Eielson Air Force Base

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 facility costing $1,557,000. Improper location of the existing control tower causes 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.

AAC—EIELSON AFB, ALASKA—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Aircraft flight operations and control facility	$80,000	85

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
ALASKAN AIR COMMAND	FTQW	ALASKA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1946	4th JUDICIAL DISTRICT	26 MILES SOUTHEAST OF FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

WEATHER RECONNAISSANCE DETACHMENT (MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND)

STRATEGIC RECONNAISSANCE WING (STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND)

TACTICAL FIGHTER (FORWARD ALERT)

AIR REFUELING SQUADRON (ROTATION) (STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND)

TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE SQUADRON (ROTATION)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	377	3,046	480	0	0	61	103	0	4,067
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	376	3,060	480	0	0	61	103	0	4,080

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	19,949	0	196,645	196,645
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				196,645
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				3,793
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (Excludes $630,000 Mobile Home Spaces)				1,557
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				3,400
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				205,395

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
149-962	Aircraft Flight Operations and Control Facility I		LS	LS	1,557	LS	1,557
	TOTAL				1,557		1,557

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

400

Mr. PATTEN. The request is for an aircraft flight operations and control facility for $1,557,000. Why is the present tower not properly situated?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, the airfield configuration has been changed and expanded since this tower was built many years ago. The tower no longer provides a full view of all of the aircraft operational areas. The airfield itself, the size of the runways and aprons have been changed.

Mr. PATTEN. Is it your plan to put both the flight operations mission and the control tower in the same building?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. The tower will actually rise vertically at only one end of the building.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the present size of the control tower? What is the proposed size?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I don't have the present size of the tower. We require 4,273 square feet of tower space. What we have now is something less than that, but I will have to provide for the record what it is.

[The information follows:]

SIZE OF PRESENT EIELSON AFB CONTROL TOWER

The existing Eielson AFB control tower is 1,575 square feet.

General REILLY. It is not large enough to accommodate the new equipment that is required.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the present size of the flight operations activity and what is the proposed size?

General REILLY. The existing base operations facility is 4,256 square feet. We require 8,175 square feet. It is about half the required size.

Mr. PATTEN. What equipment or other facilities will be moved from the present tower to the new one?

General REILLY. Sir, there will be some of the equipment from the old tower and there will be some additional new equipment installed as well.

Mr. PATTEN. What base use will the existing facilities be used for?

General REILLY. The old operations facility will become a warehouse for storage space and we will use the old control tower for miscellaneous administrative uses.

Mr. PATTEN. Where are these activities now carried out?

General REILLY. There is just a general shortage on the base of warehousing and administrative space.

Mr. PATTEN. When were the south touchdown zone area and the aircraft fueling area constructed and when was the existing control tower constructed? Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

The southern 6,300 feet of runway was constructed during World War II. In 1947 construction began to extend the runway to the north for a total length of 14,518 feet. Runway construction was completed in 1951. The present tower was constructed in 1954 and placed on top of a hangar. In 1956 the refueling loop was constructed at the south end of the runway. In 1961 an alert complex was also constructed at the south end. There are a large number of aircraft movements at this south end which is about 2 miles from the tower. Becuase of this great distance, visibility problems are encountered with the tower at its current location. Eielson has one of the longest runways in the world and a new tower properly located is essential for flight safety.

Cape Newenham Air Force Station, Alaska

Mr. Patten. Turn to Cape Newenham Air Force Base in Alaska. Insert page 111 in the record.
[The information follows:]

Cape Newenham Air Force Station

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.

AAC—CAPE NEWENHAM AFS, ALASKA—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Station composite support facility	$265,600	50

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		CAPE NEWENHAM AIR FORCE STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
ALASKAN AIR COMMAND	DBST	ALASKA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1952	4th JUDICIAL DISTRICT	70 MILES SOUTHWEST OF PLATINUM, ALASKA 460 MILES WEST OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SITE

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	4	90	8	0	0	6	13	0	121
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	4	91	8	0	0	6	13	0	122

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	2,359	0	10,901	10,901
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	0	0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				10,901
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				136
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				5,403
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				6,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				22,440

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
141-489	Station Composite Support Facility I		SF	39,055	5,403	39,055	5,403
	TOTAL				5,403		5,403

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. PATTEN. What is the mission at Cape Newenham?

General REILLY. Cape Newenham is a North American air defense surveillance station and forward air control post. It is one of 5 stations out of our prime 13 radar stations in Alaska principally involved with Early Warning. You can see on the map Cape Newenham along with Cape Romanzoff, Tin City, Cape Lisbourne, and Cold Bay.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SITES IN ALASKA

Mr. PATTEN. How many aircraft control and warning sites does the Air Force have in Alaska? What are the missions of each? Provide details for the record.

[The information follows:]

NUMBER AND MISSION OF ALASKAN A.C. & W. SITES

The 13 Alaskan radar sites are deployed primarily in an air defense role combining the functions of atmospheric radar surveillance for early warning, ground controlled intercept (GCI) capability, and command and control responsibilities.

The radar surveillance function for early warning is common to all sites; however, the following six sites have this mission as a sole function and are designated NORAD surveillance stations (NSS): Tin City, Cape Newenham, Cape Romanzof, Cape Lisbourne, Cold Bay, and Kotzebue.

The GCI capability is present at the following seven locations: Murphy Dome, King Salmon, Campion, Tatalina, Fort Yukon, Sparrevohn, and Indian Mountain.

In addition to functioning as GCI and surveillance stations, the following two sites have NORAD manual control center (NMCC) responsibility for command and control supervision of other radar sites within their assigned sectors of responsibility: Murphy Dome and King Salmon.

Mr. PATTEN. Which other stations have the same mission as Cape Newenham?

General REILLY. Four others: Tin City, Romanzoff, Lisbourne, and Cold Bay.

Mr. PATTEN. What coverage do the stations have? Do they overlap?

General REILLY. There is some overlap; yes, sir. The radar of these stations cover up to ——— feet altitude. I will have to provide the range for the five stations that I just mentioned.

[The information follows:]

RANGE OF A.C. & W. RADAR SYSTEMS

Five of the thirteen Alaskan radar sites have the same mission as Cape Newenham. These five locations are: Tin City, Cape Romanzof, Cape Lisbourne, Cold Bay, and Kotzebue.

The Alaskan radar sites have the capability to detect an air breathing vehicle up to an altitude of ——— feet. The maximum theoretical range of these sites extends to ——— nautical miles. Some overlap coverage does exist between adjacent sites.

General REILLY. There is enough overlap so there is a solid coverage throughout that part of Alaska.

Mr. MCEWEN. How many are in place now?

General REILLY. All those that you see in red on the map.

Mr. MCEWEN. This is not a new one?

General REILLY. No, sir. The stations at the top of Alaska you see there, from Point Ladeau around to Porter Island, from the western extremity of the DEW line. The distant early warning line runs across the northern part of Canada.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You mentioned there are four other stations which have the same mission as Cape Newenham. Then there are seven or

eight other stations, seven others of which have this mission, plus an additional mission; is that correct?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. Really, there are three categories of radar stations up there. There are those that I just mentioned in this group tied to the Norad, North American air defense.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Five are tied into Norad?

General REILLY. No, there are others as well. There are others that have not only the radar capability for early warning but also have ground control intercept capability. They actually can control the aircraft to an intercept. These stations that I have just mentioned don't have that capability. There are also stations that have the capability of tactical air control in fighting the ground war in Alaska because the commander of the Alaskan Command has not only air defense responsibility but he has a ground responsibility as well. Some of those stations are playing a role in the control of ground forces as well as early warning and control of aircraft.

Mr. NICHOLAS. If a station such as Cape Newenham has one mission and others have this mission plus an additional mission, does that mean Cape Newenham might be closed in the event of further consolidations? You have closed A.C. & W. stations in the past?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Would they be the likely ones to go first?

General REILLY. Not at all. These five that are on the western perimeter of the western edge of Alaska are the ones closest to the threat. They are the ones that we rely upon to make the first identification of any airborne threat. That is where we have already invested in prior programs the money to provide these consolidated composite facilities. We try to get our people out of the wooden temporary structures that have been there for so many years. These radar stations are as firm as——

Colonel Reed?

Colonel REED. The current program perceives these particular radars staying in the program in their basic configuration. Unlike the programs you might have heard about where we are going to integrate radar controls with FAA radars in the CONUS, these do not fall in the same category because there is not an FAA requirement as there is with continental traffic.

As the general pointed out, the ones on the coast are the forward-looking radars that give us the initial warning. Since that is their main purpose they would continue in that role. The interior ones give some warning, but primarily give control of the attacking U.S. forces in the air battle. So that it wouldn't imply that the coastal bases are softer or weaker.

Mr. PATTEN. In other words, if we were to close Newenham, you are saying there would be a gap in coverage?

Colonel REED. There would be a hole, yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Over which area?

Colonel REED. It is difficult to show. Approximately these radars extend out to———nautical miles in circle fashion. I think Newenham looks down on the Kamchitka Peninsula where there are Soviet air bases and launchers. You have to have a different type of map to get the projection. When that is up later you will get an idea of it. It looks as though the Russian territory from which an air-breathing ship could be launched——

Mr. NICHOLAS. Bases at which Russian bombers are permanently stationed——

Colonel REED. I am not an expert on the Russian force structure, or the bases capable of launching aircraft in that area. We have many where we might land our aircraft.

Mr. PATTEN. What other systems do you have which would supplement the AC&W sites?

Colonel REED. The only system that currently is in the inventory that could do any of this work would be the airborne EC–121, if it were so deployed. We do not currently use EC–121 airborne aircraft which would fly and then look out. We have very few of these in the inventory. There are for the air-breathing threat and warning no real supplementary systems in being now.

Mr. PATTEN. How about in the future?

Colonel REED. In the future we would hope, if it comes to pass, such things as the back scatter long-range radars might do this. AWACS, advanced-type warning might supplement these systems. However, there is no intent they would replace these systems.

FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES

Mr. PATTEN. What is the need for the diesel fuel storage facilities you are requesting here in three or four locations?

General REILLY. We have the storage now but we have some of it in rubber bladder tanks as opposed to steel tanks. They are subject to leaks.

COMPOSITE SUPPORT FACILITY—CAPE NEWENHAM

Mr. PATTEN. You are requesting a support facility of 39,055 square feet. Yet you list a deficiency of 103,711 square feet. How can you carry out your mission in so small a space?

General REILLY. Are you speaking of the scope of the Newenham composite station?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes.

General REILLY. In the total requirement of 110,000 square feet you mentioned, we have existing substandard plus some adequate space which gives us about 85,000 square feet. We are not a great deal short. One of the advantages of the new facility, is that it will all be consolidated as opposed to being scattered in 22 different buildings. We will get better utilization in a single location.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes.

Mr. MCEWEN. This rendering we are looking at shows two buildings?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, that is a building and power plant. It is a powerplant to the right.

Mr. MCEWEN. This station is remote?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCEWEN. There is no other military or civilian community nearby?

General REILLY. That is correct.

Mr. MCEWEN. Some years ago I was in and around the Arctic area and at that time we tried not to have one building but a number of buildings because we had some bad experiences where a building was lost through fire or whatever the disaster might have been.

What would happen here if we had a fire and it wiped out that main building? It looks like the other building is the vehicle storage building. Is that correct?

General REILLY. This new building will be noncombustible. We have a serious fire risk at the present time. This building will be noncombustible and one of our primary reasons for programing a new facility is to provide a completely noncombustible building.

Mr. MCEWEN. Are you saying this is completely fireproof?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, for all purposes.

Colonel RUTLAND. For all practical purposes it is noncombustible. Conventional construction, such as we note here, concrete block construction. The current facilities there are cantonment-type structures. As you intimated, we had some bad experiences throughout Alaska with cantonment structures. In one case we had to go through there with a bulldozer and rip out portions to save the remaining structure. We do feel that construction appropriations within the past 4 or 5 years for other composite facilities, have enabled us to provide good safe noncombustible quarters for assigned personnel.

Mr. MCEWEN. It is your judgment that it should be all in one building except for the vehicle storage?

Colonel RUTLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCEWEN. Everything in one building?

Colonel RUTLAND. Yes, sir. There is, as you see at the top of the map, an upper camp, which is the operations segment of the complex.

Mr. MCEWEN. How far is it from this lower camp to the upper one?

General REILLY. It is about 3,000 feet as the crow flies. Roughly 1 mile by that road you see there. This is typical of most of the Alaskan stations, the technical site or top camp on the top of a mountain or hill where the radar and technical equipment is located and where the actual operational mission is conducted. All the living quarters, messing quarters, and support functions are located down in the lower camp. There is an airstrip nearby that serves the camp.

Mr. MCEWEN. If you lose this base building here at the foot of the mountain, all of the living quarters, messing facilities would be lost?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCEWEN. None of that exists up where the radar is?

General REILLY. That is correct.

Mr. MCEWEN. General, I sure hope it is fireproof. I have not seen that building myself, but if we have one I would be interested in seeing it, a building that you cannot have a fire in.

General REILLY. There could be fires in the interior, furnishings, for example, could catch on fire. We feel that could be controlled.

Mr. MCEWEN. Paint will burn?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, but no wood walls, no combustible ceilings and things of that nature.

Colonel RUTLAND. Mr. McEwen, basically the existing structure is, if you will, a composite facility. I say that because the facilities are connected now with Jamesways or covered walkways. We plan essentially the same configuration with the exception that we will not have these adjoining Jamesways or walkways to go from one segment of the structure to the other. We feel this would give us a significant fire protection improvement.

Mr. RIETMAN. Mr. McEwen, in all our arctic installations where there is a possibility of a disastrous fire such as you mentioned, there is a survival kit which is placed separate from the building. It is not occupied but in there there is vital equipment and food that will allow the people who would be displaced to survive until rescued or until they could establish communications. It is a very serious problem, as you said.

Mr. MCEWEN. Thank you.

Mr. PATTEN. When did you plan to request a second phase of this project?

General REILLY. We are anticipating fiscal year 1975 program cost of about an additional $6 million.

Mr. PATTEN. How long will it take to construct these projects?

General REILLY. It takes about 2 years to construct a facility of this size in the remote Alaskan areas. Construction forces can only work during a very limited part of the year. It is a lengthy process.

Mr. PATTEN. If deferral of this project for 1 year will create a critical situation, why are you waiting 1 or more years to completely meet your needs?

General REILLY. This type of construction phasing, unfortunately, is generated by budgetary restraints. This essential project had to be considered for the fiscal year 1974 MCP along with many other high priority Air Force needs. It was determined to increment the funding of this sizable project into two programs in order that other similar high priority projects could also be included. We realize there is a degree of risk since the existing deteriorated condition will worsen with time. However, we believe that the construction phasing is such that complete replacement can be made prior to total structural failure. As you are aware, this remote station is a critical link in our surveillance defenses and, therefore, vital to our security.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the area cost factor here?

General REILLY. The area cost factor at Cape Newenham AFS is 2.8.

Mr. PATTEN. You include a request for a power station. Do you not now have one which could be used rather than spending $700,000 for a new one?

General REILLY. No; while the existing powerplant could be altered to furnish power to the new composite building, this would not be technically adequate because of low generation voltage and distances. The 11 existing 20-year-old 100 kW generators cannot be modified for waste heat recovery. The new plant will contain four 440 kW generators equipped for waste heat recovery. This recovered heat will be used as primary heat for the composite facility. Additional advantages accruing from the four-engine plant are a reduction in the number of operating personnel and reduced fuel requirements.

Mr. PATTEN. What would be the consequences if we defer this project?

General REILLY. The ability to operate and adequately perform a mission at such a remote site depends greatly upon the type and condition of facilities used to house the necessary equipment and operating personnel. High wind forces and heavy snow loads have caused the existing facilities to deteriorate at an accelerated rate. This creates more extensive maintenance and repair problems requiring larger O. & M. expenditures just to keep the existing facilities in operation.

The remoteness of this location, 460 miles west of Anchorage, Alaska, results in high area construction costs, both O. & M. and MCP, which drastically reduces project scope relative to high dollar expenditures. Further, as construction costs continue on the rise, the cost of deferring this project, even 1 year, could be economically critical. Also, should the existing facilities, which are old and structurally unsound, become unusable, the resultant affect would create a serious gap in our northern defense surveillance line. Therefore, the replacement of existing facilities with more permanent, maintenance-free structures is required to insure a continuous operational capability without breakdowns, interruptions, and mission degradation.

Indian Mountain Air Force Station, Alaska

Mr. Patten. Turn to Indian Mountain Air Force Station in Alaska. Insert page 113 in the record.

[The information follows:]

Indian Mountain Air Force Station

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.

AAC—INDIAN MOUNTAIN AFS, ALASKA—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Diesel fuel storage facility	$15,000	100

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		INDIAN MOUNTAIN AIR FORCE STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
ALASKAN AIR COMMAND	LKRC	ALASKA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1951	4th JUDICIAL DISTRICT	SIXTEEN MILES EAST OF HUGHES, ALASKA 195 MILES NORTHWEST OF FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING RADAR

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	9	139	11	0	0	0	0	0	159
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	9	139	11	0	0	0	0	0	159

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	4,226	0	9,551	9,551
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				9,551
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,454
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				397
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				1,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				12,402

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
411-134	Diesel Fuel Storage Facility I		BL	10,000	397	10,000	397
	TOTAL				397		397

DD FORM 1390, OCT 70 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. PATTEN. What is the mission at Indian Mountain?

General REILLY. Indian Mountain is a station to the interior of Alaska. It is a North American Air Defense ground control intercept—GCI station plus a radar control and reporting post.

Mr. PATTEN. You say that you have been using temporary storage facilities with a life expectancy of 18 months. How long has this situation existed?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I will have to furnish that for the record.

[The information follows:]

USE OF TEMPORARY STORAGE FACILITIES, INDIAN MOUNTAIN

The rubber bladder bags were put into service at Indian Mountain in 1968. Prior to 1968, fuel was delivered on a year-around basis. Economic benefit of concentrating resupply efforts in the longer daylight and milder weather summer months influenced use of the bladder bags.

Subsequently, it was determined that permanent, safer storage facilities should be provided.

Mr. PATTEN. What have been the changes in your fuel reserve requirements for the past 5 years?

General REILLY. May I furnish that for the record?

[The information follows:]

CHANGES IN FUEL RESERVE REQUIREMENTS, INDIAN MOUNTAIN

Fuel reserve requirements and consumption at both Indian Mountain and Sparrevohn have remained essentially unchanged for the past 5 years.

Mr. PATTEN. Why do you now request this facility when you have been in operation at this station since 1951? What took you so long?

General REILLY. I think the environmental protection issue brought it to a head. The bladders we refer to are rubber fuel tanks that have developed leaks and we lost some of the petroleum. Now, with the quality and pollution abatement standards we have to meet throughout Alaska, this is just one of many projects that have an environmental protection implication, although that is not the prime reason.

Mr. PATTEN. Could you list for the record other installations with similar longstanding needs?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; I think we can. We will see what our requirements are.

[The information follows:]

STORAGE NEEDS AT OTHER INSTALLATIONS

Indian Mountain and Sparrevohn are the only installations in Alaska that require replacement of bladder bag fuel storage systems with more permanent storage. The bladder bag storage arrangement is still in use in other parts of the world on a temporary basis. Bases in Thailand represent current examples.

SHEMYA AIR FORCE STATION, ALASKA

Mr. PATTEN. Turn to Shemya Air Force Station, Alaska.

Insert page 115 in the record.

[The information follows:]

SHEMYA AIR FORCE STATION

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.

AAC—SHEMYA AFS, ALASKA—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST INFORMATION)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete July 31, 1973
Alter electric power plant	$57,360	25

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		SHEMYA AIR FORCE STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
ALASKAN AIR COMMAND	VNMH	ALASKA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1943/1954	3rd JUDICIAL DISTRICT	1,500 MILES WEST OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

SECURITY SQUADRON (USAF SECURITY SERVICE)

STRATEGIC RECONNAISSANCE DETACHMENT (STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND)

SURVEILLANCE SQUADRON (AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	57	903	54	0	0	3	39	0	1,056
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	58	920	54	0	0	3	39	0	1,074

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,520	0	59,012	59,012
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				59,012
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				890
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				956
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				5,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				65,858

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
811-145	Alter Electric Power Plant I		LS	LS	956	LS	956
	TOTAL				956		956

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. PATTEN. The request is for $956,000 to alter the electric power plant. You say three of your generators are getting obsolete and three require modification. Why can you not just get three or four new, larger generators since you are going to have to replace some anyway?

General REILLY. The major portion of this project, $761,000, is for construction of electric distribution lines from this power plant to the new radar site being established. This plant will be the only source of power for the new radar, and it is essential that the electrical distribution connection be accomplished.

The balance of the project, $195,000, is required to modify the exhaust systems of three of the six Worthington generators, and will allow them to operate at rated capacity. Currently, these three generators provide 1,063 kW, without overheating, in lieu of their rated capacity of 1,250 kW each. This alteration project is well worth the expenditure of $195,000. There is no need to replace these generators at a cost of several million dollars. The modification of the exhaust system is all that is necessary. The other three Worthington's are operating at rated capacity.

In addition to the six Worthington generators in this plant, there are three ALCO units that are now obsolete. These ALCO units may be used for limited backup capability for short periods of time. They will be considered for replacement in the future.

Mr. PATTEN. Have you had power failures at this station?

General REILLY. There have been no complete power failures of the diesel generator plant; however, power failures have occurred on individual overhead feeders due to severe wind and ice conditions.

SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION, ALASKA

Mr. PATTEN. Turn to Sparrevohn Air Force Station in Alaska. Put page 117 in the record.

[The information follows:]

SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION

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 barrel 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.

AAC—SPARREVOHN AFS, ALASKA—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete July 31, 1973
Diesel fuel storage facility	$12,800	100

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		SPARREVOHN AIR FORCE STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
ALASKAN AIR COMMAND	VYLK	ALASKA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1952	4th JUDICIAL DISTRICT	110 MILES NORTHWEST OF ILIAMNA, ALASKA 195 MILES WEST OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SITE

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	9	137	11	0	0	0	0	0	157
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	9	138	11	0	0	0	0	0	158

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	1,201	0	11,724	11,724
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				11,724
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				323
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				345
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				500
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				12,892

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
411-134	Diesel Fuel Storage Facility I		BL	10,000	345	10,000	345
	TOTAL				345		345

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. PATTEN. Is this the same kind of situation as you have at Indian Mountain?

General REILLY. The diesel fuel storage situation is essentially the same at both Sparrevohn and Indian Mountain.

Mr. PATTEN. How long has the situation existed here?

General REILLY. Bladder bags have been in use at Sparrevohn since 1968.

Mr. PATTEN. We will take a short recess to vote.

[Short recess taken.]

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Mr. SIKES. Let us resume and take up the Strategic Air Command. Insert page 152 in the record.

[The information follows:]

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 two 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.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—FISCAL YEAR 1974

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Installation	*Proposed program (thousands)*
Barksdale Air Force Base, La	$1,743
Blytheville Air Force Base, Ark	140
Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz	232
Dyess Air Force Base, Tex	730
Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak	514
Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo	5,834
Grissom Air Force Base, Ind	3,100
Kincheloe Air Force Base, Mich	2,430
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont	1,507
McConnell Air Force Base, Kans	1,042
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr	617
Pease Air Force Base, N.H	526
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, N.Y	286
Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif	220
Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo	3,892
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich	616
Various locations	2,309
Total	25,738

STUDY OF COASTAL BASES

Mr. PATTEN. The conference report for the Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1973, contained the following language:

The conferees have considerable misgivings with regard to the programing of military construction projects at bases at which there are major Strategic Air Command bomber and/or tanker missions and which are located near the coast-

lines of the continental United States. In the opinion of the conferees, adequate study has not been made of the long-term effects on these coastal bases of force realinements and of the increasingly serious threat due to submarine-launched ballistic missiles. Accordingly, the conferees expect the Air Force to conduct a thorough study of the future utilization of coastal bases by Strategic Air Command aircraft. The conferees will expect a report of this study to be delivered to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives for their approval 30 days prior to the award of any construction contract for facilities at any coastal Air Force base having a major Strategic Air Command flying mission.

I understand that the Air Force has conducted such a study although it has not been delivered officially to the committee. What is the present situation? When will such a report be forthcoming?

General REILLY. Mr. Lee?

Mr. LEE. The study has been delivered officially to OSD. The OSD objected to one paragraph and they are sending it back to the Air Force to have a paragraph deleted and then it will be returned to OSD and they will send it back to the committee.

General REILLY. We would assume in the near future it will be formally transmitted to you by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SIKES. This is not a procedure which will require a very long time?

General REILLY. No, sir. As Mr. Lee mentioned, there is just one small area which the Air Force and OSD must reconcile.

Mr. SIKES. Even so, it is now 7 months from the time the conference report was issued. What has caused the delay in completing this study and delivering it to the committees concerned?

General REILLY. May I call on Major Kearl, with us from the directorate of operations, working very closely with the satellite basing program in their coastal base study.

Major KEARL. Mr. Chairman, the study was conducted primarily by the SAC evaluation of the threat situation. As a result, we did include several new looks at things not looked at since 1969 and 1970. In addition to that, the study was caught up in the turbulence of the base closures and force realinements. This required it to be redone in some respects and to address those issues so that it would be updated at the time it arrived back here, some discussions with agencies within OSD and negotiating positions and so forth. Consequently, that was the main reason it was delayed that long.

Mr. SIKES. What portions of the study are disputed by the Office of the Secretary of Defense?

Major KEARL. In the adjustments that we will be making here, there won't be any disputes. Basically judgment matters dealing with the assessment of threats since it is in many cases a judgment decision on just what you think the other fellow is going to do. Those things were negotiated.

FLIGHT TIMES OF SOVIET SUBMARINE MISSILES

Mr. SIKES. Can you tell us what the National Intelligence Estimate states with regard to the minimum flight times of current or possible future Soviet submarine-launched ballistic missiles?

MAJOR KEARL. Sir, we have here from our intelligence section, Colonel Anderson, who is dealing with Soviet naval matters. We brought him along to address those questions.

Mr. SIKES. Very well.

Colonel ANDERSON. I have with me one other man who is a ballistic missile expert in our office. He is Major Robertello. We can give you some idea of the nominal times of flight for all of the Soviet submarine-launched ballistic missiles in service today.

Mr. SIKES. We will suspend for a few minutes to answer a roll call [Short recess taken.]

Mr. SIKES. Gentlemen, let us proceed.

Lt. Colonel Anderson.

Colonel ANDERSON. Sir, in addressing the time of flight of the Soviet SLBM or submarine-launched ballistic missile to the United States target, roughly the times are the same for the current SLBM's that they employ.

The SSN–6 is the most representative I can give you, the best estimate I think we can show, and if fired for a range of about ——— miles his time of flight is about ——— minutes, about ——— minutes, ——— seconds to be precise.

Mr. SIKES. At what distance?

Colonel ANDERSON. At about ——— miles. If he fires at his full range, ——— miles, it would take ——— minutes time of flight, so from the time he broaches water, his missile broaches water, until the reentry is completed, those are the elapsed times.

Mr. SIKES. Is he limited to ——— miles? Is his ballistics such that he has to fire from about ——— miles?

Colonel ANDERSON. No, sir, he could burn shorter on his initial stages and fire to a shorter range. However, operationally he has some limitations.

Mr. SIKES. What would be the time at the minimum range and what would be the minimum range?

Colonel ANDERSON. This is a very difficult question, sir. I would say that ——— is a good minimum range for operational restrictions. If he gets in closer, and he does not ———.

Mr. SIKES. Is that for submarine security?

Colonel ANDERSON. It may be that he does this in order to preclude ———.

There are times when he does ———.

He does not move in nearer than that.

Mr. SIKES. He gains no particular advantage then by firing from less than the minimum of ——— miles?

Colonel ANDERSON. Well, sir, to our way of thinking he ———.

Mr. SIKES. What ——— are you talking about? ———.

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir, and if he starts ———.

Mr. SIKES. He may decide to do that and do it for a reasonable period of time. There is nothing to stop the Soviets from doing this and maintaining a position within a few hundred miles of our coastline for several years. But the question is, more directly, is it agreed in the national intelligence estimate what the minimum flight time is or what the minimum flight distance is for these missiles as opposed to other missiles?

Colonel ANDERSON. You mean, sir, excluding all operational considerations?

Mr. SIKES. Not all operational considerations. What is technically possible for him to do?

Colonel ANDERSON. Sir, I would have to check the distance of the ———.

Mr. SIKES. What is the minimum distance at which he could fire the missile and what is the minimum amount of time?

Colonel ANDERSON. I guess I will have to ask a missile expert.

Major Robertello, do you have an estimate of the minimum burn? Technically, sir, what you are saying is that it broaches the tube and falls in and explodes?

Mr. SIKES. That is possible?

Colonel ANDERSON. Certainly it could be set off in that fashion. However, all the operational considerations must be considered or else his attack has gained him nothing because he has ———.

Mr. SIKES. Is this a new estimate? We have always heard before that the ——— mile was considered a minimal trajectory; that really you couldn't go below this trajectory; that any shorter distance would require the missile to be shot up higher so it would take approximately the same amount of time in any case.

Colonel ANDERSON. Major Robertello, can you comment on the shortness of flight that he might be able to make?

Major ROBERTELLO. I am not absolutely sure of the minimum numbers. It is correct that the missile itself will have a minimum range, and for the N–6 I believe it is in the vicinity of ——— or ——— nautical miles.

Mr. SIKES. What would be the flight time which would correspond to that?

Major ROBERTELLO. Flight time at ——— hundred nautical miles for the continuity about ——— minutes for the SS–N–8 and about ——— minutes for the SS–N–6.

Mr. SIKES. Your study cites a minimum flight time of ——— minutes.

Major KEARL. The coastal base study?

Mr. SIKES. The coastal base study implies that the minimum would be———miles.

Major KEARL. For———miles.

Major ROBERTELLO. As rough as the chart is here, I think——— minutes for the SS–N–6 and,———minutes for the SS–N–8 are good representative values.

Mr. SIKES. But you are agreed, if I understand you, that you would not expect a launch of less than ———miles, and the flight time would be approximately———minutes?

Colonel ANDERSON. No, sir;———minutes.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You said———minutes before.

Colonel ANDERSON. And———seconds. You are right, sir, I would not expect it to be less than that, and I think that would be an aboslute minimum on operational considerations.

Mr. SIKES. What would be those operational considerations? What are they? The distance for———.

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir. I believe that would be the case to my best judgment. Plus he would want to———.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Is there any indication of whether the Russians have charted the closest possible operating areas, or is this getting a little bit——

Colonel ANDERSON. No, sir, it is not getting too bad. The systems available to the Soviets to navigate, in my opinion———.

In fact, if———.

There is nothing to preclude them from———.

On the other hand, we guess that———.

Mr. SIKES. On what do you base the statement that their———.

Colonel ANDERSON. Sir, the———.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Part of the question was also directed to other newer Soviet missiles which are being deployed, such as the SSN–8 and possible future development of that missile. What are the estimates with regard to the minimum flight time of that missile and the technical feasibility with regard to minimum flight time?

Colonel ANDERSON. Thank you, sir, because bringing up the 8, I think, proves our point. They went to a great deal of expense, including building a new submarine, to get a longer range missile. They were not looking for the short-range missile. They were looking for the long range. They moved ——— nautical miles.

Mr. NICHOLAS. But it also would give them a greater payload, which would allow them to put more of a booster and other design features on the missile, which would allow them to achieve a minimum time trajectory; isn't that right?

Colonel ANDERSON. I believe, sir, that if we were designing a missile to go shorter but carry a bigger payload we would not have designed it as they apparently designed the SS–N–8. It does not appear to be ———.

Mr. SIKES. Well, this is very interesting. What is the national intelligence estimate with regard to the feasibility of the Soviet Union's developing a ———.

Colonel ANDERSON. There is no evidence that they have done it, nor is there evidence that they have any intention of doing it.

Mr. SIKES. It is considered beyond their capability?

Colonel ANDERSON. No, sir; technically I don't think it is beyond their capability.

Mr. SIKES. There is just no indication that they are doing it?

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir. It may require a major redesign because of the ———.

We believe we would ———.

Mr. SIKES. If they should develop ———, and you have stated that they are not doing it, but if they should, is there a national intelligence estimate on the amount of time it would take between our detection of weapons testing of such a system and its deployment?

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir. The words I remember are ———.

CONSTRUCTION TIME FOR INLAND BASES

Mr. SIKES. Is this sufficient time to allow the Air Force to construct the inland bases that might be needed?

Colonel ANDERSON. Sir, in answering that question I would have to defer to General Reilly, I believe, because the question might be do you want to go inland or do you want to just disperse further to force him to commit more.

Mr. SIKES. Did you understand the question?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, I understand. Mr. Chairman, I think a lot would depend on just how far we are advanced in design. If it is just a matter of putting something under construction, advertising for bids and awarding and moving out, ————, and with decent weather we could have facilities ready.

On the other hand, to initiate——

Mr. SIKES. What would you do for authorization and appropriation?

General REILLY. Assuming we had that, yes, sir.

Without that, of course, we would have to either invoke emergency authorization of some kind or seek the annual cycle.

Mr. SIKES. It would be a more costly program I would assume.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Because of the crash aspects of the program.

General REILLY. Yes, sir, but if we had to include the design time as well, and it would depend on what we were to build. If we are talking about an alert dedicated runway or something of that nature, we would just never make it in ———.

WARNING AND LAUNCH TIMES

Mr. SIKES. The study indicates that ——— B–52's can safely escape from an SSN–6 missile launched ——— nautical miles from the SAC base, based upon a missile flight time of ———, and we have ——— minutes—we will say ——— minutes, ———and an aircraft escape time of ——— minutes with a ——— second interval between aircraft takeoffs.

Is that correct?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. SIKES. What elapsed time between missile launch and notification of SAC bases does this envision?

Major KEARL. It envisions ——— notification using the ——— satellite warning system.

Mr. SIKES. Is this warning and reaction time realistic based on the warning systems which are currently deployed?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. In the event the satellite warning system is not functioning, what would be the additional time before other warning systems would pick up an SLBM attack?

Major KEARL. The backup system is radar, and I would have to insert that time. I don't know the reaction time of backup radar.

REACTION TIME OF BACKUP RADAR SYSTEM

In the event the satellite warning system ——— is not functioning, the additional time before the Sea Launched Ballistic Missile Detection and Warning (SLBM D. & W.) system radar(s) would detect an SLBM attack is contingent upon the range at which the missiles are launched. The SS–N–6 and SS–N–8, launched at a range beyond ——— nautical miles, can ——— nautical miles. The additional time required from launch to radar detection and reporting will vary from approximately ——— minutes for a missile launched at a range of ——— nautical miles to approximately ——— minutes for a missile launched at a range of ——— nautical miles. That is, ——— would provide about ——— minutes warning to impact whereas SLBM D. & W. would provide ——— minutes warning to impact for a missile launched at ——— nautical miles. ——— would provide about ——— minutes warning to impact whereas SLBM D. & W. would provide about ——— minutes warning to impact for a ——— nautical mile launch.

Mr. SIKES. In computing the time required to launch the B–52 force, has the Air Force utilized the rules of various tests of SAC alert forces' response time?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What has been the range of times involved in these tests in the past year?

Major KEARL. I would have to provide that for the record, sir.

[The information follows:]

Strategic Air Command records indicate that for the last 4,000 alert exercises conducted in the past several years, the average time for the first B–52 to launch has been ———. This is predicated on at least 50 percent of the crews in the alert facility and includes night exercises when crews are sleeping and all types of weather. Weather is a very important factor of crew reaction time. It should be noted, however, that most all SAC bases which are susceptible to severe winter weather are the inland bases along the northern tier of the United States which have more time to react.

Mr. SIKES. Would it be different with different types of B–52's? Different models?

Major KEARL. Sir, the reaction time of the airplane starting its engines and getting to the runway wouldn't vary considerably between airplanes. The difference would be in the time of start takeoff roll until he was clear of the base target area.

This would vary with the later models accelerating faster than the earlier model D's so there would be a difference here, yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. How does the reaction time for the launch of the KC–135 tanker compare to that of the B–52?

Major KEARL. We use the same basic figures for the late model B–52 and the KC–135.

Mr. SIKES. And what is the reaction time for the FB–111's?

Major KEARL. Sir, the total reaction time of the FB–111, including its escape time out of the target area, is ——— minutes.

Mr. SIKES. What do you expect the reaction time of the B–1 to be?

Major KEARL. ——— minutes totally from the surfacing of the SLBM until the B–1 is out of the target area, for the first airplane.

QUICK START PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Your study mentions the "quick start" program for B–52's. What improvement in reaction time do you anticipate for this modification?

