senator Bellmon. Are you prepared to make reasonable estimates as to what the savings, if any, would be in going from a three- to a four-man room?

General COOPER. Yes, sir, we made some specific estimates and since the criteria still provide the lower ranks 90 square feet per man we save what would be about a third of a bathroom.

Senator BELLMON. I don't mean to go into the specifics, but can you give them to us?

General COOPER. Yes, we can give them to the committee. The savings are minor. The way we computed the $7.2 million additional cost is to analyze each barrack and indicate how long it would be delayed and where it was to be built. I have the numbers here specifically but it only saves a third of a bathroom plus the partitions. It is very small saving, around 5 percent.

Senator BELLMON. Including the bathrooms?

General COOPER. Including the bathroom; yes.

Senator BELLMON. General, I was not expecting you to have it at the tip of the tongue but if you gave the facts to the House, I am sure we can get them.

General COOPER. We can add them to the record.

Senator BELLMON. Yes; add them because we may need them if we get into a discussion with the Members about it.

[The information follows:]

IMPACT OF PROPOSED BACHELOR ENLISTED HOUSING CRITERIA CHANGE

Summary of Increased cost to the Army FY 1974 Program

Additional Design Costs	$2,188,000
Escalation Costs	7,918,000
Subtotal of Costs	10,106,000
Less Savings in Construction Costs	- 2,913,000
NET COST INCREASE	$7,193,000

Space criteria for bachelor enlisted quarters (BEQ) are as follows:

a. Present criteria for FY 73 and FY 74:

Grade	Men/Rm.	SF/Man	SF/Rm.	Bath/Rm.
E2-E4	3	90	270	1
E5-E6	2	135	270	1
E7-E9	1	270	270	1

b. Changed criteria for FY 74 by HASC would provide:

Grade	Men/Rm.	SF/Man	SF/Rm.	Bath/Rm.
E2-E4	4*	90	360*	1
E5-E7*	2	135	270	1
E8-E9	1	270	270	1

*Changes

The changes first appear to be minor. However, they would have a major impact on the FY 74 Army BEQ program.

a. New designs would be required for all new barracks. Previously prepared standard designs for the larger (over 300 men) complexes would be obsolete. The additional time required to prepare new designs and the resulting cost growth of each project would cost the Government far more than the savings resulting from the reduction in the number of rooms and the decrease in space allowance for E7's. Approximately eight months will be required to redesign the projects at an increased cost to the program of $7.2 million.

b. Designs based on the HASC criteria would not have the flexibility for troop assignment that is inherent in the present Army design. The Army design is based on one room (270 SF) with bath which will accommodate all grades from E2 through E9. The HASC criteria provide one large room for E2-E4 and a smaller room for E5-E9. Thus, if a transfer of troop units occurs at a post, the grade strengths of the new units may not readily be accommodated in the fixed barracks configuration. Over crowding may result in some instances, underutilization of space in others.

c. Army policy is to quarter intermediate grade NCO's (E5-E6) with the lower grades in the same unit to maintain discipline and control. It would be difficult - if not impossible - to configure a barracks (based on HASC criteria) which would suit the many sizes and strengths of the various Army organizational units.

d. The HASC recommended grouping of grades is incompatible with traditional Service grade breakouts. The E7's are among the higher "field grades" of the enlisted ranks. Attainment of the rank of E7 represents many years service and high job responsibility. The HASC proposal to group E7's with E5's and E6's is a serious degradation of the recognition due E7's.

e. The present Army design is readily adapted to repetitive systems construction techniques. The basic 72-man module can be built in any combination of clusters and groups to form complexes ranging in size from 300 men to 3,300 men. This modular, systems approach is favorably considered by construction contractors in bidding on projects. The HASC criteria do not lend themselves to this approach, but rather require special designs for individual buildings to accommodate the different grade strengths.

f. Over $138 million worth of FY 72 and FY 73 projects, using current criteria, are under construction. Further, an unfortunate impact will

occur at those posts where the FY 74 projects are follow-on, complex completions of FY 73 projects now under construction. Thus, a completed complex will have half of the buildings of one design, and the other half of a different design. The difference in accommodations will be very apparent to the troops quartered in one complex. A similar situation will prevail at several posts if follow-on projects presently proposed for FY 75 program are approved.

g. Necessary redesigns of FY 74 BEQ projects will delay beneficial occupancy of 24,553 programed new barracks spaces by as much as eight months. This will create a serious setback in the Army's effort to provide adequate enlisted housing in an orderly, timely manner.

h. Finally, this reversion to more austere standards will have a most unfavorable effect on the enlisted man or woman. The Army's FY 73 design, which was presented to and strongly endorsed by the Congress, was given the widest possible publicity in the public news media, and the increased amenities for BEQs have been stressed in Army recruitment and retention programs. This regression in standards cannot but generate doubts as to the Government's intentions for the Volunteer Army.

STATUS OF FUNDS—UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

Senator BELLMON. Let's go to another question. What was the unobligated balance in the military construction carried over from fiscal 1973 to 1974?

General COOPER. $529.9 million. I don't know if I have that correctly at the tip of my tongue but Mr. Carton has those figures. It is down from the fiscal year 1972 to 1973 carryover which was $673.9 million.

Senator BELLMON. Normally you carry over an unobligated balance?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. For what reason?

General COOPER. It is late when we get the appropriations. We can overcome some of that by our design schedule, as we do. We also try to let the construction contract as soon as the project is authorized and funded but it squeezes everything into a 6 months period.

There are also various other reasons we don't obligate funds, such as for pollution abatement projects. We have $88 million that has been authorized and funded for pollution control projects that we don't know how to build yet. But it is usually due to the fact that our timescale gets compressed because we don't get the appropriation and authorization at the beginning of the fiscal year.

We normally consider we do pretty well to obligate 60 percent of the moneys in that same fiscal year. But there are several different reasons. I gave you the major ones.

We can do something about this and can probably do even better and we will.

Senator BELLMON. I don't want to press you. I don't want to give you the impression I feel or the Congress feels the military should use undue haste in getting the money expended, but I think this way it is more expeditious.

General COOPER. If we think a project at a particular post, that 6 months from now might be recommended to be closed or cut down, is not needed, we would put a hold on that project and not proceed with design or construction.

Senator BELLMON. That is why I asked the question about the fairly large facilities expenditures in NATO. None of us know what will happen from the talks, but if it turns out we do return back some of our troops I hope you consider whether or not it shows a need for future facilities and the impact on same.

General COOPER. Yes, sir, we do.

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

Senator BELLMON. Was there a carryover in the minor construction account from fiscal 1973 and how much is being requested this year for minor construction?

Mr. CARTON. The carryover was $4.1 million from fiscal 1973 into fiscal 1974. The carryover for the prior year was $4.7 million so we have somewhat reduced the carryover.

General COOPER. What we are requesting this year is $15 million. That is a change in our recent submission. We answered the first part of the question and I think the second part is changed.

Senator BELLMON. For my enlightenment, and I am sure there are more experienced people in this, but could you define the term "minor construction"?

General Cooper. Minor construction concerns those projects not over $300,000 that come up on such a time schedule that you can't fit it into the normal military construction program.

We refer to them as urgent minor projects. They are limited by the dollar cost of $300,000 and they are limited by the fact you don't have time to go through the normal programing process.

Senator Bellmon. Could you describe briefly what kind of project?

General Cooper. For example, as part of a reorganization where we might close down a post, we would move some portion of the functions over to another post but might have to build some facilities, or fix up some buildings that are not being used.

We usually put in a minor project for that if time and the requirements are critical, for example to rehabilitate some of the barracks. In some cases we might have to improve World War II barracks although we prefer not to use temporary structures. We can give you a complete list of minor construction projects.

General Kjellstrom wrote a note "storm damage." Say if you have a washout in some places and it does not come under operations and maintenance funding, you can use minor construction. All of these projects over $50,000 are approved by the Office of the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of Defense. We don't approve them at the local level except for the smaller projects.

Senator Bellmon. The cave-in in the road in Georgia was too large to be handled like this?

General Cooper. Yes, sir, that was $500,000. We would not hook a minor construction project onto a project that has been specifically authorized. We are not allowed to supplement any funded projects.

You can't come in, say you have a project of $1 million, and try to do it in three or four steps for $300,000 each. The project is supposed to be complete in itself. You always have commanders who don't recognize that, but if we ever started misusing minor construction funds Congress will come back and say, "You have to come to us for the authorization."

Senator Bellmon. Do you make an accounting of where the minor construction funds might have been used?

General Cooper. Yes, sir, I am sure we submit a list to Congress.

Senator Bellmon. I understand that the committee does get a report?

General Cooper. Yes, sir.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

Senator Bellmon. Did the Army carryover any monies from fiscal year 1973 into the fiscal 1974 account and how much are you asking for planning in this year's construction bill?

Mr. Carton. Sir, we carry over into fiscal 1974 the sum of $5.7 million in the planning account and are requesting $39 million in new appropriations.

Senator Bellmon. Can you explain again why the $5.7 million was left over?

Mr. Carton. Yes, sir. These are our planning funds which are distributed from the Department of the Army to various districts and divisions which do design work on the projects.

It is spread worldwide and while we would normally expect to carry over about $2 to $3 million this year, we were a little late on obligating some of the projects for major hospital design that we had anticipated would be awarded before June 30. We are obligating those funds now for the major hospital program that we have planned for future years. We would anticipate that our carryover into fiscal 1975 will be reduced to about our normal $2 to $3 million level.

Senator BELLMON. So this would give you a total program for this year of about $44 million?

Mr. CARTON. That is correct, sir, and we would plan to obligate about $41 million of that.

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

Senator BELLMON. Did the Army receive all of the money it asked for in the access road account in this year's bill?

General COOPER. We didn't ask for any funds in this fiscal year's bill on the access roads. We do have some funds that were left over from the previous years in the access roads, and we plan to take care of two small projects.

Senator BELLMON. Do you have road projects that could be undertaken if funds were available?

General COOPER. Yes, sir, we have two that we have tentatively in our 1975 program which we could move up to the 1974 program, one at Dugway Proving Grounds and one at the White Sands Missile Range which add up to about $1.5 million. This could well be spent in the 1974 program.

Senator BELLMON. I don't know if I ask a proper question, but did you have the request for these funds in your budget when it was first developed and was it taken out by OMB?

General COOPER. No, sir; they were not taken out by OMB. We didn't request them. We work with MTMTS, Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service. They are the ones who handle the program for us.

You understand the access roads are things that connect the post to a main highway. It is my understanding that what we do with those funds is turn them over to the State and Federal Highway Administration to actually construct the projects. We didn't ask for these two projects primarily because the MTMTS people had not asked us for them at that time. They were not fully identified and not that urgent. They are required and we did plan to put them in the 1975 program. Any time we go through the total budget there are some things that have higher priorities and other items must be delayed.

Senator BELLMON. The Congress or the committee felt if you were inclined to do so you could add $1½ million to these two?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, if you added $2 million, it would give us some carryover because with those two fiscal 1975 projects plus two we had planned in Georgia and Fort Leonard Wood, funds previously authorized would be nearly wiped out.

Senator BELLMON. You would like to have $2 million?

General COOPER. Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL ISELIN, CEC, USN, COMMANDER, NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND.

ACCOMPANIED BY ROY MARKON, DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR REAL ESTATE, NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

INTRODUCTION OF ASSOCIATES

Senator BELLMON. We will now call on the witnesses for the Navy.

Admiral Iselin, you have a lengthy statement and you could insert the whole statement, if you would like, or you can read it.

Admiral ISELIN. I do have a brief of the statement and I could make the rest of it available for the record.

Senator BELLMON. That will be fine.

Do you wish to introduce those with you?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

I am Rear Adm. Donald G. Iselin, vice commander of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

I consider it an honor and privilege to review the Navy's fiscal year 1974 military construction appropriations budget with the committee.

Lt. Col. V. D. Stauch, U.S. Marine Corps is on my right and is present to respond to questions on the Marine Corps portion of the program.

On my left is Commander Kirkpatrick, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, and on my right is Captain Watson, Naval Faciilties Engineering Command.

Senator BELLMON. It is nice to have you gentlemen with us.

Admiral ISELIN. Thank you, sir.

NAVY PROGRAM

The budget requested new military construction authorization of $626,842,000, told direct program appropriations of $697,400,000 and new budget authority of $685,400,000. The appropriations request for fiscal year 1973 was $554.2 million, and the amount appropriated was $517.8 million.

The projects for new authorization were the subject of joint hearings between your committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee. Therefore I will limit my remarks to the five projects currently being considered by the Congress for addition to the authorization bill (table 1 below), a restoration of damaged facilities project, a land acquisition project at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, the requirement for increased planning and design funds, an unfunded prior year authorizations project and amendments to prior year authorizations.

PROJECT DOCUMENTS

A project document for each of the projects is in the program book provided for the hearing. The formal appropriations request for each project is being processed by the Department of Defense at this time.

As you request, Senator, I will place the rest of the detailed discussion on these projects from the following pages in the record.

[The document follows:]

TABLE I

FY 1974 NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

AUTHORIZATION ADDITIONS-(PENDING)

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

	COST
URGENT EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION	
NAVAL SUPPORT OFFICE, ATHENS, GREECE	
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT FACILITIES	$ 1,948
CONGRESSIONAL ADD-ONS	
NAVAL STATION, NORFOLK, VA	
LAND ACQUISITION - (AMENDMENT)	3,400
NAVAL COMMUNICATION TRAINING CENTER, PENSACOLA, FL	
PETTY OFFICERS MESS	831
NAVAL AIR STATION, WHITING FIELD, FL	
OUTLYING FIELDS	1,400
NAVAL COMPLEX, PUERTO RICO	
ATLANTIC FLEET WEAPONS RANGE RELOCATION	12,000
	$19,579

THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL ADD-ON PROJECT IS THE AIRCRAFT SUPPORT FACILITIES PROJECT, IN THE AMOUNT OF 1 MILLION, 948 THOUSAND DOLLARDS AT THE NAVAL SUPPORT OFFICE ATHENS, GREECE.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE HAS APPROVED THE NAVY'S PLAN TO HOMEPORT AN AIRCRAFT CARRIER AND A CARRIER AIR WING AT ATHENS, GREECE. THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS HAS STATED THAT HOME-PORTING A CARRIER IN GREECE IS ESSENTIAL TO MEETING OUR NATO COMMITMENT OF MAINTAINING TWO CARRIER TASK GROUPS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN. THE PROPOSED PROJECT PROVIDES THE MINIMUM ESSENTIAL FACILITIES NECESSARY FOR SHORE BASING AND MAINTENANCE OF 24 AIRCRAFT DURING THE FOUR PERIODS ANNUALLY WHEN THE CARRIER MUST UNDERGO MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS AT ANCHOR.

THE NEXT PROJECT IS AN AMENDMENT OF 3 MILLION, 400 THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR THE LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT AUTHORIZED IN FY 1972 AT THE NAVAL STATION, NORFOLK VIRGINIA. THIS PROJECT WAS ORIGINALLY AUTHORIZED AND FUNDED AT 18 MILLION, 450 THOUSAND DOLLARS. THE INTENT OF THE ORIGINAL ESTIMATE WAS TO ACQUIRE THE LAND AND PERMIT TENANTS TO REMAIN UNAFFECTED UNTIL SUCH TIME AS IT BECAME NECESSARY TO USE THEIR PARTICULAR AREA FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES. THIS AMENDMENT WILL GIVE THE NAVY AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE THE LEASE HOLD INTERESTS OF TENANTS OF SUBJECT LAND AND TO PAY APPROPRIATE RESETTLEMENT AND RELOCATION COSTS TO THE TENANTS AS AUTHORIZED BY PL 91-646, THE UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION POLICIES ACT OF 1970.

THE THIRD ADD-ON PROJECT IS A PROJECT FOR A PETTY OFFICERS MESS IN THE AMOUNT OF 831 THOUSAND DOLLARS AT THE NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING CENTER, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA.

THE MILITARY PERSONNEL LOADING AT THE NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING CENTER, PENSACOLA WILL BEGIN A DRASTIC INCREASE, APPROXIMATELY APRIL, 1975. THIS INCREASE WILL BE THE RESULT OF RELOCATING AND CONSOLIDATING THE ELECTRONIC WARFARE TRAINING AT THE NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING CENTER, PENSACOLA AND THE OPENING OF THE NEW 310 BED HOSPITAL PRESENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION ONBOARD THE NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING CENTER, PENSACOLA. EVENTUALLY THE ENLISTED LOADING WILL ALMOST QUADRUPLE THE PRESENT LOADING. THE PRESENT PETTY OFFICERS CLUB IS LOCATED IN A CONVERTED NAVY EXCHANGE/ CAFETERIA WHICH WAS CONSTRUCTED IN 1934. THE CONVERSION TO A PETTY OFFICERS CLUB WAS ACCOMPLISHED WITH SELF-HELP LABOR AT MINIMAL COST. THE EXISTING CLUB PROVIDES ONLY ONE-THIRD OF THE REQUIRED SPACE. EXPANSION IS NOT FEASIBLE BECAUSE ADJACENT NEEDED FACILITIES WOULD HAVE TO BE DEMOLISHED. WITHOUT THIS RECREATION PROJECT, MORALE WILL BE DIMINISHED

AND WILL RESULT IN DECREASED EFFICIENCY OF CRITICAL TRAINING. IF THIS PROJECT IS DEFERRED BEYOND THIS FISCAL YEAR, IT WILL NOT BE READY TO ACCOMMODATE THE LOADING INCREASE WHICH WILL BEGIN IN 1975.

THE NEXT ADD-ON PROJECT IS THE OUTLYING FIELDS INCLUDING LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF 1 MILLION, 400 THOUSAND AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, WHITING FIELD, FLORIDA. THIS PROJECT IS REQUIRED TO PROVIDE THE FOUR OUTLYING FIELDS NEEDED TO SUPPORT HELICOPTER TRAINING BEING TRANSFERRED FROM THE NAVAL AIR STATION, ELLYSON FIELD, TO THE NAVAL AIR STATION, WHITING FIELD IN DECEMBER 1973.

THE FINAL ADD-ON PROJECT, IN THE AMOUNT OF 12 MILLION DOLLARS, IS FOR A PROJECT TO RELOCATE WEAPONS RANGES FROM CULEBRA COMPLEX FOR THE ATLANTIC FLEET WEAPONS RANGE, NAVAL COMPLEX, PUERTO RICO. THIS PROJECT IS NEEDED TO EXECUTE AN ORDER OF THE SECREATRY OF DEFENSE DATED MAY 24, 1973 THAT TRAINING ACTIVITIES BE MOVED FROM CULEBRA TO DESECHEO AND MONITO.

UNDER THE CATEGORY OF RESTORATION OF DAMAGED FACILITIES, THE NAVY IS SEEKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR ONE PROJECT FOR THE RESTORATION OF A COMMISSARY STORE AT THE NAVAL SUPPLY CORPS SCHOOL, ATHENS, GEORGIA THAT WAS SEVERLY DAMAGED BY A TORNADO ON MAY 28, 1973. THE PROJECT COST IS 120 THOUSAND DOLLARS.

IN THE CONTINUING AUTHORIZATIONS AND "OTHER" CATEGORY, I WOULD LIKE TO FIRST DESCRIBE THE PRESENT REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA. AUTHORIZATION ONLY WAS INITIALLY REQUESTED FOR THIS PROJECT BECAUSE THE NAVY PLANNED TO EXCHANGE SOME 142 ACRES IN THE JACKSONVILLE AREA FOR THE 365 ACRES TO BE ACQUIRED BY SUBJECT PROJECT.

DURING THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION SCREENING PROCESS WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES, THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS REQUESTED THE BULK OF THE LAND TO BE USED IN EXCHANGE FOR DUMPING DREDGED MATERIALS IN CONNECTION WITH ITS WORK OF MAINTAINING THE JACKSONVILLE HARBOR. THE USE OF THIS LAND BY THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS WILL RESULT IN A CONSIDERABLE SAVINGS IN ARMY OPERATING COSTS. THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION HAS SEARCHED ITS INVENTORY AND FOUND NO OTHER LANDS THAT CAN BE USED IN PLACE OF THE LAND REQUESTED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

ORIGINALLY THIS PROJECT WAS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY A LAND EXCHANGE WITHOUT APPROPRIATIONS. BASED ON THE ARMY'S REQUIREMENTS, APPROPRIATIONS OF 2 MILLION, 800 THOUSAND DOLLARS WILL BE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THE AUTHORIZATION TO ACQUIRE THE LANDS.

UNDER CONTINUING AUTHORIZATIONS WHICH INCLUDES APPROPRIATIONS FOR URGENT MINOR CONSTRUCTION, ACCESS ROADS AND PLANNING AND DESIGN, I WOULD LIKE TO LIMIT MY REMARKS TO THE NEED FOR AN INCREASE IN FUNDS FOR PLANNING AND DESIGN.

THE ORIGINAL APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST FOR PLANNING AND DESIGN BY THE NAVY IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM WAS 53 MILLION, 800 THOUSAND DOLLARS. THE NAVY HAS A PLANNING AND DESIGN FUND DEFICIENCY OF 4 MILLION DOLLARS. THIS DEFICIENCY IS DUE PRIMARILY TO THE ACCELERATION OF THE MEDICAL FACILITIES MODERNIZATION AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROGRAMS.

WITHOUT AN INCREASE IN THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR PLANNING AND DESIGN THE NAVY MUST DEFER 4 MILLION DOLLARS OF DESIGN EFFORT UNTIL THE FOLLOWING FISCAL YEAR. THIS WOULD HAVE THE END EFFECT OF DELAYING THE START OF SOME CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS WITH THE RESULTANT ESCALATED COST OF CONSTRUCTION AND DELAY OF PROJECT AVAILABILITY.

THIS YEAR WE ARE REQUESTING APPROPRIATIONS FOR ONE PROJECT THAT WAS AUTHORIZED IN FY 1973, BUT FUNDING WAS DENIED. THIS PROJECT IS AN AVIONICS FACILITY AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, NORTH ISLAND, WITH A COST OF 1 MILLION, 640 THOUSAND DOLLARS. THE NAVAL AIR STATION IS THE HOMEPORT FOR THE NAVY'S WEST COAST DEPLOYABLE CARRIER ANTI-SUBMARINE (S-2 and S-3A) SQUADRONS AND THE HELICOPTER ANTI-SUBMATINE SQUADRONS BEING RELOCATED TO NORTH ISLAND AS A PART OF THE SHORE ESTABLISHMENT REALIGNMENT. THE AVIONICS FACILITY IS REQUIRED FOR MAINTENANCE OF THE MAGNETOMETER COMMUNICATIONS, NAVIGATION, SONAR, RADAR AND OTHER ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT AND SENSORS ON THE EQUIPMENT NOW SUPPORTED, AND ON THE NEW EVEN MORE COMPLEX S-3A WHICH IS SCHEDULED FOR FLEET INTRODUCTION IN MARCH 1974.

THE FINAL CATEGORY OF PROJECTS IS AMENDMENTS TO PRIOR YEAR AUTHORIZATIONS. THE NAVY ORIGINALLY REQUESTED TWO AMENDMENTS TOTALING 2 MILLION, 434 THOUSAND DOLLARS. UNDER THE PROGRAM CHANGE THREE ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS WERE REQUESTED IN THE AMOUNT OF 3 MILLION, 284 THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR A NEW AMENDMENT TOTAL OF FIVE AMENDMENTS WITH A TOTAL COST OF 5 MILLION, 718 THOUSAND DOLLARS. THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEES DENIED ONE OF THE FIVE AMENDMENTS IN THE AMOUNT OF 448 THOUSAND DOLLARS AND ADDED TWO AMENDMENTS TOTALING 4 MILLION, 172 THOUSAND DOLLARS. THE NEW AMENDMENTS TOTAL IS 9 MILLION, 442 THOUSAND DOLLARS , BUT FUNDING OF ONLY 8 MILLION, 670 THOUSAND DOLLARS IS REQUIRED SINCE THE LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, MIRAMAR, CALIFORNIA WILL BE ACHIEVED BY AN EXCHANGE OF AN EQUAL VALUE OF EXCESS GOVERNMENT LANDS. THE AMENDMENT FOR THIS LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT IS IN THE AMOUNT OF 772 THOUSAND DOLLARS.

MY REVIEW OF THE PROJECTS THAT HAVE NOT PREVIOUSLY BEEN REVIEWED BY THE COMMITTEE IS COMPLETED.

PREPARED STATEMENT

Admiral ISELIN. I would like to say that projects included in this year's military construction budget are all high priority projects and we therefore solicit your support for a fully funded Naval Military Construction Program.

I would like at this point to provide an additional prepared statement for the record on important elements of this year's program which relate these elements to other Navy budgets that have been considered by members of the committee.

Senator BELLMON. We will receive that information.

[The statement follows:]

PRESENTATION OF REQUIREMENTS

I WILL DEPART FROM THE PROCEDURE USED IN PRESENTING THE PROGRAM FOR THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS. I WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT ON THE IMPORTANT ELEMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM AND RELATE THESE ELEMENTS TO OTHER NAVY BUDGETS EXAMINED BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE.

I WILL DISCUSS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS ASSOCIATED WITH:

-STRATEGIC FORCES (WHICH IS PRIMARILY TRIDENT)

-AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

-MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS

-POLLUTION ABATEMENT

-NEW TECHNOLOGY

-TRAINING FACILITIES

STRATEGIC FORCES

UNDER STRATEGIC FORCES, 118 MILLION DOLLARS IS REQUESTED TO INITIATE CONSTRUCTION OF A TRIDENT REFIT COMPLEX AND FACILITIES FOR FLIGHT TESTING THE TRIDENT MISSILE. THE FACILITIES REQUESTED THIS YEAR ARE ESSENTIAL FOR MEETING THE INITIAL OPERATIONAL CAPABILITY DATE OF LATE CALENDAR YEAR 1978 FOR THIS WEAPONS SYSTEM.

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

PROJECTS THAT WILL ASSIST THE NAVY IN ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE ARE PROJECTS IN THE CATEGORIES OF BACHELOR HOUSING, COMMUNITY SUPPORT FACILITIES (WHICH ARE CLUBS, EXCHANGES, COMMISSARY STORES, AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES), MEDICAL FACILITIES AND COLD IRON FACILITIES. COLD IRON FACILITIES ARE SHORESIDE UTILITIES WHICH ENABLE A SHIP IN PORT TO SHUT DOWN ITS BOILER PLANT AND ELECTRICAL GENERATION EQUIPMENT. PROJECTS ASSOCIATED WITH AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE CONSTITUTE APPROXIMATELY 1/4 OF THE PROGRAM.

BACHELOR HOUSING

TAKING EACH OF THE PROGRAMS RELATED TO AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE IN ORDER, THIS YEAR'S BACHELOR HOUSING PROGRAM REQUESTED 80 MILLION DOLLARS FOR PROVIDING BACHELOR HOUSING AND MESSING FACILITIES. THIS IS A REDUCTION FROM LAST YEAR'S APPROPRIATIONS FOR BACHELOR HOUSING, HOWEVER THE EMPHASIS PLACED ON BACHELOR HOUSING THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS STILL EXISTS, WITH BACHELOR HOUSING CONSTITUTING ABOUT 13 PERCENT OF THIS YEAR's APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT FACILITIES

COMMUNITY SUPPORT FACILITIES - NAVY EXCHANGES, COMMISSARIES, AND CLUBS PROVIDE SOME BENEFITS TRADITIONAL WITH SERVICE LIFE. FACILITIES FOR RECREATION AND WELFARE ARE NECESSARY TO PROVIDE STIMULATING LEISURE ACTIVITIES FOR NAVY PERSONNEL COMPARABLE TO THOSE OF THEIR CIVILIAN CONTEMPORARIES. THESE FACILITIES HAVE RECEIVED A MINIMUM OF FUNDING THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS.

MEDICAL PROGRAM

THE MEDICAL PROGRAM REQUESTED THIS YEAR REPRESENTS A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE OVER THE PROGRAM APPROPRIATED LAST YEAR. IT HAS LONG BEEN RECOGNIZED THAT ONE OF THE MAJOR BENEFITS

OF MILITARY SERVICE IS COMPLETE MEDICAL CARE. THERE IS A RECOGNITION WITHIN THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OF A SERIOUS NEED TO UPGRADE MEDICAL FACILITIES SO THAT THE DELIVERY OF MEDICAL CARE WILL BE IMPROVED. THE QUALITY OF MEDICAL CARE HAS ALWAYS REMAINED HIGH, BUT THE DELIVERY OF MEDICAL CARE HAS LEFT SOMETHING TO BE DESIRED FOR THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS. SOME OF THE INEFFICIENCIES IN OUR PRESENT HEALTH CARE SYSTEM STEM FROM THE INADEQUATE FACILITIES IN WHICH MANY OF OUR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS ARE REQUIRED TO PRACTICE THEIR PROFESSION. MEDICAL FACILITIES THAT ARE UNDESIRABLE FROM A PROFESSIONAL STANDPOINT HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON MEDICAL OFFICER RETENTION.

COLD IRON PROGRAM

THE COLD IRON PROGRAM IS DIRECTED TOWARD REDUCING WATCH STANDING REQUIREMENTS WHEN A SHIP IS IN PORT, AND THEREBY MAXIMIZING THE AMOUNT OF TIME SHIPS' PERSONNEL MAY SPEND WITH THEIR FAMILIES. THE PROVISION OF UTILITIES FROM THE SHORE ALSO PROVIDES BENEFITS IN SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE AND FLEET READINESS AND THE CONSERVATION OF SCARCE PETROLEUM RESOURCES. LAST YEAR 23 MILLION DOLLARS WAS APPROPRIATED FOR 14 PROJECTS. THIS YEAR'S PROGRAM REQUESTS 26 MILLION DOLLARS FOR 6 PIER AND BERTHING WHARF UTILITIES PROJECTS, ONE BERTHING PIER PROJECT, AND ONE PROJECT FOR EXPANSION OF A STEAM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.

MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS

REQUESTED FOR MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS THIS YEAR IS 10 MILLION DOLLARS, EXCLUDING TRIDENT. AN AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS TRAINING BUILDING IS REQUESTED AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, OCEANA, VIRGINIA FOR THE F-14 SUPERSONIC JET CARRIER BASED FIGHTER AIRCRAFT. FOR THE A-7E ATTACK AIRCRAFT, AN INTEGRATED AVIONICS SHOP IS REQUESTED AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, LEMOORE,

CALIFORNIA. AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, NORTH ISLAND, CALIFORNIA, AN AVIONICS FACILITIES PROJECT IS REQUESTED FOR THE S-3A LONG RANGE ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE AIRCRAFT. FOR THE MARK 48 TORPEDO, A TORPEDO OVERHAUL SHOP IS REQUESTED AT THE NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA. THIS YEAR'S REQUEST FOR MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS IS SLIGHTLY LESS THAN THE 11 MILLION DOLLARS APPROPRIATED LAST YEAR. THIS ELEMENT IS SIGNIFICANTLY LARGER THAN LAST YEAR WHEN TRIDENT FACILITIES ARE INCLUDED.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

THIS YEAR'S REQUEST FOR 86 MILLION DOLLARS CONTINUES AN AGGRESSIVE PROGRAM INITIATED BY THE NAVY IN 1968 TO ABATE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION AT NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS. THE CONGRESS HAS GIVEN STRONG SUPPORT TO OUR REQUEST AND APPRORPIATED, THROUGH FY 1973, 198 MILLION DOLLARS FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES. THE BREAKDOWN BETWEEN AIR AND WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES IS 52 AND 146 MILLION DOLLARS, RESPECTIVELY.

FOR AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT THE NAVY HAS PROGRAMMED 27.5 MILLION DOLLARS FOR 17 FACILITIES AT 14 NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS. EIGHT FACILITIES COSTING APPROXIMATELY 18 MILLION DOLLARS ARE FOR CONTROL OF THE PARTICULATE AND CHEMICAL FUME EMISSIONS PRODUCED IN THE INDUSTRIAL OPERATION OF COATING METAL SURFACES. THREE FACILITIES WILL IMPROVE BOILER PLANT EMISSIONS THROUGH FUEL CONVERSIONS. ROUNDING OUT THE AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES ARE FOUR FACILITIES TO IMPROVE AIR EMISSIONS AND TWO PIPE INSULATION WORKING FACILITIES.

FOR WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT, FUNDING IS REQUESTED IN THE AMOUNT OF 58.8 MILLION DOLLARS FOR 45 FACILITIES AT 39 NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS. A MAJOR PORTION OF THIS REQUEST IS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PIER SEWERS FOR

COLLECTION OF SANITARY WASTES FROM SHIPS IN PORT. IN THIS, THE SECOND YEAR OF A FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM FOR CONSTRUCTING DISPOSAL ASHORE FACILITIES, THERE ARE 13 FACILITIES COSTING APPROXIMATELY 34 MILLION DOLLARS. THE PIER SEWERS ARE PLANNED TO COINCIDE WITH SCHEDULED SHIP ALTERATIONS. THERE ARE 8 FACILITIES FOR HANDLING OF FUELS AND COLLECTION, TREATMENT, AND DISPOSAL OF OILS AND OILY WASTE PRODUCTS, FROM SHIPS AND SHORE INSTALLATIONS. THERE ARE 3 MUNICIPAL SEWER CONNECTIONS, 11 IMPROVEMENTS TO SEWER SYSTEMS AND TREATMENT PLANTS, 7 FACILITIES FOR COLLECTION AND TREATMENT OF INDUSTRIAL WASTES, AND 2 FACILITIES FOR TREATMENT OF FILTER BACKWASH WATER AT WATER TREATMENT PLANTS. THE OTHER SIGNIFICANT AND SLIGHTLY UNIQUE FACILITY IS THE PROVISION OF A FACILITY TO DISPOSE OF UNSERVICEABLE AMMUNITION THAT MAY NO LONGER BE DISPOSED OF BY DEEP WATER OCEAN DUMPING. IN LOOKING AHEAD, WE EXPECT OVER THE NEXT FEW YEARS TO CONSTRUCT ADDITIONAL FACILITIES TO TRANSFER SHIP WASTES ASHORE. BASED ON TECHNOLOGY NOW IN THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT STAGE, FACILITIES WILL BE REQUIRED TO CONTROL SMOKE AND GASES FROM JET ENGINE TEST CELLS. ADDITIONAL AIR, WATER, AND FOR THE FIRST TIME, NOISE POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES WILL BE REQUIRED TO MEET STANDARDS NOW BEING ESTABLISHED UNDER THE "BEST PRACTICABLE" AND BEST "AVAILABLE" TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS OF FEDERAL POLLUTION CONTROL ACTS.

IN SUMMARY, WE HAVE MADE CONSIDERABLE PROGRESS WITH OUR POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROGRAMS, BUT WE ALSO EXPECT, FOR THE REASONS PROVIDED ABOVE, A SIGNIFICANT POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS.

