

Mr. PATTEN. How similar are the two facilities you are requesting at NRL and NELC in design and function? If you consolidated them at one or the other activity, would you save money? Have you studied this?

Captain SAPP. There is little similarity between the requested NELC facility and that for NRL. The NRL facility is dedicated to investigation of the electronic warfare aspects of ship defense, that is, the passive detection and electronic jamming of enemy threat related electronic weapon systems. The design of the NRL facility centers around the construction of a large anechoic chamber to simulate an environment of free space in order that electromagnetic radiation and its effects may be accurately measured. The anechoic features preclude radiated perturbations and make possible accurate, instrumented diagnostic measurements. This facility is electronic warfare oriented.

The NELC facility is intended to house the elements of a naval ship command and control capability and as is contained in this testimony (page 597) is intended to enhance their effort in integration of all the electronic equipment; the command support equipment aboard one of our vessels, to help attack the problems of shortness of time available to a ship commander in the current military world. The design of the NELC facility centers around the construction of a large shielded enclosure for the testing of complete integrated command, control and communications systems. The system under test may be incident to development, procurement or existing shipboard installations requiring modifications. The shielded aspect is a security requirement to contain electronic signatures. Shielding also meets the need of testing under a controlled environment free from external electromagnetic noise radiations. The NELC facility is fleet operationally oriented in the support of viable communications systems that perform the function of data acquisition, display and information dissemination.

Thus, NELC does not get into the aspects of the problem being investigated at NRL; that is, to quantify the engagement capability of the electronic warfare complement of the ship's weapon system. The NELC facility is dependent upon the NRL facility to provide the basic information necessary for its mockup of the electronic warfare module. It has neither the special facilities nor the expertise available and necessary to do the engagement modeling as was described in the NRL proposal. If consolidated at one activity there would be no saving in money. The research effort of each are different and the space requirement is a function of each different program. Work at NELC could not be performed in the NRL facility nor vice versa. The two facilities have been studied as to their different characteristics and support functions at all levels of review including the Director of Defense Research and Engineering and have been determined to be an urgent and critical technical support deficiency of each.

Mr. PATTEN. The Navy and other Government agencies have testing facilities which are located in secure areas with little or no electronic interference or compromise of signal data. Could you not support this research at one of these installations?

Captain SAPP. No, sir; not for the type of security requirements that we have in this project, and second, because this is an integrated facility which must work with different organizations within our laboratory, and in particular with the tactical electronic warfare division, we

need to bring together personnel and facilities and equipment that could not be brought together either for physical separation or security reasons.

NAVAL LABORATORY—ACOUSTIC RESEARCH FACILITY

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to the acoustic research facility which is requested at NRL at a cost of \$740,000. What functions are to be performed in this facility? Is this all to be basic research?

Captain SAPP. Yes, sir; this is just about all basic research. This is our effort in studying the physics of sound in the ocean and its characteristics for various applications that I indicated in my earlier testimony. I will be glad to elaborate again for the record.

Mr. PATTEN. I think it would be helpful.

[The information follows:]

The facility is designed to support the seagoing experimental part of a basic research program in underwater acoustics. That program, in turn, supports the Navy's mission for undersea surveillance. The experimental program consists of long-range propagation studies to explore the manner in which acoustic signatures from submarines propagate to our sensors, and from such knowledge be able to optimally locate such sensors. Additionally, by knowing the propagation characteristics, the performance of detection systems can be predicted and from such predictions optimum operational capability achieved. The experimental program also consists of acquiring ocean acoustic data in terms of ambient noise statistics (over as much as a year), bottom loss measurements, scattering coefficients, and acoustic fluctuation statistics, all of which contribute to an ultimate design of optimal acoustic systems for detection of submarine threats. Extensive specialized instrumentation, sensors, sources, handling equipment and specialized mooring equipment are characteristic of acoustic experimentation at sea.

Mr. PATTEN. Why couldn't this work be done at one of the many other laboratories involved in acoustic research and testing?

Captain SAPP. I believe the key there is in the special qualifications and experience and facilities of the personnel at the Naval Research Laboratory. Our personnel are by education and experience oriented toward the conduct of basic research in the acoustics and the behavior of sound in the ocean. We have very unique ship facilities. Our programs and support have all been directed toward long-range propagation, understanding the ambient noise of the ocean, the coherence of sound over various separations when you are talking about receiving it at two different hydrophones. So you end up, to summarize, with an organization and facilities which are uniquely dedicated to the conduct of highly specialized oceanographic research and particularly the application of underwater sound to submarine detection over long ranges.

Mr. PATTEN. Are the two research vessels which this project supports scheduled to stay at NRL through 1980?

Captain SAPP. Yes, sir; they are, and we expect a continuing and very viable program for those ships.

AIRCRAFT R.D.T. & E. FACILITIES

Mr. PATTEN. Let's turn to aircraft R.D.T. & E. facilities.

Earlier in our hearings we discussed the closure of the research functions at Philadelphia and the relationship of research and testing done at Warminster, Pa.; Lakehurst, N.J.; Patuxent River, Md.;

and China Lake, Calif. Are there any other Navy activities which have major aeronautical R. & D. or testing missions?

Dr. LAWSON. I don't know whether you mentioned the Pacific Missile Range.

Mr. PATTEN. No.

Dr. LAWSON. Or the Naval Ship Research and Development Center.

CLOSURE OF NAVAL ENGINEERING CENTER, PHILADELPHIA

Mr. PATTEN. Could you discuss the closure of the Philadelphia facility. Indicate the costs, savings, and construction impact of this action for the record.

[The information follows:]

The planned closure at the Naval Air Engineering Center, Philadelphia, Pa., is part of a Navywide effort to effect an orderly and phased reduction of shore activities and shore-based fleet activities commensurate with reductions of the operating units of the fleet already implemented or programmed.

The development effort and associated personnel (898 civilians and 16 military) in aircraft launch, recovery and landing aids and 202 civilians and 3 military in the ground support equipment effort will be transferred to the Naval Air Test Facility (NATF), Lakehurst, N.J. NATF is currently responsible for subsequent test and evaluation in aircraft launch, recovery and landing aid equipment.

240 civilian personnel will be retained at the shipyard to continue tenant support and to continue the function of the Weapons Engineering Standardization Office.

Reduction of 911 civilians and 15 military personnel will result in annual savings of \$14,945,000. The one-time cost to implement this action is \$20,099,000.

MISSION OF AERONAUTICAL TEST CENTERS

Mr. PATTEN. Could you explain for the record the differences in the major aeronautical testing centers? Also show, particularly, the extent to which there are duplications of missions and of testing facilities

[The information follows:]

The distinction between the Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, N.J. and the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md., was provided for the record as a matter of prior interest on June 21, 1973.

The two major Navy aeronautical flight testing centers are headquartered at Patuxent River, Md. and Point Mugu, Calif. The Naval Air Test Center in Maryland provides ranges and facilities and conducts piloted aircraft testing. The Pacific Missile Range in California provides ranges and facilities and supports missile and pilotless air vehicle testing conducted by the Naval Missile Center at Point Mugu. The complete dissimilarity between the major systems flight tested at these two Navy centers is accompanied by absolute differences in physical requirements for the test ranges, airborne and ground instrumentation, data-gathering methods, and supporting facilities.

To test in a representative combat environment, missiles must be fired at realistic target representations. The missiles and often the targets impact the surface, therefore vast Pacific Ocean ranges are required for safety. Highly specialized ground radar, optical tracking equipment, and radiotelemetry is provided at the Pacific Missile Range. Airborne target drone control, surveillance, and tracking is also provided. An air base complex is available inasmuch as the majority of missiles are air-launched. Specialized shops for missile assembly, checkout, and maintenance are provided.

The Naval Air Test Center has extensive airspace range reservations for test flights, but only small surface areas for gunfiring and bombing. Specialized ground radar, optical tracking equipment, and radio data links to the tested aircraft are available. Aircraft launching and recovery facilities are provided and used to test airplane flight and structural characteristics. An air base complex is available, with specialized shops for test and evaluation of airplane systems.

The necessity for operating aircraft at both of the major Navy flight testing centers does result in an airbase at each; however, a substantial portion of the supporting facilities of the airbase are unique, owing to the distinct missile and aircraft test mission orientation of each center. A limited number of functions are actually common and can use common facilities and equipment.

Although the missions of the flight testing centers are properly related to missile systems at one and aircraft systems at the other, their missions permit integrated testing, as appropriate, at either. This is possible even though there are no duplicate facilities when the full capabilities of the system being tested are not to be exercised. For example, captive-carry of a missile for an extended number of aircraft flights without launching could be done from either center.

Missions and testing facilities need to be sufficiently specialized, yet flexible and modern, if the Navy is to obtain efficient and economical flight testing and at the same time obtain adequate technical and operational test and evaluation.

PATUXENT RIVER ANTENNA TESTING FACILITY

Mr. PATTEN. There is a project in the fiscal year 1974 program for an antenna testing facility at Patuxent River. Where else do you conduct antenna testing, and why couldn't the work to be done in the new facility at Patuxent River be done at existing facilities elsewhere?

Mr. MURPHY. The antenna facility proposed at Patuxent River is a uniquely sited facility in that it requires an unobstructed overwater area in which to conduct the testing. We propose to site it there on the shore of the Chesapeake Bay. It is also a facility that will work in conjunction with and complement other aircraft testing and trial programs that we conduct at Patuxent River.

Mr. PATTEN. What you are saying is that is where it should be done and not elsewhere?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir. Since the prime function here is aircraft flight testing, we are afforded a unique opportunity to simultaneously test antenna performance in flight.

OTHER REALIGNMENT ACTIONS

CLOSURE OF PASADENA LABORATORY

Mr. PATTEN. Could you discuss the consolidation of laboratory activities at the undersea center at San Diego?

Dr. LAWSON. Yes, sir. I assume by that you mean the move of the Pasadena branch down to San Diego?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes.

Dr. LAWSON. That represents an effort to get all of those technical people under one roof and on one piece of real estate so that we don't have to maintain what amounts to two sets of overhead. This will support the technical people.

Mr. PATTEN. What will be the costs and savings from this move, and how much additional construction will be required? Provide details for the record.

[The information follows:]

Costs, savings, and construction impact as a result of closure action on the Pasadena Laboratory of the Naval Undersea Center, San Diego, Calif. are as follows:

	<i>Millions</i>
Estimated 1-time closure costs.....	\$3.1
Estimated annual savings.....	1.2
Estimated military construction impact.....	0

Mr. PATTEN. Were the existing facilities at the undersea center underutilized?

Dr. LAWSON. Were they?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes.

Dr. LAWSON. No, sir.

CLOSURE OF NAVAL CIVIL ENGINEERING LABORATORY

Mr. PATTEN. Discuss the proposed closure of the Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory at Port Hueneme for the record and indicate the costs, savings, and construction impact of this action.

[The information follows:]

The Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Port Hueneme, Calif., will be disestablished and its vital functions consolidated with other naval activities. A total of 1 military position and 157 civilian positions will be transferred to the Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme; 5 military positions and 139 civilian positions will be relocated to the Naval Undersea Center, San Diego, Calif., and 9 military and 15 civilian positions will be relocated to the Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Fla. Two military and 69 civilian positions will be reduced. The Environmental Data Base Program Office in Hawaii, a component of NCEL, will remain in place; however, command responsibility will be shifted to another naval activity.

This action will result in annual savings of \$1.1 million. The one-time cost to implement this action is \$1.7 million. No military construction impact is anticipated.

CLOSURE OF NAVAL STRATEGIC SYSTEMS NAVIGATION FACILITY

Mr. PATTEN. Could you provide similar information with regard to the Naval Strategic Systems Navigation Facility, Brooklyn, for the record.

[The information follows:]

The Naval Strategic Systems Navigation Facility, Brooklyn, N.Y., was established because of the urgency of the Poseidon program in 1969. Though the requirement for work in this area continues, the priority and level of effort have since been reduced. Centralization of inertial navigation development and test at the Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pa., will serve to consolidate similar technologies and permit savings of administrative and overhead costs of the Brooklyn activity.

These actions will result in annual savings of \$1.2 million and a reduction of 3 military and 63 civilian billets. One-time costs are expected to total \$3.3 million

CLOSURE OF NESTEF, ST. INIGOES, MD.

Mr. PATTEN. Also provide a discussion of the consolidation of systems test and evaluation at the Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, and the costs and savings for the record.

[The information follows:]

The Naval Electronics Systems Test and Evaluation Facility, Webster Field, St. Inigoes, Md., is to be disestablished as an independent field activity by the end of this calendar year. The planned action includes an organizational consolidation of the ongoing work and current employment with the Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, headquartered in San Diego, Calif. All work and associated personnel which are amenable to relocation are planned for transfer to the San Diego site. Other functions which cannot be sited in San Diego will be located in close proximity to the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md. The resultant complex will provide for more efficient operations because of the inclusion of additional complementary effort in the larger center of excellence for electronics in San Diego.

Estimated 1-time-cost

	<i>Millions</i>
Personnel :	
Relocation -----	\$1.1
Severance -----	0.2
Equipment relocation and other costs -----	1.0
Total -----	2.2
Annual savings: Personnel compensation and associated costs -----	0.4
Construction impact: Military construction avoided -----	1.648

Mr. PATTEN. What additional facilities will be required at NELC? Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

The Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, Calif., has a project in the fiscal year 1974 military construction program for the first increment of an electronics development and testing laboratory. Although the requirement for this project is not predicated upon consolidation of systems test and evaluation functions from the Naval Electronic Systems Test and Evaluation Facility (NESTEF), St. Inigoes, Md., the construction of the proposed laboratory will assist in enabling NELC to absorb the function by easing existing crowded conditions. No military construction for additional facilities at NELC is required as a result of relocation of NESTEF functions to San Diego.

FUTURE CONSOLIDATIONS OF R. & D. FACILITIES

Mr. PATTEN. Do you feel that there will be further consolidations of Navy R.D.T. & E. activities in the next few years?

Dr. LAWSON. I am under constant pressure from within the Navy to search for consolidation. I had a 2-hour meeting on that subject yesterday afternoon. I do not, at the present time, see any consolidation or significant changes that I can honestly believe it would be sensible to make. There are, as in any big organization, from time to time small pieces of work springing up somewhere where they really aren't critical and you would like to move two or three people some place else where they are more closely coupled with people doing work that their work is leading into.

Mr. PATTEN. You don't see any major ones?

Dr. LAWSON. No, sir, I don't see any major ones.

UTILIZATION OF EXCESS FACILITIES

Mr. PATTEN. What does the Navy plan to do with the Pasadena Laboratory of the Naval Undersea Center now that it is scheduled for closing?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think we propose to excess the property but I will answer it for the record.

Mr. PATTEN. All right.

[The information follows:]

The Navy is studying continued use of some of the facilities of the Pasadena Laboratory. Any real property determined to be excess to Department of Defense requirements as a result of the above actions will be reported excess to the General Service Administration for disposal.

Mr. PATTEN. What does the Navy plan to do with facilities of the Naval Air Engineering Center, Philadelphia, now that it is scheduled for closing?

Mr. MURPHY. The Naval Air Engineering Center, Philadelphia, Pa., is being relocated as a result of the shore establishment realignment program to Lakehurst, N.J.

The facilities formerly used by NAEC will be transferred for the most part to the Naval Support Activity and the Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, upon completion of the relocation.

Mr. PATTEN. Why hasn't some action been taken to dispose of the 171,866 square feet of unoccupied warehouse space assigned to the Naval Underwater Systems Center, Newport, R.I.?

Mr. MURPHY. The space concerned is buildings 32 and 35 on Gould Island, total area of which on official records is 171,994 square feet. The Navy intends to retain these buildings as vital assets for ongoing torpedo development work and for mobilization contingencies. The configuration of these buildings is such that the torpedo firing pier, at the north end of the island, is an integral part of the complex. This pier is complete with unique elevator systems for simulating varying firing depths. Continuing development work requires the availability of this firing pier, complemented by a 10,000 yard restricted range area running northward in Narragansett Bay. Because of the remote location on Gould Island, little interest would be evidenced in these facilities by the private sector, should disposal be undertaken.

All other areas totaling 42 acres on Gould Island are being excessed under Executive Order 11502 procedures.

Mr. PATTEN. Are there plans for utilization of the 42,727 square feet of unoccupied space at the facilities of the Naval Medical Research Unit No. 2 at Taipei, Taiwan?

Admiral MARSCHALL. To my knowledge there is no unoccupied space at the Naval Medical Research Unit. The total building area is approximately divided into three-fifths laboratory space, one-fifth administrative space, and one-fifth ancillary functions. The passageways, stairwells, and so forth, are allocated to the adjacent functions.

Mr. PATTEN. Are there questions? If not, I think we can excuse the good Captain and Dr. Koslov and Dr. Lawson.

Thank you. We enjoyed it and wish all Members of Congress could have heard your discourse.

Dr. LAWSON. We enjoyed being here.

Captain SAPP. We appreciated the opportunity.