Major KEARL. Sir, this modification will reduce the engine start time of the B–52 and the KC–135 from ——— minutes to a total of ——— seconds, the quick start giving us a —— minute cut in our reaction time, a very significant percentage.

Mr. SIKES. How many B–52's are scheduled to receive this modification?

Major KEARL. Sir, all of the B–52 G & H aircraft. I am sorry, I don't have a force figure for that. Les, you might.

Colonel REED. Eleven squadrons, of G's & six H's.

Major KEARL. The quick start is going to initially be with the G's and H's and all cases of the KC–135's.

Mr. SIKES. Do you still plan to modify the B–52D's?

Major KEARL. No, sir, the program right now calls for just the 600 KC, all of the KC, EC, and RC–135's, 174 B–52G's; and 99 B–52H's.

FORCE LEVELS

Mr. SIKES. What number of B–52's are there currently in the force levels? What number of B–52F's? What numbers of these aircraft will be in the force level in fiscal year 1977? Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

CURRENT AND FISCAL YEAR 1977 B–52 FORCE LEVELS

The currently approved B–52 UE force structure is as follows:

	Fiscal year—				
	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
B–52D	120	95	[Deleted.]		
B–52F	22	22			
B–52G	165	165			
B–52H	90	90			
Total	397	372			

Mr. SIKES. Are all the B–52D's and B–52F's stationed at coastal main operating bases?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Are the B–52D's considered more expendable?

Major KEARL. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Are they likely to be reduced from the force level ahead of the B–52G's and H's?

Major Kearl. Sir, the D model is much older than the other two and if age—flying time—is the criteria, we would expect that, yes, sir. But there are a group that are remaining in the present inventory because they have a very significant conventional bombing capability that conceivably could be retained past some G's and H's just because of that capability.

RELATIONSHIP OF ALERT AND FOLLOW-ON FORCES

Mr. SIKES. The Defense subcommittee has been asked to reprogram funds to fix up the airframes of 80 of these older B–52D's in order to meet strategic objectives in meeting the single integrated operations plan (SIOP) or for use against ——— as well as for minelaying and for conventional bombing roles. Does the requirement for the use of these aircraft in SIOP roles come from the assumption that only the 40 percent of the SAC bomber aircraft on alert will launch successfully?

Major KEARL. If I understand the question correctly, Mr. Chairman, the 40 percent of the ground alert rate will apply to those B–52D's just as it does to the G's and H's, however we expect over ——— of the ground alert Force to launch successfully.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Is there a requirement for additional B–52D's in the force level over the G's and H's, based upon the roles which the 40 percent or the alert force would play in the SIOP plan?

In other words, do you need to retain 40 percent of 80 B–52D's to meet your desired objectives?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir. We need 40 percent of the B–52D's on ground alert. All of the B–52's are needed to meet the SIOP ob-

jectives. The 40 percent alert rating is a function of crews and aircraft. About 40 percent is the maximum rate that we can sustain on a daily basis.

Mr. NICHOLAS. It is based on 40 percent having a great likelihood of making it in the worst case?

Major KEARL. Well, I guess it is a question of which come first, the target system or your capability to strike it.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You are saying you need the additional aircraft because you can't meet your SIOP mission. I am wondering whether you mean you need 40 percent of the total SAC force to meet your SIOP?

Major KEARL. No; SIOP requires the total force—100 percent.

The only 40 percent restriction is what has been programed and we can place on alert in an immediate reaction posture but the SIOP includes the total force. All 100 percent are targeted and all 100 percent are counted upon.

Mr. SIKES. Could you achieve the same objective by having a higher percentage of aircraft on alert?

Mr. NICHOLAS. Assuming that there is a sneak attack on the United States and that 40 percent is a realistic figure——

Major KEARL. We would like to have 100 percent on alert.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You would like to have that but would 40 percent do you any good? Is that going to meet the mission you have under the triad?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir, 40 percent of the total force is what has been determined to be the minimum we can do business with in the event of a no-warning attack. We would like to have more.

Mr. NICHOLAS. But you are not counting on having more? I mean, in the worst situation, you are not counting on it?

Major KEARL. You must remember now we have the whole bomber force programed to the target system. If there is any kind of warning at all like those submarines moving into ——— miles, we will go to ——— percent alert, ——— percent alert. We will drive the alert as far up as we possibly can if the strategic warning permits us.

So all 100 are anticipated, 100 percent are anticipated to be used. What can you afford to go day-to-day continuously, the figure is 40 percent.

Mr. SIKES. When we talk of Soviets moving into a ——— mile range, are we talking about a significant time lapse? Where is he most likely to be located? ——— miles off?

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir. He is most likely to be ——— or more in the Atlantic and Pacific.

Mr. SIKES. If he is ——— miles offshore and if he does move in to ——— miles, you have a considerable time lapse there? Of what? Twenty hours? Twenty-four?

Colonel ANDERSON. His speed of advance would probably be in the vicinity of ———.

Mr. SIKES. In the event the B–52D's were utilized for other roles, is it not likely that the number of other bomber aircraft on the alert would be increased, at least temporarily?

Major KEARL. This option is available, yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. The study mentions the SAC "follow-on force" and the "SAC dispersal plan" which are different from the satellite basing of alert forces. The implementation of these plans is based on strategic warning. Is that correct?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Your study states:

In the event of strategic warning, and at the direction of Headquarters SAC, each MOB would generate its follow-on aircraft to a ready, emergency war order loaded status. Then, again upon direction from Headquarters SAC, the generated follow-on aircraft could be flown to preplanned dispersal bases and placed on alert.

Is it correct to infer that this is a two-step process and that the second would likely result from a need to achieve a higher degree of readiness than the first?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. How long could the SAC force maintain the first posture with a majority of its aircraft in a ready status in the main operating base?

Major KEARL. Sir, I would have to provide that time for the record.

[The information follows:]

LENGTH OF TIME THAT ALERT AIRCRAFT CAN MAINTAIN READY LOADED STATUS

The Strategic Air Command maintains 40 percent of its aircraft on alert on a daily basis. In periods of increased tension or strategic warning the entire SAC bomber and tanker force can be generated to an alert configuration and maintained for approximately ——— days at the main operating bases. After this time aircrew and aircraft inactivity becomes a limiting factor.

Major KEARL. It would be depending on what state of readiness we kept even while they were there. If the crews were kept in the cockpit and were rated then, obviously there would be less time than if they all bedded down in the alert facility.

There are just a number of variables there. The second stage, moving out to the dispersal bases, we plan on at least ——— days of being able to maintain that posture, hoping in that length of time something is either negotiated or other actions are taken.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You could maintain the first posture for a longer time?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir; I am sure we could. That being the home base the facilities are much more adequate than some of these dispersal sites.

Mr. SIKES. If you maintained the second posture, the majority of aircraft on alert at dispersal bases, what penalties do you pay for maintaining this posture as opposed to keeping the aircraft in readiness at their MOB's?

Major KEARL. Just basically the wear and tear on crews moving back and forth and transportation. Otherwise we have the normal command control capability and everything else.

Mr. SIKES. In that case, in the event that the war-loaded aircraft were at a main operating base in the interior of the United States and an attack occurred, would more of these aircraft survive a surprise attack than if they were at a coastal MOB?

Major KEARL. It would depend entirely on where that main base was located. We are looking at this question right now. In our opinion the fewer airplanes on more bases will survive better than a lot of airplanes on a few bases, especially in the light of the long-range missile and the fact that now all parts of the interior United States are targetable under this new threat postulation.

EFFECT OF COUNTERFORCE STRIKES ON SAC BOMBERS ON U.S. POPULATION CENTERS

Mr. SIKES. There is a discernible tendency in the Department of Defense and the National Security Council to talk about nuclear wars which are less than all-out exchanges. One of the attractive features of the strategic nuclear submarines is that they tend to shift enemy counterforce attacks from the United States to the oceans. Should the Air Force consider moving its main operating bases and its alert bases away from major population centers in order to diminish U.S. casualties in any counterforce strike against these bases?

We are getting you into policy matters. I realize it is a little above your level, but from a hypothetical standpoint what is your answer?

Colonel ANDERSON. There is one other problem with the thesis that by putting retaliatory forces to SEA you can avoid having your people attacked. That is the chance of seducing attack, because the enemy can attack your Armed Forces without attacking your population. Therefore, you run the very risk that you were trying to avoid. He has the chance of taking you on without your fully retaliating against him.

Mr. NICHOLAS. In that case is there a purposeful policy of putting SAC alert forces near the major U.S. population centers in order to deter any type of attack on these forces?

Major KEARL. No, sir; the satelliting of the alert force is a function of targeting of those airplanes. Obviously, they have a target system, and we want to get them optimally ranged to that target system, available concrete that is long enough and stressed enough to do it, and facilities that are in place to minimize the cost of making that kind of a move.

There is no intent to put them near any population centers for that purpose.

INLAND MAIN OPERATING BASES

Mr. SIKES. In view of the greater sensitivity of coastal bases to variations in warning time, missile flight time, aircraft reaction time, et cetera, wouldn't an inland MOB and alert base structure represent a better assured deterrent?

Major KEARL. Not necessarily, Mr. Chairman. There is a question again of using those airplanes offensively which we must consider. There is the strategic question of concentrating your forces on a few bases and minimizing the target system that the other guy must attack and therefore giving him more economy.

I would say those are the two major objections to that kind of a postulation.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The question didn't mention anything about necessarily concentrating at a fewer number of main operating bases. I realize that the SAC long-range plan did contemplate this, but this question is directed at the utility of a coastal MOB or alert base versus one inland——

Major KEARL. If you were going to give me 50 bases inland to bed down the alert force I would take them versus putting 50 of them on the coast. With the economics involved I would still have the problem of moving some of those away from the target system which I would like to have closer to the target system and I would still have to address that question.

SAC BASE CLOSURES

Mr. SIKES. The Air Force study seems to be worded in an all-or-nothing manner with regard to coastal versus inland basing. I am going to let you comment on that in a few moments.

Let me continue further. Of course, the costs of moving all SAC forces inland would be enormous. The committee deferred projects at SAC coastal bases last year not because it felt that all SAC coastal bases would be closed in the near future but because it felt that some would be closed and the Air Force refused to admit this or accept the logic that coastal bases likely would be the first to be closed.

Since that time, you have announced plans to close two coastal bases with a total of 40 B–52D's and 35 KC–135's located at them. That is correct, is it not?

Major KEARL. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. Based on past history and logic, would it be reasonable to assume that if further bases are closed they would also be coastal bases?

Colonel REED. The consideration of survivability was one of the considerations in determining the base closure package. It was one of several considerations, others being as I mentioned before, the increasing air traffic density in and around McCoy, its further southern extremity, the condition of facilities in the Westover area, and so forth.

It certainly would be a consideration if we were to reduce strategic bases, that we would have to look hard at the coastal bases. It would not be the sole determinant, however, determining which base to close.

Mr. SIKES. Your force structure is scheduled to decline by a total of 73 B–52 aircraft, assuming that the reprograming for the 80 B–52D's is approved. Is that correct?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Do you foresee a possibility in the next 2 to 3 years of further SAC force reductions?

Major KEARL. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Not willingly then?

Major KEARL. Not unilaterally.

Mr. SIKES. You have eliminated bases which accommodated 40 B–52's. What about the other 33, if you are going down by a total of 73 B–52 aircraft?

Colonel REED. Sir, the announced closure package was 15 at McCoy, 25 at Westover, and 5 at Dyess, which went into the announcement, but no major base closure since we have a continuing SAC mission and a tactical airlift mission at Dyess.

The other 22 aircraft are associated with the F model combat training down at Castle and in our studies we projected that these aircraft do come out in the 1975 time frame.

However, we are studing various options in conjunction with the 1975 budget as to how to provide combat crew training and if we will continue Castle for B–52 training. The questions are we will relocate, for example, one aircraft out of each squadron and by adjusting the crew ratios continue the same SIOP force and train with the aircraft the individual will fly, whether we will relocate a squadron, and so forth.

These decisions have not been reached. I think that will account for all of the aircraft that will be reduced in the decision.

Mr. SIKES. What reductions are planned for the KC–135 tankers? Has that been decided?

Major KEARL. There are no reductions planned for KC–135's, no, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Are you still studying tanker requirements?

Major KEARL. Continuously.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You just reduced the B–52 force level by 73 aircraft.

Major KEARL. Yes, sir, however it is 67 aircraft, 45–D and 22–F aircraft.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You don't plan any KC–135 reductions along with that?

Major KEARL. Oh, no, sir. We were short of tankers before we reduced.

Mr. NICHOLAS. How did the Air Force get in the position where they got short of tankers?

Major KEARL. Increased requirements. You must remember that all the latest TAC fighters now are refuelable and so forth and those requirements have driven up but we haven't bought any more tankers.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Does this mean you may transfer the tankers to TAC?

Major KEARL. No, sir; it means we have other commitments in addition to the SIOP for those tankers and the other commitments have grown.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Is there any reason to have them on alert status?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. At SAC bases?

Major KEARL. That will be the second part of my rationale. The target system which we are dealing with has improved considerably. More low level time for those bombers is required. We are making modifications to enhance the low-level capability.

They are going to need more gas. Our tanker ratios for some targets are one tanker to one bomber, when we would like to have three tankers to one bomber. These requirements have all grown and consequently we are tanker-limited and will not reduce tankers on a 1-to-1 ratio just because we reduce the bombers.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The reduction of B–52's would not seem to be desirable unless there is a strategic arms limitation agreement, but it may be necessary, as a result of the same reason that you have knocked the 67 out of the force level, fiscal limitations.

Are you anticipating that fiscal limitations could again force you to reduce your tankers? This is the reason you reduced B–52 forces, isn't it?

Major KEARL. The answer to anticipation is no; we do not anticipate that. And the tanker requirement is a separate examination and is not tied in with the bomber reduction.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Are you still studying it?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir; absolutely.

CLOSURE OF FORBES AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SIKES. The Air Force plans to close Forbes Air Force Base with the exception of the SAC alert mission. What studies did you make with regard to transferring a SAC MOB mission to Forbes and closing a coastal SAC base instead?

Colonel Reed. Primarily our consideration was that the installation in its runway complex and in its basic facilities on the flight line and so forth is not B–52 capable.

To upgrade this would mean a major construction of runway systems and so forth. We are planning primarily to operate KC–135's. Our programs include, I think, launching those necessarily that are survivable and therefore we felt there was no gain in consideration of the economics involved.

REVIEW OF RELOCATION OF COASTAL MAIN OPERATING BASES

Mr. SIKES. The coastal base study states: "The possibility of relocating SAC coastal MOB's or satellite missions in a base-by-base trade-off for inland bases of other commands was also reviewed. However, costs of conversion are not competitive with other solutions * * *." What bases did you look at, and what were the costs of conversion?

Could you supply that for the record?

[The information follows:]

A detailed specific base-by-base examination of the cost to trade-off Strategic Air Command (SAC) coastal main operating bases (MOB's) or satellite operations for inland bases of other major commands was not conducted. However, a general review of base trade-offs using gross planning estimates was accomplished.

Initial planning for satellite basing included an in-depth study of all bases throughout the United States capable of supporting B–52/KC–135 operations. As a result, all bases that did not require extensive military construction were incorporated into the current satellite basing program. For example, it was possible to implement the first 12 satellite bases without the use of any military construction funds. At other bases it has been necessary to expend $4–5 million to upgrade the runway/taxiways and crew quarters to support only a very austere satellite operation.

The SAC was tasked to investigate the cost of using Scott AFB, Ill., a military airlift command (MAC) base for satellite operations. Scott AFB is typical of other bases such as Richards Gebaur AFB, Mo.; Chanute AFB, Ill.; Williams AFB, Ariz.; and Nellis AFB, Nev., which had previously been dropped from consideration because of inadequate runway size and load-bearing capability to permit operation of SAC flying missions. It has been estimated that some $10 million would be needed to prepare Scott AFB for satellite operations. The attached list provides a breakout of these costs and shows that over $7.5 would be required to overlay, widen, and extend the runway, and construct a parking apron and taxiway. Additionally, any air base without adequate airfield pavements, also lacks maintenance facilities which will accommodate large bomber/tanker aircraft. Thus, in order for Scott AFB to support a SAC MOB mission, extensive aircraft maintenance facilities would have to be constructed and existing facilities altered and expanded. Facilities such as hangers, maintenance docks, avionics, field maintenance, engine build-up shops, wash racks, test cells, and other industrial facilities were estimated to cost an additional $8 to $12 million.

Relocation of SAC bomber missions to bases such as Scott AFB would also require missile assembly shops and storage areas for weapons such as the short range attack missile (SRAM). The costs for land acquisition and negotiations with local governments to locate, acquire, and construct facilities with adequate clearance for the storage, assembly, and maintenance of nuclear weapons were also considered. These costs would range from $5 to $15 million depending on availability of land and proximity to large metropolitan areas.

While facilities at any SAC coastal base should accommodate missions similar to those at Scott AFB, experience has shown that unit relocations even where existing facilities are available, always involve various minor construction and alteration projects and frequently some military construction to support specific peculiar mission requirements. Thus, a base trade-off between Scott AFB and one of the SAC coastal MOB's would include some $2 to $4 million in facilities construction to relocate MAC HQs and other Scott AFB missions to a coastal base.

The cost for facilities alone, in such a base trade-off could amount to some $25 to $40 million. In addition, the one-time costs for personnel and equipment movement generally range from $2 to $4 million. This review led us to conclude that other inland bases with similar missions, which did not possess bomber/tanker capable airfield pavements would cost more than $30 million to accomplish a wholesale trade-off or flip-flop.

Moreover, we concluded that bases such as Chanute AFB, Ill., a technical training center, would be even more costly to trade-off or relocate because large training facilities are not generally available at SAC bases in quantities to support technical training center missions.

The Air Force thus concluded that a detailed cost analysis of specific base-by-base trade-offs was not warranted; and that construction of alert dedicated runways (ADR's) at existing SAC inland bases, or improvement of airfields for satelliting only, at bases such as Scott AFB, were more economical alternatives to proliferate the SAC alert force in countering future threats, than trade-off of inland bases of other commands for SAC coastal bases.

Construction requirements for SAC satellite operations at Scott AFB

ITEM:	*Cost in thousands*
Improve runway, taxiways, parking apron	$7,640
Construct lighting and navigational aids	520
Construct security fencing and lighting	100
Construct crew quarters	450
Construct composite operations building	255
Construct AGE shop	55
Expand utilities	60
Construct drainage, culverts, and site work	500
Construct roads	62
Design costs	358
Total	10,000

BASING OF B–1

Mr. SIKES. One of the capabilities of the B–1 is supposed to be the ability to operate from a greater variety of airfields, which will allow greater dispersion in the basing of this aircraft.

Will the introduction of the B–1 make joint basing with other commands at inland bases or conversion costs of other commands' bases more feasible?

Major KEARL. Sir, the B–1 base in that question as well as the base selection itself has not been determined and is still under study.

Mr. NICHOLAS. In answer to this question, wouldn't it be cheaper if the aircraft required less runway length?

Major KEARL. Since we are also talking about facilities and support facilities for the B–1, simulators and things like that I couldn't tell you it would be cheaper to double up. I just don't have that answer.

EFFECT OF SATELLITE BASING ON MAIN OPERATING BASES

Mr. SIKES. Last year, although the Air Force claimed to have made a study on the effect of satellite basing on MOB facilities requirements, the surveys and investigations staff discovered that no specific study had been made.

Has a specific study been made since last year?

Major KEARL. Yes, sir; that situation was addressed in this coastal base study and as a result, as we indicated or had intended to indicate at an earlier time, the vacancy of facilities at a main operating base on the coast when in fact you move that alert force inland is so small that it didn't warrant at that time, we felt, a major study at each individual base.

When the alert force leaves that main coastal base and moves inland all it does is vacate some alert facility and parking space at that main base which, of course, would be reutilized if we generate any more planes. It didn't involve a mass movement or vacancy of facilities for personnel and consequently wasn't examined in any detail. It is addressed in the coastal study.

CONSTRUCTION AT COASTAL BASES

Mr. SIKES. In view of the shortcomings of the coastal base study that has been made, which is not yet fully concurred in by OSD, and with a possible excess capacity at B–52 bases, is the committee justified in approving construction at SAC B–52 or KC–135 bases on the coasts?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Why?

General REILLY. I hope we have convinced the committee that we have a firm requirement for our main operating bases and that these facilities that we are requesting are essential to the continued utilization of those bases.

Mr. SIKES. You may want to expand that answer for the record.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. And give us some more detailed justification.

[The information follows:]

JUSTIFICATION FOR MAIN OPERATING BASES ON COASTS

All MOB's, including coastal, currently play a major role in the SAC mission and will retain significant utility even if a Soviet ——— capability should be developed in the future. Under the current threat, the coastal MOB's can support and survive alert aircraft, support satellite operations, and generate and disperse follow-on aircraft. Coastal MOB's support required aircrew training, aircraft, and airborne missile maintenance, and provide facilities for assigned personnel and their families. The coastal MOB's, in effect, are home bases for their deployed alert aircraft and personnel. They also support collateral mission activities and, in many cases, the primary mission of the base supports activities of other major air commands such as depot overhaul, training, and airlift.

Even if a ——— threat should materialize and precipitate the implementation of additional satellite basing plans, coastal MOB's maintain utility in all areas except the maintenance of an alert force on home station. They would still be needed as "home ports" to support their satellite alert force, all other EWO activities, and all other aspects of the mission now being supported. No significant personnel reductions or facility vacancies would be created if the entire coastal MOB alert force is rotated elsewhere.

Satellite basing increases survivability of the aircraft alert force under any foreseeable SLBM threat. It complicates an attacker's targeting and timing problems, thus enhancing survival of all elements of the TRIAD. The creditability of the TRIAD as an effective deterrent is thereby strengthened.

The construction programed for coastal MOB's provides continued support for normal mission activity as well as home satellite alert. The SLBM threat alone will not require the Air Force to close any of the coastal bases. The coastal MOB's retain their utility under any foreseeable threat. Current inland facilities are not adequate to support the entire SAC mission; consequently, the construction program for all coastal bases should proceed based on the continuing necessity for normal mission support.

Mr. SIKES. Gentlemen, are there questions on this general situation before we get into specific base facilities?

On my right?

On my left?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

CLASSIFIED ITEMS

Mr. SIKES. We now turn to the Air Force classified items.

Mr. Reporter, please place all pages of the justification book in the record at this point.

[The pages follow:]

[Editors note: The discussion of classified items has been deleted in toto from the hearing record.]

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, MARYLAND

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Andrews Air Force Base in Maryland.

Insert page 120 in the record.

[The information follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY	
HEADQUARTERS COMMAND	AJXF	MARYLAND	
7. STATUS	**8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**9. COUNTY (U.S.)**	**10. NEAREST CITY**
ACTIVE	1943	PRINCE GEORGES	ELEVEN MILES SOUTHEAST OF WASHINGTON, D.C

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

AIRBORNE COMMAND CONTROL SQUADRON

HELICOPTER SQUADRON

MILITARY AIRLIFT SPECIAL MISSION WING (MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND)

TACTICAL AIRLIFT WING (RESERVE)

TACTICAL FIGHTER WING (AIR NATIONAL GUARD)

HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

SUPPORT FUNCTIONS FOR AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,550	5,233	3,046	0	0	133	78	0	10,040
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	1,529	5,117	3,043	0	0	133	78	0	9,900

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	6,959	1,720	169,443	171,163
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	650	114	0	114
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				171,277
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY Excludes $17,780,000 Family Housing)				4,548
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (Excludes $8,700,000 Family Housing)				16,935
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				13,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				205,760

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
100-000	Special Aircraft Support Facilities I		LS	LS	13,500	LS	13,500
141-784	Add to & Alter Air Passenger Terminal 20	MAC	SF	7,975	296	7,975	296
510-278	Aeromedical Staging Facility I		SF	30,800	1,739	30,800	1,739
800-000	Utilities I		LS	LS	1,400	LS	1,400
	TOTAL				16,935		16,935

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

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 1 increment of special operational and maintenance support facilities will provide hangar, pavement, and taxiways, operations and alert facility, fuel system, and support construction.

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.

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.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND—ANDREWS AFB, MD.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Special aircraft support facilities	$1,260,000	40
Add to and alter air passenger terminal	27,400	20
Aeromedical staging facility	106,100	15
Utilities	82,200	40

Mr. SIKES. You are requesting various projects including special aircraft support facilities at a cost of $13.5 million. What aircraft will be supported there?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, this will be what the Air Force will call the E–4. This is a military version of the Boeing 747 aircraft.

Mr. SIKES. What is the long range program for the number of aircraft to be stationed here?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, may I call on Lieutenant Colonel Herod of Operations to say just a few words on behalf of this project.

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Gentlemen, again let us suspend for a few minutes.

[Brief recess.]

PASSENGER TERMINAL ADDITION

Mr. PATTEN. The committee will come to order. We will skip the first project for a moment and discuss the request for $296,000 to alter and add to the passenger terminal.

You have stated that the present lobby is not of sufficient size to handle the distinguished visitors and others who use the facility. How

often does a head of state spend time in the public lobby because of the alleged current space shortage?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, our problem does not center around providing space for heads of state and people of that nature, although there is some space in the terminal which we call the VIP area. The requirement stems from the need for the military people who are transienting the base and normal Air Force operations.

Mr. PATTEN. Is this the area where they can eat and get a cup of coffee next to the VIP room?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. You have been in the terminal?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes.

General REILLY. The large central area is what we are talking about where the people congregate. There is a small cafeteria, and I was just in there last Friday or Thursday morning, a week ago today, before 7 in the morning, when there was standing room only.

Mr. PATTEN. How often is the present terminal overcrowded?

General REILLY. On very frequent occasions.

Mr. PATTEN. What do you do about this?

General REILLY. We just try to work around the problem. Also when aircraft with 50 or more people come in they are being diverted to Dulles Airport, where there are the necessary customs and where they can be handled. We have a passenger load running in the neighborhood of 16,000 to 20,000 per month.

Mr. PATTEN. Speaking of distinguished visitors, who was in recently that they couldn't find? They were afraid of some outsiders or protesters, and they took them and put them on a helicopter and nobody saw him. He was in and gone.

General REILLY. I should add, Mr. Chairman, the terminal does play a role in supporting these distinguished visitors as it accommodates people that must arrive ahead of the aircraft and be there at departure. The terminal is put to good use during arrivals of these heads of state.

Mr. PATTEN. Provide details as to costs incurred over the past two years when aircraft which would use Andrews were sent instead to Dulles for customs clearance.

[The information follows:]

During 1971–72, only six aircraft were diverted from Andrews AFB to Dulles International due to a lack of adequate facilities to clear the passengers. Each of these six diversions incurred costs of $350 to include services such as water services, lavatory services, ramp charges, passenger transportation, et cetera. Total charges were $2,100. Prior to these diversions, U.S. Customs had placed a limit on the number of inbound passengers that could be practically cleared at one time at Andrews AFB. This limit is 50; however, it has not been strictly enforced by U.S. Customs since they are aware of USAF efforts to provide an adequate clearance facility. This means the $2,100 figure could have been much higher since there were at least 10 aircraft with over 50 passengers that were allowed to land at Andrews AFB instead of diverting to Dulles. A strict enforcement of the 50-passenger maximum rule will probably result if the USAF is not able to provide an adequate U.S. Customs facility. Customs personnel are now working out of an equipment storage garage and maintaining a limited capability on the condition that adequate facilities are being programed.

Mr. PATTEN. Provide details on the square footage to be assigned to each function in the proposed addition, for the record.

[The information follows:]

The 7,000-square-foot addition to the air passenger terminal is distributed functionally, as follows:

Area:	*Square feet*
Lounge/customs	1,980
Boarder clearing	120
Passports	540
Barbershop	297
Administrative space	4,063
	7,000

This addition will permit better functional utilization of the complete terminal and greatly reduce this overcrowding and relieve the passenger processing problem referred to in the prior testimony.

Mr. PATTEN. Tell us this for the record: How many passengers a day use the terminal? How many inbound and how many outbound? How many require customs and immigration facilities? Provide average figures for the past 2 years.

[The information follows:]

The average number of passengers using the Andrews AFB terminal is indicated below:

June 1971 through May 1972—639 average per day.
June 1972 through May 1973—570 average per day.

The average number of inbound and outbound passengers for the period June 1971 through May 1973 is shown below:

June 1971 through May 1972—298 average per day inbound.
June 1972 through May 1973—263 average per day inbound.
June 1971 through May 1972—341 average per day outbound.
June 1972 through May 1973—307 average per day outbound.

The daily average number of passengers requiring customs and immigration facilities is shown below:

June 1971 through May 1972—107 average per day.
June 1972 through May 1973—95 average per day.

AEROMEDICAL STAGING FACILITY

Mr. PATTEN. You also are requesting $1,739,000 for an aeromedical staging facility. With the end to American involvement in Southeast Asia hostilities, why do you feel you now need this new facility?

General REILLY. There will be a continuing requirement to stage people through Andrews Air Force Base even with the cessation of activities in Southeast Asia. These are the facilities in which a patient remains overnight or held while the aircraft remains overnight, and it accommodates patients transitioning onto other activities. We have these facilities at Andrew Air Force Base on the east coast, Travis Air Force Base on the west coast, and Scott Air Force Base where the aeromedical evacuation aircraft are home based. Those are the three principal areas for these aeromedical staging facilities.

Mr. PATTEN. You cite your experience over the past 5 years as part of your justification for the facility. What are your projections over the next 5 years?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we estimate we will have approximately 14,000 arrivals and 14,000 departures of patients at the Andrews AFB aeromedical staging facility during the next 2 years until we have an adequate facility. In the succeeding 3 years the patient loads are estimated to increase to 16,000 arrivals and 16,000

departures—without any allowance for surges relating to an international incident.

Mr. PATTEN. In this facility actually a hospital? You mention waiting lists for surgery. Can't Walter Reed or Bethesda perform surgery?

General REILLY. No, sir. It is a unique facility—distinct from a hospital or any other type of medical facility—in which an organized group of medical personnel process patients who are being moved within the Department of Defense's aeromedical evacuation system. Within this facility we provide for the reception, ground transportation, feeding, medical care, and administrative processing of patients en route in the system. There are no physicians assigned to this facility and no patient remains in the facility for a very long period. Ideally, an aeromedical staging facility is sited adjacent to the composite medical facility, but not in the hospital so as to minimize disturbances and interruption of normal hospital operations. On the other hand, it should be close enough to the hospital—preferably with an "all-weather" interconnection of minimal distance—to permit easy access for physician visits and enable the transient patients to use the hospital's support services, such as the food service and patient welfare services. It should be a single-story structure to reduce litter handling and ease ambulance and bus-ambulance access. With regard to surgery, the situation has changed in the few months since this documentation was prepared, and elective surgery waiting lists are no longer a factor.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the average length of stay for men brought to this facility?

General REILLY. It is usually less than 15 hours. However, it can extend to 48 hours for a patient who is awaiting a flight to a destination which is serviced less frequently.

Mr. PATTEN. What will you do with the present staging facility if you abandon it?

General REILLY. It will be returned to the base for the 459th Reserve Wing's training activities.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the square footage of your present facility? How would it compare in size with the proposed facility, keeping in mind an anticipated drop in potential load?

General REILLY. In early 1973, it became important to provide space within the Andrews AFB composite medical facility for the returning American prisoners of war. The best location was the ground floor wing, which was being temporarily used for the aeromedical staging facility, because it offered close proximity to hospital resources, the required space, personal security, and personal privacy for the former prisoners. The aeromedical staging function was moved to an older single-story 6,775 square foot building located 3.4 miles from the aircraft parking apron and 4.5 miles from the hospital. At minimal cost, we converted the Z-shaped building into an interim facility. Although the building is overcrowded, has no food service space, little administrative space, and inadequate toilet facilities, we have chosen to remain there until we get the new facility. This has enabled the Andrews AFB hospital to regain general medical/surgical beds for its patients.

The proposed facility will be approximately 30,800 square feet overall. It will provide 100 square feet per bed plus adequate space for other patient functions and patient management. The scope of the proposed facility has been computed on the basis of the reduced workload which dictates a requirement for the 75-bed facility rather than the 100-bed facility we operated prior to mid-1971.

I will provide the space deficiencies of the present facility for the record.

[The information follows:]

[In square feet]

	Present facility	Deficiency	Proposed facility
Patient bed areas	4,000	8,885	12,885
Patient welfare and recreation areas	60	980	1,040
Patient support functions	800	3,435	4,235
Patient management and administration	250	860	1,110
Mechanical, electrical, corridors, and loading dock areas	1,665	9,846	11,511
Total	6,775	24,006	30,781

UTILITIES

Mr. PATTEN. You are requesting $1.4 million for utilities at Andrews' citing as your justification the projects requested this year and planned future projects. Will you still need the utilities if you don't get any projects this year?

General REILLY. Yes. The electrical substation and distribution system require significant alterations to meet the commercial utility company's planned conversion of 34 kV to 69 kV transmission feeds. The principal item is the substation transformers and related equipment. This $1.4 million will include electrical and water distribution items not included in the fiscal year 1973 MCP.

Mr. PATTEN. Your justification sheets would make us believe you are so critically short of power and water at Andrews that a 7,000 square foot addition to the terminal, the replacement of an existing facility with a new one, and the change in type of two aircraft require you to spend $1.4 million for utilities?

General REILLY. The projects referred to do not constitute the total requirement. Normal growth, in addition to these projects and future projected growth, combine to cause the situation. The electrical capacity of existing 34 kV feeders is rated at 25,000 kW. Present peak demand for 1972 was 24,000 kW and will increase into overload conditions during the summer of 1973. The proposed water lines are needed to increase the pressure of the water distribution system and to provide sufficient fire protection capability.

Mr. PATTEN. What are the future projects on which you base this requirement? Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

The load growths for Andrews AFB were based on the past several years actual billing demands. The key point for the change is the Potomac Electric Power Co.'s decision to convert 34 kV to 69 kV based on present conditions. This conversion is based on the 25,000 kW rated capacity of the existing 34 kV lines. The

calendar year loads are currently estimated for 1973 at 29,000 kW, 1974 at 35,000 kW and 1975 at 49,000 kW. Specific projects include the Advanced Airborne Command Post, with ultimate design load of 5,000 kW (previously estimated at 1,000 kW prior to initial design considerations), family housing for fiscal year 1972 and fiscal year 1973 for 750 units now changed from 4,550 kW to 6,000 kW because additional gas is not available from the supplier. Future plans call for construction of medical, community and administrative facilities.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you, Mr. Patten. Please proceed with the briefing.

SPECIAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT FACILITIES

Colonel HEROD. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the purpose of this briefing is to describe the advanced airborne command post, the survivable element of the national military command system to be supported by the new facilities requested for construction at Andrews Air Force Base. The briefing is classified secret.

ADVANCED AIRBORNE COMMAND POST

The advanced airborne command post program consists of seven specially equipped Boeing 747 aircraft designed to serve as airborne command posts for the national command authorities and the Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command—CINCSAC.

Its purpose is to provide a modernized, highly survivable capability for effective and continuous command and control of our strategic forces during the pre-, trans-, and post-attack phases of general war.

To develop and acquire the advanced airborne command post system, the Air Force—as DOD executive agent, has pursued two major program objectives established by the Secretary of Defense.

The first objective is to achieve an early interim capability for the national emergency airborne command post—referred to as NEACP—with initial deployment in 1974. This interim advanced airborne command post will be used to obtain experience in aircraft and mission operations, and to assist in equipment design for the advanced command-control-communications package.

The second objective is to obtain a fully integrated, EMP-hardened advanced airborne command post that provides the desired improved capabilities.

The total development and acquisition program is estimated at $548 million. Three of the seven aircraft will be used for NEACP, with the remaining four being assigned to SAC.

To provide an interim advanced NEACP capability at Andrews, three aircraft will initially be equipped with communications equipment currently used in the existing EC–135 NEACP aircraft. The first of these three aircraft is scheduled to arrive at Andrews on ——— with the third aircraft scheduled for ———. Once an advanced command, control and communications package has been developed and procured, these three aircraft will be retrofitted and will be configured identically with the other four advanced airborne command posts.

The mission of the NEACP is shown on this chart.

The operational resources planned for the National Emergency Airborne Command Post are shown here.

ALERT POSTURE

This is the normal NEACP alert posture. The NEACP will be on ground alert. The aircraft will be continually linked to the National Military Command System by secure landlines. The aircraft communications systems will be operating around the clock.

Mr. SIKES. Very well, thank you very much.

General REILLY. May I show you the construction schedule?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, please.

General REILLY. This is a layout, Mr. Chairman, of Andrews Air Force Base. I think everyone here is quite familiar with the base. We have parallel runways and a large parking apron on the west side of the base shown there. In the overlay we see the area in which the current Airborne Command Post activity, existing NEACP, that uses the Boeing–707 aircraft operates. This area was originally designed for fighter aircraft. When we went into Night Watch in a hurry, this area was pressed into duty. Modifications were made to the various facilities there to accommodate the Boeing–707 aircraft. While it is not an ideal situation, those aircraft have been able to operate from that location. However, the new 747, with its tremendous size and weight, its much slower ground handling characteristics, and the absolute must that it be able to proceed to the runway and take off in minimum time, precludes the use of that old area.