NEW TECHNOLOGY

FOR THE ELEMENT NEW TECHNOLOGY, THIS YEAR'S PROGRAM ALLOCATED APPROXIMATELY 4 PERCENT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION FACILITIES ASSOCIATED WITH UNDERWATER ACOUSTIC

SURVEILLANCE, COMMUNICATIONS, MANNED UNDERWATER SYSTEMS, AND COASTAL REGION WARFARE. THIS EXCLUDES RDT&E FACILITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRIDENT MISSILE, SINCE ALL TRIDENT FACILITIES ARE INCLUDED UNDER THE STRATEGIC FORCES ELEMENT. TO ADVANCE BASIC RESEARCH IN UNDERWATER SURVEILLANCE, AN ACOUSTIC RESEARCH FACILITY HAS BEEN REQUESTED FOR THE NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, WASHINGTON, D.C. UNDERSEA SURVEILLANCE RESEARCH HAS THE OBJECTIVE OF INCREASING THE NAVY'S CAPABILITY FOR ACOUSTIC SURVEILLANCE OF SUBMARINES. THIS RESEARCH IS DIRECTED TOWARD TECHNIQUES UTILIZING LARGE, HIGH POWER, LOW FREQUENCY ACOUSTIC ENERGY SOURCES AND LARGE RECEIVER ARRAYS. THE BASIC RESEARCH FINDINGS OF THE NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY WILL BE USED BY PERSONNEL OF THE NEW LONDON LABORATORY OF THE NAVAL UNDERWATER SYSTEMS CENTER. THE NEW ENGINEERING BUILDING REQUESTED AT NEW LONDON IS NEEDED FOR PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF SONAR SYSTEMS, AND IMPROVED UNDERWATER ACOUSTIC SENSORS FOR ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE SHIPS. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOTYPES OF ACOUSTIC ENERGY TRANSMITTING AND RECEIVING (TRANSDUCER) COMPONENTS WILL ALSO BE PERFORMED IN THE ENGINEERING BUILDING. OTHER RDT&E TO BE PERFORMED IN THE ENGINEERING BUILDING IS IN THE FIELDS OF THE GENERATION OF SPURIOUS SIGNALS AND ELECTROMAGNETIC SILENCING FOR JAMMING SYSTEMS. THE ACOUSTIC RDT&E TO BE PERFORMED IN BOTH FACILITIES SHOULD FIND DIRECT APPLICATION IN THE TRIDENT WEAPON SYSTEM.

IN THE COMMUNICATIONS AREA, AN ELECTRONICS DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING LABORATORY IS REQUESTED AT THE NAVAL ELECTRONICS LABORATORY, SAN DIEGO. THIS LABORATORY IS NEEDED FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT AND "TRY-BEFORE-BUY" PERFORMANCE TESTING OF ELECTRONIC COMMAND CONTROL, COMMUNICATION AND SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS FOR THE NEW GUIDED MISSILE FRIGATES, DESTROYERS,

AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIPS, AND TRIDENT SUBMARINE.
A FACILITY FOR TESTING AND EVALUATING AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT AND SYSTEMS IS REQUESTED FOR THE NAVAL AIR TEST CENTER, PATUXENT RIVER, MARYLAND.

IN THE FIELD OF MANNED UNDERWATER SYSTEMS, THIS YEAR'S PROGRAM REQUESTS FACILITIES TO PERFORM EXPERIMENTATION WITH ANIMALS TO A 3,300 FOOT DEPTH SO THAT OPERATIONAL HUMAN DIVING DEPTHS MAY BE LOWERED FROM 1,500 FEET TO 2,000 FEET AND BEYOND. THE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH EFFECTS LABORATORY AT THE NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, BETHESDA WILL PROVIDE THE FACILITY FOR THIS EXPERIMENTATION. THE LABORATORY WILL ALSO PROVIDE FACILITIES FOR PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN SEEKING A SOLUTION TO MEDICAL PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE INHALATION OF TOXIC VAPORS AND THE ABSORPTION OF TOXIC COMPOUNDS IN WEAPONS SYSTEMS ATMOSPHERES. THE TOXIC VAPORS OR COMPOUNDS ARE THOSE ASSOCIATED WITH EXISTING PROCESSES SUCH AS FUELING MISSILES AND TORPEDOS OF THE POLARIS/POSEIDON SUBMARINE FLEET. AT THE NAVY COASTAL SYSTEMS LABORATORY, PANAMA CITY, FLORIDA, AN EXPERIMENTAL DIVING FACILITY IS REQUESTED THAT WILL UTILIZE THE RESULTS OF THE BASIC RESEARCH COMPLETED AT THE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH EFFECTS LABORATORY IN TESTING AND EVALUATING DIVING SCHEDULES, EXCURSION DIVING, CREW TRAINING AND UNDERWATER SALVAGE OPERATIONS. THE EXPERIMENTAL DIVING FACILITY IS A LOGICAL ADJUNCT TO THE OCEAN SIMULATION FACILITY FUNDED IN FY 1969 TO PROVIDE A FACILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION OF THE MAN/EQUIPMENT INTERFACE IN AND ON EXCURSIONS FROM MANNED DIVING SYSTEMS TO DEPTHS OF 2,200 FEET.

IN THE COASTAL REGION WARFARE FIELD, A SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND TEST FACILITY IS REQUESTED FOR COASTAL TECHNOLOGY, AND AMPHIBIOUS OPERATIONS RESEARCH; THE DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING OF VEHICLES, SENSORS, AND OTHER EQUIPMENT UTILIZED IN RIVERINE

OPERATIONS AND INSHORE UNDERSEAS WARFARE; AND RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND SUPPORT OF MARINE CORPS INVESTIGATIONS OF COUNTERMEASURES FOR LAND MINES; SENSOR EQUIPMENT; AND OVERLAND MOBILITY EQUIPMENT.

THERE IS ONE PROJECT AT THE NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY WASHINGTON FOR AN INTEGRATED ELECTROMAGNETIC TEST AND ANALYSIS LABORATORY. THIS LABORATORY WILL PROVIDE FACILITIES TO CONDUCT BASIC RESEARCH REQUIRED TO DEVELOP AND EVALUATE COUNTERMEASURES AGAINST THREAT WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUCH AS THE ANTI-SHIP CRUISE MISSILE.

TRAINING FACILITIES

THE NAVY OPERATES ONE OF THE LARGEST SCHOOL SYSTEMS IN THE COUNTRY. SINCE TRAINED PERSONNEL ARE THE NAVY'S GREATEST ASSET, THE NAVY IS TAKING SEVERAL CONCURRENT ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN, MODERNIZE AND VITALIZE ITS TRAINING PROGRAMS. ONE ACTION WAS THE ESTABLISHMENT IN AUGUST 1971 OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY OF OVERSEEING AND MANAGING ALL TRAINING, WHETHER ACADEMIC OR APPLIED, SHIPBOARD, AIRCRAFT OR SUBMARINE. TRAINING WITH A COMMON CORE CURRICULUM WILL BE CONSOLIDATED TO THE DEGREE FEASIBLE AT ONE INSTALLATION, AND EFFORTS ARE BEING UNDERTAKEN TO RAISE THE QUALITY OF TRAINING IN ALL AREAS TO THE HIGH STANDARD OF SUBMARINE AND AVIATION TRAINING.

8 PERCENT OF THIS YEAR'S PROGRAM IS DEVOTED TO NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS TRAINING FACILITIES. THE MAJORITY OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM IS DIRECTED TOWARD APPLIED INSTRUCTION WITH FACILITIES FOR NEW FLIGHT SIMULATORS BEING PROVIDED AT THREE INSTALLATIONS. THE NEW FLIGHT SIMULATORS WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND VISUAL MOTION INTEGRATION WILL ENABLE SOME OF THE FLIGHT HOURS OF THE JET PILOT TRAINING SYLLABUS TO BE TRANSFERRED TO THE SIMULATORS WITH A RESULTANT INCREASE IN SAFETY AND SAVINGS IN FUEL. FOR SHIPBOARD PERSONNEL, THE TRAINING PROGRAM WILL PROVIDE FACILITIES FOR: (1) ANNUALLY TRAINING ABOUT 3,000 TECH-

NICIANS AND OPERATING PERSONNEL WHO WILL BE DEPLOYED ABOARD NUCLEAR POWERED VESSELS, (2) FACILITIES FOR EXPANDING BY 350 STUDENTS ANNUALLY THE TRAINING FACILITIES AVAILABLE FOR BASIC ELECTRICITY AND ELECTRONICS TRAINING, WHICH IS A PREQUISITE COURSE FOR TRAINING IN 17 PERCENT OF THE NAVY RATES, (3) MACHINIST MATE AND BOILERMAN TRAINING ON THE HIGH PRESSURE (1,200 PSI) PROPULSION PLANTS GOING INTO THE NEWER FLEET SHIPS. IN THE ORDNANCE AREA, A TRAINING BUILDING IS REQUESTED TO PROVIDE FACILITIES FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS ORIENTATION TRAINING ANNUALLY OF 3,800 OFFICER AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF THE ATLANTIC FLEET. IN THE ELECTRONIC WARFARE AREA, AN ELECTRONICS WARFARE TRAINING BUILDING IS REQUESTED FOR CONDUCTING ANNUALLY ADVANCED TRAINING FOR 700 ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNICIANS, 150 NAVAL FLIGHT OFFICERS AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE OFFICERS AND 400 AVIATION ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE SPECIALISTS. THERE IS A SERIOUS SHORTAGE OF PERSONNEL WITH ELECTRONIC WARFARE TRAINING, WHICH MAKES THIS PROJECT VERY IMPORTANT TO THE NAVY.

THE FIELD OF ACADEMIC TRAINING, FACILITIES ARE REQUESTED FOR CONDUCTING TACTICAL COMMAND AND DIRECTION SYSTEMS TRAINING AT TWO INSTALLATIONS. AT THE NAVAL ACADEMY, THE CONSTRUCTION PROPOSED WILL MODERNIZE, IN CONSONANCE WITH THE MASTER PLAN, AN EXISTING BUILDING TO PROVIDE CLASSROOMS, LABORATORIES AND SIMULATION TRAINING SPACES FOR WEAPONS AND SYSTEMS ENGINEERING COURSES.

SUMMARY

THIS YEAR'S PROGRAM PROVIDES FACILITIES FOR THOSE ELEMENTS WITH THE GREATEST NEED. THE PROJECTS ARE REQUIRED THIS YEAR TO SATISFY NEW AND CURRENT MISSIONS, AND TO PROVIDE FACILITIES TO MODERNIZE THE SHORE ESTABLISHMENT. WE APPRECIATE THE PAST SUPPORT OF THE COMMITTEE AND EARNESTLY SEEK IT FOR THIS YEAR'S PROGRAM.

RESTORATION OF DAMAGED FACILITIES PROJECTS

Admiral ISELIN. We are prepared to answer any questions you might ask.

Senator BELLMON. The information you give us will include a description of the damaged facilities you intend to repair?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, it will. There is one project.

Senator BELLMON. Can you give us a brief oral description of what you are talking about?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. The project is a commissary store restoration at the Naval Supply Corps School in Athens, Ga., hit by a tornado in May of this year and very severely damaged. It will take about $120,000 to bring that building back to shape. It literally gutted the building.

Senator BELLMON. In the meantime, you have been without that facility?

Admiral ISELIN. Basically, that is right; yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. You do not have the same authority, that I believe we heard from the Army, that you can repair some thing up to $300,000 without waiting for an appropriation?

Admiral ISELIN. I would like to ask Commander Kirkpatrick to answer that.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes; we do have authority to proceed with this and reprogram projects to obtain necessary funding. It happens that the reprograming action is occurring at this time and the Department of Defense suggested we include it in our appropriations request, since our reprograming action was taking place at the same time as the appropriations hearings, or approximately the same time.

If it happened another time of the year, we would use canceled projects or cancel projects to obtain the funds to build the project.

Senator BELLMON. But you did have same flexibility as the Army?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes.

Senator BELLMON. Up to $300,000 or do you have a different standard?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. The same.

Senator BELLMON. It would seem rather unfortunate if you had to wait for Congress to act?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir. It just happened the timing was right on this.

ADD-ON PROJECTS

Senator BELLMON. Admiral, I will ask you some specifics in relation to the justifications that you furnished the committee. Could you go into a little more detail relating to the airport support facilities projects at Athens, Greece?

AIRFIELD SUPPORT FACILITIES, ATHENS, GREECE

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. This project would primarily provide for an airfield parking apron, a hangar, maintenance and operating features included within it, and a small bachelor enlisted quarters to handle 16 men who will be deployed there.

Senator BELLMON. These are carrier planes?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. When a carrier is homeported in Athens, some of its planes will operate and be maintained from the field. One of the squadrons will be there at any given time.

This basically will provide today, the capability for limited maintenance for those airplanes that will be on that station.

LAND ACQUISITION—NORFOLK, VA.

Senator BELLMON. At Norfolk, Va., Naval Station, you have a project for land acquisition?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. This project is a follow-on to a major project which we had authorized, I believe, in 1972, for acquiring some 509 acres of land the Navy requires for expansion in that area.

However, that project did not include the buying out of leasehold interest. It had been the Navy's intention to purchase the leasehold interest as the Navy needed the specific lands for specific projects as authorized by the Congress.

This item was introduced by the House Armed Services Committee basically to permit us to clean up the entire situation at once. We are talking of $3.4 million, and that would give us the authority to carry out under the Relocation Act all of the provisions affecting the people who currently reside there, thereby completely cleaning up that project.

Senator BELLMON. You would be acquiring land or acquiring access to land in advance of your actual need for the land? You won't be developing the land immediately after you take over from the leasehold?

Admiral ISELIN. Part of the land we will develop immediately. What this will give us is the authorization and the funding when we need it, to buy out the leasehold interest.

It would make, obviously, for a smoother movement for the Navy, but it would be a little in advance in some cases.

Senator BELLMON. You may not go and consummate an agreement with the leaseholders; you want the funds available so when you make arrangements with leaseholders, you will be able to pay the costs?

Admiral ISELIN. That is right, sir. Some of the leaseholders are ready right now, and we, too, are ready to submit projects.

It gets a little involved. As we submit a project, we would be able to move the leaseholders out and also be able to assure them they are going to get their relocation expenses. This would permit us to plan and construct in a little more orderly fashion.

EQUITY FOR LEASEHOLDERS

Senator BELLMON. For the record, can you state how the Navy goes about deciding on an equitable settlement with a leaseholder?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir; I would like to call on our real estate specialist, Mr. Markon.

Mr. MARKON. This particular land was acquired by the Navy from the Norfolk & Western Railway. The particular land was developed for commercial enterprise which would usually be found outside of a Navy main gate, such as a pizza house, tavern, theater, things of that sort. All of these were constructed on land owned by the railroad under a lease to various individuals who have a very small property right but own the buildings themselves.

Under a law passed by Congress, Public Law 91–646, they are entitled to relocation adjustment payments. All of the small businesses may be entitled to approximately $10,000 each, in addition to the value of their structures.

The payments for the value of their structures provide a basis to buy out their legal interest in the structures, to which is added the relocation benefits provided by law, and this is negotiated with the particular leaseholder.

Senator BELLMON. And once you negotiate with the leaseholder, then those payments will be made and the buildings will be razed or removed?

Mr. MARKON. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. And the land will be available?

Mr. MARKON. Yes, sir. Part of this $3 million includes money to demolish the buildings and clean up around them.

Senator BELLMON. How do you go about setting the value of a future site? Do you have a local realtor do it for you or your own people?

Mr. MARKON. We do it by contract appraisers, and it is reviewed by our own appraisers.

Senator BELLMON. Would they give you relief through local courts if the private property owner feels he is not receiving fair treatment?

Mr. MARKON. As to legal rights of the property owner, yes. There is a constitutional right to have just compensation for property taken from you, but as to relocation payments, this is an administrative determination.

Senator BELLMON. Thank you very much.

PETTY OFFICERS' MESS, PENSACOLA

Now, on page 6, the Naval Communications Training Center at Pensacola, petty officers' mess. The amount is $831,000, as I understand it.

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. This mess is located actually at Corry Field, which is some 4 or 5 miles from the main base, and it is an area in which we are building up quite rapidly. An electronics school and our new 310-bed hospital are going there, and it will bring a great influx of petty officers and other naval personnel into the area. As a result, we need to improve this club, which is now a converted Navy exchange/cafeteria building—built in 1934 and rehabilitated by Navy self-help.

It is too small, too old, and it cannot be expanded without knocking down facilities adjacent to it. So the real answer here is to provide a new structure to meet the new requirement.

Senator BELLMON. The individuals who use the mess do not make any contribution to the cost? This is a part of their emolument for their services?

Admiral ISELIN. That is right, sir. The basic building structure which we are requesting here would not be recompensed in any way by the personnel.

WHITING FIELD—OUTLYING FIELDS

Senator BELLMON. All right. On page 7, the Naval Air Station at Whiting Field and outlying fields, including land acquisition. Can you explain the need for this expenditure?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. Part of the Navy's reorientation of its operations in the Pensacola area is to have helicopters operating at Whiting Field, and along with the basic fields, you need three outlying fields for touch and go and various other flight training operations. If the fields are nearby, then they don't have to traverse inhabited areas and expose the local populace to safety and noise hazards.

There are some outlying fields at some distance they are currently using, but it will improve local safety, reduce our runs, give us more time for training, and reduce the amount of fuel used if the new outlying fields are provided.

Senator BELLMON. Will the fields be operated exclusively for military uses?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. I am at a loss to know why it is not possible for military operations to be carried on at fields that also serve civilians?

Admiral ISELIN. This is done, Senator, in some cases. Where the local civilians feel they have a requirement or would like to use a field, they make a request, which is reviewed by the Navy and eventually passed to the Department of Defense. A determination is made after evaluating all of the facts. There are a number of stations at which common use is available.

To my knowledge, no requests have been made for these, particularly because they are helicopter fields, relatively short, and they would not be useful.

Senator BELLMON. They are?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, real short stubby fields.

Senator BELLMON. Is it the Navy's practice to invite civilian inputs when you are considering developing aviation facilities? For instance, I can understand, if you were developing even a helicopter field on the gulf coast area, some of the firms that supply the offshore drilling operations might be interested in participating.

ADMIRAL ISELIN. Senator, in general, the Navy does its planning for future facilities by taking into account the needs as expressed by the local planners in the community. We meet with the planning boards the zoning boards, usually with their public works departments, on almost a continuing basis. It is our policy to maintain this kind of communication and dialog with the local people so that, as we develop our properties, particularly in cases like this where we go outside of the normal bounds to develop these pads, they will know what we are up to and, if they have particular objections of any substance, we usually will work with them. In general, something like this is well worked out and acceptable to the local interests.

Senator BELLMON. And if the local civilian interests need facilities, you attempt to work out a joint agreement so they will have access?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir, that is correct. In fact, at Pensacola itself, there are some historic forts right in the middle of the Naval station, and arrangements have been made quite satisfactorily for a couple of years whereby the public can use the roads leading to them without interfering with the military operations.

Senator BELLMON. I wondered sometimes why we don't develop military, particularly airfields, in areas where civilian needs exist and then have one airfield where it is possible to serve both needs, but I am glad we are moving in that direction at least in the Navy.

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir.

ATLANTIC FLEET WEAPONS RANGE RELOCATION

Senator BELLMON. On page 8, the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training in Puerto Rico, you have a request for $12 million to relocate weapons ranges in Culebra, and can you explain the basis now for this request?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. The Secretary of Defense directed the Navy in May of this year to relocate its range facilities from Culebra to the Desecheo/Monito area, which is really on the other side of Puerto Rico. In order to accomplish that, we will require funding for the project which was introduced by the Senate Armed Services Committee based on the decision that had been made by the Secretary of Defense.

Senator BELLMON. This is primarily for acquisition of real estate or for construction?

Admiral ISELIN. Both for real estate and construction. We do have some refinements—that is, since the time this figure appeared—it looks as though we would need something in the neighborhood of $14½ million rather than the $12 million contained in the project introduced by the Senate Armed Services Committee, if we do it under what we call normal procedures, which would take us to the middle of 1976 to complete. If it is necessary to accelerate the construction, those costs would go up to approximately $19 million.

I am not asking for those amounts but only indicating that we really don't have a final figure, just a ball park figure, probably on the low side.

Senator BELLMON. Is the real estate you are acquiring presently owned by private interests or some other government entity?

Admiral ISELIN. I will ask Mr. Markon to answer.

Mr. MARKON. The real estate interests are owned by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. One of the islands is already under Federal ownership, but what we are acquiring, or what we need in addition to what is owned by the Federal Government is owned by the Commonwealth.

Admiral ISELIN. And it would be on a no-cost basis.

Senator BELLMON. The reason I raised the question: Is there no presently U.S. Government-owned property that is suitable for this purpose?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. There is only one island, Desecheo, and it is not sufficient to accommodate the range facilities currently existing on Culebra.

Senator BELLMON. So it is necessary to take over more property?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes.

Senator BELLMON. Will it be inhabited property where you move lots of people?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Desecheo is uninhabited, and Moito is not inhabited.

Senator BELLMON. There will not be civilians?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Not on those two pieces of property. There could be a safety arc reaching out in the Mona area, but it still does not require relocation.

AMENDMENTS TO PRIOR YEAR AUTHORIZATIONS

Senator BELLMON. On page 21, there are several cost overruns.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. I won't ask for explanation of all of them, but could you give us further justification for the overruns in the record?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir; we will be pleased to do so.

[The information follows:]

AMENDMENTS TO PRIOR YEAR AUTHORIZATION

The Navy originally requested two amendments totaling $2,434,000. Under the program change three additional amendments were requested in the amount of $3,284,000 for a new amendment total of five amendments with a total cost of $5,718,000. The Armed Services Committees denied one of the five amendments in the amount of $448,000 and added two amendments totaling $4,172,000. The new amendments total is $9,442,000, but funding of only $8,670,000 is required since the land acquisition project at the Naval Air Station, Miramar, California will be achieved by an exchange of an equal value of excess government lands. The amendment for this land acquisition project is in the amount of $772,000.

A review of the requirement for each amendment follows:

1. A $448,000 amendment was requested to the FY 1967 program, Public Law 89-568, for the hypervelocity wind tunnel project at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md. A recent evaluation of the project discloses that the amendment is no longer required, therefore the Armed Services Committees excluded this amendment from the Authorization Bill.

2. A $1,986,000 amendment is requested to Public Law 90-408 (FY 1969) for the deep ocean engineering pressure facility project at the Navy Mine Defense Laboratory (Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory), Panama City, Fla. This amendment is required to complete the final contract, provide for the required material certification and to pay approved contractor claims.

3. Under Public Law 91-511 (FY 1971), a $249,000 amendment is required for the sewage treatment system project at the Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va. This amendment is required to correct a failure which was caused by unforeseen subsurface soil conditions in the dike of the finishing pond.

4. Under Public Law 92-145 (FY 1972), an amendment of $3,400,000 is required for the land acquisition project at the Naval Station, Norfolk Va. This project was originally authorized and funded at $18,450,000. The intent of the original estimate was to acquire the land and permit tenants to remain unaffected until such time as it became necessary to use their particular area for construction purposes. This amendment will give the Navy authority to acquire the lease hold interests of tenants of subject land and to pay appropriate resettlement and relocation costs to the tenants as authorized by Public Law 91-646, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.

5. A $593,000 amendment is required for the installation total of the Naval Air Station, Meridian, Miss., under Public Law 92-145, FY 1972. This amendment is required to permit award of the Enlisted Men's Club project authorized at $714,000. The FY 1972 bachelor enlisted quarters project generated the need for the amendment. Since the relative need is greatest for the bachelor enlisted quarters, a decision was made to proceed with the bachelor enlisted quarters, and to defer the Enlisted Men's Club project and seek an amendment this year.

6. For FY 1973, Public Law 92-545, an amendment of $2,442,000 is requested for the bomb loading plant modernization project at the Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla. This amendment is required to provide construction in accordance with new safety criteria promulgated by the Armed Services Explosive Safety Board for structures housing the manufacture and/or handling of explosives.

7. Under Public Law 92-545 (FY 1973) an amendment of $772,000 is required for the land acquisition project at the Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif. This project was authorized for $702,000 with no funding as it was to be acquired by an exchange of land of equal value. A revised estimate of the value of the land to be acquired indicates an increase of $772,000 is required to make new project authorization $1,474,000. The land to be acquired will preclude further encroachment on the south side of the Air Station and thus minimize citizen complaints due to aircraft operations. No funds are requested for this project since the land acquisition will be achieved by an exchange of an equal value of excess Government land.

AMMUNITION DEPOT OVERRUNS

Senator BELLMON. I would ask you about the one for the $2,400,000 at the ammunition depot. Do you have reason for that?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. Basically what happened was that new safety criteria were promulgated by the Armed Services Explosive Safety Board after the project was submitted in the fiscal 1973 program. The new criteria will provide greater protection for personnel. It will also prevent total destruction of a single building.

Previously, criteria specified letting the buildings go, but now, as we are getting into larger and larger facilities, some of these being industrial plants, they want us to segregate and be able to save parts of a building. In addition, they have increased some of the distance arcs, or the distance you must displace uninhabited buildings.

So, as a result, we will have to provide heavier construction and some additional safety features in our main production building and have to replace two buildings which would otherwise have been cleared by the old criteria. That is really the reason for the two-plus-million-dollar addition.

Senator BELLMON. It is certainly long overdue that we modernize that facility and, I think, at the same time provide better working conditions. Frankly it was kind of a sweatshop the way it was run. I don't know what your modernization of the program will result in when you finally finish it, but it certainly needed a great deal of attention.

Admiral ISELIN. I have not been at that station, personally, Senator, but it certainly ought to be a good first step here, and I know that the Ordnance people do have modernization planning for all of their facilities.

NEW CRITERIA FOR BARRACKS

Senator BELLMON. Admiral, I am not sure you were in the hearing room when we went over the problem with the Army relating to the new criteria for barracks. Did you hear the comments?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes. I would subscribe wholeheartedly to the comments General Cooper made. We, too, have standardized. In fact, we are not stealing anybody's thunder, but feel we are leaders in barracks standardization. What we are asking for in the 1974 program, in the $67 million, are barracks that are precisely the same as those we built in 1973 for which we have our designs essentially completed.

To go back and redesign those would cost us not only redesign costs but also the delay in construction which will probably run us up approximately $3.7 million, in additional construction costs.

Senator BELLMON. The Army gave us a figure of, I think, $7.2 million as their additional costs. And your costs are in addition to the Army costs?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes.

Senator BELLMON. That is about $11 million without considering the Air Force?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. The Air Force will speak to their own, I am sure.

Senator BELLMON. I am lead to believe that perhaps each of the services are concerned; I am led to believe that perhaps there may be competition between the services in trying to outdo the others maybe in

trying to upgrade their recruiting efforts. Do you think justification exists for standardizing barracks specifications between the various services?

Admiral ISELIN. Actually, Senator, we have standardized very, very closely between the services on our barracks. We have the same three-to-a-room modules you were talking about with the Army.

Senator BELLMON. The Army and the Navy has the same?

Admiral ISELIN. Basically the same. We have precisely the same criteria.

Senator BELLMON. These are before the new criteria are adopted?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Some of the designs may be different, but the criteria we build to, so many square feet per man per grade, is the same for all services.

Admiral ISELIN. The barracks, the bed, the number of men to a room, the number of square feet per man per room, and the square footage you can put into areas—all of these are standardized very, very closely.

Senator BELLMON. Are there any questions?

Senator MANSFIELD. No.

Senator BELLMON. I might say we hope you can avoid unnecessary expense and if there is to be new criteria, at least it can be put off until the present construction has been completed according to plans you have already completed.

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir; that will be advantageous, and we, of course, are more than willing to work with any Members of Congress who are interested in our criteria or their criteria to achieve—well, I am sure our objections are the same. We don't feel we will have any problem in reaching agreement, but we would be hurt by this, sir.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

Senator BELLMON. What was the unobligated balance in the military construction account carried over from fiscal 1973 to 1974 by the Navy?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Total?

Senator BELLMON. The unobligated balance.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. $314,436,000.

Senator BELLMON. $300 million?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Approximately $314 million.

Senator BELLMON. Is this larger or smaller than normal?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It is a little bit larger than in the past year, in 1972.

Senator BELLMON. Can you give us an explanation as to why it is larger?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir. We have had some delays with our programs, pollution abatement projects, the large Trident projects. While Trident construction was not funded in prior years, it has caused our planning to be shuffled to accommodate it; therefore we are not able to get projects off as fast as we would like.

Admiral ISELIN. Most of these are running in the neighborhood of 4 to 6 months behind. We are also working against a larger Navy program than in the past. Normally we would have anticipated some of this.

Senator BELLMON. Can you explain why you are running 4 or 5 months behind? Is it because you have a larger program and not the personnel?

Admiral ISELIN. No, sir; it is in two specific areas: One is the pollution abatement in which you have many tie-ins with the local authorities and in working out the details of the design and coordination with them.

It takes us a little more time—and we are talking about $80 million in that area—than you would normally spend, so that is why we have a 6-months' lag.

On Trident, as you know, this a new program and, while we are moving off fast and rapidly, we still want to do our master planning properly so we know the entire development in considerable detail before we let our first major construction contract. We are moving back awarding of contracts, even though we have designs well under way, to do some final deciding before we make a move. When we make a move, we want to do it properly.

Senator BELLMON. The Army statement was that they had completed most of the environmental and pollution abatement projects at their facilities and, as you probably noticed, their request for funding went down sharply from previous years. Is the Navy behind the Army in dealing with the problem of pollution?

Admiral ISELIN. We had the same basic pollution guidance that they had to respond to, Executive Order 11507, and we were to have everything submitted by December 31, 1972, with certain exceptions, which we did. First, there were a number of items in which we could not tie in with the local community until some later date, and those were purposely deferred until this year or some future year.

Second, the Environmental Protection Act itself increased requirements significantly in a number of areas.

Third, we have some projects for which we did not have technical solutions in 1972.

These were noted during the hearings at that time, and they are now coming before the Congress.

Basically, we have recognized again that there were a lot of technical difficulties, a lot of coordination difficulties, with local people, and we wanted to solve those before we put the facilities under contract. We have a high level—$80 million—and we will go, I think, close to $100 million—no; about $83 million in 1975, and it looks about the same for 1976. We will still have another 3 or 4 years ahead of us before we meet all present requirements.

Senator BELLMON. Do you expect, then, that your pollution abatement program will be concluded in fiscal year 1976?

Admiral ISELIN. The major water and air pollution requirements will be met unless more stringent requirements are established, which could happen.

Senator BELLMON. Do you think you will include both water and air pollution abatement?

Admiral ISELIN. This includes the facilities aspects of air and water. Now, there will be shipbuilding conversion, which I do not represent. There will be considerable funds included in ship costs for pollution. There is one other area; the figures I talked about do not cover noise pollution, primarily for aircraft. There are some technical advances

being made in the engines themselves, and that is a separate problem. If these advances are not successful, abatement measures will be required. We have not addressed any such program requests.

NOISE POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Senator BELLMON. When do you expect to be able to attack the problem of noise pollution?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Sir, there is an Executive order that has been issued. I am not familiar with the number or details, but it has been issued or is on the verge of being issued. It speaks to this. The Office of Management and Budget will issue an implementing directive, and we hope it will be in time to speak to in the 1976 program. It looks like it may take until 1976 to have this laid out for the Federal Government.

Senator BELLMON. 1976 before you begin?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. And then you will go from there?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

MINOR CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT CARRYOVER

Senator BELLMON. I would ask the same question I asked also of the Army about the carryover in the minor construction account in fiscal 1973.

Admiral ISELIN. That was $5.3 million.

Senator BELLMON. How much has been requested this year for minor construction?

Admiral ISELIN. $15 million.

Senator BELLMON. This 5.3 is normal carryover?

Admiral ISELIN. 5.3 is a little higher than normal. The basic reason for that this year was that the Navy funded some of its shore establishment realinement facilities under this authority. If a station had to move elements to another activity, some of the facilities required at the actiivty, all of those that could be accomplished under $300,000, were put into one package.

As you know, the announcement was made in April of this year, although it was know a little before. We held the money while those projects were being put together. It has all been subsequently spent.

Senator BELLMON. Do you make an accounting to the Congress as to the project that has been undertaken under the minor construction account?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir, a complete accounting.

Senator BELLMON. Most of these projects are done by competing contractors on competitive bids?

Admiral ISELIN. That is correct.

Senator BELLMON. Are they all done that way?

Admiral ISELIN. I should say almost 100 percent. There may be, on occasion, a project which would be done by military troops, Seabees primarily, at a place where you might have a security station or some place like Adak, Alaska; you just don't get contractors to go up there. It is almost 100 percent.

Senator BELLMON. These sums are not used to pay the costs of construction overruns on larger projects?

Admiral ISELIN. No, sir.

PLANNING AND DESIGN ACCOUNT

Senator BELLMON. Would the Navy carry over any moneys from fiscal 1973 to fiscal 1974 planning accounts?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes; three-tenths of $1 million.

Senator BELLMON. You are close to running out?

Admiral ISELIN. We have great difficulties in that account, and that is why we had requested originally $53 million this year; but, in the intervening time between that request and now, we have identified a need for an additional $4 million. We have mentioned this need informally to the staffs of both Appropriations Committees, and we are submitting a request through the Department of Defense to address the additional $4 million. What we would really like is $57.8 million to carry out properly the planning and design for future programs.

Senator BELLMON. Why do you need the extra $4.0 million?

Admiral ISELIN. We are accelerating, within the Navy, construction of medical facilities, and, second, trying to catch up on the situation that I talked to you before regarding pollution abatement. We have run a little behind on it, but part of it is beyond our controls; we didn't have the planning money to put against it.

Senator BELLMON. What is used for weapons systems planning—these are not that but construction planning?

Admiral ISELIN. Principally design.

Senator BELLMON. What is the Navy's manpower situation as compared to, say, a year ago? Is it up or down?

Admiral ISELIN. Total Navy manpower is down, sir.

Senator BELLMON. I am a little lost to know why we need, for instance, more medical facilities. Do you think some of them are obsolete?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir; this is the major medical modernization program—replacing the entire medical structure with modern facilities—not just cleaning up the walls or whatnot but complete reorganization of the way they dispense medical care. You have seen it go on at Walter Reed—new hospital facilities that we are now designing are so different from what we did in the World War II days, and that is the basic reason.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It is the result of the overall review by Secretary Laird, the Secretary of Defense, affecting all services, and encouraging them to upgrade medical facilities.

Senator BELLMON. Does your medical facility planning get handled in-house or do you have consultants to do it?