OTHER CLASSIFIED PROJECTS

Mr. PATTEN. Insert pages 1 through 3 of book III in the record.
[The pages follow:]

17 APRIL 1973

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

UNCLASSIFIED PROJECTS WITH CLASSIFIED DESCRIPTION/REQUIREMENT - SECTION 201

	<u>Authorization</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>		
	<u>Project</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Installation</u>	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Total</u>	
<u>NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON, D.C.</u>					
<u>District of Columbia</u>					
<u>Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C. (ONR)</u>					
P-180	Integrated Electromagnetic Test & Analysis Laboratory (310.34 - 56,250 SF)	4,655	<u>4,655</u>	4,655	<u>4,655</u>
<u>FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT</u>					
<u>State of Virginia</u>					
<u>Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown (CNM)</u>					
P-329	Torpedo Overhaul Shop (216.40 - 13,400 SF)	1,327	<u>1,327</u>	1,327	<u>1,327</u>
<u>FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT</u>					
<u>State of Hawaii</u>					
<u>Naval Station, Pearl Harbor (PACFLT)</u>					
P-004	Evaluation Center - Ford Island (141.83 - 20,677 SF)	1,870	<u>1,870</u>	1,870	<u>1,870</u>

606

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
 (ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

UNCLASSIFIED PROJECTS WITH CLASSIFIED DESCRIPTION/REQUIREMENT - SECTION 201

<u>Installation and Project</u>	<u>Authorization</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>	
	<u>Project Amount</u>	<u>Installation Total</u>	<u>Project Amount</u>	<u>Installation Total</u>
	<u>ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA</u>			
	<u>Bermuda Islands</u>			
<u>Naval Air Station, Bermuda (LANTFLT)</u>				
P-108 Air/Underwater Weapons Compound (216.55 - LS)	1,725	1,725	1,725	1,725
	<u>EUROPEAN AREA</u>			
	<u>Spain</u>			
<u>Naval Station, Rota (NAVEUR)</u>				
P-390 Tactical Support Center (141.90 - 658 SY)	85	85	85	85
	<u>PACIFIC AREA</u>			
	<u>Mariana Islands</u>			
<u>Naval Magazine, Guam (PACFLT)</u>				
P-439 Mine Assembly Facility (216.30 - 43,434 SF)	3,229	3,229	3,229	3,229

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
 (ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

UNCLASSIFIED PROJECTS WITH CLASSIFIED DESCRIPTION/REQUIREMENT - SECTION 201

<u>Installation and Project</u>	<u>Authorization</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>	
	<u>Project Amount</u>	<u>Installation Total</u>	<u>Project Amount</u>	<u>Installation Total</u>
	<u>PACIFIC AREA (CONTINUED)</u>			
	<u>Republic of the Philippines</u>			
<u>Naval Air Station, Cubi Point (PACFLT)</u>				
P-999 Tactical Support Center (141.90 - LS)	161	161	161	161
		9,718		9,718
TOTAL - SECTION 201 CLASSIFIED		9,718		9,718

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, YORKTOWN, VA.

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to the Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Va. You are requesting a torpedo overhaul shop. Are there questions?

NAVAL STATION, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

Mr. PATTEN. Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

EVALUATION CENTER—FORD ISLAND

Mr. PATTEN. You are proposing a building addition for an evaluation center. Why do you need an addition to this particular building instead of utilizing one of the many permanent buildings in the vicinity which are, or soon will be, underutilized?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, to answer that, I would like to quote from a message where I asked the very same question, and this is the reply.

While it is true that other facilities on Ford Island will or could be made to fit or adapted for this project, the nature of the operation and the technical requirements of the evaluation center are such that new construction is necessary, and possibly total costwise the most economical solution. One of the basic and most important requirements is that the evaluation center be physically contiguous to the 3d Fleet Operations Command and Control Center.

This is required primarily for the interphase necessary for the Commander 3d Fleet to act on enemy nuclear submarine threat and to coordinate and direct retaliatory prosecution with antisubmarine aircraft. Reaction to the Soviet long-range ballistic missile threat is time critical. In addition to the costly major engineering construction and electrical work required to move the present evaluation center to an existing bare building, to physically relocate the evaluation center to a new location would require additional communications equipment at both the evaluation center and at the present communications center to incrypt and transmit secure data as well as additional equipment between the evaluation center and the 3d Fleet Operations Center. Presently, only minor costs are involved expanding the present COM center as part of this project. It would not be economically feasible nor operationally desirable to also relocate the COM center concurrently with the evaluation center.

Mr. PATTEN. Provide for the record the utilization of all the permanent facilities on Ford Island.

[The information follows:]

CURRENT USE OF PERMANENT ASSETS
ON FORD ISLAND

<u>BLDG #</u>	<u>CURRENT USE(S)/USER</u>	<u>CAT CODE</u>	<u>AREA (SF)</u>
S169	Photo Bldg/U.S. Army	141.60	8,998
S168	Photo Bldg/U.S. Army	141.60	8,998
219	Damage Control Bldg/NAVSTA (Vacant)	141.90	962
220	Damage Control Bldg/NAVSTA (Vacant)	141.90	962
221	Damage Control Bldg/NAVSTA (Vacant)	141.90	962
222	Damage Control Bldg/NAVSTA (Vacant)	141.90	962
223	Damage Control Bldg/NAVSTA (Vacant)	141.90	962
284	Shop, Eng Test Stands/NAVSTA (Vacant)	211.50	29,196
3	Ready Supply Store/NAVSTA Supply	441.10	6,240
3	Boat Repair Shop/NAVSTA Opns	213.58	14,897
174	Gen Whse/NAVSTA (Vacant)	441.10	9,724
173	Smoke Drum Whse/NAVSTA (Vacant)	441.10	1,996
43	Gen Whse/NAVSTA	441.10	19,800
94	Gen Whse/NAVSTA Opns/Supply	441.10	9,518
130	Gen Whse/U.S. Army	441.10	29,640
134	Gen Whse/NAVSTA Rep Ford Island	441.10	29,640
176	Gen Whse/U.S. Army	441.10	64,363
207	Messhall Strg/NAVSTA Supply	723.10	1,995
225	Gen Whse/NAVSTA Opns	441.10	3,472
264	Gen Whse/NAVSTA Supply	441.10	1,180
293	Gen Whse/NAVSTA (Vacant)	441.10	515
S214	Gen Whse/NAVSTA Rep Ford Island	441.10	10,125
79	OPNL Strg/NASA	141.77	42,875
79	Gen Whse/Marines MCAS	441.12	42,875
79E	Gen Whse/Marines MCAS	441.12	71,535
79W	Gen Whse/Marines MCAS	441.12	77,285
309	Flamm Strg/U.S. Army	441.30	240
310	Flamm Strg/U.S. Army	441.30	240
311	Flamm Strg/U.S. Army	441.30	240
541	Strg/NAVSTA (Vacant)	740.60	1,106
25	Gen Whse/NAVSTA Opns	441.10	1,455
25	Admin Off/NAVSTA Opns	610.10	800
38	Auto Strg/NAVSUBTRACOMPAC	740.77	119,546
54	Auto Strg/NAVSTA Ford Island Rep	740.77	76,069
133	Auto Strg/U.S. Army	740.77	29,640
76	Dispensary/NAVRFCMED C1	550.10	16,916
76	Dental Clnc/Den Clnc	540.10	2,548
77	Admin/FICPAC	610.10	36,500
77	OPCON/Com 3rd Flt	141.83	10,500
77	Photo Lab/COMOCEANSYSPAC	141.60	4,000
166	Admin Bldg/U.S. Army	610.10	3,045
167	Admin Bldg/U.S. Army	610.10	21,959
175	EM Bks/U.S. Army	722.11	42,315
175	Admin Off/U.S. Army	610.10	22,048

<u>BLDG #</u>	<u>CURRENT USE(S)/USER</u>	<u>CAT CODE</u>	<u>AREA (SF)</u>
208	Admin Off/COMOCEANSYSPAC	610.10	5,074
208	Pers Shltr/NAVSTA Dis CONTROL	730.65	600
170	Admin Bldg/U.S. Army	610.10	6,620
171	Admin Bldg/U.S. Army	610.10	6,540
55	EM Bks/NAVSTA BEQ Ofc	721.11/12	166,447
55	Bank/Bank of Hawaii	740.18	608
44	Gen Whse/NAVSTA Opns	441.10	4,104
175	EM Bks/U.S. Army	722.11	42,315
175	Admin Ofc/U.S. Army	610.10	22,048
136	EM Bks/NAVSTA BEQ Ofc	722.11/12	54,340
78	BOQ/NAVSTA BOQ Ofc	724.11/12	58,354
89	Indoor Theatre/NAVSTA Spec Svcs	740.56	14,512
89	Personnel Shltr/NAVSTA Dis Contl	730.65	2,500
596	Personnel Shltr/NAVSTA Dis Contl	730.65	4,611
599	Personnel Shltr/NAVSTA Dis Contl	730.65	8,516
S180	Personnel Shltr/NAVSTA Dis Contl	730.65	3,412
S181	Personnel Shltr/NAVSTA Dis Contl	730.65	4,258
42	Admin/NRFC	610.10	2,741
42	Tel Exch/FWC	131.40	1,352
42	Post Ofc/NAVSTA Ford Island Rep	740.33	1,344
42	Laund Mat/Thrifty Wash	740.09	432
216	BEQ/NAVSTA (Vacant)	722.11	8,370
217	Hobby Shop/NAVSTA Spc Svcs	740.38	1,938
37	Gym/NAVSTA Spc Svcs	740.43	42,552
88	EM Club/Navy Exch	740.63	15,764
6	Gen Whse	441.10	68,693
26	Trng Bl/FLETRAGRU	171.20	36,695
86	Appl Inst/FLETRAGRU	171.20	8,750
132	Trng Struc/FLETRAGRU	171.20	1,344
204	WATRFR OPS Bldg/COMTHIRDFLT	159.64	1,950
26A	SSBN Term/Trnr/NAVSUBTRACENPAC	171.20	46,471
39	SSBN Term Trnr/NAVSUBTRACENPAC	171.20	201,260
87	Gen Whse/FICPAC	441.10	53,864
87	Admin Ofc/FICPAC	610.10	3,600
75	Admin Bldg	610.10	39,600

Mr. PATTEN. Are the communications inputs to the present building so extensive that it would be more expensive to extend them to one of the other buildings which has space for the entire Evaluation Center and room for future expansion, than to build this addition?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, it would. And I believe I expanded on that in my first answer.

Mr. PATTEN. Provide the equipment and the costs for the record.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

Cost of equipment, Ford Island Evaluation Center

Existing equipment to be relocated:

AN/FSC-1(v) communications center equipment (teletype, etc.)	-----	\$800,000
AN/FQA-4(v) data analysis equipment (acoustical analysis)	----	2,350,000
CDC-3100 computer and interface equipment	-----	2,000,000
New equipment arriving in January 1974: Fast time analyzer	-----	420,000
New equipment—purchase in 1974, 1975, and 1976: Main evaluation center equipment:		
Other procurement, Navy funds	-----	10,000,000
Research and development funds	-----	7,745,000

Shore equipment includes instrumentation tape recorders, permanent storage recorders, recall storage recorders, consoles for control and switching, displays for data monitoring and retrieval, "real time" analyzer, "eight times real time" analyzer (play base from tape), high speed analyzer, computer, photogram displays, nonphoto displays (chart displays), and computer interactive display for recalling and correcting computer stored data.

Future equipment to be purchased after fiscal year 1976: Data relay system, \$2 million.

Mr. PATTEN. Do you expect future expansion of these systems?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, this project is not in actuality an expansion of functions nor addition of many new billets and equipment but is the installation of recently developed equipment which will expand the Commander Oceanographic Systems Pacific capability — within the greater Pacific area. This equipment is new, the technology is new, and the concept is relatively new such that calibration testing and possibly redesign or reconfiguration will be necessary prior to its being put on the line for full operation. This means that the present space and equipment must be maintained intact until the new evaluation center is completed and acceptable. This could require as much as 2 full years once construction is started.

It is also a distinct possibility that some of the new display equipment must be powered and controlled by the existing equipment room and computer until hardware and software for the new computer is fully acceptable. Some of these problems will have to be worked out on-site as equipment installation progresses. Difficulty would be encountered with such an interim or temporary configuration if the new location is not close at hand.

Mr. PATTEN. Has the Navy reviewed its undersea surveillance and ASW control systems to determine if their capabilities to handle large volumes of information rapidly should be further expanded?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, we are expanding our underwater capability all the time. We have very recently expanded our _____.

Mr. PATTEN. How much of your existing equipment are you planning to keep?

Mr. TAYLOR. All of the existing equipment will continue to be used. The new equipment is just additional equipment which is keeping up with the state of the art.

Mr. PATTEN. It wouldn't hurt to defer this for 1 year would it?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, it certainly would.

Mr. NICHOLAS. This is an area in which the investigative staff among others says the command and control functions need to be further developed and expanded. I think the Navy acknowledges this. You will be developing new equipment. You will be expanding the coverage of existing systems, which will mean new equipment. Plus you may be developing more sophisticated equipment to expand and to make more manageable the data that you have. This is the type of project in which you are just going to keep adding and adding year after year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Anywhere there are technological advances we keep pace with the advanced technology.

Mr. NICHOLAS. So you are asking for an addition to this building this year, but this is not to say that 3 years from now you won't be back with another addition to this building.

Amiral MARSCHALL. Let me answer that. If the enemy develops better ——— submarines we are going to have to develop better technology to keep up with it. This business of national defense is not a static thing whatsoever and we must keep pace with the threat. We are not in a position to tell you that we have the perfect answer yet or in a position to tell you there won't be modifications, improvements, or additions at some future time. It is a dynamic thing.

Mr. NICHOLAS. I think the indications are you have to make improvements just to keep up with a possible wartime situation. The investigative staff report last year indicated that basically the Navy couldn't keep track of more than ——— and get the data in a usable way in which the commander could utilize it.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is what we are proposing, sir, the addition of equipment that technological advances have just produced so we can do this very thing.

Mr. NICHOLAS. If, in the last year, you have been able to develop solutions, procure equipment, and get your facility lined up to take care of the job it seems remarkable, because the indications were the Navy was beginning to realize, having just conducted a survey in the area, that they had a lot more to do.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have been in a crash program to improve our capability ———. That is why we have increased the ——— we almost ——— within the past year or so.

Mr. NICHOLAS. I guess the point of my question is, if you are going to be expanding and if it is going to be something that is growing, and if you have lots of vacant permanent facilities at Ford Island, which you do, maybe it would be more economical in the long run just to put this thing in one of those permanent facilities and pay the one-time cost for the new cryptographic equipment.

Mr. TAYLOR. As you pointed out this is something that will continue to grow and further equipments will have to be developed and put into service. As our new equipments are developed and become operational, they can hopefully replace some of the equipments we are presently using.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Will you double check on whether this will be the last facility required?

Admiral MARSCHALL. As I have indicated, Mr. Nicholas, I can't say that and no one in the Navy can say that. It is something that is a dynamic thing. This will continue to grow as far as I can see. The state of the art is just increasing by leaps and bounds.

Mr. DAVIS. I think we can understand the problem on that, but it is bothersome to be talking about something costing \$92.50 a square foot and then to have the statement made that we don't know if, 2 years thereafter, this is going to do the job.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We certainly feel 2 years thereafter it will be doing the job. My point is for the foreseeable future we are using state-of-the-art equipment. We are convinced it is going to work or we wouldn't be in for this facility. The alternative which Mr. Nicholas has presented has been looked at. We feel it doesn't suit our particular requirement at this time. And if at some future time there can be a use for the buildings he mentioned we will certainly look at them then.

NAVAL AIR STATION, BERMUDA

Mr. PATTEN. Turn to Naval Air Station, Bermuda.

You are requesting an air/underwater weapons compound. What is the present situation here, and how long has it existed?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, the present situation is one of our inability to meet an operating requirement and a safety problem regarding hauling ammunition across Bermuda Island. Pointing to this map of Bermuda, I can give you an idea. The Navy 3 years ago took over the former Kindley Air Force Base here and all of our aircraft operations and our need for ordnance are centered here.

Mr. DAVIS. Was that a British base?

Mr. MURPHY. Kindley Air Force Base was a USAF base for transports. The Navy originally was here on the western tip, at a former seaplane base. We are now, except for some small operations, entirely located at Kindley but our storage facilities are back here at the former seaplane base. We are handling the ordnance on a narrow road, a 1-hour haul, and our project will enable us to have ammo and ordnance storage capability here where our aircraft are located.

Mr. PATTEN. P-3's are stationed at various locations along the east coast of the United States. What part does Bermuda play in P-3 deployments?

Mr. MURPHY. One of the total of 12 P-3 squadrons stationed at Brunswick, Maine, or Jacksonville, Fla., is always deployed to NAS Bermuda. A squadron remains in Bermuda normally for 6 months and is then relieved by a similar squadron. The Bermuda squadron performs ASW patrols in consort with other squadrons operating over the Atlantic Ocean from the two Conus P-3 bases, and from NS Iceland, NAF Azores, and NS Rota. ———.

Mr. LONG. Why are there no secure storage facilities ——— at this facility, which, according to the justification sheet, is required to "launch fully armed aircraft within 1 hour of an alarm?"