We have just shown here a comparison in size of the 747 in red versus the existing aircraft in the blue outline. In terms of weight, the 747 weighs 778,000 pounds. Existing aircraft, 299,000 pounds. That gives you a feel of the increased capability.

The existing 135 has 880 square feet of floor space usable within the aircraft. The 747 has 3,500 square feet. The 135 has an unrefueled flight capability of 8 to 10 hours. The new aircraft 12 to 16. The maximum payload to permit carrying additional people on the staff as well as the new and more modern equipment is almost three times the payload of the past. It has increased the size of this aircraft, time involved in loading a larger staff on board, and together with the extreme security we must have, which necessitates the construction of new facilities immediately adjacent to the south end of the runways, as you can see by the orange dot. Seventy-eight percent of the takeoffs are made to the north on those runways.

To look a little closer at that area, we first show the construction that is involved.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS AND SCHEDULE

This is being done in phase 1. Phase 1 is that work which must get underway at the earliest possible time. We delayed until phase 2 that work which can be accomplished in a shorter time and can be slipped downstream to minimize the cost at this time.

Now a picture of the work. You see here again the south end of the runway, a new large hangar with adjacent operations, crew support facilities, maintenance for the aircraft. We are making use of an existing old runway which goes across there. That apron will have fueling facilities in it. It will be an area apart from the rest of the base to provide the necessary security.

We have a picture of what the hangar will look like. We are site adapting the design used by the airlines for the 747 aircraft.

Mr. SIKES. If I am not mistaken, General Ryan testified here that costs would be about $9 million. Now you say it is $19 million. Is that correct?

General REILLY. Per aircraft?

Nineteen million dollars for facilities to support all aircraft.

Mr. RIETMAN. That construction cost is in there.

Mr. SIKES. Did you estimate the construction would cost $9 million a year ago?

General REILLY. At one time, yes, sir. When we first looked at this we didn't realize at that time the costs involved in maintaining this aircraft with all of its systems operational. That is with the communications in a hot configuration.

Mr. SIKES. You say this is the first year of construction costs. What is the subsequent cost?

General REILLY. The $19 million we show will be the complete cost at Andrews.

Mr. SIKES. Is that already carried in this construction package?

General REILLY. Just the $13½ million.

Mr. SIKES. For phase 1?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

ALERT RESPONSE TIME

Mr. SIKES. I understand that you will be on a ground alert. One aircraft on ground alert ——— minutes. Does that mean ——— minutes takeoff time?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. In other words, it has to be airborne in ——— minutes maximum with a much shorter time desired.

Mr. SIKES. ———

General REILLY. From a threat standpoint?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

General REILLY. Can you address that, Colonel Herod?

Colonel HEROD. The ——— minute maximum criterion is not what is used operationally. We use an as-soon-as-possible takeoff criterion.

Mr. SIKES. What does than mean?

Colonel HEROD. That means that the operation team and the crew are prepositioned with the aircraft in this facility at all times, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The aircraft is in a cocked configuration. They respond to a Klaxon and immediately board the aircraft and taxi and take off as soon as physically possible to do so.

Mr. SIKES. What does that mean?

Colonel HEROD. That means——

Mr. SIKES. What is the actual time involved for takeoff?

Colonel HEROD. I have the average times if I can just refer to my notes.

Mr. SIKES. Supply it for the record.

Colonel HEROD. ——— minutes, sir, for runway 01 left. ——— minutes for runway 19 right.

That is the average time.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the comparative time for the 747?

General REILLY. Were those existing NEACP times you were citing?

Colonel HEROD. Yes, sir. Those represented the average of the 17 exercises that were conducted in the first half of 1972. It is estimated that using the same criteria, the average time for a 747 would be ——— minutes for runway 01 left; ——— minutes for runway 19 right.

General REILLY. With the new aircraft?

Colonel HEROD. Yes, sir. From the location we show here.

General REILLY. It would be much longer if we had to come out of that old airstrip.

Mr. MCKAY. What was the comparative rating that you had?

General REILLY. ———.

Colonel HEROD. If the primary alert aircraft which is on a 15-minute alert develops mechanical difficulty, the secondary aircraft can assume its posture within ———.

Mr. MCKAY. That may be too late. By SAC alert standards ——— is too long, isn't it?

General REILLY. That is maximum time. Locally much less than ———.

Colonel HEROD. That is maximum time.

Mr. MCKAY. Maximum time. Aren't you talking in terms of a missile situation? You have to have them off in ——— minutes?

General REILLY. At SAC you will have the aircraft airborne at all times. The Looking Glass operation at SAC is an airborne operation. This is not here; it is a ground alert.

Mr. MCKAY. Even then what do you have to have for the rest of your forces to get them off the ground? ——— minutes if you are going to save them?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, if we are talking again about the sea-launched threat.

Mr. MCKAY. You have the same need on this operation, don't you?

General REILLY. Yes, in a worse case. We can envision this aircraft becoming airborne before there is actually a firing of a missile. In a period of tension it could be airborne ahead of that. There is no doubt about it, if we are hit with a sea-launched missile with little or no warning, it is going to be tough to get these aircraft airborne.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT

Mr. MCKAY. What is the cost of one of those aircraft?

General REILLY. Roughly $30 million.

Colonel HEROD. Let me provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

The cost of one interim NEACP aircraft with selected modifications and the transfer of existing NEACP C^3 (command, control and communications) equipment with AGE and data is approximately $32.3 million.

Mr. PATTEN. Also provide this information for the record: How many of these aircraft are currently procured? When will they be delivered to Andrews for use? Have the aircraft to be delivered to Andrews been procured yet?

[The information follows:]

At the present time, two E-4A (747) aircraft are being procured from the Boeing Co. These will be the interim NEACP aircraft which will primarily utilize C^3 equipment transferred from the existing EC-135 NEACP aircraft. The two aircraft are scheduled for delivery to Andrews AFB in ———. A third interim NEACP aircraft is programed to be procured and modified in fiscal year 1974 for delivery to Andrews AFB in ———.

FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS

Mr. PATTEN. Why can you not use existing facilities such as aprons, maintenance shops, et cetera, which currently support this mission? Provide that for the record and show us the present and proposed location on a map.

[The information follows:]

REQUIREMENT AND MAP OF ADVANCED NEACP FACILITIES

There are three major reasons 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, but not later than ——— minutes after notification. Existing EC135 aircraft can meet this criteria from the existing location. The new E–4A aircraft will ———. A location near the south end of the runway is also necessary as 78 percent of the takeoffs are from south to north into prevailing winds.

Second, the existing area and facilities cannot support the expanded mission. The increased physical size of the E–4A 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.

Finally, the NEACP mission requires stringent security measures because of the dominant role it plays in the national defense. Relocations of this activity into an area remote from the day-to-day base activity is essential. [The location of the existing and proposed facilities is shown on a map, which was retained in the committee files.]

Mr. PATTEN. What is the design status of these facilities? What is their estimated construction time? Provide details for the record.

[The information follows:]

DESIGN STATUS AND CONSTRUCTION TIME OF ADVANCED NEACP AIRCRAFT

The apron, POL and other necessary outside support has been designed. Design on the hangar and alert complex is 60 percent complete. The apron and POL will take 6 months to construct, with the hangar and alert complex requiring approximately 2 years.

Mr. MCKAY. This $19 million, is that strictly the support facilities?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCKAY. Hangar and apron?

General REILLY. Hangar, pavements, electric power, operations center, support for the crews, communications support; it will be a self-sustaining activity.

Mr. MCKAY. One aircraft?

General REILLY. Three aircraft.

Mr. MCKAY. Under that housing?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RIETMAN. One in the hangar.

General REILLY. We figure one will be in the hangar and two parked outside at all times.

Mr. MCKAY. That will provide a support facility for the three aircraft?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

PERSONNEL

Mr. MCKAY. How many people are associated with that?

Colonel HEROD. Total?

General REILLY. At Andrews in that complex in and around the buildings.

Colonel HEROD. It is approximately 400, I believe. I would like to provide the specific figure for the record.

[The information follows:]

Current plans call for exactly 400 personnel to be assigned to the National Emergency Airborne Command Post (NEACP) complex at Andrews AFB.

Mr. MCKAY. 400 people, on an alert basis, so you have 24-hour manning. Is that how you figure 400 people?

Colonel HEROD. It will be approximately 400 people assigned to the 1st Airborne Command Control Squadron/NEACP complex. They will not all be there at any one time.

Mr. MCKAY. That is how many it takes for one squadron, that is three airplanes?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCKAY. How many do you get per one shift?

Colonel HEROD. I will have to provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

Current plans call for 62 people to be on alert under normal (DEFCON 4 or higher) conditions.

Mr. DAVIS. You are going to have 40 people aboard this plane and you are planning to have 5 crews?

General Reilly. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. That takes half of your 400 and you have another 200 for the maintenance and other work involved?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. There will be 5 crews of 7 members each, and 3 operations teams of 39 members each. This represents a total of 152 personnel to fly the aircraft. The remainder are maintenance, support, staff, and supervisory personnel.

INTERIM OPERATING FACILITIES

Mr. PATTEN. What will you do until the new hangar, operations, and alert facilities are complete? Why couldn't you continue to operate in this manner?

General REILLY. We are going to have to make some interim provisions. Our plan is to get the construction of the parking apron and supporting fueling system done as quickly as possible. We feel that we can have that done by the end of next summer. The hangar is going to take us the better part of 2 years to get constructed. We are going to have to use some of the existing space out there. It is going to be difficult operationally but we are going to have to use things on a temporary basis until we get the new facilities in place.

NECESSITY FOR LOCATION AT ANDREWS

Mr. NICHOLAS. This aircraft is going to ———; is that the basic idea?

Why couldn't you locate it anywhere within 100 or 200 miles of Washington?

General REILLY. Where this aircraft will ———.

Mr. NICHOLAS. It would ———. Why does it have to be placed at Andrews? Why not Dover or Norfolk?

Colonel HEROD. We want it close to the National Command authorities, which are the President and the Secretary of Defense. Andrews does meet that requirement.

Mr. PATTEN. Why couldn't you continue to operate in the interim manner without the hangars?

General REILLY. This aircraft will have to have covered maintenance space and in inclement weather we have to have protection for the maintenance being done. You couldn't for a sustained period of time not have covered space for an aircraft of this nature with its very sophisticated equipment. Covered space will also keep ice and snow off the aircraft so that it can be launched immediately under adverse weather conditions.

Mr. PATTEN. You are going to get along for 2 years without it?

General REILLY. Yes. Not the whole 2 years, but at least a goodly portion of it.

Mr. PATTEN. What types of equipment will be installed aboard these aircraft?

Colonel HEROD. It will be comprised essentially of two types: (1) communications; (2) automatic data processing.

Mr. PATTEN. Will similar equipment be installed for the aircraft which will subsequently be assigned to SAC headquarters at Offut?

Colonel HEROD. Yes, sir. The equipment will be identical in both the SAC and the NEACP advanced airborne command posts, except for certain components which can be easily installed and removed. The aircraft will be rotated between the two bases.

Mr. PATTEN. Will the same data on damage assessment, force status, and intelligence be available to SAC as to the NCA?

Colonel HEROD. That has not been determined, to my knowledge.

Mr. PATTEN. What would be the response time and missile flight time at Offutt for their 747 aircraft? Supply that for the record.

[The information follows:]

No response time would be required at Offutt for the SAC advanced airborne command post, as it is planned to be continuously airborne. The missile flight time would be a minimum of ——— minutes.

Mr. PATTEN. Is the requirement for these larger aircraft based upon guaranteeing that in case the United States is attacked, we will be able to respond with sufficient nuclear weapons to deter any enemy?

General REILLY. We feel it is essential to have a creditable deterrent.

Mr. PATTEN. Are we sufficiently assured of our capability to command and control our retaliatory forces from SAC Headquarters so that we do not need these aircraft for that function?

General REILLY. No, sir. We feel that the increased capability is necessary both for the SAC Looking Glass mission as well as the national emergency airborne command post we were talking about here.

Mr. PATTEN. Why are we not placing our first priority on providing SAC with better control of our forces so as to assure deterrence?

General REILLY. Colonel Herod.

Colonel HEROD. Sir, one of the primary reasons for the advanced airborne command post is to survive the NCA.

For that reason, we feel that we must provide the aircraft first to the National Military Command System.

Secondly, the National Military Command System is the primary element of the Worldwide Military Command and Control System, and the NEACP is a portion of the National Military Command System.

Mr. SIKES. If these first aircraft were to be sent to Offutt rather than Andrews, could they be temporarily supported with existing facilities?

[The information follows:]

USE OF FIRST AACP AIRCRAFT AT OFFUTT

If the mission priorities were adjusted and the first E-4A's assigned to CINCSAC, the aircraft could operate from Offutt, but a fully responsive operation could not be sustained.

It is currently estimated that approximately $9.4 million in facility construction will be required to adequately support CINCSAC advanced airborne command post operations at Offutt AFB. Facility deficiencies consist primarily of electrical power systems, apron, and covered maintenance space. The severe weather at Offutt AFB at times makes it impossible to accomplish certain maintenance work out-of-doors and often impacts on the quality, safety, efficiency, and timeliness of this work. A covered facility is required at Offutt to support the year-around aircraft maintenance needed to obtain mission requirements, and there is no hangar at Offutt AFB large enough to accommodate the E-4A.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you, gentlemen.

General REILLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1973.

BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. LONG. The committee will come to order. Turn to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D.C.

Insert page 125 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
HEADQUARTERS COMMAND	BXUR	WASHINGTON, D.C.

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1917.	WASHINGTON, D.C.	WASHINGTON, D.C.

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE BAND

SUPPORT FOR AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	349	1,675	938	0	45	68	39	0	3,114
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	344	1,652	938	0	45	68	39	0	3,086

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	625	1,065	38,330	39,395
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				39,395
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Excludes $19,671,000 Family Housing)				6,301
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,500
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				15,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				62,796

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
300-000	UTILITIES I		LS	LS	1,500	LS	1,500
	TOTAL				1,500		1,500

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Page No. 125

447

BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE

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 Air Force Headquarters Command; United States 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 1973 and fiscal year 1972 military construction programs.

HQ. COMD.—BOLLING AFB, WASHINGTON, D.C.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete July 31, 1973
Utilities	$81,800	30

Mr. LONG. You say these roads and utilities are to serve facilities already funded by Congress. Why didn't you include the cost of roads, water, electricity, and sewers in the original requests instead of coming along when the projects are underway to tell us you can't use the facilities—unless we spend another $1.5 million?

General REILLY. May I call on Colonel Rutland.

Colonel RUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, the wording in the project document is perhaps somewhat misleading. What we are requesting in this project is a new road network to more efficiently serve fiscal year 1972 and 1973 line items.

The utility segment of this project is for a planned community complex. The 1972 and 1973 projects which are mentioned in the project document at the same time can stand alone on utilities already provided.

The existing road network, which consists primarily of the deteriorated taxiway and runway complex, can also be used but not quite as efficiently as we would like.

This new request ties in directly with the revised master plan and provides a more efficient road system tieing in the listed projects with the community complex and also with the existing road network.

Mr. LONG. Of the projects you list as those to be served by this project, how much was included for each project to pay for roads, street lights, chilled water lines, storm drainage, sanitary sewers, water and electric lines? Why was this not enough?

Colonel RUTLAND. As we indicated, Mr. Chairman, utilities that were provided were adequate to allow these projects to stand alone, Of the projects that we list in the regular military construction program for prior fiscal years, the total utility support was approximately $870,000 and we had about $122,000 electric, $66,000 for water and sanitary sewer, $240,000 for heat and chilled water lines, $32,000 for storm drainage, $82,000 for lighting, and $329,000 for roads.

If you like, sir, we will be happy to provide for the record the detailed breakdown by project for these utilities.

[The information follows:]

Breakdown by project for Bolling utilities

	Amount
Administration facility:	
Electric	$46, 000
Water and sanitary sewer	21, 000
Heat and chilled water lines	196, 000
Storm drainage	5, 000
Lighting	28, 000
Roads, parking and walks	129, 000
Airmen dorms:	
Electric	36, 000
Water and sanitary sewer	28, 000
Heat	44, 000
Storm drainage	8, 000
Lighting	35, 000
Roads, parking and walks	81, 000
Chapel center:	
Electric	30, 000
Water and sanitary sewer	13, 000
Storm drainage	4, 000
Lighting	14, 000
Roads, parking and walks	29, 000
NCO open mess:	
Electric	10, 000
Water, sanitary sewer and heat	4, 000
Storm drainage	15, 000
Lighting	5, 000
Roads, parking and walks	90, 000

Mr. LONG. What is the requirement for $390,000 for heat in this request? What are you heating?

Colonel RUTLAND. Sir, this is essentially to extend the primary heating distribution lines to the new complex. We are talking about 6,000 linear feet of heating lines.

Mr. LONG. Can you give us assurances that the Air Force will not be coming back in future years for this kind of project when you should have asked for it in the first place?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Do all your fiscal year 1974 requests carry sufficient funding for this kind of work?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; they do.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Mr. LONG. Turn to the Military Airlift Command.

Please insert page 127 in the record.

[The page follows:]

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 audiovisual service, the air rescue and recovery service, an aeromedical evacuation system, and military airlift wings. This program involves 14 projects at six 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.

Department of the Air Force military construction program, Military Airlift Command, fiscal year 1974

Installation:	*Proposed program (in thousands)*
Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma	$1,770
Dover Air Force Base, Delaware	3,387
McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey	1,860
Norton Air Force Base, California	1,283
Scott Air Force Base, Illinois	3,092
Travis Air Force Base, California	1,024
Total	12,416

C–5A OPERATING HOURS

Mr. LONG. What are the approved operating hours for the C–5A?

General REILLY. It is 2.79 hours per 24-hour day per aircraft, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LONG. How does this differ from the original plan for operations?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I would have to provide that for the record. I don't recall just what the original plan was.

Mr. NICHOLAS. It was a much higher figure, though, on the order of 10 hours a day?

Colonel REED. The initial plan for MAC airlift, peace-time operation, is 5 hours. The 10 hours you refer to is wartime utilization.

Mr. NICHOLAS. But actually the 5 hours was a cutback from an earlier figure you had of something like 8 hours when you first planned the C–5A and justified it as economically feasible. Check the record on that.

Colonel REED. I will. Ten was the surge. Eight was sustained wartime. Five peacetime. The planning was against the wartime rate and that is where the confusion rests but we will check the record.

[The information follows:]

C–5A OPERATING HOURS

The C–5A was planned to fly a 10-hour per 24-hour-day surge rate, and an 8-hour per 24-hour-day sustained wartime rate. In order to do this, it was planned that the peacetime rate needed to support wartime demands be approximately 50 percent of the sustained wartime rate. However, with the experience gained in the all jet airlift force and the introduction of the reserve associate units as a part of the total force concept to meet contingency demands, we were able to reduce our peacetime training activity level to 2.79 hours per 24-hour-day. Evaluation of the peacetime use rates is continuous and is based on an assessment of all elements of the worldwide airlift system and its capability to respond to contingency activity levels. The C–5 is only a part of the total system.

Mr. LONG. What we want to find out I believe is whether this cutback in operating hours reflects any substantial retreat because of inadequate performance of the plane.

General REILLY. I understand, sir.

Mr. LONG. Do you feel there has been a substantial retreat because of the inadequate performance of the plane?

General REILLY. No, sir. There has been a reduction in the utilization. However, the aircraft has proven to be a very good aircraft.

Mr. LONG. What then is the reason for the reduction, if it is not because of the plane's poor performance? We are familiar, of course, with the fact that the plane has been under considerable attack.

Colonel REED. I think if you will review strategic airlift in total there has been a reduction in the planned utilization in peacetime commensurate with requirements and some follow-on reductions in manning and so forth.

Two things enter the picture, I believe. One is a need to reduce operating levels and activity levels as discussed last year by the Chief of Staff in his posture statement. This is to meet fiscal constraints.

The second is the fact that in the peacetime mode the requirement for the optimum airlift operations can be met with the lower rates discussed and adequate crew training can be accomplished within this rate.

The main factor of flying MAC airlift in peacetime is to exercise the system in order to keep trained crews and trained en route support available to react to wartime. MAC does not, as you realize, haul passengers over the normal routes. We generally only haul cargo and that cargo primarily is to exercise the system and to keep it attuned for wartime.

It has been felt that current rates will keep the crews trained, the system responsible for wartime utilization, and conserve resources.

Mr. LONG. So this is purely for economy reasons, and has nothing to do with the disappointing performance of the plane? Are you prepared to say that?

Colonel REED. I am not prepared to make that statement, sir. I believe that some consideration was given to the extent of useful life of the aircraft in order to get maximum use.

However, my understanding is that under the operating experience to date, the optimum performance profile that we generally plan to use for the aircraft, and with certain modifications we will get approximately 20,000 hours airframe life from the C–5A. I don't believe that some of the other figures I have heard which curtail it greatly are figures that are being used within the air staff.

Mr. LONG. I want to know whether this reduction has anything to do with inadequacies in the plane itself.

Colonel REED. Yes, sir.

General REILLY. Let us provide you a very positive statement on that.

[The information follows:]

CAUSE OF REDUCTION IN C–5 OPERATING HOURS

The reduction in peacetime operating hours in the C–5 aircraft is the result of the experience the Air Force has gained with an all-jet cargo force and the reserve associate units which provide trained manpower for wartime augmentation. These factors allow us to meet our wartime utilization criteria in the C–5 by flying 2.79 hours per 24-hour day per aircraft. This lower peacetime activity level is also required as a result of the predicted reduction in the operating life of the aircraft from our original expectations. This conserves airframe life and assures that this valuable national asset is responsive to our contingency and wartime requirements.

Mr. NICHOLAS. What are your programed flying hours for the C–141?

General REILLY. 3.79 hours.

Mr. NICHOLAS. They have a little higher rate?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

MAINTENANCE HOURS FOR C–5A

Mr. LONG. How many maintenance hours are required by the C–5A?

General REILLY. Approximately 50 maintenance hours per hour of flying.

Mr. LONG. Fifty maintenance hours per hour of flying?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Is that higher than it is for other planes?

General REILLY. No, that wouldn't be considered high, considering the size of the airplane.

Mr. LONG. You mean the bigger the plane, the more maintenance hours?

General REILLY. Yes.

Mr. LONG. The bigger the ratio.

General REILLY. I think in comparison to the F–4 which runs about 30 maintenance hours per flying hour, 50 hours for that much larger aircraft is not out of line at all.

Mr. NICHOLAS. How would it compare with a civilian aircraft such as the 747?

General REILLY. I can't tell you exactly but you have to consider that the civilian utilization is much different than ours and direct comparison of figures wouldn't be very valid.

Mr. LONG. Why not?

General REILLY. Well, some of the airlines use their aircraft as much as 18 hours a day and they fly them over long flights like from New York to London and back in 1 day.

The amount of maintenance man-hours that go into supporting that operation would be very low per flying hour.

Mr. LONG. Exactly. What we want to find out is why. Why the difference between the C–5A and other military planes and the civilian performance?

Why are civilian aircraft able to do this when the military can't?

General REILLY. There are two primary reasons. One of them is again the high utilization rate of the 747 which is a comparable type airframe. If they would fly that same airframe at a utilization of under 3 hours a day they would have a very high maintenance man-hour per flying-hour cost.

Mr. LONG. You mean it is the fact that——

General REILLY. The more you use it, the less it costs you to use it per hour flown.

Mr. LONG. And the less maintenance it needs.

General REILLY. Per flying hour, right.

Mr. LONG. That, I think needs some explanation, at least to an amateur.

General REILLY. As an example, corrosion and lubricant requirements are a factor of time, calendar days, not flying days or flying hours.

For instance, in a severe corrosion area a B–52 goes through corrosion control treatment every 60 days, whether it flies or not, whether it sits on alert, or whether it flies. That takes approximately 2 to 3 days, two shifts a day, to perform this corrosion control treatment. If that aircraft was flying every day and utilized at, say, a 10-hour-a-day rate, the cost of corrosion treatment per flying hour would be con-

siderably lower than if the aircraft sat a full 60 days on alert and didn't fly at all. So the more you use your airplane, the less——

Mr. LONG. The more economical it is.

Generl REILLY. That is right.

Mr. LONG. We were just told a little while ago we were only flying the C–5A a few hours a day for economy reasons.

General REILLY. That is more economical maintenancewise. Of course the petroleum, oil, and lubricant costs, the pilot costs, go up higher as you fly it more.

Mr. LONG. Is the maintenance cost a very large part of the cost of the plane operation?

General REILLY. I could only answer that generally.

Mr. LONG. You can see the conflict here.

General REILLY. I would have to say it is not too high a cost because 50 man-hours per flying hour as the cost of maintenance labor would not be significant compared to the cost of the——

Mr. LONG. All right.

What effect will the reduced flying hours have on your facilities requirements?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, very little effect. We have now the basic facilities to support the entire C–5 fleet and it will have very little effect.

STRATEGIC AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT REQUIREMENTS

Mr. LONG. When will the C–5A's cease to be operational?

General REILLY. Sir, it is scheduled to continue in operation for the foreseeable future. It is one of our two prime airlift aircraft. We see no phasing out of that aircraft.

Mr. LONG. Do you plan to buy more whenever these currently operational are grounded?

General REILLY. I think the present buy of 81 aircraft is all that is envisioned for the foreseeable future.

Mr. LONG. Does that mean that this plane is a disappointment?

General REILLY. No, sir. You may recall at one time 120 were to be bought. The decision was then made to reduce that to 81. That has been the firm requirement for a number of years now.

Mr. LONG. What was the reason for cutting back from 120 to 81.

General REILLY. Sir, I think the high cost of the aircraft and our being able to meet our projected wartime airlift requirements with the C–5 and the C–141, supplemented, of course, by the contract carriers.

Mr. LONG. But since the cost of a plane is so much in the original development, I would think it would pay you, once you have done all that, to buy more planes to reduce the average cost.

General REILLY. But the number of aircraft has been scaled back to the projected airlift requirement and the current——

Mr. LONG. I am not quite sure I understand why. Is this for economy reasons?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; to meet our wartime airlift capability at minimum cost.

Mr. LONG. Was it because the C–5A is very expensive or just simply to save money generally?

General REILLY. Of course it is a very expensive plane; however, a very high capacity cargo lifter as well, but it is with the mix of the C–5, the C–141 and our reserve civilian carriers we can meet our forecasted airlift requirements.

Mr. LONG. You just don't need it?

General REILLY. We just don't need more than 81 of them based upon projected airlift requirements.

Mr. LONG. Looking back on the basis of your present requirements and as you see the thing in the future, was this in order at all?

General REILLY. Oh, yes, sir; I think it has filled a very definite need.

Mr. LONG. Eighty-one planes don't seem to me like many planes considering what it costs.

General REILLY. Sir, but its cargo carrying capacity compared even to the C–141 is much, much greater. Can anyone help me on the comparison of the C–5 with other aircraft?

I would like to furnish the information for the record, Mr. Chairman, if I could.

[The information follows:]

The wartime cargo capacity of the C–5 is 265,000 pounds compared with a load of 72,014 pounds for the C–141.

Mr. LONG. How many C–141's do we have?

General REILLY. We have 200 and some odd of those, something over 200 in operation.

Mr. LONG. Well, I wish you would put in the record what the cost of the C–141 is per plane in relation to the original cost and the same way with the C–5A to see——

Mr. DAVIS. That is hardly within the cognizance of this subcommittee. We go into that in the Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. LONG. Has this all been brought out in the Defense Subcommittee?

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, yes; a number of times we have discussed this. Of course, the decision was already made. We are practically through with the C–5 procurement, are we not?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. The last aircraft has been delivered.

Mr. LONG. It is an enormously costly thing and now you are terminating it. Do you have plans for replacement aircraft?

General REILLY. No, sir, no plans at the moment.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Eventually you will have to replace it with something.

General REILLY. Oh, yes, at some point in time there will have to be another generation of cargo aircraft, but certainly not for the foreseeable future.

COST OF C–5A AND FACILITIES

Mr. LONG. What is the status of your C–5A oriented programs at all MAC bases?

General REILLY. Sir, all aircraft have been delivered and are now operational with the exception of one aircraft remaing in the test program and one test aircraft undergoing refurbishment prior to delivery. Our plans are to have the aircraft operationally based at two bases, Dover on the east coast, and Travis on the west coast, and with several aircraft engaged in crew training at all times at Altus Air Force Base, Okla. You might say three home bases for the aircraft.

Mr. LONG. How much money has been obligated for these programs?

General REILLY. Facilities, sir? About $17 million has been spent for construction, that is, strictly peculiar to the C–5. That has been principally for hangars and nose docks.

Mr. LONG. Will they be usable when and if the C–5A is phased out?

General REILLY. Sir, for any large aircraft of that size, yes, sir, but, of course, we don't see the C–5 phasing out for many, many years.

Mr. LONG. But you just don't plan to continue with the C–5A?

General REILLY. Not in buying additional aircraft, no, sir; not at the present time.

Mr. LONG. Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

General REILLY. Dr. Long, it has been about a $4.5 billion program, that is, all costs, including development.

Mr. LONG. For 81 planes?

General REILLY. Aircraft and all the spares and construction and everything. The total system has cost something over $4 billion.

Mr. LONG. I would appreciate for my own information finding out about the cost of the plane per plane and whether this was a big mistake or whether it wasn't.

General REILLY. Yes, sir. Be happy to provide that.

Mr. LONG. You will get us that.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. And what this has cost us in bases, quite aside from the plane itself, what it has cost us in our military construction operation.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. You will get that for the record.

General REILLY. Yes, I will.

[The information follows:]

COST OF THE C–5A

The program unit cost of the C–5A is $55.67 million, as reflected in the March 31, 1973 Selected Acquisition Report. When Lockheed repays $100 million of the total Air Force outlay, the program unit cost to the Government will be $54.43 million. The March 31, 1973 Selected Acquisition Report also shows a direct military construction cost of $17.2 million. There are also indirect military construction costs which vary according to the assumptions made on meeting our airlift requirements.

Mr. LONG. Will these facilities be usable when and if the C–5A is phased out? Will these facilities be available?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. So none of the money we have spent on military construction is down the drain as a result of the C–5A and it can be used as salvage for other programs, is that right?

General REILLY. That is right, sir.

Mr. LONG. I wish you would tell us whether this is a 100-percent salvage, or 50-percent salvage, or what.

General REILLY. Sir, the C–5 peculiar facilities have been principally the large hangar in which the aircraft can be completely enclosed and, of course, that can be used for just all of our aircraft. It is big enough to take anything we have and in large numbers.

Mr. LONG. But you wouldn't have built it that big for——

General REILLY. No; that is correct, because of its tremendous height and breadth. The maintenance docks are facilities in which the front of the aircraft and the wings can be enclosed but the tail protrudes. This, too, is a large facility and can be used for any aircraft we have.

Mr. LONG. I know that.

General REILLY. While the facility would not be tailored to the smaller aircraft, it can certainly be used.

Mr. LONG. You have maintenance problems with these gigantic hangar facilities, too. I think I saw that thing when we went down there when they breathlessly announced this project. We saw these vast places where the planes would go.

On a smaller scale we have a lot of buildings like that at Martin-Marietta in Baltimore. The only trouble is nobody wants them for anything else because they are just not adaptable for other use. They are too expensive.

I suppose they could be used but they are not going to be used. So they sit there largely idle. Are they going to be used?

General REILLY. Oh, yes, sir; I envision them being used just as long as we have aircraft that must be maintained.

Mr. LONG. You are not going to say, "Well, they are too expensive and they cost too much for this and that and therefore we need to tear them down"?

General REILLY. No, sir.

ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLA.

Mr. LONG. Turn to Altus Air Force Base.

Please insert page 128 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND	AGGN	OKLAHOMA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1943/1953	JACKSON	THREE MILES NORTHEAST OF ALTUS, OKLAHOMA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

MILITARY AIRLIFT TRAINING WING

HEAVY REFUELING SQUADRON (STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND)

MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS GROUP (AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	646	3,770	688	220	86	15	10	0	5,435
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	544	3,732	687	144	99	15	10	0	5,231

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	2530	366	67,756	68,122
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	1240	(2) 35	11	46
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				68,168
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Excludes $348,100 Mobile Home Spaces)				626
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,770
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				4,800
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				75,364

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
141-453	Base Flight Operations Facility 9		SF	15,732	692	15,732	692
211-152	Aircraft Maintenance Shop I		SF	21,210	716	21,210	716
211-157	Aircraft Engine Shop I		SF	7,200	122	7,200	122
740-675	Library I		SF	7,800	240	7,800	240
	TOTAL				1,770		1,770

DD FORM 1 OCT 76 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE

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, a 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 adequately 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:

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.

MAC—ALTUS AFB, OKLA.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Base flight operations facility	$31,140	80
Aircraft maintenance shop	52,000	100
Aircraft engine shop	4,700	100
Library	13,200	95

BASE OPERATING COSTS

Mr. LONG. What is the operating cost of this base excluding mission cost?

General REILLY. May I furnish that to you, sir? I don't have it readily available.

[The information follows:]

OPERATING COST FOR ALTUS AFB

Following are the base operating support costs for ALTUS AFB. The costs shown are not direct mission support costs but are indirect support for the prime missions.

FISCAL YEAR 1973

Base operating support:	*Thousands*
Operation and maintenance	$7,132
Military personnel	11,054
Total base operating support including real property maintenance	18,186

TRAINING MISSIONS

Mr. LONG. What are the particulars of your training mission? Why do you need new training facilities in the face of crew ratio reductions?

General REILLY. Colonel Ballif.

Colonel BALLIF. Currently there are two training programs going on, one in the C–5 aircraft and one in the C–141 aircraft, and we anticipate

that they will continue at approximately the same level of training as we have experienced in the past year as the result of two factors, primarily.

One is to update the Military Airlift Command Air Force Reserve associate squadron program whereby reservists fly right along with the active duty people in the Air Force.

Secondarily is the continuing turnover of personnel which is experienced with new pilots coming into the force and the other persons retiring or moving on to other jobs and things like this. There is a continuing requirement for us to maintain the training program.

Mr. LONG. How efficient is it to have a SAC refueling squadron at this location?

Colonel REED. Sir, the SAC refueling squadron is an efficient operation and meets the requirements of mating post launch with other aircraft and it is considered to be a good SAC location.

BASE FLIGHT OPERATIONS FACILITY

Mr. LONG. Your first request is for a base flight operations facility at a cost of $692,000. Exactly what do you do in a base flight operations facility?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, the base flight operations or base operation facility is more like you might say the head office for flying at an air base.

It contains weather facilities, is the heart of air-ground communications, and is where the aircraft are controlled and dispatched. It is just, you might say, the terminal, the hub, of the flying operation at a base.

Mr. LONG. What increases in mission requirements have taken place at Altus which bring about this requirement?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, this is principally a replacement requirement. We have a base flight operations activity now which is housed in three old substandard buildings and the combination of them still do not provide enough space.

This is a replacement project.

Mr. LONG. What is the need for a consolidated command post in the proposed facility?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we have had a program underway in the Air Force for a number of years to consolidate the command posts of various types. It has been an expensive operation having them scattered throughout the base. This base flight operations building, since we are providing a new one, provides an ideal location for the military airlift and the Strategic Air Command post functions to be consolidated.

Mr. LONG. Can you save money?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. This is principally an economy move.

Mr. LONG. Would you put the details in the record, please.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Cost avoidance savings will amount to $112,000. Determined annual savings are $8,800. Additionally, some manpower savings will be generated when all the facilities are located in a single building. Tests of command post consolidation have been accomplished and have indicated that manpower savings can be realized. However, these savings cannot be precisely identified until the actual consolidation is accomplished. Each base involves different Air Force commands

with different missions and a period of combined operation is needed before manpower adjustments can be made.

Another advantage of this consolidation of facilities, will be greatly increased speed of service to the units committed to Emergency War Operations (EWO).

Mr. LONG. And provide details of the square footage to be assigned each function in the facility.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

The major functions in the base flight operations facility are distributed functionally as follows:

Area:	*Square feet*
Command control	5,000
Communications	1,315
Weather	2,100
Flight brief	800
Disaster control	200
Planning and schedule	664
Administration	2,776
Common use areas and mechanical space	2,877
Total	15,732

Mr. LONG. Also put in the record details as to the functions to be assigned to the building you intend to keep.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

ALTUS FUNCTIONS PLANNED FOR VACATED BASE OPERATIONS BUILDING

The existing facility, building No. 1, has a total scope of 15,147 square feet. The base operations functions currently occupy only 3,303 square feet of this area. When vacated, it will be utilized for the following wing headquarters functions: Directorate of maintenance staff personnel, information, and safety offices.