Admiral ISELIN. We hire for each project civilian consultants and work with special consultants of the Office of Management and Budget; and obviously we deal with the Surgeon General of the Navy, who also has a very specialized staff for this purpose. The big work, though, is done by hospital consultants.

ACCESS ROAD ACCOUNT

Senator BELLMON. Did the Navy receive all of the money it had asked for in the access road account in the fiscal 1974 bill?

Admiral ISELIN. We did request only $1 million, which will allow us to meet our most urgent needs. We requested only that amount

simply because we were drawing a cut line on a high priority item or items. However, if that $1 million were $3 million, for example, we could then accomplish the majority of the projects we have certified, approved, and ready to go. If we got $3 million, we would still have a backlog of $4 million to go into future years.

Senator BELLMON. So you would like to see the $1 million increased to $3 million?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir.

PROPOSED FUTURE PROJECTS

Senator BELLMON. Could you furnish the subcommittee with a list of the projects that would be undertaken next year?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. Would you like it for the record?

Senator BELLMON. Yes, for the record.

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir.

[The list follows:]

With the proposed funding of $3.000,000, the Navy anticipates satisfying the following urgent access road requirements through the Federal Highway Administration during the fiscal year:

Area	Location	Amount
West entrance road	NAS, Pensacola, Fla	$750, 000
4-Lane improvements [1]	NAS, Meridian, Miss	417, 000
Road improvements	Virginia Beach, Va., housing	228, 000
Entrance way improvements	NSB, New London, Conn	50, 000
Entrance way improvements	Little Creek, Va., housing	100, 000
Entrance improvements	NH, Pensacola, Fla	25, 000
Street improvements	NTC, Orlando, Fla	275, 000
Road improvement	MCAS, Yuma, Ariz	332, 600
Road relocation	NADC, Warminster, Pa	822, 400
Total		3, 000, 000

[1] Additional funding to upgrade access road to a 4 lane, divided facility consistent with revised State highway program which changed the proposed access highway from 2 to 4 lanes. Total CWE is $900,000 ($483,000, fiscal year 1973 and $417,000, fiscal year 1974).

NAVY COOPERATION WITH STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

Senator BELLMON. Again, as I asked the Army witnesses, do you cooperate with the State highway departments in these projects when the roads relate to the State highways, or how do you go about it? These roads are all built on Navy property?

Admiral ISELIN. No, sir, only on a dedicated right-of-way on Navy property or a tie-in between Navy property and the civilian system.

Senator BELLMON. Do they become a part of the local or State highway road work?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir. The access highway program we are addressing now has to do with roads abutting our property—State highways and the like—and we work very closely with the State so that their construction is phased in with ours which is onbase, and, of course, any roads that abut our property, are coordinated very closely with the State.

Senator BELLMON. We have not heard from the Marine Corps. Do you have any comments to make, Colonel?

Colonel STAUCH. No, I do not at this time.

Senator BELLMON. Do you think the Navy does a pretty good job in connection with these things?

Colonel STAUCH. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. I might say that, as a former Marine—and I believe Senator Mansfield is also—I was not always convinced of that when I was in the service, or maybe we ought to talk about this privately after the admiral is gone.

Are there any questions?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes. Admiral, what is the status of the Kagnew Communications Station in Eritrea, Ethiopia.

Admiral ISELIN. Senator Mansfield, I would like to ask Commander Kirkpatrick to bring you up to speed on what we have on it.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir. We are in the process of planning for that activity—There are new designs.

Senator MANSFIELD. Planning for that project?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. Is this Kagnew, Ethiopia?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir. We are not doing any construction there——

Senator MANSFIELD. Are you withdrawing from Kagnew?

Admiral ISELIN. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, the Navy is planning for the closure of Kagnew Station, the details of which are classified, but I will be happy to supply them in executive session.

Senator MANSFIELD. But you are on the way out?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

NAVY STATUS IN CULEBRA

Senator MANSFIELD. What about Culebra? Are you on the way out of Culebra, too?

Admiral ISELIN. Senator, we testified earlier to the need for $12 million that will permit us to respond to the Secretary of Defense's directive to the Navy in May of this year to relocate facilities from Culebra. We do plan to locate them in the Desecheo/Monito area of Puerto Rico.

I mentioned also that $12 million is obviously an early figure and we already know that it should be $14½ million under normal construction practices. We still do not have, obviously, all of the engineering studies completed so we could change from that. But certainly the $12 million would get us well underway. It is in the ball park. We are doing hard planning right now for the project.

Senator MANSFIELD. And is it the purpose of the Navy to get completely out of Culebra?

Admiral ISELIN. Yes, sir, the Navy will remove all weapons training operations from Culebra and nearby cays. Some small instrumentation and control sites will remain on Culebra, however for support of the outer sea range.

Senator MANSFIELD. And the movement to the three islands in the passage—those three islands are uninhabited?

Admiral ISELIN. Right now, Senator, we are attempting to move to two islands—Desecheo and Monito—and those are both uninhabited.

STATUS OF DIEGO GARCIA

Senator MANSFIELD. What is the status of Diego Garcia at the present time?

Admiral ISELIN. Diego Garcia is well under construction. As you may know, the runway is completed and logistics flights are coming in there. The station itself went on the air in March of this year and, I might say, on a sort of austere basis. We are now putting in permanent power; it is under emergency power at the present time, and we are keeping one battalion of Seabees, which is a construction force down there. The dredging contract which you authorized last year, has been let, and initial work started. That project, I would say, is moving well and approximately on schedule, although we are a little delayed overall.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BELLMON. Admiral, thank you very much. Do you have any further comments?

Admiral ISELIN. No, sir. And we thank you very much for your questions and your patience with us.

Senator BELLMON. We thank you for your testimony.

Department of the Air Force

STATEMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL BILLIE J. McGARVEY, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, CIVIL ENGINEERING

ACCOMPANIED BY:

HARRY P. RIETMAN, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, CIVIL ENGINEERING

JOHN LEE, DIRECTORATE OF BUDGET

PREPARED STATEMENT

Senator Bellmon. General McGarvey, I see that you have a lengthy statement and if you want to read it, you may. You can either read it, all or part and it will be made a part of the record and you may also want to introduce your witnesses.

General McGarvey. Yes, sir, we will submit the statement for the record.

Senator Bellmon. Your statement will be received and made a part of the record at this point.

[The statement follows:]

AUTHORIZATIONS

MAJ. GEN. McGARVEY:

OUR FISCAL YEAR 1974 AUTHORIZATIONS REQUIREMENT FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE AND THEIR FINDINGS HAVE NOW BEEN APPROVED BY BOTH HOUSES OF THE CONGRESS. BY HOUSE ADDITION AND DELETION ACTIONS OUR ORIGINAL REQUEST OF $409,451,000 HAS BEEN REDUCED TO A NET OF $ 364,137,000 . DETAILS OF THE AMOUNTS REQUESTED AND APPROVED ARE:

	REQUEST	APPROVED
REGULAR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	$303,200,000	$260,741,000
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING	81,251,000	78,396,000
GUARD/RESERVE CONSTRUCTION	25,000,000	25,000,000
TOTALS	$409,451,000	$364,137,000

APPROPRIATIONS

OUR ORIGINAL REQUIREMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS WAS FOR $403,851,000. BECAUSE OF THE NET REDUCTION OF $ 30,659,000 IN AUTHORIZATIONS MADE BY THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEES OUR APPROPRIATION REQUIREMENT IS NOW $375,192,000. OF THIS AMOUNT, THE HOUSE HAS MADE APPROPRIATIONS REDUCTIONS OF $ 24,394,000 FOR PROJECTS THAT THE AIR FORCE CONSIDERS OF SUFFICIENT URGENCY TO WARRANT CURRENT FUNDING. WE THEREFORE SOLICIT YOUR SUPPORT OF FULL FINANCING OF $375,192,000 IN NET AUTHORIZATIONS OF $364,137,000 AFTER HOUSE/SENATE ADDITIONS AND DEFERRALS AND SUBSEQUENT REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCESS ROADS AND $8,746,000 FOR DEFICIENCY AUTHORIZATIONS. DETAILS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS REQUIREMENTS ARE:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE		
ORIGINAL REQUEST	$291,900,000	
HOUSE/SENATE AUTHORIZATION ADJUSTMENTS	27,804,000	
ACCESS ROAD ADDITIONS	2,000,000	
SUBTOTAL		$266,096,000
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE: FOR THE AIR FORCE		
ORIGINAL REQUEST	$ 81,951,000	
HOUSE/SENATE AUTHORIZATION ADJUSTMENTS	2,855,000	
SUBTOTAL		$ 79,096,000
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
ORIGINAL REQUEST	$ 20,000,000	
HOUSE/SENATE AUTHORIZATION ADJUSTMENTS	0	
SUBTOTAL		$ 20,000,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE		
ORIGINAL REQUEST	$ 10,000,000	
HOUSE/SENATE AUTHORIZATION ADJUSTMENTS	0	
SUBTOTAL		$ 10,000,000
TOTAL AIR FORCE APPROPRIATION REQUEST		$375,192,000

IN ADDITION TO MY ASSOCIATES AT THE TABLE, THERE ARE SEVERAL OTHER SUPPORT WITNESSES PRESENT AND WE ARE READY AT YOUR PLEASURE TO PROVIDE IN-DEPTH DETAIL ON SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS AS YOU MAY DESIRE.

WITH YOUR CONCURRENCE, WE OFFER FOR THE RECORD A DETAILED STATEMENT THAT SUPPORTS THE ORIGINAL FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SENATOR BELLMON, YOUR PREPARED STATEMENT WILL BE PLACED IN THE RECORD AS OFFERED. ALSO, THE JUSTIFICATION YOU HAVE SUBMITTED IN AN EFFORT TO RESTORE FUNDING FOR PROJECTS DENIED BY THE HOUSE WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE RECORD.

STATEMENT

THE PRIMARY OBJECTIVE OF THE AIR FORCE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM IS TO SUPPORT THE FORCE AND DEPLOYMENT GOALS PRESENTED TO THE CONGRESS IN THE AIR FORCE CHIEF OF STAFF'S POSTURE STATEMENT. THE BILL NOW BEFORE YOUR COMMITTEE REQUESTS APPROPRIATION FOR PROJECTS VALUED AT $423,851,000 FOR THE AIR FORCE, WITH MAJOR SUBDIVISIONS AS FOLLOWS:

REGULAR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	$311,900,000
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING	81,951,000
GUARD/RESERVE CONSTRUCTION	30,000,000
TOTAL	$423,851,000

THE MAJOR SHARE OF OUR REQUEST IS FOR CONSTRUCTION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES WITH ONLY ABOUT 10% FOR OVERSEAS CONSTRUCTION. AGAIN, THIS YEAR'S PROGRAM DOES NOT INCLUDE FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA.

LONG RANGE PLANNING

OUR PROGRAM HAS BEEN KEYED TO LONG RANGE PLANNING. WE HAVE MADE ENGINEERING AND ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS OF EACH ITEM TO PROVIDE A PROGRAM OF NEW CONSTRUCTION BALANCED TO SUPPORT NEW AND CHANGING MISSIONS, AND TO MODERNIZE EXISTING FACILITIES TO ADEQUATELY AND ECONOMICALLY SUPPORT OUR MOST PRESSING FORCE AND MISSION REQUIREMENTS SCHEDULED OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS. CONSISTENT WITH THAT OBJECTIVE, OUR REQUEST INCLUDES SOME $192 MILLION FOR FACILITIES MODERNIZATION, OR ABOUT 60% OF THE TOTAL PROGRAM AS COMPARED TO SOME 40% LAST YEAR. AGAIN, AS IN THE PAST, WE'VE LOOKED IN DEPTH AT OUR TOTAL LONG RANGE REQUIREMENTS, USING PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING AND ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF EACH ITEM IN CONCERT WITH REQUIRED PHASING OF OPERATIONAL NEEDS TO ARRIVE AT A REALISTIC AND RESPONSIVE PROGRAM OF FACILITIES SUPPORT. PROJECTS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1974 REQUEST NOW BEFORE YOU HAVE UNDERGONE EXTENSIVE REVIEW AND REPRESENT OUR HIGHEST PRIORITY REQUIREMENTS FOR FUNDING.

COMPLETION OF REQUIREMENTS

CONSISTENT WITH THE COMMITTEES INTEREST, LINE ITEMS REQUESTED IN THIS YEAR'S PROGRAM WILL, FOR THE MOST PART, SATISFY REQUIREMENTS FOR THE TYPE OF FACILITY TO BE CONSTRUCTED AT EACH LOCATION. OF THE 185 LINE ITEMS IN THE PROGRAM, 157 WILL COMPLETE THE RESPECTIVE FACILITY REQUIREMENT. FOR THE REMAINDER, PHASED CONSTRUCTION IS NECESSARY TO COINCIDE WITH EQUIPMENT DELIVERY OR MISSION BUILDUP, OR THE CONSTRUCTION IS OF SUCH MAGNITUDE AND COST AS TO MAKE ONE-TIME PROGRAMMING IMPRACTICAL.

COST SAVINGS

ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS HAVE PLAYED AN IMPORTANT PART IN THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR EACH ITEM IN THIS PROGRAM. ACCEPTABLE ALTERNATIVES HAVE BEEN REVIEWED FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION TO DETERMINE OPTIMUM COMBINATIONS OF SITING, MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION METHODS. DECISIONS TO REPLACE OR MODERNIZE EXISTING FACILITIES HAVE BEEN BASED PRIMARILY ON ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS. UPON COMPLETION, THE PROJECTS WILL PROVIDE SAVINGS ON THE ORDER OF $56 MILLION INITIAL COST AVOIDANCE AND $8 MILLION ANNUALLY THEREAFTER. A PORTION OF THESE ANTICIPATED SAVINGS RESULT FROM REMOVAL OF AGED AND OBSOLETE FACILITIES FROM OUR INVENTORY. MOST OF THESE WERE CONSTRUCTED OVER 30 YEARS AGO WITH A DESIGN LIFE OF FIVE YEARS USING MATERIALS CONSISTENT WITH THAT ECONOMIC LIFE. THESE FACILITIES ARE NOW FUNCTIONALLY INADEQUATE AND REQUIRE CONSTANT AND EXPENSIVE MAINTENANCE FOR CONTINUED USE. WE HAVE DISPOSED OF 5,300 OBSOLETE FACILITIES, CONTAINING OVER 14 MILLION SQUARE FEET, IN THE LAST THREE YEARS.

OBLIGATION OF FUNDS

WE HAVE FURTHER INTENSIFIED OUR EMPHASIS ON EARLY AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR APPROVED CONSTRUCTION. THE OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN TO PROVIDE THE AIR FORCE WITH THESE NEEDED FACILITIES AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE AFTER THE CONGRESS HAS APPROPRIATED FUNDS.

I AM PLEASED TO REPORT TO THIS COMMITTEE THAT THE FIRST OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1973 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM PROJECTS WENT UNDER CONTRACT IN JANUARY 1973, JUST 90 DAYS AFTER THE APPROPRIATION LAW WAS SIGNED. WE ANTICIPATE THAT THE MAJOR PORTION OF THE PROGRAM WILL BE UNDER CONTRACT BEFORE THE END OF THIS FISCAL YEAR AND THE BALANCE PRIOR TO THE END OF THE CALENDAR YEAR.

WE NOW ESTIMATE THAT THERE WILL REMAIN ABOUT $161 MILLION IN PRIOR YEAR CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS UNOBLIGATED ON 30 JUNE 1973. THIS REPRESENTS A DOWNWARD TREND FROM THE AMOUNT CARRIED OVER INTO FISCAL YEAR 1973, WHICH WAS $220 MILLION. SIGNIFICANT EFFORT WILL BE EXERTED TO CONTINUE THIS TREND INTO THE FUTURE.

IN ANALYZING THIS CARRY-OVER IN LIGHT OF OUR EMPHASIS ON EARLY CONTRACT AWARD, WE CONCLUDE THAT APPROXIMATELY $100 TO $125 MILLION IS THE MINIMUM FEASIBLE RANGE OF CARRY-OVER TO PROVIDE FOR EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION BEYOND THE END OF THE FISCAL YEAR AND PRIOR TO THE FOLLOWING YEAR'S APPROPRIATIONS.

PERSONNEL SUPPORT

OUR CONCERN FOR OUR PEOPLE IS EXPRESSED IN THE FACT THAT MORE THAN 40% OF THE REQUEST NOW BEFORE YOU IS IN DIRECT OR RELATED SUPPORT OF PERSONNEL. WE MUST CONTINUE TO IMPROVE LIVING CONDITIONS, ON BASE SUPPORT AND HEALTH CARE FOR OUR PERSONNEL. TOWARD THAT END, WE HAVE INCLUDED $125.1 MILLION FOR THESE FACILITIES. OF THAT AMOUNT, $39.7 MILLION IS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF 4,768 NEW DORMITORY SPACES AND 60 NEW BACHELOR OFFICER ACCOMMODATIONS, AND FOR IMPROVE-

MENT OF 4,757 EXISTING DORMITORY SPACES. IN ADDITION, WE ARE REQUESTING $28.4 MILLION FOR ON BASE PERSONNEL SUPPORT FACILITIES SUCH AS COMMISSARIES, GYMNASIUMS, CHAPELS AND OPEN MESSES. MODERNIZATION AND REPLACEMENT OF OUTMODED AND OBSOLETE MEDICAL FACILITIES ARE BEING GIVEN ADDED EMPHASIS IN THIS YEAR'S MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM. WE ARE REQUESTING $37 MILLION TO INITIATE A PHASED PROGRAM FOR MEDICAL FACILITIES THAT WILL INSURE MODERN AND EFFICIENT HEALTH CARE. ANOTHER VERY IMPORTANT PERSONNEL RELATED PROJECT IN THIS PROGRAM IS THE REPLACEMENT OF THE AIR FORCE ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE CENTER AT A COST OF APPROXIMATELY $20 MILLION.

DEPOT PLANT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

PROJECTS TO SUPPORT OUR DEPOT PLANT MODERNIZATION ARE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE PROGRAM BEFORE YOU. INCLUDED IS ANOTHER INCREMENT OF DEPOT PLANT MODERNIZATION VALUED AT $31.4 MILLION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF 16 PROJECTS AT FIVE AIR MATERIAL AREAS.

COST ESTIMATES & DESIGN STATUS

IN PREPARING OUR PROGRAM, WE SEEK TO REFINE OUR COST ESTIMATES ON INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS TO A CAREFUL PROJECTION OF ACTUAL CONTRACT COSTS. THIS ENTAILS AS MUCH ADVANCED INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ENGINEERING AS PRACTICABLE, A SOUNDING ON INFLATIONARY TRENDS AND ANTICIPATED MARKET CONDITIONS, AND AN ANALYSIS OF OUR MOST RECENT BIDDING EXPERIENCE. WE HAVE TAKEN THIS SAME APPROACH FOR THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS. ACTUAL BIDDING EXPERIENCE VERSUS OUR ESTIMATES HAS SHOWN IT TO BE A SOUND APPROACH. PLANNING OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROGRAM IS WELL ADVANCED AND WE HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE IN THE ESTIMATES NOW BEFORE THE COMMITTEE.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

WE HAVE $9.8 MILLION SET ASIDE IN THIS APPROPRIATION REQUEST FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROJECTS. WITH THE EXCELLENT SUPPORT OF THIS COMMITTEE WE HAVE ALREADY RECEIVED SUFFICIENT FINANCING OF OUR ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM TO ENABLE US TO MEET THE POLLUTION ABATEMENT GOALS ESTABLISHED BY PRESIDENT NIXON IN 1970. HOWEVER, AS AIR AND WATER QUALITY STANDARDS GROW MORE STRINGENT AND AS NEW ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION IS ENACTED, WE SHALL HAVE TO PRESENT YOU WITH ADDITIONAL FISCAL REQUIREMENTS AS WE ARE THIS YEAR.

LAND USE PLANNING

CONSISTENT WITH LONG RANGE PLANNING, DISCUSSED EARLIER, WE ARE CONTINUING TO PURSUE THE AIR INSTALLATIONS COMPATIBLE USE ZONE CONCEPT PRESENTED LAST YEAR. AT THAT TIME, WE ORIENTED THE PROGRAM TOWARD THREE BASES INVOLVING 20,000 ACRES. THIS YEAR, WE ARE EXTENDING THE CONCEPT TO 13 ADDITIONAL BASES INVOLVING OVER 78,000 ACRES. ALSO, WE ARE EXTENDING OUR EFFORTS TO A MUCH BROADER APPLICATION OF LAND USE PLANNING. THIS OCCURS AS WE DETERMINE THE FULL IMPACT OF RECENT AND PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND LAND USE POLICIES.

WHEN OUR AIR BASES WERE SITED YEARS AGO, WE SELECTED AREAS CONSIDERABLY REMOVED FROM URBAN DEVELOPMENT WHERE NOISE LEVELS AND ACCIDENT POTENTIALS WERE NOT A PROBLEM TO ADJACENT COMMUNITIES. WE WERE PRETTY MUCH OF AN ISLAND TO OURSELVES. NOW, AS URBAN DEVELOPMENT HAS EVOLVED IN OUR DIRECTION, WE MUST DISCARD OUR INSULAR THINKING AND CONSIDER OUR AIR BASE AS PART OF A LARGER COMMUNITY. WE MUST PLAN ON-BASE LAND USAGE AND INFLUENCE OFF BASE LAND USAGE IN A SINGLE CONCEPT.

TO THIS END, WE HAVE RECENTLY ESTABLISHED A MULTI-DISCIPLINED CAPABILITY WITHIN THE AIR FORCE. WE WILL CONTINUE TO EMPHASIZE OUR AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONE REQUIREMENTS. THIS WILL CARRY US FURTHER TOWARD OUR OBJECTIVE OF ENCOURAGING ONLY THAT USE OF LAND IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO AIRFIELDS THAT WILL BE LEAST SENSITIVE TO HIGH NOISE LEVELS AND ACCIDENT POTENTIALS. IN THIS WAY, WE BELIEVE WE CAN PRECLUDE ENCROACHMENT THAT WILL ADVERSELY AFFECT OUR FLYING MISSIONS.

OUR PRIMARY EFFORTS IN OBTAINING COMPATIBLE LAND USAGE IN THE VICINITY OF OUR AIR BASES CONTINUES TO BE DIRECTED TOWARD ENCOURAGING LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO ENACT SUITABLE ZONING ORDINANCES. WE HAVE HAD GENERALLY FAVORABLE REACTION TO THIS APPROACH WITH LAST YEAR'S PROGRAM, AND EXPECT ZONING ORDINANCES TO BE ENACTED SOON AT THE BASES LISTED IN OUR FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROGRAM.

CONCURRENTLY WITH OUR EFFORTS ON THE COMPATIBLE USE ZONE CONCEPT, WE ARE DEVOTING OUR ENERGIES TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS RELATING TO COMMUNITY CENTERS, INSTALLATION RENEWAL, RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND PARKS AND OPEN SPACES. IN THIS EFFORT, WE WILL BE WORKING WITH LOCAL, STATE AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES CONCERNED WITH TOTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.

IN ESSENCE, OUR LAND USE PROGRAM IS ORIENTED TOWARD OPTIMUM USE OF THE LAND IN THE AREA WHERE OUR BASES ARE LOCATED. OUR PERIMETER FENCES CONFINE ONLY THE AREA UNDER OUR DIRECT CONTROL. OUR PLANNING REACHES OUT INTO THE ADJACENT COMMUNITY.

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

AS IN PAST YEARS, OUR PROGRAM REFLECTS OUR DEEP CONCERN FOR THE WELFARE OF OUR MILITARY FAMILIES. WE ARE VERY GRATEFUL TO THE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE FOR THE ASSISTANCE WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE AIR FORCE AND THE OTHER SERVICES IN MEETING THE HOUSING NEEDS OF MILITARY FAMILIES. I REFER ESPECIALLY TO THE SECTION 236 PROVISIONS OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1968, INCREASES IN MILITARY PAY AND BASIC ALLOWANCES FOR QUARTERS; ADDED APPROPRIATIONS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROGRAM FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING QUARTERS, AND AUTHORITY TO DECLARE AS INADEQUATE ADDITIONAL SUB-STANDARD HOUSING UNITS.

THE TOTAL REQUEST FOR THIS YEAR IS $382,683,000. OF THAT AMOUNT, $218,211,000 IS FOR THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF OUR HOUSING RESOURCES; $81,951,000 IS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW UNITS, MOBILE HOME SPACES AND IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING QUARTERS; AND $82,521,000 FOR THE ANNUAL INCREMENT OF DEBT PAYMENT ON HOMES CONSTRUCTED IN PRIOR YEARS.

OUR OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE REQUEST REPRESENTS AN INCREASE OF $23,700,000, OR ROUGHLY 12 PERCENT, OVER THE AMOUNT APPROPRIATED LAST YEAR. THIS INCREASE IS REQUIRED TO ACCOMMODATE ADDITIONAL HOUSING UNITS COMING INTO THE INVENTORY, AS WELL AS INCREASED COST OF LABOR AND MATERIALS. THIS INCREASE WILL ALSO ALLOW US TO HOLD THE BACKLOG OF DEFERRED MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR TO A MANAGEABLE LEVEL.

OUR NEW CONSTRUCTION REQUEST IS FOR 1800 UNITS, 1100 TO BE CONSTRUCTED AT SIX INSTALLATIONS IN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES AND 700 UNITS AT TWO LOCATIONS OVERSEAS. OF THE 1800 UNITS, 1798 ARE FOR AIRMEN FAMILIES AND CONSTRUCTION WILL BE ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY FOUR BEDROOM UNITS.

THE NEW CONSTRUCTION PORTION OF OUR REQUEST ALSO INCLUDES $2,000,000 TO DEVELOP 415 SPACES AT EIGHT LOCATIONS TO ACCOMMODATE MOBILE HOMES OWNED BY AIR FORCE PERSONNEL. THIS CONSTRUCTION WILL

MATERIALLY ASSIST OUR YOUNG MARRIED AIRMEN WHO DESIRE TO PURCHASE AND LIVE IN MOBILE HOMES.

THE IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING FAMILY HOUSING UNITS REMAINS A MATTER OF MAJOR CONCERN TO THE AIR FORCE. OUR INVENTORY OF HOUSING UNITS WAS ACQUIRED OVER MANY YEARS. WHILE THE STANDARD OF ACCOMMODATIONS VARIES WIDELY, THE FORFEITURE OF QUARTERS ALLOWANCE BY GRADE IS THE SAME AS LONG AS THE QUARTERS ARE CLASSIFIED AS ADEQUATE. THE $23,750,000 WE ARE REQUESTING FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974 REPRESENTS A 100 PERCENT INCREASE OVER OUR PROGRAM OF A YEAR AGO. WE FEEL THIS MAJOR INCREASE IS APPROPRIATE AND THOROUGHLY JUSTIFIED IN VIEW OF THE VERY LARGE DEFICIENCY WHICH EXISTS TODAY. IN ADDITION, WE WILL MORE EFFECTIVELY MANAGE AND EXECUTE THE IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM THROUGH EMPHASIS ON FEWER BUT LARGER PROJECTS. THIS WILL PERMIT US TO SECURE BETTER COST COMPETITION AS WELL AS SATISFYING THE TOTAL IMPROVEMENTS REQUIREMENT AT A NUMBER OF LOCATIONS.

THE PLANNING FOR THE NEW CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDED IN THIS PROGRAM IS PROGRESSING SATISFACTORILY, AND WE EXPECT TO BE ABLE TO PLACE ALL PROJECTS UNDER CONTRACT BY JUNE 30, 1974.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

THIS REQUEST TOTALS $16.0 MILLION, AND PROVIDES ONLY OUR MOST ESSENTIAL FACILITIES NECESSARY TO SUPPORT THE FLYING AND NON-FLYING TRAINING MISSION OF OUR UNITS.

THIS FISCAL YEAR 1974 REQUEST PROVIDES A PROGRAM OF 37 PROJECTS. TWENTY-FOUR PROJECTS ESTIMATED TO COST $9.0 MILLION ARE FOR DIRECT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES; NINE PROJECTS AT $5.0 MILLION ARE FOR OPERATIONAL FACILITIES AND FOUR PROJECTS ARE FOR TRAINING FACILITIES COSTING $2.0 MILLION. THIS REPRESENTS A MINIMUM ESSENTIAL PROGRAM WHICH PROVIDES ONLY OUR MOST URGENT REQUIREMENTS AT 35 OF OUR 153 INSTALLATIONS.

IT IS TO BE NOTED THAT COST FIGURES SHOWN ARE FOR PLANNING ESTIMATES ONLY, AND UNDER THE LUMP SUM AUTHORIZATION/APPROPRIATION PROCEDURE ALL PROJECTS WILL BE CLEARED WITH THE COMMITTEES PRIOR TO ADVERTISEMENT WITH THE COST ESTIMATED ADJUSTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH FINAL DESIGN.

AT THIS TIME I AM PLEASED TO NOTE THAT MAXIMUM UTILIZATION IS MADE OF AVAILABLE AUTHORIZATION BY THE PERIODIC REPROGRAMMING OF ADDITIONAL PROJECTS. AS THE RESULT OF THIS PRIVILEGE, OUR CARRY-OVER OF UNCOMMITTED AUTHORIZATION INTO FY73 WAS ONLY $300,000. THIS WAS BY FAR THE SMALLEST CARRY-OVER SINCE THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD HAS HAD A SEPARATE AUTHORIZATION. THIS REPRESENTS A MINIMUM DOLLAR RESERVE NECESSARY TO ALLOW FOR POSSIBLE CHANGES TO GOING CONSTRUCTION.

AS WE HAVE PREVIOUSLY STATED, OUR UNITS WERE PROGRAMMED TO CONVERT TO MODERN SOPHISTICATED AIRCRAFT SUCH AS F-100's, F-105's, RF-101's and C-130's THROUGH FY75. NOT ONLY HAS A MAJORITY OF THESE CONVERSIONS ALREADY TAKEN PLACE, SEVERAL OF OUR UNITS HAVE CONVERTED TO F-4 AND RF-4 AIRCRAFT AND DURING THE PHASE OF THIS REQUEST, WE WILL ALSO BE RECEIVING A-7's.

INHERENT WITH THESE MODERN WEAPONS SYSTEMS ARE REQUIREMENTS FOR MODERN FACILITIES; PARTICULARLY IN THE AREA OF AVIONICS SHOPS, ENGINE REPAIR SHOPS, AIRCRAFT ARRESTING BARRIER SYSTEMS, NOISE SUPPRESSION EQUIPMENT, SQUADRON OPERATIONS AND FLIGHT SIMULATORS. LIKE THE AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS THEY SUPPORT, THESE FACILITIES ARE HIGHLY TECHNICAL - COMPLEX ITEMS VITAL TO TRAINING AND OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONS OF MAINTENANCE, OPERATIONS AND FLYING SAFETY.

A GREAT NUMBER OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD UNITS ARE PRESENTLY HOUSED IN FACILITIES CONSTRUCTED DURING OR BEFORE WORLD WAR II AND HAVE OR ARE APPROACHING THE END OF THEIR ECONOMICAL LIVES. IT IS ESTIMATED THAT THESE FACILITIES ARE DETERIORATING AT THE ANNUAL RATE OF $11 MILLION. BECAUSE OF THESE OBSOLETE FACILITIES AND INCREASED REQUIREMENTS, OUR BACKLOG OF MAINTENANCE PROJECTS HAVE INCREASED FROM OVER $8 MILLION TO ALMOST $15 MILLION DURING THE PAST YEAR.

OUR ESTIMATED CURRENT AND LONG RANGE FACILITY DEFICIENCIES TOTAL $280 MILLION WITH APPROXIMATELY $54 MILLION OF THESE REQUIRED IMMEDIATELY IN SUPPORT OF ALREADY COMPLETED OR IN-PROCESS CONVERSIONS. TO ESTABLISH AN ORDERLY PROGRAM, WHICH WOULD PROVIDE FOR CURRENTLY PLANNED AND FUTURE AIRCRAFT CONVERSIONS, AND TO REPLACE OBSOLETE FACILITIES, IT WILL REQUIRE AN ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION OF $26 MILLION FOR THE NEXT SIX YEARS. THIS WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE OUR DEFICIENCY OF ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENTS; HOWEVER, IT WOULD NOT CONSIDER NORMAL BASE SUPPORT ITEMS.

THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD AND I ARE MOST APPRECIATIVE OF YOUR EFFORTS IN INCREASING THE FY73 ANG MCP AUTHORIZATION/APPROPRIATION BY $5.5 MILLION. THIS GENEROSITY ENABLED US TO CONSTRUCT 15 ADDITIONAL PROJECTS LOCATED IN TEN STATES.

AS WE HAVE IN PREVIOUS YEARS, WE PLAN, IN SEVERAL INSTANCES, TO USE THE STATES AS OUR CONSTRUCTION AGENCY. THROUGH THEIR SERVICES, WE CONTINUALLY ACHIEVE A SIGNIFICANT COST SAVINGS AVERAGING FROM 11 TO 15 PERCENT.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

OUR REQUEST FOR NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY TOTALS $10 MILLION. OF THIS TOTAL, $9 MILLION IS FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, $800,000 IS FOR PLANNING AND DESIGN, AND $200,000 IS FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION.

I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE A FEW MOMENTS TO GIVE YOU A REPORT ON OUR FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROGRAM. OF THE EIGHTEEN PROJECTS IN OUR ORIGINAL FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROGRAM, FOURTEEN ARE UNDER CONTRACT. THE REMAINING PROJECTS SHOULD BE UNDER CONTRACT BY THE END OF JULY 1973. OUR UNCOMMITTED BALANCE OF FISCAL YEAR 1973 AND PRIOR AUTHORIZATION IS $100,000. WE CONSIDER THIS A REASONABLE AMOUNT TO PROVIDE CONTINGENCIES FOR ON-GOING PROJECTS AND FUTURE BID OPENINGS. WE ANTICIPATE AN UNOBLIGATED BALANCE OF APPROXIMATELY $2.5 MILLION ON 30 JUNE 1973.