Either the alert planes are now loaded, making this project not justified on the need for emergency speed, or this is a neglected security situation.

Mr. MURPHY. Storage facilities ——— have existed at this location, but they are unsatisfactory and require replacement, primarily because they are located some 23 miles away from our airfield. The 1-hour haul time over builtup areas is hazardous, a security problem, and stretches out our reaction time. Stated concisely, we developed a bad situation when, upon phasing out our old seaplane base and moving over to the airfield on the other end of Bermuda, we did not obtain a proper ordnance storage facility at the new location. This project will give us the needed storage at the right location.

NAVAL STATION, ROTA, SPAIN

Mr. PATTEN. Naval Station, Rota, Spain. You are requesting a tactical support center. I have no questions.

NAVAL COMPLEX GUAM, MARIANA ISLANDS

Mr. PATTEN. Naval Complex, Guam, Mariana Islands. You are requesting a mine assembly facility at the Naval Magazine. Will this project complete the requirements?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir. This shop will take care of all mines at Guam for the foreseeable future.

NAVAL COMPLEX, SUBIC BAY, REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. PATTEN. Naval Complex, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines. You have another tactical support facility here. The committee is familiar with the requirement.

Mr. PATTEN. It has been a pleasure having you gentlemen here. The committee is adjourned until 10 tomorrow morning.

THURSDAY, JULY 12, 1973

Mr. LONG. The committee will come to order.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Mr. LONG. Sixth Naval District. Insert in the record I-88 through I-88c.

[The pages follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

<u>Installation and Project</u>	Authorization		Appropriation	
	Project Amount	Installation Total	Project Amount	Installation Total
<u>SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT</u>				
<u>State of Florida</u>				
<u>Naval Air Station, Cecil Field (LANTFLE)</u>				
P-191 Weapons System Training Facility (171.35-13,932 SF)	791		791	
P-192 Intermediate Maintenance Facility (211.37-79,332SF)	2,845		2,845	
<u>Naval Regional Medical Center, Jacksonville (BUMED)</u>				
P-600 Dispensary Addition (550.10-2,250 SF)	107		107	
		3,743		3,743
<u>Naval Air Station, Ellyson Field (CMT)</u>				
P-351 Electric Distribution System Improvements (812.90-IS)	75		75	
		75		75
<u>Naval Air Station, Jacksonville (LANFFLT)</u>				
P-497 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (722.11-45,516 SF-228 MN)	1,494		1,494	
P-702 Bachelor Officer Quarters Modernization (724.11-80,570 SF-96 MN)	850		850	
P-018 Land Acquisition (911.50-365 AC)	2,200		0	
<u>Naval Air Rework Facility (CMM)</u>				
P-409 Aircraft Final Finish Facility (211.30-42,150 SF)	6,925		6,925	
P-417 Utilities (812.30-IS)	2,297		2,297	
		13,766		11,566
<u>Naval Hospital, Orlando (BUMED)</u>				
P-001 Hospital Replacement (510.10-310 Beds)	22,312		22,312	
		22,312		22,312

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

<u>Installation and Project</u>	<u>Authorization</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>	
	<u>Project</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Installation</u>
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT CONT'D</u>				
<u>State of Florida (Cont'd)</u>				
<u>Naval Training Center, Orlando (CNT)</u>				
<u>Administrative Command</u>				
P-118 Dental Clinic (540.10-19,834 SF)	1,481		1,481	
<u>Service School Command</u>				
P-035 Nuclear Power Training Building (171.20-131,300 SF)	4,628		4,628	
P-076 Basic Electricity & Electronics Training Building (171.20-25,000 SF)	1,274		1,274	
		7,383		7,383
<u>Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City (CNM)</u>				
P-245 Experimental Diving Facility (310.86-16,000 SF)	1,363		1,363	
P-214 Systems Development and Test Facility (310.89- 38,400 SF)	2,100		2,100	
P-213 Deep Ocean Engineering Pressure Building (Amendment) (Navy Mine Defense Laboratory (310.90-1S) (FY 1969 - PL 90-408 Authorization \$7,411,000)	-		1,986	
		3,463		5,449
<u>Naval Air Station, Pensacola (CNT)</u>				
P-270 Air Operations Building Addition (141.40-4,100 SF)	199		199	
P-455 Operations Flight Trainer Building (171.35-17,952 SF)	791		791	
P-465 Naval Aviation Museum Supporting Facilities (890.90-1S)	299		299	
P-420 Entrance and Arterial Roads (2nd Increment) (851.10- 4.4 MI)	1,410		1,410	
		2,699		2,699

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

<u>Installation and Project</u>	<u>Authorization</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>	
	<u>Project</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Installation</u>
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT CONT'D</u>				
<u>State of Florida (Cont'd)</u>				
<u>Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola (CNT)</u>				
P-059 Electronics Warfare Training Building (171.20-55,333 SF)	3,982		3,982	
P-038 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (722.20-188,400 SF- 1,200 MN)	5,877		5,877	
		9,859		9,859
<u>Naval Air Station, Whiting Field (CNT)</u>				
P-097 Dispensary and Dental Clinic (550.10-31,235 SF)	2,186		2,186	
		2,186		2,186
<u>State of Mississippi</u>				
<u>Naval Home, Gulfport (BUPERS)</u>				
P-002 New Naval Home (Phase II) (724.20-600 MN- 345,424 SF)	9,444		9,444	
		9,444		9,444
<u>Naval Air Station, Meridian (CNT)</u>				
P-212 Flight Training Device Building Addition (171.35-11,286 SF)	525		525	
P-150 Dispensary and Dental Clinic (550.10-40,600 SF)	2,500		2,500	
<u>Naval Technical Training Center</u>				
P-151 Administration Building (610.10-20,900 SF)	675		675	
P-148 Gymnasium (740.43-21,000 SF)	832		832	
		4,532		4,532

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
 (ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

<u>Installation and Project</u>	<u>Authorization</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>	
	<u>Project</u> <u>Amount</u>	<u>Installation</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>Project</u> <u>Amount</u>	<u>Installation</u> <u>Total</u>
<u>SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT CONT'D</u>				
<u>State of South Carolina</u>				
<u>Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston (CNM)</u>				
P-592 Addition to Dispensary (550.10-3,600 SF)	252		252	
		252		252
<u>Naval Station Charleston (IANTFLT)</u>				
P-856 Communication Facility (131.50-1S)	1,321		1,321	
<u>Poseidon</u>				
P-398 Submarine Deployed Crew Storage (730.35-5,000 SF)	177		177	
		1,498		1,498
<u>State of Tennessee</u>				
<u>Naval Air Station, Memphis (CNT)</u>				
P-999 Applied Instruction Building (171.20-92,925 SF)	4,478		4,478	
		4,478		4,478
TOTAL - SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT		85,690		85,476

1/ See Classified Book for Requirement Statement

BASE REALIGNMENT

Mr. LONG. Could you discuss briefly the major realignment actions affecting the 6th Naval District?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The first project that comes up, Mr. Chairman, is the administration building at Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Ga., which is a move from Philadelphia. At Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla., we have two projects moving from Quonset Point, R.I. The intermediate maintenance building at \$2,845,000.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The question is what activities are moving?

Admiral MARSCHALL. If you would prefer the activities, I think Mr. Murphy can speak to that.

Mr. MURPHY. Speaking first to the air community moving into the Jacksonville-Cecil complex, aircraft units which will be displaced upon the closure of Quonset Point Naval Air Station, this is predominantly carrier-based ASW aircraft squadrons and helicopter squadrons.

Moving out of the Key West area to Patuxent River under the realignment we have another squadron of VX-1's, a test and evaluation aircraft squadron. Essentially that covers the naval air involving the 6th Naval District.

Talking to the surface fleet, we will be moving several surface ships from the Newport area into the Charleston Naval Base for homeporting at that location.

For purposes of talking to the training command beyond the air surface Navy, Mr. Taylor can address the training command move.

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, within the Naval Training Command from Ellyson Field, Fla. we are relocating helicopter training presently conducted here to Whiting Field, Fla. Then residual elements of the Naval Publications and Examining Center, Great Lakes, Ill., the Naval Correspondence Course Center, Scotia, N.Y., the Naval Publications and Examining Center, Memphis, Tenn., and the Naval Training Publications Division, Washington, D.C. will be relocated and consolidated into a new Naval Publications and Examining Center to be established at this activity.

Mr. LONG. Which activity?

Mr. TAYLOR. Ellyson Field, Fla.

Mr. LONG. You know, Horace Greeley was born too soon. He said, if you recall, "Go West, young man." Now it seems the motto is go South. There seems to be an enormous exodus of military installations out of the North and northeast into the southern part of this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

PERSONNEL MOVES

Mr. McEWEN. I wonder if we could have something on numbers of people involved in all of these various moves. Do you have that?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir. For example, at Ellyson, the relocation to Whiting of the helicopter training I spoke of involves 641 permanent party individuals and 229 nonstudents. To Ellyson Field, the four activities I mentioned will be moving there involve 588 personnel total.

To continue on, the disestablishment of the Naval Air Station, Glynco, Ga., requires the relocation of the naval flight officer training

from Glynco to NAS Pensacola. Additionally technical training conducted there will be relocated in two places, to Dam Neck, Va., and Memphis, Tenn. The Combat Information Center training will be relocated to Dam Neck, Va., and the GCA training will be relocated to Memphis, Tenn.

Admiral MARSCHALL. In addition, Mr. Chairman, we do have some ships moving from Newport down to Mayport and we have the experimental diving unit moving out of Washington, D.C.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS OF EXCESSED FACILITIES

Mr. LONG. All these moves involve military construction requests of quite a few millions of dollars. Is that right, Admiral?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Not all of it, sir. I think the total 1974 program base alinement items which require Milcon amount to \$45,500,000.

Mr. LONG. I would like to know how much we are leaving stranded in all of these places you are moving out of. I think that is very important.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We could provide for the record the plant value at places from which we move.

[The information follows:]

A summarization of costs of land and structures to be considered surplus as a result of implementation of the shore establishment realignment program shows Navy real property facilities with an acquisition cost of \$526 million will be declared excess to the Navy's needs. However, maximum facility use studies are continuing which may entail some adjustment to the total of acquisition costs for facilities to be excessed.

Admiral MARSCHALL. The total impact, of course, is one of savings. We have a savings figure generated for each of the moves. Each one will generate savings.

Mr. LONG. You mean operating savings?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes; and some cost avoidance, of course.

Mr. LONG. We are not dealing with operating costs here, of course?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No.

Mr. LONG. We have to deal with construction. I can't help feeling that operating costs are pretty much a theoretical matter anyway, a matter of speculation. You can figure different ways.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Some of these items—

Mr. LONG. And operating costs will never show up anywhere in items you can identify in the Defense budget, will they?

Admiral MARSCHALL. As a matter of fact, I think the whole base closure proposition is based on the fact we can't afford what we have now and we probably can make do with the money we have with the closures.

COST OF NEW CONSTRUCTION RESULTING FROM REALINEMENTS

Mr. LONG. That would be fine—if you weren't asking for new construction to make the move.

Admiral MARSCHALL. The base closure proposition was done in the context of the whole fabric of the Navy as opposed to a specific item such as military construction, and we did recognize there would be one time costs which had to be incurred. Some of these items associated

with the \$45.5 million which I mentioned were scheduled for other places.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if you could give for the record a list of the new construction requests as a result of Secretary Richardson's closure and realignment announcement of April 1973.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes.

[The information follows:]

The following is a summary of projects included in the FY 1974 Program as a result of the 17 April base closure announcement.

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>P-NO</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
NSA Brooklyn, NY	008	BEQ Modernization	1,056
	998	Relocate Telephone Switchboard	75
NSY Philadelphia, PA	501	Computer Support Facility	180
	502	Electronics Equipment Facility	735
NAS Norfolk, VA	517	Helicopter Maintenance Hangar	2,525
NS Norfolk, VA	697	Relocation of Flt Landing	803
	889	Dredge Southside Pier 2	314
	025	Vehicle Parking Area	310
	999	Applied Instruction Building	3,950
FCDSTC Dam Neck, VA	999	Applied Instruction Building	5,959
MCSC Albany, GA	900	Admin Building	5,204
NAS Cecil Field, FL	112	Intermediate Maintenance Building	2,845
	101	Weapons System Training Facility	791
NAS Jacksonville, FL	702	BOQ Modernization	850
	497	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	1,494
NAS Memphis, TN	999	Applied Instruction Building	4,478
NS San Diego, CA	182	Berthing Pier	10,000
NAS Miramar, CA	301	Avionics Shop Addition	331
	302	Applied Instruction Building	1,542*
NAS North Island, CA	999	Applied Instruction Building	476
NSY Hunters Point, CA	401	Dry Dock Support Facility	250
NSY Mare Island, CA	201	Electronic Shop Alterations	200
NAS Moffett Field, CA	017	BEQ Modernization	500
	402	Parking Apron	750
	403	Fuel Storage	300
			45,918

*Project increase of \$419,000 provided by ASN (I&L) ltr House and Senate Committees on Armed Services of 17 Jul 1973.

Mr. LONG. As nearby McCoy Air Force Base is to be closed, and some McCoy facilities are to be transferred to Orlando, what steps can be taken to use McCoy facilities for nuclear power training development?

Mr. TAYLOR. We have looked at McCoy to see if there were suitable training facilities that would satisfy our requirement for nuclear power schools. However, as you realize, McCoy was an operational SAC base and has limited number of training facilities. So far we have been unable to find any facilities which are suitable for conversion for use for the nuclear power school.

Mr. LONG. Provide for the record the projects requested for the 6th Naval District in fiscal year 1974 which are required as a result of base realignments. Also provide similar information on out-year projects. [The information follows:]

The following projects have been requested for the 6th Naval District in the fiscal year 1974 program as a result of base realignments:

Activity and project	Cost (thousands)
MCSC Albany, GA.: Administration building.....	\$5, 204
NAS Cecil Field, Fla.:	
Intermediate maintenance facility.....	2, 845
Weapons system training facility.....	791
NAS Jacksonville, Fla.:	
BOQ modernization.....	850
Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	1, 494
NAS Memphis, Tenn.: Applied instruction building.....	4, 578
The following projects are anticipated to be requested in the fiscal year 1975 program as a result of base realignments:	
NAS Jacksonville, Fla.:	
Maintenance hanger modernization.....	632
Helicopter training facility.....	1, 200
NAS Pensacola, Fla.:	
Aircraft parking ramp.....	1, 260
Hanger.....	1, 500
Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	1, 200
NAS Memphis, Tenn.: Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	2, 760

IMPACT OF PERSONNEL CHANGES

Mr. LONG. Which bases will be affected by major personnel increases, and how will these personnel be housed and supported?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Murphy and Mr. Taylor take care of different segments of this thing if they could speak separately.

Mr. MURPHY. With regard to the aircraft units moving to Cecil and Jacksonville, we have an immediate need, and that is reflected in our program for Jacksonville this year, for a bachelor enlisted quarters project and a bachelor officers quarters modernization project. Essentially those two projects will accommodate the increase in personnel there, the bachelor enlisted and bachelor officer personnel.

At Cecil Field we have no immediate requirements for bachelor enlisted space as people can be absorbed into existing assets. Of course the great number of personnel assigned to the large ships being moved from Newport into 6th Naval District are housed aboard the ships to which they are assigned. So they will simply be living aboard their ships as far as accommodations are concerned.

ANALYSIS OF SAVINGS AND COSTS OF REALINEMENTS

Mr. LONG. Have all of the costs been taken into account in your estimates of costs and savings resulting from these realinements?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We certainly hope so, Mr. Chairman. We have done an exhaustive study.

Mr. LONG. Do you take into particular account the interest and depreciation on the new structures you would put up in order to make the move?

Admiral MARSHALL. Yes, we have done that.

Mr. LONG. Is that part of the cost?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Did you give full value to this?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We would have to give that figure for the record.

Mr. LONG. You depreciate your buildings awfully fast.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Twenty-five years.

Mr. LONG. Business does that for income tax purposes, but it is always done with tongue in cheek because they know the building is going to be worth a lot more at the end of that time. Apparently, the armed services don't feel buildings are worth anything at the end of that time, and want to replace them.

Mr. NICHOLAS. How are you showing those figures? I had a feeling you were showing the new investments, and discounting the long-term saving against those.

Admiral MARSCHALL. I don't have the methodology used in the base realignment studies. I know all of these things were considered. We could provide the methodology for the record.

Mr. LONG. I would like to see it. You are going to be coming back. I would like to get into a little discussion on this subject later on.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We did not use the present value technique on the base closure items simply because the savings were so dramatic we felt it would be an unnecessary exercise.

Let me show one of the things we have, Dr. Long, which would indicate the extent to which—this is the broad picture, of course—it was done on an individual basis.

Mr. LONG. For example, consider the Boston complex. You have estimated annual savings here of \$23.9 or \$24 million. Is that your summary of everything that follows?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. That is the annual savings, sir. The other is anticipated savings.

Mr. LONG. Is that the net you are expecting?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It does not include the military construction savings for future years. It is the annual savings of operating costs.