Mr. LONG. Do the buildings presently in use constitute a hazard?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; they are a fire hazard principally at the present time.

AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SHOP

Mr. LONG. You are requesting an aircraft maintenance shop at a cost of $716,000. What are the locations of the five buildings now being used for this function, and the location of the proposed facility?

Colonel MANSPERGER. These five buildings are somewhat scattered throughout the central section of the base. The project is a joint MAC–SAC project to support the C–135, C–141, and C–5's. The proposed location is centralized into the maintenance complex.

Mr. LONG. Can you justify this project on the basis of savings?

General REILLY. Sir, yes, I can cite savings of almost $200,000 cost avoidance and annual savings of about $4,000 a year.

Mr. LONG. Is that net?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. That is to say, you are counting all the costs of the building you are building?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. And the operating cost?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Are you counting the return on the money?

General REILLY. Well, sir, really we are not having to borrow any money for this. This is fully financed.

Mr. LONG. Well, when the Government puts money into something like this there is an implicit interest on the money.

General REILLY. Oh, yes.

Mr. LONG. Is that right?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Do you count that in your estimate of savings?

Mr. REITMAN. No, sir. The figures that General Reilly stated are the cost avoidance, money that we would not have to spend to repair or maintain the existing buildings. The annual cost savings would be the difference in operating costs, but there has been no offset taken for the amount of money had it been invested in interest.

Mr. Long. Yes, but how can you talk about savings unless you consider what the return on the money would be in alternative uses? Presumably we are borrowing money at 6 percent.

Mr. REITMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Presumably this adds a little bit to the national debt which we are paying interest on.

Mr. REITMAN. Yes.

Mr. LONG. At 6 percent a year. At $716,000, that is about $40,000 a year, and then you have other costs. Do you count that in when you talk about savings?

Mr. REITMAN. No, sir. The figures that we have cited are to give the committee a comparison of what our cost would be if we continued under the present circumstances.

Mr. LONG. Well, if it is only $4,000 that you are saving by putting this in, then you could figure it is going to cost $40,000 a year on the interest alone. How can this be called a net saving or an economical proposition?

Mr. REITMAN. This project is not justified purely on economical means, sir.

General REILLY. It is principally in the interest of aircraft maintenance and to replace a substandard facility. Mr. Chairman, we are seeking a specific appropriation for this project. If not appropriated the money just won't be provided by the Congress. It is not as if the money would be used somewhere else.

Mr. LONG. All money you spend for anything always has an alternative use, isn't that right?

General REILLY. But not in our instance here; of course, within the total budget, yes.

Mr. LONG. This committee and Congress have to consider other uses. Otherwise we are not doing our job. You can't spend $700,000 and say, "We are saving $4,000," and forget about the fact that the money could be used in many, many other ways—to pay off the debt, to build buildings elsewhere that have a use, to build sewers, and so forth.

Do you follow me?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. As Mr. Reitman says, it would take along time to amortize——

Mr. LONG. You can't possibly justify this on economic grounds if there is only $4,000 saved.

General REILLY. Not on that alone.

Mr. LONG. So it has to be on technical grounds.

General REILLY. Yes, sir; principally in terms of direct mission support and aircraft maintenance.

Mr. LONG. I would say the answer then to the question, Can you justify this project on the basis of savings? is "No."

General REILLY. Some savings but certainly not the prime——

Mr. LONG. No; I think it has to be considered a dead loss on the basis of savings. I would hope you would keep that in mind in your future answers to questions like this.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Consider all the costs, not just some of them, when you are talking about savings.

Mr. DAVIS. Either that or we should make it clear when we are talking about savings, we are talking about annual operation and maintenance costs. That is really what we are talking about.

Mr. REITMAN. That is what we are talking about, Mr. Davis.

Mr. LONG. As long as we understand, but the average person who reads that, including me, is going to assume that you figured all these factors in and that you came up with a real net savings.

AIRCRAFT ENGINE SHOP

Also at Altus you seek $122,000 for an aircraft engine shop. Is this an addition to the building currently in use, or is it the first increment?

General REILLY. Colonel Mansperger.

Colonel MANSPERGER. Yes, sir, this is in addition to the existing adequate building that we currently have in use.

Mr. LONG. With fewer flying hours why do you need a larger facility?

Colonel MANSPERGER. The functions that occur here that are not properly housed now are not directly affected by flying hours. The functions conducted in the open now are in support of equipment for engine overhaul. Also, at present we perform work on the nacelles outdoors, and auxiliary power units for the C–141 and C–5 aircraft. These requirements would not be directly affected by the number of flying hours.

Mr. LONG. You know, my confidence is a little bit shaken when I get that kind of an answer you gave me a while ago. Is this whole thing something that is terribly important, or just something nice to have?

Colonel MANSPERGER. These are important functions. In the case of the aircraft maintenance shop just addressed, the activities are now accomplished in five separate buildings. Three of these buildings are functionally inadequate and beyond economic repair. They were never constructed as maintenance shops.

The ceilings are too low. We cannot move the large sections of the aircraft through the doors. Environmental controls are lacking and it is impossible to do a good job of curing fiber glass for the radomes or to control fiber glass dust.

Complete deterioration of the existing three buildings and no replacement facility would require that we send the material to another base. This would cause a delay in responsiveness, increase pipeline

times, and handling costs. So these are mission essential type requirements.

Mr. LONG. You are saying then that these are critically needed for the accomplishment of the mission. Is that what you are saying?

Colonel MANSPERGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Critically needed, and you will stand by that.

Colonel MANSPERGER. We can always get the job done some way. We have good American GI's and those maintenance people can get it done, but to do it correctly and prevent possible flying and safety problems associated with working outside, getting sand and contaminants into critical areas of aircraft components, these facilities should be constructed.

Mr. LONG. Are there any questions?

BASE FLIGHT OPERATIONS FACILITY

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. I note the base flight operations facility represents an expansion of something over 3,000 square feet from what you now have. Normally you would think that if you were consolidating something that is going on at several different buildings you would be able to do it without increased space and you might even need less total space because you have a consolidation of operations.

I think what you better do is provide for the record a pretty solid justification of the need for additional space in one facility over what you now have scattered about.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Actually we have one of the typical World War II wood frame base operations buildings, constructed for short time use when Altus was just a training base for small twin-engine aircraft. That old facility is supplemented by two other small buildings. These buildings were not built to sustain the type of activity that must be conducted today in support of a new, complex, modern flying operation. While we are consolidating we are providing additional space because we have just been very short on space through the years and this just brings us ur to our standards in the various elements of the facility.

I can provide you the details, sir.

Mr. LONG. All right, if you would, please.

[The information follows:]

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL SQUARE FEET IN ALTUS BASE OPS

The base passenger service facilities and the disaster control center were formerly located in a building that was destroyed to allow construction of a new fire station. These facilities occupied some 2,930 square feet. The base message center now occupies some 300 square feet not listed on DD Form 1391. This additional square footage totals 3,230. The mechanical room of the proposed base operations facility houses an emergency power source and is a new requirement. This room occupies some 400 square feet. Therefore, rather than being something over 3,000 square feet more than the existing area, the proposed base flight operations facility will occupy approximately 400 square feet less than now utilized or required.

DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DEL.

Mr. LONG. Turn to Dover Air Force Base.

Insert page 133 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		DOVER AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND	FJXT	DELAWARE

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1941/1951	KENT	FOUR MILES SOUTHEAST OF DOVER, DELAWARE

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

MILITARY AIRLIFT WING

MILITARY AIRLIFT GROUP (RESERVE-ASSOCIATE)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	549	4,625	1,441	0	0	70	210	25	6,920
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	538	4,249	1,569	0	0	70	210	25	6,661

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	2,830	831	124,684	125,515
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	1,616	(35) 52	0	52
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				125,567
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Excludes $6,909,000 Family Housing)				5,958
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (Excludes $205,000 Mobile Home Spaces)				3,387
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				12,500
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				147,412

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
219-94A	Base Facilities Maintenance Complex 36		SF	26,200	829	26,200	829
722-211	Airmen Dormitories I		MN	400	2,558	400	2,558
	TOTAL				3,387		3,387

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

CONGRESSIONAL

Dover Air Force Base

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 accomplished in 10 widely separated buildings, four 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 proper rest, relaxation, and individual well-being.

MAC—DOVER AFB, DEL.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Base facilities maintenance complex	$50,000	30
Airmen dormitories	125,000	35

Enlisted barracks summary, Dover AFB, Del.

	Men/women [1]
Total requirement	1,808
Existing substandard	[2] 3,240
Existing adequate	[3] 1,233
Funded, not in inventory	0
Adequate assets	1,233
Deficiency	575
Fiscal year 1974 program	400
Barracks spaces occupied (average) Mar. 31, 1973	2,119

[1] 90 square feet per man, permanent party E2–4; 135 square feet per man, permanent party E5–6; 270 square feet per man, permanent party E7–9.
[2] None upgradeable.
[3] Includes 9 personnel in private housing.

BASE FACILITIES MAINTENANCE COMPLEX

Mr. Long. You are requesting $829,000 for a base facilities maintenance complex. Why is it necessary to have this mission housed in a single complex?

General Reilly. Mr. Chairman, again for efficient and maximum productivity. Our base engineer complexes are made up of administration and engineering facilities supplemented by the various shops, heating, air-conditioning, plumbing, electrical, and so on, where the craftsmen do their shopwork.

A consolidated function gives us much greater economy and efficiency over a scattered operation. I have visited Dover many times and the base engineers facilities are scattered over a wide area. It is a very difficult operation.

Mr. Long. Judging from the information submitted with this request, most of the space you request is to be assigned for adminis-

trative and engineering work. These functions are now performed in widely separated buildings, I suppose, as you just indicated.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. When will the second increment be programed, and what is the estimated cost?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we hope to program the second phase, which will be additional shop space and storage, in the 1975 program. It will run slightly over $1 million.

AIRMEN DORMITORIES

Mr. LONG. You are requesting $2,558,000 for airmen dormitories. In 1972 you showed a requirement for 2,336 bachelor enlisted quarters, this year a requirement of 1,808. That is a reduction of about 500 or so. What has changed?

General REILLY. Colonel Shook.

Colonel SHOOK. Sir, primarily that resulted in a reduction because of relocation of an ADC fighter interceptor squadron and the reduction in overall MAC activity level with associated people adjustments.

We should note, sir, that announcements recently made will bring it back to approximately a 1967 requirement which will be further revalidated by the calendar year 1973 bachelor housing survey.

Mr. LONG. In 1972, you showed a figure of 1,512 adequate spaces; this year, only 1,233 adequate spaces. What has changed there?

Colonel SHOOK. That was a change in the capacity of four dormitory buildings built in 1959. They were rerated from the prior 72-square-foot standard to the new DOD standard of 90 square feet. This resulted in the loss of these spaces.

Mr. LONG. What is the offbase support for bachelor enlisted men? How many live off base?

Colonel SHOOK. Sir, Dover receives its community support housing from the city of Dover that is located about 4 miles away with a population of approximately 50,000. Rentals range anywhere from $125 to about $225 a month, with a 1-year lease required. These prices generally exceed the financial capability of most of our lower grade enlisted personnel.

In addition, there is no commercial transportation available between the base and the city. It might be interesting to note that OSD's 90-percent programing limit will require that 10 percent of our people use either substandard housing or rely on community support housing. Again, as I stated earlier, we do have an increased requirement for 160 spaces because of the recently announced population change. Our requirements are revalidated each year, sir.

Mr. LONG. Are there questions?

Mr. DAVIS. No questions.

McGUIRE AIR FORCE BASE, N.J.

Mr. LONG. Turn to McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.

Place page 136 in the record, please.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		MCGUIRE AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND	PTFL	NEW JERSEY

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942	BURLINGTON	ADJACENT-NORTH OF WRIGHTSTOWN, NEW JERSEY, TWELVE MILES SOUTH SOUTHEAST OF TRENTON, NEW JERSEY

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

MILITARY AIRLIFT WING

TACTICAL FIGHTER WING (AIR NATIONAL GUARD)

MILITARY AIRLIFT GROUP (RESERVE-ASSOCIATE)

21ST AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	844	4,908	1,762	62	109	134	234	487	8,540
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	831	4,753	1,763	62	109	134	234	487	8,373

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,548	714	128,440	129,154
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	317	(1) 0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				129,154
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY Excludes $261,500 Mobile Home Spaces				4,592
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,860
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				7,200
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				142,806

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
134-511	Aircraft Navigation and Landing Facility I		EA	1	75	1	75
149-962	Aircraft Flight Control Facility I		LS	LS	948	LS	948
218-712	Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop 22		SF	17,600	675	17,600	675
610-245	Air Condition Base Personnel Office 31		SF	26,781	162	26,781	162
	TOTAL				1,860		1,860

DD FORM 1 OCT 74 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

McGuire Air Force Base

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 airspace 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 the 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.

MAC—McGUIRE AFB, N.J.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Aircraft navigation and landing facility	$5,600	70
Aircraft flight control facility	36,200	60
Aerospace ground equipment shop	31,000	90
Air-condition base personnel office	9,500	85

Mr. Long. You are requesting $948,000 for an aircraft flight control facility. Has the flight pattern here been changed, or was the tower placed in the wrong location when it was built?

General Reilly. Mr. Chairman, the existing tower was built many years ago. It is actually out in the center of the airfield. With expansion and realinement of the airfield facilities over the years the location of the tower no longer provides visual surveillance over the entire airfield area.

The facility will combine the control tower with a new radar flight control center. There has been no change in traffic patterns, you might say.

Mr. Long. What new equipment will you be installing in the radar section?

General Reilly. Mr. Chairman, I can furnish a detailed listing. It will be new equipment. We haven't had the space really to install this new equipment.

Mr. Long. Would you put the date of delivery and the cost in the record?

General Reilly. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

McGUIRE A/C FLIGHT CONTROL FACILITY/NEW EQUIPMENT INSTALLED

The new equipment to be installed in the McGuire radar section is (addition to the current radar equipment):

1 Air Traffic Control Radar Beacon System.
1 Video Mapper.
1 Radar Approach Control Console Canopy.

The total cost of this equipment is $231,000 (funded prior to fiscal year 1974) and delivery of the equipment is expected during August 1973.

Mr. LONG. You are asking for $625,000 for an aerospace ground equipment shop. Provide for the record a map showing the location of the present facility and the location of the proposed facility.

What has been the workload for the past 5 years and what do you project for the next 5 years?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, we will be pleased to furnish it.

Mr. LONG. You will put all that in the record.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Statistics concerning the aerospace ground equipment shop workload are available for the past 40 months prior to April 1973 only. For the 40-month period a total of 117,560 items (1,129,363.5 man-hours) were expended in the repair/maintenance of AGE. McGuire AFB has programed for the maintenance/repair of 176,353 AGE items (1,692,988 man-hours) during the projected 5-year period. This is an average of 35,207 items (337,987 man-hours) per year of 2,939 items (28,214 man-hours) per month. Maintenance is performed both on a scheduled and on an as required basis.

[The map was retained in the committee's files.]

Mr. LONG. You say the present situation necessitates a round trip of 3 miles for processing. You also indicate you will build the new facility in the same area. How will this reduce the travel for processing?

Colonel MANSPERGER. The Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) maintenance activities are now separated by work categories of major repair, daily maintenance and dispatch, and inspection functions, because we have had to utilize existing facilities.

Major repair work is now accomplished 1½ miles from the daily maintenance and dispatch area, the latter being close to the area where the equipment is mainly used. So every time a piece of equipment needs major maintenance, it must be dispatched 1½ miles to an existing nose dock, which is not an adequate AGE repair facility, and then returned. Our proposed project will enable consolidation of activities in one location.

Mr. LONG. You are asking $126,000 for air conditioning the base personnel office. This is a low priority item. Would you agree?

General REILLY. Sir, we have shown it in the bottom 20 percent of our priorities. However, it is badly needed.

Mr. LONG. How many days a year require air-conditioner operation?

General REILLY. Colonel Rutland.

Colonel RUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, the criteria for air-conditioning is based upon the temperature experienced at a particular base during the 6 warmer months of the year.

McGuire is in Weather Zone B which means the wet bulb temperature exceeds 67° F for 800 hours or more during the 6 warmer months. At McGuire it is 1,400 hours. It is difficult to say how many days but generally speaking it is around 110 days per year at McGuire.

Mr. LONG. It is about what temperature?

Colonel RUTLAND. The criteria is 800 or more hours at a wet bulb temperature of 67° F or above.

Mr. LONG. You mean you turn on the air-conditioning when the temperature gets above 67°?

Colonel RUTLAND. That is the design criteria.

General REILLY. Sir, this is so-called wet bulb temperature which is a measure of humidity as well as strictly temperature.

Mr. LONG. At 67 I want heat.

General REILLY. But 67 coupled with humidity. It is just a standard that is used in air-conditioning design.

Mr. LONG. Is there no air-conditioning at all in the facility?

General REILLY. No, sir, we have no air-conditioning. These are good buildings, structurally sound buildings. They are just lacking in air-conditioning.

Mr. LONG. No window air-conditioning?

General REILLY. Sir, there may be some just for——

Mr. LONG. Why can't window units be used?

General REILLY. Sir, they can but they are usually not as efficient and economical as a central system.

Mr. LONG. Could you give an economic comparison for the record?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, certainly can.

[The information follows:]

M'GUIRE BASE PERSONNEL OFFICE, ECONOMIC COMPARISON, WINDOW AIR CONDITIONER VERSUS CENTRAL SYSTEM

Central air-conditioning systems are proposed for base personnel office facilities, buildings 29–05 and 26–02, McGuire AFB, N.J., in accordance with DOD air-conditioning policy. The DOD policy is based on the premise that lower operating and maintenance costs of a central system will offset the higher first costs for buildings with long-term planned use. Buildings 29–05 and 26–02 are permanent type buildings and have an economic life of at least 25 years. Window units could provide adequate cooling in building 29–05. In building 26–02 there are large central areas that could not be adequately cooled with window units. Two 15-ton packaged units would be required for these areas. The central system would provide the best environmental conditions with tempered ventilating air during the winter. Air distribution, ventilation, and noise would be unsatisfactory in some areas with the window units.

The following cost analyses indicate a uniform annual cost of $18,907 for the central systems versus $18,970 for the multiple packaged systems (window units and two-packaged air-conditioning systems). Thus, in addition to the disadvantages of the window units, as stated, above, the life cycle cost of the central system is approximately $60 less per year.

ECONOMIC COMPARISON—AIR-CONDITION McGUIRE BASE PERSONNEL OFFICE (ECONOMIC LIFE, 25 YEARS)

Item	Central system	Multiple-package unit
Initial investment cost	$162,000	$76,400
Total project cost (discounted)	180,072	180,600
Uniform annual cost (terminal value=0)	18,907	[1] 18,970
Total annual operating and maintenance cost	1,808	[1] 10,436

[1] Includes cost of replacing window units on an average of every 7 years.

NORTON AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

Mr. LONG. Norton Air Force Base, Calif.

Please insert page 141 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		NORTON AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND	SCEY	CALIFORNIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942	SAN BERNARDINO	THREE MILES EAST OF SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

MILITARY AIRLIFT WING

MILITARY AIRLIFT GROUP (RESERVE-ASSOCIATE)

AEROSPACE AUDIO-VISUAL SERVICE

AUDITOR GENERAL GROUP

AIR FORCE INSPECTION AND SAFETY CENTER

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,190	4,803	3,347	0	188	70	112	47	9,757
b. PLANNED (End FY)	1,196	4,664	3,298	0	188	70	112	47	9,575

12. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	2,056	860	93,357	94,217
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	340	13	0	13
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				94,230
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				2,725
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,283
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				11,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				109,238

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
740-617	NCO Open Mess I		SF	27,800	1,283	27,800	1,283
	TOTAL				1,283		1,283

DD FORM 1390 OCT 70 CONGRESSIONAL

NORTON AIR FORCE BASE

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-Associate); the Aerospace Audio-Visual 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.

MAC—NORTON AFB, CALIF.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
NCO open mess	$78,100	60

Mr. LONG. You are asking $1,283,000 for an NCO open mess. What is the current situation?

General REILLY. Colonel Shook.

Colonel SHOOK. Sir, right now we are located in a building that was originally built as a civilian personnel office. Our main problem there is that it is a manager's nightmare. It is like walking down a warehouse building. You have rooms on each side. It is not laid out properly to give the manager a chance to operate the facility effectively.

Mr. LONG. How many NCO's are eligible to use this facility?

Colonel SHOOK. Three thousand three hundred, sir.

Mr. LONG. Will you construct the new facility so as to withstand earthquakes?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Colonel RUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, it would probably be better stated to say we would construct it to resist earthquakes as opposed to withstanding them.

Our normal design considerations do take into effect the seismic zones at 56 locations in our country. Norton is in seismic zone 4 and thus does qualify for rather extensive seismic considerations in the design of its facilities.

Mr. LONG. Do you take a good look at all of your new construction projects from the standpoint of the earthquake factor?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. On all of them, particularly on the west coast.

Mr. LONG. You plan to spend more than $100,000 for such things as electricity, water, sewer, lighting, et cetera. Can you not use the present water and other systems in a new building and save some of these costs?

Colonel RUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, the $113,000 that is indicated here on the project document for supporting facilities is for those facilities or utilities support outside the 5-foot line.

Within the primary unit cost of the facility we provide the basic utilities within the 5-foot line of the building. In this particular case we have 300 lineal feet of electrical lines underground. One 450 kVA transformer, 800 lineal feet of waterlines, 765 lineal feet of sanitary

sewers, 460 lineal feet of gaslines, and 8 area lighting fixtures to illuminate the exterior of the building.

Mr. LONG. Are there any questions?

Mr. DAVIS. Do you have any records as to when you changed the use of the present building from a personnel office over to an NCO mess?

General REILLY. Sir, we don't have it. We can provide it for the record.

[The information follows:]

NORTON NCO OPEN MESS

Chronological record of transfer of 33,180 square feet in building No. 45 from personnel office to NCO open mess is as follows:

In 1950, about 10 percent of the building area was assigned to NCO open mess with personnel functions occupying balance.

In the time period in 1965–66, most of the balance of the building was assigned to the NCO open mess, with about 5 percent retained for personnel functions.

The balance of the building was utilized by the NCO open mess in 1970.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Will the new NCO mess be built on the site of the old NCO mess and if so could you use the old utility system?

General REILLY. It will be adjacent to it.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Are you planning to use some of the present utilities?

General REILLY. We have utilities in the area.

Mr. NICHOLAS. I would think you would have them for the old NCO mess.

General REILLY. Yes. Of course as to the interior utilities, it is not feasible to use those in the new building.

Mr. NICHOLAS. These are utilities inside the 5-foot line?

General REILLY. Utility costs for this project are for those outside the 5-foot line. The unit cost of the building includes the interior utilities, that is, within the building, and what we are doing is providing the hookup outside the building to utilities within the area.

SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILL.

Mr. LONG. Turn to Scott Air Force Base, Ill.

Insert page 143 in the record.

[The page follows:]

SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE

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 a comprehensive and balanced program for recreational sports, athletic training, and physical fitness.

MAC—SCOTT AFB, ILL.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Aeromedical staging facility	$123,000	100
Gymnasium	57,000	55

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND	VDYD	ILLINOIS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1917	ST. CLAIR	EIGHT MILES EAST SOUTHEAST OF BELLEVILLE, ILLINOIS

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

AEROMEDICAL AIRLIFT WING

AEROMEDICAL AIRLIFT GROUP (RESERVE-ASSOCIATE)

HEADQUARTERS MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

AEROSPACE RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICE HEADQUARTERS

AIR WEATHER SERVICE HEADQUARTERS

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,447	3,226	2,647	0	0	142	85	0	7,547
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	1,456	3,152	2,652	0	0	142	85	0	7,487

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	2,531	970	106,896	107,866
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	470	39	-	39
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				107,905
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,197
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				3,092
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				16,800
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				128,994

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
510-278	Aeromedical Staging Facility I		SF	34,750	2,019	34,750	2,019
740-674	Gymnasium 27		SF	21,000	1,073	21,000	1,073
	TOTAL				3,092		3,092

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

AEROMEDICAL STAGING FACILITIES

Mr. LONG. You are requesting $2,019,000 for a new aeromedical staging facility. What are you now using, when was it built, and what did it cost?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we are now using a modular relocatable facility that was erected a year ago last fall to meet an interim requirement until this permanent facility could be programed and built under the regular military construction program.

The existing facility is roughly a $300,000 building. It is designed to be taken down and returned to storage.

Mr. LONG. What has been the workload at this facility over the past 3 years?

General REILLY. Colonel Baird.

Colonel BAIRD. The aeromedical staging facility at Scott Air Force Base has provided transient medical facilities for approximately 18,000 patients per year for calendar years 1970 and 1971.

The workload dropped slightly in calender year 1972 to just short of 17,000 patients. During calendar year 1972 the average high daily census, which is calculated by averaging the 7 highest occupancy days of each month per year, was 98 occupants and on 41 occasions in calendar 1972 the daily census exceeded 100 occupants.

We calculated a requirement for a projected workload of approximately 17,000 patients per year for the next 5 years.

Mr. LONG. What is the average length of stay for a patient?

Colonel BAIRD. The average length of stay at the Scott Air Force Base aeromedical staging facility is about 26 hours.

Mr. LONG. 17,000 patients, is that weighted by the length of stay?

Colonel BAIRD. No, sir; that is individuals.

Mr. LONG. Well, don't you think it ought to be weighted by the length of stay?

Colonel BAIRD. No, sir. Each person requires a bed while he is being housed, fed, and processed through the aeromedical evacuation system. Therefore, we have to build for the total volume.

Mr. LONG. You say 26 hours now. What has it been in the past and what do you expect in the future? Is that stabilizing at 26 hours?

Colonel BAIRD. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Then it makes a fair comparison. Provide for the record a listing of all your aeromedical staging facilities worldwide and list deficiencies at these facilities.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

The USAF presently operates six aeromedical staging facilities worldwide. These are listed and identified below as currently adequate or inadequate:

USAF WORLDWIDE AEROMEDICAL STAGING FACILITIES

ANDREWS AFB, MD.

This aeromedical staging facility is inadequate, and the deficiencies are specified in the fiscal year 1974 MCP proposal.

CLARK AB, PHILIPPINES

This aeromedical staging facility is adequate and no deficiencies are noted.

LACKLAND AFB, TEX.

This aeromedical staging facility is inadequate and is presently under study for replacement. Its deficiencies include lack of air conditioning, extreme shortage of latrine facilities, temporary World War II structure, no patient privacy, no provisions for female patients, and the ¾-mile distance from the Composite Medical Facility.

MAXWELL AFB, ALA.

This aeromedical staging facility is inadequate and is presently under study for replacement. Its deficiencies include inefficient air conditioning, shortage of latrine facilities, age of building built in 1942, minimal patient privacy, and not connected to the Composite Medical Facility.

SCOTT AFB, ILL.

This aeromedical staging facility is inadequate and the deficiencies are specified in the fiscal year 1974 MCP proposal.

TRAVIS AFB, CALIF.

This aeromedical staging facility is inadequate and is presently under study for replacement. Deficiencies include the lack of air conditioning and the lack of covered access to the Composite Medical Facility. The facility's configuration impedes optimum utilization because it is a converted dormitory.

Mr. LONG. Is it your intention to dismantle the present facility, or will it be kept for other uses?

General REILLY. It will be dismantled and put back into storage for follow-on use.

GYMNASIUM

Mr. LONG. You are asking $1,070,000 for a gymnasium. This is a low priority item. Would you agree?

General REILLY. Sir, we have shown it in the bottom 20 percent. However, it is one of just two or three gymnasiums in our program and we feel it is very urgently required.

Mr. LONG. Is this a new gym or an addition to the existing one?

General REILLY. No, sir; this is a new gymnasium.

Mr. LONG. Will you keep the present one in use?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. We have one adequate gymnasium and will continue to use it. This large base is authorized two gymnasiums.

Mr. LONG. Why do you need two gymnasiums instead of one?

General REILLY. Sir, just to handle the large population.

Mr. LONG. Are you turning people away?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, the one gymnasium does not begin to meet the requirements of the people. There is just not enough room in it, not enough hours of the day to meet the requirements.

Mr. LONG. Why will it cost $45.60 a square foot for this facility?

General REILLY. Colonel Rutland.

Colonel RUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, the area cost factor is 1.20 so the unit cost of this becomes approximately $38 per square foot which meets our historical gym cost experience and projected growth to the spring of 1974.

Mr. LONG. You indicate the present facility is about 50 percent of the requirement. How do you arrive at that requirement.

General REILLY. Colonel Shook.

Colonel SHOOK. Sir, it is based upon military population at a given installation. OSD authorizes two gyms at all locations where our military population is between 3,000 and 6,000 people, sir.

Mr. LONG. 3,000 to 6,000?

Colonel SHOOK. Yes, sir; less than 3,000 is one gymnasium.

Mr. LONG. How many people use the gym?

Colonel SHOOK. Sir, this is probably one of the most used facilities that we have as far as——

Mr. LONG. I know that but how many do use it?

Colonel SHOOK. This particular one, sir, I would have to provide that for the record.

Mr. LONG. I would be interested to know how many use it and how many don't use it. Do you have the names of the people who use it?

Colonel SHOOK. All military people on the base have access to it.

Mr. LONG. Everybody has access to the House gym but not everybody uses it. I haven't been in it for years now.

Colonel SHOOK. It is not like the House gym or the Pentagon gym in that you have to be a member. There is no membership involved in our base gyms, just limited to the military base population.

General REILLY. Dr. Long, we can provide data on the use of our gymnasium.

Mr. LONG. I don't think you can give the kinds of answers you give, such as 50 percent of requirement and so on, unless you do know how many people use it and how many people don't use it.

General REILLY. We can certainly provide that.

[The information follows:]

NUMBER OF PEOPLE USING SCOTT GYM

The following daily average use figures for the Scott Gymnasium are provided as requested:

	Average number of people per day
Main gym floor	556
Sauna bath	55
Exercise room	32
Weight lifting	25
Handball	72
Squash	48
Indoor track	51

The main problem in participation is the lack of facilities. With only one gym floor, basketball, volleyball, and badminton have to be scheduled around each other for use of the same court for intramural play. There is always a waiting list for handball/squash courts. The new gymnasium will provide the additional facilities to relieve the current overcrowded conditions.

Mr. LONG. Have you had a consumer survey made?

Colonel SHOOK. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. You require people to use the gymnasium?

Colonel SHOOK. No, sir. The Air Force aerobics program does in fact use our gymnasiums as a running track. The aerobics program is a required program, but to use a gymnasium per se is not required.

Mr. LONG. Why don't you require gymnasium attendance to keep military men in good condition?

Colonel SHOOK. There is the aerobics program, sir, but it does not include, as an example, a requirement to play basketball. It does not include a requirement to play badminton. It does require them to perform a running test.

Mr. LONG. Are all personnel required to make some kind of use of the gym?

Colonel SHOOK. No, sir; they are not required to use the gym. Each year they are required to perform to certain standards in running. It is a running type exercise that the Air Force uses in the aerobics program. That can be done in or outside the gym.

Mr. LONG. They have to pass a physical test?

Colonel SHOOK. Yes, sir; once a year.

Mr. LONG. How many pass it and how many fail it?

Colonel SHOOK. I don't have the statistics.

[The information follows:]

Approximately 97 percent of all personnel pass the aerobics annual physical fitness test. The remaining 3 percent are entered into a remedial exercise program and are periodically tested until they meet the required standards.

General REILLY. Those who fail it have to work their way up to where they can pass it.

Mr. LONG. We think of military people being in the peak of physical condition. However, I have sometimes heard that that is somewhat less than true.

General REILLY. Sir, in my mind you can't make a better dollar investment.

Mr. LONG. I agree, if you make people use it; but if you don't that is another matter. Would this gym be adequate if you made everyone use the gym at a certain time of day for a certain kind of exercise?

General REILLY. It is a voluntary thing, but there has been a resurgence in physical conditioning.

Mr. LONG. You make it totally voluntary?

General REILLY. It is a wonderful thing for our young people on the base.

Mr. LONG. You don't have to justify it to me on that ground.

General REILLY. We have included just a few of these in our program each year, the ones we feel are most important.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me if you are going to provide a gym in a military organization there ought to be a requirement that people use it. A lot of people won't take exercise unless they are required to do it.

General REILLY. We just haven't required people to use the gymnasium. Hopefully they will use it in meeting their physical standards requirements.

Mr. LONG. You also plan to build a steam and massage room. Is this standard for an Air Force gym?

General REILLY. Sir, not the massage part of it, a steam room is a standard fixture in a gymnasium.

TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

Mr. LONG. Travis Air Force Base, Calif. Insert page 146 in the record.

(The page follows:)

TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE

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.

MAC—TRAVIS AFB, CALIF.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Aircraft hydrant refueling system	$48,900	65

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND	XDAT	CALIFORNIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1943	SOLANO	FORTY MILES NORTHEAST OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., SIX MILES EAST OF FAIRCHILD, CALIFORNIA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

MILITARY AIRLIFT WING

MILITARY AIRLIFT GROUP (RESERVE-ASSOCIATE)

AIR REFUELING SQUADRON (STATEGIC AIR COMMAND)

22ND AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,424	7,783	2,633	0	70	260	479	592	13,241
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	1,373	7,531	2,775	0	70	260	479	592	13,080

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	5,272	664	181,178	181,842
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	2,307	(9) 168	14	182
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				182,024
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Excludes $231,800 Mobile Home Spaces)				410
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,024
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				112,500
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				295,958

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
121-122	Aircraft Hydrant Refueling System I		LS	LS	1,024	LS	1,024
	TOTAL				1,024		1,024

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. LONG. The request is for $1,024,000 for an aircraft hydrant refueling system. On the form 1391 you list no requirement under item 23. What is the requirement?

Colonel MANSPERGER. The requirement is to place hydrant refueling on the major and largest ramp for parking aircraft on Travis Air Force Base. There are other hydrants on that base, but they are in the SAC alert area, on the air freight terminal, and in the SAC 135 and 141 parking areas.

Mr. LONG. Why are the present systems constructed at locations remote from most parking spaces?

Colonel MANSPERGER. KC–135 aircraft on alert have to be fueled and defueled in alert positions. This was also the case when the B–52's were in the same location. It is remote to the rest of the ramps.

The reason for this is that the war fuel load is heavier than any normal peacetime flying fuel load. Also, fuel loads must be changed as required by weather and takeoff conditions. The air freight terminal hydrants were placed there so the aircraft could turn around in a very quick time during a contingency, and also it is much cheaper to refuel at the loading position at the air freight terminal area. The other hydrants were put in place sometime in the past, where aircraft generally of the size being parked there now were parked. Most of these are still being used by assigned KC–135 and C–141 aircraft.

Mr. LONG. How many parking spaces do you have, and how many are removed from the present system?

Colonel MANSPERGER. I would have to answer that for the record.

[The information follows:]

TRAVIS A/C HYDRANT REFUELING SYSTEM

The number of parking spaces compared to those provided with hydrants is shown below; 59 parking spaces do not have hydrant refueling.

Location	Aircraft type	Parking positions	With hydrants
Air freight terminal	C–5	2	2
	C–141	6	6
KC–135 maintenance apron and stubs includes some C–135 docks	KC–135	11	7
C–141 maintenance apron includes some C–141 docks	C–141	25	13
Power check pad	C–5	1	0
C–5 maintenance apron includes all C–5 docks	C–5	23	4
Base flight area	C–141	3	0
	Other aircraft	7	0
Passenger terminal area	Extra large	4	4
	Large	5	4
	Medium	2	2
Total nonalert parking		101	42
SAC alert area	KC–135/B–52	12	(1)

[1] Pit refueling.

As can be seen, the major deficiency is in the C–5 parking and maintenance area where only four positions have hydrant refueling. It would be impossible to maneuver the 35 assigned C–5 aircraft over these four positions or one of the terminal fueling positions for fueling and defueling operations to support maintenance, functional test flights, local training flights, adjustments to fuel loads as dictated by weather changes, etc. The best alternative is truck refueling. This project will eliminate the need for 19 R–9 refueling vehicles ($34,000 each) and 57 personnel which will save over one-third of a million dollars per year. It will

also save time; e.g., a C–5 carries over 10 R–9 loads of fuel and it requires 2½ hours to defuel 130,000 pounds using trucks.

Mr. LONG. With reduced flying hours, what do you expect as a refueling workload? Provide past, present, and projected workloads for the record.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

WORKLOAD HISTORY AND PROJECTION FOR TRAVIS REFUELING HYDRANT SYSTEM

The past, present, and anticipated C–5 refueling workloads for Travis AFB are presented below:

Average monthly distribution (gallons)

Fiscal year monthly average:	
1971	775, 459
1972	1, 537, 011
1973	2, 272, 221
1974	3, 015, 405
1975	No increase

The fuel requirements in the C–5 parking area supported by the hydrant fuel project have increased because Travis AFB did not receive its full complement of aircraft until this year.