THE RECENTLY ANNOUNCED AIR FORCE BASE REALIGNMENT ACTIONS FOR WESTOVER AFB, MASSACHUSETTS HAVE RESULTED IN SOME ADJUSTMENTS IN OUR FISCAL YEAR 1973 AND FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROGRAMS. THE PLANNED TRANSFER OF WESTOVER AFB TO THE AIR FORCE RESERVE WILL MAKE ADDITIONAL FACILITIES AVAILABLE FOR OUR USE. AS A RESULT, WE HAVE CANCELLED AN AERIAL PORT TRAINING FACILITY IN OUR FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROGRAM AND THE AEROMEDICAL EVACUATION TRAINING FACILITY IN OUR FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROGRAM FOR WESTOVER. TO PROVIDE TIMELY OBLIGATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1973 FUNDS RELEASED BY THE CANCELLATION OF THE AERIAL PORT TRAINING FACILITY, WE HAVE MOVED FOUR ALTERATION PROJECTS FOR WHICH DESIGN WAS WELL ADVANCED FROM OUR FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROGRAM TO THE FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROGRAM. THE PROJECTS INVOLVED ARE THE ALTER NON-DESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION SHOP PROJECTS AT MINNEAPOLIS-ST PAUL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, MINNESOTA; NIAGARA FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, NEW YORK; YOUNGSTOWN MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, OHIO, AND WILLOW GROVE AIR RESERVE FACILITY, PENNSYLVANIA. TO FILL THE VOID IN THE TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 LIST, WE HAVE ADDED AN ASSAULT LANDING STRIP PROJECT FOR EGLIN AFB, AUXILIARY FIELD NUMBER

3, FLORIDA. I HAVE A REVISED TENTATIVE PROJECT LISTING FOR OUR FISCAL YEAR 1974 REQUEST WHICH I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE INSERTED IN THE RECORD.

OUR FISCAL YEAR 1974 REQUEST PLACES PRIMARY EMPHASIS ON MAINTENANCE FACILITIES. THE REVISED TENTATIVE LIST INCLUDED THIRTY-TWO (32) PROJECTS AT SIXTEEN (16) LOCATIONS IN FIFTEEN (15) STATES. THE PROJECTS IN THIS REQUEST ARE PRIMARILY FOR LOCATIONS WHICH HAVE TACTICAL AIRLIFT AND TACTICAL FIGHTER MISSIONS WHICH HAVE EXPERIENCED EQUIPMENT CONVERSIONS IN RECENT YEARS. ONE NEW UNIT IS ALSO INVOLVED. THIS IS A C-130 TACTICAL AIRLIFT UNIT AT KEESLER AFB, MISSISSIPPI. THE DETAILED JUSTIFICATION FOR EACH PROJECT AND MANPOWER STATISTICS FOR EACH UNIT INVOLVED ARE INCLUDED IN THE BACKUP BOOKS PROVIDED TO YOUR COMMITTEE.

OUR FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROGRAM IS REQUESTED UNDER THE LUMP SUM FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING PROCEDURES UTILIZED SINCE FISCAL YEAR 1963. PLANNING AND DESIGN ACTIONS FOR OUR 1974 PROGRAM ARE WELL ADVANCED. ADVERTISING IS SCHEDULED FOR JANUARY AND FEBRUARY OF CALENDAR YEAR 1974. MY EFFORTS TO PROVIDE THE MOST ECONOMIC FACILITIES TO ENHANCE THE TRAINING CAPABILITY AND OPERATIONAL READINESS OF THE AIR FORCE RESERVE WILL CONTINUE DURING FISCAL YEAR 1974.

CONCLUSION

IN CONCLUSION, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE WISH TO ASSURE YOU AND YOUR COMMITTEE THAT THIS PROGRAM REPRESENTS OUR VERY BEST CONSTRUCTION PROPOSALS WITHIN THE CONFINES OF A LIMITED BUDGET. PROJECTS FOR IMPROVED BACHELOR HOUSING, MEDICAL CARE FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT ITEMS AMOUNT TO MORE THAN A THIRD OF THE TOTAL PROGRAM. IN ADDITION, WE ARE CONTINUING TO GIVE PRIORITY SUPPORT FOR THE OPERATIONAL MISSION. THE FISCAL YEAR 1974 CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM HAS BEEN CAREFULLY DESIGNED TO MEET NEW AND CHANGING MISSIONS WHILE HOLDING A TIGHT REIGN ON EXPENDITURES. CAPITAL INVESTMENTS ARE PROPOSED ONLY FOR THOSE INSTALLATIONS PROGRAMMED TO REMAIN IN THE INVENTORY FOR THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE. ATTACHED TO THE PRINTED COPIES OF MY STATEMENT ARE NARRATIVE DESCRIPTIONS OF THE ENTIRE PROGRAM BROKEN OUT BY CATEGORY OF FACILITIES, BY COMMAND TOTALS, AND BY MISSION ELEMENTS SUPPORTED.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR ONCE AGAIN BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE. IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT OUR PROGRAM, WE WILL BE PLEASED TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

(ATTACHMENTS TO STATEMENT FOLLOW:)

TABLE I
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION PROGRAM
FOR THE ACTIVE FORCES

SECTION 301

COMMAND	
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES	($000)
AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND	8,794
AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE	3,963
AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND	60,934
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND	9,062
AIR TRAINING COMMAND	56,282
AIR UNIVERSITY	5,462
ALASKAN AIR COMMAND	8,658
HEADQUARTERS COMMAND, USAF	18,435
MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND	12,416
PACIFIC AIR FORCES	7,331
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	25,738
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	17,703
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY	645
POLLUTION ABATEMENT	9,070
AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONES	2,000
TOTAL INSIDE THE UNITED STATES	$246,493
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES	
AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND	1,355
PACIFIC AIR FORCES	11,788
UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE	15,925
UNITED STATES AIR FORCES SOUTHERN COMMAND	1,038
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE	221
POLLUTION ABATEMENT	750
WORLD-WIDE COMMUNICATIONS	330
TOTAL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES	$ 31,407
CLASSIFIED (SECTION 302)	
RADAR SUPPORT FACILITY - VARIOUS WORLD-WIDE	1,000
TOTAL CLASSIFIED	$ 1,000
SUPPORT	
PLANNING AND DESIGN	18,000
MINOR CONSTRUCTION	15,000
TOTAL SUPPORT	$ 33,000
TOTAL APPROPRIATION PROGRAM	$311,900

TABLE II

SUMMARY BY PROGRAM ELEMENT

	AMOUNT ($ MILLIONS)	% OF TOTAL
STRATEGIC FORCES	44.8	14.4
GENERAL PURPOSE FORCES	38.3	12.3
INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS	32.1	10.3
AIRLIFT AND SEALIFT	14.1	4.5
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	16.6	5.3
CENTRAL SUPPLY AND MAINTENANCE	36.8	11.8
TRAINING, MEDICAL AND OTHER GENERAL PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	71.6	22.9
ADMINISTRATION AND ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES	57.6	18.5
TOTAL	311.9	100.0

TABLE III

PROGRAM BY CONSTRUCTION CATEGORIES

	AMOUNT ($ MILLIONS)	% OF TOTAL
OPERATIONAL	52.6	16.9
TRAINING	7.8	2.5
MAINTENANCE	36.9	11.8
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT & TEST	10.0	3.2
SUPPLY	11.7	3.8
HOSPITAL & MEDICAL	36.7	11.8
ADMINISTRATION	31.2	10.0
BACHELOR HOUSING	39.7	12.7
COMMUNITY	28.4	9.1
UTILITIES	21.9	7.0
REAL ESTATE	2.0	0.6
SUPPORT	33.0	10.6
TOTAL	311.9	100.0

23-751 O - 73 - 31

NARRATIVE CATEGORY ANALYSIS

(MILLIONS)

$52.6

OPERATIONAL FACILITIES

THIS CATEGORY REPRESENTS 16.9 PERCENT OF THE APPROPRIATION REQUEST. IT CONTAINS SUCH ESSENTIAL ITEMS AS AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS, AIRCRAFT FUELING SUPPORT FACILITIES, FLIGHT OPERATIONS BUILDINGS, COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, AND NAVIGATIONAL AIDS. IMPORTANT ITEMS IN THIS CATEGORY ARE THE SECOND INCREMENT OF THE TECHNICAL INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS FACILITY FOR $11.0 MILLION AT WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB; SPECIAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT FACILITIES AT ANDREWS AFB FOR $13.5 MILLION; A STATION COMPOSITE SUPPORT FACILITY AT CAPE NEWENHAM AFS, ALASKA FOR $5.4 MILLION; AND AN AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL COMPLEX AT HICKAM AFB FOR $4.5 MILLION.

(MILLIONS)

$7.8

TRAINING FACILITIES

TRAINING FACILITIES INCLUDED IN THIS CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COVER A RANGE OF AIR FORCE TRAINING ACTIVITIES SUCH AS TRAINING FOR PILOTS, AIRCREWS, AND BASE MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL. MAJOR PROJECTS ARE: FLIGHT SIMULATOR TRAINING FACILITY AT REESE AFB, TEXAS, FOR $2.8 MILLION, A BASE MAINTENANCE TRAINING FACILITY AT SHEPPARD AFB, TEXAS, FOR $2.8 MILLION, A BASE MAINTENANCE TRAINING FACILITY AT SHEPPARD AFB, TEXAS, FOR $2.8 MILLION; AND A FLIGHT SIMULATOR TRAINING FACILITY AT LUKE AFB, ARIZONA, FOR $.9 MILLION.

(MILLIONS)

$36.9

MAINTENANCE FACILITIES

THE MAINTENANCE CATEGORY REPRESENTS 11.8 PERCENT OF OUR REQUEST. IT CONTAINS FACILITIES TO SUPPORT AIRCRAFT AND ENGINE MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES, SPECIAL PURPOSE SHOPS, AS WELL AS SHOPS TO SUPPORT MAINTENANCE OF BASE FACILITIES. ALSO INCLUDED IN THIS CATEGORY ARE TEN PROJECTS TOTALING $22.0 MILLION FOR MODERNIZATION OF AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND'S DEPOT FACILITIES. THIS CATEGORY ALSO PROVIDES VARIOUS MAINTENANCE AND STORAGE FACILITIES FOR SHORT-RANGE ATTACK MISSILES AT TWO LOCATIONS FOR $1.0 MILLION.

(MILLIONS)

$10.0

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

A VIGOROUS R&D PROGRAM IS AN INVESTMENT IN OUR FUTURE SECURITY. THIS SEGMENT OF OUR CONSTRUCTION REQUEST PROVIDES THE BUILDINGS, LABORATORIES, AND SPECIALIZED TEST STRUCTURES THAT ARE REQUIRED IN THE CONDUCT OF A QUALITY R&D PROGRAM. AN AIRCRAFT FUELS AND LUBRICANTS LABORATORY FOR $4.9 MILLION; ALTERATION OF A AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENTS RESEARCH FACILITY FOR $1.9 MILLION; AND A MINOR ALTERATION AND EXPANSION OF THE HUMAN IMPACT LAB ARE LOCATED AT WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB, OHIO. OTHER MAJOR PROJECTS ARE A WEAPONS GUIDANCE TEST FACILITY AT HOLLOMAN AFB FOR $0.9 MILLION AND ALTERATION OF A ROCKET PROPULSION RESEARCH LABORATORY AT EDWARDS AFB FOR $0.9 MILLION.

(MILLIONS)

$11.7

SUPPLY FACILITIES

THE MAJOR PORTION OF THIS CATEGORY IS FOR TWO PROJECTS TOTALING $5.9 MILLION FOR MODERNIZING AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND DEPOT FACILITIES.

OTHER SUPPLY FACILITIES INCLUDE AMMUNITION STORAGE FACILITIES AT TWO PACAF LOCATIONS, DIESEL FUEL STORAGE FOR REMOTE SITES IN ALASKA, A BALLISTIC MISSILE PROCESSING FACILITY AT HILL AFB, UTAH, FOR $3.0 MILLION AND A BASE SUPPLY FACILITY AT REESE AFB, TEXAS, FOR $1.0 MILLION.

(MILLIONS)

$36.7

MEDICAL FACILITIES

THIS YEAR'S PROGRAM IS DIRECTED TOWARD EXPANSION AND ALTERATION AND REPLACEMENT OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES TO PROVIDE PROPER CLINICAL AND DENTAL CARE. COMPOSITE MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS ARE INCLUDED FOR: RICHARDS-GEBAUR AFB, MISSOURI, AT $3.8 MILLION; TINKER AFB, OKLAHOMA, AT $3.9 MILLION; MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA, AT $4.9 MILLION; FRANCIS E. WARREN AFB, WYOMING, AT $5.8 MILLION; LAUGHLIN AFB, TEXAS, AT $4.6 MILLION; AND UPPER HEYFORD RAF STATION, UNITED KINGDOM, AT $5.5 MILLION. ALSO INCLUDED ARE TWO AEROMEDICAL STAGING FACILITIES; ONE AT SCOTT AFB, ILLINOIS, FOR $2.0 MILLION AND THE OTHER AT ANDREWS AFB, MARYLAND, FOR $1.7 MILLION. A DISPENSARY AT LACKLAND AFB, TEXAS, FOR $0.5 MILLION AND AT KEESLER AFB, MISSISSIPPI, FOR $1.6 MILLION, BARKSDALE AFB, LOUISIANA, FOR $1.2 MILLION, AND SHAW AFB, SOUTH CAROLINA FOR $1.1 MILLION, ARE ALSO INCLUDED IN THE MEDICAL PROGRAM.

(MILLIONS)

$31.2

ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES

THE MOST SIGNIFICANT ITEM IN THIS CATEGORY IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN AIR FORCE ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE CENTER AT LOWRY AFB, COLORADO, FOR $20.4 MILLION.

IN OUR CONTINUING OBJECTIVE TO HOUSE MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL IN FACILITIES THAT WILL ENABLE THEM TO ACHIEVE MAXIMUM PRODUCTIVITY, WE ARE REQUESTING MODERN EFFICIENT BASE PERSONNEL OFFICES AT NELLIS AFB, NEVADA, FOR $1.9 AND AT MATHER AFB, CALIFORNIA, FOR $1.7 MILLION.

OTHER SIGNIFICANT ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES INCLUDED IN THIS CATEGORY ARE: AN ARMAMENT DEVELOPMENT TEST CENTER HEADQUARTERS FACILITY AT EGLIN AFB, FLORIDA, FOR $4.0 MILLION AND A DATA PROCESSING FACILITY AT RANDOLPH AFB, TEXAS, FOR $1.5 MILLION.

(MILLIONS)

$28.4

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ARE REQUESTED IN ORDER TO PROVIDE FOR THE WELFARE AND MORALE OF OUR MILITARY PERSONNEL AND DEPENDENTS, BOTH IN THE UNITED STATES AND OVERSEAS. THIS CATEGORY INCLUDED PROJECTS

FOR RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES, COMMISSIONED, NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS' AND AIRMEN OPEN MESSES, A BASE POST OFFICE, AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES. IT ALSO INCLUDES COMMISSARIES IN THE AMOUNT OF $7.4 MILLION AT THREE LOCATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES WHERE EXISTING FACILITIES ARE GROSSLY INADEQUATE AND THREE DEPENDENT SCHOOLS AT OVERSEAS LOCATIONS FOR $7.4 MILLION.

(MILLIONS)

$39.7

BACHELOR HOUSING

THE PROVISION OF SUITABLE LIVING QUARTERS FOR OUR BACHELOR ENLISTED AND OFFICER PERSONNEL IS VIEWED AS A PRIORITY OBJECTIVE BY THE AIR FORCE. THIS YEAR $39.7 MILLION, OR 12.7 PERCENT OF OUR REQUEST, IS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF 4,768 NEW DORMITORY SPACES AT A COST OF $25.7 MILLION, AND 60 NEW OFFICERS' QUARTERS AT A COST OF $1.2 MILLION. WE ARE MODERNIZING 4,757 EXISTING DORMITORY SPACES FOR $11.3 MILLION. INCLUDED IN THIS PROGRAM ARE A STUDENT HOUSING COMPOSITE BUILDING AT ONE OF OUR MAJOR TECHNICAL TRAINING CENTERS, KEESLER AFB, MISSISSIPPI, FOR $5.1 MILLION AND A COMPOSITE RECRUIT TRAINING AND HOUSING FACILITY AT LACKLAND AFB, TEXAS, FOR $5.1 MILLION, AND EACH PROPOSING HOUSING FOR 1,000 MEN. BUILDINGS OF THESE TYPES PROVIDED IN EARLIER PROGRAMS HAVE PROVEN TO BE EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE. THIS IS A CONTINUATION OF A PHASED PROGRAM TO REPLACE THE OLD WORLD WAR II BARRACKS WITH MODERN COMPOSITE STRUCTURES.

THIS CATEGORY OF PROJECTS ALSO INCLUDES AIR CONDITIONING FOR AIRMEN DINING HALLS AT LACKLAND AFB, TEXAS, FOR $1.0 MILLION, AND A NEW DINING HALL FOR AIRMEN AT WEBB AFB, TEXAS, FOR $0.6 MILLION.

(MILLIONS)

$21.9

UTILITIES

OUR UTILITY PACKAGE INCLUDES POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROJECTS AS WELL AS PROJECTS TO INSTALL THE NECESSARY UTILITY SUPPORT FOR EXISTING AND PROGRAMMED CONSTRUCTION. THIS YEAR'S INCREMENT OF PROJECTS FOR AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT IS $3.7 MILLION; AND FOR WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT IS $6.1 MILLION.

(MILLIONS)

$2.0

REAL ESTATE

THE ONLY ITEM IN THIS CATEGORY IS THE $2.0 MILLION REQUESTED FOR ACQUISITION OF RESTRICTIVE EASEMENTS TO PROTECT OUR BASES FROM ENCROACHMENT BY INCOMPATIBLE LAND USE.

(MILLIONS)

$33.0

SUPPORT

THE SUPPORT PORTION OF OUR REQUEST AMOUNTS TO 10.6 PERCENT OF THE PROGRAM AND CONSISTS OF $18.0 MILLION FOR PLANNING AND DESIGN, AND $15.0 MILLION FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

INTRODUCTION OF ASSOCIATES

Senator BELLMON. Would you introduce those witnesses accompanying you here today?

General MCGARVEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the Air Force appreciates the time that you have set aside to review our requirements for fiscal year 1974 military construction appropriations. To my left is Mr. Harry P. Rietman, associate director of civil engineering, who will assist in the presentation of our requirements: And Mr. John Lee, from the Office of the Director of Budget, on my right.

Senator BELLMON. You have no further comments?

General MCGARVEY. No, sir.

Senator BELLMON. Mr. Chairman, do you have any comments?

AIR FORCE ALERT POSTURE

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the general one question anyway. How effective was the alert stage as far as the various segments of the Air Force involved last week?

General MCGARVEY. Yes, sir. I would have to provide that information to the record for you, Senator. It is pretty far afield from my engineering responsibilities, but we will be happy to provide such a statement for you.

[The information follows:]

EFFECTIVENESS OF ALERT REG FORCES

The United States Air Force was directed to assume an increased readiness state by the National Command Authorities. We believe we were extremely effective in providing the designated forces which would help demonstrate the United States' purpose and resolve during the recent Middle East hostilities. Worldwide, the Strategic, Tactical, Air Defense and Airlift Forces were required to rapidly convert from a normal day-to-day posture to an increased alert readiness. This conversion was accomplished with required resources well within JCS established timing.

The Strategic Air Command was called upon to redeploy to CONUS selected B–52s temporarily based in the Pacific, provide KC–135 air refueling support, increase the number of Strategic Bombers on nuclear alert and maintain the missile force in a high state of readiness. All these objectives were met. Approximately 70 B–52Gs were returned to CONUS bases; within hours of notification the first aircraft were configured for deployment and airborne. The movement was completed well ahead of redeployment planning factors. The strategic land based missile forces are always maintained in a constant state of readiness with nearly 100 percent of the force available for immediate launch; therefore, the ICBM force continued to provide strategic deterrence throughout the crisis.

Tactical fighter forces world-wide responded to the increased readiness in minimum time. All major commands reported the initial required actions completed within a matter of hours, thus, providing a nuclear and conventional strike force available with significantly reduced reaction times. All weapons systems were readied and manned providing theater commanders with a tailored tactical fighter force capable of meeting foreseeable contingency requirements.

The Continental Air Defense forces received the alerting instructions and within a few hours reached a posture with 100 percent of required aircraft on either a 5- or 15-minute alert. All defensive warning systems were fully activated to provide the required data for the National Command Authorities.

As you are aware, some of our strategic airlift aircraft were already involved in the transportation of material to Israel when the alert stage was called. The aircraft which were not immediately involved with the Israeli resupply

were, of course, performing their normal missions. Recovery of these aircraft and the assignment of an increased alert posture was begun immediately and generation of noncommitted aircraft was undertaken. The availability of strategic airlift bettered the time requirement established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The tactical airlift force was brought to increased readiness posture by the Commander in Chief, USREDCOM, as a part of a REDCOM committed force. This force is comprised of 13 squadrons assigned to the Tactical Air Command. (11 located on the CONUS and two on temporary duty in Europe). The initial deployment requirement of two squadrons within a specified time was met with the aircraft loaded and ready for launch. Follow-on requirements were met within the required time frame.

It is safe to say, that the CONUS based airlift forces responded to the increased readiness with dispatch. The overseas airlift forces currently assigned to the European, Pacific and Alaskan Air Commands were also brought to a state of increased readiness within the time frame established by the JCS.

The final evaluation of the United States Air Force effectiveness is provided in a 30 October 1973 message released by Secretary of Defense Schlesinger:

> "Throughout the last two weeks the men and women of the Department of Defense have been called upon to support the National interests and objectives of the United States during a highly sensitive and complex period. Everyone involved has performed magnificently, and I extend my personal 'well done.'
>
> The teamwork and high level of readiness demonstrated by the U.S. Armed Forces during this period is proof to every American, to our friends and allies around the world, and to potential adversaries, of the capabilities and the professionalism of our defense establishment. I am confident that the Department will accomplish any necessary tasks in the future with the same high level of dedication and performance."

AIR GUARD ALERT

Senator MANSFIELD. Could you also, General, provide a statement as to how effective the National Air Guard was at the time the alert was ordered?

General MCGARVEY. Again, sir, we will provide that for the record.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is all, Mr. Bellmon.

[The information follows:]

EFFECTIVENESS OF ANG AT THE TIME OF ALERT

Eighty-three percent of the ANG flying units (92) were operationally ready at the time of the alert.

LAND USE PLANNING

Senator BELLMON. General, I would like to raise a question in relation to land use planning which you cover in your statement. I will use the specific amount stated to make a point. At Tinker, which I am sure you are well acquainted with, after the air bases had been located, I think it was public knowledge they had been there, civilian developers came in across from the base and directly in front of the main runway and built some 300 homes plus a shopping center and school. Since that time there have been several airplane incidents around the runway and the housing area and there has been some loss of life involved.

Now the local community—well, those homes were put there, I am sure, almost 100 percent with either VA loans or FHA loans and all of it was Government money that built those houses. You talk about this planning here and what is being done to prevent those kinds of absolutely idiotic conflicts with land use in the future as far as the military is concerned?

General McGarvey. Well, sir, our thrust has been and is certainly heavily emphasized at the moment to avoid this, if possible, through joint planning with the local communities, with an effort to get the local community authorities to zone the surrounding territory around the airfields for uses that are fully compatible with aircraft operations and the accompanying accident potential and noise exposure factors.

Senator Bellmon. Well, is there any effort made by the Military or by the Air Force to tell the Department of Housing and Urban Development or the Veterans' Administration that this is an area which the military feels is unsuited for this housing and other types of development? In other words, is the Federal Government at this late date even in a position to have the right hand know what the left hand is doing?

General McGarvey. Yes, sir; I think the Housing and Urban Development have the same kind of general guidelines that the Air Force is pursuing in zoning for compatible usage both from hazard and noise standpoints.

Senator Bellmon. Do you know the Congress is trying to pass land use planning and we may pass it or may not, but it seems without this action that the military could work up its own land planning around its facilities and at least furnish its planning to other Federal agencies so those who make housing loans or for parks or highways or whatever or provide funding, would know whether or not the projects they were planning were compatible with military needs? Do you have any such programs?

General McGarvey. We don't have a specific program with the other Federal agencies, only through the cooperation and exchange with the local planning and zoning folks who are involved with the other Federal agencies as well as ourselves.

Harry, are you aware of such efforts?

Mr. Rietman. Mr. Chairman, right now FHA has a criteria on noise zones around the airfields, and this includes the military, and they do draw lines in which they will not underwrite loans. That does not prohibit conventional loans from being secured. It doesn't prohibit building, but does keep the Federal Government out of an inconsistent position.

Senator Bellmon. Only for noise. What about for approaches to your runways?

TINKER COMPATIBLE-USE ZONES

Mr. Rietman. That is normally where the high noise incidence occurs, is on the approaches and departures of our runways.

Senator Bellmon. Just for the guidance of the committee, could you give me the land use planning or give the committee the land use planning information you have around an airbase, and I will use Tinker as an example, and I would like to know what you have provided to either Federal agencies or local zoning authorities to give them guidance as to how they zone land around that installation.

I can't imagine any more ridiculous situation than we had down there with the runway and the deaths and very heavy costs of litigation that occurred as a result of it. Can you furnish that information? If it is in existence, I am not aware of it, and I think you would be surprised how little is actually done.

General McGarvey. I assume you would be aware of the very recent action taken by Oklahoma City?

Senator Bellmon. This was accomplished by a local board issue which I think was farsighted action on the part of local leaders, but it should not have been necessary?

General McGarvey. Yes, sir, but going back to the earlier question, it came about as a direct result of the two working together, the airbase at Tinker with the local community.

Senator Bellmon. Don't forget there are some politicians working on that, too, and I think you will find that I have made efforts myself to get that cleaned up.

General McGarvey. Yes, sir.

Senator Bellmon. What I want to know is, will it happen again? I am curious to know if you really have a policy of saying to the local FHA office, local VA office, local mayors, "This is an area we feel"—and I think what you can insist upon as far as the Federal agencies are concerned—"should not be allowed to develop for housing or other conflicting uses."

Mr. Rietman. Yes, sir. There has been such a policy, and it has just been recently formalized and restated again to our major commands to be implemented through or bases. Additional guidance is being provided to them because the main thrust of this is going to be through cooperation with the communities to secure zoning that is compatible with our needs and theirs.

Senator Bellmon. I hope you appreciate the tremendous pressures put on local zoning authorities to allow land to be developed for industrial and/or housing purposes, and I don't think the military branches are safe to rely entirely on local use of government because they can't resist pressures, but I think through working with the Federal Housing Administration or the Farmers Home Loan Administration or the VA that you can literally stop the availability of Federal loans for any undesirable developments in the areas that are sensitive, and I want to know if you are doing it. That is the point.

DIRECTIVE ON LOCAL FUNDING DEVELOPMENT

My information from the local FHA office in Oklahoma City is that they didn't know the area they were making these loans in was an area the military felt ought to be rezoned as an open space. That is some time back. I hope you are doing better now, but I would like to know that you are, and can you give us the directives you furnished to local branches of various Federal agencies that furnish funding for developments?

General McGarvey. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

AICUZ-Directives Furnished Local Branches of Federal Agencies

Early in 1970, when the Department of Housing and Urban Development was developing minimum standards for acceptable noise levels in residential areas, the Air Force directed that vicinity noise maps of Air Force installations be made available to HUD and Veterans' Administration field offices upon request. At this time, Air Force involvement consisted primarily of providing these noise maps to HUD and the VA for their use in applying their guidelines.

In 1971, the Air Force established a buffer zone concept, called Greenbelt, which was designed to protect bases from further encroachment. This later became

known as the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone concept and emphasized the necessity to work with local planning and zoning authorities in obtaining compatible land uses around our installations. As research into noise assessment techniques has progressed and studies of the effect of noise on people have continued, refinements in the application of noise tolerance criteria have taken place. Accordingly, the Air Force has updated its approach to include the latest technological advancements.

In July of this year the Department of Defense published a land use planning policy which was an outgrowth of Air Force land use planning activities. This policy requires the development of compatible land use plans for air installations, with implementation to be accomplished primarily by local zoning. Full cooperation and participation of local authorities in the planning process is vital and is being sought. What this really involves is working hand in hand with local communities to develop comprehensive land use plans which consider such items as the anticipated future growth of the area and the base, the impact of aircraft operations on the surrounding area, the intrinsic suitability of the land for various uses, and the potential effect of these uses upon the flying mission. Such plans have been accomplished at a few locations, and are in the initial stages at many others. We are in the process of establishing land use compatibility standards based on our most recent experience and the experience of others in this field. Within the next few months, these standards, and other definitive information relating to the Air Force program, will be presented to other government agencies and departments as desired Air Force land use policies. The Air Force is striving to work for mutually beneficial results in this program, considering both the necessity to maintain the operational capability of our installations and to protect local residents from the inherent hazards of flying operations.

DORMITORIES, MALMSTROM

Senator BELLMON. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to monopolize the time.

Senator MANSFIELD. I have just one question. What is the status of the $900,000 for enlisted men's barracks at Malmstrom Air Base in Montana?

General MCGARVEY. Yes, sir, I am sure you are aware, Senator Mansfield, we bid that project and were not successful in awarding it, that we had insufficient money. We have submitted a request for a deficiency authorization.

Senator MANSFIELD. Had you bid that project, or was that the dormitory for the WAC's?

General MCGARVEY. Maybe I am speaking of the wrong one.

Senator MANSFIELD. Both at Malmstrom.

General MCGARVEY. The only one we have in the program is the one at $552,000, and we bid it and were short of money and came back for deficiency authorization.

Senator MANSFIELD. Are you making up the difference from any other source?

Probably the reason for the increase in the cost is due to the fact they have to make larger rooms for the WAF's, and the original contract, I understand—and you can correct me—was for man-sized rooms rather than for lady-sized rooms?

General MCGARVEY. Colonel Rutland, can you respond on changes associated with that?

Senator MANSFIELD. There is a dieffrence in the sizes, is there not?

Lieutenant Colonel RUTLAND. You are speaking now of the 1972 project, sir, the one being built for WAF's now?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes.

Colonel RUTLAND. In basic design change, sir—there is no actual change with respect to space. There is still the 90 square feet net per person. The only changes in design with respect to the WAF's would be the tub-shower combination as opposed to just a shower for the male airmen. There would be a lounge, for example, and a men's room adjacent. There will be additional laundry space and a small kitchen on each floor. So, basically the prime design for WAF and male airmen is the same. The problem with respect to the Malmstrom project is that it was designed in-house. We felt during the review of that design that there were certain elaborate features that we could have taken out. We are now going back with an AE designing the facility in consort with a Vandenburg dorm project for WAF. We hope to get it on the street within the next few months.

Senator MANSFIELD. Has the project been let for the WAF dormitory?

Colonel RUTLAND. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. Where are the additional funds coming from if needed?

General MCGARVEY. That was the one I made reference to, sir. We are caught in the bind because it is a single line item for the station. We were not able to obtain bids within the 125-percent limitation. We have submitted a deficiency request.

MALSTROM BARRACKS

General MCGARVEY. To go back to the earlier question, which I misunderstood, on the $907,000 barracks at Malstrom, is also a subject of conference at the moment. It was knocked out by the House Armed Services, and we don't know why. We need it very badly and support it strongly as a requirement. Whether it is going to survive conference action, we do not know, of course.

Senator MANSFIELD. We will see and I am just delighted to have the Air Force's further recommendation that this is needed at that airbase.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BELLMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

VANCE COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

General, to go on a little further with the land use planning data we had, you must be familiar with Vance Air Force Base.

General MCGARVEY. Yes.

Senator BELLMON. The airbase is located some 3 or 4 miles south of the city and between the airbase and the city presently there the land is mostly agriculture. The city is growing and there is a new plant that is going in that will put 1,000 people to work and pressures on the landowners and on the city government is to allow residential development in that approach area. It has now been flooding and some rains which you are well aware of, which has made much of the previous residential section less desirable as far as future occupancy is concerned, so there will be other pressures to find areas to build homes and my question is what, if anything, is the Military doing to make certain we won't have another Tinker Air Force situation growing up in the approaches to Vance? Do you happen to know?

General McGarvey. No, sir, I am not aware of any current activity at Vance being posed as a problem of encroachment at the moment. We will certainly take a look at it and see if this—well, this has not been brought to our attention at this level. We will look and see if we have that problem at Vance.

VANCE STUDY ON NOISE IMPACT

Senator Bellmon. I notice in your further land use planning you say you are continuing to pursue their installation compatible to the zoning concept presented last year and I discussed this matter with the commander at Vance and I wouldn't want to quote or misquote him, but I think you will find that there is some concern as time passes, you know, present local governments on your good jobs are zoning something out in a desirable development and it occurs to me the Air Force ought to look at that situation and perhaps come to Congress to ask for funds to either acquire properties or acquire easements, a legal right to control the future development of, or at least limit the development of that area to compatible uses.

Would you look into this and give us a report on what your findings are?

General McGarvey. Indeed, yes, sir.

Senator Bellmon. At Vance?

General McGarvey. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

AICUZ Problems at Vance

As early as 1967, a study was performed at Vance AFB to determine the area of noise impact due to the flying mission. This study did not prescribe tolerable or intolerable noise limits, but only served as a guide for the local communities in planning appropriate land uses. Since that time many advances have been made in defining land use determinants, such as noise impact, and, as a result, the Air Force has recently disseminated guidance to all flying installations incorporating the latest technology. This guidance requires the development of compatible land use plans in full cooperation and participation between the base and local communities, implementation of these plans by local zoning ordinances. The use of zoning is considered to be the appropriate method of implementing these plans, since the highest and best compatible uses are available to the property owner and the land remains on local tax rolls, since it encourages local communities to establish comprehensive development plans to maintain orderly growth, and since protecting the health, safety and general welfare of local citizens is the purpose of zoning. It is not the Air Force's intent to purchase property rights in lieu of appropriate local zoning, however, limited exchanges or acquisitions may be necessary where restrictions on land uses are most severe. We believe that this approach is reasonable and in the best interests of both the Federal government and the local citizen.

The initial guidance which directs the assembling of aircraft operational data as a first step in developing an airport environs land use plan, has been received and is now being accomplished at Vance. Following this, new noise maps will be generated using the latest techniques, and then working together with the local planning commission, a comprehensive area land use plan will be developed which considers all relevant land use determinants. Maintenance of the plan will be accomplished via a continuing dialogue between base and community officials regarding any matters which may affect the plan. We do not anticipate a requirement to acquire land interests at Vance at the present time.

DORMITORY OCCUPANCY STANDARDS

Senator Bellmon. I will now ask the questions you heard me ask perhaps of other witnesses this morning. Could you describe briefly the

impact of the new criteria for barracks that the House's military construction authorization bill will cause, what will it mean to the Air Force?

General McGarvey. It will not impact upon us, of course, the same as it does the other two services. In dollars and cents, it probably impacts the Air Force to a lesser degree from two standpoints. One, our programs are much smaller in numbers of spaces and the actual dollars associated with them. But also the Air Force, for a number of years now, since about 1968, has been pursuing an objective of housing our people two men per room where possible.

Senator Bellmon. Enlisted?

General McGarvey. Enlisted men, sir, for those grades of E–2 through E–4. There was this discussion about the four men per room. Previously our dormitories were constructed on a three-men-per-room basis but since 1970 all of our construction has been geared to two men per room of course staying with the 90 square foot per man and not exceeding the dollar-per-man costs. So we have the situation where our current designs are two two-man rooms that share a common bath facility.