Mr. LONG. Your annual operating savings?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. That is different.

Admiral MARSCHALL. There is another figure, the second one over, military construction avoided.

Mr. LONG. That is another highly theoretical item. Many people might question very much whether by staying, these new requests would have been necessary.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We realize that is theoretical. That is based on valid figures. However, in the base closure analysis generally speaking our estimated annual savings within a few years cover the one time closure costs, and that is the basis from which the decisions on base closures were made.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Take the Boston case you are looking at.

Mr. LONG. Is there no military construction required anywhere as a result of that move?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This \$915,000 item is the one we discussed previously in the committee which would be required.

Mr. LONG. That is little or nothing; you are not moving it anywhere, you are just closing it down. Is that what you are saying?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We are closing the shipyard down. Some of the people may move. One or two of the functions may move. It has been discussed for the record.

Mr. LONG. You can show an easy saving there if one accepts the nearly \$12 million of military construction avoided, but that seems to me to be quite a controversial thing.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Dr. Long, even if you don't look at the military construction avoided and you look just at estimated annual savings and one-time closure costs, you can see that there is a quick return on the money.

Mr. LONG. Of course the estimated annual savings is a big grab bag. Who says there is that much annual savings?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This is based on historical figures and the rate of the operation of the Boston shipyard.

Mr. LONG. I would like to see much more information on how those figures are arrived at.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We will provide that for the record.
[The information follows:]

The "estimated annual savings" mentioned above consist of eliminated military and civilian salaries and operating and maintenance costs.

The "one-time closure costs" mentioned above consist of severance pay, terminal leave pay, transportation costs for personnel, permanent change of station costs for military personnel and dependents, preservation and caretaker costs and equipment transportation costs.

The "military construction avoided" mentioned above consists of projects that were programed for construction in fiscal years 1974 through 1978 which will not now be required.

BOSTON COMPLEX
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

1. Savings - Ultimate:

a. Manpower Authorization		5,892
Military	554	
Civilian	5,338	
b. Annual Fiscal		\$23.980M
Military Pay	\$ 5.236M	
Civilian Pay and Other O&MN	\$ 2.184M	
Navy Industrial Funds	\$16.560M	

2. Construction Costs Avoided:

FY-1973 and prior	None
FY-1974	\$.937M
FY-1975	None
FY-1976	\$.195M
FY-1977	\$10.648M

3. Costs:

Relocation of personnel and equipment	\$33.054M
---------------------------------------	-----------

4. Personnel changes resulting from this action only:

	<u>Preceding Action</u>	<u>Following Action</u>
a. Manpower Authorization		
Military	1,649	634
Civilian	6,417	318
b. Annual Fiscal		
Military Pay	\$15.035M	\$5.557M
Civilian Pay and other O&MN	\$14.671M	\$4.848M
Navy Industrial Funds	\$91.838M	0

IV. PERSONNEL ANALYSISA. Present Complex Personnel Status

Unit	Ceiling			On-Board		
	OFF	ERL	CIV	OFF	ERL	CIV
Naval Support Activity	12	53	72	11	69	72
Area Audit Service	5	0	49	4	0	49
Finance Office IHD	1	4	25	1	5	25
Naval Reserve Center, Boston	2	23	0	2	23	0
Naval Reserve Center, Quincy	1	12	0	1	12	0
Res Suppl. Hdqs/Res & Tra Act	15	18	30	13	19	30
SOAP TEAM Boston	1	3	0	0	2	0
AFEES Boston	1	1	0	1	1	0
NAVELEX Activity	1	0	50	1	0	61
Headquarters 1st H.D.	33	22	50	34	22	53
Naval Investigative Service Off	3	6	46	3	6	46
Naval Recruiting District	15	160	11	17	140	11
Naval Courier Service Det.	3	11	0	1	12	0
Naval Research Branch Office	3	0	83	2	0	83
Navy Exchange	2	0	0	2	0	0
Armed Forces Police Det	0	13	0	0	0	0
Navy Band Unit #110	1	23	0	1	20	0
Correctional Center (NAVSTA)	0	30	0	0	32	0
SUPSHIP COMB & REP (Boston)	3	0	46	2	0	46
SUPSHIP COMB & REP (Quincy)	10	0	107	10	0	107
DEFCONADMINSERVREG	14	0	0	1	0	0
Naval Shipyard (Incl Serv Craft)	66	92	5000	59	80	5319
Naval Hospital	169	311	307	185	287	311
NAS, South Weymouth	36	386	187	35	367	173
Regional OCMH	0	0	15	0	0	14
Marine Barracks	2	80	0	2	80	0
USS Constitution	2	43	0	1	66	0
ESD Hanscom Field	1	0	0	1	0	0
NROTC & ADMIN Unit, (MIT)	5	3	4	5	3	4
	407	1294	6082	395	1254	6417

B. Planned Action: Relocate the following Ceiling/On-Board personnel.

NSY Philadelphia, Pa	0	0	392	0	0	392
NSC Norfolk, Va.	0	0	191	0	0	191
NSC Charleston, S.C.	0	0	25	0	0	25
NSY Portsmouth, Va.	0	0	3	0	0	3
Other Naval Activities	76	80	12	68	80	12
Other Naval Hospitals	102	144	129	102	144	129
	178	224	752	170	224	752
Remain in Boston Area						
NAS South Weymouth	36	386	187	35	367	173
SUPSHIPS Quincy	10	0	107	10	0	107

	Ceiling			On-Board		
	<u>OFF</u>	<u>ENL</u>	<u>CIV</u>	<u>OFF</u>	<u>ENL</u>	<u>CIV</u>
Armed Forces Police Det.	0	4	0	0	4	0
Naval Recruiting District	15	160	11	17	140	11
Naval Investigative Service Off	1	3	23	1	3	23
AFFEES Boston	1	1	0	1	1	0
Naval Reserve Centers	3	35	0	3	35	0
USS Constitution	2	42	0	1	66	0
ESD Hanscom Field	1	0	0	1	0	0
NROTC & Admin Unit (MIT)	5	3	4	5	3	4
Commandant First Naval District	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>
	76	640	332	76	625	316
Reassigned Ceilings/On-Board	254	864	1083	246	849	1070
C. Available for RIF/ Reassignment	153	430	4999	149	405	5347

V. ECONOMIC ANALYSIS (\$000)A. Annual Complex Operating Costs:

Activity Operation	O&M (NAVSUPACT)	7,672
Activity Operation	NIF (NSY)	91,838
Activity Operation	O&M (USNH)	4,833
Activity Operation	O&M (NAS)	2,166
Military Salaries	(NAVSUPACT)	5,460
Military Salaries	(NSY)	1,503
Military Salaries	(USNH)	4,964
Military Salaries	(NAS)	3,108
	TOTAL	\$ 121,544

B. Annual Complex Cost After Action:

Activity Operations	\$ 4,848
Military Salaries	5,557
	\$ 10,405

C. Estimated Increase in Annual Operating Costs at Gaining Installations Resulting from Action:

Activity Operations O&M	\$ 7,639
Military Salaries	4,329
NIF Operations	75,278
	\$ 87,246

D. Estimated Annual Savings Resulting from Action:

Current O&M	\$ 14,671
Proposed O&M	12,487
Savings	\$ 2,184
Current Military Salaries	\$ 15,035
Proposed Military Salaries	9,886
Savings	\$ 5,149
Current Operations NIF	\$ 91,838
Proposed Operations NIF	75,278
Savings	\$ 16,560
Total Savings	\$ 23,893

E. Schedule of Completion of Actions:

Commence Deactivation	15 January 1973
Commence Transfer of Functions	1 April 1973
Complete Transfer of Functions	1 June 1974
Complete Deactivation	30 June 1974

F. Estimated One-Time Cost of Action:

Relocation Cost Military		\$ 946
Relocation Cost Civilian		2,547
Severance Pay		8,911
Preservation of Equipment & Facilities		<u>10,824</u>
		\$ <u>23,228</u>

G. Budget Impact Schedule until full savings are Realized:FY-1973

Total Present Costs		\$ 125,425
One-Time Costs	\$ 3,750	
Activity Operations	<u>123,647</u>	<u>127,397</u>
	Savings	\$ (1,962)

FY-1974

Total Present Costs		\$ 125,425
One-Time Costs	\$ 19,478	
Activity Operations	<u>103,942</u>	<u>123,423</u>
	Savings	\$ 2,005

FY-1975

Total Present Costs		\$ 125,425
One-Time Costs	\$ -0-	
Activity Operations	<u>101,532</u>	<u>101,532</u>
	Savings	\$ 23,893

H. Military Construction (Estimated)

Total MILCON Avoided at Old Site: \$ 11,780

Total MILCON Required at New Sites:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>FY</u>	<u>Cost</u>	
NSYD Philadelphia	Rehab Shop Space	74	560	
NSYD Philadelphia	Aided Ship Design Off.	74	180	
				<u>740</u>
			Savings	\$ <u>11,040</u>

Mr. LONG. Anybody can come up with a number. You understand that.

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think you understand also that it is difficult for us to know precisely the depth to which the committee would like to go on each of these specific items. We certainly are prepared to give you this for the record or discuss it at some future date.

Mr. LONG. Military construction avoided of nearly \$12 million and \$24 million estimated annual savings are just numbers as far as I am concerned—unless they are documented.

Admiral MARSCHALL. These are documented.

Mr. LONG. But they aren't documented here. Unless they are given some justification, as far as I am concerned, somebody can scratch his head and put, say, \$15 or \$30 million if he wants to.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We have a specialized group that developed this and they do have records of this which we can provide for the record.

Mr. LONG. I don't know that I need to go into these others. You have an even more glaring example in closing down the Newport, R.I., complex, \$43 million military construction avoided and \$18 million estimated annual operating savings. I do think there is a lot here to be explained. It might be a question of judgment how much explanation you give, but here you have given none at all. I would hope you would give us something to satisfy our curiosity.

Did you give us a full explanation on the relocations affecting the 6th Naval District?

Mr. MURPHY. We discussed the berthing for the move of air squadrons and ships, and we are going to discuss the training command berthing requirements.

Mr. TAYLOR. We discussed the relocations from Glynco and what was required as a result of those. I am quickly thumbing through to see if we overlooked anything that was also included, sir.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. At Memphis, in the 1975 program, we will need a bachelor enlisted quarters and at Pensacola, in the 1975 program, we will need a bachelor enlisted quarters. Those are the only two projects that have not been mentioned in the past few minutes related to the berthing of personnel.

Mr. LONG. All of these costs have been taken into account in your estimates of costs and savings?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. My principal question has to do with giving us much more information on these numbers.

Mr. SIKES. Are there general questions?

NAVAL AIR STATION, CECIL FIELD, FLA.

Mr. SIKES. We will take up Cecil Field. Insert page I-89 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 17 APR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. INSTALLATION NAVAL AIR STATION										
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET		5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 1540-215		6. STATE/COUNTRY CECIL FIELD, FLORIDA										
7. STATUS ACTIVE		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1942		9. COUNTY (U.S.) DUVAL	10. NEAREST CITY 13 MILES NORTHEAST TO JACKSONVILLE									
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of Aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations. <u>Major Activities Supported</u> Two carrier air wings Fourteen attack squadrons <u>Major Function:</u> Support for all East Coast A-4 and A-7 attack squadrons		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 1972		483	4,685	507	0	158	4	50	150	6,037		
		b. PLANNED (BUD FY 1977)		864	5,891	571	67	180	4	50	160	7,787		
				13. INVENTORY		LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)
				a. OWNED	18,985	1,253	76,254	77,507						
				b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS #	0# = 679#	0# = 5#	0	5						
		c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Exclpt land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72		3,743		3,743		4,575		89,163				
		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														
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b				TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM e		FUNDING PROGRAM f					
							SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) g	SCOPE h	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) i				
171.35	WEAPONS SYSTEM TRAINING FACILITY				/	SF	13,932	791	13,932	791				
211.37	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE FACILITY				/	SF	79,332	2,845	79,332	2,845				
	<u>NAVAL REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER, JACKSONVILLE</u>													
550.10	DISPENSARY ADDITION				/	SF	2,250	100	2,250	107				
							TOTAL	3,743		3,743				

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, FL., \$3,743,000

This station supports all light attack aircraft squadrons of the Naval Air Force, Atlantic Fleet. A new mission assigned under the shore Establishment Realignment is the support of all Atlantic Fleet carrier capable, anti-submarine warfare (ASW) squadrons (excluding helicopters).

The weapons system training facility project will provide housing for operational flight and weapons systems trainers. Trainers for S-3A aircraft cannot be located in existing spaces as they are being fully utilized for A-7 attack aircraft weapons training.

The intermediate maintenance facility project will provide a maintenance facility principally for airborne electronics equipment for the S-3A aircraft. Existing avionics maintenance space is fully utilized for the A-7 attack aircraft workload. The addition of 60 S-3A aircraft being relocated from other bases creates the requirement for this increase in maintenance space.

At the Naval Regional Medical Center which provides general and specialized clinical services for active duty personnel, dependents and other authorized persons in the Jacksonville area, a dispensary addition project will be provided. This project will construct an addition to the existing dispensary at NAS Cecil Field, some 15 miles west of the Naval Hospital Jacksonville, to enable it to effectively serve the current out-patient workload.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	\$57,453,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	55,667,707
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	55,966,168

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Weapons system training facility	\$ 37,968	0
Intermediate maintenance facility	136,560	0
Dispensary addition	5,300	29

Mr. SIKES. The request is \$3,743,000, for a weapons system training facility, an intermediate maintenance facility, and a dispensary addition.

Do you have the costs and the savings associated with the relocations of this installation?

Admiral MARCHALL. Mr. Chairman, that has been discussed.

Mr. SIKES. Provide details for the record at this point.

[The information follows:]

The non-Milcon costs and savings associated with relocations into NAS Cecil Field, are included in the overall calculation of such data resulting from the closing of NAS Quonset Point. Navy has not prorated or split these costs and savings at Quonset Point to the stations receiving the people and aircraft leaving Quonset Point. The total estimated annual savings resulting from closure of Quonset Point are \$22,880 million. One-time closure costs, excluding Milcon, are \$20,773 million. These amounts are roughly proratable to the receiving stations on the basis of the following loading changes:

Unit	To NAS Cecil		To NAS Jax		To Pt. Mugu	
	Pers.	Acft.	Pers.	Acft.	Pers.	Acft.
Carrier ASW squadrons, VS, 6 each.....	817	44				
Helo ASW squadrons, HS, 4 each.....			849	38		
Antarctic support squadron, 1 each.....					367	7

Fiscal year 1973 and prior Milcon costs avoided as a result of relocations to NAS Cecil Field are \$3.636 million. However, this same amount is required in fiscal year 1974 for Milcon at NAS Cecil Field.

FORCE LEVELS

Mr. SIKES. Are both of these projects associated with the S-3 mission being moved here?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, Mr. Chairman; both are. One supports the training of the flight crew for the S-3, the other supports the maintenance of its peculiar onboard equipment for that airplane.

Mr. SIKES. Will that complete the requirements for the respective areas?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Your total requirement for intermediate maintenance is shown as 173,732 square feet, and the additional 79,332 square feet you are requesting will bring you within 10,853 square feet of your total requirement. Provide for the record the force level at Cecil Field upon which this total requirement is based.

[The information follows:]

1. The intermediate level maintenance requirement at NAS Cecil Field is based on the following projected aircraft loading:

a. Carrier ASW Squadrons (VS): (Deployable)

Six squadrons of 10 S-3A aircraft each.

These units located at NAS Cecil due to Shore Establishment Realignment.

b. Carrier Light Attack Squadrons (VA): (Deployable)

Twelve squadrons of 12 A-7 aircraft each.

c. Refresher and Replacement Training Squadrons (VA): (Non-Deployable)

One squadron of 8 TA-4J aircraft.

One squadron of 38 A-7 aircraft.

d. Station Aircraft and Miscellaneous

NAS 1 C-1 and 1 T-28 aircraft

VC-2 Det 2 S-2 aircraft

2. The above loading totals 254 aircraft. Planning factors require that one-third of the deployable squadrons be considered in deployed status, hence maintenance space needs are derived from some 186 aircraft on board.

3. Updated personnel strength for NAS Cecil Field is as follows:

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL (9)
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	
	a. AS OF 31 DEC 72	483	4,685	657	104	158	4	50	
b. PLANNED (End F.Y. 77)	730	5,853	790	134	115	7	48	0	7,677

The upward personnel trend results from the SER action moving in VS squadrons from Quonset Point. The immediate surge in personnel will be roughly 817 personnel associated with the present VS squadrons moving from Quonset Point with S-2 propeller aircraft. These squadrons will begin transitioning to S-3 jet aircraft in January 1974, reaching a level of six squadrons with 60 S-3's by December, 1976. The progression from 0 to 60 will be uniform over the period. Typical S-3 squadron includes 49 officers and 221 enlisted. Typical A-7 squadron (deployable) includes 21 officers and 229 enlisted.