Mr. LONG. Also provide details as to why existing systems, which now are operational, will not be satisfactory with reduced flying hours.

[The information follows:]

NEED FOR NEW TRAVIS REFUELING SYSTEM

It would be highly impractical to tow or taxi the C–5 from its parking position to one of the hydrant fueling positions at the terminals each time the aircraft needed fueling or defueling in support of maintenance, functional test flights, local training flights, or adjustments in fuel loads because of weather changes. It would also be impractical to tow or taxi to the four C–5 parking positions which presently have a hydrant capability. It would be nearly impossible to use the KC–135 or C–141 hydrant-equipped positions because they are used by the KC–135 and C–141's, and also because of the difficulty of getting an aircraft the size of a C–5 into the positions. The practical alternative is truck refueling which is both less responsive (slower) and would cost approximately $½ million per year.

Mr. NICHOLAS. I don't think the question on the total requirement and existing assets was ever answered. Could you also provide that for the record?

General REILLY. Yes.

[The information follows:]

TRAVIS ARG TOTAL REQUIREMENT/EXISTING ASSETS

The total requirement in the C–5 parking area is for 18 parking positions to be equipped with hydrant refueling. There are four positions now equipped and adequate. This project provides for 14 additional positions. Hydrant fueling positions at other locations on Travis AFB are adequate to support other aircraft parking or terminal operations, but they cannot adequately support the C–5 parking and maintenance ramp.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Mr. LONG. Strategic Air Command.

[Note: See p. 416 for further information.]

COMPARISONS OF SAC COASTAL BASES

Mr. LONG. Can you tell us how the various coastal bases for which funds are requested in this program are ranked according to your criteria for SAC bases?

Colonel REED. As I stated earlier, the criteria for base realinement actions are not criteria which can be used to determine numerical sequencing or ordinal listing of bases. They are used to evaluate bases under given conditions of force posturing and used in that manner. Therefore I don't think we can provide a listing or ranking of the bases, sir.

Mr. LONG. Can't you tell us which are better according to certain criteria?

Colonel REED. Certain bases perhaps could be characterized as better or worse on conditions of facilities. Certain bases might have encroachment problems, and so forth. But to build this matrix and to state here is a list or a matrix which ranks a given number of bases in order of their effectiveness would, I think, not be possible or meaningful.

Mr. LONG. Which ones are the ones that have encroachment problems?

Colonel REED. In current programs, sir? I would have to research the individual bases for the record. I am not prepared at this moment to state the encroachment problems at each base.

[The information follows:]

The 26 Conus SAC main operating bases at which strategic offensive operational forces are stationed are all scheduled for inclusion in our air installation compatible use zone program because they are susceptible to encroachment and protective measures must therefore be initiated. While two of these bases: Barksdale AFB, La., and March AFB, Calif., do have current encroachment problems, the problems are not serious or beyond resolution. These problems, in fact, were not of sufficient urgency for the base to be included in our fiscal year 1973 or 1974 AICUZ authorization requests. They will, however, be considered for inclusion in a future military construction program.

Mr. LONG. Which ones are the ones that have poorer facilities and which ones have special missions which would be hard to locate elsewhere? In other words, I think we need some material that will enable us to get our teeth into this.

General REILLY. Yes, sir. I think we would have to analyze these in some depth to provide you good answers on which ones we feel the facilities are not so good as at others.

[The information follows:]

TOPICAL HEADING: SAC Bases-Comparison of SAC Base Facilities Poorer Facilities.

The 26 CONUS SAC Main Operating Bases at which strategic offensive operational flying forces are stationed do not have any "special missions" in the context of unique or esoteric functions which could not be relocated given unlimited resources and time. However, as a practical matter under current operational concepts the Numbered Headquarters at March AFB, California and Barksdale AFB, Louisiana could not be relocated without very significant expenditure due to their extensive communications facilities associated with the strategic command and control mission. Additionally, some flying Main Operating Bases support strategic missile operations at Ellsworth AFB, North Dakota; Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota; McConnell AFB, Kansas; and Minot AFB, North Dakota. These missile functions are tied explicitly to their current geographic location and facilities, and could not be relocated. Further, major non-SAC missions exist at Altus AFB, Oklahoma; Dyess AFB, Texas; Griffiss AFB, N.Y., Lockbourne AFB, Ohio; Mather AFB, California; Robins AFB, Georgia; Seymour-Johnson AFB, North Carolina; Travis AFB, California; and Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio. As a practical matter these non-SAC missions could not be relocated except at great expense since no excess base capacity exists to accept them.

As previously stated, the base posture is tailored to fit the force structure, and with current force programs the base structure is considered near optimum. No assumption can be made concerning a single base relocation since the total force structure must be known so a complete evaluation of the base structure can be made. With the current authorized force, all SAC Main Operating Bases support essential missions which are critical to the national defense.

SAC MAIN OPERATING BASES INVENTORY

Main Operating Base	$ Value Total Inventory** ($000)	$ Value of Adequate Facilities (Code 1) ($000)	$ Value of Inadequate But Upgradeable Facilities (Code 2) ($000)	$ Cost To Upgrade Inadequate To Adequate ($000)	$ Value Of Forced Use Facilities (Code 3) ($000)	$ Cost Of Replacing Forced Use Facilities ($000) ***
Barksdale	107,067	92,074	14,342	4,735	651	10,359
Beale	126,838	108,629	12,881	13,610	5,328	33,629
Blytheville	51,933	48,042	3,640	2,578	251	12,501
Carswell	67,368	48,537	13,097	5,545	5,734	21,724
Castle	58,452	47,580	7,057	1,767	3,815	27,490
Dyess	70,026	59,154	10,739	8,472	133	8,577
Ellsworth	262,341	213,318	39,231	10,921	9,792	27,743
Fairchild	104,317	73,114	29,167	10,878	2,036	10,000
Grand Forks	298,403	291,565	5,819	4,743	1,019	46,123
Griffiss	137,060	89,328	41,620	13,529	6,058	19,601
K.I. Sawyer	94,240	79,733	14,242	9,734	265	34,618
Kincheloe	67,901	61,348	3,018	4,659	3,535	11,169
Loring	162,571	110,786	51,145	8,244	640	12,086
March	96,809	78,174	15,672	7,602	2,963	17,567
*Mather	11,707	6,689	4,994	1,603	24	60
Minot	248,869	245,781	3,030	4,589	58	43,149
Pease	95,073	89,086	5,323	5,868	664	24,734
Plattsburg	95,601	82,801	12,277	5,292	523	6,632
*Robins	5,293	4,307	961	0	25	0
*Seymour Johnson	5,809	5,198	603	26	8	62
*Wright-Patterson	4,931	3,240	1,626	0	65	0
Wurtsmith	85,309	76,022	8,580	4,011	707	15,588

*Value of SAC assigned facilities only as SAC is not the base host.

**Total does not include Real Estate Land Value, Sterile Facility Value, and Value of Facilities committed to disposal.

***Includes total deficiencies.

FUTURE CLOSURES OF SAC BASES

Mr. LONG. Are you anticipating additional closures of SAC bases as a result of force reductions which are planned now or in later years?

General REILLY. No, sir. The most recent realinements have reduced our base structure. We see no more in the foreseeable future.

Mr. LONG. You don't see them now, but do you rule that out?

Colonel REED. Any hypothesis would be possible as to the level of forces, depending on threat and budgetary restraints.

Mr. LONG. It all depends on the level of forces, right?

Colonel REED. It depends on level of forces.

Mr. LONG. You mean the level of SAC forces?

Colonel REED. Total forces within the Air Force, since it has to be an interplay of all missions, and we have to review the bases not only as the result of reductions of the SAC force, if that should occur, but what would be the residual force in other areas in our posturing. Just a hypothetical case could be exercised.

You might reduce strategic forces and determine your tactical level was appropriate. However, deployment overseas would not be appropriate. Therefore you would return some to the States. We would then need bases for tactical forces in the States so the payoff might be a reduction of SAC in the States with an increase of tactical basing in the States. That is why I say when you determine what bases would close or try to make statements about that, you have to have the total spectrum of what is happening within the Air Force in terms of force levels.

Mr. LONG. You have reduced or closed SAC B–52 bases with a capacity for 45 aircraft. Is it unreasonable for the committee to suspect that there may be further reductions of SAC bases in the future?

MODIFICATION OF B–52D AIRCRAFT

Colonel REED. The residual D model aircraft, which is the oldest aircraft staying in the fleet, is to be modified to increase its life expectancy. The aircraft that were phased out were phased out because they had reached the end of their airframe hours. The aircraft that are residual in the fleet have extensive airframe hours remaining, and I don't believe it is reasonable to anticipate further reductions in the strategic force.

Mr. LONG. Is the B–52 going to last forever?

Colonel REED. It is going to last a considerable time, at least into the era of the B–1, and that was the purpose of modifying the D model aircraft, to provide use into the future.

Mr. LONG. What do you feel is the time limit for the B–52?

Colonel REED. I don't foresee alterations.

Mr. LONG. Do you see this going on for another decade?

Colonel REED. Yes, sir. I see the B–52 into the 1980's.

Mr. LONG. Everybody keeps talking about the B–52 as barely able to get back to base.

Mr. DAVIS. Many people keep talking about the B–1 as if we had it, too.

BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LA.

Mr. LONG. Barksdale Air Force Base, La. Insert page 153 in the record.

[The page follows:]

BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE

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 is 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.

SAC—BARKSDALE AFB, LA.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Dental clinic	$55,320	25
Air-condition base headquarters facility	26,260	90

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	AWUB	LOUISIANA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1932	BOSSIER PARISH	ONE MILE EAST OF BOSSIER CITY, LOUISIANA, THREE MILES EAST OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

HEAVY BOMBARDMENT WING

SPECIAL OPERATIONS GROUP (RESERVE)

COMBAT EVALUATION GROUP

2nd AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,143	5,035	1,083	0	314	30	19	0	7,624
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	1,113	5,140	1,082	0	314	30	19	0	7,698

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	22,188	273	100,277	100,550
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	565	(1) 0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				100,550
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				3,251
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,743
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				2,400
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				107,944

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
540-243	Dental Clinic I		SF	17,700	1,200	17,700	1,200
610-243	Air Condition Base Headquarters Facility 32		SF	107,454	543	107,454	543
	TOTAL				1,743		1,743

DD FORM 1 OCT 71 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. LONG. What type of B–52 aircraft are stationed here? Is this a firm base?

General REILLY. B–52 and KC–135, yes, sir; a firm base.

Mr. LONG. What are you currently using for a dental clinic?

Colonel BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we are using a building constructed in 1954, which has inadequate space. It is poorly configured. It has utility systems problems, and we recommend that a new facility be constructed.

Mr. LONG. What would be the subsequent use of the current facilities?

Colonel BAIRD. It will be converted to nonmedical administrative space.

Mr. LONG. I note that the project to air-condition the base headquarters facility has a low priority of 32. Is this building partially air-conditioned at the present time?

General REILLY. Sir, not to my knowledge. I presume that some special purpose space, such as where they may have computer equipment or something like that, might be air-conditioned.

Mr. LONG. Put that in the record.

[The information follows:]

AIR-CONDITIONING FOR BARKSDALE BASE HEADQUARTERS FACILITY

At the present time, the two headquarters buildings (No. 502 and No. 503) at Barksdale AFB have air-conditioning for approximately 4,100 square feet of special purpose space within the total of 107,454 square feet included in the project.

In building No. 502 approximately 900 square feet of space for accounting and finance functions and approximately 2,300 square feet of space for data processing functions are air-conditioned. In building No. 503 approximately 900 square feet are air-conditioned for the office of special investigations (OSI) communications function.

Air-conditioning for these existing special purpose areas will be incorporated into the proposed new central system and the existing systems removed.

BLYTHEVILLE AIR FORCE BASE, ARK.

Mr. OBEY. Blytheville Air Force Base, Ark. Insert page 156 in the record.

[The page follows:]

BLYTHEVILLE AIR FORCE BASE

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 beyond economical repair and which contain less than half the required space needed to properly perform security activities.

SAC—BLYTHEVILLE AFB, ARK.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Security police facility	$4,700	95

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		BLYTHEVILLE AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	BWKR	ARKANSAS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942/1955	MISSISSIPPI	FOUR MILES NORTHWEST OF BLYTHEVILLE ARKANSAS 65 MILES NORTH OF MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

HEAVY BOMBARDMENT WING

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	413	2,311	399	0	0	12	20	0	3,155
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	403	2,454	400	0	0	12	20	0	3,289

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,071	247	50,187	50,434
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	642	23	0	23
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				50,457
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,182
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (Excludes $2,762,000 Family Housing)				140
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				3,500
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				55,279

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
730-833	Security Police Facility I		SF	3,500	140	3,500	140
	TOTAL				140		140

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZ.

Mr. OBEY. Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz. Insert page 158 in the record.

[The page follows:]

DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE

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.

SAC—DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB, ARIZ.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Refueling vehicle maintenance facility	$20,100	100

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	FENV	ARIZONA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1927	PIMA	FOUR MILES SOUTHEAST OF TUCSON, ARIZONA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

STRATEGIC MISSILE WING (TITAN)

STRATEGIC RECONNAISSANCE WING

TACTICAL FIGHTER WING (TACTICAL AIR COMMAND)

MILITARY AIRCRAFT STORAGE AND DISPOSITION CENTER (AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND)

STRATEGIC MISSILE DIVISION HEADQUARTERS

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,105	6,962	1,846	34	0	97	43	0	10,087
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	1,104	6,927	1,842	34	0	97	43	0	10,047

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	7,096	553	205,515	206,068
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	8,594	(6) 0	4,852	4,852
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				210,920
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Excludes $9,378,000 Family Housing)				2,097
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (Excludes $200,000 Mobile Home Spaces)				232
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				17,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				230,249

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
214-467	Refueling Vehicle Maintenance Facility I		SF	3,600	232	3,600	232
	TOTAL				232		232

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. OBEY. Are there no existing facilities in which the maintenance of refueling vehicles can be performed?

General REILLY. No, sir. We have been performing maintenance in the open, and there are just no adequate existing facilities in which this special type of work can be done safely.

Mr. OBEY. Have you restudied the requirement for a regional hospital at this location in the out years?

Colonel BAIRD. Yes, sir, we have. We have determined that there is not a requirement for a regional hospital at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base. However, we do feel that there is a requirement to modernize the present facility, and we have so programed in an out year.

DYESS AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Mr. OBEY. Dyess Air Force Base, Tex. Insert page 160 in the record.

[The page follows:]

DYESS AIR FORCE BASE

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.

SAC—DYESS AFB, TEX.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Runway	$58,000	100

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		DYESS AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	FNWZ	TEXAS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942/1955	TAYLOR	TWO MILES SOUTHWEST OF ABILENE, TEXAS

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

HEAVY BOMBARDMENT WING

TACTICAL AIRLIFT WING (TACTICAL AIR COMMAND)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	707	3,779	510	14	65	24	27	0	5,136
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	744	4,045	511	29	58	24	27	0	5,438

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	5,273	66	70,206	70,272
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	1,838	(1) 64	0	64
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				70,336
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				730
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				2,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				73,066

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
116-116	Runway 2	TAC	SY	45,288	730	45,288	730
	TOTAL				730		730

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. OBEY. What was the Air Force's rationale for deleting five B–52D's from this base rather than from some other coastal base?

Colonel REED. The squadron there had 20 aircraft. The deletion would bring it down to 15 which is the standard UE or unit equipage for those squadrons. Taking five from another coastal base would bring them down to 40 and give us a nonstandard unit. We felt a 15 aircraft unit would better meet its alert commitments and so forth in its posturing.

Mr. OBEY. What type of a runway are you requesting for $730,000?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, this is an assault strip for training, a 3,500-foot-long runway, 60 feet wide, with a hard surface, asphaltic concrete all weather service.

Mr. OBEY. For what kind of aircraft?

General REILLY. C–130 tactical airlift aircraft that are based at Dyess.

Mr. OBEY. Would you provide for the record weather data to support your contention that you need this to provide training during periods of bad weather.

General REILLY. Yes, sir; we will.

[The information follows:]

WEATHER CONDITIONS AT DYESS/SUPPORTING RUNWAY REQUIREMENT

The climatological data for the period July 1, 1971—October 1971 (referred to in the AF form 1391 for Dyess short-field takeoff and landing runway) is:

	Rain days	Inches
Month:		
July	7	3.87
August	16	8.92
September	7	6.62
October	9	1.93

The U.S. Weather Bureau reported 65 days of rain during last year. The climatological data for the last 6 months is:

	Rain days	Inches
Month:		
October 1972	10	6.4
November	9	.48
December	5	.05
January 1973	16	3.35
February	7	1.92
March	9	2.54
April	9	1.70

ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE, S. DAK.

Mr. OBEY. Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak. Insert page 162 in the record.

[The page follows:]

ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE

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. The 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.

SAC—ELLSWORTH AFB, S. DAK.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Communications and electronics shop	$40,000	80

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	FXBM	SOUTH DAKOTA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942/1947	MEADE	SEVEN MILES NORTHEAST OF RAPID CITY, SO.DAKOTA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

HEAVY BOMBARDMENT WING

STRATEGIC MISSILE WING(MINUTEMAN)

AIRBORNE COMMAND AND CONTROL SQUADRON

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,035	5,150	709	0	0	16	45	0	6,955
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	1,003	5,212	651	0	0	16	45	0	6,927

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	7,316	564	263,965	264,529
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	18,693	909	23	932
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				265,461
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				10,103
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				514
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				6,700
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				282,778

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
217-722	Communications and Electronics Shop I		SF	13,194	514	13,194	514
	TOTAL				514		514

DD FORM 1 OCT 74 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. OBEY. You are requesting a communications and electronics shop, largely to replace existing facilities. What type of systems are you repairing here?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, this has to do with the support of the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile wing at Ellsworth. It has to do with the maintenance and repair of the communications equipment used in support of that big complex.

Mr. OBEY. What will be done with existing substandard facilities?

General REILLY. They will be torn down, demolished, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Would this be equipment peculiar to the Minuteman or general base communications equipment?

General REILLY. No; it is not the normal base communications activity. This has to do with all the communications tying in all of the many Minuteman sites together, and their intra-wing communications. Of course they must be very responsive to directions through communications, so it is a very important function.

Mr. OBEY. Are there any questions?

Mr. DAVIS. This was the base that was substantially expanded at the time of Korea, wasn't it?

General REILLY. Did it come back in in the early fifties in Korea, Colonel Reed?

Colonel REED. I will research that for the record. However, not to my knowledge. I think it is a relatively permanent base and has been.

Mr. RIETMAN. Since 1947.

General REILLY. It was expanded due to increases in flying and ballistics missile missions.

Mr. DAVIS. They were put in mostly during Korea, weren't they?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. B–36's were assigned to the base at one time and it had been a SAC bomber base for some time when the missiles were added during the Korean War period.

[The information follows:]

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S.D., was activated in 1942 and has been in continuous operation except for a short period between September 1946 and March 1947. The base has been used as a training or operational base for strategic forces during this period. It has hosted B–17, B–29, and B–36 bombers and is currently a B–52 base. Since 1962 the base has also served as a Minuteman missile installation.

FRANCIS E. WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYO.

Mr. OBEY. Turn to Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo. Please insert page 164 in the record.

[The page follows:]

FRANCIS E. WARREN AIR FORCE BASE

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 facilities 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.

SAC—F. E. WARREN AFB, WYO.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Composite medical facility	$390,000	100

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		FRANCIS E. WARREN AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	GHLN	WYOMING

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1867	LARAMIE	ONE MILE WEST OF CHEYENNE, WYOMING

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

STRATEGIC MISSILE WING (MINUTEMAN)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	614	3,225	607	0	0	9	12	0	4,467
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	676	3,227	535	0	0	9	12	0	4,459

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	16,070	299	188,681	188,980
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	26,526	(1) 1,502	2,745	4,247
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				193,227
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				5,834
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				3,500
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				202,561

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
510-001	Composite Medical Facility I		SF	86,000	5,834	86,000	5,834
	TOTAL				5,834		5,834

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

501

Mr. OBEY. What type of hospital facilities are you using at the present time?

Colonel BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we are using seven structures as a medical facility at Francis E. Warren Air Force Base. The main structure of 77,200 square feet was constructed in 1887. There are support facilities such as a dental clinic, a dispensary structure, dining halls and medical supply structures which were built in years ranging from 33 to 59 years ago.

Mr. OBEY. Would you provide for the record your workload for fiscal years 1968 through 1977.

[The information follows:]

WORKLOAD FOR USAF HOSPITAL F. E. WARREN

Fiscal year	Outpatient visits	ADPL [1]	X-ray	Lab procedures [2]	Prescriptions
Actual:					
1968	54,347	25.0	27,326	55,172	81,642
1969	56,162	21.6	28,674	52,531	69,679
1970	58,001	23.3	29,376	60,092	65,685
1971	65,638	23.2	39,134	121,328	80,215
1972	56,365	21.2	32,777	97,373	76,754
Projected:					
1973	50,885	17.0	34,020	103,500	79,650
1974	49,000	15.0	35,000	107,000	82,000
1975	49,000	15.0	36,000	110,000	85,000
1976	53,000	18.0	39,000	119,000	92,000
1977	65,000	23.0	47,800	146,000	113,000

[1] Average daily patient load.
[2] Laboratory specimens were reported prior to Jan. 1, 1970. Specimens and procedures are not equal units of measure. ment.

The mathematical basis for programing this facility is a historical and projected fiscal year 1977 average daily patient load of 23, plus a dispersion factor of 16 beds, as authorized by DOD criteria to allow for beds rendered unusable due to a patient's age, sex, or condition, plus 2 beds as authorized by DOD as a 5-percent additive factor for nonteaching hospitals to accommodate retired military personnel and their dependents. These figures dictate a mathematical programing base of 41 beds which converts to a design objective of 40 beds for this facility.

Mr. OBEY. Your workload apparently doesn't show a significant increase over the 10-year period. What specialists will be accommodated in the new hospital?

Colonel BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this is primarily a base hospital. We will have few specialists, primarily a pediatrician and internal medicine specialists.

Mr. OBEY. What geographic area does this hospital support?

Colonel BAIRD. It supports Francis E. Warren Air Force Base and the immediate surroundings only.

Mr. OBEY. How far is this from Fitzsimons Army Medical Center in Denver?

General REILLY. Something like 85 miles.

Colonel BAIRD. Approximately 2 hours driving time. I believe it is around 110 or 130 miles.

Mr. OBEY. Could you make greater use of this center for your specialized support?

General REILLY. Yes, the Fitzsimons Medical Center is used extensively for specialized support.

Colonel BAIRD. That is correct.

Mr. OBEY. What are the major deficiencies of the current hospital?

Colonel BAIRD. Primarily the deficiencies have to do with a structure that is 85 years old. It was built back when we didn't practice medicine as we do today. The hospital we have now has open wards. We are unable to configure them into private or simiprivate rooms because the width of the wards themselves will not permit us to put two rooms on each side of a corridor. The clinical services occupy a portion of the basement. The buildings have exposed pipes, concrete exposed walls, and generally professionally obsolete, inadequate facilities. The individual buildings are also dispersed. As I said, we have seven buildings in that particular location. Movement of personnel and patients between seven buildings in the heavy snow load areas is most difficult.

OFFICER POPULATION

Mr. OBEY. Could I just ask a general question? On Francis E. Warren Base, and also going back to Hickam, if we can, I notice on the sheet here at Warren that the number of officers goes up from 614 to 678, from 1972 to 1976 in your planning. Civilians are going down; enlisted men are staying the same; but officers are going up. At Hickam there is quite a marked difference, 1,316 officers in December 1971, and an increase of 300 planned by 1976. Enlisted men declined somewhat there, and civilians declined somewhat. I was just curious as to the reason for the difference here as opposed to some of the others, where the ratio between officers and enlisted men stayed somewhat the same.

General REILLY. I don't know. I would have to research this. I would think the officer changes at Francis E. Warren are just those which we would normally anticipate over a period of years as the levels of manning change within the various base organizations. The larger increase at Hickam I just don't know.

Mr. OBEY. I just noticed that at these two locations there seemed to be a much greater difference between what was happening with the officer corps and what was happening with enlisted and civilian personnel. Why don't you submit something for the record on that.

General REILLY. Yes, sir, I will have to find out with what units those increasing number of officers are associated. Sometimes it can mean an increase in numbers of aircraft with an increased number of people in air crews or changing aircraft from a one seater to a two seater or something like that, but I don't see any key or clue here as to just what is happening. Let us look that one over for you.

[The information follows:]

REASON FOR INCREASE IN OFFICERS AT F. E. WARREN

The increase of 64 officers at F. E. Warren is due to actions related to the conversion from Minuteman I to Minuteman III. The Minuteman III requires a higher crew ratio so the number of officers in the 319th, 320th, and 321st Strategic Missile Squadrons increases by 28 each. This increase is partially offset by the loss of conversion team authorizations in the 90 Strategic Missile Wing and detachments of the Air Force Contract Management Office and the Space and Missile Systems Organization.

The fiscal year 1972 officer figure for Hickam is in error. The number should be 1,616 and the total figure should read 13,975 instead of 13,675; thus the change is a decrease of one officer at that location.

GRISSOM AIR FORCE BASE, IND.

Mr. OBEY. Grissom Air Force Base, Ind. Insert page 166 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 7h MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		GRISSOM AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	CIGC	INDIANA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1955	MIAMI	2 MILES WEST OF BUNKER HILL, INDIANA 9 MILES SOUTH OF PERU, INDIANA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

AIR REFUELING WING

AIRBORNE COMMAND AND CONTROL SQUADRON

SPECIAL OPERATIONS WING (RESERVE)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	474	2,654	714	0	0	36	24	0	3,902
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	492	2,573	707	0	0	36	24	0	3,832

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	2731	798	75,507	76,305
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	323	170	0	170
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				76,475
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				877
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				3,100
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				3,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				83,452

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
722-211	Alter Airmen Dormitories 24		MN	1,050	3,100	1,050	3,100
	TOTAL				3,100		3,100

DD FORM 1 OCT 74 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

GRISSOM AIR FORCE BASE

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.

SAC—GRISSOM AFB, IND.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Alter airmen dormitories	$217,400	80

Enlisted barracks summary, Grissom AFB, Indiana

	Men/ Women [1]
Total requirement	1,050
Existing substandard [2]	1,669
Existing adequate [3]	0
Funded, not in inventory	0
Adequate assets	0
Deficiency	1,050
Fiscal year 1974 program	1,050
Barracks spaces occupied (average) March 31, 1973	1,292

[1] 90 square feet per man, permanent party E2-4, 135 square feet per man, permanent party E5-6.
[2] All spaces upgradable.
[3] None in private housing.

Mr. OBEY. You have a total of 1,669 dormitory spaces on base, all of which are upgradable?

General REILLY. They are all substandard. Whether they are all upgradable or not I don't know.

Colonel SHOOK. Yes, sir, they are.

Mr. OBEY. How did you arrive at 1,050 spaces to be upgraded in this year's program at a cost of $3,100,000? How will this work be phased?

Colonel SHOOK. Sir, it is based upon the projected end-position requirements for airmen spaces. We have more dorms there than we will need for end-position requirements. In this particular case we are modernizing and upgrading 11 out of 16 buildings located on the base. This is all that OSD will allow us to upgrade because this is all we project the requirement for with our final force posture, sir. It will complete our requirement for dormitory spaces.

The phasing of work will depend upon the final design. However, it most likely will be two or three buildings at a time.

KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE, MICH.

Mr. OBEY. Kincheloe Air Force Base, Mich. Place page 168 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	5. INSTALLATION
	AF		KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	MERM	MICHIGAN

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942/1952	CHIPPEWA	THREE MILES NORTH NORTHEAST OF KINROSS, MICH.

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

HEAVY BOMBARDMENT WING

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	412	2497	414	0	0	12	12	0	3,347
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	401	2627	414	0	0	12	12	0	3,466

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	847	12	21,065	21,077
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	4,766	7	61,971	61,978
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				83,055
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				2,005
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,430
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				5,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				92,490

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
131-111	Add to and Alter Base Communications Facility I		SF	7,984	219	7,984	219
134-375	Radar Flight Control Center I		SF	5,168	456	5,168	456
722-211	Airmen Dormitories I		MN	250	1,755	250	1,755
	TOTAL				2,430		2,430

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE

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.

SAC—KINCHELOE AFB, MICH.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Add to and alter base communications facility	$16,500	80
Radar flight control center	18,500	80
Airmen dormitories	67,000	90

Enlisted Barracks Summary, Kincheloe AFB, Mich.

	[1] Men/Women
Total requirement	1333
Existing substandard [2]	470
Existing adequate [3]	765
Funded, not in inventory	0
Adequate assets	765
Deficiency	568
Fiscal year 1974 program	250
Barracks spaces occupied (average) March 31, 1973	1079

[1] 90 square feet per man—permanent party E2-4, 135 square feet per man—permanent party E5-6, 270 square feet per man—permanent party E7-9.
[2] None upgradable.
[3] Includes 45 personnel in private housing.

Mr. OBEY. When is the new digital subscriber terminal equipment scheduled to be delivered to the base communications facility at Kincheloe?

General REILLY. Sir, I would have to give you the exact date. The installation of this equipment has been phased over several years. This will be available coincidentally with the completion of the construction. I can provide the details as to just when it will be delivered.

(The information follows:)

The digital subscriber terminal equipment for Kincheloe has been procured and is scheduled to be delivered to Kincheloe during fiscal year April 1974. The exact date the equipment will be delivered is dependent on the completion date of the associated military construction project.

Mr. OBEY. Is the addition to the present facility the only way to accommodate it?

General REILLY. Sir, the project provides for interior alteration as well as additional space. This is the best arrangement to actually improve our existing facility.

MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONT.

Mr. OBEY. Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont. Insert page 172 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	NZAS	MONTANA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942	CASCADE	5 MILES EAST OF GREAT FALLS, MONTANA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

STRATEGIC MISSILE WING (MINUTEMAN)

DEFENSE SYSTEM EVALUATION SQUADRON
(AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	878	4421	624	0	0	20	40	0	5,983
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	898	4467	640	0	0	20	40	0	6,065

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	4,617	646	264,388	265,034
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	(3)	1,172	59	1,231
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				266,265
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,667
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,507
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				5,700
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				275,139

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
212-218	Alter Missile Maintenance Support Facility 21		SF	65,734	600	65,734	600
722-211	Airmen Dormitories I		MN	160	907	160	907
	TOTAL				1,507		1,507

DD FORM 1 OCT 76 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Malmstrom Air Force Base

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. The $1,507,000 is requested for construction of two items, as follows:

Item 1 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.

SAC—MALMSTROM AFB, MONT.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Alter missile maintenance support facility	$25,110	25
Airmen dormitories	64,500	25

Enlisted barracks summary, Malmstrom AFB, Mont.

	[1] Men/Women
Total requirement	1,986
Existing substandard [2]	376
Existing adequate [3]	1,647
Funded, not in inventory	0
Adequate assets	1,647
Deficiency	339
Fiscal year 1974 program	160
Barracks spaces occupied (average) March 31, 1973	1,496

[1] 90 square feet per man—permanent party E2-4.
[2] None upgradable.
[3] Includes 70 personnel in private housing.

Mr. Obey. Can you show savings from the alterations of the missile maintenance facilities you are proposing?

General Reilly. Sir, I don't have anything noted here. May I research that and see just what savings we can come up with.

[The information follows:]

This project is primarily required to fill mission requirements. As such, most of the savings are in terms of hard-to-quantify intangible savings. Examples are increased reliability of work accomplished and, therefore, the weapon system supported; reduced repair time; less rework; etc. It is very difficult to build an economic analysis on a project of this type and none has been accomplished. Therefore, savings have not been quantified.

Mr. Obey. For airmen dormitories you appear to be programing above the 90 percent level, apparently by a margin of 20 units. Why?

Colonel Shook. I would like to point out first of all, sir, that OSD normally limits us to 90 percent of our projected end-position requirements. This is not a hard and fast ruling; this is a normal programing constraint. In this particular case we are only going with 91 percent which is just very slightly over the 90 percent criterion. This is a northern tier location, and generally speaking we try to provide facilities on the base at these type locations, sir.

Mr. OBEY. Why don't you provide for the record some other places where you are doing this.

Colonel SHOOK. Where we are exceeding 90 percent, sir?

Mr. OBEY. Yes.

Colonel SHOOK. All right.

[The information follows:]

As previously stated, we program on-base housing for bachelors at our northern tier locations and where community support housing is either limited or nonexistent. In addition we program on-base housing where community support assets exceed the financial capabilities of our personnel. This happens many times at bases located in tourist areas. Some examples of recent programing in excess of the OSD 90 percent general criterion are listed below. All projects were for new dormitory construction and were approved in the fiscal year 1973 MCP.

ASSETS

Base	Requirement	On base	Off base	Approved project	New adequate housing level (percent)
Homestead	3,460	3,026	28	360	99
Minot	2,330	1,860	78	240	93
Reese	656	426	58	144	96

Mr. OBEY. Are you proposing to build relocatable dormitories here?

Colonel SHOOK. No, sir.

Mr. OBEY. Why not?

General REILLY. Sir, our standard dormitory for 1974 will be of conventional construction. We have a pilot program underway in the 1972 program for relocatable dorms, and we are going to wait for experience from that program before considering additional ones.

McCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE, KANS.

Mr. OBEY. McConnell Air Force Base, Kans. Insert page 175 in the record.

[The page follows:]

McCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE

The 10th installation is McConnell Air Force Base, located 5 miles south, southeast of Wichita, Kans. McConnell supports a missile wing, an 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 presently being accomplished on open ramps. Corrosion control is severely hampered or impossible in winter. Isolated fuel cell repair activities, using mobile purge equipment, results in delays, inefficiencies, and increased workloads.

SAC—McCONNELL AFB, KANS.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Aircraft corrosion control and maintenance facility	$76,000	55

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	PRQE	KANSAS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1951	SEDGWICK	FIVE MILES SOUTH SOUTHEAST OF WICHITA, KANSAS

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

STRATEGIC MISSILE WING (TITAN)

AIR REFUELING SQUADRON

TACTICAL FIGHTER SQUADRON (TACTICAL AIR COMMAND)

TACTICAL FIGHTER TRAINING GROUP (AIR NATIONAL GUARD)

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	636	3,912	533	0	0	36	70	0	5,187
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	627	3,786	533	0	0	36	70	0	5,052

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	2,853	1,550	185,851	187,401
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	4,709	258	20	278
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				187,679
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,042
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				3,600
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				192,321

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
211-159	Aircraft Corrosion Control and Maintenance Facility I		SF	30,300	1,042	30,300	1,042
	TOTAL				1,042		1,042

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

RELOCATIONS OF ACTIVITIES

Mr. OBEY. You are planning to increase the KC–135 mission here, is that correct?

General REILLY. Sir, I think it actually reduces. There is some increase from McCoy.

Colonel REED. There is an increase of 10 tankers coming from McCoy Air Force Base.

Mr. OBEY. Will that result in any problems?

Colonel REED. It is offset by the reduction of an F–105 fighter unit which moves from McConnell Air Force Base to George Air Force Base, so the total base loading stays about the same in terms of population. There are sufficient maintenance and support facilities to handle the aircraft. What happens is that there are 20 aircraft currently stationed there, 10 come aboard for a total of 30, and we form two, 15–UE squadrons.

Mr. OBEY. Provide details for the record of whatever additional facilities might be required.

[The information follows:]

ADDITIONAL FACILITIES REQUIRED FOR KC–135 INCREASE AT MCCONNELL

We have identified no additional facility requirements at McConnell Air Force Base as a result of base realinement actions.

CORROSION CONTROL AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY

Mr. OBEY. How long have you been performing corrosion control on open ramps?

Colonel MANSPERGER. Ever since KC–135's have been there, and I believe that is at least 2 to 3 years. That is approximately the correct length of time.

Mr. OBEY. Why is that inadequate for KC–135 aircraft?

Colonel MANSPERGER. Sir, the fuel cells in an aircraft are generally made of rubber or rubberized material. Then they are sealed with a sealant. When we work on these fuel cells, we have a safety problem in that if the personnel working inhale too much of the fumes they will get sick and can actually pass out. We must have some type of ventilation system to pull the fumes away from the cells as people are working in them. We must also have warning devices that warn the personnel when the fumes get too high. We must also be able to control the temperature. If it is too hot, the sealant sets up too quickly and does not allow sufficient time to work on it. If it is too cold, it will not set up quickly enough. Working on the ramps also exposes the cells to windblown contaminates that present safety problems.