Now, for us to go to four-man, it is cheaper for us to do that than the Army or Navy because we would simply remove the partition and put those two rooms together. So we have an impact of a little over $200,000 in design costs to go back and redesign on the numbers we have, but we are confronted with the same problem of the big delay of having to redesign now because the designs are nearing completion and ready to go out on the market. We have the same problem of additional costs by delays and the inflationary spiral that will cause the ultimate construction prices to go up.

Also of concern to us is the horrible management problem that a commander will have if we would now build three or four man-per-room dormitories or barracks on his base whereas all of his dormitories constructed previously are now occupied at two men per room. He would be confronted with a dual standard of living or forcing everybody to retrograde to a three- or four-man-per-room situation.

We feel very strongly that the driving factor is privacy and security of the airmen's personal belongings, which are the prime reasons for wanting two men per room. We also feel very strongly that we in the Air Force have a situation that is different from the other two services in that living and operating on an air base is different than living in the field or operating on an Army post or a naval station. A large number of our people are shift workers and they work around the clock, 24 hours a day and they do not all belong to the same company or the same battalion, but members of different organizations live in the same dormitories. We have people coming and going at all hours of the day and night, so we feel very strongly about this privacy situation and two per room.

Senator Bellmon. From what you have said, the only additional cost of using the two-per-room design, if you have the same number of square feet per person, is the cost of building one short partition, perhaps one additional wall?

General McGarvey. Yes, sir. We have to reduce the number of partitions and make those design changes.

Senator BELLMON. I am saying if you stayed with two per room rather than going—or if you go from four per room rather than two per room, all you would do is take out the one dividing partition?

General MCGARVEY. Yes.

Senator BELLMON. You wouldn't need to add one, you have a lavatory now for four people.

General MCGARVEY. You are correct.

Senator BELLMON. The only thing I see as we go to the House's criteria is the cost of one partition?

Mr. RIETMAN. Yes; but it is offset by the fact we would be delayed in getting on the street because of the future designs.

Senator BELLMON. Yes; future designs.

Mr. RIETMAN. But it is one less door and one less partition.

DESIGN COSTS

Senator BELLMON. And perhaps you have already furnished the House committee with estimates of the cost of your design as compared to the cost of the new design? Have you done this?

Mr. RIETMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. Does this committee have copies of that information?

General MCGARVEY. Yes.

Senator MANSFIELD. Could this committee have copies?

General MCGARVEY. Yes.

[The information follows:]

23-751 O - 73 - 32

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

28 SEP 1973

Mr. James F. Shumate, Jr.
Professional Staff Member
House Armed Services Committee
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Jim,

In accordance with your request, enclosed are analyses by the Military Departments of the impact that would result from the subcommittee's proposed revision to bachelor enlisted housing criteria.

Summations of the adverse impacts of the proposed changes, which are substantial both in terms of time and money, are included below. Essentially, comments of the Military Departments reflect an unanimity of views that the changes will result in major delays occassioned by the necessity of redesign, plus costs of lost design effort and higher construction costs anticipated due to inflationary construction trends. In short, the changes will not only be seriously disruptive to the scheduled accomplishment of the housing program, but in terms of cost effectiveness or economic balance must inevitably result in higher costs.

Impact of Bachelor Enlisted Housing Criteria Change
on FY 1974 Military Construction Authorization Bill
(all figures in thousands of dollars)

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Summary of Increased Cost Required				
New Construction				
Additional Design Costs	$ 2,188	$1,368	$119	$ 3,675
Escalation Loss	7,918	3,502	135	11,555
Subtotal Losses	$10,106	$4,870	$254	$15,230
Less Savings Construction Cost	2,913	1,245	242	4,400
NET COST INCREASE	$ 7,193	$3,625	$ 12	$10,830
Modernization				
Net Cost Increase	$ 3,700	$ 100	$123	$ 3,923
TOTAL COST INCREASE	$10,893	$3,725	$135	$14,753

In summary, the Military Departments contend it will cost the government $14.8 million more if new bachelor housing criteria is imposed on the FY 1974 program.

Sincerely,

PERRY J. FLIAKAS
Director of Facilities Planning
and Programming
Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Installations and Housing)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

IMPACT OF CRITERIA CHANGE

on

FY 1974 MCP DORMITORY PROGRAM

PART III - Projects not affected by new criteria

Location	Scope (Men)	Requested Amount ($000)	Design Lost ($)	Design Lost (Days)	Inflation Effect ($)	Construction Cost Diff ($)	Remarks
Lackland	1,000	5,053					Recruit Housing Open Bay
Clark	1,302	1,800					Air Condition only.
Osan	1,104	2,077					E-5 and E-6 only

NOTE: Proposed criteria change has net impact of increasing dormitory design and construction cost in the amount of $135,385.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

IMPACT OF CRITERIA CHANGE

of

FY 1974 MCP DORMITORY PROGRAM

Part I - New Construction

PROJECT	1 ORIGINAL COST (1391) (+$000)	2 SCOPE COST SAVINGS (-$000)	3 ADDITIONAL COST ESCALATION (+$000)	4 TOTAL CONST. COST (+1-2+3) (+$000)	5 LOST DESIGN COSTS (+$000)	6 ADDITIONAL DESIGN COSTS (+$000)	7 TOTAL DESIGN COST (5+6) (+$000)	8 ADDITIONAL COST TO GOV'T (-2+3+7) (+$000)
Peterson Field	989	6.0	7.4	990.4	2.5	2.5	5.0	6.4
Wright-Patterson	1,117	8.0	8.4	1,117.4	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.4
Webb	2,500	50.0	0	2,450.0	0	0	0	-50.0
Dover	2,558	-30.0	19.2	2,607.2	25.0	25.0	50.0	99.2
Kincheloe	1,755	71.0	17.6	1,701.6	17.5	17.5	35.0	-18.4
Malmstrom	907	7.0	4.5	904.5	2.3	2.2	4.5	2.0
Keesler	5,130	35.0	38.5	5,133.5	3.0	3.0	6.0	9.5
Kunsan	1,838	40.0	18.4	1,816.4	2.3	2.3	4.6	-17.0
Osan	2,085	45.6	20.9	2,060.3	2.0	2.0	4.0	-20.7
Incirlik	800	9.5	0	790.5	0	0	0	- 9.5
Part II - Modernization (Alteration) Lump Sum	7,384	-15.7	14.2	7,413.9	46.9	46.9	93.8	123.7
							TOTAL	+135.6

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

General McGarvey. I would like to make one further comment. As you know, in regard to the All-Volunteer Force the Air Force has not suffered any problems in recruitment. We have met 100 percent without any difficulty. We attribute it directly, to a great degree, to our current two men to a room accommodations and we are concerned, if we retrograde to lesser criteria, that it will impact on our recruiting ability.

Senator Mansfield. My observation, based on what you told us this morning, is that there, of course, might be upgrading of the other services?

General McGarvey. Well, I make the comment about the peculiarities of the requirements of the services as the Air Force views them, we do comply with the DOD criteria and statutory cost limit and we feel we can meet our requirements much better.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

Senator Mansfield. What was the unobligated balance in military construction carried over by the Air Force from fiscal 1973 to 1974?

Mr. Lee. $199 million and it was reduced $157 million as of September 30.

Senator Mansfield. Again, is it more or less than normal?

General McGarvey. That was less than last year. Last year the carryover was $220 million.

Senator Mansfield. Why such a large carryover year after year?

Mr. Lee. Again, just to complete the cost of going work, much of it, and some of it, of course, is due to contracts not awarded as of June 30. There are involved a number of problems, either uncompleted design or also we have some projects that have not as yet been cleared by Congress in this session. In other words, they were delayed, as an example, at the coastal bases, where the Appropriations Committees prohibited us from going ahead with any construction at coastal bases having a major strategic command flying mission.

Mr. Rietman. General Cooper was alluding to earlier that after that point in time we have to continue to spend money without any replenishment until appropriation bills are enacted, so that by the time we get a new appropriation bill, our unobligated balance is significantly down from the June 30 figure.

Senator Mansfield. And if we make appropriations in November or December you have only 6 or 7 months?

Mr. Rietman. To obligate, that is right, sir. So because of that imbalance it is an artificial point in time to take the unobligated balance.

MINOR CONSTRUCTION CARRYOVER

Senator Mansfield. What was the carryover in minor construction in fiscal 1973 and how much are you requesting now?

Mr. Lee. In the minor construction account, the carryover was $1.5 million and as of September 30 we have no funds left in the minor construction account.

Senator Mansfield. Do you handle the construction account the same way as the other services generally?

Mr. Lee. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. The $300,000 unit?

Mr. LEE. A single authorized project not exceeding $300,000.

Senator MANSFIELD. Did your service carry over any moneys from the fiscal 1973 to 1974 planning account and how much are you asking for planning in this year's construction bill?

Mr. LEE. We carried over $5 million and that has been reduced to $2.5 million as of September 30.

General MCGARVEY. We requested $18 million. The previous request, the request was $15 million on the minor construction.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you use the minor construction moneys if you have a fire or windstorm? Do you go ahead and repair the damage if it is under $300,000?

General MCGARVEY. That is one category, Senator. The others, the same types of projects that were described to you by the other two services.

ACCESS ROADS

Senator MANSFIELD. Did you get all of the money you asked for, for access roads?

Mr. RIETMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the fiscal year 1974 request, at the time our budget was put together we had a carryover of money that was sufficient to cover the projects that had been validated at that time so when we sent our request over and it was forwarded to Congress, we did not have a requirement for funds. However, subsequent to that time at an earlier session of this committee Mayor Keith of Biloxi appeared and identified a requirement for some access road funding around Keesler Air Force Base and during his appearance he mentioned that on the road into the Air Force base, all within the city of Biloxi, "In 1972 there were 830 accidents causing $327,000 in vehicular damage, 123 bodily injuries, and four fatalities. In 1971 there were 860 accidents and $347,000 in vehicular damage, 115 injuries, and three deaths."

As General Cooper said earlier, we used the Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service, MTMTS, to survey access roads and identify the need for them. They completed the survey in June of last year which was provided to us, which identified the requirement at the base. By the time that could be validated and turned into estimates, it was too late to get in this budget request that is before the committee now. However, the city has agreed they will participate in funding of this requirement and because of that they have been able to use their money to initiate design and have even started on the procurement of the right-of-way so that we are now in a situation that if the Congress should provide money, it could be put to work very quickly on this badly needed project.

Senator MANSFIELD. What is the division of cost between the city and the Air Force?

Mr. RIETMAN. They volunteered to underwrite 10 percent of the cost, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. What is the sum that the Air Force would need?

Mr. RIETMAN. There are two parts of it. On the road, the major part, there is a $2 million requirement and the total requirement around the air base is about $3.3 million. We feel that the only amount

of money that could be put to bid in the fiscal year time period would be about $2 million.

Senator MANSFIELD. So you would like to add $2 million for this purpose?

Mr. RIETMAN. We could put it to very good use, yes.

Senator MANSFIELD. I have no further questions.

Senator BELLMON. Thank you very much.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Additional Funds Requested as Part of Devaluation For Fiscal Year 1973 Program

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. KENNETH B. COOPER, OFFICE OF DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR LOGISTICS, U.S. ARMY

ACCOMPANIED BY CHARLES NEUENDORF, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS AS PART OF DEVALUATION

Senator Mansfield. Will you identify yourself?

General Cooper. Maj. Gen. Kenneth Cooper, Director of Installations of the Department of the Army, and I have with me Mr. Charles Neuendorf from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The directive asked that we discuss the request we made on May 7, 1973, to you. Mr. Chairman, concerning additional funds required as part of the devaluation for the fiscal year 1973 program. We asked specifically for an additional $20.65 million. This request had been agreed to by the House Appropriations Committee, but not yet been acted on by the Senate.

COST OF MAINTAINING NATO INFRASTRUCTURE

Senator Mansfield. That is fine, General. I would like to ask some general questions and if you can't answer them, I wish you would furnish them for the record. What is the cost of maintaining the NATO infrastructure in Western Europe at this time?

General Cooper. The NATO infrastructure program contribution of the United States, has been about $40 to $50 million per year. The total program itself has been about $4.8 billion, for all of the countries.

You may remember initially the United States provided 43 percent of those funds. At the present time if France is involved, the United States provides 25.77 percent. If France is not involved—and it can choose to be in or out—the U.S. portion is 29.67 percent.

Senator Mansfield. General, what is the overall cost of maintaining all U.S. NATO forces in Europe?

General Cooper. Sir, I would like to provide that information for the record. I believe it has been testified to by the Secretary of Defense.

Senator Mansfield. And I wish you would bring it up to date. The last figure I saw was $17 billion in January of this year. Could you give the committee an up-to-date figure?

General Cooper. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

COSTS OF U.S. FORCES FORMALLY COMMITTED TO NATO

Total costs - One measure of the U.S. contribution to NATO security is the total annual costs for the general purpose forces the U.S. maintains in support of NATO security. Such a cost estimate is very sensitive to how one allocates our non-Europe deployed forces for possible European, Asian and minor contingencies. It is possible to allocate these forces in different ways, thereby substantially raising or lowering the "cost" of our forces in support of NATO security. One way of making such an estimate is to include costs for the forces in the U.S. formal commitment to NATO (i.e., those in Europe and those in CONUS ready for early deployment to Europe) and the support costs associated with these forces. The most recent DOD estimate of the costs for all these forces and support programs is roughly $17 billion for FY 74. 1/

It includes:

All the U.S. general purpose forces and related support elements and headquarters in Europe.

Some of the U.S. general purpose forces (both active and reserve) that are formally committed to NATO but are not in Europe.

Variable costs of U.S.-based support including training, individual support and logistics for the above forces.

Military assistance for European countries (including Greece and Turkey) and the NATO Infrastructure program.

About $7.7 billion of the $17 billion is related to the cost of U.S. combat forces actually in Europe and their U.S.-based support -- i.e., the cost of new equipment, and a proportionate share of U.S.-based training and logistics support. In order to save this $7.7 billion, all 300,000 men and associated units in Europe would have to be eliminated from total U.S. forces along with eliminating U.S.-based support units and cancelling of U.S.-based support programs.

The $17 billion estimate assumes that costs for our strategic offensive and defensive forces, administration, research and development, and retired pay would be unchanged even if we eliminated the forces and programs described above.

Direct costs of U.S. forces in Europe - Another way to look at the U.S. costs in support of NATO security is the $4 billion cited as the direct annual operating costs of approximately 300,000 troops actually based in Europe. The $4 billion covers only the military pay and allowances and direct operatings and maintenance costs for the U.S. forces in Europe including the Sixth Fleet. Since the $4 billion excludes such items as procurement of new equipment and necessary U.S.-based support (training, logistics, etc.), it gives an incomplete view of the costs of our forces in Europe and does not represent the cost of all the forces we keep for use in Europe.

In addition, the $4 billion figure has been misused by people who believe that if we merely returned the 300,000 people to the U.S. we could save $4 billion annually. This is not true since roughly 90 percent of the $4 billion is needed to keep and operate these forces whether they are in Europe or in the U.S. Further, if we maintained these 300,000 people in the U.S. but wanted to be able to return them quickly to Europe in a crisis, we would have to spend more than we presently spend on prepositioned unit equipment in Europe or on airlift and sealift forces.

This argument applies also to the $17 billion estimate. That is, redeploying the 300,000 men to the U.S. would save very little and would result in increased costs.

1/ This is the concept which underlies the $16 billion FY 73 estimate. The differences between this $16 billion estimate and the $17 billion estimate is inflation.

NATO PERSONNEL

Senator MANSFIELD. Could you tell the committee how many generals and admirals there are attached to all NATO elements in Europe?

General COOPER. Again, I would have to provide that for the record since my area of expertise is in military construction.

Senator MANSFIELD. Fine. Could you also provide for the record the number of colonels, lieutenant colonels, majors, and captains, or take in the whole thing—first lieutenants, second lieutenants?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. United States?

Senator MANSFIELD. United States.

General COOPER. All services?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, all services.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The document follows:]

U.S. ARMED SERVICES OFFICER ALLOCATIONS, NATO

Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marines	Tota
General/flag (07–010)	14	13	15	0	42
Second lieutenant through colonel/captain (01–06)	439	217	415	22	[1] 1,093
Total	453	230	430	22	1,135

[1] 192 are grade 06.

DEVALUATION IMPACT

Senator MANSFIELD. Now in this reprograming action you are asking to reprogram, as you indicated, $20,650,000. Can the Department of Defense finance this sum from recoupments from the NATO infrastructure funds?

General COOPER. No, sir. We have already taken into account in our total funding recoupments.

We have a detailed breakdown of where we would get the funds from. Basically every year we estimate the total amount that we can get from recoupments and make our request on that basis. We would plan for this request of $20.65 million to reprogram Safeguard funds

Senator MANSFIELD. Now General, you indicated in your letter to the committe that this money was required because of the devaluation of the dollar; is that correct?

General COOPER. That is correct.

Senator MANSFIELD. Will you explain for the record exactly how devaluation affected our contribution to the NATO infrastructure?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. Can you furnish it or do you have it?

General COOPER. I thought you said, "Would I furnish it for the record" and I was trying to say I would furnish it for the record.

Senator MANSFIELD. Can you explain or furnish it?

General COOPER. We can do both. For all projects in past slices where the United States has obligated but not yet expended funds, we have to provide additional dollars so that our contribution in essence is the same. In other words, any time a country devalues its currency, it has to go back and put more money into the pot so that its

contribution comes back to the percentages I mentioned in the beginning.

Senator MANSFIELD. I will get to them in a minute. How much has the devaluation of the dollar increased the cost to military personnel in the various countries of Western Europe in which they are stationed and in the Mediterranean?

General COOPER. For all accounts?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes.

General COOPER. Operations and maintenance, I can provide it for the record.

Senator MANSFIELD. The reason I asked that question is we have had two devaluations of the U.S. dollar, 10 percent each time, and we had a float which further devalued the dollar, and it is my understanding that it amounts to somewhere in the vicinity of 30 percent, perhaps more than that in West Germany, because of the revaluation of the deutsche mark and I would like to get those figures by country because it means that, economically speaking, an added burden has been placed on all military personnel and especially affects the lower levels.

General COOPER. That is correct, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. I would like a detailed explanation of that by country and I don't know whether you can get this information or not, what effect it has had on the morale of the troops and what effect it has had on the morale of the troops and what effect it has had on the family situations inherent therein. Will you do the best you can?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. Morale is difficult to quantify, as to the effect on the families we have the numbers—I don't have them with me—of how many men had to send their families back to the United States.

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes.

IMPACT OF DEVALUATION ON MORALE

General COOPER. And we have taken some steps to alleviate that by providing station allowances that we didn't provide before. But I don't have all of the dollar figures here and I think you would like that.

Senator MANSFIELD. Of course that adds to the cost of maintaining these forces overseas?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

MORALE IMPACT OF DEVALUATIONS

The effect on morale has not been too significant for military command-sponsored personnel, so long as they shop in the PX and commissary and take few meals on the economy. Additional station allowances and quarter allowances have been authorized, which have eased greatly the effects of the dollar devaluations. Military personnel who have suffered the most are the low ranking personnel who are not command sponsored, and may have brought dependents along at their own expense. Since these personnel do not qualify for off base housing allowances, any rent paid by them immediately increased as a result of the devaluations and continuing inflation. The DOD has directed employment efforts to attempt to place dependents of these personnel in jobs previously held by local nationals.

Tabulated below are values of European currencies prior and subsequent to the dollar devaluation and the percentage of cost increase resulting therefrom.

Foreign Currency Adjustment Costs

Dollars Per Foreign Currency Unit

Country	Monetary Unit	Prior to Devaluation	Subsequent to Deval.	Percentage of Cost Inc.
Belgium-Luxembourg	Belgian Franc	022313	.028300	26.8%
Canada	Can. Dollar	-	-	-
Denmark-Greenland	Krone	.14327	.182500	27.4%
France	Franc	.19547	.245500	25.6%
Fed Rep of Germany	Deutschemark	.310318	.432900	39.5%
Greece	Drachma	.0333	.0335	.6%
Iceland	Krona	1.0146	-	-
Italy	Lira	.001708	.001730	1.3%
Netherlands	Guilder	.30819	.389000	26.2%
Norway	Krone	.15048	.190200	26.4%
Portugal (Incl. Azores)	Escudo	.036697	.045000	22.6%
Turkey	Lira	.07142	-	-
United Kingdom	Pound	2.35	2.5410	8.1%

HIRING PRACTICES

Senator MANSFIELD. Now, is it true, General, that American dependents find it almost impossible to get a job at U.S. military installations?

General COOPER. I don't have the detailed facts. There is blanket prohibition against hiring them as such. There are certain jobs that have been held normally by the Germans. Now, in those jobs, we can't, or we don't intend to, displace the Germans. To the extent that jobs are available, I don't think there is any discrimination. But I had better provide you with some more details.

Senator MANSFIELD. Now, we pay the German employees in deutsche marks?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

INDIGENOUS EMPLOYEES

Senator MANSFIELD. Could you give the committee a breakdown of the number of indigenous employees in all of the countries in which of indigenous employees in all of the countries in which we have installations of any significance, includng Greece, Italy with our forces in the north there, and other countries?

General COOPER. Yes, sir; for all services or just the Army?

Senator MANSFIELD. All services.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Indigenous hires

The total numbers of indigenous employees in NATO countries is as follows:

Country:	
Belgium	468
Denmark	18
France	17
Germany	58,858
Greece	577
Iceland	543
Italy	2,405
Netherlands	288
Norway	38
Portugal	910
Turkey	587
United Kingdom	2,251
Luxembourg	0
Total	66,960

DEPENDENT OVERSEAS EMPLOYMENT

Senator MANSFIELD. It is my understanding, and you might check me on this, Mr. Rexroad, that most of these jobs are allocated in Germany, for example, to German nationals, and that the only place where an American dependent might be able to get a job at a U.S. military installation is in the kitchen.

Mr. REXROAD. They have some secretaries, but it is very limited.

General COOPER. And schoolteachers.

Senator MANSFIELD. The schoolteachers are sent over?

General COOPER. Yes, sir, but I think if dependents are otherwise qualified.

Senator MANSFIELD. That you can then hire some others?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. And I would like that statement either corroborated or refuted, because I understand also that some of these dependents cannot find jobs at U.S. military installations because they have been usurped by German nationals, and that they have gone to work in German automobile factories and the like; is that a correct statement?

General COOPER. I don't have firsthand knowledge. I think it probably is correct, sir. You remember that since one of our objectives has been to try to reduce the number of U.S. nationals overseas, we civilianized jobs and we tried to convert jobs before all of this devaluation, to use a maximum number of Germans and the fewest number of civil servants from the United States, because it cost more.

Now, as a result of the devaluation and inflation we may be in a reverse position and we may not have adjusted to that reverse position.

[The document follows:]

EMPLOYMENT OF DEPENDENTS IN FOREIGN AREAS

The Department of Defense has made a concerted effort to improve the employment opportunities for dependents of military assigned in foreign areas over the past several years.

Dependents have been given priority in jobs with nonappropriated fund activities since July 1971. No local nationals are hired for these jobs unless a qualified dependent is not available.

In March 1972, a memorandum was issued giving preference in employment in appropriated fund activities to dependents. This memorandum required that to the extent possible within controlling appropriations, positions would be designated to be filled by dependents and that manpower space adjustments would be made to accommodate this effort. While the services still have manpower ceilings, they are now flexible enough to permit the employment of a dependent in all jobs that have typically been held in the past by local nationals. In Germany and most other countries, every local national position that becomes vacant is now filled with a dependent, unless there are no qualified ones available.

Costs are still a major factor, but with the rapidly increasing cost of local national labor and recent currency adjustments, the cost ratio of a local national employee to a U.S. military dependent is approximately the same in many grade levels, particularly at the lower end of the scale.

While the Presidential hire freeze and later hire controls from 12/72 to 4/73 somewhat limited the impact of these hiring changes, significant improvements have been realized. For instance, the number of dependents employed in Germany increased from 7,634 in March 1972, to 11,882 in September 1973, a 65% increase.

PAYMENTS TO GERMAN HIRES

Senator MANSFIELD. Now, General, when you paid the German nationals, again, as an example, you paid them in deutsche marks?

General COOPER. That is correct.

Senator MANSFIELD. When the dollar is devalued, are their salaries or their wages in turn devalued, or are they still paid the same salary in deutsche marks?

General COOPER. They are paid the same salary in deutsche marks, but it costs us more, because we have to pay more for the deutsche marks.

U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS

Senator MANSFIELD. Now, you have indicated that, or have you, let me put it this way. Is the United States still contributing 29.7 to the NATO infrastructure construction fund?

General COOPER. Yes, sir, for all of those projects that France does not participate in.

Senator MANSFIELD. France is in an in-and-out position. She belongs to NATO, and she does not belong to NATO. She still has 60,000 troops staked in southern Germany, but the French Forces—Army, Navy and Air Force—are not under NATO command, is that correct?

General COOPER. That is my understanding, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. What steps is the Department of Defense taking to reduce this contribution figure to 20 percent?

General COOPER. I will defer to Mr. Neuendorf.

Mr. NEUENDORF. The U.S. negotiating position, and under the current discussion regarding the next 5 years' program, is 20 percent. The proposed U.S. negotiating position, plus reasons for taking these positions, is contained in a Secretary of Defense letter dated October 7, 1973, transmitted to the congressional committees.

Senator MANSFIELD. Twenty percent over a 5-year period?

Mr. NEUENDORF. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. Does that depend on whether France stays in or participates or does not?

Mr. NEUENDORF. This would be without France's participation. It would be somewhat lower with France's participation.

Senator MANSFIELD. If the French condescended to participate in the meantime, maybe the figures can be reached that much sooner?

Mr. NEUENDORF. If they do; sir, yes.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 FUNDING

Senator MANSFIELD. In this year's appropriation, General, I noticed that the Department of Defense has asked for $80 million in new authorizations, and only $60 million in new fundings for NATO infrastructure for fiscal year 1974. Now, why the difference between the funding and the authority you are requesting?

Mr. NEUENDORF. Our request recognized the problem of operating in a new fiscal year during the interim period when we did not receive new authorization from the Congress.

We, therefore, asked for $20 million over our then estimated funding requirement in order that we might have $20 million in unused authorizations to carry over into the new fiscal year to operate for per-

haps the first 4 months until new authorization was provided. NATO infrastructure is the only continuing program funded under the military construction appropriation. The other line items in the military construction appropriation pertain to single projects such as the Walter Reed Hospital, whereas NATO infrastructure is unique in that it is a continuing program to which the United States had previously committed itself through an agreed multiyear program and participation in the various infrastructure committee actions leading to authorizing contracting for specific projects.

GERMAN CONTRIBUTION

Senator MANSFIELD. Did the reevaluation of the German mark lessen the Federal Republic of Germany's contribution to the NATO infrastructure in relation to dollars?

General COOPER. The answer is yes.

Senator MANSFIELD. In other words, they could contribute their marks at an increasingly increased value and credit for that, because of the devaluation of the U.S. dollar?

General COOPER. That is correct, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. Are the Germans still buying U.S. bonds?

General COOPER. I can't answer that. I will get it for the record, sir.

If I may, the German contribution has gone up from 13 percent in February of 1957, and it was about 1954 that Germany was added to NATO, up to about 25 percent now without France. The fact that their mark is revalued helps them in the existing program, but then, when they start discussing the percentages again, what each country is going to contribute, the state and the health of their economy is one of the factors considered.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, General, would a 25-percent increase in their contribution be less than the increase in the value of the deutsche mark in relation to the dollar?

The reason I asked the question, General, is I understand in Germany, again as an example, that the differential there is probably closer to 40 percent as far as the devaluation of the dollar is concerned and the revaluation of the deutsche mark.

General COOPER. Well, that helps them out with the old slices, there is no question about it, but these are all discussed in international IAU's, so they get the benefit from it. I mean Germany does, but it is not in direct proportion to our additional payment, because it depends upon all of the countries currencies—you have to relate it to all of the different countries.

Senator MANSFIELD. Could you give the committee a detailed explanation in answer to that question?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

CURRENCY ADJUSTMENTS

When a NATO nation agrees to participate in a long range (usually five-year) NATO Infrastructure Program, it agrees to pay its percent share of a total Infrastructure program expressed in terms of Infrastructure Accounting Units (IAUs). An IAU is an accounting unit used to express the cost of Infrastructure projects. Currently, one IAU has a value of $3.38, which reflects the effect of the recent dollar devaluations by its change from $2.80.

When a NATO country devalues or revalues its currency, the nation will normally reaffirm its commitment in real terms, i.e., IAUs, to the approved NATO Infrastructure program. This means in the case of a currency devaluation, that it will take more of that nation's currency to continue its commitment in terms of IAUs. The reverse is true in the case of a revaluation. All NATO nations which have devalued their currency have reaffirmed their commitment in real terms to NATO Infrastructure.

In the case of Germany, as a result of successive dollar devaluations and DM revaluations, the DM has increased in relation to the dollar by approximately 40%. The current German contribution to NATO Infrastructure is 21.86% with France participating and 25.18% with France not participating. A 25% increase in the FRG contribution—approximately 6%—would be less than the increase in the value of the DM in relation to the dollar.

SECURITY INTEREST RATES

Senator MANSFIELD. And, also, when you furnish the information relative to the German contribution in the form of buying U.S. bonds, would you put down the rate of interest we are paying to the holders of those bonds?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. It is not really a contribution—if what I have said is a fact, and I think it is, it is an investment on which they are making money under the guise of compensatory payments.

[The information follows:]

PURCHASE OF U.S. SECURITIES BY FRG

The past two German offset agreements have included credits at concessional interest rates. The FY 70–71 agreement provided for a 10-year FRG Government loan of $250 million at 3½% interest. The FY 72–73 agreement provided for the repurchase by the Deutsch Bundesbank of some $620 million of special 4½%-year USG securities at 2½% interest. The FRG agreed to pay $31 million of the interest, resulting in an effective interest rate of 1.38%. No further arrangements have been made subsequent to these.

PROJECTED EXPENDITURES

Senator MANSFIELD. For fiscal year 1974, what is the projection of expenditures for the NATO infrastructure fund? I think, maybe, you have indicated that already prior to this question, but if you haven't, could you repeat it?

Mr. NEUENDORF. We had originally estimated our expenditures at $70 million for the fiscal year 1974; however, since the February 12, 1973, devaluation, the foreign exchange rate for the dollar has been lower than the official dollar rate. This will increase our expenditures.

Senator MANSFIELD. Let me have that again, the foreign exchange rate is lower than the official?

Mr. NEUENDORF. That is correct, sir. We record obligations for a given construction project on the basis of the official dollar rate. When we go to pay that bill, the dollar in the foreign market is less than the official value, which is 42.22 per fine Troy ounce. In fiscal year 1974, to date this difference has exceeded 10 percent.

Senator MANSFIELD. You are losing me there. Are you speaking of gold, silver, or what, when you use the term?

Mr. NEUENDORF. In terms of gold. On February 12, 1973, the dollar was devalued from $38 to 42.2222 per fine Troy ounce. This is a devaluation of 11.1 percent. When the U.S. Treasury advised the Interna-

tional Monetary Fund on October 15, 1973, the dollar would be devalued as of October 18, 1973, we ascertained our unliquidated obligations, which were $188 million, we multiplied this amount by 11.1 percent, the percent of devaluation to ascertain the increase in our obligations.

Senator MANSFIELD. So, the total figure is what?

Mr. NEUENDORF. The total figure, then, would be—unliquidated obligations on October 18, 1973 of $188 million, plus the $21 million—which totals $209 million.

Mr. REXROAD. That would be what the United State's projected contribution would be?

Mr. NEUENDORF. No, sir, this is not related to new contributions, it is obligations which we have previously incurred over the years, but have not yet liquidated because the construction and the follow-on paper work has not as yet been completed.

Senator MANSFIELD. Over the years up to and including fiscal '74?

Mr. NEUENDORF. Yes, sir, including fiscal year 1974 to October 18, 1973.

General COOPER. I will give you a figure that might be easier to track for you. We estimate that the total increased requirement—increased requirement in our '74 budget due to the dollar devaluation—is $52.7 million. That includes $12.7 million in projects deferred from fiscal year 1973 due to the impact of dollar devaluation.

COST OF DOLLAR DEVALUATIONS

Mr. NEUENDORF. I think you would want the record updated from our 7 May request, Senator. Our 7 May request comtemplated that Congress would devaluate the dollar during fiscal year 1973. This did not occur until September 1973, and the dollar was not officially devalued until the Treasury notified the "IMF" in October 1973. When we came to you intially on 7 May, we estimated the impact on fiscal 1973 of the dollar devaluation at about $43 million plus $20 million in '74, or a total of $63 million. The figure of $63 million is still a good estimate. However, of that amount, fiscal year 1973 devaluation costs were $23 million. Fiscal year 1974 devaluation costs are now estimated at $40 million, plus $12.7 million in projects deferred from fiscal year 1973. I can add a detailed summary for the record.

[The information follows:]

COST OF RECENT DOLLAR DEVALUATIONS
U.S. SHARE OF NATO INFRASTRUCTURE (MCA)

On February 12, 1973, the President announced the second recent devaluation of the dollar. Public Law 93-110, "Par Value Modification Act, Amendment," was signed by the President on September 21, 1973. This legislation authorized a change in the parity of the U.S. dollar in terms of gold from $38.00 to $42.2222 per fine troy ounce.

On October 15, 1973, the Treasury Department notified the International Monetary Fund of this action and established the effective date for the devaluation as October 18,1973.

The two recent devaluations of the dollar have significantly increased the FY 1973 and FY 1974 cost of the U.S. share of the NATO Infrastructure program over the amounts budgeted by DOD. The December 18, 1971, dollar devaluation increased DOD FY 1973 costs by $20 million and our FY 1974 costs by $5 million. The most recent devaluation increased our FY 1973 costs by $3 million and our FY 1974 costs by $35 million, resulting in a total FY 1973 cost of $23 million and in FY 1974 cost of $40 million. Of the total $63 million cost of devaluation only $5 million was included in the FY 1973 and the initial FY 1974 DOD budget estimates.

The actual impact on the FY 1974 program totals $52.7 million, inasmuch as $12.7 million in urgent FY 1973 approved projects were deferred into FY 1974 as a result of the dollar devaluations. The initial FY 1974 DOD budget included only $5 million for devaluation. Financing of the unbudgeted $47.7 million FY 1974 devaluation costs and FY 1973 deferrals leaves only $7.3 million to apply toward the $60 million program contemplated by the DOD FY 1974 initial budget request.