Mr. SIKES. You are programing a substantial amount of additional space. Is it prudent to program this much space in view of possible future force level reductions?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I assume you are referring to the space for the training and maintenance of the S-3.

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. The proposed force level at Cecil will be six squadrons of S-3 aircraft and these projects are based on that force level. We foresee maintaining the six level compatible with our Atlantic fleet carriers for the foreseeable future.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

MEDICAL SUPPORT

Mr. DAVIS. What is the situation with respect to availability in the Jacksonville area of professional health people, physicians, dentists, and so on?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Jacksonville, Fla., is one of our bright spots as far as I know, Mr. Davis. As far as specifics are concerned I don't know the ratio of the number of doctors to the population, but we would attempt to provide that for the record.

Mr. DAVIS. The reason I ask is that you have an existing dispensary constructed in 1957. You do mention it was sized for active duty personnel. Apparently what we are talking about here is entirely to take care of dependents and retired people. Is that correct?

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is an outpatient facility, Mr. Davis. Again even if this area were loaded with professional people, part of the concept of Navy medical care is that we take care of our dependents, not retired dependents but active duty dependents. People feel it is a little out from the major metropolitan center of Jacksonville, Fla. It is half an hour out from the Naval Air Station.

This is Cecil and this is our main city of Jacksonville and this is our air station here and Mayport over here.

Mr. DAVIS. Champus certainly does cover the dependents doesn't it?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think Dr. Etter has testified previously that the Navy prefers to use its own when it can.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

NAVAL AIR STATION, ELLYSON FIELD, FLA.

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Ellyson Field. Place in the record page I-93.
[The page follows:]

1. DATE 13 APR 1973		5. DEPARTMENT NAVY		6. FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			9. INSTALLATION NAVAL AIR STATION														
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING			8. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 1452-705			9. STATE/COUNTRY FLORIDA															
7. STATUS ACTIVE			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1941			9. COUNTY (U.S.) ESCAMBIA		10. NEAREST CITY 12 MILES SOUTH TO PENSACOLA													
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Naval Training 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 Dec 1972	139	1,128	128	229	26	0	16	0	1,666	
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)											66	839	437	0	35	0	16	0	1,393		
13. INVENTORY																					
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)													
a. OWNED		588		49		7,811		7,860													
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		0* 19#		0* 6#		0* 31#		37													
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972								7,897													
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								0													
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								75													
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION NEXT 4 YEARS								4,940													
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								12,918													
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS																					
PROJECT DESIGNATION																					
15. CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b				TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM SCOPE e		FUNDING PROGRAM SCOPE f		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) g										
812.90	ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS				50	LS	-		75		-	75									

638

Naval Air Station, Ellyson Field, Fla., \$75,000.

This station supports the Navy's Flight training program administered by the Naval Air Training Command.

The electrical distribution system improvements project will provide additional power distribution lines to correct critically overloaded feeders and prevent power outages.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973.....	\$2,251,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual).....	2,250,423
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	2,250,423

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Electric distribution system improvements.....	\$5,192	22

Mr. SIKES. The request is for \$75,000 for electrical distribution system improvements. Is this the normal routine type of improvement required from time to time?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, it is. We have just had a growing electrical load.

Mr. SIKES. Why is this not being done under minor construction?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Minor construction limitation in O. & M. are now \$50,000, Mr. Chairman, and to get it under minor construction Milcon there must be some urgency. We felt this was the appropriate place for this particular item.

NAVAL AIR STATION, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA

Mr. SIKES. Take up Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida. Place I-95 in the record.

[The page follows:]

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, FL., \$11,566,000

This station provides support for aircraft squadrons engaged in all-weather anti-submarine operations and logistic support of the Naval Air Rework Facility, and a Navy Air Maintenance Training Detachment.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living spaces for 228 men who are members of the 6 helicopter squadrons being transferred to this station. There are no adequate existing facilities to house these men.

The bachelor officers quarters project will modernize existing spaces and provide new living spaces for 96 men, who are members of the 6 helicopter squadrons being transferred to this station. Existing spaces are substandard, require air conditioning and fire protection systems.

At the Naval Air Rework Facility, the aircraft final finish facility project will provide spaces for painting, and corrosion protection of aircraft. Existing facilities have no provisions for maintaining the required temperature and humidity control.

Also, at the Naval Air Rework Facility the utilities project will provide additional essential utilities required to accommodate workload projections and plan facility expansion.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	\$58,753,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	48,593,198
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	51,291,664

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Bachelor enlisted quarters	\$ 71,712	0
Bachelor officers quarters modernization	40,800	0
Aircraft final finish facility	304,328	15
Utilities	32,050	31

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NAS, Jacksonville, FL

1. Effective BEQ requirement	2446
2. Adequate Assets	1636
Installation	1334
Community	302
3. Deficit	810
4. Fiscal Year 1974 project	228
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	582

Current Bachelor Officer Status at NAS, Jacksonville, FL

1. Effective BOQ requirement	370
2. Adequate Assets	214
Installation	179
Community	35
3. Deficit	156
4. Fiscal Year 1974 project	96
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	60

Mr. SIKES. This is a request for \$11,566,000 for bachelor enlisted quarters, bachelor officers quarters modernization, and for items at the naval air rework facility.

LAND EXCHANGES

Will you explain this land acquisition item?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. The land acquisition is an exchange. Certain privately owned properties right outside the naval air station, which fall under the composite noise zone criteria discussed at some length in previous committee meetings. It is for that reason we need to acquire that property. It appears that there will be homebuilding in that area in the immediate future and we intend to acquire it by land exchange.

Mr. SIKES. Can you show us its location on the map?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We have one coming, sir.

Admiral MARSCHALL [referring to map]. This particular area too, in my opinion, would be a severe safety hazard.

Mr. MURPHY. This [indicating] is the Jacksonville runway, somewhat hard to see. This is our naval air station area. The land acquisition is this acreage here.

Mr. SIKES. What will you exchange for it?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. The present plan is for exchanging excess Navy land including the Naval Reserve Training Center in downtown Jacksonville.

Mr. SIKES. Is it an even trade?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. The appraisals are being worked up. It appears to us it is.

Mr. SIKES. What acreage are you acquiring and what acreage are you giving up?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We will acquire 365 acres. The property we are giving up is smaller than that; about 142 acres. Of course, there is a difference in value based on location.

Mr. SIKES. Who owns the property you are acquiring?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It is owned by the Urban Homes, Inc., of Jacksonville.

Mr. SIKES. Is the exchange with them rather than with the city?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir. That is the present plan and the GSA is working in that direction.

Mr. LONG. Again, I want to express my uneasiness about the property exchanges. I think almost anybody in business would question whether this is the best way to handle affairs because, first, it requires a kind of double coincidence of desire. Obviously, you are not going to get the widest possible market if you confine yourself to one party who has the property to give up, and who wants to take over the property you are going to give up. I wonder whether the Treasury is doing well on the property exchanges?

Second, it does bypass the appropriations process; it does bypass the Congress to a very large extent as far as money is concerned. I think it is contrary to the general policy of Congress which has always been, as I understand it, to have as much money as possible go into the Treasury and to be reported when it goes out. I would hope we would require the military to stop this business of land exchange.

Mr. SIKES. I think the Navy may have a response for the record on that as far as the reason for exchange rather than sale and purchase.

Mr. LONG. I brought this up because we discussed one yesterday. I don't know whether you were here. That was in connection with Yuma, Ariz., where there was a sizable exchange contemplated.

[Additional information follows:]

This land acquisition item for the Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Fla., resulted from a developer, Urban Homes Developers, Inc., requesting rezoning of their land (a 365-acre area) to permit construction of 1,100 apartments and an 800-condominium complex. The proposed construction is not compatible with the air operations and lies partly within the proposed compatibility use zone criteria. With the cooperation of the parties, including the General Service Administration, a plan was devised wherein GSA would acquire the 365 acres for the Navy in exchange for other surplus Government properties in the Jacksonville area. The acquisition by exchange in lieu of a cash purchase and sale is an arrangement of convenience. The requirement for the acquisition of the land was accelerated by the rezoning request by the landowners. The owners agreed to consider an exchange of lands in the interest of time since the Navy had declared some of its land in the area as excess to military requirements. Because of program constraints and other military construction priorities, the land acquisition by purchase with appropriated funds would be delayed for at least another year. With available land for trade and a desire by all parties to resolve the matter, an exchange was proposed as the best means to accomplish the project.

Mr. LONG. I would also like to get some idea from the Defense Department—perhaps this is not the time to raise this with the Navy—what the total number of land exchanges are and get a full record of what the exchanges have been.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Have been, sir?

Mr. SIKES. In what period of time?

Mr. LONG. Certainly in the last fiscal year. It would be nice to see other years.

Mr. SIKES. Provide a breakdown by services for this point in the record.

[The information follows:]

NAVY LAND EXCHANGE SUMMARY

	Acres	Value	Fiscal year
MCAS, El Toro and MCAS (H) Santa Ana, Calif.—Public Law 91-511:			
Acquired.....	86.952	\$374,000	1972
Disposed.....	17	374,000
Family housing.....			
PWC, San Diego (Murphy Canyon)—Public Law 91-145:			
Acquired.....	26.2	39,500	1972
Disposed.....	26.2	39,500
Family housing.....			
Portsmouth, VA USO Bldg.—Public Law 91-440:			
Acquired.....	1.49	100,000	1972
Disposed.....	1.918	75,000
Armed Forces Reserve Center, Midland, Tex.—10 U.S.C. 2672:			
Acquired.....	1.342	6,000	1973
Disposed.....	1.194	5,355

ARMY LAND EXCHANGES

Army Materiel Command, Holston, Tenn.:			
Acquired.....	2 4.67	1,311	1972
Disposed.....	3 4.48	1,311
	2 4.7		
	3 1.13		
Golden Gate National Cemetery, San Francisco, Calif.:			
Acquired.....	.191	10,500	1972
Disposed.....	.317	13,700

ARMY LAND EXCHANGES

	Acres	Value	Fiscal year
Army Reserve Center, Fairfield, Ill.:			
Acquired.....	0.23	\$620	1972
Disposed.....	.31	620	-----

AIR FORCE LAND EXCHANGES

Williams AFB, Ariz.:			
Acquired.....	80.0	48,000	1972
Disposed.....	640.0	48,000	-----
Charleston AFB, S.C.:			
Acquired.....	19.07	66,000	1973
Disposed.....	18.33	64,000	-----
Luke AF Range, Ariz.:			
Acquired.....	1,679	67,000	1973
Disposed.....	Incomplete	67,000	-----
MAC, Altus, AFB, Okla.:			
Acquired.....	1.30	900	1973
Disposed.....	1.30	900	-----
AF Systems Command, Eglin AFB, Fla.:			
Acquired.....	.08	1,000	1973
Disposed.....	.06	1,000	-----

¹ Plus building.

² Fee.

³ Easement.

MISSION TRANSFERS AND COSTS

Mr. SIKES. What functions are being relocated to Jacksonville?

Mr. MURPHY. Sir, the HS ASW helicopter squadrons will transfer here to Jacksonville from Quonset Point. Also, helicopter squadron HS-15, an interim sea control unit, will move here from NAS Lakehurst. Finally, helicopter squadron HC-2, scheduled to transition to LAMPS function, will also move to Jacksonville from Lakehurst.

Of course, it has been our continuing plan to bring the P-3 VP squadrons down to Jacksonville from Patuxent River in about another year, upon completion of training facilities now under construction at Jacksonville.

Mr. SIKES. What are the costs and savings associated with these moves?

[The information follows:]

The non-Milcon costs and savings associated with relocations into NAS Jacksonville are included in the overall calculation of such data resulting from the closing of NAS Quonset Point. Navy has not prorated or split these costs and savings at Quonset Point to the stations receiving the people and aircraft leaving Quonset Point. The total estimated annual savings resulting from closure of Quonset Point are \$22,880,000. One-time closure costs, excluding Milcon, are \$20,773,000. These amounts are roughly prorable to the receiving stations on the basis of the following loading changes:

Units	To NAS Cecil		To NAS Jax		To Point Mugu	
	Personnel	Aircraft	Personnel	Aircraft	Personnel	Aircraft
Carrier ASW squadrons, VS, 6 each....	817	44	-----	-----	-----	-----
Helo ASW squadrons, HS, 4 each.....	-----	-----	849	38	-----	-----
Antarctic support squadron, 1 each.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	367	7

Fiscal year 1973 and prior Milcon costs avoided as a result of relocations to NAS Jacksonville are nil. Milcon required to support the move at NAS Jacksonville in fiscal year 1974 is \$2,344,000. Tentatively, an additional \$1,832,000 in Milcon is required in fiscal year 1975.

HOUSING REQUIREMENT

Mr. SIKES. When you provide the bachelor housing situation here for the record, be sure to identify separately the requirements associated with personnel being moved here.

[The information follows:]

The requirements associated with the move of personnel to NAS Jacksonville are as follows:

Fiscal year 1974:	<i>Cost</i>
Bachelor enlisted quarters (500 men) -----	\$1, 494, 000
Bachelor officer quarters modernization (96 men) -----	850, 000
Fiscal year 1975:	
None -----	

The projected fiscal year 1976 total base loading for NAS Jacksonville is for 1,200 officer and 5,788 enlisted men. Included in these totals are approximately 225 officers and 1,350 enlisted men being transferred in due to the SER announcement. The bachelor housing survey estimates that approximately 1,000 officers and 3,600 enlisted men will be married and will live with dependents in family housing. After adjustments, the bachelor housing requirement amounts to 205 officers and 2,100 enlisted men, with some 125 and 230 spaces respectively for this need being available in private housing.

Senior officer portion of the 205 requirement is 93 officers. The combination of 230 enlisted spaces in the private sector, plus 228 spaces proposed in fiscal year 1974 Milcon, plus 504 spaces under construction, plus 1,145 spaces existing, essentially completes the 2,100 space enlisted requirement.

Significant reduction in the Jacksonville base loading is now occurring, due to closure of the NATTC Jacksonville. This action eliminated some 28 officer and 1,800 enlisted billets from the base. This reduction has been considered in the above requirements projections.

Mr. SIKES. Generally, what is the off-base support situation in Jacksonville? Are there any problems?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. We find Jacksonville to be one of our better Navy areas. It is a friendly community. It is a big city now. Generally I think the support is good.

As an indication, Mr. Chairman, we have about a fourth of our bachelor enlisted living in private housing. Based on personal experience I have always found it one of the friendlier communities.

NAVAL AIR REWORK FACILITY

Mr. SIKES. NARF, Jacksonville was selected to take over the overhaul of S-1 and E-2 from Quonset Point as a result of base closures. Give the committee the rationale for selection of Jacksonville.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, the NARF at Jacksonville has the capability in being for the maintenance of airframe. They have been working for some time on the SA-4 airframe. Without a substantial increase in plant equipment they are capable of handling these particular aircraft. Also the utilization of NARF Jacksonville was down. As a matter of fact, its percent utilization was dropping below 80 percent and we are striving for the upper eighties. Hence we felt it could absorb the workload.

Mr. SIKES. Will any new facilities be required as a result of the moves shown here?

Mr. MURPHY. Not directly required at NARF. The projects in the program for paint facilities will of course accommodate the small additional work from the Quonset closure.

Mr. SIKES. Then this is not the result of the transfer?

Mr. MURPHY. Definitely not, sir. It is for existing load at Jacksonville.

Mr. SIKES. Will any new facilities be required?

Mr. MURPHY. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record an economic analysis for the aircraft final finish facility. Have you included cost escalation in this analysis? In what years were the cost of investments and the first savings included?

[The information follows:]

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS FOR THE AIRCRAFT FINAL FINISH FACILITY

1. Submitting DOD component: Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Fla.
2. Project title: Aircraft Final Finishing Facility, P-409.
3. Date of submission: August 1972.
4. Description of project objectives: To provide a facility to accomplish aircraft final finishing (painting, corrosion protection, and marking of exposed surfaces) in accordance with aeronautical specifications and directives.
 - 5a. Present alternative: To continue the finishing of aircraft in one-half of a seaplane hangar. There are no provisions in this hangar for maintaining temperature and humidity conditions to meet specifications for aircraft finishing. Ventilation of the painting area does not comply with Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 and air exhaust violates Florida's clean air requirement for fiscal year 1975.
 - 5b. Proposed alternatives: To build an assembly of two steel frame hangars which will contain six separated painting areas each having separately controlled downdraft ventilation with temperature and humidity control. The new facility will increase efficiency by reducing aircraft movement required by the existing facility by 40 percent and process time for final finish of the A5 aircraft 2 days and the A7 aircraft 1.5 days.
6. Economic life: Twenty-five years for both alternatives.