Mr. OBEY. It was my understanding that this was a corrosion control facility and not for fuel cell maintenance.

General REILLY. It is a combined facility.

Colonel MANSPERGER. To economize in this case, since we only have the one type aircraft there, both functions will be accomplished in one facility. Both the fuel cell and corrosive control activities require control of ventilation, control of temperatures, and special drains to control pollution. Therefore, in this case, the two activities can be accommodated by the one facility.

OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, NEBR.

Mr. OBEY. Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr. Insert page 177 in the record.

[The page follows:]

OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE

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, an airborne command and control squadron, the Headquarters of 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 lineal feet of runway approach lighting. Lighting will help alleviate the hazardous flying conditions while landing during periods of darkness and reduced visibility.

SAC—OFFUTT AFB, NEBR.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete July 31, 1973
Runway approach lighting	$40,600	20

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	SGBP	NEBRASKA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1888	SARPY	EIGHT MILES SOUTH SOUTHEAST OF OMAHA, NEBRASKA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

STRATEGIC RECONNAISSANCE WING

AIRBORNE COMMAND AND CONTROL SQUADRON

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND HEADQUARTERS

AEROSPACE RECONNAISSANCE TECHNICAL WING

WEATHER WING (MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	3,009	8,377	1,914	34	35	68	61	0	13,498
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	2,990	8,236	1,913	34	35	68	61	0	13,337

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,417	1,193	141,882	143,075
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		(3) 26	313	339
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				143,414
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				5,271
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				617
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				8,200
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				157,502

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
136-661	Runway Approach Lighting I		LF	2,000	617	2,000	617
	TOTAL				617		617

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. OBEY. Will the project for runway approach lighting here complete the requirements?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, it will.

PEASE AIR FORCE BASE, N.H.

Mr. OBEY. Pease Air Force Base, N.H. Please insert page 179 in the record.

[The page follows:]

PEASE AIR FORCE BASE

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 1 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 are 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.

SAC—PEASE AFB, N.H.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete July 31, 1973
Alter aircraft corrosion control facility	$13,800	65
Alter electric substation	13,600	80

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		PEASE AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	SZDT	NEW HAMPSHIRE

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1956	ROCKINGHAM	THREE MILES WEST NORTHWEST OF PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

MEDIUM BOMBARDMENT WING

TACTICAL AIRLIFT SQUADRON (AIR NATIONAL GUARD)

AIR RESCUE AND RECOVERY SQUADRON
(MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	512	3,350	503	0	0	24	55	0	4,444
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	515	3,371	501	0	0	24	55	0	4,466

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	4,320	1,369	94,402	95,771
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	57	40	0	40
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				95,811
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				8,128
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (Excludes $150,000 Mobile Home Spaces)				526
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				6,400
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				110,865

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
211-159	Alter Aircraft Corrosion Control Facility I		SF	28,616	256	28,616	256
812-231	Alter Electric Substation I		KVA	7,500	270	7,500	270
	TOTAL				526		526

DD FORM 1 OCT 76 1390

Mr. OBEY. Apparently this is a good location for FB–111's. Why is that?

Colonel REED. Primarily range. The aircraft is based in the northeast quadrant in order to strike its targets due to its range and fuel requirements. From a strategic requirement it is a good location. Additionally, it has good facilities to support the aircraft and facilities have been provided specifically for the FB–111 mission.

Mr. OBEY. In your judgment it is a firm base?

Colonel REED. Yes, sir.

Mr. OBEY. What type of alterations are you proposing? Will this be the same hangar you are presently utilizing for this purpose?

Colonel RUTLAND. Yes, sir; this is the same facility that we are currently utilizing. What we are primarily doing here is modifying the partitions, the floor, electrical and mechanical systems appropriately to make this a corrosion-control facility. We do have a storage area and a 30-by-20 office area within the structure. We are putting in hot water converters and pipes to service the units. There will be a 6,000-gallon detergent tank. There will be exhaust ducting service outlets, a new rollup door, and a concrete overlay sloped to drain to the existing floor drains, sir.

PLATTSBURGH AIR FORCE BASE, N.Y.

Mr. OBEY. Turn to Plattsburgh Air Force Base, N.Y., and insert page 182 in the record.

[The page follows:]

PLATTSBURGH AIR FORCE BASE

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. The structure currently utilized is too low and too small resulting in a portion of large aircraft extending outside the building. Inclement weather renders effective work on exposed portions of the aircraft impossible.

SAC—PLATTSBURGH AFB, N.Y.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Alter aircraft corrosion control facility	$12,870	20

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		PLATTSBURGH AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	THWA	NEW YORK

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1812/1955	CLINTON	TWO MILES SOUTHWEST OF PLATTSBURGH, NEW YORK

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

MEDIUM BOMBARDMENT WING

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	577	3,314	482	20	0	29	52	0	4,474
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	583	3,439	480	20	0	29	52	0	4,603

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	8,895	1,583	97,158	98,741
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	1,432	200	0	200
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				98,941
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				286
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				1,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				100,227

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
211-159	Alter Aircraft Corrosion Control Facility I		SF	24,364	286	24,364	286
	TOTAL				286		286

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. OBEY. Does the same consideration with regard to the basing of FB–111's apply here as at Pease?

Colonel REED. Yes, sir.

IMPACT OF RELOCATIONS

Mr. OBEY. How will you accommodate the 10 additional KC–135 aircraft and the attendant personnel.

Colonel REED. Sir, the review of the base facilities indicated there were sufficient personnel support facilities and direct support facilities to accommodate 10 aircraft without additional facilities being provided.

Mr. OBEY. Have you reviewed the family housing situation at this base, particularly the availability of four-bedroom units, to determine the impact of the additional mission here?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir. The number of four-bedroom units at Plattsburgh is relatively small in comparison to threes and twos. We have been considering a project at Plattsburgh for the last 2 or 3 years to add additional bedrooms to some of our two-bedroom units. However, because of the other higher priority projects we have not yet accomplished that particular project at Plattsburgh. It will be given consideration maybe in next year's program, sir.

VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

Mr. LONG. Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. Insert page 184 in the record.

[The page follows:]

VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE

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.

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Data collection theodolite stations	$19,300	100

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	XUMU	CALIFORNIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1941	SANTA BARBARA	8 MILES NORTHWEST OF LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA 130 MILES NORTHWEST OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

STRATEGIC AEROSPACE DIVISION HEADQUARTERS

MISSILE COMBAT CREW TRAINING SQUADRON

STRATEGIC MISSILE EVALUATION SQUADRON

SPACE AND MISSILE TEST CENTER (AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND)

AEROSPACE DEFENSE SQUADRON (AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND)

AEROSPACE TEST WING (AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,201	4,709	1,747	150	100	30	62	7	8,006
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	1,130	4,696	1,746	150	100	30	62	7	7,921

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	98,809	12,304	369,928	382,232
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		5	46	51
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				382,283
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				4,285
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				220
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				13,400
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				400,188

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
390-485	Data Collection Theodolite Stations I	AFSC	EA	3	220	3	220
	TOTAL				220		220

DD FORM 1 OCT 74 1390 CONGR[illegible]

Page No. 184

522

Mr. LONG. What are you currently using to monitor launches in lieu of the requested theodolite stations?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we are now using trailer mounted equipment.

Mr. LONG. What is a theodolite?

General REILLY. It is an instrument used to precisely locate a missile in space with regard to position and time throughout the missile flight path. It is a surveying instrument. It has been used many years in surveying, and it is very comparable to a transit. At the present time mobile equipment is used which must be transported back and forth from the main base to the instrumentation sites. Since this is very sensitive optical equipment it is not a good practice to do this. This project will provide protective, fixed shelter and stable platforms for these rather sensitive pieces of equipment.

Mr. LONG. What is the precise reason for the inadequacies of the present facility?

General REILLY. Sir, at the present time there are no shelters existing. The equipment is simply moved into place mounted on an open trailer bed and is exposed to the weather.

Mr. LONG. The main problem is a lack of shelter?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. We would like to have a stable platform and leave the equipment there as opposed to moving it in and out.

SPACE SHUTTLE

Mr. LONG. If it becomes necessary to build a polar launch complex for the Space Shuttle, what allowance are you making for this in your base planning at Vandenberg?

General REILLY. Sir, are you speaking of Space Shuttle facilities now?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

General REILLY. Sir, the planning has not progressed very far. It will be a number of years before we would even go into the Space Shuttle program, so we really don't have anything pinned down too precisely at this point in time. We know generally what will be required, and we feel that it can be accommodated at Vandenberg, although a lot of construction will be involved.

WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MO.

Mr. LONG. Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo. Insert page 186 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	YWHG	MISSOURI

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942/1951	JOHNSON	25 MILES WEST OF SEDALIA, MISSOURI

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

STRATEGIC MISSILE WING (MINUTEMAN)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	534	2,781	436	0	0	20	20	0	3,791
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	554	2,788	446	0	0	20	20	0	3,828

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	4,062	458	152,758	153,216
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	21,491	(51) 2,084	66	2,150
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				155,366
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				3,892
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				8,800
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				168,058

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
217-722	Communications and Electronics Shop I		SF	10,560	376	10,560	376
722-211	Alter Airmen Dormitories I		MN	1,045	3,516	1,045	3,516
	TOTAL				3,892		3,892

DD FORM 1 OCT 74 1390 CONFIDENTIAL

Whiteman Air Force Base

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 1 is for a new communications and electronics shop with a scope of 10,560 square feet. Inadequate facilities, poor environmental control, deterioration, separated locations, and crowding make 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.

SAC—WHITEMAN AFB, MO.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Communications and electronics shop	$22,600	80
Alter airmen dormitories	246,000	80

Enlisted Barracks Summary, Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo.

	[1] *Men/Women*
Total requirement	1,086
Existing substandard	[2] 1,045
Existing adequate	[3] 41
Funded, not in inventory	0
Adequate assets	41
Deficiency	1,045
Fiscal year 1974 program	1,045
Barracks spaces occupied (average) 31 March 1973	1,090

[1] 90 ft² per man—permanent party E2-4; 135 ft² per man—permanent party E5-6.
[2] All spaces upgradable.
[3] All in private housing.

Mr. Long. How are you planning to phase the dormitory alterations here?

Colonel Shook. Sir, the project is still under design. The actual work will be done, we assume, probably two to three buildings at a time, but a final decision hasn't been made on that yet.

Mr. Long. Over what period will this be done?

Colonel Shook. One year, sir.

Mr. Reilly. It will take about a year to build these.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich.

Mr. Long. Turn to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich. Please insert page 189 in the record.

[The page follows:]

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—WURTSMITH AFB, MICH.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Alter aircraft corrosion control facility	$17,000	90
Add to and alter chapel center	22,100	90

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		WURTSMITH AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	ZJXD	MICHIGAN

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1926/1951	IOSCO	THREE MILES NORTHWEST OF OSCODA, MICHIGAN

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

HEAVY BOMBARDMENT WING

STRATEGIC AIR DIVISION HEADQUARTERS

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	474	3085	432	0	0	12	44	0	4,047
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	414	2674	423	0	0	12	44	0	3,567

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	1,903	622	74,733	75,355
b. LEASED AND EASEMENTS	3,315	0	12,235	12,235
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				87,590
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,278
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM	Excludes $255,000 Mobile Home Spaces			616
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				3,100
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				92,584

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b Priority	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
211-159	Alter Aircraft Corrosion Control Facility I		SF	32,548	175	32,548	175
740-236	Add to and Alter Chapel Center I		SF	10,336	441	10,336	441
	TOTAL				616		616

DD FORM 1 OCT 76 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. LONG. What is SAC's policy on the joint usage of chapel centers?

Colonel MOORE. The SAC policy, sir, is identical with that of the Chief of Chaplains. Any other organization may use the base chapel working around our schedule. They can use the facilities working around our schedule of activities.

Mr. LONG. For any community activities of any kind?

Colonel MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. You mean a local Rotary club?

Colonel MOORE. No, sir. That is not an Air Force organization.

Mr. LONG. You mean military community?

Colonel MOORE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Does that include a peace movement?

Colonel MOORE. I don't think I will answer that.

Mr. LONG. You are probably just as wise. Will these two projects complete the requirements in their respective areas?

General REILLY. Sir, with the exception of the chapel we will still have a deficiency in chapel facilities.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Mr. LONG. Various locations. Insert page 192 in the record.

[The page follows:]

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, checkout, and store components and fully assembled missiles. This item completes the multiyear phased program for providing SRAM facilities on selected bomber bases.

SAC—VARIOUS LOCATIONS—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Aircraft instrument landing facilities	$81,300	15
Short range attack missile (SRAM) facilities	59,300	80

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		VARIOUS

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND	N/A	VARIOUS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	N/A	N/A	N/A

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

VARIOUS FLYING MISSIONS

SHORT RANGE ATTACK MISSILE

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December ___									
b. PLANNED (End FY)									

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED				
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		( )		
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 18 ___				
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
134-352	Aircraft Instrument Landing Facilities I		LS	LS	1,321	LS	1,321
200-000	Short Range Attack Missile (SRAM) Facilities I		LS	LS	988	LS	988
	TOTAL				2,309		2,309

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. LONG. By including instrument landing facilities and SRAM facilities under the heading "Various," do you gain any greater flexibility with regard to authorization limits?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, it does provide us a major flexibility. These are small projects dollarwise. As design progresses we may find some variation in these costs. This does provide us with a degree of flexibility.

Mr. LONG. Is that why you do it, why you lump them together?

General REILLY. That is one reason, sir. It is also to reflect the entire program. We have ILS facilities at 18 bases, for example. It is a convenient way of grouping them and addressing the total requirement as opposed to seeing them on 18 different base listings.

SRAM FACILITIES

Mr. LONG. Will the instrument landing and SRAM facilities complete the requirements for these programs?

General REILLY. Sir, it will not complete the requirement for the ILS. We will still have other bases to be equipped with the new equipment in subsequent programs. It will complete the SRAM program. We have had SRAM facilities in several programs now. This will complete the program in support of the B–52.

Mr. LONG. What does that acronym stand for?

General REILLY. Short range attack missile.

Mr. LONG. The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Mr. LONG. The committee will come to order.

We will take up the Tactical Air Command.

Insert page 196 in the record.

[The page follows:]

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The Tactical Air Command participates in tactical air operations employing air operations and air power 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.

Department of the Air Force military construction program, Tactical Air Command, fiscal year 1974

Installation:	*Proposed programs in thousands*
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Tex	$2,273
Cannon Air Force Base, N. Mex	162
England Air Force Base, La	183
Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex	2,432
Langley Air Force Base, Va	503
Little Rock Air Force Base, Ark	1,165
Luke Air Force Base, Ariz	2,986
MacDill Air Force Base, Fla	2,657
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho	253
Nellis Air Force Base, Nev	2,588
Shaw Air Force Base, S.C	2,501
Total	17,703

PLANS FOR BASING F–15 AIRCRAFT

Mr. LONG. We have previously discussed somewhat the progress of your plans for basing F–15 aircraft. Can you tell us at this time, or provide it for the record, whether F–15 aircraft will be additive to the F–4 force, will replace them on a one-for-one basis, or will replace a greater number of F–4's.

Colonel REED. The F–15 is not a replacement aircraft per se for the F–4. There will be some reduction in the F–4 inventory, not on a one-for-one basis.

The major role of the F–15 is air to air, whereas the F–4, although carrying out an air-to-air role has an air-to-ground role, so their roles are not compatible. There will be no one-to-one replacement.

Mr. LONG. So you will be adding more F–15's than you will be reducing F–4's?

Colonel REED. That is correct, sir.

Mr. LONG. Will the single-pilot F–15 reduce the requirement for officer housing or other support substantially?

Colonel REED. In general the housing requirements in the officer bachelor area—I am preempting Colonel Shook, I recognize—has been provided for the permanent party in an offbase mode so therefore we have not built large numbers of these units and I would think the reduction in the crew ratio would be rather nominal. Twenty-four aircraft, three squadrons to a base, 72 aircraft, approximately maybe 100 officers involved in the reduction of the base.

Mr. LONG. A 100-officer reduction. So there will be some reduction in requirement for officer housing and other support?

Colonel REED. Yes, sir.

General REILLY. There will be some reduction; yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. It is fair to say it will be a substantial reduction.

Colonel REED. No, sir; I have to say nominal. We are talking bases in the neighborhood of 700, 800 officers and we have a reduction of perhaps one-seventh, one-eighth normally.

Mr. LONG. As much as 100.

Colonel REED. As much as 100. Exact numbers we would have to provide for the record, the difference in two wings.

[The information follows:]

REDUCTION IN OFFICER REQUIREMENTS WITH F–15

The difference in officer authorizations between a 72-aircraft fighter wing with a two crewmember aircraft such as the F–4 and a single crewmember fighter aircraft wing such as the F–15 is 90 less officer authorizations in the single crewmember wing.

FLYING HOURS—TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Mr. LONG. What are the approved flying hours for TAC in fiscal year 1974, exclusive of Southeast Asia?

Generally REILLY. Sir, I don't have that. May I furnish that for the record?

Mr. LONG. Also indicate how this compares to flying hour programs in previous years.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

TAC FLYING HOUR PROGRAM

Currently the wartime flying rate for TAC fighters is 50 hours per month. This compares to 60 hours in years prior to fiscal 1973. These flying hour rates are exclusive of SEA activity.

SINGLE WING BASING

Mr. LONG. What were the approved flying hours when the TAC single wing basing plan was established?

General REILLY. We don't have that, sir. May we provide that also?

Mr. LONG. Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

TAC FLYING HOURS BASED ON SINGLE WING BASING PLAN

The approved wartime flying hour rate at the time the TAC single wing basing plan was established was 60 hours per month for fighter aircraft.

This flying hour rate is exclusive of SEA activity.

Mr. LONG. Do you have any idea whether they have gone down?

Colonel REED. They have gone down.

Mr. LONG. Substantially?

Colonel REED. Sir, I would be speculating to tell you the exact amount.

Mr. LONG. They have gone down noticeably, because you have noticed it?

Colonel REED. Sir, I notice many things. A small reduction maybe is significant in fighter force when you are talking about proficiency, but it has gone down since the original single wing to a base concept that was presented to this committee several years ago.

Mr. LONG. What was the TAC crew ratio when the single wing plan was established, and what is it now?

General REILLY. May we furnish that?

[The information follows:]

TAC CREW RATIO DURING SINGLE WING BASING PLAN

The TAC fighter crew ratio when the single wing plan was established was 1.5 crews per aircraft. The approved crew ratio is currently 1.1 per fighter.

Mr. LONG. Does each TAC wing have a combat crew training squadron attached to it?

Colonel REED. No, sir.

Mr. LONG. Wasn't this one of the reasons given for going to the single wing basing plan?

Colonel REED. Yes, sir, among other reasons. However, it was one of the considerations.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Another one, as I recall it, was because you had two pilots in the F–4.

Colonel REED. Some of the considerations were; the number of crew members, the level of activity, and the fact that at that time there was a program which would have put 25 training aircraft in a phase 2 CCTS mode in each wing. That program has not been implemented. The combat crew training is done centrally and not done in the individual wings.

Mr. LONG. In view of the reductions in crew, flying hours, training, et cetera associated with each wing, would it be possible that, if economic factors became more severe, the Air Force might revert to putting two wings at some bases?

Colonel REED. Unlikely, sir, since wings prior at two-wing bases were 18 aircraft per squadron and generally three squadrons for a total of 54 aircraft, whereas now they are constituted on a standard 72 UE in a wing, or 24 aircraft in a squadron. Additionally new aircraft with more complex maintenance systems and so forth opposed to rather simpler older aircraft have taken up a lot of the space.

Also, as has been testified, we have rerated facilities such as bachelor housing from a standard of about 72 square feet per man to 90 square feet so the asset picture has changed.

Additionally, the demand in air space and range time of our modern aircraft make it such that we probably would not go back to the two-wing basing.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You mentioned range time as one of the requirements. Would there be a requirement for range time with other types of aircraft?

Colonel REED. The main consideration is air-to-air space. When I say range time, I talk air-to-air maneuvers as well as air-to-ground, and one of the things in the F–15 particularly is large air space which must be dedicated and used because of the high performance speeds in maneuvers. This is a consideration.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You wouldn't need specific range facilities?

Colonel REED. When you are talking ground range that is not a major consideration.

Mr. LONG. Would such consolidations at bases where you have adequate operating facilities and personnel support save money?

Colonel REED. I know of no base that could accommodate two TAC wings without considerable expenditure for support facilities. We have looked at this option again. However, when you consider family housing, bachelor housing, it becomes extremely expensive.

BERGSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Mr. LONG. Let us turn to Bergstrom Air Force Base, Tex.

Insert page 197 in the record.

[The page follows:]

Bergstrom Air Force Base

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 square feet for foodstuff sales, efficient storage, and low facility maintenance costs.

TAC—BERGSTROM AFB, TEX.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Commissary	$132,000	85

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		BERGSTROM AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	BJHZ	TEXAS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942	TRAVIS	FIVE MILES SOUTHEAST OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE WING

TACTICAL CONTROL GROUP

12TH AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	761	4,401	599	0	47	37	87	0	5,932
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	807	4,628	617	0	47	37	87	0	6,223

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,159	170	62,485	62,655
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	767	(1) 70	20	90
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				62,745
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,244
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,273
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				5,300
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				71,562

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
740-266	Commissary 37		SF	81,000	2,273	81,000	2,273
	TOTAL				2,273		2,273

Priority

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

COMMISSARY

Mr. LONG. I note that you award this project a low priority of 37. Where does this commissary rate in priority among the commissaries in the fiscal year 1974 program?

General REILLY. We rate this No. 3 in priority of three projects.

Mr. LONG. This is the lowest?

General REILLY. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Three out of three.

General REILLY. Although it is very much needed.

Mr. LONG. Couldn't you get along without it?

General REILLY. Sir, we could continue with our present operation but that is far from satisfactory.

Mr. LONG. Lots of things are far from satisfactory these days. I have people in my district right now who have sewage flowing up into their homes, and they can't get Federal money to clean up the situation; it is absolutely beyond belief what these people are living in.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. I wish the Armed Forces would take that view of it. Sure, we are willing to give money where it is necessary and strongly needed, but I wish you folks could just look at some of the things that we have to tell people they can't get money for.

General REILLY. Yes; I can well imagine.

Mr. LONG. Looking at it from that point of view do you still think you need the commissary?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, we certainly do.

Mr. LONG. This is as bad as sewage coming up in your house?

General REILLY. No; it is not that bad, Mr. Chairman, but many of our bases are in need of improved commissary conditions. We have selected three of the highest priority projects for this particular program and Bergstrom happens to be one of them.

Mr. LONG. Well, I think that is something this committee ought to look into, because we are the ones that have to compare the priorities as between military and civilian.

12TH AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS

What is the mission of the 12th Air Force Headquarters? How many people are assigned to this headquarters?

Colonel REED. The number of personnel assigned would have to be provided for the record. I do not have it with me.

[The information follows:]

Personnel assigned to Headquarters, 12th Air Force:

	Military	Civilian	Total
Actual, June 30, 1972	346	47	393
Estimate, June 30, 1973	282	39	321

MISSION STATEMENT FOR 12TH AIR FORCE

In accordance with directives and policies of Tactical Air Command and higher headquarters, 12th Air Force will command, administer, supervise unit training, and employ assigned and attached forces and TAC-gained Air Force

Reserve/Air National Guard forces assigned upon mobilization. To carry out its mission, 12th Air Force will have a headquarters and tactical fighter, tactical airlift, tactical reconnaissance, tactical air control system, and support units. And 12th Air Force will have a tactical drone force.

Colonel REED. However, it has command control cognizance over the tactical forces stationed west of the Mississippi primarily.

COMMISSARY

Mr. LONG. What are you currently using for commissary facilities at this location?

General REILLY. Sir, at the present time, we have 9,000 square feet of adequate space in five individual facilities. Two are acceptable facilities, and three are substandard deteriorated buildings. It is these latter buildings that are the principal cause of the problem. Also, the space provided by all facilities is far less than that required.

Mr. LONG. What are your past and projected sales at this commissary?

General REILLY. Our current sales are running about $943,000 a month. I can provide you what they have been in the past. We would expect it to continue at this rate or even increase, especially after the new facility is completed.

[The information follows:]

PROJECTED SALES—BERGSTROM COMMISSARY

Past sales in the Bergstrom AFB commissary were:

Fiscal year 1970 monthly average, $638,800; fiscal year 1971 monthly average, $756,700; fiscal year 1972 monthly average, $886,000.

Current sales: Fiscal year 1973 monthly average, $943,000.

Projected sales:

Fiscal year 1974 monthly average, $1,021,000; fiscal year 1975 monthly average, $1,072,000; fiscal year 1976 monthly average, $1,447,000; fiscal year 1977 monthly average, $1,519,000; fiscal year 1978 monthly average, $1,595,000.

[NOTE.—The above are gross sales figures. In determining space requirements, the gross sales are adjusted downward based on the value of the food dollar as of July 1970, using the Wholesale Processed Food Index developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.]

Mr. LONG. What increase in sales are you anticipating as the result of the construction of the new commissary at Bergstrom?

General REILLY. Colonel Mansperger.

Colonel MANSPERGER. Our past experience has been that when we do provide an adequate commissary in an area versus a substandard one, we have been getting increases in sales of 30 to 50 percent.

Mr. LONG. Is this rate of increase higher than that anticipated at the other commissaries in the fiscal year 1974 program?

Colonel MANSPERGER. No, sir.

Mr. LONG. Check that, would you, for the record?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

RATE OF INCREASE IN SALES—BERGSTROM COMMISSARY

It is anticipated that Bergstrom AFB will experience a 10- to 15-percent greater increase in sales than Peterson Field or Hickam AFB will during the year in which the new commissary stores are placed in operation. The lack of other DOD commissary stores in the general area of Bergstrom AFB was the primary factor in projecting a higher percentage sales increase at this base.

Mr. LONG. What is the comparison of costs in this commissary to costs in the community?

SUBSIDIES TO COMMISSARIES

Colonel MANSPERGER. About 33 percent savings by using the commissary over using the local economy.

Mr. LONG. Do you have any idea to what extent the Federal Government is subsidizing this? What is the nature of any subsidy?

Colonel MANSPERGER. I don't believe there is any direct subsidy to this sir.

Mr. LONG. You have figures which show the average cost to a person is about one-third less for groceries at this commissary over off-base stores. Can't you give us some idea? It must be due to the fact that the Federal taxpayer is paying a lot of the cost of the commissary.

What is the nature of the subsidy?

Colonel MANSPERGER. The prices charged to the consumer in the commissary are tied to the cost of the Government putting the commodities on the shelf plus a 3-percent surcharge for operation. Any subsidy would be in the nature of possibly providing a facility or along these lines.

Mr. LONG. So the new building is basically entirely a subsidy, right?

General REILLY. Yes; they get a rent-free building and I suppose there is some subsidy in terms of procurement and such as that. Is that correct?

Colonel MANSPERGER. Only because we buy by volume.

Mr. LONG. So this building is pure subsidy so far as these groceries are concerned?

General REILLY. Yes, I think the facility is, yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. How about the people that work in the commissary itself? Are they funded through direct appropriation?

General REILLY. Commissary employees are paid out of appropriated funds. Isn't that correct?

Colonel MANSPERGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, would you yield?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. MCEWEN. This is a subject that, as a new member of this subcommittee, I would welcome some information on, just how this is set up. We found out from the chairman's questioning that one part of the subsidy is the building that is provided.

Now, General, you are saying that in addition there are some people paid out of appropriated funds who work in the commissary. May I suggest that this is an area that I think is of some sensitivity and some problem in base-community relations, and I anticipate maybe a little more, particularly as we have taken the action that I believe we should have on military pay and allowances to make them more comparable with the civilian community.

I have just had the feeling from the two military installations I have in my own district that there is a little more awareness now of commissaries and questions are being raised. I assume it is the same in each commissary, is it not? How many people are paid out of appropriated funds?

Just how much out of appropriated funds are we providing to grant this one-third reduction in cost?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, we would be happy to furnish it if you want a full report on this.

[The information follows:]

All Air Force personnel (military and civilain) assigned to duty in the commissary, both the issue and the resale functions, are paid from appropriated funds. The commissary is a part of the base services operation which includes other activities such as food service, clothing sales, and billeting. The Air Force has not had any recent indications of questions being raised in the civilian community relative to the justification for commissary stores. Additional data concerning the appropriated fund support for commissary operations is provided below.

Mr. LONG. You have the land there. That is a subsidy.

General REILLY. Yes.

Mr. LONG. You have the light, the heat, and other utilities. That is all part of the subsidy. You have some of the salaries of personnel. That is part of the subsidy. You say even part of some of the cost of supplies is a part of the subsidy.

Are there any other things that I haven't been able to think of that could be regarded as part of a subsidy? Do they pay sales taxes?

General REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. LONG. No sales taxes.

General REILLY. No, sir, although a surcharge is paid. It is a percentage of the actual sales; I would be happy to provide the details for you. The surcharge fund pays for utilities and supplies; therefore, these cannot be considered a subsidy. The commissary has been one of those activities that has been very important to our people and the benefits derived from that activity have been carefully weighted in the context of the total benefits that the service provides an individual.

For our lower ranking people in many instances it has just been the difference between being able to get by and not getting by.

Mr. LONG. Well, I hope you will complete your list of the elements of subsidy in here. I think a number of things ought to be taken into consideration here.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

OTHER FORMS OF COMMISSARY SUBSIDY

The following demonstrates how commissary operations are funded:

Air Force commissaries are operated using three types of funds: Stock funds, appropriated funds, and trust revolving (or surcharge) funds.

All subsistence, both for consumption in the dining halls and for resale, is financed by the Air Force stock fund. The stock fund is reimbursed by the military personnel appropriations for subsistence used in the dining halls and by the patron who purchases in the resale store. The commissary division of the Air Force stock fund, therefore, operates on a true revolving fund which cannot be considered a direct subsidy to commissary customers.

Funds appropriated by Congress are used for all military pay, all civilian pay, transportation of commissary goods from U.S. ports to overseas base destinations outside the United States, and for facilities modification and construction when authorized. These funds, in some degree, can be considered a subsidy. Transportation charges to Alaska and Hawaii are included in the price of the goods sold in the commissary store and are, therefore, not subsidies.

In accordance with the annual Appropriations Act, operating expenses within the commissary store function are financed by a surcharge on all sales made in the commissary store. These funds are used to pay for commissary store equipment (display cases, cash registers, and so forth); operating supplies (wrapping paper, bags, and so forth); and utilities. When a surplus of surcharge funds accumulates, these funds are also used for modifications and construction. Projects accomplished with these funds are reported to the Congress. The current surcharge rate of 3 percent is paid by the customers and is not a subsidy.

Mr. LONG. First, this is not a defense item. This is a nondefense item. Consequently in deciding whether to build buildings or not, I think we ought to give priority to defense items, those which you throw at the enemy, so to speak.

Mr. MCEWEN. Would the Chairman yield on that point?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. MCEWEN. I am going to add again the subject of housing. Frankly, it seems incredible to me that we subsidize commissaries, because even without such subsidies obviously they are going to be cheaper than on the local economy, through the buying power that the Army has, through the absence of any sales tax, and if it is a nongrocery item, in my area of New York State, you get a 7-percent sales tax. That doesn't apply, I am sure, to a military installation. That is a State jurisdiction, the sales tax, so I would say there is a 7-percent saving right there. Housing has to come from appropriated funds.

Mr. LONG. I think the gentleman has an excellent point. Anybody in the United States can get groceries. There is always a drugstore. There is always a place to buy food. Such food costs do not vary from installation to installation nearly so widely as do housing expenses.

Some places you just can't find adequate housing. People live in pig pens almost, and certainly a higher priority should be given to the problem of poor housing than to relative luxury items.

OFFSETS TO SAVINGS FROM COMMISSARY USE

There is another element here, too, of perhaps a net economic loss. Lots of people must travel long distances to get to commissaries; isn't that right?

General REILLY. Yes, some people do; yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. They are not getting 33 percent off, when you figure the cost of transportation, if they are driving 15 or 20 miles. Instead of buying the produce at the local grocery, they are traveling long distances, using up gasoline—which seems to be short these days—in order to take advantage of a commissary.

They may come out a little bit better but not a great deal better, and that is not necessarily economical from the standpoint of the economy as a whole.

LOCAL BUSINESS VERSUS COMMISSARIES

Still another factor that we should consider is the local businessman. He has to sell his product. He has to pay taxes to support all these things. Yet the Government is giving one-third off on groceries to the people who go to the Government installation.

Is that fair to the local businessman who is subsidizing his own competition?

General REILLY. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, it is in competition in many locales with local stores. At some of our installations, however, commercial facilities and communities are not conveniently available.

Mr. LONG. Is that the problem here?

Are there a lack of stores in this area?

General REILLY. Bergstrom is close to Austin, Tex. That is a pretty good sized town.

However, there is not another commissary within 65 miles.

Mr. LONG. Why do people have to buy their things at the commissary? It seems to me if you are going to pay your armed services adequately, pay it to them in the paycheck. Let servicemen pay taxes on it like anybody else. Let them be on a tax equal footing with all citizens. These hidden subsidies benefit some people unduly, and don't help other people who probably need it very, very much.

It is a very crude, very blunt way of dealing with the question of making sure your armed forces get adequate treatment.

I want to say that I have a note here from my assistant, whose friend served in the military up in Congressman McEwen's district; and he is pointing out that he had to stay at a motel for the duration of summer camp rather than at the Camp Drum barracks, because the housing situation there was sufficiently bad, so you have some support here that doesn't come from a Congressman necessarily seeking votes.

Mr. MCEWEN. Can we go off the record?

[Discussion off the record.]

INTANGIBLE BENEFITS FROM COMMISSARIES

Colonel MANSPERGER. I wanted to appeal here from the point of view of having spent 18 years in the Air Force and having been a SAC crew member and having been a field maintenance squadron commander.

Now, the commissaries were an extremely important part of my wife's family community at the time I was a SAC crew member and was gone from home good portions of the time.

As a squadron commander I felt that the commissaries were one of the things that brought these airmen's wives into the Air Force community. They were extremely important.

In fact, I would say that the commissary was a very large factor in the retention of airmen and if you didn't get the wife sold on staying in the Air Force you were not going to get the airman to stay in, or the young officer, either.

To say that commissaries are of lesser importance then things such as housing or hospitals would be a very bad mistake because the wives use these about once a week and they are just about forced to use them because of economic reasons. If they have to wait in line to get a basket, have to wait in line to get to the display cases, have to wait in line to get out, they come home each night saying how bad the Air Force is. That can happen about once a week.

Provisions of commissaries, I think, are extremely good investments. We were talking about the subsidy that the Government actually pays, I haven't got it quantified, but I am sure it is very, very small compared to the effective increase in value to the serviceman and his family.

I think it is one of the cheapest ways to pay a wage or to get the support of the service family.

Mr. LONG. If you people are being underpaid why shouldn't your salary be raised instead of being given a hidden subsidy which no one can measure?

Colonel MANSPERGER. Well, I am not qualified to speak on the salary issue. I was just saying what the commissary does for our people.

Mr. LONG. Just why should anybody receive hidden subsidies that no one can measure? The point you raise also, I think, raises other questions. Is not a base commissary open for retired people?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. All sorts of people who are not closely connected and, therefore, don't have to have an incentive to stay in.

General REILLY. Yes, sir, not only for military people, but retired people are eligible also.

Mr. LONG. Should we be building new commissaries to take care of these people? Say you have a bigger load and you want to attract more business, but is that the way it ought to be? We ought to take a look at that.

Your object is not to attract more business. Your object is to help the people.

General REILLY. That is correct. Throughout the years, the commissary, the base exchanges or post exchanges, have been, together with medical care, the prime fringe benefits of a career in uniform; and, as Colonel Mansperger has explained, the benefits sometimes go beyond strictly the monetary benefits, and the morale of our people and in making—

Mr. LONG. These are intangibles, and it seems to me we have enough problems dealing with money—and the nuts and bolts—instead of getting into all these hidden benefits you can't measure.

I think it is unfair to come to this committee and say that you want something but you can't measure what the benefit is.

General REILLY. Well, there are intangible benefits.

Mr. LONG. I don't want to be asked to vote for something because somebody else has in his mind some intangible benefit, especially when we have so many tangible factors that we have to deal with.

COMMISSARIES AS FRINGE BENEFITS

General REILLY. But if we are serious about an All-Volunteer Force, we have to attract people and we have to retain them, and the balance——

Mr. LONG. We have volunteer forces that work for Bethlehem Steel Co., in my district. Every industry in my area has volunteer forces. It is done through the paycheck. They don't all have commissaries and so on.

General REILLY. No, but those companies, I am sure, have many, many fringe benefits for employees, which are a factor in their electing to work for those companies.

Mr. LONG. Do you think the average company has anything like the fringe benefits that the military has?