As of October 17, 1973, $18 million of the FY 1974 program had been obligated. On October 18, 1973, an additional $21 million was obligated, reflecting the immediate impact of the official dollar devaluation, announced by the U.S. Treasury on that date ($188 million unliquidated obligations x 11.1% devaluation). Approval of the DOD May 7, 1973 reprograming request in the amount of $20.650 million and additional funding of $25.3 million,

over and above the $60 million requested in the initial DOD FY 1974 budget is required to finance the FY 1974 program. Of the $25 million, it is estimated that $6 million will be covered by an increase in estimated FY 1974 recoupments from $20 to $26 million. Authority to utilize $15 million unobligated prior year SAFEGUARD money is also requested, along with $4.3 million additional NOA -- making a total revised FY 1974 requirement of $85 million TOA and $44.3 million NOA.

($ Millions)

$21.0	Increase in unliquidated obligations ($188M X 11.1%, 12 Feb 1973 devaluation)
5.0	May 8, 1972 revaluation NATO IAU (reflecting Dec 18, 1971 $ devaluation)
8.0	February 12, 1973 $ devaluation, FY 1974 projects
6.0	Increased cost FY 1974 expenditures (official Feb 12, 1973 $ vs foreign exch)
$40.0	Total cost $ devaluation, FY 1974 program
12.7	Projects deferred FY 1973 to FY 1974
$52.7	Total increased requirement FY 1974 budget, due to $ devaluation

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL FUNDING

($ Millions)

$-6.7	Included in FY 1974 Initial Budget (including $1.7M carryover)
$46.0	Total unbudgeted
$-20.7	FY 1973 Reprograming from SAFEGUARD, requested May 7, 1973
$25.3	Balance not provided for in initial budget or through reprograming
$15.0	Additional Reprograming from SAFEGUARD, requested FY 1974 Budget Amendment
6.0	Estimated additional recoupments ($26M vs $20M), forecast FY 1974 Budget Amendment
4.3	Additional FY 1974 NOA, requested FY 1974 Budget Amendment

TOTAL FUNDING REQUIREMENT FY 1974

NOA	TOA	
$40.0	$60.0	Initial DOD FY 1974 Budget
4.3	25.3	FY 1974 Budget Amendment Request
$44.3	$85.3	Total FY 1974 Budget Request (contemplates approval of FY 1973 reprograming request, $20.650M).

CURRENCY MARKET VALUE

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, now, you are a financial man, well versed in economics, since the last official devaluation of the dollar, and the imposition of the "float," has the dollar declined still more?

Mr. NEUENDORF. In the first few months following the devaluation, the dollar declined an additional 10 percent in the marketplace. It varied by country, considerably more in Germany where we have a great deal of our expenditures, a lesser amount in Greece. The dollar has strengthened somewhat since that time. We are now estimating that for fiscal year 1974, when we make our expenditures, it will cost us approximately 10 percent more than our recorded obligations which are based on official dollar values. In other words, our initial estimate of $70 million expenditures will now become $77 million for fiscal year 1974. The combined fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 dollar devaluation costs of $63 million, has a significant impact upon all our ability to continue participation in NATO, in that the fiscal year 1973 budget provided for none of the costs of devaluation. The fiscal year 1974 budget only $5 million.

General COOPER. You asked, did the dollar go down?

Senator MANSFIELD. Since the official devaluation and the organization of the so-called float?

General COOPER. It did go down, and has come part way back up. And, we can give you a track on it on a month-by-month basis. We track it in the Army, particularly with regard to Germany, which is where the greatest impact on our expenditures is. Most economists that I read, and I am not an economist, think that the dollar presently is undervalued. In other words, that the swing down, went too far. I note, having talked to the Mediterranean division engineer yesterday, there are some U.S. firms, because of the devaluation, plus decrease from the float, who can now bid on projects that they couldn't bid on.

Senator MANSFIELD. I will agree, I think, the dollar has been undervalued all along. I think, it has always been a good investment, and I just can't understand why the devaluation has occurred, except on the basis of speculation on the part of certain individuals and countries in the oil-rich regions, and deliberate raids on the dollar itself.

RECLAMA MATERIAL

There will be placed in the record at this point for all three services reclamas for those projects disapproved or reduced by the House Appropriations Committee.

[The information follows:]

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

RECLAMA

Installation: Fort George G. Meade, Maryland

Project: Logistics Support Facility

Budget Request	$3,529,000
House Action	-0-
Requested of Senate	$3,529,000

Justification

Authorization for four NSA construction projects, including a Logistic Support Facility, was requested in the DoD FY 1974 Authorization Bill. All of these NSA projects have been authorized in the House and Senate versions of this Bill. The House has, however, in their action on the Appropriation Bill deleted the Logistics Support Facility as lacking urgency and not being cost effective.

This project is urgently needed by NSA in order to consolidate at Fort Meade a number of dispersed logistic activities in one facility specifically designed for this purpose. It has become even more important and urgent as a result of recently developed plans for the relocation to Fort Meade of additional cryptologic missions and components. This would place even more emphasis for streamlining our logistics activities and providing a greater capacity to handle expanded logistic effort.

With regard to cost effectiveness, the Agency provided an economic analysis reflecting recurring costs of decentralized operations at Fort Holabird and other locations, which supported new construction. It is now understood that Ft. Holabird will be turned over to the GSA by 1 July 1974. This means that if NSA must stay there, the Agency will have to commence paying GSA in FY75 for the leased costs and operations and maintenance expenses of those facilities in accordance with Public Law 92-313. These additional charges are estimated at about $400,000 - $500,000 per year. This would increase considerably the recurring costs for staying at that facility and thereby make the construction alternative even more compelling.

We therefore request Senate approval for funding in FY 1974 of the Logistics Support Facility.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Installation: United States Military Academy, New York

Line Item: New Hospital

Budget Request:	$25,000,000
House Action:	$ 0
Restoration Requested:	$22,900,000

JUSTIFICATION

The U. S. Military Academy hospital is the oldest hospital in use in the Army's inventory, having been initially constructed in 1923 and the last major addition occurring in 1943. It is now outmoded and seriously inadequate.

In anticipation of replacement, the existing structure has received little more than breakdown maintenance since 1965 with respect to those building systems or portions thereof peculiar to the structure's continued use as a hospital. Building systems requiring the expenditure of substantial funds, if continued in use as a hospital for any extended period of time, include: the high pressure steam system; electrical service and branch wiring; both hot and cold water systems; the central dictation, nurses' call, personnel paging and telephone systems; three elevators and the piecemeal air conditioning and ventilation system.

Serious deficiencies exist with respect to space in much of the hospital due in large part to changes in the practice of medicine over the years. Those changes have seen an increased emphasis on outpatient care, placing nearly insurmountable burdens on clinics, diagnostic services and the pharmacy. For example, the cadet sick call area is so limited that the line of waiting cadets frequently extends out of the area, past the pharmacy, radiology clinic and administrative areas, and to the hospital main entrance. The pharmacy has only 25% of the area needed to meet operational requirements.

For most efficient utilization, each physician should have two examining rooms, whereas physicians now have only combination office/examination rooms. The Optometry Section and the Mental Hygiene Consultation Service are fragmented into more than one area, greatly reducing the efficiency of those activities. Only one emergency treatment room is available for multiple patients.

Replacement procurement of modern medical equipment has also been deferred over the past seven years in anticipation of a new facility. Thus, a major expenditure for new medical equipment will be required in the near future regardless of whether a new hospital is constructed.

The present facility is located in a highly congested part of the main cadet area. The activities, noise and traffic generated by cadets, staff, support personnel, and visitors associated with the functioning of the center of the Military Academy make the area unsuitable for continued operation of a hospital. Very limited parking in the vicinity of the hospital results in patients, visitors and staff being required to park great distances from the hospital.

Renovation of the existing hospital and construction of a new outpatient building would be a possible but unacceptable alternative to a new hospital. The cost would be in excess of $20 million and the result still would not

be truly functional. In addition, other Academy construction planning and programing has been predicated on availability, on a timely basis, of the present hospital for other uses. The Department of Admissions and the Cadet Store are both presently located in totally inadequate and fragmented locations, having been programed to move into the old hospital upon construction of a replacement.

Delay in construction of this required facility will place it in direct competition for labor resources with three other major projects in the general area: the expansion of Stewart Field as a major jet port for New York City, the construction of an additional bridge across the Hudson River and of a reservoir-power station complex. This can be expected to result in not only higher labor costs but a significant labor shortage -- both of which will exacerbate the existing conditions contributing to high construction costs in the Academy area.

The scope of the proposed hospital, i.e. 100 beds, has been seriously challenged as overscoped. There is some validity to this challenge. The trend of the average daily in-patient load has been downward over recent years, reaching a low of 54 patients per day for fiscal year 1973. Strict application of DOD technical criteria substantiates a 65 bed requirement based on the demonstrated demand and the eligible population at West Point. However, other considerations can also apply. In particular is the DOD concept for regionalization of health care services. Under this concept the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health and Environment determined that 100 beds was the proper scope for the proposed West Point hospital.

The estimated cost of the hospital, $25 million, has also been strongly criticized as too expensive. Medical facilities, as a class, are normally more expensive than other facilities due to very stringent, and often significantly increased, standards for electrical, mechanical, environmental, and fire protection systems. Also construction costs at West Point have been traditionally high with a record of unanticipated increases and cost overruns. Recognizing these points and the unattractive price tag of the hospital, the Army very early implemented an extraordinary management effort to insure the proposed facility was designed to reasonable standards without "gold plating" and could be built for the least cost.

An additional architect-engineer firm, aside from the designing firm, was hired to assist the Government in reviewing the hospital design throughout the design cycle. This firm was experienced in both design and construction in the New York area and value-engineered every aspect of the design to eliminate such items as any over design, costly construction techniques, and unnecessarily costly materials.

This management effort has borne fruit as reflected in the reduced cost requested for restoration to the Army budget for the hospital project. Over $2 million in costs have been eliminated resulting in a revised estimate of $22.9 million.

ADD ON

Installation: General Authorization

Project: Minor Construction

Budget Request	$12,500,000
House Action	15,000,000
Requested of Senate	15,000,000

Justification

The fiscal year 1974 MCA appropriations request includes $12,500,000 for minor construction. This funding level was based on past experience. Requirements within the minor construction area are proving greater then originally anticipated during formulation of the budget. We forecast this higher level of activity will continue, thereby generating a need for additional funds in the minor construction account.

The unobligated carryover from fiscal year 1973 totaled $4,100,000 which when added to the fiscal year 1974 request would provide a total of $16,600,000 for obligation in fiscal year 1974. Of this total $3,900,000 is required to complete projects approved and funded for execution in fiscal year 1973, leaving a balance of $12,700,000 to finance new projects in fiscal year 1974. At this early date in fiscal year 1974 we have committed $9,200,000 for projects approved or pending approval at the Secretariat level. This leaves only $3,500,000 for the balance of the fiscal year. There are approximately $2,000,000 in valid projects under review with the Department of the Army plus another $1,500,000 requirement for upgrading medical facilities for US Army Europe expected to arrive shortly.

Based on the increased activity, it is estimated that an additional $2,500,000 will be required in fiscal year 1974 to finance projects for which approval may be obtained and design completed in time to execute construction prior the end of the fiscal year. If the additional funds are not approved these projects would have to be postponed or funds reprogramed from other sources.

ADD ON

Installation: Germany, Various Locations

Project: Deficiency Item - Dependent School Additions

Budget Request	0
House Action	$607,000
Requested of Senate	607,000

Justification

This project was authorized and funded in FY 1972, PL 92-145. Recent dollar devaluations and rapidly increasing construction costs in Europe have driven project costs beyond the authorization and funds available for the project. The project is under contract, having been awarded within the original authorization. The authorized station total available is $1.946M against a current estimated cost of $2.553M. Deficiency authorization and appropriation of $607K are required.

If increased authorization and funds are not provided we will be unable to complete the project as planned.

ADD ON

Installation: STRATCOM, Overseas - Various Locations

Project: Deficiency Item - Upgrade Power

Budget Request	0
House Action	$237,000
Requested of Senate	237,000

Justification

This project was approved in FY 1973, PL 92-545. Successful completion of the project is now jeopardized by recent dollar devaluations. The project is presently under contract and current estimated project costs exceed the FY 1973 authorization and appropriation. The approved amount is $1.412M against a current estimate of $1.649M. Deficiency authorization and appropriation of $237K are required.

Unless additional authorization and funds are approved we will be unable to complete the project at full scope.

ADD ON

Installation: Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.

Project: Deficiency Item - Laundry

Budget Request	0
House Action	$2,705,000
Requested of Senate	2,705,000

Justification

Deficiency authorization and appropriation are required to permit award of a contract to construct a laundry at the Forest Glen Annex, WRAMC. The laundry was originally authorized and funded with two other WRAMC projects in FY 1973, PL 92-545. Construction costs have increased in the Washington, D. C. area much more rapidly than was anticipated when project cost estimates were developed in FY 1973, thereby causing a shortfall in authority and funds. The authorization and funding initially available for the new laundry have been utilized to support award for the two other FY 1973 companion projects (vehicle and equipment maintenance facilities and an EM Barracks).

The existing laundry must be razed during the summer of 1974 to allow the scheduled start of the WRAMC underground parking structure (authorized in FY 1972, PL 92-145) which is integral to the new hospital building. Therefore, it is important to award the laundry project at the earliest date possible to minimize the time that alternate arrangements must be made for laundry services to WRAMC.

Installation: Fort Belvoir, Virginia

Line Item: Helicopter Landing Facility and Parking Area

Budget Request	$1,628,000
House Action	0
Restoration Requested	$1,628,000

JUSTIFICATION

This item is required to provide a facility that will permit the separation of fixed wing and rotary wing aircraft operations at Davison Army Airfield.

Thirty-one fixed wing and 61 rotary wing aircraft are stationed at Davison Army Airfield. These aircraft provide aviation support of contingency operations under national emergencies and provide helicopter support to the White House and US Government officials in the Washington area. Additional missions include priority air transportation for the Army General and Special Staff and aviation support of troop units and test activities.

Both rotary wing and fixed wing aircraft currently must operate from the single main runway creating congestion and a potential safety hazard. The US Army Agency for Aviation Safety recognized these conditions and recommended, as a matter of urgency, the separation of fixed wing and rotary wing operations.

Separate parking aprons and maintenance areas have been provided for the Executive Flight Detachment and the Army Materiel Command Aviation Detachment supporting the Night Vision Lab for security reasons. The existing parking apron will only accommodate 14 observation or utility helicopters. This item will provide additional surfaced areas for outdoor maintenance and spaces to permit 75% of the authorized helicopters to park under their own power in accordance with current criteria.

This project is required for safe, efficient operation and maintenance of high value equipment and will not be excess to future installation requirements.

Denial of this project will perpetuate congested and potentially hazardous conditions for aircrews and high value equipment.

Installation: Fort Gordon, Georgia

Line Item: Commissary

Budget Request	$2,924,000
House Action	0
Restoration Requested	$2,924,000

JUSTIFICATION

The House Appropriations Committee proposed to eliminate this project from the program with a view toward the Department of Defense proposing necessary enabling legislation to permit construction of new commissaries from funds provided by commissary patrons. This action would be the equivalent of a reduction in pay for the serviceman and his family. It would also impact heavily on the retired serviceman and his family, as well as other authorized patrons such as widows and disabled veterans who are generally dependent on relatively fixed incomes.

With food one of the major items in the family cost of living, military personnel rely heavily on this benefit. Along with other similar benefits, the

commissary serves to partially offset the disadvantages and hardships, such as long periods of separation and frequent changes in geographical location, which are inherent to a military career. As such, the commissary plays a vital role in making service life more attractive and in supporting the attainment of an effective all volunteer force.

An important factor which should be considered is the fact that patrons' funds are already making significant contributions in support of commissary construction and improvement projects. Based on legal opinion, funds paid by patrons which are excess to those required to meet certain expenses specified in annual recurring provisions of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act are available for use for construction and improvements. Consequently, since 1971 the Army has built or has three stores under construction at Forts Monmouth, Benning and Sill. Funds paid by patrons (surcharge funds) exceeding $18 million are currently programmed through 1975 in support of equipment for commissaries in the FY's 1973 and 1974 MCA programs and surcharge funded construction and improvement projects. However, this action will deplete surcharge funds anticipated to be available to a level sufficient only to support equipment for MCA programs through FY 1978.

Other requirements in recent years have relegated Army commissary construction requirements to a low priority. As a result, approximately 40 commissaries within the United States are recognized as being in urgent need of new stores or major additions due to inadequate facilities. These deficiencies cause inefficiencies of operation and result in increased costs, primarily personnel, to the supporting appropriations. Therefore, a time-phased program has been established for construction of the new commissaries required within the next seven years to provide customers the required degree of service and to overcome the present inefficiencies.

The Fort Gordon commissary is high among those most urgently requiring replacement. Approximately 10,000 families are dependent on this store as the source of their grocery needs. The present store, although open six days a week, is inadequate to accommodate all of these families. The nearest commercial stores are approximately eight miles distance in the vicinity of Augusta, Georgia. The current situation serves to deprive military personnel stationed at Fort Gordon of a substantial benefit which is available to military personnel at other installations.

The Fort Gordon store is housed in a converted mobilization type warehouse constructed in 1941. It has a gross area of 13,992 square feet (approximately 14 percent of the total square foot authorization in Department of Defense criteria), which results in extreme congestion of customer traffic and insufficient space to display merchandise. The back-up storage is contained in seven remote warehouses and necessitates double-handling of most of the merchandise, which results in an additional personnel requirement of nine employees ($60,000 per year) and the full time use of three 4-ton motor trucks, ($7,000 per year). Further, the deteriorated condition of the present building makes it impossible to maintain sanitary standards adequate for a food establishment. It is strongly recommended that the proposed $2.9 million be restored.

Installation: Fort Sheridan, Illinois

Line Item: Veterinary School Facility

Budget Request:	$762,000
House Action:	$ 0
Restoration Requested:	$762,000

JUSTIFICATION

The U. S. Army Medical Department Veterinary School moved to Fort Sheridan, Illinois, from southwest Chicago in 1971 and 1972. The School was located in a General Services Administration managed warehouse complex near the Chicago stockyards for over thirty years. The warehouse complex was vacated due to the extreme deterioration of the physical facilities as well as that of the general area.

The purpose of the School is to teach the military medical aspects of food hygiene, food inspection, food procurement and veterinary preventive medicine as performed for the Department of Defense by the Army Veterinary Service. Students are both enlisted food inspection specialists and officers. The officer students are already Doctors of Veterinary Medicine.

Alternative locations have been considered for the School but the Chicago area remains as the ideal location, providing the necessary multiple training resources required by the School. The Chicago area is the recognized geographical, research and production center for the food industry, as well as having many small meat packing plants ideally suited for training purposes. Relocation to any other installation in the United States will require new construction.

This project is the final phase of the relocation of the School to Fort Sheridan, which it is estimated will result in an eventual savings of approximately $693,000 per year in per diem and bus transportation costs, reduced operating and facility support costs and increased staff efficiency. This project is required, however, to renovate existing buildings so as to provide an adequate training facility at the new site.

The School proper occupies four buildings at Fort Sheridan, including office and academic space. This project concerns only the three academic buildings used for classroom and instructional laboratory space, all three of which were constructed in the late 1800's as horse barns. Although structurally sound, the relatively unfinished interiors are inadequate for the attainment of acceptable standards of instruction. Present configuration requires conduct of two or more classes simultaneously in single large rooms with attendant acoustical overflow and visual distraction. Seminar, counseling, and instructional laboratory rooms, among others, are not available. Inadequate electrical power provisions in conjunction with these problems preclude effective use of much on-hand instructional equipment such as TV monitors, projectors and amplifiers. Heating, lighting and ventilation are acutely substandard.

Failure to conclude this final phase of the relocation of the Veterinary School to Fort Sheridan will result in a very marginal academic institution. It is essential that students of this School be afforded the benefit of adequate facilities to prepare them for assuring the wholesomeness of the foods procured by the Department of Defense, assessing the sanitation aspects of the sources and processing of such foods, and performing the procurement inspections which ensure supplies meet specifications.

Installation: Cold Regions Research & Engineering Laboratory
New Hampshire

Project Title: Logistics and Storage Facility

Budget Request	$597,000
House Action	0
Restoration Requested	$597,000

JUSTIFICATION

This item is required to provide an adequate and safe storage facility for the Cold Regions Laboratory. Present storage is now provided in the leased basement of an 80 year old former textile mill located in Lebanon, N. H., eight miles from the laboratory. The building has a very high fire risk and the leased storage area is difficult to secure due to adjacent operations of a discount department store open to the public 6 days per week until 10 P. M. Recent sale of the facility has resulted in the new owner demanding higher rent, and negotiations have resulted in holding the increase to $4,000 per year above the original rent of $14,000 per year; extremely little leased space is available in the area as a 1965 fire in Lebanon destroyed 25-30% of the business district and very little reconstruction has taken place. A torturous access road serves the leased facility with the result that trucking companies refuse to provide direct service and all large shipments must be double-handled to smaller vehicles. Stored materials include prototype and specially manufactured project equipment with high replacement costs; their loss due to fire, vandalism or theft would result in ongoing research and development work slowdown or stoppage. Also, stored are irreplaceable historical data from past research. Acquisition value of stored items approximates $500,000 with replacement value estimated in excess of $1,000,000. No other adequate space is available within the commuting area of the laboratory. An on-site storage facility would save approximately 600 miles of travel per week as well as valuable man hours. If this project is not approved, the distant and high-risk leased storage facility must continue in use at an increased lease cost.

Installation: Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado

Project Title: Stack Emission Controls

Budget Request	$395,000
House Action	0
Restoration Requested	$395,000

JUSTIFICATION

This project is required to provide air pollution control and abatement measures for the 135 million BTU per hour coal-fired heating plant which contains five boilers. Enforcement of the State of Colorado Air Pollution Control Act of 1970 has resulted in two citations to date for violations of the particulate emission standards. Replacement of the five stacks and addition of electronic particulate precipitators is necessary to bring the heating plant into compliance with current State and Federal regulations.

Installation: Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey

Line Item: Electric Substation

Budget Request	$400,000
House Action	0
Restoration Request	$400,000

JUSTIFICATION

This project is related to the request for administrative facilities for Bayonne MOT, also requested in the fiscal year 1974 program. The project provides a new 3,000 KVA substation to provide additional electrical capacity at Bayonne MOT. The work is necessary to improve the reliability of the present system to meet the additional load generated by new tenants, i.e. the Headquarters Eastern Area, Military Transportation Management and Terminal Service (MTMTS). This organization is scheduled to relocate to Bayonne from Brooklyn MOT and will occupy the requested administrative facilities.

The electrical substation must be approved concurrently with the administrative facilities. Otherwise, the existing electrical system at Bayonne will be overtaxed.

Installation: Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey

Line Item: Administrative Facilities

Budget Request	$3,203,000
House Action	0
Restoration Request	$1,800,000

JUSTIFICATION

This project is required to provide administrative space for relocation of Headquarters, Eastern Area, Military Transportation Management and Terminal Service (HQ, EAMTMTS) from Military Ocean Terminal (MOT), Brooklyn, NY. MOT, Brooklyn is excess to DOD requirements and is only partially utilized by DOD activities for administrative functions. The current annual cost of operation and maintenance of facilities under the present austere basis exceeds $1.8 million. If the DOD activities remain at MOT, Brooklyn, major rehabilitation of the utilities systems must be accomplished. Numerous power outages and water line breaks have disrupted operations repeatedly. Additional expenditures are required to correct serious hazardous conditions. Minimum rehabilitation will add $1.4 million a year to the annual operating costs for the next five years. Consolidation of the activities in existing facilities at MOT, Bayonne will permit savings by reduction in civilian and military manpower spaces, equipment rental costs, and maintenance costs for unoccupied facilities.

If the project is not approved the alternative is to lease administrative space elsewhere in the general area. This is less responsive to the MTMTS needs, anticipated to be more expensive than the construction proposed, and does not take advantage of Government facilities available at Bayonne.

The reduction in project cost shown in the amount requested for restoration reflects very recent developments. Headquarters, MTMTS is developing a revised management structure which impacts the Eastern Area headquarters. This will effectively reduce the administrative space requirements and consequently the funds needed to support the relocation to Bayonne.

Installation: Memphis Defense Depot, Tennessee/Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania

Line Item: Medical Equipment Maintenance Facility

Budget Request	$456,000
House Action	0
Restoration Request	$456,000

JUSTIFICATION

This project is required to provide a facility for a medical equipment maintenance activity. This activity is currently being conducted at the Atlanta Army Depot, Georgia. Atlanta Army Depot is being closed as part of the Army reorganization/realignment announced in early 1973. Since the requirement for medical equipment maintenance at the depot level still exists, a replacement facility must be provided.

The Army originally requested this project for the Memphis Defense Depot, Tennessee but later developments required that it be requested for Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania. Through misunderstanding of the Army's desires the project was still authorized for the Memphis Depot. Actions are underway attempting to clear-up the misunderstanding and have the project authorized for Tobyhanna AD. Failing this, the funds should still be approved to provide the Army with resources for eventual reprograming to build the facility at Tobyhanna.

Denial of this project will cause this required maintenance activity to relocate from Atlanta AD to inadequate facilities thereby reducing operational efficiency and the quality of maintenance provided.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
RECLAMA

Subject: Total Obligational Authority/New Obligational Authority

Budget Request - (General Reduction	$12,000,000
House Action (General Reduction)	$35,072,000
Requested of Senate (General Reduction)	$39,072,000

Justification

The Navy in its original budget identified $12 million of prior year savings and therefore reduced the total obligational authority by $12 million requesting new obligational authority of $685.4 million. Subsequently the Navy identified a total of $31.2 million of savings which included the aforementioned $12 million. The Navy further indicated that a portion of these funds were required for reprogramming to planning and design, and a project required under Section 202 of PL 92-545 (Emergency Construction).

The reprogramming under Section 202 for the Siss Zulu Various Location project was approved in September 1973, therefore $5.0 million is not available for general appropriations reductions, which leaves $26.2 million available. The planning and design fund requirement is $4.0 million.

A summary of the general appropriations reductions by the Armed Services Committees and the MILCON Subcommittee is shown below:

Armed Services Committees - Authorization Act		$7,500,000
Navy Original Budget Request		$12,000,000
House Appropriations Committee		$19,572,000
Southeast Asia	4,700,000	
General (Base Realignment)	7,500,000	
Souda Bay/Sigonella	3,372,000	
Planning and Design	4,000,000	
		$39,072,000

The difference between the House Appropriations Committee reduction of $39.072 million and the current available funding of $26.2 million to satisfy that reduction, is $12.872 million. Of this $12.872 million reduction remaining, $4.7 million can be sustained without detriment as it has been identified as Southeast Asia savings in addition to those originally reported in the total $31.2 million. Considering this increased savings in Southeast Asia funding, the Navy will be left in an underfunded position of $8.172 million. At this time, it does not appear that such a reduction will have a significant adverse impact on the Navy's military construction program.

Installation: Naval Underwater Systems Center,
New London Laboratory, New London, Conn.

Project: Engineering Building

Budget Request	$3,600,000
House Action	$ 0
Requested of Senate	$3,600,000

Justification

The New London Laboratory has been successful in providing the best in sensor technology to the submarine fleet. The gap between current technology and physical plant facilities which are available for sensor development is ever-widening and presents a growing risk to every new submarine program.

Submerged submarines are blind and without effective sensors they are nearly helpless. When submerged, submarines rely upon acoustic sensors (sonar) to determine the presence, locations and characteristics of other submarines as well as surface vessels and underwater weapons such as torpedoes. Acoustic sensors are also used for under ice navigation, bottom profiling, communications over moderate distances, and low frequency electromagnetic sensors to receive low frequency radio traffic transmitted from shore.

Almost all of the underwater sensors and acoustic communication systems used by submerged submarines continue to have substantial conceptual and developmental roots in the New London Laboratory. Some above-surface systems also depend upon significant technical contributions from this Laboratory. Thus the success of every submarine program depends upon the performance of the New London Laboratory of Naval Underwater Systems Center.

In addition to the impact which the New London Laboratory has upon the submarine program a nearly comparable relationship exists with respect to submarine detecting sensors for surface ships. The existing fac-

ilities to be replaced by the proposed engineering building house several million dollars worth of instruments, machines, prototype work in process and records in old frame buildings which are susceptible to catastrophic damage from fires and storms. These items are essential to the success of ongoing submarine programs.

The urgency of the engineering building at this time is predicated upon the need to overcome the growing risk to submarine programs and surface ship anti-submarine warfare programs.

House Armed Services Report

At the Naval Underwater Systems Center New London, Connecticut, an engineering building was requested to provide space for engineering and scientific personnel engaged in the research and development of sonar and acoustic sensor systems. This project was denied on the basis of its low priority.

Senate Armed Services Report

An engineering building at the Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London, Connecticut, was requested to replace existing facilities and provide space for engineering and scientific personnel engaged in the research and development of sonar and acoustic sensor systems.

House Appropriations Committee Report

The Navy's request includes $3,600,000 for an engineering building at the Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London Laboratory, Connecticut. The Committee feels there is too much duplication in Navy research in this area and that the missions of the various laboratories involved should be restudied. Accordingly, it has denied this project.

Installation: Military Ocean Terminal Bayonne, New Jersey

Project: Military Sealift Command/Atlantic Relocation

Budget Request	$1,806,000
House Action	$ 0
Requested of Senate	$1,806,000

Justification

This project will convert third floor and partial fourth floor of a warehouse to general administrative space. The rehabilitation includes improvements to electrical, lighting, heating and plumbing systems, acoustical ceilings, toilets and floor and wall coverings.

The Department of Defense directed in 1964, that the Brooklyn Army Terminal be closed. The Military Sealift Command, Atlantic, is a tenant on the Army Base. From 1964 to 1970 various relocation studies were initiated, but discarded. In May 1970, the Office of Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics indicated that it was in the best interest of the Defense Department for the Military Sealift Command, Atlantic, and the eastern area of the Army's Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service to be co-located at Bayonne. The two organizations are presently co-located at the Brooklyn Army Terminal.

The Military Sealift Command, Atlantic, is the single Department of Defense activity responsible for the ocean shipment of personnel and material in the Atlantic Ocean area. Presently, the headquarters of the Military Sealift Command is located at the Brooklyn Army Terminal, which is scheduled for

closure. Activities presently operating at the Brooklyn Terminal are being relocated to the Military Ocean Terminal located in Bayonne, New Jersey. In order to accommodate the Military Sealift Command, it will be necessary to convert existing warehouse space into administrative and special purpose spaces. This project will provide for the conversion of the required spaces at the Bayonne Terminal.

House Armed Services Report

At the Military Ocean Terminal Bayonne, the Military Sealift Command, Atlantic, relocation project approved will convert existing space to accommodate the facilities to be relocated from the Military Ocean Terminal Brooklyn.

Senate Armed Services Report

At the Military Ocean Terminal Bayonne, New Jersey, the Military Sealift Command/Atlantic relocation project will convert existing space to accommodate the facilities to be relocated from the Military Ocean Terminal, Brooklyn.

House Appropriations Committee Report

At the Military Ocean Terminal Bayonne, New Jersey, a project to support the relocation of the Military Sealift Command, Atlantic, is denied.

Installation: Naval Air Development Center Warminster, PA

Project: Primary Substation Expansion

Budget Request	$215,000
House Action	$ 0
Requested of Senate	$215,000

Justification

The primary substation for which this expansion is being requested serves the entire industrial complex of the Naval Air Development Center (NADC). Included within this complex are two large buildings (approximate dimensions, 700' x 600' and 500' x 500') which are former aircraft assembly plants and have an interior vertical dimension of approximately 40'. Other structures in the complex requiring power include the Administration Building, a man rated centrifuge, other small laboratories, storage, public works type facilities and structures of the Naval Air Facility.

Expansion of NADC to meet increased RDT&E requirements resulting from program growth primarily occurs in the two large buildings. Areas on the ground floor are partitioned off and mezzanines are added where possible to create new laboratory areas. This results in continual constriction of space available for existing functions and creation of large new power demands within individual buildings. All areas thus created require air conditioning, some labs require more sophisticated environmental control and others have special equipment with special power requirements. Research efforts of almost all laboratories would be seriously curtailed by power interuptions which could not only cause temporary inability to function but could also necessitate expensive repetitive efforts to reconstruct and restart projects underway.

House Armed Services Report

The House Armed Services Committee denied the project because of a relatively low priority.

Senate Armed Services Report

The Senate Armed Services Committee approved the project.

House Appropriations Committee Report

At the Naval Air Development Center Warminster, Pennsylvania, a low priority request for $215,000 for a primary substation expansion has been deferred.

Installation: Naval Air Station Norfolk, Virginia

Project: Land Acquisition (Amendment)

Budget Request	$ 0
House Action	$ 0
Requested of Senate	$3,400,000

Justification

Acquisition of this land was authorized and funded in FY 1972 at an estimated cost of $18,450,000. The estimated project cost reflected value of the interest of the Norfolk and Western Railway and did not include the value of tenants occupying portions of the property. Section 302, Public Law 91-646 (January 2, 1971) requires that the head of a Federal agency acquiring any interest in real property shall acquire at least an equal interest in all buildings, structures, or other improvements located on the real property which is required to be removed from the real property, or which will be adversely affected by the use to which such real property will be put. Subsection b of Section 302 sets forth the basis for determining just compensation in these cases. The law requires that the Navy compensate the tenants not only for their interests in the real property and improvements but also for their relocation expenses. The Navy cannot deprive these tenants of their rights to be compensated by deferral of the acquisition.

It was intended to acquire all of the leasehold interest at such time as the particular land was required for other Navy construction projects. The amendment to the authorization and the approval of funds at this time will provide the Navy with the authority and the funds to properly compensate and relocate all of the tenants at one time instead of the piecemeal basis as originally planned. Although there is no immediate need for all of the land for construction by the Navy, it will be required in the very near future, with tenants' interest obtained at probably a higher cost, and any delay in providing for relocation at this time will work a severe hardship upon the numerous small businesses located on the land.

House Armed Services Report

The House Armed Services Committee approved the project.

Senate Armed Services Report

Not addressed.

House Appropriations Committee Report

The Committee has provided no additional funds to meet an additional authorization of $3,400,000 for a land acquisition project at Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia. The $3,400,000 was to be used for lease termination and building demolition on land recently acquired by the Navy with funds provided in fiscal year 1972. The prior owner of the land, Norfolk and Western Rail-

way, had entered into a total of 41 leases with individuals and businesses. The Navy now desires to terminate these leases and demolish the buildings. There are no immediate needs for the land for construction by the Navy.

Of the 41 leases, only four are long term in nature, with expiration dates ranging from 1976 to 1996. The remaining leases are either on a month-to-month basis or are renewed yearly, some with special provisions.

The Committee feels it unwise to provide money to the Navy with which to purchase a lease and relocate a business when such lease is subject to cancellation or expiration within a year. The Committee further questions the Navy's liability to pay relocation costs to a business upon the legal expiration of a lease.