7. Detail of Savings:

	<u>SAVINGS</u>
a. Personnel: Civilian	\$57,924
b. Operating	
1) Labor Savings due to temperature and humidity conditions	44,604
2) Labor saving of premium pay	24,192
3) Movement of aircraft in and out of hangar	8,455
4) Towing of aircraft	815
5) Movement of aircraft within paint area	14,837
6) Refinish of contaminated paint surfaces	9,537
7) Overhead Cost - Not charge	<u> </u>
TOTAL ANNUAL SAVINGS	\$160,364

8. Present Value of New Investment:

a. Land and Buildings	\$6,924,979
b. Equipment	15,212
c. Other	-0-
d. Working capital changes	<u>-0-</u>
9. Total Present Value of New Investment	\$6,940,191
10. Less: Present value of existing assets replaced	\$1,433,078
11. Plus: Value of Existing Assets to be Employed on the project	-0-
12. Net Investment	\$5,507,163
13. Present Value of Savings from Operations	\$1,527,306
14. Plus: Present Value of the Cost of Refurbishment or Modification Eliminated	\$5,400,000
15. Total Present Value of Cost Savings	\$6,927,306
16. Savings/Investment Ratio:	1.26
Payback Period	14 years

17. EXPLANATION OF SOURCE/DERIVATION OF ESTIMATES:

This cost analysis is derived on the basis of providing a completely modern facility including new structure and equipment. This comparison shows anticipated cost for fiscal year 1973, with and without the new facility.

Item 7a. Personnel: Only civilian personnel are employed in this area. From workload projections, present manning, planned equipment, procedural changes, and present process times the following projection was made:

A/C Model	Work-load 1974	Existing Process Time	Existing Situation 1974	Proposed Situation 1974	Savings
A5	13	360 M/H	4,680	3,510	1,170
A7	125	170 M/H	<u>21,250</u>	<u>14,375</u>	<u>6,875</u>
Total Man-Hours			25,930	17,885	8,045

1974 Labor Cost \$5.54/hr + \$1.66 fringe benefits = \$7.20/man-hour

1974 Existing Situation 25,930 M/H X \$7.20/M-H = \$186,696.

1974 Proposed Situation 17,885 M/H X \$7.20/M-H = \$128,772.

PERSONNEL SAVINGS \$57,924

Item 7b. Operation:

(1) Temperature and humidity in the paint spray area are recorded on a 24-hour basis. An analysis of the data for the past year shows that of 240 working days, 59 days had temperature and/or humidity conditions which did not meet specifications for paint spraying. It is estimated approximately 5 man-hours are lost by all production personnel when the condition occurs:

5 Man-hours X \$7.20 X 21 employees X 59 days = \$44,604 lost Employee/day
Employee-day Man-hrs

(2) Since there are no work dividers within the final finish area, all operations are affected when the doors are open. Especially in the winter months and in foul and blustery weather, small whirlwind dust laden turbulences can be observed in the spray area. The forced ventilation water wash system effectiveness is also reduced, inside temperature and humidity may rise or fall out of specifications, resulting in the termination of painting operations. These conditions have resulted in the practice of loading the facility with aircraft and preparing them for painting during the first shift and doing the final paint on second and third shift. This, in turn, resulted in having to operate the facility 6 days a week. This overtime pay will be avoided with the new facility.

Overtime differential \$7.20/hr X 50% = \$3.60/hr

21 men X \$3.60 X 8 Hour X 40 Weekends = \$24,192
weekend Man-hour Shift Year

(3) Movement of the aircraft in and out of the painting facility is hampered by having to manually open the hangar doors. Daily observation reveals these doors are opened an average of 469 times for aircraft and 442 times for parts and supplies per year. Production is suspended an average of 15 minutes for each aircraft move and 10 minutes for parts delivery. Four aircraft painters are required to assist the transportation crew of three to open and close these doors. The yearly results are as follows:

552 A/C moves X .25 hr/move X 4 A/C painters @ \$7.20/hr	\$3,974.
522 A/C moves X .25 hr/move X 3 A/C towman @ \$6.72/hr	2,782.
422 supply deliveries X .083 hr/delivery X 4 A/C painters @ \$7.20/hr	1,009
422 supply deliveries X .083 hr/delivery X 3 A/C transportation @ \$6.57/hr	<u>690</u>
TOTAL	\$8,455.

(4) A total of 91 aircraft towing miles will be saved in fiscal year 1974 by the new location of the paint facility. It requires a 4-man crew to move an aircraft at a rate of 3 miles/hour. It, therefore, follows that the following savings can be accounted for in aircraft towing:

91 A/C miles X $\frac{1 \text{ hour}}{3 \text{ miles}}$ X 4/men $\frac{\$6.72}{\text{hour}}$ = \$815.

(5) Handling of the aircraft in the proposed facility will be greatly simplified. Presently, the aircraft has to be moved from the preparation area to the paint booth area and back to the preparation area for application of insignias. This results in at least two-hour delays and requires a 4-man move crew.

276 aircraft X 4 men X 2 hours X $\frac{\$6.72}{\text{hour}}$ \$14,837.

(6) Air supply fans in the existing facility have no provisions for filtering the air removal of air borne particles and bugs. During early spring and summer months this area has a large batch of flying insects. During the past year the surface finish of 4 aircraft has been contaminated to the extent the aircraft had to be stripped and completely refinished. Cost involved (per aircraft) averaged as follows:

(1) Removal of Contaminated Surface
32 Man-hrs. X \$7.20/M-H + \$121.00 material \$351.40

(2) Preparation and Refinishing of Aircraft 218 Man-hrs. X \$7.20/M-H + \$463.17 material	\$2,032.77
(3) Sub Total	\$ 2,384.17
(4) Total Additional Cost for 4 Aircraft	\$ 9,536.68

Item 7c. Overhead Cost - No Change

Item 10 Value of Existing Facilities to be replaced.
46,542 Square Feet @ \$30.79/SF = \$1,433,028

Item 13. Present Value Savings

Utilizing a discount rate of 10% and an economic life of 25 years, the present value of \$1 (cumulative) factor of (.524 is derived. The product of this factor and the annual savings determines present value of savings = \$160,364 X 9.524 = \$1,527,306.

Item 14. Engineering study shows the existing paint facility (in a converted seaplane hangar) would be better restored to primary service as a much needed maintenance hangar, rather than extensively modified to meet today's painting and pollution control technology. Cost to modify is estimated \$5.4 million.

18. Other Considerations:

The new facility will increase the availability of aircraft by cutting down on the number of days the aircraft will be at the facility. An estimated savings in time for each A5 is two days and 1.5 days for each A7.

Mr. SIKES. The profitability index of 1.14 which you show for this project is not very high. Is it required for reasons other than savings?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Very definitely, Mr. Chairman. The ventilation of the painting area does not comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act Standards of 1970 and has resulted in employee hospitalization from exposure to new and highly toxic polyurethane paints required for the fleet aircraft. Air exhausts violate Florida's clean air requirement for 1975. We have had numerous complaints from the unions concerning the occupational hazards there. It is as much a safety matter as it is anything else, safety and cleaning up of the atmosphere.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

NAVAL TRAINING CENTER, ORLANDO, FLA.

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla. Insert page I-103 in the record.

[The page follows:]

Naval Training Center, Orlando, FL., \$7.383,000

This center provides basic indoctrination for recruit training and advanced and specialized training for enlisted and officer personnel of the regular Navy and Naval Reserve.

The dental clinic project will provide a new facility to replace a grossly undersized clinic used by service school students.

The nuclear power training building project will provide a facility for nuclear power training to accommodate an average on-board student load of 1,885 enlisted men, 240 officers and 176 staff members.

The basic electricity and electronics training building will provide the additional training spaces required to accommodate the increased number of students being required to take this training. Existing capacity at Great Lakes and San Diego is inadequate to meet this requirement.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through Fiscal Year 1973	\$59,081,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	49,246,813
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	52,592,187

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Dental clinic	\$ 36,817	50
Nuclear power training Building	162,403	15
Basic electricity and electronics training building	49,513	45

Mr. SIKES. The request is \$7,383,000 for a dental clinic, a nuclear power training building, and for a basic electricity and electronics training building.

RELOCATION OF NUCLEAR POWER TRAINING

Is the nuclear power training building the only facility required as the result of realignments of activities here?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; it is.

Mr. SIKES. Where, other than Orlando, will you have nuclear power training facilities?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, nuclear power training is presently conducted in two locations, at the Naval Training Center, Bainbridge and at Mare Island in California. Our plan is to relocate the first part of the nuclear power training from Bainbridge to Orlando using this project. We hope to follow up next year with a project to bring the Mare Island nuclear power training to Orlando and consolidate it at the one location.

Mr. LONG. Is this \$4.6 million from the transfer from Bainbridge, in Maryland, to Orlando, Fla.? Is this a new construction request because of that move?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. What kind of a facility, and what was the value of the facility left in Maryland because of that transfer?

Mr. TAYLOR. Our facilities in Maryland, sir, that we are using for nuclear power training have outlived their usefulness and would have to be replaced. So this expenditure would be required either at Bainbridge or at Orlando.

Mr. LONG. When was the Bainbridge facility built?

Mr. TAYLOR. I don't have the date but if I remember correctly it is the World War II temporary facility that we are still using for nuclear power at Bainbridge.

Mr. LONG. I didn't think they had nuclear power that early.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. These facilities were not originally constructed for nuclear power training. However, they were available and when we set up nuclear power training we moved into existing facilities.

Mr. LONG. What are these facilities at Bainbridge you are moving out of?

Mr. TAYLOR. As I say, I don't have the specifics of them before me, but from memory I recall that they were facilities put up for the training of—

Mr. LONG. Is this for training on all kinds of nuclear power equipment, reactors and that kind of thing? I never heard of reactors at Bainbridge.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir; we don't have any reactors involved with this. These are the powerplants that are on our ships and where we teach our personnel to maintain them.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Principally academic training, Dr. Long.

Mr. TAYLOR. Primarily classrooms.

Mr. LONG. Is this expensive equipment?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We will have to provide the details for the record, sir. It is basically textbooks, charts, and some visual aids. There is not any large amount of equipment.

Mr. LONG. Why does this have to be built at Orlando?

Mr. TAYLOR. The primary reason is that the principal number of students that attend classes come directly from recruit training, and we need to collocate it with one of our recruit training centers.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Also the President had made the decision to move from Bainbridge prior to the recent base relocation action.

Mr. LONG. Don't I know it.

What is in these nuclear power training buildings? What are they? Are they just buildings or do they have a lot of technical equipment?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mockups, classrooms, things that would direct the student toward nuclear training.

Mr. LONG. It is just ordinary buildings in other words, classrooms, and such. It doesn't really consist of any real technical and nuclear power equipment. Is that correct?

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

Admiral MARSCHALL. No reactors or anything of that sort.

Mr. LONG. So the term nuclear power sort of gives this request a dignity which it wouldn't otherwise deserve?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. I think if you go to the next project we attach as much dignity to the base electricity and electronics building.

Mr. LONG. You know what I mean.

Admiral MARSCHALL. I recognize that.

Mr. LONG. It has a great mystery, and conjures up all kinds of buzzings and clicking going on. You don't have those mysterious and sophisticated machines. What you really have is a building with blackboards and classroom apparatus.

Captain WATSON. I have not seen the Bainbridge nuclear power school, but the one at Mare Island, which I understand is similar, is in really terrible condition. It was a temporary facility the school was put into when it was first established. It is isolated from the rest of the base. The barracks the students are living in are old wooden temporary World War II type construction that are disintegrating.

Mr. LONG. I am beginning to get the picture. These are just some buildings where you teach people.

I understand the hospital has already been discussed.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

ORLANDO HOSPITAL

Mr. LONG. I wasn't here at the time. Would it be out of place to ask a few questions about the hospital?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We would be delighted to try to answer them.

Mr. LONG. All right, because I have gotten very much interested in hospitals because of the West Point request.

I notice this is a 310-bed hospital for \$20 million, your new revised figure. Is that right?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. It has been reduced from 310 beds to 235 beds.

Mr. LONG. Is the cost \$20 million?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, \$20 million.

Mr. LONG. At West Point the Army proposed to build a 100-bed hospital for \$25 million. I want to get that in the record to give us

some idea of the value and cost of the West Point facility. That doesn't reflect on what you are trying to do here in any way.

I would like to ask this question. There is a hospital at McCoy Air Force Base. Why couldn't this be used? It is only a few minutes away I understand.

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is not a hospital, it is a dispensary.

Mr. LONG. Does that mean that people at McCoy will then be using this?

Admiral MARSCHALL. McCoy, of course, is closing. There has been some small population from McCoy. I think Dr. Etter quoted a figure of an average of nine per month.

RELOCATIONS

Mr. LONG. To go back to the McCoy facilities, are there any possibilities of using those facilities for the nuclear power training building?

Mr. TAYLOR. We have examined those very closely to see if there was a facility that would satisfy our needs. As I mentioned earlier, McCoy being primarily a SAC facility had limited training facilities at SAC operational base. Therefore their training facilities are very small, and so far we have not found either training facilities or other facilities which would satisfy this nuclear power requirement. So we definitely have surveyed McCoy for facilities.

Mr. LONG. You have provided for the record an economic analysis of the move from Bainbridge to Orlando. Tell us now exactly what functions and how many personnel are involved in this move.

Mr. TAYLOR. The nuclear power training being relocated involves 118 military personnel. The onboard student load is 1,885 enlisted personnel.

Mr. LONG. How many are you moving?

Mr. TAYLOR. 118 military personnel will be relocated from Bainbridge to Orlando.

Mr. LONG. There is a \$4,600,000 building involved.

Admiral MARSCHALL. The average onboard student load, Dr. Long, is 1,885 students.

Mr. LONG. You are not building this, then, because of the move from Bainbridge to Orlando?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. When you say you are not doing this because of the move from Bainbridge to Orlando, are you referring to the nuclear power training building?

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is based on two reasons. If we didn't move from Bainbridge we would have to build a nuclear power school at Bainbridge. Since we are moving from Bainbridge we have chosen Orlando to build it. But it is a need which much be satisfied in order to train these people.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. There are only 118 permanent party transfers involved but a student load of a little under 2,000.

Mr. LONG. At Bainbridge?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Those people are in and out, of course.

Mr. LONG. That clarifies it.

FAMILY HOUSING AT M'COY AIR FORCE BASE

What additional family housing will be required as a result of this move? Was this taken into account in your cost analysis?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Actually, the additional family housing based on this move is part of the whole fabric of the family housing situation. We are going to take over 678 units of housing from the Air Force at McCoy. This has been directed by OSD already.

Mr. LONG. I certainly applaud that.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We do too, because there are houses in being we can use very quickly.

Mr. LONG. How many houses at McCoy are you going to make use of?

Admiral MARSCHALL. 678, sir.

We also will get with the houses some other facilities, such as community facilities, which they have there.

In addition, in the 1973 and 1974 programs for military housing we plan to build additional houses at McCoy to satisfy the total Orlando requirements.

Mr. LONG. Why build additional houses at McCoy since that is some distance and you are closing it down?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There is no real available property at the base at Orlando on which to build family quarters. When we didn't know of the availability of McCoy we were faced with the proposition of having to buy property for these houses. Now, with the move of McCoy we are able to site our additional houses to satisfy the total requirements on McCoy property.

Mr. LONG. How much land do you have at Orlando?

Admiral MARSCHALL. 1,702 acres.

Mr. LONG. That is a lot of acres.

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is extremely well built up. You need about a 125-acre plot for 600 houses.

Mr. LONG. That is right, but you have 1,700 acres and you are not proposing to build on all of them. You say 600 additional houses will be built at McCoy?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes.

Mr. LONG. This would only take about 100 acres. It seems to me all of these people are going to be moving back and forth 10 or 20 miles a round trip. I can understand making use of the houses at McCoy. Will you look at building new houses at Orlando?

Admiral MARSCHALL. In this 1,702 acres we have at Orlando we have two fair-sized lakes which take up a great deal of the property. So it is not all land.

Mr. LONG. How much is golf course?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There is a small nine-hole golf course.

Mr. LONG. Which is how many acres?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I would have to guess. Ten acres at the most. This is a very small course, very tight.

Mr. LONG. I hope you look into that.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We have studied this Orlando property very carefully.

HOUSING TO BE VACATED

Mr. LONG. Let me ask this question. You are leaving how many houses at Bainbridge as a result of the move?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I would have to provide that for the record.

Mr. LONG. There is a substantial amount of Wherry housing in Bainbridge. I think it cost a couple million dollars recently to fix up. [Discussion off the record.]

Mr. LONG. This is a good many million dollars' worth of housing. As I say, \$2 million was spent to renovate it just at the time the decision was made to move from Bainbridge to Orlando. Almost at that exact time several million dollars was spent to renovate housing as well as to build a new WAVE's building. I would like to know what is proposed to make use of that housing at Bainbridge in view of this move?

Admiral MARSCHALL. May we provide that for the record? I just don't have the answer at hand.

[The information follows:]

DISPOSITION OF HOUSING

The Navy has reported as excess to the GSA for disposition 505 units of Wherry family housing, 18 units which were funded before fiscal year 1950, 63 substandard units, and 68 mobile homesites.

It is understood that the Army had submitted a request for 166 units of family housing for the Aberdeen Proving Grounds in their fiscal year 1974 housing program, but updated survey data did not support their requirement and they withdrew their request. Accordingly, there is no known military requirement for the excess units of family housing.

Mr. LONG. I think we certainly ought to follow that through. Let me know what we get in the record. It is a disturbing thing.