General REILLY. Some of them have some pretty good——

Mr. LONG. Some.

General REILLY [continuing]. Health and medical and savings plans.

Mr. LONG. Does the general realize that about one-half of all the people covered by their pension plans in private companies will never collect a cent?

General REILLY. No, I am not that——

Mr. LONG. Never collect a cent, and a large part of them will collect only a very tiny percentage. That is the way the average company pension plan is set up. When an employee changes jobs, he loses everything. There are tremendous advantages that the military have that people in private sector don't have. I don't know about the relative pay. I ran into a captain the other day who said he was making $15,000, which doesn't sound very bad to me for a young fellow in his late twenties.

It compares very well, and he said he had no complaints with the pay. Now, if we are getting pay up to the point where it is comparable, and I think it should be, then I think we should get away from these other subsidies.

Don't you? Are you people going to continue to insist that you want all these fringe benefits even after your pay has been made comparable, completely comparable, with private industry?

General REILLY. Sir, I am just not qualified to address that issue of the mix of fringe benefits versus total salary. It has continued to be the policy of the Department of Defense that these so-called fringe benefits play an important part of the total income of the serviceman, and I am just not qualified to say at what point pay will completely replace those.

GAO STUDY OF NONAPPROPRIATED FUNDS

Mr. PATTEN. My recollection is that there was a study of this in depth 3 or 4 years ago.

Bob, do you have a recollection of that? We had the commissary people, the people who run the program, and we had a full-blown investigation.

Our liquor dealers strenuously oppose liquor being sold at Fort Dix, and we had the beer problem over here across the river in Virginia—I think it was—make the front page. And things of that type.

I don't think it was this committee but it was the Armed Services Committee. There was a full blownup review of all the factors that had to be considered. I thought that was looked over pretty thoroughly.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Yes, sir; the GAO did a fairly substantial study on the total question of nonappropriated fund activities.

Mr. PATTEN. Right.

Mr. NICHOLAS. For these types of items.

Mr. PATTEN. And I can remember, because I changed my view on a couple of things as a result of things that they said, because none of us is an expert. My experience with commissaries has always been at some isolated spot. I mean what I have seen was eithe · Elmendorf, or where prices downtown were prohibitive, or in Korea, or in Taiwan, or Tokyo, or some other place where the case for the commissary was easily sustained.

I think if the members want a full discussion on commissaries, the people who run it and take care of it are the people who should be in here testifying.

General REILLY. Yes, sir; and we would be happy to——

Mr. PATTEN. I know we went over it. I felt, sort of like Congressman Long, a little leery, felt these things were unfair, but the people

running the program certainly can justify some percentage of what they are doing.

I don't know how close you are to any place at Bergstrom. Does anyone know? How many miles are you from any place?

General REILLY. Just outside of Austin, about 5 miles outside of Austin.

Mr. LONG. They have a marvelous shopping layout in Austin.

Mr. PATTEN. But I think, Congressman Long, it is important to be refreshed by those running the program who would know the answers.

In the first place I don't know if 33 percent is valid. I think that is too high. I knew it was substantial, but the highest differential that I ever heard was in the 20's. I never heard 33 percent.

Mr. LONG. That would be quite a bargain counter if it were 33 percent.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the report of our surveys and investigations staff dated last month uses a figure of about 32 percent.

Mr. LONG. I can understand the enthusiasm for it. I would be for it too if I were in the service. It is not up to us, I think, to decide the philosophy here. I agree it is up to the authorizing committee, but we do have to decide which priorities on new construction come first. I would be disposed, anyway, to put commissaries pretty far down on the list.

You have several bases at which tactical reconnaissance wings are based. What are the good and bad points at Bergstrom for this mission?

General REILLY. Colonel Reed.

Colonel REED. Bergstrom is a base with relatively good facilities. It has a multimission capability with a number of forces stationed there. It is a large administrative complex, as well as flying mission, and the aircraft at Bergstrom predominantly support units and so forth west of the Mississippi, and with its geographical location there as far as its training aspects, it is a good base from that standpoint.

Mr. LONG. Are there any more questions?

CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, N. MEX.

Mr. LONG. Turn to Cannon Air Force Base, N. Mex.

Please insert page 199 in the record.

[The page follows:]

CANNON AIR FORCE BASE

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.

TAC—CANNON AFB, N. MEX.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete July 31, 1973
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	$2,800	98

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		CANNON AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	CZQZ	NEW MEXICO

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942/1951	CURRY	SEVEN MILES WEST SOUTHWEST OF CLOVIS, NEW MEX.

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL FIGHTER WING

AIR DIVISION HEADQUARTERS

TACTICAL CONTROL SQUADRON

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	525	4,316	413	31	0	32	64	0	5,381
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	485	4,046	421	31	0	32	64	0	5,079

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,782	381	51,421	51,802
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	634	(1) 18	17	35
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				51,837
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY Excludes ($6,141,400 Family Housing & Mobile Home Spaces)				558
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				162
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				5,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				57,557

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
812-926	Aircraft Maintenance Area Lighting 28		EA	9	162	9	162
	TOTAL				162		162

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. LONG. You are requesting a project for aircraft maintenance area lighting. It has a low priority. What would be the impact of deferring this project?

General REILLY. Colonel Mansperger.

Colonel MANSPERGER. Approximately 70 percent of the aircraft maintenance is actually performed on the ramp. Here we have one of our latest weapons systems, the F–111D.

Increased lighting has many advantages. One of them is it certainly helps those maintenance boys out there at night, and approximately half of the ramp work is accomplished at night because the aircraft either fly in the afternoon or in the evening and are fixed immediately afterward.

It also increases security supervision.

Mr. LONG. Why does it have a low priority then? You make it sound as though it were very high priority indeed.

General REILLY. It is within the lower 20 percent.

Mr. LONG. Why? You make it sound as if, good God, we just have to have it.

Colonel MANSPERGER. Very desirable, sir. All the projects are very desirable.

Mr. LONG. All right, but we have to decide between them. You can't make everything sound as if it is the most important thing in the world. That is why you have priorities here.

What would be the impact of deferring the project? What would happen?

Colonel MANSPERGER. They would continue to operate on the ramp with insufficient lighting.

Mr. LONG. What is the impact of that? What does it do?

Colonel MANSPERGER. Greater risk, greater maintenance man-hours, possibly poorer quality work.

Mr. LONG. Do you have any evidence of that, any measures of the quality of the work?

Colonel MANSPERGER. Not quantified, sir. However, I am sure from experience that the amount of accidents on the ramp are much higher in unlighted areas.

Mr. LONG. Do you have statistics on that?

Colonel MANSPERGER. No, sir.

Mr. LONG. Then why are you sure?

Colonel MANSPERGER. Because I have beat the ramp a good many days as a field maintenance officer and I knew where the problems occurred and where they didn't.

General REILLY. Certainly the potential for accident——

Mr. LONG. How many F–111D's do you have at Cannon?

General REILLY. We have 72 unit equipment aircraft.

Mr. LONG. Do you have similar lighting for all your F–111 apron areas worldwide?

Colonel MANSPERGER. No, sir. Most of our SAC bases, most of our MAC bases, have area lighting. Those TAC bases that were at one time SAC bases usually have area lighting, but this particular base and some other TAC bases do not have the ramp lighting.

Mr. LONG. In how many other areas are you going to be asking for this lighting, where you don't have ramp lighting?

General REILLY. We have been providing aircraft maintenance apror lighting through the years, a selected project here or there. This just happens to be one of those bases where we are still operating with portable lights and would like to improve the situation.

Mr. LONG. You have others in the same boat?

General REILLY. I am sure we do.

Mr. LONG. Why aren't you asking for it for them?

General REILLY. Again it is a matter of priority, this being one of our, as Colonel said——

Mr. LONG. This one you indicate has a low priority.

General REILLY. We have assigned it No. 28 within the lower 2 percent, but I hope I have conveyed to the committee the importance of all of these projects and how difficult it has been for us to establish an order of relative priority.

Mr. LONG. I am not sure I am getting a very good answer from you, General.

General REILLY. Dr. Long, this project, while it is not as costly as many others and doesn't sound quite as exotic, it has found its way into the program against a lot of very hard core requirements.

It is considered very essential by our people who have to maintain our aircraft, especially a very sophisticated aircraft such as this.

Mr. LONG. You haven't stated whether, in other areas where you have the same poor lighting, whether you are asking for lighting for them.

General REILLY. I am sure we will have other projects of this nature in future programs.

Mr. LONG. Could you put in the record what other areas might fall in the same situation for which you are not asking lighting this year?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

RESIDUAL REQUIREMENT FOR MAINTENANCE LIGHTING

Air Force is considering aircraft maintenance area lighting projects for the following Air Force bases over the next several years: Dyess, Nellis, Pope, Little Rock, England, Bergstrom, George, Luke, Holloman, MacDill, Mountain Home, Davis Monthan, Langley, Myrtle Beach, Seymour Johnson, Eglin 9, and Eglin Main.

Mr. LONG. Provide for the record the long-range construction program for Cannon which comprises the $5 million shown here.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Long Range Construction Requirement, Cannon AFB

The $5 million long-range construction projects are as follows:

	Item	Scope	Amount (thousands)
Fiscal year:			
1975	Shop, nondestructive inspection	4,000 square feet	$210
1975	Precision measuring equipment lab	6,940 square feet	330
1975	Water supply treatment	1,500 TD	180
1976	Maintenance docks, small aircraft	5 each	980
1976	Commissary	36,700 square feet	1,100
1977	Aircraft corrosion control covered	11,470 square feet	500
1978	Maintenance docks, small aircraft	6 each	1,700
Total			5,000

ENGLAND AIR FORCE BASE, LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG. Let us turn to England Air Force Base, La.
Insert page 201 in the record.
[The page follows:]

ENGLAND AIR FORCE BASE

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.

TAC—ENGLAND AFB, LA.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Additions to squadron flight operations facilities	$7,800	95

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		ENGLAND AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	GAMH	LOUISIANA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942/1950	RAPIDES PARISH	FIVE MILES WEST OF ALEXANDRIA, LOUISIANA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL FIGHTER WING

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	372	2,952	474	73	55	28	41	0	3,995
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	307	2,764	443	0	0	28	41	0	3,583

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	2,281	147	44,838	44,985
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	144	(3) 3	27	30
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				45,015
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				2,095
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				183
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				6,200
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				53,493

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
141-753	Additions to Squadron Flight Operations Facilities 7		SF	5,237	183	5,237	183
	TOTAL				183		183

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

Mr. LONG. What are you currently using for squadron flight operations facilities, and what will be done with the buildings you vacate?

General REILLY. We are currently occupying five buildings. We have one adequate squadron operations facility. This is a three-squadron base, three squadrons to the wing. We have one adequate squadron operations facility.

We have four buildings being used to accommodate the other two squadrons. We propose under this project to expand two existing buildings to provide us with our three adequate squadron operations facilities.

We are short of space in a scattered operation. This supports the A–7 fighter aircraft.

HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, N. MEX.

Mr. LONG. Next is Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex.

Insert page 203 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	KWRD	NEW MEXICO

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942/1947	OTERO	SIX MILES WEST SOUTHWEST OF ALAMOGORDO, N.MEX.

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL FIGHTER WING

TEST GROUP (AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	600	4,653	1,366	0	0	24	50	0	6,693
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	539	4,463	1,382	0	0	24	50	0	6,458

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	50,821	162	102,046	102,208
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	5,902	(3) 18	22,321	22,339
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				124,547
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,447
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,432
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				18,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				146,426

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
116-661	Aircraft Weapons Arming/Disarming Pad 29		SY	14,000	237	14,000	237
136-66A	Runway Lighting 10		LS	LS	903	LS	903
310-476	Radar Image Test Facility I	AFSC	SF	14,400	384	14,400	384
310-541	Weapons Guidance Test Facility I	AFSC	SF	16,200	908	16,200	908
	TOTAL				2,432		2,432

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE

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.

The second item 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 foot 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 foot 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.

TAC—HOLLOMAN AFB, N. MEX.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Aircraft weapons arming/disarming pads	$9,400	100
Runway lighting	62,000	90
Radar image test facility	31,000	95
Weapons guidance test facility	64,000	100

Mr. LONG. You show a decrease in the base population here. What is the reason?

General REILLY. Principally the training activity. May I call on Colonel Reed?

Colonel REED. I think approximately 140 is the decrease and it is primarily associated with management actions such as combination of various manpower standards that occur in routine bases. In general it would not be considered a significant reduction, 140 out of a total population of 6,500.

AIRCRAFT WEAPONS ARMING/DISARMING PAD

Mr. Long. You are requesting an aircraft weapons arming/disarming pad for $237,000. How long have you operated under the current situation?

General REILLY. Sir, the F–4 fighters have been in Holloman 4 or 5 years now.

Colonel REED. It was being prepared as an F–4 base prior to Southeast Asia and they came back from Europe several years ago.

General REILLY. It has been quite a number of years, sir.

Mr. LONG. Where are the taxiways now used for this purpose located?

General REILLY. Sir, I don't have a large map of the base. The airfield there consists of two major intersecting runways. What this will

do is provide paved areas adjacent to the ends of one of the runways where the aircraft park just before taking off. There they can be armed and then after returning if the weapons are still aboard they can be disarmed before taxiing in.

Mr. LONG. Is this a safety measure?

General REILLY. Principally safety, so that armed ordnance is not on the aircraft when it is taxiing up in the main portion of the base.

Mr. LONG. Do you have that dangerous situation prevailing in many places?

General REILLY. Sir, we have been constructing these arming and disarming pads at our fighter bases for a number of years. Without them we have to take special precautions that adversely affect the training operations.

Mr. LONG. Have you had any accidents?

General REILLY. I don't recall any accidents, no, sir.

Mr. LONG. Is this project urgent, particularly with your reduced base loading?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, we consider it a very urgent project. We have a very large flying mission at Holloman. The 49 tactical fighter wing with actually——

Mr. LONG. Are there many other bases where you also have this situation for which you are not asking money?

General REILLY. I think we have corrected most of them. There may be some additional construction required but I think we have been able to satisfy most of the——

RUNWAY LIGHTING

Mr. LONG. You are asking for runway lighting for the crosswind runway at a cost of $903,000. How often is this runway used? Is there lighting on it now?

General REILLY. Sir, I don't have that readily available. I can provide that, what percent of the time that runway is used.

[The information follows:]

HOLLOMAN CROSSWIND RUNWAY AND LIGHTING

Runway 21 is presently being used 30 percent of the time; however, the utilization of runway 21 is expected to increase by 75 to 80 sorties per day with the increased mission of 31 T–38 aircraft scheduled to arrive in October 1974. This will increase runway 21 usage to 40 percent.

Current there is no approach lighting to runway 21.

Mr. LONG. Is there lighting on it now?

General REILLY. No, sir, we have no——

Mr. LONG. There is no lighting on it at all?

General REILLY. No, sir, not on this particular runway.

Mr. LONG. Describe a weapons guidance test facility.

General REILLY. Just a moment, sir. May I correct myself. Yes, we do have.

Mr. PATTEN. You are talking about an extension of the lighting system, aren't you? You must have lighting, but you want to extend it 3,000 feet.

General REILLY. We do not have any approach lighting at the present time. We do have lighting along the runway edge and threshold

to the runway. However, it is not adequate. This will be the installation of the first approach lighting on this runway and the upgrading you might say of the runway edge and threshold lighting.

Mr. PATTEN. Would that, General, be beyond the actual field, beyond the actual runway?

General REILLY. Yes. It extends the standard approach out 3,000 feet from the end of the runway.

Mr. PATTEN. Like you have in Atlantic City there?

General REILLY. Yes; red lights coming in.

Mr. PATTEN. By the way, you don't get fog in New Mexico, do you, like we had this morning?

General REILLY. Not much.

Mr. PATTEN. We had it this morning. It was raining and the fog was heavy. The turnpike was reduced to 35 miles an hour. It was pretty gloomy.

General REILLY. You get a little dust there once in a while.

Mr. PATTEN. Oh, yes.

WEAPONS GUIDANCE TEST FACILITY

Mr. LONG. Describe a weapons guidance test facility both as to design and function.

General REILLY. Colonel Stanton.

Colonel STANTON. The central inertial guidance test facility provides a capability to test and evaluate aircraft and missile guidance or navigation systems and related components in a closely controlled repeatable environment and under simulated operational conditions.

This capability permits the Air Force and Department of Defense to obtain an independent and unbiased evaluation of guidance equipment under development and projected for procurement.

Integral to the central inertial guidance test facility is the environmental facility providing the various effects of altitude, temperature, vibration, and shock to the guidance equipment undergoing evaluation.

This organization provides support to a wide range of customers throughout DOD.

Initially the mission of the central guidance inertial test facility was limited to intertial guidance equipment, but now with advancing technology it must include a capability to test various types of terminal guidance systems: for example, those systems based on seeking radar or infrared emissions of the target or the light contrast of the target versus the background using low light level television or laser illumination. Therefore, this new facility is needed to provide a new capability to meet the rapidly expanding terminal guidance technology.

Mr. LONG. Why are you proposing that this type of work be done at Holloman instead of at locations where you have facilities suitable for environmental testing?

Colonel STANTON. The best capability in the Air Force in terms of expertise in guidance technology is at Holloman Air Force Base, sir. It has been since its inception in 1959.

The personnel that will effectively operate this new facility are located at Holloman Air Force Base.

Mr. LONG. What does the facility look like?

Colonel STANTON. I don't know how to verbally create a mental picture. Primarily the facility will provide the capability for computer control of the simulation equipment. It will contain a three-axis flight simulator that will effectively simulate the missile flight, in terms of roll, pitch, and yaw.

It will contain target emission devices such as infrared generators. The guidance system will be maintained on a three-axis simulator and run through full flight simulation in the laboratory to evaluate its performance prior to sled or flight testing.

LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VA.

Mr. LONG. Next is Langley Air Force Base, Va.

Insert page 208 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	MUHJ	VIRGINIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1916	HAMPTON	FIVE MILES NORTH OF HAMPTON, VIRGINIA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL AIRLIFT WING

FIGHTER INTERCEPTOR SQUADRON (AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND)

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND HEADQUARTERS

CINCLANT AIRBORNE COMMAND POST

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,852	6,299	1,572	0	72	99	67	0	9,961
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	1,884	6,680	1,613	0	72	99	67	0	10,415

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,545	965	103,789	104,754
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	278	100	0	100
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				104,854
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Excludes $11,223,000 Family Housing)				2,514
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				503
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				6,300
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				114,171

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
134-375	Radar Flight Control Center I		SF	2,884	403	2,884	403
610-125	Alter Command Administrative Facility I		SF	10,125	100	10,125	100
	TOTAL				503		503

DD FORM 1 OCT 74 1390

LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE

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.

TAC—LANGLEY AFB, VA.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Radar flight control center	$20,000	80
Alter command administrative facility	4,500	90

Mr. LONG. Why do you need additional administrative space at Langley?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, this particular project will provide interior alterations to space formerly occupied by a dental clinic. The committee may recall in last year's program we obtained approval to provide a new dental clinic. It had been located for a number of years in the second story of a large permanent administrative building, and this project will permit us to restore the space to that for which it was originally designed.

Mr. LONG. How much administrative space do you have here now?

General REILLY. Sir, I would have to provide the total administrative space requirements.

[The information follows:]

ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE EXISTING AT LANGLEY

There are 600,624 square feet of administrative space currently existing on Langley AFB. This leaves a deficiency of over 102,000 square feet, based on a total administrative space requirement of 702,734 square feet.

Mr. LONG. What addition is this going to be?

General REILLY. This would be just a small percentage of the total base administrative part.

Mr. LONG. Ten percent? Twenty percent?

General REILLY. Oh, it would be far less than that, sir. We have a major command headquarters there. I will just have to provide that for you.

[The information follows:]

PERCENT OF ADDITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE ADDED BY LANGLEY ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITY

The project for the Langley AFB administrative facility will add 10,125 square feet to the present total of 600,624 square feet of administrative space. This amounts to 1.7 percent increase.

Mr. LONG. What functions would occupy this space?

General REILLY. This will be those general functions associated with a large major command headquarters building. I don't have before me just the particular functional uses but it would be those associated with major command headquarters activities.

[The information follows:]

FUNCTIONS OCCUPYING ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE IN LANGLEY ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITY

The administrative space proposed for Langley AFB will be occupied by the Headquarters TAC communications staff.

LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARK.

Mr. LONG. Little Rock Air Force Base, Ark.

Insert page 210A in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	HKRZ	ARKANSAS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1955	PULASKI	1 MILE NORTHWEST OF JACKSONVILLE

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL AIRLIFT WING

STRATEGIC MISSILE WING

TACTICAL AIRLIFT TRAINING SQUADRON

TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE SQUADRON (ANG)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	826	4548	627	109	50	10	75	0	5,245
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	1040	5370	749	109	50	10	75	0	7,403

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	8,554	1,147	153,792	154,939
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	2,632	(2) 342	23	365
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				155,304
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				150
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,165
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				3,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				159,619

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
211-175	Aircraft Maintenance Docks I		SF	60,000	1,165	60,000	1,165
	TOTAL				1,165		1,165

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

CONGRESSIONAL

Little Rock Air Force Base

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 is 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.

TAC—LITTLE ROCK AFB, ARK.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Aircraft maintenance docks	$69,900	10

RELOCATION OF C–130 UNITS FROM FORBES AFB

Mr. Long. Will the maintenance docks requested here complete the requirements for C–130's to be relocated from Forbes Air Force Base?

General Reilly. Yes, sir, they will.

Mr. Long. What will be the total cost of the relocation from Forbes and what savings are anticipated?

General Reilly. Colonel Reed can respond to that, sir.

Colonel Reed. Sir, the anticipated savings on an annual basis for the relocation from Forbes is anticipated to be $9.3 million per year. The identified construction cost of relocation, the total relocation of all functions out of Forbes, is $1.65 million, of which the major amount was associated with these nose docks at Little Rock.

Mr. Long. What did you say the savings are?

Colonel Reed. Our estimated annual saving, once all relocations have occurred, is $9.239 million annually. There is additional construction cost avoidance of about $9.5 million at Forbes, which would have been required if we stayed.

Mr. Long. $1,165,000 for the aircraft maintenance docks and you say $9 million annual savings. I don't get it.

Colonel Reed. Sir, reduction of Forbes Air Force Base, the ability to reduce the opening costs for maintaining the base for support of the various functions.

This opening cost which already exists at Little Rock and Dyess where the primary missions are being relocated enables us to save ultimate manpower of 1,324 manpower positions by phasing down Forbes to Air National Guard activity only.

The military pay, civilian pay, and other O&M costs associated with——

Mr. Long. You are saving a lot of money by moving out of Forbes?

Colonel Reed. Yes, sir.

Mr. Long. Of which this operation here is only a small part; right?

Colonel Reed. Well, there are three squadrons primarily and two of them go to Little Rock, two-thirds of the major mission moves to Little Rock.

Luke Air Force Base, Ariz.

Mr. Long. Luke Air Force Base, Ariz.

Insert page 211 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		LUKE AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	NUEX	ARIZONA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1941/1951	MARICOPA	FIVE MILES SOUTHWEST OF SUN CITY, ARIZONA, THIRTY MILES NORTHWEST OF PHOENIX, ARIZONA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL FIGHTER TRAINING WING

GERMAN AIR FORCE COMBAT CREW TRAINING

AEROSPACE RESCUE AND RECOVERY SQUADRON (RESERVE)

26TH AIR DIVISION HEADQUARTERS (AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND)

SAGE DIRECTION CENTER (AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	704	4,567	1,136	111	6	35	58	0	6,617
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	628	4,753	1,159	111	6	35	58	0	6,750

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	2,511	892	82,431	83,323
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	1,784	(41) 307	96	403
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 ____				83,726
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				723
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,986
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				21,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				108,435

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
116-665	Aircraft Run-Up Facility I		EA	1	93	1	93
171-212	Flight Simulator Training Facility I		SF	23,250	939	23,250	939
171-618	Aircraft Field Training Facility I		SF	21,865	734	21,865	734
724-414	Officer Quarters 25		MN	60	1,220	60	1,220
					2,986		2,986

DD FORM 1 OCT 74 1390

LUKE AIR FORCE BASE

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 runup facility. Existing runup facilities cannot accommodate a newly assigned aircraft. The new facility is required for aircraft engine runup to full power maintenance checkouts.

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 aicrraft. 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.

TAC—LUKE AFB, ARIZ.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Aircraft run-up facility	$3,000	98
Flight simulator training facility	16,500	55
Aircraft field training facility	4,000	98
Officer quarters	58,700	60

Requirements, assets, and deficiencies for bachelor officers at this location are:

	Men
Requirement	274
Existing substandard	[1] (91)
Existing adequate	40
Authorized not in inventory	---
Community support adequate	136
Total adequate	176
Deficiency	98
Design status on requirement: as of May 1, 1973 (percent)	[2] 15

[1] None upgradable.
[2] Est. Comp. Dec.

F–15 TRAINING

Mr. LONG. Why was Luke selected as the location for F–15 training?

Colonel REED. It provides the ideal training environment. There is sufficient air space and it has the basic training capability since it has been used for a training base for many years.

The F–4 has been there and the foreign training in the F–104.

Mr. LONG. When is the first group of trainees scheduled?

General REILLY. In the fall of 1974, isn't it?

Colonel REED. Yes, sir.

General REILLY. In the fall of 1974.

Mr. LONG. What is the total construction program in support of this new mission at Luke?

General REILLY. Sir, we have, I think it is, about $3 million total or a little less than that. I would have to tally it up but it is several millions of dollars at Luke in support of this training.

[The information follows:]

TOTAL CONSTRUCTION IN SUPPORT OF NEW MISSION AT LUKE

The four fiscal year 1974 items listed below for $2.986 million encompasses the total MCP requirement for support of the new mission at Luke AFB, Arizona:

Aircraft run up facility	$93,000
Flight simulator training facility	939,000
Aircraft field training facility	734,000
Officer quarters	1,220,000
Total	2,986,000

Mr. LONG. That is for the four items?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; four items are an aircraft run-up facility, the flight simulator, a field training facility, and a bachelor officer quarters.

FLIGHT SIMULATOR TRAINING FACILITY

Mr. LONG. What simulators will be housed in the flight simulator training facility and what is their cost?

General REILLY. Colonel Ballif.

Colonel BALLIF. There will be two F–15 simulators programed for the simulator facility in this program. In addition there will be the air-to-air combat simulator which is a separate mission which is primarily to develop new techniques of air-to-air combat.

Three primary purposes of the air-to-air combat simulator are to develop and evaluate tactics to be employed against the weapons systems of proposed enemy forces, to provide a means of designing and evaluating the fighter aircraft and weapons systems according to the pilot capabilities, and to determine any simulation requirements for future aircraft.

Mr. LONG. What is their cost?

Colonel BALLIF. $13.8 million exclusive of the construction, facilities construction.

Mr. LONG. This is for all of them?

Colonel BALLIF. No, sir, this is for the air-to-air combat simulator only.

Mr. LONG. Just for that one?

Colonel BALLIF. Yes, sir. The F–15 simulators are included in the buy for the aircraft provided by McDonnell-Douglas.

Mr. LONG. When will they be procured and when delivered?

Colonel BALLIF. They are being built by the Singer Simulation Products Corp. in New York. They will be completed by September of 1975 and ready for December of 1975 at Luke Air Force Base.

Mr. LONG. If this simulator will not be delivered to Luke until October 1975 when do you need to start to construct the facility?

Colonel BALLIF. It will take at least a year to complete the fabrication on the simulator device. In order to be completely in operation by December of 1975 the facility should be ready approximately 5 to 6 months prior to that time.

Mr. REED. What month do you plan to start?

Colonel BALLIF. We anticipate the move would begin in September of 1975.

Mr. LONG. That is when you would begin to——

Colonel BALLIF. Yes, the simulator into the facility.

Mr. LONG. Will the air-to-air combat simulator complete the Air Force's requirements for this type simulator?

Colonel BELLIF. Yes, sir, it is a one-of-a-kind device used primarily as an evaluation and training development model which will be located at Luke since it is the primary fighter training base in the Air Force.

Mr. LONG. Will you have just one pilot there at one time?

Colonel BALLIF. There are two pilots opposing one another through a simulator and computer hookup so they are flying against one another through models projected on the screen.

Mr. LONG. What will you do when the new lightweight fighter comes into inventory?

Colonel BALLIF. We don't have the parameters of the requirements for that weapons system yet, sir. We anticipate that there would be a simulation requirement because this has proved to be a very effective way of improving the quality of our personnel.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Patten.

Mr. PATTEN. Is this fighter simulator part of the $28 million you mentioned for new simulators—we saw a picture of a new modern simulator for training pilots?

Colonel BALLIF. The simulator picture that you saw, sir, is of this one that I am speaking of here, the air-to-air combat simulator. This is not part of that buy, no. The previous one is strictly an instrument flight simulator. This one is the air-to-air combat simulator in which, through the use of a closed circuit television arrangement, aircraft will appear on the video tubes surrounding each cockpit and they will fly against one another as though they were in the airborne environment.

Mr. PATTEN. That is all.

Mr. LONG. What is the necessity for this type of simulator training? Why do you need it?

Colonel BALLIF. The air-to-air combat simulator, as I pointed out before, has three primary purposes, not as much in the training environment as to develop the techniques and evaluate the techniques of air-to-air combat.

With this system the parameters of any enemy fighter aircraft which we anticipate would be brought against us can be simulated through the model and our pilots can actually fly against the parameters designed for that aircraft.

For example, the MIG–23 flight parameters could be placed into one computer and the F–4 or the F–15 parameters be placed in the other computer and be flown against one another.

Mr. LONG. Do our possible adversaries have anything like this?

Colonel BALLIF. I couldn't say, sir. These simulators are pretty much a state-of-the-art thing. The art of simulation is being developed to a high degree, not only within our country but in other countries also.

Mr. LONG. When was the last time anybody did any combat between two planes?

Colonel BALLIF. In the Vietnam conflict, sir.

Mr. LONG. Was there any there?

Colonel BALLIF. Yes, sir.

We had several aces come out of that conflict. Mainly on the flights into North Vietnam, our flights would provide airborne cover for bomber aircraft and would actually engage in air-to-air combat against the MIG aircraft.

Mr. LONG. Very interesting.

Mr. Nicholas.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You mentioned a year's construction time. Is that for the simulator itself or the simulator facility?

Colonel BALLIF. The facility. The simulator itself is under construction at this time at Singer.

AIRCRAFT FIELD TRAINING FACILITY

Mr. LONG. Will the aircraft field training facility complete the requirements for F–15 maintenance training?

General REILLY. They will for F–15. Colonel Ballif.

Colonel BALLIF. It will complete the requirement for the F–15 aircraft.

OFFICER QUARTERS

Mr. LONG. You are requesting 60 officer quarters at Luke. What is the situation on off-base support? Are these units for personnel who are required to live on the base?

Colonel SHOOK. Yes, sir. This project is for students and/or transient personnel. We normally program onbase housing for our student/transient personnel in lieu of depending upon community support housing.

MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.

Mr. LONG. MacDill Air Force Base, Fla. Insert page 216 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	NVZR	FLORIDA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1940	HILLSBOROUGH	ONE MILE SOUTH SOUTHWEST OF TAMPA, FLORIDA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL FIGHTER WING

JOINT COMMAND HEADQUARTERS (US READINESS COMMAND)

TACTICAL CONTROL SQUADRON

COMBAT SUPPORT GROUP

COMMUNICATIONS GROUP (AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH (Includes Avon Park)

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	766	5,402	777	0	0	72	124	0	7,141
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	789	5,717	784	0	0	72	124	0	7,486

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	10,796	313	113,977	114,290
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	133	46	0	46
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				114,336
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				4,513
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (Excludes $1,315,000 Family Housing)				2,657
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				12,000
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				133,506

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
134-375	Radar Flight Control Center I		SF	2,884	495	2,884	495
141-45A	Aircraft Tactical Air Control Facility I		SF	16,280	445	16,280	445
722-222	Range Composite Support Facility (Avon Park) I		MN	60	925	60	925
740-674	Gymnasium I		SF	21,000	792	21,000	792
	TOTAL				2,657		2,657

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE

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, combat 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.

TAC—MACDILL AFB, FLA.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Radar flight control center	$25,000	80
Aircraft tactical air control facility	17,000	100
Range composite support facility	40,000	80
Gymnasium	21,000	60

Mr. LONG. What is the situation with regard to ranges and range support facilities at MacDill?

Colonel REED. The major range at MacDill is Avon Park. The Avon Park Range recently has been selected to be upgraded to an electronic environment range. We found in our experience in Southeast Asia that in flying combat in areas in which surface to air missiles are prevalent or part of the defense we have to alter some of our tactics and train our people in different ways. We haven't had heretofore that real type of simulated environment in which they would learn the maneuvers necessary to avoid the missiles and so forth. We are providing this type of range, one on the east coast and one in the western coast area to provide air crew training. Support facilities are required for some of the additional people who will be required to maintain the equipment down at Avon Park.

Mr. LONG. Is there any encroachment problem at MacDill?

Mr. JONKERS. Yes, sir. We do have some residential and commercial encroachment on the north and west side of the base. However, we have been working with the zoning board down here, and since we have they have not approved any zoning requests which conflict with the compatible use concept.

Mr. LONG. Is this a firm installation?

Colonel REED. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Can you tell us why?

Colonel REED. Sir, it supports a significant nonflying mission as well as a significant flying mission, giving us maximum economy. I speak of the Readiness Command which is the DOD joint headquarters. Ad-

ditionally it has good flying weather, and is in proximity to the Avon Park Range just mentioned, which is a prime training range. It also has access to overwater ranges, with relative large air space out on the gulf side. It is a good base for tactical operations.

Mr. LONG. What are you currently using for a gymnasium?

General REILLY. At the present time we have a 30-year old World War II gymnasium, built in 1942. It is a wooden structure, very inadequate by today's standards. In fact, it is in such poor condition that we will demolish it upon completion of this new facility.

MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE, IDAHO

Mr. LONG. Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho. Insert page 221 in the record.

[The page follows:]

MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE

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 housed in a temporary frame building. The new facility will have environmental controls required for regulation of temperature, humidity, and dust.

TAC—MOUNTAIN HOME AFB, IDAHO—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Precision measurement equipment facility	$24,000	90

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	QYZH	IDAHO

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942/1951	ELMORE	ELEVEN MILES SOUTHWEST OF MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO, FORTY-THREE MILES SOUTH SOUTHWEST OF BOISE, IDAHO

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL FIGHTER WING

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	377	3,246	440	0	0	12	29	0	4,104
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	407	3,550	451	0	0	12	29	0	4,449

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	7,933	40	86,008	86,048
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	893	(51) 12	8	20
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				86,068
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,865
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				253
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				6,600
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				94,786

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
218-868	Precision Measurement Equipment Facility I		SF	4,288	253	4,288	253
	TOTAL				253		253

DD FORM 1390, OCT 70 CONGRESSIONAL

TAC BASE STRUCTURE

Mr. TALCOTT. May I ask a question about Mountain Home. Is this a permanent tactical base?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, it is.

Mr. TALCOTT. Are there any tactical bases that have been consolidated or closed that I missed?

Colonel REED. No, sir. You did not miss any testimony on closing of any tactical bases.

Mr. TALCOTT. So we are closing everything else but tactical bases. Yet we had very little airplane-to-airplane combat in Vietnam.

Colonel REED. Air to air is just a portion of the tactical mission. Delivering ordnance against ground targets probably accounted for the major flying hours committed from the tactical air spectrum. That mission continues, particularly at bases like Mountain Home, where we have the F–111 which, as you know, has a lot of penetration aids in getting into a highly defended area against rather difficult targets and can release ordnance with great accuracy. This aircraft is able to take out a lot of bridges and things which we couldn't do with massive type bombings. TAC-Air I think will not be reduced. Its force levels have not gone down significantly which I testified to earlier. Consequently they will be postured pretty much as we have depicted them now.

PRECISION MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT LABORATORY

Mr. TALCOTT. This request at Mountain Home is for a precision measurement equipment facility. You claim it is located too close to the engine runup facility which causes extra vibrations. It was a mistake to locate it there in the first place, is that right?

Colonel REED. I defer to Colonel Mansperger, the expert.

Mr. TALCOTT. He located it?

Colonel REED. They are both his facilities.

Colonel MANSPERGER. The existing precision measurement equipment laboratory is a World War II structure. It is a 29-year-old temporary-type two-story frame building. It was built for who knows what purpose back in World War II. It was adapted for Precision Measurement Equipment Laboratory operations since, but being a wood frame building it is easily affected by vibrations. Vibrations, of course, prevent the accurate calibration of equipment. The upper story has been closed so that the dust does not filter down as badly into the precision measurement laboratory. It is just not suitable for a laboratory at all.