The Navy is requested to restudy this matter and to submit to the Committee a revised and realistic estimate of what it will cost to purchase the leases of and relocate businesses with long-term commitments. The Navy is further requested to provide the Committee construction schedules for the area in question together with a phased plan to terminate short-term leases.

Installation: Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida

Project: Land Acquisition

Budget Request	$ 0
House Action	$2,400,000
Requested of Senate	$2,400,000

Justification

The project is urgently required to give the Navy control of 365 acres lying within high intensity aircraft noise zones on which construction of 1,900 residential units is planned to begin within the next year. Should this development proceed, noise complaints and restrictions on aircraft operations at this vital base will occur.

Authorization only was initially requested, as the Navy planned to exchange some 142 acres in the Jacksonville area for the land to be acquired. However, during the General Services Administration screening, the Army Corps of Engineers requested that the bulk of the land set for exchange be transferred to them for use in spoiling dredging materials generated in maintaining the Jacksonville harbor. The use of this land by the Army Corps of Engineers will result in a considerable savings in operating costs. The General Services Administration has searched their inventory and found no other lands that can be used in place of the lands requested by the Corps of Engineers. Therefore, appropriations are required to support the authorization to acquire the lands.

The Navy's current estimate for this acquisition, based on contract appraisals, is $2,800,000. The authorizing legislation has approved $2,800,000. Appropriations in amount of $2,400,000 are adequate and acceptable to Navy on the basis that a 1.8 acre parcel of land, currently the site of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center in Jacksonville, is available for exchange. The appraised value of the Reserve Center site is sufficient to make up the difference between funding and authorization.

House Armed Services Report

During the hearings, the Navy advised that a more refined estimate for this project, indicated the project cost should be increased by $600,000 to $2,800,000.

Senate Armed Services Report

Senate Armed Services Committee approved this project at the original cost of $2,200,000.

House Appropriations Committee Report

The House approved appropriations in amount of $2,400,000.

Installation: Naval Station Charleston, South Carolina

Project: Communication Facility

Budget Request	$1,321,000
House Action	$ 0
Requested of Senate	$ 0

Justification

The Navy recently conducted a joint survey of overall communications needs in the Charleston Naval Base area. This survey showed that our present plan to move only the Navy transmitter needs to be restudied. Also, a joint project with the Coast Guard on a cost sharing basis may offer the most economical approach to new communications facilities here. For these reasons, the Navy is not requesting restoration of the project this year.

House Armed Services Report

The House Armed Services Committee approved this project.

Senate Armed Services Report

The Senate Armed Services Committee approved this project.

House Appropriations Committee Report

At the Naval Station Charleston, South Carolina, the budget request includes $1,321,000 for a communication facility. The Navy testified that they recently conducted a joint survey with the Coast Guard of the overall communications needs in the Charleston Harbor area. This survey shows our present plan to move only the Navy transmitter may not offer the best solution. Also a joint project on a cost-sharing basis might offer the most economical approach to a new communications facility here. The present project emphasizes high frequency equipment and antennas. It now appears most needs can be met with VHF and UHF equipment, and small band transmitter and receiver can serve the high frequency needs.

The Committee feels it could be wasteful to provide funding for this project at the present time.

Installation: Naval Station Pearl Harbor, Hawaii

Project: Enlisted Men's Dining Facility

Budget Request	$1,345,000
House Action	$ 0
Requested of Senate	$1,345,000

Justification

The messhall at Pearl Harbor is a totally substandard facility. It is old, temporary, inflammable, and in an extraordinarily poor state of repair. The building is structurally unsound and equipment in the kitchen has far more than served its intended life. This is a wooden structure that is suffering from considerable rot and termite infestation. Additionally, the messhall is remotely located from the new bachelor enlisted quarters. The men in the barracks must walk one-half mile, along and across a busy industrial roadway that serves the harbor area.

If this project is not funded, it will be necessary for the men to continue the risk of personnel injury while walking to a structurally unsound dining facility.

House Armed Services Report

The House Armed Services Committee denied this project because of a low priority.

Senate Armed Services Report

The Senate Armed Services Committee approved the project.

House Appropriations Committee Report

At the Naval Station Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, the Navy requested the replacement of an enlisted men's dining facility. In the opinion of the Committee, the present facility is adequate. The request is denied.

Installation: Marine Corps Air Station,
Yuma, Arizona

Project: Commissary

Budget request	$999,000
House action	- 0 -
Senate action	999,000
Restoration request	999,000

JUSTIFICATION

Marine Corps commissaries have been constructed in the past with commissary store profit reserve funds, with the exception of one store at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, constructed in 1942.

Current construction costs preclude the Marine Corps from presenting a viable commissary modernization program within the limited dollars generated by commissary profit reserves.

Accordingly, the request for Yuma MILCON is intended to supplement the total commissary construction effort throughout the Marine Corps. Without this assistance, the Marine Corps can only provide lip service to a modernization effort of its commissaries through profit reserves in support of a volunteer service goal.

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT

Not specifically address.

SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT

A gymnasium, commissary and dispensary that will provide needed recreational and personnel welfare facilities were approved at a total cost of $5.9 million.

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

The Marine Corps requested a commissary at Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, in the amount of $999,000. The Marine Corps testified that previously all of their commissaries have been provided with surcharge funds. The Committee feels that this project should not be provided with appropriated funds.

Installation: Naval Complex (Naval Station) Guam

Project: Theater

Budget Request	$1,480,000
House Action	$ 0
Requested of Senate	$1,480,000

Justification

The movie theaters for the military installations on Guam are separate and distinct facilities. To arrive at the proper location and size for the theaters, the total requirements for the island were computed, based on the number of personnel to be served. This total was then distributed over three major installations, the Naval Air Station at the center of the island, the Naval Communications Station at the northern part of the island, and the Naval Station to the south.

This distribution serves the purpose of making the theater facilities more convenient to the personnel who will be using them, as the distances between the major facilities are 8 to 12 miles over crowded island highways. More important, the theaters are divided between the family and bachelor housing areas to reduce commuting of dependent children and bachelor enlisted personnel. Both of these groups have problems in obtaining transportation to off-base areas, and would find it difficult to attend movies and other entertainment functions much of the time. By building the three separate theaters, most of these people can walk or bicycle to the events.

As it now stands, the new theater at the Naval Air Station, and one proposed for the Communications Station will only be large enough to accommodate personnel from those areas. The personnel from the Naval Station, who now have a totally inadequate outdoor theater, would severely overcrowd other available theaters on the island. The only alternative left to them if this project is not funded would be to continue in the outdoor facility.

House Armed Services Report

The Committee denied this project because it believes theaters at other bases, like the 500 seat theater authorized in fiscal year 1973 at the Naval Air Station, Agana, may be utilized by personnel of the Naval Station.

Senate Armed Services Report

The Senate Armed Services Committee approved the project.

House Appropriations Committee Report

At the Naval Complex, Guam, the budget request contained $1,480,000 for a theater. The Committee believes, in view of the costly nature of this construction, that present facilities will have to suffice.

Installation: Nuclear Weapons Training Group Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia

Project: Nuclear Training Building

Budget Request	$2,470,000
House Action	$ 0
Requested of Senate	$2,470,000

Justification

This urgently needed project will enable Navy to eliminate problems of security, safety, training environment and duplication in the entire program for training Atlantic Fleet personnel to assemble, inspect and employ nuclear weapons. These problems all derive from the present facility situation. The principal training building in use is a totally deficient, temporary prefab, originally pressed into service as an expedient, but now outmoded, deteriorated and ready for demolition. With increased numbers of ships attaining nuclear weapons capability, and realignments concentraing ships in Norfolk, the urgency for this project becomes acute.

Security is a vital consideration in this nuclear weapons training program. From 25 to 35 training weapons and 3,000 documents are stored in the outmoded training building. The location, inadequate perimeter fencing and lighting, thin metal skin and temporary nature of the building are security problems. The safety of the building's 200 occupants is a grave concern. The Fire Marshall estimates the building would be consumed by fire in seven minutes. Evacuation would have to be made in four minutes through the three exits available. The building is windowless. Antiquated electrical wiring in the building adds to this hazard.

The training environment is bad due to small, poorly configured training bays, humidity, defective air conditioning, low lighting intensity and insect infestations. The aircraft apron immediately adjacent to the building is used for run-up of transport aircraft. Recent transition to jet DC-9 aircraft makes the noise level more intense. Coupled with the foregoing shortcomings, is the separation of the training facilities by some five miles, with attendant duplication in staffing, lost time and added security considerations.

In summary, the primary existing training building will be marginally able to remain in service for the two or three more years associated with construction lead time on a new facility proposed in FY 1974. Training equipment valued at $705,000 is on hand in storage, earmarked to go into the proposed new facility. Deferral of the replacement project will be detrimental to the mission of training personnel in nuclear weapons technology.

House Armed Services Report

The nuclear training building project approved at the Nuclear Weapons Training Group, Atlantic, Norfolk will provide classrooms and the other spaces required for the training of officers and enlisted personnel in nuclear weapons orientation, employment, planning, workloads and supply.

Senate Armed Services Report

The nuclear training building project approved at the Nuclear Weapons Training Group, Atlantic, Norfolk will provide classrooms and the other spaces required for the training of officers and enlisted personnel.

House Appropriations Committee Report

The budget request includes $2,470,000 to provide a nuclear training building at the Naval Weapons Training Group, Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia. This is a low priority project to replace present training facilities at this location. The Committee feels the existing spaces should continue to be utilized by this training function.

Installation: Naval Academy
Annapolis, Maryland

Project: Maury Hall Rehabilitation

Budget Request	$4,334,000
House Action	4,034,000
Requested of Senate	4,334,000

Justification

The Naval Academy prepares midshipmen to be professional officers in the Naval Service. Facilities are required for the Weapons and Systems Engineering Department's expanded weapons program, increase in elective courses, new research programs and the application of computer techniques in the weapons systems field. The Department is presently operating in various areas dispersed throughout the Naval Academy. This dispersal impacts adversely on departmental operations, creating inefficiencies and duplication of many administrative and support functions.

This project will rehabilitate existing substandard academic facilities to provide classrooms, laboratory and facilities for naval weapons systems training simulators.

The rehabilitation of Maury Hall to provide modern facilities will be extensive. The existing structure is nearly 100 years old and while the structure is sound, the interior will require complete replacement of the entire electrical and sanitary systems. This work and that associated with installing the heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems is complicated by the original design and construction features of the existing building.

The exterior rehab is complicated also, by the intent to preserve the original architectural features. The original roofing materials, copper sheeting and slate, will require custom procurement to effect repairs. However, the preservation of the traditional and historic architecture of

the original Naval Academy justifies this approach, and the inherent costs associated with the rehabilitation of Maury Hall. The costs of rehabilitating Maury Hall are considered to be comparable to the costs of the FY 1968 rehabilitation of Sampson Hall on a constant dollar basis, when, (based on Sampson Hall experience), the 10% contingency which is included, and the Maury Hall chilled water plant which is sized to provide service to Luce Hall and the midshipmen's mess and galley, are considered.

Reduced funding on this project may result in some spaces remaining unfinished and unusable. Since all the spaces are required, this would require the Navy to request additional authorization and funding in a subsequent year. If recent trends in construction industry cost escalation continue, this procedure would not be cost effective.

House Armed Services Report

At the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, the Maury Hall rehabilitation project was approved. The project will provide classrooms, laboratories and the training spaces required for an expanded program of the Weapons and Systems Engineering Department.

Senate Armed Services Report

The Maury Hall rehabilitation project at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland will correct existing deficiencies in classrooms, laboratories and training spaces required for the expanded program of the Weapons and Systems Engineering Department.

House Appropriations Committee Report

At the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland the Navy is requesting $4,334,000 to rehabilitate Maury Hall. The Committee feels that the cost per square foot for this rehabilitation is excessive. Accordingly, the Committee has reduced the cost of this project by $300,000.

Installation: TRIDENT Support Complex and Flight Test Facilities (Phase I)

Budget Request.....$118,320,000
House Action.....$112,320,000
Requested of Senate.....$112,320,000

Justification

The House reduction of $6 million is appropriations is acceptable to the Navy for the following reasons:

a. Land Acquisition

Land Acquisition which was estimated at $5,100,000 for FY 1974 can be reduced by approximately $1,000,000 and deferred to FY 1975 as it is required for facilities whose occupancy will be in that year.

b. Utilities (First Increment) and Site Improvements (First Increment)

It is planned that these two projects will be constructed in various construction phases. The design for the facilities will commence in December 1973 and will be completed in March 1975. The initial phase of construction is planned to commence in November 1974 with the final phase in calendar year 1975. A deferral of $2,500,000 funds for each facility is feasible.

The Navy accepts the decision to defer $6 million and will request funds for the above facilities in FY 1975.

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES REPORT

The committee approved $118,320,000 for the various locations, Trident facilities, United States project. For Trident facilities the original program requested $125,223,000 for establishment of support facilities for the Trident weapons system.

The project was reduced by $6,903,000 by the Navy based on more detailed land use studies which identified smaller land acquisition requirements than were originally anticipated. The revised estimated cost for the land is $5,000,000.

At the Trident support site, Bangor, Washington, the Navy advised that approximately $83 million will be required for providing: a maximum of 150 acres of land to assure that the necessary explosive safety zone arcs are within Government owned land; a covered explosive handling pier essential to the deployment of the weapons system and a refit pier to provide logical sequencing of construction; a weapon/navigation training building to permit early crew training by Naval personnel at Naval facilities; and roads and utilities.

At the Air Force Eastern Test Range, Cape Kennedy, Florida, the Navy advised that $35 million dollars is required for missile flight test facilities to support an initial flight test of the Trident I missile in late calendar year 1975. The facilities to be provided are a wharf and dredging, alterations to a launch complex, missile checkout building, guidance and telemetry building and a lifting device proofing building.

SENATE ARMED SERVICES REPORT

For Trident facilities, the original program requested $125,223,000 for establishment of the Trident weapon system support facilities.

Under the program change, the project was reduced by $6,903,000. This reduction resulted from more detailed land use studies which identified smaller land acquisition requirements than were originally anticipated. The estimated cost for the land is $5,000,000.

Under the Various Locations, Trident Facilities project, the Navy is requesting $118,320,000 for Trident facilities construction at two sites.

SUPPORT COMPLEX FACILITIES, BANGOR, WASHINGTON

At the Trident support site, Bangor, Washington, $83 million is requested. One requirement at Bangor is the acquisition of at most 150 acres of land to assure that the necessary explosive safety zone areas are within government owned land. This year's project includes a covered explosive handling pier which is essential to the deployment of the weapon system and a refit pier to provide logical sequencing of construction. A weapon/navigation training building is included to permit early crew training by Naval personnel at Naval facilities. This will enable the Navy to eliminate the more costly contractor factory crew training for all crews except those of the lead ship. The other facilities requested will initiate road and utilities construction required to assure timely utilization of Trident support facilities.

MISSILE FLIGHT TEST FACILITIES

At the Air Force Eastern Test Range, Cape Kennedy, Florida, the request was for $35 million for missile flight test facilities. The facilities to be provided are a wharf and dredging, alterations to a launch complex, missile checkout buildings, guidance and telemetry building and a lifting device proofing building. These facilities will support an initial flight test of the Trident I missile in late calendar year 1975.

The wharf and turning basin are the high cost facilities at Cape Kennedy with an approximate cost of $30 million.
The committee approved the amount requested of $118,320,000.

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

As a result of the lack of adequate time to accomplish proper planning, several items included in the revised request will not be required at the cost present by the Navy. In view of these, the Committee feels safe in reducing the overall amount appropriated for TRIDENT facilities by $6,000,000. The land acquisition cost is currently estimated by the navy at $5.1 million. However, in the Committee's opinion, this figure contains unreasonably large contingency factors and can be reduced. The Navy, after restudy, decided that an explosion proof crane at the explosive-handling pier was not required and that a less expensive crane could be used. Finally, the requirement for a sewage treatment plant, which is included in the first increment of the utilities request, appears doubtful as a result of plans which the county has, and of which the Navy was not aware, to build a sewage treatment facility in the area

The Committee has reduced the amount provided for the TRIDENT support complex by $6,000,000. This should leave sufficient funds to complete the facilities requested in fiscal year 1974.

Military Construction, Reserve Components
Naval Reserve

Budget Request.....$20,300,000
House Action.....$22,900,000
Requested of Senate.....$23,100,000

Justification

The action by the Authorization Committees added $2,600,000 to the Naval Reserve Lump Sum Authorization for FY 1974. These funds will be used for construction of urgently required Reserve facilities that were deferred to accommodate the relocation of Naval Reserve Headquarters.

An increase of $200,000 is required in appropriations to provide for planning and design of the facilities included under the lump-sum authorization.

House Armed Services Report

The Naval and Marine Corps Reserve total reflects an added $2,600,000 which the Committee approved in response to testimony concerning the previous diversion of prior year funds to accommodate the necessary relocation of the surface and air reserve headquarters.

Senate Armed Services Report

The Committee agreed to the $2,600,000 additional amount in the Conference on Authorization.

House Appropriations Committee Report

It is also $2,600,000 above the budger estimates for Fiscal Year 1974, an amount added by the authorizing committee to compensate for construction funds used to transfer Naval Reserve headquarters from Glenview, Illinois and Omaha, Nebraska to New Orleans, Louisiana.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	ACCESS ROADS

5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION	6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	9. STATE/COUNTRY
$	P.L. 23 USC 210	010-311		VARIOUS

10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION	11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE
$2,000,000	350		ACCESS ROADS

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION
- a. PERMANENT
- b. SEMI-PERMANENT
- c. TEMPORARY

15. TYPE OF WORK
- a. NEW FACILITY
- b. ADDITION
- c. ALTERATION
- d. CONVERSION
- e. OTHER (Specify)

16. REPLACEMENT

17. TYPE OF DESIGN
- a. STANDARD DESIGN
- b. SPECIAL DESIGN
- c. DRAWING NO.

18. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY

a. NO. OF BLDGS | b. NO. OF STORIES | c. LENGTH | d. WIDTH

e. DESIGN CAPACITY | f. GROSS AREA

g. COOLING | CAP. | COST ($)

19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

These funds will be used for construction and improvement of off-base access roads serving Air Force Bases and sites under authorization contained in 23 USC 210. Installations at which this work is to be done include Keesler AFB, Mississippi.

SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES

20. PRIMARY FACILITY	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST ($000)
Access Roads	LS		$	$2,000
a.		( )		( )
b.		( )		( )
c.		( )		( )
d.		( )		( )
21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES				$
a.				( )
b.				( )
c.				( )
d.				( )
e.				( )
f.				( )
g.				( )
h.				( )
i.				( )
j.				( )
22. TOTAL PROJECT COST				$2,000

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT

23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M _____)		
a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT		
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD	( )	
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE		
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY		
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (c + d)		
	AUTHORIZED	FUNDED
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION		
g. INCLUDED IN FY _____ PROGRAM		
h. DEFICIENCY (a - e - f - g)		

24. RELATED PROJECTS

25. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT

These projects are required for replacement or relocation of roads necessitated by airfield expansion; for access roads to new facilities; for relocation of roads to satisfy airway-highway clearance criteria; for road improvement to provide all-weather access to military facilities; and reconstruction of roads under the provisions of Sec 210 (h) 23 USC.

DD FORM 1 OCT 76 1391 PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	GOODFELLOW AFB

5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION	6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	9. STATE/COUNTRY
$ 6,115,000	P.L.	510-001		TEXAS

10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION	11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE
$ 6,115,000	320		COMPOSITE MEDICAL FACILITY

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION

a. PERMANENT	X
b. SEMI-PERMANENT	
c. TEMPORARY	

15. TYPE OF WORK

a. NEW FACILITY	X
b. ADDITION	
c. ALTERATION	
d. CONVERSION	
e. OTHER (Specify)	
16. REPLACEMENT	X
17. TYPE OF DESIGN	
a. STANDARD DESIGN	X
b. SPECIAL DESIGN	
c. DRAWING NO.	

18. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY

a. NO. OF BLDGS. | b. NO. OF STORIES | c. LENGTH Irreg | d. WIDTH Irreg

e. DESIGN CAPACITY 30 Bed/14 DTR | f. GROSS AREA 91,000 SF

g. COOLING Air Cond CAP. 300 TN COST ($450,000)

19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

Construction:

Masonry walls; concrete foundations, footings, floor slabs and structural frame, and built-up roof.

Area Includes:

Outpatient and dental clinics, nursing units, laboratories, radiology and emergency rooms, pharmacy, food service, medical supply, administrative space, toilets and mechanical equipment rooms.

All utilities and other necessary support.

SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES

20. PRIMARY FACILITY	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST ($000)
Composite Medical Facility	SF	91,000	$ 60.00	$ 5,460
a.		( )		( )
b.		( )		( )
c.		( )		( )
d.		( )		( )
21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES				$ 655
a. Electric	LS			(100)
b. Water, Sanitary Sewer & Heat	LS			(110)
c. Storm Drainage	LS			(54)
d. Site Improvement	LS			(120)
e. Roads, Parking & Walks	SY	15,000	6.50	(98)
f. Ambulance Shelter	SF	700	24.00	(17)
g. Emergency Power	KW	600	260.00	(156)
h.				( )
i.				( )
j.				( )
22. TOTAL PROJECT COST				$ 6,115

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT

23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M SF)

a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT	91,000
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD	42,135
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE	0
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY	0
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (c + d)	0

	AUTHORIZED	FUNDED
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	0	
g. INCLUDED IN FY ____ PROGRAM	0	0
h. DEFICIENCY (a - e - f - g)	91,000	91,000

24. RELATED PROJECTS

25. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT

PROJECT: Construction of a new composite medical facility with thirty beds, fourteen dental treatment rooms, outpatient clinics, and support areas.

REQUIREMENT: A composite medical facility of sufficient size and functionally configured to meet the total medical and dental needs of the military community served. It permits optimum use of medical personnel and resources in providing medical operational support and general health care.

CURRENT SITUATION: The existing health care facility consists of ten 32 year old temporary wood-frame buildings which are badly deteriorated. The buildings have served beyond useful life and cannot be economically upgraded to satisfy this essential function. In addition to being seriously deteriorated, these buildings are poorly configured, making efficient service extremely difficult. Specific functional deficiencies are: lack of sufficient space for dental treatment rooms; severe overcrowding of outpatient reception, waiting entries and service areas; and inadequate latrine facilities. Utility systems are inadequate and the sanitary, fire protection and safety systems are well below current standards. Ten buildings will be disposed of upon completion of this project.

DD FORM 1391 1 OCT 70 PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE

5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION	6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	9. STATE/COUNTRY
$ 820,000	P.L.	740-674		FLORIDA

10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION	11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE
$ 820,000	320		GYMNASIUM

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION	
a. PERMANENT	X
b. SEMI-PERMANENT	
c. TEMPORARY	
15. TYPE OF WORK	
a. NEW FACILITY	X
b. ADDITION	
c. ALTERATION	
d. CONVERSION	
e. OTHER (Specify)	
16. REPLACEMENT	X
17. TYPE OF DESIGN	
a. STANDARD DESIGN	X
b. SPECIAL DESIGN	
c. DRAWING NO.	

18. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY

a. NO. OF BLDGS 1 | b. NO. OF STORIES | c. LENGTH Irreg | d. WIDTH Irreg

e. DESIGN CAPACITY | f. GROSS AREA 21,000 SF

g. COOLING Air Cond | CAP. 5 TN | COST ($ 4,750)

19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

Construction:

A gymnasium to be designed and built, using modern methods, materials, and construction technology to provide an economical and functional facility. Special features include the hardwood floors and clear span ceiling above the main floor area.

Area Includes:

Gymnasium floor, exercise and locker rooms, squash and handball courts, steam and sauna rooms, administrative space, storage, toilets, and mechanical equipment room. All utilities and other necessary support.

SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES

20. PRIMARY FACILITY	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST ($000)
Gymnasium	SF	21,000	$ 34.20	$ 718
a.		( )		( )
b.		( )		( )
c.		( )		( )
d.		( )		( )
21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES				$ 102
a. Electric	LS			(12)
b. Water, Sanitary Sewer and Heat	LS			(18)
c. Storm Drainage	LS			(9)
d. Site Improvement	LS			(25)
e. Roads, Parking and Walks	SY	6,000	6.25	(38)
f.				( )
g.				( )
h.				( )
i.				( )
j.				( )
22. TOTAL PROJECT COST				$ 820

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT

23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M SF)		
a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT	21,000	
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD	(13,280)	
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE	0	
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY	0	
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (c + d)	0	
	AUTHORIZED	FUNDED
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	0	
g. INCLUDED IN FY ____ PROGRAM	0	0
h. DEFICIENCY (a - e - f - g)	21,000	21,000

24. RELATED PROJECTS

25. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT

PROJECT: Construction of a new gymnasium.

REQUIREMENT: A gymnasium adequately sized and properly configured is required to accommodate comprehensive and balanced programs for recreational sports, athletic training, and physical fitness. These programs are designed to attract participation by all members of the military community; and, they are of particular importance in providing young airmen with wholesome sports and recreational activities that enhance their mental and physical well-being. This facility will be used by Air Force and Army personnel.

CURRENT SITUATION: The existing gymnasium was built in 1942, using semi-permanent construction criteria of 20-year designed life; it is now structurally and functionally inadequate. In addition to the worn condition of the hardwood basketball court - the main floor area, this facility lacks a proper exercise area. It is limited in game courts for handball and squash. Inadequate spectator seating exists. The current configuration of locker rooms, showers, and toilet accommodations will not permit concurrent use of this facility by both male and female military members. This substandard gymnasium will be disposed of upon completion of this project.

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1391 PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

APPROPRIATION REQUEST

INSTALLATION: United States Air Force in Europe, Germany

ITEM: Deficiency Authorization Funding

AMOUNT: $7,333,000

PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 92-545 (Military Construction, 1973) As amended

DESCRIPTION:

AWARDED ITEMS	AUTHORIZATION CURRENT	REVISED	INCREASE REQUIRED
Addition to Dependent School, Rhein Main AB	$ 2,191,000	$ 4,964,000	
Dependent School, Ramstein AB	2,746,000	5,142,000	
Sub-Total	4,937,000	10,106,000	
UNAWARDED ITEMS			
Air Freight Terminal, Ramstein AB	3,261,000	4,280,000	
Aircraft Maintenance Complex, Ramstein AB	842,000	1,149,000	
Base Telephone Exchange, Rhein Main AB	362,000	459,000	
Chapel Center, Rhein Main AB	705,000	431,000	
Dependent School, Hahn AB	1,315,000	2,330,000	
Sub-Total	6,485,000	8,649,000	
Total	$11,422,000	$18,755,000	7,333,000

JUSTIFICATION:

The appropriation of $7,333,000 is required to finance the deficiency authorization and to cover the estimated cost of construction for the entire fiscal year 1973 program for Germany. The scope of all the line item projects remains as originally authorized. The dollar has devalued significantly in relation to the Deutche mark since the original construction cost estimates were prepared. In addition inflation has increased at a very rapid rate in Germany. The revised construction costs totalling $18,755,000 versus the original programmed costs of $11,422,000, an increase of $7,333,000, are based upon bid experience and current construction cost factors. The facilities are required to support current and projected missions and deployments.

SOURCE OF FUNDS:

It is proposed to fund this deficiency authorization by including the $7,333,000 in the FY 1974 Military Construction Appropriation Program in lieu of dollars deleted by the Congress during their review of the Program.

INSTALLATION: Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi

ITEM: Deficiency Authorization Funding

AMOUNT: $1,200,000

PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 92-545 (Military Construction, 1973) As Amended

DESCRIPTION:

	AUTHORIZATION		
AWARDED ITEMS	CURRENT	REVISED	INCREASE REQUIRED
Gymnasium	$ 703,000	$ 744,000	
Technical Training Facility	973,000	1,021,000	
Sub-Total	1,676,000	1,765,000	
UNAWARDED ITEM			
Runway Extension	2,778,000	3,889,000	
Total	$4,454,000	$5,654,000	$1,200,000

JUSTIFICATION:

The appropriation of $1,200,000 is required to finance the deficiency authorization and to cover the estimated cost of construction for the fiscal year 1973 program for Keesler Air Force Base. The scope of all the line item projects remains as originally authorized. Bid proposals received for the construction of the runway extension were considerably above the $2,778,000 authorized. The revised cost of $3,889,000 is based upon bid experience and cost factors that have been applied to the fiscal year 1974 military construction program. The increased cost is due in part to local unit price increases for cement and aggregates and the need for phased construction to maintain an operable runway. The requirement remains firm for the foreseeable future.

SOURCE OF FUNDS:

It is proposed to fund the deficiency authorization by including $1,200,000 in the FY 1974 Military Construction Program in lieu of dollars deleted by the Congress during their review of the Program.

INSTALLATION: Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana

ITEM: Deficiency Authorization Funding

AMOUNT: $213,000

PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 92-145 (Military Construction, 1972) As amended

DESCRIPTION:

UNAWARDED ITEM	AUTHORIZATION CURRENT	REVISED	INCREASE REQUIRED
Airmen Dormitory, Women in the Air Force	$522,000	$735,000	$213,000

JUSTIFICATION:

The appropriation of $213,000 is required to finance the deficiency authorization and to cover the estimated cost of construction for this facility. The base program consists of only this one line item. Bids for its construction were received in April 1973. The total cost based upon the low bid was in excess of the authorized dollars plus the 25 percent overrun permitted by the authorizing Act. Therefore, a contract could not be awarded. The current estimated cost is $735,000. It is based upon bid experience and cost factors that have been applied to the fiscal year 1974 military constructio program. The scope of the project, dormitory space for 120 women airmen, remains as originally authorized. The facility is required to support current and projected missions and deployments and to permit single enlisted women to be housed on base.

SOURCE OF FUNDS:

It is proposed to fund this deficiency authorization by including the $213,000 in the FY 1974 Military Construction Appropriation Program in lieu of dollars deleted by the Congress during their review of the Program.

PART III - RECLAMAS

		(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)	PAGE NO.
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB, OHIO	Alter Aircraft Engine Component Research Facility	1,887	18
SATELLITE CONTROL	Automotive Maintenance Facility-Kodiak, Alaska	462	19
ANDREWS AFB, MARYLAND	Special Aircraft Support Facilities	13,500	20
BERGSTROM AFB, TEXAS	Commissary	2,273	21
NELLIS AFB, NEVADA	Base Personnel Office	1,933	22
VARIOUS LOCATIONS	Radar Support Facility	1,000	23
		21,055	

INSTALLATION: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

ITEM: Alter Aircraft Engine Component Research Facility

BUDGET REQUEST: $1,887,000

HOUSE ACTION: 0

RESTORATION REQUESTED: $1,887,000

JUSTIFICATION: One of the more important mission responsibilities of the Aeropropulsion Laboratory is executing the exploratory and advanced development programs for airbreathing aircraft engines.

The modern gas turbine engine is a very complex and complicated machine whose external and internal environment pose very difficult engineering design and manufacturing problems. Due to lack of design knowledge and criteria, past engine development programs have been plagued by engine problems which are solved in a "build-it, run-it, break-it, fix-it manner" at a considerable toll in time and cost.

The compressor is the most critical component of a gas turbine engine and its dynamic operation is the least understood. Thus an urgent requirement exists to provide a research and development test capability which will provide this knowledge. To this end, the Air Force has proposed this project which will be dedicated to perform real-time transient compressor research to establish understanding of compressor performance and stability. Such a research test capability is non-existent in the free world, but is a much needed national resource. Improved compressor design also means increased operating range and better fuel economy, which in today's environment of critical energy supplies, becomes an increasingly important objective.

By way of illustration, aerolastic instability in compressors has recently become a major problem in new engine development programs. This is currently illustrated by recent experience of the F-5E International Fighter Engine. This proposed research facility would provide the knowledge to establish design techniques to avoid such problems and avoid physical damage to expensive experimental engines.

This laboratory has the personnel, the expertise, an existing $12 million investment in real property and equipment which will be used, and a programmed significant corollary investment of $18.7 million of RDT&E funds over the next five years. All that is needed to bring this national capability to fruition is this proposed Military Construction Project. The avoidance of just one engine compressor development problem would result in savings which would amortize this facility investment multi-fold.

It is requested that this project, which will make a significant contribution to the defense posture of this nation, be restored.

INSTALLATION: Satellite Control

ITEM: Automotive Maintenance Facility-Kodiak, Alaska

BUDGET REQUEST: $462,000

HOUSE ACTION: 0

RESTORATION REQUESTED: $462,000

JUSTIFICATION: There is no facility at this station which can be effectively used to maintain the 27 vehicles needed to support the mission. There is also no practical solution to providing vehicle maintenance other than use of the proposed facility. It is 42 miles via gravel road to the nearest town, Kodiak, which does not have the commercial capability required. Elmendorf AFB, the nearest Air Force activity, is 360 miles away and on the mainland. No other DOD installations could provide this support. Climatic conditions prohibit effective maintenance and care of vehicles outdoors at least six months of the year, due to low temperatures and snowfall. During each of the other six months, three and one half to six inches of rain falls. Vehicles include buses, personnel vans, tractors and snow removal equipment. Many of them must remain operational for ambulance and fire protection roles. It is requested that this project be restored.

INSTALLATION: Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland

ITEM: Special Aircraft Support Facilities

BUDGET REQUEST: $13,500,000

HOUSE ACTION: 0

RESTORATION REQUESTED: $13,500,000

JUSTIFICATION: The National Emergency Airborne Command Post (NEACP) aircraft have as their primary mission the survivability of the National Command Authorities (NCA) which consists of the President and the Secretary of Defense or their duly deputized alternates or successors. In addition the NEACP is also charged with insuring survivability of the Secretary of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The NCA are normally located in the Washington, D.C. area. In order for the NEACP to perform its primary mission most effectively, it must remain in close proximity to the persons it is intended to survive. Location of the NEACP aircraft away from the National Capital Area would make a quick escape more difficult, and would detract from the credibility of our contention that we can survive our command and control structure in the event of war. To support this critical mission major new facilities are required. First, the critical factor that drives all NEACP operation requirements is response time. The primary alert aircraft must be capable of launching as soon as possible. The new Boeing 747 aircraft will not be able to satisfy the mission response time from the existing location. A location near the south-end of the runway is also necessary as 78% of the take-offs are from south to north into prevailing winds. Secondly, the existing area and facilities cannot support the expanded mission. The increased physical size of the Boeing 747 aircraft, the increase in personnel to nearly double the current strength, combined with larger operations and communications requirements far out strip the capacity of the existing facilities. Relocation of this activity into an area remote from the day to day base activities is essential to the required stringent security. Air Force witnesses are prepared to provide additional information which is classified. It is requested that this project be restored.