CLOSURE OF BAINBRIDGE

What is going to be done with the WAVE's building when they move out?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The whole property will be excessed except for the Navy Academy preparatory school at Bainbridge which will be turned over to GSA for disposition as required. About 6 months ago I met with a portion of the Maryland delegation, Mr. Mills and Senator Mathias, and a group of citizens from that area and we had a very amicable meeting discussing ultimate use of the property.

Mr. LONG. I wasn't invited to that meeting, and it might not have been so amicable if I had been there.

The WAVE building is basically a dormitory isn't it?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir, it is.

Mr. LONG. I would like to ask, since the Army has a great need for housing at Aberdeen, why that too isn't going to be explored. It does seem to me when you people move out of buildings after you have asked Congress and this committee to spend so many millions of dollars for buildings at new locations, something more is required of you than merely washing your hands and leaving the other buildings to the GSA. This is particularly so, when you have other military installations in the area.

Admiral MARSCHALL. When we leave a place the facilities are screened through the Department of Defense first prior to being reported excess to GSA.

Mr. LONG. You have a very poor screening system. If you do have one, the other services don't know about it because the Army knew nothing about it.

Admiral MARSCHALL. It has been very successful not only for facilities and real property but for equipment.

Mr. LONG. What about the first part?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I have used those lists very successfully. For example, when McCoy Air Force came up we jumped right in because this satisfies a definite requirement of ours.

Mr. LONG. I don't know about McCoy, but I know a lot about Bainbridge. I know what a fabulous place it is and a splendid location. I think that I know something about the reasons for the move.

I would hope to get a report from the Navy on what you propose to do with the warehousing and the WAVES building, in view of the needs of the Army and requests for housing of one kind or another. What could be done to make use of this, instead of coming to us for new money. All right?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

NAVY PLANS FOR BAINBRIDGE

The entire Navy interest at Bainbridge, except for the Naval Academy preparatory school, will be reported as excess to the GSA for disposition.

Mr. LONG. Provide for the record the total construction required and avoided as a result of this move.

[The information follows:]

CONSTRUCTION APPROVED AT ORLANDO

The following projects have been approved for construction at the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla., from fiscal years 1967 through 1973. This construction was required to facilitate the disestablishment of the Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Md.:

Projects:	<i>Cost (thousands)</i>
Fiscal Year 1968:	
Ship mockup.....	\$300
Outdoor training pool.....	250
Firefighting training facility.....	995
Cold storage warehouse.....	274
Warehouse.....	778
Administration building.....	970
Staff barracks.....	886
Recruit barracks.....	1, 957
Receiving barracks.....	1, 241
Chapel and Sunday school.....	600
Reception center.....	223
Gymnasium, field house, and theater building.....	918
Community center.....	567
Utilities.....	486
Fiscal year 1969:	
Indoor rifle range.....	322
Utilities (1st increment).....	854
Recruit in-processing facility.....	2, 094
Recruit barracks.....	1, 996
Fiscal Year 1970:	
Recruit training building.....	1, 509
Drill field.....	185
Recruit barracks.....	8, 285
Mess hall.....	2, 023
Utilities.....	907
Fiscal year 1971:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters with mess.....	8, 892
Utilities.....	2, 435
Fiscal year 1973: Enlisted men's club.....	1, 058
Family housing:	
Fiscal year 1972: 4 units.....	131
Fiscal year 1973: 300 units.....	10, 975
Total.....	52, 111

With minor exceptions, these same items of construction would have been required as replacement projects at the Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Md., if the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla. had not been constructed. The replacement construction at Bainbridge would have taken place in approximately the same time period as the new construction at Orlando since the existing facilities at Bainbridge, with the exception of the 1954 Wherry housing, are temporary structures of World War II vintage and in need of replacement. Due to the higher cost of construction at Bainbridge, compared to Orlando, the new construction cost of these same facilities at Bainbridge would have been approximately \$57,300,000. This higher cost is recognized in the DOD construction cost indices which cite Bainbridge, Md. at 1 and Orlando, Fla. at 0.90. It can then be stated that no additional construction was required as a result of the relocation and that the Orlando construction was less expensive than comparable construction at Bainbridge.

The same considerations apply to the project for the nuclear power training building included in the fiscal year 1974 military construction program.

BASIC TRAINING LOAD PROJECTIONS

Mr. LONG. What are your projections for average loading of basic trainees at the Navy's three basic training centers?

Mr. TAYLOR. We are at a low point at this moment at loading at our recruit training centers. We are at about the 17,000 level. However, we are predicting that in the 1976 time frame we will be at the 23,000 recruit load for all three centers with a total availability of 26,000 recruit spaces at the three centers.

Mr. LONG. This reminds me of a definition I once heard of teaching: The process by which information goes from the notes of the teachers into the notes of the students without going through the minds of either one. Does this figure differ markedly from what you planned in previous years?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir, this is about the same as we had planned.

Mr. PATTEN. We will take a short recess to answer a quorum call.

[Short recess taken.]

TRAINING WORKLOAD

Mr. PATTEN. Provide for the record the detailed workload for the Navy's basic training, technical training, service schools, professional training, and aviation training for the past 5 years and as projected for the next 5 years by installation. Also show the training capacities of each of these installations in each of these years. Indicate whether this capacity is based upon permanent or temporary facilities in each case.

[The information follows:]

NAVY TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES

The data has been assembled in an expeditious manner and, consequently, portions are unrefined. However, liberal usage of footnotes has been employed in order to qualify and make more meaningful the information requested. Only student loadings, average on board (AOB), and capacities are shown. Facility data and requirements for staff and support or tenant loadings are not addressed.

It should be noted that although on-station berthing data is supplied for certain activities and is designated as permanent type facilities, they are, in fact, inadequate or standard facilities due to space criteria or physical conditions.

It is important that extreme care be exercised in the analysis of the data to avoid misinterpretations. For example, many activities experience cyclical loading which would cause the actual base loading to fluctuate extensively. In these instances, the average-on-board data would not be true reflection of training facility requirements. Also, AOB data cannot be the sole criteria for facility requirements which relate to training devices and other large sophisticated equip-

ment. The technical advances being experienced in training necessitate continuous reappraisal and recalculations of the training facility requirements on a case-by-case basis. One additional area of concern is the necessity of effective utilization of all existing facility assets. Numerous facilities are currently utilized for purposes for which they were not originally constructed, resulting in apparently unfavorable utilization factors.

It will be noted that certain activities appear to exhibit low AOB amounts in relation to stated capacities. The condition occurs primarily at those activities which employ large, complicated training devices and equipment. Due to the equipment complexity and the extensive facility/accommodation requirements to support these devices, their relocations are not economically feasible.

AUG 24 1973

TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES

BASIC TRAINING

ACTIVITY	FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78
RTC GREAT LAKES AOB	13853	9990	7968	7625	6803	6359	6603	9338	6930	7593
CAP PERM FAC	10320	10320	10320	10320	10080	10080	10080	10080		
CAP TEMP FAC	1044	1044	1044	1044						
RTC SAN DIEGO AOB	11375	8327	6490	6334	7158	5358	5013	7807	5198	5694
CAP PERM FAC	5991	5991	5991	5991	5991	5981	5981	5981		
CAP TEMP FAC	2447	2447	2447	2447	2447	1993	1993	1993		
RTC ORLANDO AOB	2935	3323	3770	4103	5704	6045	5593	7480	5678	6494
CAP PERM FAC	3200	4000	4800	7720	7720	7720	7720	7720		
CAP TEMP FAC										
CONSTRAU GULFPORT AOB					96	48	48	48	48	48
CAP PERM FAC										
CAP TEMP FAC					136	136	136	136		
RTC BAINBRIDGE (W) AOB	461	436	471	454						
CAP PERM FAC	356	356	356	356						
CAP TEMP FAC	119	119	119	119						

Note: Cyclic loading tendencies which are typical of recruit training centers and follow-on Class "A" schools create additional constraints on capacity utilization. To illustrate this problem, peak loadings/annual occurrence the three RTCs are indicated below:

RTC GREAT LAKES PEAKLOAD OCCURRENCE			9656 AUG	9989 OCT	11,435 AUG					
RTC SAN DIEGO PEAKLOAD			8446 AUG	8247 OCT	9991 SEP					

() Restraints: B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space

662

SPECIALIZED TRAINING

TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES

AUG 24 1973

ACTIVITY	FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	
FLTCONBATDIRSTRACENLANT AOB	398	386	345	324	335	343	343	531	590	600	(1)
DANNECK CAP PERM FAC	415	458	522	367	445	445	445	445			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0			
NAVSUBSCOL GROTON AOB	2357	1916	2089	1593	1552	1338	1269	1269	1269	1269	(2)
CAP PERM FAC	2100	2100	2100	2100	2100	2100	2100	2100			(B)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
FLESONARSOL KEY WEST AOB	770	695	620	587	628	690	680	---	---	---	(3)
CAP PERM FAC	692	666	696	706	694	728	724	---	---	---	(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
FLTASWTRACENPAC SAN DIEGO AOB	Not Avail	752	549	462	751	819	747	1218	1218	1218	
CAP PERM FAC	Not Avail	1106	1106	1106	1106	1166	1216	1216			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC											
NAVSCOLCONST DAVISVILLE AOB	531	309	246	140	276	233	140	140	140	140	
CAP PERM FAC	89	89	89	93	93	93	93	93			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	803	799	651	372	372	372	372	372			
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P)		144	144	144	144	144			
SERVSCOLCOM BAINBRIDGE AOB	1427	1668	1295	840	719	804	780	---	---	---	(4)
CAP PERM FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	1893	1836	1605	960	960	960	960				
SERVSCOLCOM GREAT LAKES AOB	8146	7703	7289	6570	7176	6984	7145	8517	8517	8517	
CAP PERM FAC	4670	4670	4670	4670	4670	5210	5966	5966			(B)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
SERVSCOLCOM SAN DIEGO AOB	5003	4904	4264	4889	5287	5812	5249	6103	6103	6103	
CAP PERM FAC	4278	4049	4136	4334	4394	4394	4394	4394			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	1747	1654	1689	1685	1709	1709	1709	1709			
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P/T)-			2942/1143	2942/1143	3611/842	3611/842			
		() Restraints: B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space									

699

SPECIALIZED TRAINING

ACTIVITY	TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES										AUG 24 1973
	FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	
Navscologyenics Portsmouth AOB	39	37	43	29	87	85	85	119	119	119	
CAP PERM FAC	210	210	210	202	232	232	464	464			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NAVSCOLCONST PORT HUENEME											
AOB	1456	730	759	799	1226	1186	1022	972	972	972	
CAP PERM FAC	327	331	331	334	334	334	334	334			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	1395	942	942	777	777	777	777	777			
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P)			844	844	844	844			
NAVSCOLDIVESALV WASHINGTON											
AOB	78	80	109	83	222	150	142	142	142	142	
CAP PERM FAC	70	70	76	75	75	75	75	75			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	93	93	101	100	100	100	100	100			
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P)			64	64	64	64			
NAVSCOL BT PHILADELPHIA											
AOB	210	214	188	152	221	223	181	181	181	181	
CAP PERM FAC	260	289	280	184	184	184	184	184			(T) 69-
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			(B) 72-
SCOL MUSIC NORFOLK											
AOB	440	336	388	310	476	699	792	790	790	790	
CAP PERM FAC	846	846	846	846	846	846	846	846			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NAVSCOLWTRSWIMMERS KEY WEST											
AOB	69	53	57	48	54	54	54	---	---	---	(5)
CAP PERM FAC	115	115	115	115	115	115	115				(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
NAVSCOLCECOFF PT HUENEME											
AOB	76	104	66	73	181	80	78	76	76	76	
CAP PERM FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	105	105	105	180	180	180	180	180			
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P)			67	67	67	67			
AOB	Note (1) While training space is listed as the constraint, there are no adequate berthing facilities available to activate this activity.										
CAP PERM FAC	Note (2) All berthing facilities under cognizance of host.										
CAP TEMP FAC	Note (3) Disestablished by SER program.										
	Note (4) Scheduled for disestablishment.										
	Note (5) Relocated by SER program.										

() Restraints; B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space

SPECIALIZED TRAINING		TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES									AUG 24 1973	
ACTIVITY		FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	
FLETRACEN MAYPORT	AOB	166	239	160	153	165	209	209	298	298	298	
	CAP PERM FAC	308	324	395	302	312	347	347	347			(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NATTC JACKSONVILLE												
	AOB	3006	3271	1934	1662	1710	---	---	---	---	---	(4)
	CAP PERM FAC	0	0	0	0	0						(B)
	CAP TEMP FAC	3187	3187	3187	2580	2130						
FLTCOMBATDIRSYSTRACENPAC SAND												
	AOB	Not Avail	285	277	208	222	190	240	280	280	280	
	CAP PERM FAC	200	290	290	250	211	190	190	190			(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC	105	105	105	145	145	175	175	175			
FLETRACEN SAN DIEGO												
	AOB	Not Avail	779	740	616	1933	1591	1212	1212	1212	1212	(6)
	CAP PERM FAC		990	990	990	1098	1098	1098	1098			(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC		0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
FLETRACEN NORFOLK												
	AOB	Not Avail	Not Avail	Not Avail	612	1311	901	700	1332	1332	1332	
	CAP PERM FAC				1332	1332	1332	1332	1332			(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC				0	0	0	0	0			
FLEMINEWARTRACEN CHARLESTON												
	AOB	Not Avail	Not Avail	351	302	492	510	300	500	500	500	
	CAP PERM FAC			1379	1464	1464	1464	1464	1464			(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC			0	0	0	0	0	0			
NAVSCOLCOM SAN FRANCISCO												
	AOB	2592	2393	1955	1477	2711	2177	2125	1745	1515	1515	(7)
	CAP PERM FAC	3500	3500	3500	3500	3500	3500	3500	3500			(B)
	CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
	AOB	Note (4) Scheduled for disestablishment.										
	CAP PERM FAC	Note (6) Although facilities are permanent type structures, they are substandard for training.										
	CAP TEMP FAC	Note (7) Even though capacity is limited by berthing, the majority of the training is conducted in wood frame, converted barracks.										

() Restraints: B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space

SPECIALIZED TRAINING

TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES

AUG 24 1973

ACTIVITY	FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	
NAVSCOLEOD INDIAN HEAD AOB	269	224	249	219	167	335	327	381	381	381	
CAP PERM FAC	216	216	216	216	216	216	251	251			(B)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NAVOFFTRACEN NEWPORT											
AOB	197	170	220	205	203	236	236	236	236	236	
CAP PERM FAC			526	526	526	526	526	526			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	400	400	166	166	166	166	166	166			
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P)			200	200	200	200			
NAVSCSCOL ATHENS											
AOB	507	398	325	312	310	285	270	270	270	270	
CAP PERM FAC	510	510	510	540	540	540	540	540			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P)			204	204	204	204			
FLETRACEN NEWPORT											
AOB	Not Avail	690	594	487	571	375	375	---	---	---	(3)
CAP PERM FAC	Not Avail	1150	1150	1150	1150	1150	1150	---	---	---	(T)
CAP TEMP FAC		0	0	0	0	0	0	---	---	---	
CONSTRAU GULFPORT											
AOB	693	340	239	316	248	100	100	92	92	92	
CAP PERM FAC	363	363	363	363	363	363	363	363			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	243	243	243	243	243	243	243	243			
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P)			56	56	56	56			
NAVPHIBSCOL SAN DIEGO											
AOB	804	760	771	566	433	369	340	350	350	350	
CAP PERM FAC	671	671	671	671	671	671	671	671			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	274	274	274	274	274	274	274	274			
NAVPHIBSCOL NORFOLK											
AOB	517	517	221	107	105	125	123	119	119	119	
CAP PERM FAC	900	900	900	432	432	432	432	432			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NAVCOMMTRACEN PENSACOLA											
AOB	1367	1678	1314	777	1046	1156	1156	1467	2547	2547	
CAP PERM FAC	1367	1367	1367	1367	1126	1126	1126	1126			(B)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
		Note (3) Disestablished by SER program.									

(C) Restraints; B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space

AUG 24 1973

SPECIALIZED TRAINING		TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES									
ACTIVITY		FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78
NATTC MEMPHIS	AOB	8704	8639	8053	7339	6418	8237	5975	7825	7825	7825
	CAP PERM FAC	3420	3318	3398	3365	3159	3375	5200	5200		(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC	8372	8121	5544	4460	4178	3962	3971	3971		
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P)				4436	6096	6096	6600		
NATTC LAKEHURST	AOB	733	671	708	733	756	671	671	636	636	636
	CAP PERM FAC	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700		(B)
	CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NATTU PENSACOLA	AOB	301	278	230	269	326	218	218	207	207	207
	CAP PERM FAC	376	375	307	336	345	345	345	345		(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NATTC GLYNCO	AOB	697	774	781	644	592	567	440	---	---	---
	CAP PERM FAC	522	522	522	522	522	522	522	---	---	---
	CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	---	---	---
NAVSUBTRACENPAC PEARL HARBOR	AOB	499	616	589	577	406	348	348	330	330	330
	CAP PERM FAC	978	978	978	1334	1334	1334	1334	1334		(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC	292	292	292	116	116	116	116	116		
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P/T)				140760	141/44	141/44	141/44		
NAVDMCONTRACEN PHIL	AOB	340	351	203	255	256	270	270	248	248	248
	CAP PERM FAC	377	377	377	286	286	286	286	286		(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
		Note: On-Station Berthing (P)				250	250	250	250		
NAVDESCOL NEWPORT	AOB	260	280	259	269	325	344	336	326	326	326
	CAP PERM FAC	424	424	424	424	424	424	424	424		(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NAVSCOLTRANSMT OAKLAND	AOB	105	95	64	62	82	73	73	69	69	69
	CAP PERM FAC	225	245	200	228	228	228	228	228		(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
		Note (5) Relocated by SER program.									