The runup facility is correctly located in that it is far enough away from the areas sensitive to noise but still close enough to the maintenance activities to make it convenient from a dispatch point of view of maintenance personnel.

Mr. TALCOTT. This was a B–24 base at one time. You ran out of B–24's so you put the next best thing there, I guess. Is it really well located for an F–111 base?

Colonel REED. It is ideally located. It provides the right type of environment, the terrain radar can be used in the hilly land, lots of turns and lots of tactics that can be followed, plus there is a great deal of air space and a large Sailor Creek range. It is a good base.

NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEV.

Mr. LONG. Nellis Air Force Base, Nev. Insert page 223 in the record. [The page follows:]

NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE

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 construct 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.

TAC—NELLIS AFB, NEV.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete July 31, 1973
Addition to aircraft operational apron	$33,300	100
Base personnel office	98,200	75

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	RKMF	NEVADA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1941/1948	CLARK	EIGHT MILES NORTHEAST OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL FIGHTER WING

FIGHTER WEAPONS WING

USAF TACTICAL FIGHTER WEAPONS CENTER

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	768	6,393	994	106	0	65	67	0	8,393
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	769	6,250	1014	84	0	65	67	0	8,249

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	23,220	104	86,725	86,829
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	95	6	2	8
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				86,837
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Excludes $5,631,200 Family Housing & Mobile Home Spaces)				2,865
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,588
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				10,400
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				102,690

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b (Priority)	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM SCOPE e	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	FUNDING PROGRAM SCOPE g	FUNDING PROGRAM ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
113-321	Addition to Aircraft Operational Apron I		SY	41,155	655	41,155	655
610-245	Base Personnel Office 41		SF	53,100	1,933	53,100	1,933
	TOTAL				2,588		2,588

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 (ORIGINAL)

Page No. 223

572

AIRCRAFT APRON

Mr. LONG. What problems have you had with lack of apron space at Nellis?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, the problem here is just a general overcrowding with something over 200 aircraft stationed there at all times. Our principal problem has been that when they run their many exercises there, transient aircraft come in from many other bases, and we just don't have the space to park them. They average from 15 to 20 transient aircraft at all times, so this is to alleviate that constant overcrowded condition.

Mr. LONG. How often do you have exercises here, and what types?

General REILLY. Sir, I would have to provide the details, but this is the fighter weapons center in the Air Force for all types of fighter aircraft. Crews come in from their parent bases on a continuing basis. I can provide detail, but there are continuing exercises.

Mr. LONG. Provide for the record a schedule of these exercises please, and the numbers of aircraft accommodated at Nellis at any one time due to these exercises over the past 2 years.

General REILLY. All right, sir.

[The information follows:]

SCHEDULE OF EXERCISES AND NUMBER OF AIRCRAFT AT NELLIS AFB FOR THE LAST 2 YEARS

1. Exercise Gunsmoke 1971. There were 53 aircraft involved; 37 from Nellis and 16 from other bases. There was a total of 159 aircraft on base. No Nellis aircraft were relocated.

2. Exercise Coronet Organ 1971. There were 59 aircraft involved, 12 from Nellis and 47 from other bases. There was a total of 163 aircraft on base. As part of the exercise, 36 F–111's were deployed from the base.

3. Exercise Gunsmoke 1972. Fifty-three aircraft were involved, 30 from Nellis and 23 from other bases. There was a total of 157 aircraft on the ramp. None were relocated.

4. Exercise Gunsmoke 1973. Forty-eight aircraft involved, 33 from Nellis and 15 from other bases. There was a total of 150 aircraft on base. None were relocated. In addition to the above exercises, there are other activities which involve aircraft deployments into Nellis; that is, squadron deployments, test aircraft, reserve deployments, et cetera.

BASE PERSONNEL OFFICE

Mr. LONG. I note that the base personnel office has a priority of 41 in the bottom 20 percent of this year's program. Could it be deferred?

General REILLY. Sir, it could. However, we certainly would hope that it wouldn't be.

Mr. LONG. I am glad to hear you say it could be deferred. What savings do you anticipate from the construction of a new facility?

General REILLY. Sir, we expect $100,000 one-time cost avoidance, that is in not having to do work on existing facilities and an annual savings thereafter of about $8,000 a year. We are not justifying this on strictly economic savings. It is to pull together into a single facility work which is now in five separate locations.

Mr. LONG. Again, these are savings without any reference to the costs of construction of the new facility, is that right?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. PATTEN. How is the morale of the force at Nellis? Do they have rest and recreational facilities nearby?

General REILLY. Just a few miles away. It is kind of expensive.

Mr. PATTEN. The Governors are out there today in Las Vegas.

General REILLY. Most of that recreation is beyond the capability of most of our airmen.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. LONG. Is that gambling on limits for the military?

General REILLY. There are no restrictions.

Mr. LONG. After having spent, as I told you once before, a year of my boyhood in an army camp, and noticing how personnel gamble their money away, I would say you couldn't have found a dollar in that camp 3 days after payday. It was all gone, mostly from gambling.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. LONG. Mr. Patten.

EXECUTIVE SESSION VOTED

Mr. PATTEN. I move that the meetings of the Military Construction Committee on Wednesday, June 6, be held in executive session. These meetings with the Navy are scheduled to discuss general strategy, the location of naval forces and its relation to the military construction program, the Trident submarine program and the strategic reasons for deployment in the Pacific, and other subjects which are classified secret. On this we need a record vote.

Mr. TALCOTT. Will all the matters that are brought up be classified secret?

Mr. NICHOLAS. No, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. The parts not considered classified as secret will be part of the public record, is that right?

Mr. LONG. I agree. Of course that motion would probably have to be amended, wouldn't it?

Mr. NICHOLAS. No; that is the normal procedure, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. Aye.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Dr. Long?

Mr. LONG. Aye.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Mr. Obey?

Mr. OBEY. Aye.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Mr. Talcott?

Mr. TALCOTT. Aye.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Mr. Patten?

Mr. PATTEN. Aye.

SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, S.C.

Mr. PATTEN. Shaw Air Force Base, S.C. Insert page 226 in the record.

[The page follows:]

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 structures. 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.

TAC—SHAW AFB, S.C.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, July 31, 1973
Communications transmitter/receiver facilities	$18,000	15
Dental clinic	16,500	40
Officer open mess	15,500	60

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		SHAW AIR FORCE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
TACTICAL AIR COMMAND	VLSB	SOUTH CAROLINA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1941	SUMTER	8 MILES WEST NORTHWEST OF SUMTER, S.C.

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE WING

TACTICAL CONTROL GROUP

9TH AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	938	5,124	651	28	13	30	74	0	6,858
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	930	4,967	666	28	13	30	74	0	6,708

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,089	141	60,903	61,044
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	119	(11) 6	66	72
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				61,116
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Excludes $10,143,000 Family Housing)				5,121
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,501
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				8,800
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				77,538

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
131-116	Communications Transmitter/Receiver Facilities I		SF	3,850	306	3,850	306
540-243	Dental Clinic I		SF	16,500	1,089	16,500	1,089
740-618	Officer Open Mess 39		SF	22,650	1,106	22,650	1,106
	TOTAL				2,501		2,501

DD FORM 1 OCT 74 1390

RUNWAY

Mr. PATTEN. Last year a third runway was requested at Shaw. It was primarily justified on the basis of the bare base sets which were stored here. Now these are to be transferred. Do you still plan to construct the runway?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, we do. A contract has been awarded. The support of the bare base was just one aspect of the requirement for additional runway takeoff and landing capability. The Shaw mission, involving the RF–4C reconnaissance aircraft and the other aircraft located there, makes it very desirable to have two runways in order that the slower aircraft can be segregated from the fast RF–4C.

Mr. DAVIS. I thought you already had two there.

General REILLY. No, sir, just a single runway. It is a second runway that is under construction. The base supports something over 70 RF–4 aircraft together with helicopters and 24 of the O–2, the small, light observation aircraft. This runway permits those O–2's especially to operate separately from the much higher performance RF–4.

Mr. PATTEN. Are the facilities requested this year of higher or lower priority than the runway?

General REILLY. Sir, I couldn't differentiate between these projects and the project for the runway, from an operational standpoint. The runway, of course, is extremely important. These projects in the program this year are also important: two of them are personnel support, a dental clinic and an officer's open mess; and the other is a communications facility.

OFFICER OPEN MESS

Mr. PATTEN. What are you currently using for an officer open mess?

General REILLY. Sir, at the present time, the open mess functions are housed in a building of temporary construction dating back to the early 1940's. It is old and deteriorated. It is not properly laid out for club activities. It lacks sufficient dining, kitchen, storage areas. It is just an old, wornout wooden building that we have been using for support of almost 1,000 officers. If we are successful with the project in this year's program, the existing structure will be demolished.

Mr. PATTEN. Is the structure unsound structurally?

General REILLY. No, sir, it is not in danger of collapsing at the moment, I don't think. However, it would require an awful lot of heavy repair to put it back. In fact, it would be impossible to put it back.

Mr. PATTEN. Has it been operating under a waver of safety criteria?

Colonel SHOOK. No, sir.

DENTAL CLINIC

Mr. PATTEN. Provide for the record your dental clinic workload at Shaw for fiscal years 1968 through 1977.

[The information follows:]

WORKLOAD FOR SHAW AFB DENTAL CLINIC

Fiscal year	Clinical procedures	Laboratory procedures
Actual:		
1968	117,731	28,220
1969	119,828	39,685
1970	138,752	34,782
1971	170,813	25,486
1972	161,615	33,959
Projected:		
1973	150,000	38,000
1974	150,000	38,000
1975	150,000	38,000
1976[1]	195,000	40,000
1977[1]	205,000	40,000

[1] The projected increases in workload after fiscal year 1975 when the facility becomes operational reflect the anticipated rise in work output which will be achieved in the larger facility.

Mr. PATTEN. What are you currently using for dental facilities at Shaw?

Colonel BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we are currently using a wood frame building which was completed in 1956. It has asbestos shingles and asbestos tile roof. It is inadequate for the operation of the dental programs by the dental staff there, and for delivery of dental care. It is an older building, and it does not lend itself to modernization as it sits, because of the complicated utilities systems which accompany dental structures.

Mr. PATTEN. Provide for the record the functions that will utilize this space if the new dental clinic is approved.

Mr. REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

It will be returned to the base for non-medical administrative use.

U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. PATTEN. U.S. Air Force Academy, Colo. Please insert page 231 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY	XQPZ	COLORADO

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1958	EL PASO	TEN MILES NORTH OF COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,110	1,278	2,077	0	4,557	52	0	-	9,074
b. PLANNED (End FY 76)	1,108	1,277	2,077	0	4,557	52	0	-	9,071

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	18,786	3,219	197,707	200,926
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	1,472	11	-	11
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				200,937
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Excludes Family Housing $4,940,000)				3,312
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				645
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				4,900
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				209,794

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE Priority b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
131-113	Add to and Alter Base Telephone Exchange Facility I		SF	10,159	162	10,159	162
812-231	Addition to Electric Substations I		LS	LS	483	LS	483
	TOTAL				645		645

DD FORM 1390 OCT 70 CONGRESSIONAL

U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

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 square feet. Existing telephone equipment is not capable of adequately supporting Academy telephone users. Lack of environmental 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 additon 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 on weekends. Load forecasts indicate overload of the system by 1975.

USAFA-USAF ACADEMY, COLO.—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete July 31, 1973
Add to and alter base telephone exchange facility	$13,000	70
Addition to electric substations	29,600	70

Mr. PATTEN. The request is for $162,000 to add to and alter the base telephone exchange. Is this new equipment being forced on you by the telephone company?

General REILLY. No, sir; I don't think it is being forced on us. This will provide a small addition and interior alterations to the existing telephone center to provide the necessary temperature and humidity conditions we require, and also some additional space for additional equipment. They have just had a general increase in the communications requirements there.

Mr. PATTEN. That is your full answer on how this new equipment will improve service?

General REILLY. Sir, I can provide additional information for the record on the various advantages of this, but the basic requirement stems from the need to improve the some 8,000 square feet we already have in terms of better air-conditioning, and to provide about 1,800 square feet for additional equipment which is needed to meet the expanding requirements.

[The information follows:]

TELEPHONE EXCHANGE ALTERATION AT AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The telephone equipment scheduled for installation serves two purposes: (1) It replaces installed equipment which is outdated, and (2) it provides for future telephone requirements. This new equipment has a lower or less frequent failure rate than the installed equipment; consequently, fewer service interruptions will occur because of malfunctioning telephone equipment.

At present, the telephone exchange is cooled by an insufficient and obsolete evaporative cooler and the daily summer temperature in the AUTOVON equipment room frequently ranges between 105 degrees F. and 115 degrees F. AUTOVON equipment specifications are designed for operation below 100 degrees F. Although the AUTOVON equipment has not yet failed because of high tempera-

tures, there is increased potential for failure because of the continued stress that results from high temperatures. In addition, the lack of proper temperature and humidity controls in the telephone exchange has caused the trouble recording equipment to malfunction due to warping, et cetera, of the key-punched perforated paper cards which are used in the equipment.

Mr. PATTEN. You are also requesting $483,000 for an addition to the electric substations. Have you had any experience of transformer failure?

Colonel RUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, we do have problems with the transformers from time to time. We have to take them down for maintenance. At these times what we have to do with the two existing transformers in the west substation is to exercise a load-shedding plan. We do take down portions of the cadet area in these cases while the maintenance is being performed.

Mr. PATTEN. What facilities would be affected by a power failure in this area of the Academy?

General REILLY. This would affect the entire so-called cadet area.

Mr. PATTEN. What do you use for fuel out there, oil, gas? Are you creating your own electricity?

General REILLY. No, sir, it is commercial electricity. These are just substations, transformer banks.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT (ZONE OF INTERIOR)

Mr. PATTEN. Pollution Abatement (Zone of Interior). Place page 234 in the record.

[The page follows:]

POLLUTION ABATEMENT—ZONE OF INTERIOR

The pollution abatement program amounts to $9,070,000 at various locations 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.

Pollution abatement—(Zone of Interior)

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation:	*Proposed program*
Various locations	9,070
Air pollution abatement	(3,689)
Water pollution abatement	(5,381)

AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Air Pollution Abatement. Insert pages 235 through 238 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete July 31, 1973
AAC—Eielson AFB, Alaska, heating plant (dust collectors)	$100,000	15
AU—Maxwell AFB, Ala., fuel storage (tank replacement)	5,000	80
AFLC—Lynn Haven FDS, Fla., fuel storage (floating pans)	23,000	100
PAF—Hickman AFB, Hawaii, fuel storage (vapor burning systems)	5,600	60
TAC—Nellis AFB, Nev., fuel storage (floating pans)	3,200	100
SAC—Minot AFB, N. Dak., fuel storage (floating pans)	6,000	100

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		VARIOUS LOCATIONS

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
VARIOUS	N/A	VARIOUS LOCATIONS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	N/A	N/A	N/A

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December ___									
b. PLANNED (End FY)									

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED				
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		( )		
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 ___				
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION			TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	Priority	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
899-00A	Air Pollution Abatement	I		LS	LS	3,689	LS	3,689
	TOTAL					3,689		3,689

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 PROFESSIONAL

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION	6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	9. STATE/COUNTRY
$ 3,689,000	P.L.	899-00A		VARIOUS LOCATIONS

10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION	11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE
$ 3,689,000	320		AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION	
a. PERMANENT	X
b. SEMI-PERMANENT	
c. TEMPORARY	
15. TYPE OF WORK	
a. NEW FACILITY	
b. ADDITION	
c. ALTERATION	X
d. CONVERSION	X
e. OTHER (Specify)	
16. REPLACEMENT	
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 | d. WIDTH

e. DESIGN CAPACITY | f. GROSS AREA

g. COOLING CAP. COST ($)

19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

Work Includes:

Modification of central heating plant, and aircraft fuel storage facilities to comply with air pollution abatement requirements.

Specific work at each location will be as defined by engineering studies.

Where the local situation will permit advantageous accomplishment of any portion of this project by connection to, utilization of, or participation in a public system, the public system will be used with contribution of project funds as required.

SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES

20. PRIMARY FACILITY	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST ($000)
Air Pollution Abatement	LS		$	$ 3,689
a. Heating Plant Alterations	LS	( )		(2,600)
b. Fuel Storage Facilities Alterations	LS	( )		(1,089)
c.		( )		( )
d.		( )		( )
21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES				$
a.				( )
b.				( )
c.				( )
d.				( )
e.				( )
f.				( )
g.				( )
h.				( )
i.				( )
j.				( )
22. TOTAL PROJECT COST				$ 3,689

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT

23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M)	As Required	
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

PROJECT: Work includes provisions for air pollution abatement by central heating plant modification and alteration of aircraft fuel storage facilities to control vapor emission.

REQUIREMENT: This project is required to continue the Air Force program for correcting, controlling, and preventing air pollution at Air Force installations and to comply with Federal, State, and local air pollution regulations.

CURRENT SITUATION: The existing facilities were provided in accordance with air quality standards in existence at the time of construction. Consequently, these facilities do not have emission controls which comply with recently imposed air quality standards. This request provides six air pollution abatement projects at six locations, and it will allow compliance with applicable air quality standards.

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1391 PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE

CONGRESSIONAL

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION LINE ITEM DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE - VARIOUS LOCATIONS
5. LINE ITEM NUMBER		6. LINE ITEM TITLE		
		AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT		

I. HEATING PLANT ALTERATION

State	Command	Installation	Number of Boilers	($000) Cost	Existing Conditions and Solution
Alaska	AAC	Eielson AFB	6	2,600	Particulate emission from the existing coal-fired central heating and generating plant exceeds allowable limits established by Federal, State and local air quality regulations. This project provides for the modification of this plant in order to meet acceptable standards.
HEATING PLANT ALTERATIONS - TOTAL				$2,600	

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1968 O—356-933

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION LINE ITEM DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE - VARIOUS LOCATIONS
5. LINE ITEM NUMBER		6. LINE ITEM TITLE		
		AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT		

II. AIRCRAFT FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES ALTERATIONS

State	Command	Installation	Capacity	($000) Cost	Existing Conditions and Solution
Alabama	AU	Maxwell AFB	LS	115	One substandard tank is approximately 40 years old. Due to extensive corrosion, the bottom was replaced 15 years ago. Without a floating pan, the vents on the tank allow volatile fuel vapors to escape into the atmosphere. The tank does not comply with State and local air pollution regulations. It is not economically sound to install a floating pan in this old tank. This project provides for the construction of a new tank with interior floating pan to prevent evaporation of fuel.
Florida	AFLC	Lynn Haven Fuel Distribution Station	LS	532	Nine existing aircraft fuel storage tanks are not equipped with floating pans and allow volatile fuel vapors to escape into the atmosphere. The tanks do not comply with State and local air pollution control regulations. This project provides for the installation of floating pans in the tanks to prevent evaporation of fuel and emission of vapor into the air.
Hawaii	PAF	Hickam AFB	LS	225	The open vents on 15 horizontal underground tanks allow volatile fuel vapors to escape into the atmosphere. The tanks do not comply with State and local air pollution control regulations. It is not possible to install floating pans in the underground horizontal tanks. This project provides for the installation of vapor burning flare systems to collect and burn the fuel vapors and prevent them from dispersing into the air.
Nevada	TAC	Nellis AFB	LS	98	Four aircraft fuel storage tanks at Nellis AFB and Minot AFB (each) are not equipped with floating pans and allow volatile fuel vapors to escape into the atmosphere. The tanks do not comply with State and local air pollution control regulations. This project provides for the installation of floating pans in the tanks to prevent evaporation of fuel and emission of vapor into the air.
North Dakota	SAC	Minot AFB	LS	119	
AIRCRAFT FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES ALTERATIONS - TOTAL				1,089	
AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT - TOTAL				$3,689	

Mr. PATTEN. Will this complete the air pollution abatement requirements at each of these bases?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; as far as meeting prescribed water and air quality standards. Of course we will undoubtedly have other pollution abatement projects in future years, but these projects will meet the current requirement.

Mr. PATTEN. Are all of these projects at firm bases?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; they are.

Mr. PATTEN. Will you keep the committee advised of any projects which appear weak?

General REILLY. We certainly will.

LONG-RANGE POLLUTION ABATEMENT NEEDS

Mr. PATTEN. How much more money will be required to bring the Air Force into compliance with existing pollution laws?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we have essentially satisfied our requirements for current quality standards, that is in air and water. However, we know with the recent water quality legislation in 1972 it will lead to, we feel, some sizable outlays in the Air Force to meet the new quality standards which are going to be developed. For example in 1977, we will be required to have not less than secondary treatment at all plants. The ultimate goal by 1983 is to have all discharged water suitable for swimming, and to be able to support aquatic life.

Mr. PATTEN. Limiting this to air pollution how long will it take to complete the air pollution program?

General REILLY. Sir, I really can't say. We have met our initial goals by having either completed or underway by the end of 1972 projects to meet applicable State and local or Federal standards. But again the air quality amendments or the amendments to the air quality act not too long ago are going to promulgate more stringent standards. As the States and local areas develop that new criteria we will have to comply. So we are going to have a continuing program I think in the years ahead to keep pace with the more stringent requirements.

FUEL SHORTAGES

Mr. PATTEN. Do you expect further costs as a result of fuel shortages?

General REILLY. Yes. It is undoubtedly going to result in increased cost. We are now concerned, of course, with the shortage of gas and oil, and greater reliance on coal. We have a great deal of coal but it has high sulfur content. If we burn high sulfur coal, we are going to have to have the necessary ways of meeting our air quality criteria.

Mr. PATTEN. You heard what the administrator said about coal? He made a comment about coal. He said coal creates more of a pollution problem. Colorado has a lot of coal. Mr. Nicholas.

ENGINE TEST CELLS

Mr. NICHOLAS. What about the requirements to abate pollution from engine test cells? Is the Air Force into this program now?

General REILLY. We have been working very closely with the Navy on this, but I don't think there are any definite quality standards that have to be met with test cells at the present time. We envision that they are coming, and it is probably going to lead to considerable expense for our test cells.

WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Water pollution abatement. Insert pages 239 through 245 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT—DESIGN INFORMATION (DESIGN COST ESTIMATED)

Project	Design cost	Percent complete July 31, 1973
SAC—Blytheville AFB, Ark., sewage treatment facilities	$19,000	85
SAC—Beale AFB, Calif., sewage treatment facilities	102,000	60
TAC—Eglin AFB, (Aux Field 9), Fla., sewage treatment facilities	43,000	60
PAF—Wheeler AFB, Hawaii, sewage treatment facilities	11,200	100
ADC—Charleston AFS, Maine, sewage treatment facilities	5,400	80
SAC—Offutt AFB, Nebr., sanitary sewer main	3,000	90
TAC—Myrtle Beach AFB., S.C., sewage treatment facilities	18,500	40
AFLC—Kelly AFB, Tex., sanitary sewer main	3,600	100
SAC—Fairchild AFB, Wash., sanitary sewer main	9,400	95
AFLC—Robins AFB, Ga., industrial waste treatment facilities	15,880	65
HQC—Andrews AFB, Md., industrial waste treatment facilities	18,240	15
SAC—K. I. Sawyer AFB, Mich., industrial waste treatment facilities	11,700	80
SAC—Pease AFB, N.H., industrial waste treatment facilities	9,800	80

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		VARIOUS LOCATIONS

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
VARIOUS	N/A	VARIOUS LOCATIONS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	N/A	N/A	N/A

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December ___									
b. PLANNED (End FY)									

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED				
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		( )		
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 ___				
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b — Priority	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
899-00W	Water Pollution Abatement I		LS	LS	5,381	LS	5,381
	TOTAL				5,381		5,381

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION	6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	9. STATE/COUNTRY
$ 5,381,000	P.L.	899-00W		VARIOUS LOCATIONS

10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION	11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE
$ 5,381,000	320		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION		16. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY				
a. PERMANENT	X	a. NO. OF BLDGS.	b. NO. OF STORIES	c. LENGTH	d. WIDTH	
b. SEMI-PERMANENT		e. DESIGN CAPACITY		f. GROSS AREA		
c. TEMPORARY		g. COOLING	CAP.	COST ($)		

15. TYPE OF WORK	
a. NEW FACILITY	X
b. ADDITION	X
c. ALTERATION	X
d. CONVERSION	
e. OTHER (Specify)	
16. REPLACEMENT	
17. TYPE OF DESIGN	
a. STANDARD DESIGN	X
b. SPECIAL DESIGN	
c. DRAWING NO.	

19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

Work Includes:

Collection and treatment of industrial and sanitary waste, upgrading of sewage systems, separation and disposal of waste oil, chemical/water mixtures and prevention of oil contamination due to spillage. Specific work at each location is as defined by engineering studies. Where the local situation will permit advantageous accomplishment of any portion of this project by connection to, use of or participation in a public system, the public system will be used with contribution of project funds as required.

SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES

20. PRIMARY FACILITY Water Pollution Abatement	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST ($000)
	LS		$	$ 5,381
a. Sewage Treatment Facilities	LS	( )		(4,287)
b. Industrial Waste Facilities	LS	( )		(1,094)
c.		( )		( )
d.		( )		( )
21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES				$
a.				( )
b.				( )
c.				( )
d.				( )
e.				( )
f.				( )
g.				( )
h.				( )
i.				( )
j.				( )
22. TOTAL PROJECT COST				$ 5,381

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT

23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M _____)	As Required	
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

PROJECT: Work includes provisions for water pollution abatement through the construction of collection and treatment facilities for industrial and sanitary wastes as well as upgrading existing facilities.

REQUIREMENT: This project is required to continue the Air Force program for correcting, controlling and preventing water pollution at Air Force installations in the United States to comply with Federal, State, and local water pollution regulations.

CURRENT SITUATION: Waste water treatment and disposal systems at existing facilities were constructed to comply with water quality standards then existing. As these standards have become more stringent, existing water treatment and water protection provisions at these Air Force installations have become inadequate. Industrial and sanitary wastes discharged into receiving waters are inadequately treated to maintain current and forecasted water quality standards. Also preventive measures for the protection against water contamination through fuel spillage do not exist. This request provides 13 water pollution abatement projects at 13 locations, and allows compliance with applicable water quality standards.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION LINE ITEM DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE - VARIOUS LOCATIONS
5. LINE ITEM NUMBER		6. LINE ITEM TITLE		
		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT		

I. SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITIES

State	Command	Installation	Capacity	($000) Cost	Existing Conditions and Solution
Arkansas	SAC	Blytheville AFB	LS	276	Domestic wastes are currently being discharged into a natural drainage course without adequate treatment. This practice does not meet Federal and State water pollution control requirements. The requested project will correct existing unsatisfactory conditions by providing additional clarifiers, sludge digesters, chlorine contact chamber, pumps and instrumentation to assure complete treatment.
California	SAC	Beale AFB	LS	1,978	Domestic and industrial wastes are not adequately treated to permit discharge into the natural drainage basin of the Sacramento Valley. Proposed facilities will provide required treatment to allow the base to comply with the latest regional pollution abatement requirements. This item will provide: operational control building, sludge handling system, equalization and holding basins, industrial waste oil separators, chemical neutralization equipment and detention units, instrumentation, chlorination equipment and detention tanks, waste oils storage, and all required components for complete waste treatment and disposal.
Florida	TAC	Eglin AFB Aux Afld #9	LS	859	Treated effluent from Eglin AFB, Auxiliary Airfield #9 sewage treatment plant is discharged into Santa Rosa Sound, an inlet of the Gulf of Mexico. State pollution control requirements prohibit discharge of effluent into the salt water basin because of commercial and recreational usage. Proposed facilities will assure adequate disposal of treated effluent in compliance with all applicable pollution abatement requirements.
Hawaii	PAF	Wheeler AFB	LS	280	Effluent from domestic waste oxidation ponds is being discharged into a local stream which flows into Pearl Harbor. This practice does not meet Federal pollution control requirements. This item will provide necessary pumps, mains and connections to pump sanitary sewage to a treatment facility being constructed by the Army. This will allow abandonment of existing oxidation ponds and assure proper treatment of domestic waste.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1969 O—360-938

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION LINE ITEM DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE - VARIOUS LOCATIONS
5. LINE ITEM NUMBER		6 LINE ITEM TITLE		
		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT		

State	Command	Installation	Capacity	($000) Cost	Existing Conditions and Solution
Maine	ADC	Charleston AFS	30 TD	136	The existing sewage treatment facility is currently operating at 150% of rated capacity and in need of extensive repairs. This facility cannot be altered to accommodate the required capacity and meet Federal or State of Maine effluent quality standards. This item will replace the existing facility with a pre-engineered package treatment plant which will adequately control effluent quality and meet water pollution abatement requirements.
Nebraska	SAC	Offutt AFB	3,225 LF	82	Effluent from the base sewage plant, lime slurry waste from the water treatment plant, and photographic waste all flow into Papillion Creek. A new Omaha-Missouri River Sewage Treatment Facility is to be built in 1975. This project will provide a sewage main from Offutt AFB to this new facility. It will enable Offutt AFB wastes to be treated in the new municipal plant and will allow closing of the base treatment plant.
South Carolina	TAC	Myrtle Beach AFB	LS	417	Inadequately treated domestic and industrial wastes are discharged into the Intracoastal Waterway canal. This waterway is used for recreational activities. Proposed construction will upgrade the quality of the effluent to meet established Federal and State criteria. This project will correct deficiencies by providing a grit chamber, sludge recycle and high rate sludge digestion system, surface scum removal units, laboratory facilities, chlorination units and detention contact facilities, instrumentation, water line, recycle system, and mechanical equipment components for complete waste treatment and disposal.
Texas	AFLC	Kelly AFB	LS	66	The trunk sewer serving the warehouse area of the base is flowing at maximum capacity. This condition overloads the collection facilities in the down stream areas with eventual overflow into surface drainage. Proposed construction will eliminate this pollution problem by providing an interceptor sewer for the warehouse area and discharge this flow into the 15-inch main at Billy Mitchell Village. This item will provide sewer mains, manholes and branch line connections required for an adequate sewage collection facility.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION LINE ITEM DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE - VARIOUS LOCATIONS
5. LINE ITEM NUMBER		6. LINE ITEM TITLE		
		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT		

State	Command	Installation	Capacity	($000) Cost	Existing Conditions and Solution
Washington	SAC	Fairchild AFB	LS	193	Unsatisfactorily treated domestic wastes are currently being discharged into a natural drainage basin contaminating water courses. This project will divert waste water flow from the existing Deep Creek treatment plant to the main base treatment plant. The project will include tie-in connections, pump station and force main.
TOTAL SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITIES				$4,287	

1. DATE	2 FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION LINE ITEM DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE - VARIOUS LOCATIONS
5. LINE ITEM NUMBER		6. LINE ITEM TITLE		
		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT		

II. INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT FACILITIES

State	Command	Installation	Capacity	($000) Cost	Existing Conditions and Solution
Georgia	AFLC	Robins AFB	LS	364	Activities in all industrial areas of the base are not served by an industrial waste collection system. Waste is stored in holding tanks for pick-up and removal to the waste treatment plant. The storage facilities do not have sufficient capacity and some times overflow into the Horse Creek run-off basin. These wastes contain pollutants that affect the quality of the receiving stream, in violation of the established pollution abatement criteria. This item will provide the collection lines, pump stations, force main and tie-in connections required to convey the waste waters to the industrial waste treatment plant.
Maryland	HQC	Andrews AFB	LS	304	Surface drainage from fuel storage areas enters the storm sewer system which discharges into natural drainage courses. Fuel spillages at these areas are flushed into the storm drains to eliminate a potential fire hazard; however, the concentration of materials violates State water quality standards for effluents discharged to a surface stream. The proposed oil separation units will eliminate the discharge of oil entrained runoff water and meet current Federal and State pollution abatement requirements. This item will provide all necessary holding basins, oil separation equipment, and effluent connections.
Michigan	SAC	K.I. Sawyer AFB	LS	229	Industrial wastes are collected in a lagoon and discharged into the base sanitary sewer system. Seepage from the lagoon allows possible contamination of ground water which is a source of water supply for the base. Materials discharged into the base sewers are toxic to microorganisms at the base domestic waste treatment plant and aquatic life in Silver Head Creek. This item will provide necessary pretreatment units, storage tanks, transfer pump system, and waste disposal facilities to adequately treat and dispose of base industrial waste in accordance with applicable pollution abatement requirements.

U S GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1969 OF—368-932

1 DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION LINE ITEM DATA (Continued)	3 DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE - VARIOUS LOCATIONS
5. LINE ITEM NUMBER		6. LINE ITEM TITLE		
		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT		

State	Command	Installation	Capacity	($000) Cost	Existing Conditions and Solution
New Hampshire	SAC	Pease AFB	108 TD	197	The existing industrial waste collection system does not provide adequate collection of oil and aircraft cleaning compounds from the aircraft corrosion control facility. These contaminants flow into the storm drainage system, thus polluting nearby streams, the Piscataqua River, and Great Bay. This item will provide an adequate collection system and will increase the capacity of the industrial waste treatment facility to adequately process these wastes.
TOTAL INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT				$1,094	

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1969 O—368-832

Mr. PATTEN. Will this complete the requirement at each base?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; it will for sanitary sewage collection and treatment, and for industrial waste treatment facilities.

Mr. PATTEN. How much money will be needed to bring the Air Force into compliance with existing water pollution laws?

General REILLY. Sir, I think we are in compliance. I might just mention that in fiscal years 1968 through 1973 the Congress has appropriated over $53 million for facilities to bring us into compliance with water quality criteria.

Mr. PATTEN. Will you keep us advised if any of these projects look weak?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. You are not eligible for that $23 billion we passed on water quality. It is like taking it out of one pocket to pay another. I don't know how broad that act is. I don't know how much they are going to release. It is going to be billions. We didn't think of you as we were debating the bill, I am quite sure of that. OMB would probably be happy to say they spent so much, if they have to spend it. If we give you $30 million, they could say they spent that for the overall category.

General REILLY. It will indirectly affect us. I am sure it will lead to development of new regional and municipal systems which the Air Force will elect to tie into, as opposed to treating our own waste.

AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

Mr. PATTEN. Air installation compatible use zones. Insert pages 247 through 249 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
	AF		AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
VARIOUS	N/A	VARIOUS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	N/A	N/A	N/A

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December ___									
b. PLANNED (End FY)									

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED				
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		( )		
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 ___				
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
911-146	Land 46		LS	LS	25,909	LS	2,000
	TOTAL				25,909		2,000

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390 CONGRESSIONAL

1 DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	3. DEPARTMENT	4 INSTALLATION
	1974		AF	VARIOUS

5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION	6 PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	7 CATEGORY CODE NUMBER	8 PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	9 STATE/COUNTRY
$ 26,300,000	P.L.	911-146		CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

10 PROPOSED APPROPRIATION	11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13 PROJECT TITLE
$ 2,000,000	320		AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

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) Land Acquisition

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 78,605 AC

g. COOLING — CAP — COST ($)

19 DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

Land Acquisitions:

Acquire real estate by exchange, donation, and restrictive easements to establish necessary protective air installation compatible use zones at Air Force bases within the Continental United States.

Area Includes:

Approach and take-off zones and areas adjacent to base activities and facilities that present a potential source of hazard or disruption to the civilian community; conversely, it includes areas adjacent to off-base developments that threaten the safety and effectiveness of air installation operations.

SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES

20 PRIMARY FACILITY Air Installation Compatible Use Zones	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST ($000)
	LS		$	$ 2,000
a.		( )		( )
b.		( )		( )
c.		( )		( )
d.		( )		( )
21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES				$
a.				( )
b.				( )
c.				( )
d.				( )
e.				( )
f.				( )
g.				( )
h.				( )
i.				( )
22. TOTAL PROJECT COST				$ 2,000

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT

23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M AC)

a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT	78,605	
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD	78,605	
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)	78,605	78,605

24. RELATED PROJECTS

25. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT

PROJECT: Acquire by exchange, donation, or restrictive easement interests in 78,605 acres of land at 13 Air Force installations in the Continental United States.

REQUIREMENT: Protective zones must be established adjacent to selected air installations to prevent further encroachment by residential and certain commercial developments, into hazardous and high aircraft-noise areas. It is necessary that land use in these zones be restricted to activities such as: light commercial/industrial usage, farming, and recreation that are compatible with airfield operations.

CURRENT SITUATION: Expanding residential, commercial and industrial developments accompanying recent population growth in urban areas have resulted in progressive encroachment upon Air Force installations. If encroachment continues without restraint, both the military and civilian communities will be exposed to operational incompatibilities and safety hazards; further, the high-noise levels of operating aircraft will be a source of annoyance to the civilian community and will adversely affect community and base relations. The Department of Defense is giving priority attention to protecting the operational capability of airfields by acquiring necessary interests in land around affected installations.

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1391 PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE

CONGRESSIONAL