INSTALLATION: Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas

ITEM: Commissary

BUDGET REQUEST: $2,273,000

HOUSE ACTION: 0

RESTORATION REQUESTED: $2,273,000

JUSTIFICATION: Commissary sales stores are considered one of the most important benefits afforded to the military member and his family. Not only is the savings obtained from buying through this outlet necessary to allow many families to adequately subsist, but also, the commissary is one of the effective means of creating a viable Air Force community. Adequate commissaries play an essential role in making Air Force life acceptable to the military wife, a very necessary ingredient in retaining expensively trained personnel. This is particularly true in cases where the sponsor is required to perform temporary duty at other locations, or is assigned to an unaccompanied tour. Adequate commissaries also make a significant contribution toward the initial recruitment of high quality personnel.

The present inadequate commissary facility adversely affects the personnel and their families assigned to Bergstrom AFB: (1) Sales are in three different buildings; (2) checkout time is 60 percent more than the 15-minute criteria on normal days and 120 percent more on pay days because nineteen checkout registers are required, based on sales, but there is room for only twelve; (3) the store is often out of meat because the meat-room has space to hang no more than a 2-day supply - late deliveries caused the store to run out three times in the month before the beef price freeze; (4) the sales area is one-third of that required and is therefore overcrowded, aisles are narrow, display cases limited which restricts the number of items, display cases are also small and cannot be refilled since customers fill the aisles leading to even greater restrictions on selectivity as shelf stocks run out, and personnel must wait in line to enter and checkout; (5) insufficient storage and preparation space limits line items that can be carried and leads to outages of others,e.g., there is no produce preparation area and less than one day's produce storage capacity; and (6) parking is a serious problem - 350 spaces are required and 186 exists so customers often have to park over one-fourth mile away on grass. There were six major, and many minor, commissary parking accidents last year. These conditions make use of the commissary on Bergstrom a frustrating experience and are not conducive to building strong military communities.

Operations are very inefficient: (1) They are scattered through five separate buildings which necessitates dual handling of merchandise with attendant added costs for labor, transportation, spoilage, and damage; e.g., meat is prepared in a facility on a separate block from where it is sold and a truck and full-time driver are needed just to move meat between these locations; (2) three buildings are deteriorated and cannot be economically maintained; (3) warehousing is at four locations, overcrowded aisles are full and create fire hazards and Bergstrom must rent 6,000 square feet of commercial space; and (4) bad wiring in temporary 1941 warehouses has caused three blown fuses in two weeks - one at night took out all refrigeration. In our opinion, the provision of a new commissary facility at Bergstrom would be a very sound investment on the part of the Government. We beleive it would amortize very rapidly due primarily to its positive effect upon the retention of expensively trained personnel. It is requested that this project be restored.

INSTALLATION: Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada

ITEM: Base Personnel Office

BUDGET REQUEST: $1,933,000

HOUSE ACTION: 0

RESTORATION REQUESTED: $1,933,000

JUSTIFICATION: This project is urgently needed to provide adequate space for base personnel support activites. Currently, these activities are housed in five scattered World War II wood frame mobilization buildings which are in an advanced stage of deterioration despite constant maintenance efforts. Windows and door frames are cracked and split; floors are uneven and sagging; exposed plumbing lines, electrical conduits and heating ducts create unsafe working conditions. The only environmental control is provided by evaporative coolers which are ineffective when the temperature exceeds 90° which occurs almost six months of the year. The consolidated base personnel office is used by more people than any other facilities on base, it serves all civilian and military employees in important actions which affect their lives, including hiring, duty assignments, promotion, personal affairs, off-duty education and separations. Considerable otherwise productive time is wasted because of the existing fragmented operation. Over 8,000 personnel are supported by this function. The problems created by this heavy workload are compounded by the inefficiencies and limitations placed on personnel activities because of the poorly configured, structurally unsound and widely scattered facilities in which they are housed. It is requested that this project be restored.

INSTALLATION: VARIOUS LOCATIONS (Western United States)

ITEM: Radar Support Facilities

BUDGET REQUEST: $1,000,000

HOUSE ACTION: 0

RESTORATION REQUESTED: $1,000,000

JUSTIFICATION: This project is urgently required to provide the radar support facility to support acquisition for the first of two phased array radars for a credible and reliable SLBM Detection and Warning Program. The requirement for phased array SLBM radars is essential to provide unequivocal warning of SLBM launches and to resolve deficiencies. The need for tactical warning of SLBM launches is vital to the national strategy. In the instance of a strategy of launch-on-warning, then warning credibility must be absolute. Very high credible warning is required for a strategy which contemplates a response tailored to the provocation (the flexible response strategy). In either case, some attack assessment information is required. A launch-on-warning strategy requires knowledge of the size of the attack so as to distinguish between an accidental and a deliberate attack, the source of the attack and if the attack is directed at the Continental United States. For the flexible response case, that same attack assessment data is required. Thus, future attack assessment needs of the flexible response strategy would be provided for. The phased array radar inherently possesses a much greater capability in this regard than other radar technology. Given confirmed tactical warning on SLBM launched from their current patrol areas, most of the alert force bombers and tankers would be able to launch and fly to a safe distance from their air bases before impact of the first weapon. Air Forces witnesses are prepared to furnish additional information which is classified. It is requested that this project be restored.

Department of the Navy

CORRESPONDENCE

Senator Mansfield. Correspondence received by the subcommittee concerning both the Boston Naval Shipyard, and the Charleston Naval Shipyard will be inserted at this point in the record.

[The letters follow:]

House of Representatives,
Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1973.

Hon Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction,
Senate Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I understand that a Report of Excess (No. 432) for the Boston Naval Shipyard has been filed with your subcommittee. This report has been strongly challenged by the Mayor of Boston as "imprecise and vague." He feels that particular problems must be reversed by the Department of Defense if the City of Boston is to successfully convert the Navy Yard to civilian purposes. These include:

(1) As present plans stand, the land in the South Boston Naval Annex will be completely landlocked, and, therefore, virtually unusable.

(2) The Report does not give the Defense Department's intentions regarding the most important properties for early development of the shipyard: the recreation facilities, the Fargo building, and adjacent properties.

(3) The report of excess for the Charleston Naval Shipyard is inconsistent with the Department of the Interior's plans for refuse as the Constitution Historic Maritime Park.

(4) There are inconsistencies between the rights of reversion as discussed in the Excess Property Report and statements by Defense Department officials to the Mayor's office.

There shortcomings in the Excess Report must be corrected if the City of Boston is to avert the economic catastrophe that would follow from the closing of the Navy Yard. It is possible for us to use the land productively to create new jobs if we all—public officials, business, and labor—join together. I urge you to consider the reservations raised by the Mayor before you act on the Excess Report, and to encourage the Department of Defense to revise the Report in accordance with the legitimate economic needs of Boston.

Yours sincerely,

Michael J. Harrington.

Department of the Navy,
Office of the Comptroller,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1973.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: Mr. Harrington's letter to you of October 23, 1973 has been referred to me by your office for information which will form a basis for a reply. I appreciate the opportunity to do this for you.

The following paragraphs correspond to the numbered paragraphs of Mr. Harrington's letter:

(1) Every attempt is being made to insure that proper access is made available to the ultimate recipient of this property. Two letters of assurance have been sent to the City of Boston guaranteeing full access to the parcel in question.

(2) The Fargo Building and its adjacent properties are not on the plant account for the Boston Naval Shipyard; hence, the inclusion of this area in report number 434 would not be appropriate. With respect to plans for the Fargo Building, the Defense Department is currently studying needs of re-

maining forces in the Boston area, with the possibility of using the Fargo Building for this purpose. The results of their study are expected about the middle of this month.

(3) Recent discussions involving the Commandant of the First Naval District, the Department of the Interior, and the City of Boston have centered on this issue. A basic agreement between all parties exists now as to the area to be set aside for the Park area. The City of Boston and the Park Service have been furnished maps showing this area.

(4) The status of the government's title to the land has been recently reviewed. Based upon this review it appears that the attempted reversionary provisions in the deed are either inoperative or have expired.

In all, I believe the disposal report that has been filed with the Armed Services Committees for the Boston Naval Shipyard is consistent with the needs of the interested parties. It permits productive use of the excess land and encourages a worthwhile addition to the City's economy.

I trust the information that has been provided will be useful in your response to Mr. Harrington.

Sincerely yours,

E. W. COOKE,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Director of Budget and Reports.

CONCLUSION OF HEARING

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, gentlemen, that concludes this hearing. Thank you very much, and the meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., Wednesday, October 31, the hearings were concluded and the subcommittee was recessed to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

○

LIST OF WITNESSES AND STATEMENTS

	Page
Harry Belinger, city representative and director, Philadelphia Department of Commerce	328
Harry E. Bergold, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (European and NATO affairs)	23
Alan M. Carton, Chief, Program, Planning and Civil Preparedness Branch, Directorate of Military Construction, U.S. Army	427
Emanuel Celler, of the law offices of Weisman, Celler, Spett, Modlin, & Wertheimer	100
Rear Adm. E. W. Cooke, U.S. Navy, Director of Budget and Reports	549
Vice Adm. Damon W. Cooper, USN, Chief of Naval Reserve	91
Maj. Gen. Kenneth B. Cooper, USA, Director of Installations, DCS/Logistics, Department of the Army (overall Army program)	94, 421, 429
Brig. Gen. William J. Crandall, Deputy to the Chief of Air Force Reserve	92
Rear Adm. John G. Dillon, USN, Director of Construction Operations, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (installations and housing) (construction matters)	8
Perry J. Fliakas, Director, Facilities Planning and Programing, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (installations and housing) (family housing)	28, 492
Vice Adm. Walter D. Gaddis, USN	33
Dennis Garrison, executive vice president, American Federation of Government Employees	319
Maj. Gen. Francis S. Greenlief, Chief, National Guard Bureau	90
Evan R. Harrington, Acting Director, Facilities Programing, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (installations and housing) (Reserve and National Guard)	24
Michael J. Harrington, letter	549
Rear Adm. Donald G. Iselin, CEC, U.S. Navy, Vice-Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	439
Brig. Gen. M. T. Jannell, USMC, Assistant Quartermaster General (facilities and services)	193
Hon. Harold T., Johnston, U.S. Representative from California	389
Comdr. James D. Kirkpatrick, Director, Program/Technical Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	454
Maj. Gen. J. A. Kjellstrom, Director of Army Budget, Office of the Comptroller	426
Rear Adm. Foster M. Lalor, USN	5
John H. Lee, Directorate of Budget, U.S. Air Force	495
J. T. Loveland, U.S. Mission, NATO	174
Maj. Gen. Billie J. McGarvey, Deputy Director, Civil Engineering, U.S. Air Force	469
Maj. Gen. Henry W. McMillan, president, National Guard Association of the United States	93
Roy Markon, Deputy Assistant Commander for Real Estate, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	455
Hon. Mike Mansfield, U.S. Senator from Montana	54
Rear Adm. A. R. Marschall, USN, Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy (overall Navy program)	181
Hon. Dawson Mathis, U.S. Representative from Georgia	342
Hon. Arthur I. Mendolia, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics)	353, 391
Charles Neuendorf, Office of the Secretary of Defense	508
Hon. Sam Nunn, U.S. Senator from Georgia	367
Jerry O'Keefe, mayor, Biloxi, Miss	335

23-751 O - 73 - 36

Page

Maj. Gen. Harry C. Olson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Installations and Logistics, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps 358, 395
Maj. Gen. Donald V. Rattan, Deputy Chief, Office of Reserve Components, USA 88
Maj. Gen. Maurice R. Reilly, USA, Director of Civil Engineering, Department of the Air Force (overall Air Force program) 248, 420
Maj. Gen. Darrie H. Richards, USA, Deputy Director, Defense Supply Agency 47
Harry Rietman, Associate Director of Civil Engineering, U.S. Air Force 339, 485
Lt. Col. George L. Rutland, Directorate of Civil Engineering, U.S. Air Force 487
Maj. Gen. J. Milnor Roberts, Chief Army Reserve 89
Francis B. Roche, Director, Real Property and Natural Resources, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (installations and housing) (real estate and general provisions) 42
Hon. Hugh Scott, U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania (letter from) 407
Forrest Sellers, President, Local 89, American Federation of Government Employees 316, 397
Edward J. Sheridan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (installations and housing) (overall program) 2
Royal Sims, national vice president, third district, American Federation of Government Employees 311
Lt. Col. Victor D. Stauch, Jr., Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Installations and Logistics, U.S. Marine Corps 465
Hon. Herman E. Talmadge, U.S. Senator from Georgia (letter and statement from) 384
Hon. John Tower, U.S. Senator from Texas 416
Hon. John V. Tunney, U.S. Senator from California 254
Hon. John W. Warner, Secretary of the Navy (letter from) 322
Brig. Gen. Thomas B. Wood, USAF, Assistant Director for Installations and Logistics, National Security Agency 45

INDEX BY STATE

State and installation: Page

Alabama:
- Army:
  - Anniston Army Depot ... 140
  - Fort McClellan ... 121
  - Fort Rucker ... 124
  - Redstone Arsenal ... 145
- Air Force: Maxwell AFB, Montgomery ... 276

Alaska:
- Army:
  - Fort Greely ... 160
  - Fort Richardson ... 162, 429
  - Fort Wainwright ... 162
- Navy: Naval Complex, Adak ... 228
- Air Force:
  - Eielson AFB, Fairbanks ... 277
  - Kodiak Station ... 546

Arizona:
- Army:
  - Fort Huachuca ... 152
  - Yuma Proving Ground ... 150
- Navy: Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma ... 234, 532
- Air Force:
  - Davis Monthan AFB, Tucson ... 288
  - Luke AFB, Phoenix ... 295
  - Williams AFB, Chandler ... 276

Arkansas:
- Army: Pine Bluff Arsenal ... 145
- Air Force:
  - Blytheville AFB, Blytheville ... 287
  - Little Rock AFB, Little Rock ... 295

California:
- Army:
  - Fort McArthur ... 135
  - Fort Ord ... 135
  - Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation ... 134
  - Presidio of San Francisco ... 136
  - Oakland Army Terminal ... 159
  - Sacramento Army Depot ... 146
  - Sierra Army Depot ... 147, 389
- Navy:
  - Naval Weapons Center, China Lake ... 220
  - Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach ... 221
  - Naval Hospital, Long Beach ... 221
  - Naval Air Station, Miramar ... 221, 444, 459
  - Naval Air Station, North Island ... 222, 444, 448
  - Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, San Diego ... 222
  - Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego ... 223, 450
  - Naval Station, San Diego ... 223
  - Naval Training Center, San Diego ... 224
  - Naval Public Works Center, San Diego ... 224
  - Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego ... 224
  - Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach ... 225
  - Naval Air Station, Alameda ... 225
  - Naval Air Station, Lemoore ... 225, 447

State and installation—Continued
California—Continued
Navy—Continued
Page
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field 226
Naval Hospital, Oakland 226
Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco 227
Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island 228
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo 228
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow 235
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendelton 235
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro 236
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego 236
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms 236
Air Force:
Edwards AFB Muroc 266
March AFB 254
Mather AFB, Sacramento 273
McClellan AFB, Sacramento 262, 389
Norton AFB, San Bernardino 284
Travis AFB, Fairfield 285
Vandenberg AFB, Lompoc 291
Colorado:
Army:
Fort Carson 133
Pueblo Army Depot 523
Air Force:
Lowry AFB, Denver 271
Peterson Field, Colorado Springs 256
U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs 297
Connecticut:
Navy:
Naval Submarine Base, New London 198
Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London Laboratory, New London 199, 526
Delaware:
Air Force: Dover AFB, Dover 283
District of Columbia:
Army: Walter Reed Army Medical Center 158, 425, 519
Navy: Naval Research Laboratory, Washington 200, 450, 452
Air Force: Bolling AFB, Washington 281
Florida:
Army: Eglin AFB, Valparaiso 267
Navy:
Eastern Test Range (Trident) Cape Kennedy 537
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field 209
Naval Air Station, Ellyson Field 210
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville 210, 442, 530
Naval Hospital, Orlando 212
Naval Training Center, Orlando 64, 212
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City 213, 451, 459
Naval Air Station, Pensacola 214
Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola 215, 441, 456
Naval Air Station, Whiting Field 197, 215, 442, 456
Air Force:
Eglin AFB, Valparaiso 267
MacDill AFB, Tampa 295
Tyndall AFB, Panama City 255, 257, 541
Georgia:
Army:
Atlanta Army Depot 141
Fort Benning 113, 426
Fort Gordon 118, 520
Fort McPherson 123
Fort Stewart 124
Navy:
Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany 233, 307, 341, 391
Naval Supply Corps School, Athens 442, 454
Air Force: Robins AFB, Warner Robins 262

State and installation—Continued
Hawaii:
Army: Page
Fort Shafter 163
Schofield Barracks 162
Navy:
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point 229
Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu 229
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor 230, 532
Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor 230
Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor 231
Naval Communication Station, Honolulu 231
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay 236
Air Force: Hickam AFB, Honolulu 286
Idaho:
Air Force: Mountain Home AFB, Mountain Home 296
Illinois:
Army:
Fort Sheridan 129, 522
Savanna Depot 146
Navy: Naval Complex, Great Lakes 219
Air Force: Scott AFB, Belleville 285
Indiana:
Army: Fort Benjamin Harrison 125
Air Force: Grissom AFB, Peru 289
Kansas:
Army: Fort Riley 128
Air Force: McConnell AFB, Wichita 290
Kentucky:
Army:
Fort Campbell 116
Fort Knox 109
Louisiana:
Army: Fort Polk 128
Navy:
Naval Hospital, New Orleans 217
Naval Support Activity, New Orleans 218
Air Force:
Barksdale AFB, Shreveport 287
England AFB, Alexandria 293
Maine:
Navy:
Naval Air Station, Brunswick 198
Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor 198
Maryland:
Army:
Aberdeen Proving Ground 137
Fort Meade 112
Fort Ritchie 153
Navy:
Naval Academy, Annapolis 201, 453, 535
Naval Station, Annapolis 201
National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda 202
Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda 203, 451
Naval Communications Station, Cheltenham 203
Naval Ordnance Station, Indianhead 203
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak 459
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River 203, 451
Air Force: Andrews AFB, Camp Springs 219
National Security Agency: Fort George G. Meade 110, 515
Massachusetts:
Army:
Army Material and Mechanics Research Center 140
Fort Devens 106
Natick Laboratories 144
Air Force:
Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford 268
Westover AFB, Chicopee 476

State and installation—Continued
Michigan:
Air Force: Page
Kincheloe AFB, Kinross 289
Wurtsmith AFB, Oscoda 292
Mississippi:
Navy:
Naval Home, Gulfport 216
Naval Air Station, Meridian 216, 459
Air Force: Keesler AFB, Biloxi 269, 335, 496, 543
Missouri:
Army: Fort Leonard Wood 132
Air Force:
Richards-Gebaur AFB, Grandview 258
Whiteman AFB, Knob Noster 291
Montana:
Air Force: Malmstrom AFB, Great Falls 289, 487, 544
Nebraska:
Air Force: Offutt AFB, Omaha 290
Nevada:
Air Force: Nellis AFB, Las Vegas 296, 548
New Hampshire:
Army: Cold Regions Laboratories 159, 523
Air Force: Pease AFB, Portsmouth 290
New Jersey:
Army:
Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal 426, 524, 527
Fort Dix 106
Fort Monmouth 142
Picatinny Arsenal 144
Navy: Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne 199
Air Force: McGuire AFB, Wrightstown 284
New Mexico:
Army: White Sands Missile Range 147
Air Force:
Cannon AFB, Clovis 293
Holloman AFB, Alamogordo 293
New York:
Army:
Camp Drum 107
U.S. Military Academy 153, 516
Navy: Naval Support Activity, Brooklyn 199
Air Force: Plattsburgh AFB, Plattsburgh 290
North Carolina:
Army:
Fort Bragg 115
Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal 160
Navy:
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejune 232
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point 232
Marine Corps Air Station, New River 233
Ohio:
Air Force: Wright Patterson AFB, Dayton Defense Supply 265, 545
Oklahoma:
Army: Fort Sill 132
Air Force:
Altus AFB, Altus 283
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma City 263, 484
Vance AFB, Enid 275, 488
Navy: Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester 459
Pennsylvania:
Army:
Carlisle Barracks 105
Frankford Arsenal 141
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation 109
Tobyhanna Army Depot 525

State and installation—Continued
Pennsylvania—Continued
Page
Navy:
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia 200
Naval Air Development Center, Warminister 200, 528
Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia 307, 341, 391
South Carolina:
Army: Fort Jackson 120
Navy:
Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston 216
Naval Supply Center, Charleston Naval Station, Charleston 531
Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort 234
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island 234
Air Force: Shaw AFB, Sumter 296
South Dakota:
Air Force: Ellsworth AFB, Rapid City 288
Tennessee:
Army: Defense Depot, Memphis 141
Navy: Naval Air Station, Memphis 217
Texas:
Army:
Aeronautical Maintenance Center 138
Fort Bliss 125
Fort Hood 126
Fort Sam Houston 127
Navy:
Naval Air Station, Chase Field 219
Naval Air Station, Kingsville 219
Air Force:
Bergstrom AFB, Austin 293, 547
Dyess AFB, Abilene 288
Kelly AFB, San Antonio 261
Lackland AFB, San Antonio 270
Laughlin AFB, Del Rio 271
Randolph AFB, San Antonio 273
Reese AFB, Lubbock 274
Sheppard AFB, Wichita Falls 275
Webb AFB, Big Spring 275
Brooks AFB, San Antonio 416
Goodfellow AFB, San Angelo 540
Utah:
Air Force: Hill AFB, Ogden 259
Virginia:
Army:
Camp A. P. Hill 108
Camp Pickett 113
Fort Belvoir 102, 520
Fort Eustis 107
Fort Lee 109
Fort Monroe 112
Vint Hill Farms Station 152
Navy:
Naval Hospital, Quantico 203
Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Dam Neck 204
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek 204
Naval Communications Station, Norfolk 204
Naval Air Station, Norfolk 205, 441, 455, 459, 529
Naval Station, Norfolk 205
Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk 207
Nuclear Weapons Training Group Atlantic, Norfolk 207, 534
Naval Air Station, Oceana 207, 447
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth 208
Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown 209, 448
Marine Corps Air Station, Quantico 231
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico 232
Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic, Norfolk 233
Air Force: Langley AFB, Hampton 294

State and installation—Continued
Washington:
Page
Army: Fort Lewis 135
Navy:
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton 229
Support Complex Facilities, Bangor 237
Trident Support Site, Bangor 537
Wyoming:
Air Force: Francis E. Warren AFB, Cheyenne 288
Outside the United States:
Australia:
Navy: Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth 245
Bermuda:
Navy: Naval Air Station, Bermuda 240
Canal Zone:
Army: Panama Area 164
Air Force: Howard AFB 304
Cuba:
Navy: Naval Complex, Guantanamo Bay 241
Ethiopia:
Navy:
Kagnew Communications Station 466
Germany:
Air Force:
Various locations 542
Army:
Various locations 518
Greece:
Navy: Naval Detachment, Souda Bay 242
Greece:
Navy:
Naval Supply Corps School, Athens 442
Naval Support Office, Athens 440, 454
Guam:
Navy: Naval Complex 245, 533
Iceland:
Navy: Naval Station, Keflavik 241
Air Force: Naval Station, Keflavik 299
Italy:
Navy: Naval Air Facility, Sigonella 243
Kwajalein Island:
Army: Kwajalein Missile Range 166
Puerto Rico:
Army: Fort Buchanan 165
Navy: Naval Complex 239, 442, 458, 466
Republic of the Philippines:
Navy: Naval Complex, Subic Bay 247
Air Force: Clark AB 300
Spain:
Navy: Naval Station, Rota 245
United Kingdom:
Navy: Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland 244
United Kingdom (possession of Diego Garcia):
Navy:
Naval Communications Station 467
West Indies:
Navy: Naval Facility, Grand Turk 240

INDEX BY INSTALLATION

	Page
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md	137
Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Tex	138
Adak Naval Complex, Alaska	228
Air Force Academy, Colo	297
Air University, Ala	276
Alameda Naval Air Station, Calif	225
Albany Marine Corps Supply Center, Ga	233
Altus AFB, Okla	283
Andrews AFB, Md	279
Annapolis Naval Academy, Md	201
Annapolis Naval Station, Md	201
Anniston Army Depot, Ala	140
Army Material and Mechanics Research Center, Mass	140
Atlanta Army Depot, Ga	141
Bangor Support Complex Facilities, Wash	237
Barbers Point Naval Air Station, Hawaii	229
Barksdale AFB, La	287
Barstow Marine Corps Supply Center, Calif	235
Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, N.J	199, 426, 524, 527
Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station, S.C	234
Bergstrom AFB, Tex	293, 547
Bermuda Naval Air Station	240
Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, Md	202
Bethesda Naval Medical Research Institute, Md	203
Bitburg AB, Germany	302
Blythville AFB, Ark	287
Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C	281
Brooklyn Naval Support Activity, N.Y	199
Brooks AFB, Texas	416
Brunswick Naval Air Station, Maine	198
Bremerton Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Wash	229
Camp A. P. Hill, Va	108
Camp Drum, N.Y	107
Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base, N.C	232
Camp Pickett, Va	113
Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base, Calif	225
Cannon AFB, N. Mex	293
Cape Kennedy Missile Flight Test Facilities, Fla	237
Cape Newenham AFS, Alaska	278
Carlisle Barracks, Pa	105
Cecil Field Naval Air Station, Fla	209
Charleston Naval Shipyard, S.C	216
Charleston Naval Station, S.C	216
Chase Field Naval Air Station, Tex	219
Cheltenham Naval Communication Station, Md	203
Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station, N.C	232
China Lake Naval Weapons Center, Calif	220
Clark AFB, Philippines	300
Cold Regions Laboratory, N.H	159, 523
Crete, Greece	242

	Page
Dam Neck Fleet Combat Direction System Training Center, Va	204
Davis-Montham AFB, Ariz	288
Diego Garcia Naval Communications Station, (possession of United Kingdom)	467
Dover AFB, Del	283
Dyess AFB, Tex	288
Eastern Test Range (Trident), Cape Kennedy, Fla	537
Edwards AFB, Calif	266
Edzell Naval Security Group Activity, Scotland	244
Eglin AFB, Fla	267
Eielson AFB, Alaska	277
El Toro Marine Corps Air Station, Calif	236
Ellsworth AFB, S. Dak	288
Ellyson Field Naval Air Station, Fla	210
England AFB, La	293
Exmouth Naval Communications Station Harold E. Hold, Australia	245
Fort Belvoir, Va	102, 520
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind	125
Fort Benning, Ga	113, 426
Fort Bliss, Tex	125
Fort Bragg, N.C	115
Fort Buchanan, P.R	165
Fort Campbell, Ky	116
Fort Carson, Colo	133
Fort Devens, Mass	100
Fort Dix, N.J	106
Fort Eustis, Va	107
Fort George G. Meade, Md	110
Fort Gordon, Ga	118, 520
Fort Greely, Alaska	160
Fort Hood, Tex	126
Fort Huachuca, Ariz	152
Fort Jackson, S.C	120
Fort Knox, Ky	109
Fort Lee, Va	109
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo	132
Fort Lewis, Wash	135
Fort MacArthur, Calif	135
Fort McClellan, Ala	121
Fort McPherson, Ga	123
Fort Meade, Md	515
Fort Monmouth, N.J	142
Fort Monroe, Va	110
Fort Ord, Calif	135
Fort Polk, La	128
Fort Richardson, Alaska	162, 429
Fort Richie, Md	153
Fort Riley, Kans	128
Fort Rucker, Ala	124
Fort Sam Houston, Tex	127
Fort Shafter, Hawaii	163
Fort Sheridan, Ill	129, 522
Fort Sill, Okla	132
Fort Stewart, Ga	124
Fort Wainwright, Alaska	162
Francis E. Warren AFB, Wyo	288
Frankford Arsenal, Pa	141
Goodfellow AFB, Tex	540
Glynco, Ga	178
Grand Turk Naval Facility, West Indies	240
Great Lakes Naval Complex, Ill	219
Grissom AFB, Ind	289

	Page
Guam Naval Complex	245
Guantanamo Bay Naval Complex, Cuba	241
Gulfport Naval Home, Miss	216
Hickam AFB, Hawaii	286
Hill AFB, Utah	259
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, Calif	134
Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif	227
Howard AFB, C.Z	304
Honolulu Naval Communications Station, Hawaii	231
Holloman AFB, N. Mex	293
Incirlik AB, Turkey	304
Indian Head Naval Ordnance Station, Md	203
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Md	109
Indian Mountain AFS, Alaska	278
Jacksonville Naval Air Station, Fla	210
Kagnew Communications Stations, Ethiopia	466
Keesler AFB, Miss	269, 335, 496, 543
Keflavik Naval Station, Iceland	241, 299
Kelly AFB, Tex	261
Kincheloe AFB, Mich	289
Kingsville Naval Air Station, Tex	219
Kodiak Station, Alaska	546
Kunsan AB, Korea	300
Kwajelein National Missile Range, Marshall Islands	166
Lackland AFB, Tex	270
Langley AFB, Va	294
Laughlin AFB, Tex	271
Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Mass	268
Little Rock AFB, Ark	295
Lemoore Naval Air Station, Calif	225, 447
Little Creek Naval Amphibious Base, Va	204
Long Beach Naval Hospital, Calif	221
Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Calif	221
Lowry AFB, Colo	271
Luke AFB, Ariz	295
MacDill AFB, Fla	295
Malmstrom AFB, Mont	289, 487, 544
March AFB, Calif	254
Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Ariz	532
Marine Corps Supply Activity, Pa	307, 341, 391
Marine Corps Supply Center, Ga	307, 341, 391
Mather AFB, Calif	273
Maxwell AFB, Ala	276
McClellan AFB, Calif	262, 389
McConnell AFB, Kans	290
McGuire AFB, N.J	284
Memphis Defense Depot, Tenn	141
Memphis Naval Air Station, Tenn	217
Meridian Naval Air Station, Miss	216, 459
Mildenhall Royal Air Force, England	302
Military Academy, West Point, N.Y	153
Military Ocean Terminal, Sunny Point, S.C	160
Miramar Naval Air Station, Calif	221, 444, 459
Misawa AB, Japan	300
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho	296
Moffett Field Naval Air Station, Calif	226
Natick Laboratories, Mass	144
Naval Air Development Center, Warminister, Pa	528
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla	442, 530

	Page
Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va	441, 455, 459, 529
Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va	447
Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla	442, 456
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md	451
Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla	459
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Fla	451, 459
Naval Communication Training Center, Pensacola, Fla	441, 456
Naval Complex, Guam	533
Naval Complex, Puerto Rico	442, 458, 466
Naval Electronics Laboratory, San Diego, Calif	450
Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, Md	451
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md	459
Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C	450, 452
Naval Station, Charleston, S.C	531
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii	532
Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Ga	442, 454
Naval Support Office, Athens, Greece	440, 454
Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va	459
Naval Weapons Training Group Atlantic, Norfolk, Va	534
Nellis AFB, Nev	296, 548
New London Laboratory, Conn	199, 526
New London Naval Submarine Base, Conn	198
New Orleans Naval Hospital, La	217
New Orleans Naval Support Activity, La	218
New River Marine Corps Air Station, N.C	233
Norfolk Fleet Marine Force, Va	233
Norfolk Naval Air Station, Va	205
Norfolk Navy Public Works Center, Va	207
Norfolk Nuclear Weapons Training Group, Va	207
North Island Naval Air Station, Calif	222, 444, 448
Norton AFB, Calif	284
Oahu Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii	236
Oahu Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawaii	229
Oakland Army Base, Calif	159
Oakland Naval Hospital, Calif	226
Oceana Naval Air Station, Va	207
Offutt AFB, Nebr	290
Orlando Naval Hospital, Fla	212
Orlando Naval Training Center, Fla	64, 212
Osan AB, Korea	301
Panama City Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Fla	213
Parris Island Marine Corps Recruit Depot, S.C	234
Patuxent River Naval Air Test Center, Md	203
Pearl Harbor Naval Station, Hawaii	230
Pearl Harbor Naval Submarine Base, Hawaii	230
Pearl Harbor Navy Public Works Center, Hawaii	231
Pease AFB, N.H	290
Pensacola Naval Aerospace Regional Medical Center, Fla	214
Pensacola Naval Air Station, Fla	214
Pensacola Naval Communications Training Center, Fla	215
Peterson Field AFB, Colo	256
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Pa	200
Picatinny Arsenal, N.J	144
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Ark	145
Plattsburgh AFB, N.Y	290
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, N.H	198
Portsmouth Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Va	208
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif	136
Pueblo Army Depot, Colo	523
Puerto Rico Naval Complex, P.R	239
Quantico Marine Corps Air Station, Va	231
Quantico Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Va	232
Quantico Naval Hospital, Va	203

	Page
Ramstein AB, Germany	302
Randolph AFB, Tex	273
Redstone Arsenal, Ala	145
Reese AFB, Tex	274
Richards Gebaur AFB, Mo	258
Robins, AFB, Ga	262
Rota Naval Station, Spain	245
Sacramento Army Depot, Calif	146
San Diego Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Pacific, Calif	222
San Diego Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Calif	236
San Diego Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, Calif	223
San Diego Naval Station, Calif	223
San Diego Naval Training Center, Calif	224
San Diego Navy Public Works Center, Calif	224
San Diego Navy Submarine Support Facility, Calif	224
Sananna Army Deport, Ill	146
Schofield Barracks Military Reservation, Hawaii	162
Scott AFB, Ill	285
Seal Beach Naval Weapons Station, Calif	225
Sembach AB, Germany	302
Shaw AFB, S.C	296
Shemya AFS, Alaska	278
Sheppard AFB, Tex	275
Sierra Army Depot, Calif	147, 389
Sigonella Naval Air Facility, Sicily, Italy	243
Skaggs Island Naval Security Group Activity, Calif	228
Sparrevohn AFS, Alaska	279
Subic Bay Naval Complex, Republic of the Philippines	247
Tinker AFB, Okla	263, 484
Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pa	525
Travis AFB, Calif	285
Trident Support Site, Bangor, Wash	537
Twentynine Palms Marine Corps Base, Calif	236
Tyndall AFB, Fla	255, 257, 541
Upper Heyford Royal Air Force, England	303
U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md	453
Vallejo Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Calif	228
Vance AFB, Okla	275, 488
Vandenberg AFB, Calif	291
Vint Hill Farms Station, Va	152
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia and Md	158, 425, 519
Warminster Naval Air Development Center, Pa	200
Washington, D.C. Naval Research Laboratory	200
Webb AFB, Tex	275
Westover Air Force Base, Mass	476
White Sands Missile Base, N. Mex	147
Whiteman AFB, Mo	291
Whiting Field Naval Air Station, Fla	197, 215
Williams AFB, Ariz	276
Winter Harbor Naval Security Group Activity, Maine	198
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	265, 545
Wurtsmith AFB, Mich	292
Yorktown Naval Weapons Station, Va	209, 448
Yuma Marine Corps Air Station, Ariz	150
Yuma Proving Ground, Ariz	234