() Restraints: B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space

668

SPECIALIZED TRAINING

TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES

AUG 24 1973

ACTIVITY	FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	
NAVCOMBATSYSTECHSCOLCOM AOB	1356	1150	931	985	1451	1200	1135	1135	1135	1135	
MARE ISLAND CAP PERM FAC	1665	1555	1565	1320	1320	1320	1320	2169			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	0			
FLERAINISUBTRACEN CHARLESTON											
AOB	727	614	270	387	526	453	430	430	430	430	
CAP PERM FAC	1103	1103	1103	1546	1546	1546	1546	1546			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
LANTTLEASWTACSCOL NORFOLK											
AOB	35	35	35	35	41	38	38	115	115	115	(B)
CAP PERM FAC	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	---	---	(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NAVU (LOWRY)											
AOB	40	80	49	74	192	164	164	164	164	164	
CAP PERM FAC	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86			(B)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NAVGMSCOL DAM NECK											
AOB	1315	1387	1468	976	931	853	809	809	809	809	(B)
CAP PERM FAC	1570	1570	1570	1530	1530	1530	1530	1530			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
	Note: On-Station Berthing (P)				1158	1158	1158	1158			
COMMSYSTECHSCOL WASH DC											
AOB	34	35	51	61	27	41	34	33	33	33	
CAP PERM FAC	60	40	90	90	32	32	32	32			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
SERVSCOLCOM ORLANDO											
AOB	---	216	260	360	562	773	751	805	805	805	
CAP PERM FAC	---	350	285	285	285	285	285	285			(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	---	0	605	605	605	605	0	0			
	Note (8) AOB will experience a significant increase in the out-years due to anticipated consolidation of east coast AS training at Norfolk.										
AOB	Note (9) On-Station berthing in permanent facilities but do not meet adequacy standards.										
CAP PERM FAC											
CAP TEMP FAC											
	() Restraints: B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space										

SPECIALIZED TRAINING

ACTIVITY	TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES										AUG 24 1973	
	FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78		
NAVTRADET MERIDIAN	AOB	---	---	---	---	80	171	945	1295	1295	1295	(B) FY 73
	CAP PERM FAC	---	---	---	---	138	644	1295	1295			(T) 74-75
	CAP TEMP FAC	---	---	---	---	0	0	0	0			
FLETRACEN LONG BEACH	AOB	Not Avail.	Not Avail.	80	54	56	77	---	---	---	---	(3) (T)
	CAP PERM FAC			93	93	93	93	---	---	---	---	
	CAP TEMP FAC											
FLINTELTRACEN LANT NORFOLK	AOB						32	32	58	58	58	
	CAP PERM FAC						0	125	125			(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC						69	0	0			
FLINTELTRACEN PAC SAN DIEGO	AOB	---	---	---	42	52	55	55	57	57	57	
	CAP PERM FAC	---	---	---	48	51	68	68	68			(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC	---	---	---	0	0	0	0	0			
NAVSCOL JUST NEWPORT	AOB	180	157	141	112	151	139	139	132	132	132	
	CAP PERM FAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC	210	286	210	294	294	294	294	294			
NAVNUWRTRAU WINDSOR	AOB	236	261	263	269	340	395	382	316	373	351	
	CAP PERM FAC	MUST BE OBTAINED FROM AEC										
	CAP TEMP FAC											
NAVNUWRTRAU IDAHO FALLS	AOB	562	584	636	624	1208	1432	1381	1159	1368	1288	
	CAP PERM FAC	MUST BE OBTAINED FROM AEC										
	CAP TEMP FAC											
NAVNUWRTRAU SCHENECTADY	AOB	255	262	347	564	863	787	761	632	746	703	
	CAP PERM FAC	MUST BE OBTAINED FROM AEC										
	CAP TEMP FAC											
		Note (3) Disestablished by SER program.										
		() Restraints: B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space										

SPECIALIZED TRAINING

ACTIVITY	TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES										AUG 24 1973
	FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	
NAVNUPWRSOL BAINBRIDGE AOB	640	708	929	1060	1672	895	1288	---	---	---	
CAP PERM FAC											(T)
CAP TEMP FAC	980	980	980	1280	1280	1280	1280	---	---	---	
NAVNUPWRSOL MARE ISLAND											
AOB	558	733	867	1138	1672	895	1288	1411	---	---	
CAP PERM FAC											
CAP TEMP FAC	600	940	940	1249	1489	1489	1489	1489	---	---	(T)
NAVNUPWRSOL ORLANDO											
AOB	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1411	3258	3148	
CAP PERM FAC	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	(T)
CAP TEMP FAC											
NAVCOMMTRACENDET FT DEVENS	NOT INCLUDED - TRAINING CONDUCTED BY OTHER SERVICES										
AOB											
CAP PERM FAC											
CAP TEMP FAC											
NAVCOMMTRACENDET GOODFELLOW	NOT INCLUDED - TRAINING CONDUCTED BY OTHER SERVICES										
AOB											
CAP PERM FAC											
CAP TEMP FAC											
NAVTRAU FT MCCLELLAND	CLOSED										
AOB											
CAP PERM FAC											
CAP TEMP FAC											
NAMTRAGRU MEMPHIS	EXCLUDED DUE TO TRAINING CONDUCTED AT VARIOUS INSTALLATIONS										
AOB											
CAP PERM FAC											
CAP TEMP FAC											
AOB											
CAP PERM FAC											
CAP TEMP FAC											

() Restraints; B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space

OFFICER ACQUISITION TRAINING

TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES

AUG 24 1973

ACTIVITY		FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	
USNA ANNAPOLIS	AOB	3592	4108	4212	4144	4098	4243	4243	4243	4243	4243	
	CAP PERM FAC	4340	4340	4340	4340	4340	4340	4340	4340			(6) (M)
	CAP TEMP FAC											
OCS	AOB	1615	1035	868	863	735	750	617	576	576	576	(10)
	CAP PERM FAC	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000			(B)
	CAP TEMP FAC											
NAPS BAINBRIDGE	AOB	198	240	211	250	240	240	240	300	300	300	
	CAP PERM FAC	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280			(B)
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											

(6) Although facilities are permanent type structures, they are substandard for training.
 (10) Berthing facilities are only adequate for officer candidates.

() Restraints: B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space

672

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING		TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES										AUG 24 1973
ACTIVITY		FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	
NAVWARCOL NEWPORT	AOB	329	445	492	534	463	463	463	694	723	752	
	CAP PERM FAC	511*	511*	511*	511*	535*	535*	565*	565*			*(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC											
NAVDACOMD AFSC NORFOLK	AOB	249	246	246	251	251	251	251	251	251	251	
	CAP PERM FAC	540	540	540	540	540	540	540	540			(T)
	CAP TEMP FAC											
NAVPGSCOL MONTEREY	AOB	1361	1627	1927	1784	1675	1704	1704	1748	1748	1748	
Includes	CAP PERM FAC	1850	1850	1875	1875	1900	1900	1900	1900			(T)
NAVMGMTSYSCEN	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
	AOB											

FLIGHT TRAINING

ACTIVITY	TRAINING WORKLOADS AND CAPACITIES										AUG 24 1973	
	FY69	FY70	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78		
1. NAS PENSACOLA	AOB											
	CAP PERM FAC											
	CAP TEMP FAC											
a. SCOLCOM												
(1) ACOS PILOT	AOB	278	404	370	206	141	220	227	227	226	226	
	CAP PERM FAC	400	400	400	400	400	351	351	437			*
	CAP TEMP FAC											
(2) ACOS NFO	AOB	126	255	167	94	139	121	135	122	143	143	
	CAP PERM FAC	200	200	200	200	200	188	188	188			*
	CAP TEMP FAC											
(3) EI PILOT	AOB	127	185	170	95	93	64	62	62	62	62	
	CAP PERM FAC	150	150	150	150	150	95	95	119			*
	CAP TEMP FAC											
(4) EI NFO	AOB	58	117	77	33	34	33	44	33	39	39	
	CAP PERM FAC	75	75	75	75	75	51	51	51			*
	CAP TEMP FAC											
b. PILOT	AOB	245	171	156	135	71	62	69	69	69	69	
	CAP PERM FAC	120	120	120	120	120	94	94	94			*
	CAP TEMP FAC											
c. NFO	AOB	362	519	398	356	349	342	531	436	440	440	
	CAP PERM FAC	420	420	420	420	420	620	620	620			*
	CAP TEMP FAC											
2. NAS SAUFLEY	AOB	742	630	423	406	279	255	270	261	391	588	
	CAP PERM FAC	510	510	510	510	510	590	590	590			*
	CAP TEMP FAC											

* NOTE: Capacities are Pilot Capacities (Base and Aircraft are Limiting Factors)

() Restraints: B-Berthing; M-Messing; T-Training Space

674

AUG 24 1973

EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. While training space is listed as the constraint, there are no adequate berthing facilities available to activity.
2. All berthing facilities under cognizance of host.
3. Disestablished by SER program.
4. Scheduled for disestablishment.
5. Relocated by SER program.
6. Although facilities are permanent type structures, they are substandard for training.
7. Even though capacity is limited by berthing, the majority of training is conducted in wood frame, converted barracks.
8. AOB will experience a significant increase in the out-years due to anticipated consolidation of east coast ASW training at Norfolk.
9. On-Station berthing in permanent facilities, but do not meet adequacy standards.
10. Berthing facilities are only adequate for officer candidates.

ORLANDO TRAINING JUSTIFIED

Mr. PATTEN. Why is Orlando considered by the Navy to be the best location for nuclear power and basic electricity and electronics training?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, as far as nuclear power training is concerned, as I mentioned earlier in the hearings, we are trying to establish some core centers. In fact, six around the country to take the lead in all our enlisted training. We have chosen Orlando to be the center where all our nuclear power training is conducted.

As far as basic electronics and electricity goes, we already have two basic electricity and electronics schools in existence at the Great Lakes Center and San Diego Training Center. However, because basic electricity and electronics is a prerequisite for 25 percent of our Navy rates, we require this school collocated with our recruit training center at Orlando to take care of those students coming out of the training center at Orlando going on for further service school training.

Mr. PATTEN. What are the Navy's core centers for training?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not cover that. I covered only Orlando and how it is the core center for nuclear power training. We have Pensacola for electronic warfare training, Great Lakes as our center for boilermen training. We have San Diego as our center for radiomen training. Memphis is our center for air-related rates, and Meridian is our center for clerical schools.

RECRUITS GIVEN TRAINING CHOICE

Mr. PATTEN. Are recruits screened before they are sent to basic training at a particular location to insure, to the extent possible, that their follow-on technical training will be conducted at or near that installation?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. At the present time they are not. However, steps are being taken to try and work in this direction. At the present time because we are trying to achieve an all-volunteer choice, recruits are given sort of a choice as to which center or recruit training centers they will attend.

Mr. PATTEN. One problem is that recruits claim the promises given to them by recruiters are not lived up to and that they don't get the slots they thought they would get. This problem does not occur solely with regard to this installation, but across the board.

It is hard to establish a record of whether the enlistee is correct or the service.

It must be the No. 1 problem to fit everybody where they want to go, when you want them where you need them, not where they want to go. We, in Congress, have a problem when the families tell us there was definitely a promise of an opportunity for education. In electricity, to take an example, one fellow never made it, but the Navy said that in the competition and on qualifications he didn't measure up, but at least we got an intelligent answer and we know that when the recruit was tested, he did get a fair shake.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my 2 cents to this same subject. I know these gentlemen are not in the recruitment end, but if you ever are talking to anybody that is, Admiral, you can

unburden all of us of a lot of problems we have on that particular subject. I think they are needless.

Admiral MARSCHALL. May I go off the record?

Mr. McEWEN. Yes.

[Discussion off the record.]

ORLANDO WORKLOAD PROJECTIONS

Mr. PATTEN. Provide for the record the workload for the past 5 years and projected for the next 5 years for basic electricity and electronics training and for nuclear power training, by location.

[The information follows:]

	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Workload for basic electricity and electronics training:										
San Diego.....	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Great Lakes.....	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700
Orlando.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	350	350	350	350
Workload for nuclear power training:										
Bainbridge.....	824	887	1,050	1,304	1,309	1,010	1,230	0	0	0
Mare Island.....	838	918	1,058	1,315	1,350	1,010	1,235	820	0	0
Orlando.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,880	3,100	3,245

NEED FOR THREE ELECTRICITY AND ELECTRONICS SCHOOLS

Mr. PATTEN. Why do you feel that it is necessary to set up a third center for basic electricity and electronics training at Orlando when you already have such training established at San Diego and Great Lakes?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, to begin with, the schools at Great Lakes and San Diego do not have the capacity to train the number of students we require. Another good reason is that basic electricity and electronics is a prerequisite for 25 percent of all Navy rates. This means a large number of our recruits when they graduate have to go through basic electricity and electronics before they can go on to their advanced schooling. We need to have it collocated at the recruit training center so that we can take these individuals and see if they can make the grade in this training before spending additional travel money on them or sending them to a future school. Therefore we really require this basic electricity and electronics at each training center.

Mr. PATTEN. Nothing was said about this electronics school when Orlando was established. You are not responsible for that?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir.

As you know, about every weapon system in this day and age is getting more and more complex with the additional electronics gear, and so electricity and electronics are becoming one of the prime requirements for advanced training.

CONSOLIDATION OF NUCLEAR POWER TRAINING

Mr. PATTEN. What is the long-range program for nuclear power training facilities at Orlando?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, the first increment included in this program will relocate those from Bainbridge. Next year we hope to follow up with a similar project which will consolidate our nuclear power training presently conducted in Mare Island and bring all nuclear power training together at Orlando.

NAVAL HOME, GULFPORT, MISS.

Mr. PATTEN. Let us go on to Mississippi. Insert page I-122 in the record.

[The information follows:]

1. DATE 19 FEB 1973		5. DEPARTMENT NAVY		FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		2. INSTALLATION NAVAL HOME								
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL			8. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 3427-999		6. STATE/COUNTRY GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI									
7. STATUS NEW		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1975		9. COUNTY (U.S.) HARRISON		10. NEAREST CITY WITHIN CITY								
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Provide an honorable and comfortable home for old and disabled officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps who may be entitled, under the law, to the benefits of the Institution.				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)			
				PERMANENT			OFFICER		ENLISTED			CIVILIAN		
				a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
				b. PLANNED (2nd FY) 1975			5	10	390	0	0	0	0	0
							10	26	800	0	0	0	0	0
				13. INVENTORY										
				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)		
				a. OWNED ASSETS TO BE TRANSFERRED FROM PRESENT OWNER 0										
				b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS NOT FIRM 0										
				c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Exclpt land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972 0										
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$0) 3,881														
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$200,000) 9,444														
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$0) 0														
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f) 13,325														
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS														
PROJECT DESIGNATION					TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM					
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b						SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h				
724.20	NEW NAVAL HOME (PHASE II)				/	SF	345,424	9,444	345,424	9,444				
*Includes 284 residents in June 1972 and 600 residents end of FY 1975														

681

Naval Home, Gulfport, Miss., \$9,444,000.

This home provides a residence for old, disabled Navy and Marine Corps personnel.

The new naval home project is the second phase of providing a new home for 600 residents to replace the existing, inadequate facility currently located in Philadelphia, Pa.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973.....	\$3, 300, 000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual).....	330, 000
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	1, 650, 000

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
New naval home (phase II).....	\$110, 050	57

Mr. PATTEN. Could you review for us the history of plans to relocate the Naval Home to this new location? Please insert summaries of pertinent studies, et cetera, for the record.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

RELOCATION OF NAVAL HOME TO GULFPORT

During the course of the hearing on Milcon authorization, fiscal year 1972, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Navy witnesses testified that a study was being performed to determine whether the Naval Home should remain in Philadelphia or whether a more suitable location could be found. Based on this testimony the Senate Armed Services Committee, recognizing a need to provide the Navy with greater flexibility, modified the bill. The modification authorized the use of a portion of the \$991,000 for the Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa., to be utilized at such other installation or site as approved by the Armed Services Committees. This modification was accepted by the House conferees. The conference report stated: "The conferees were unanimous in their opinion that any attempt to construct entirely new facilities for the Naval Home would be entirely too costly at this time; that the Navy should act promptly in relocating the home at a more desirable location where existing Government-owned facilities may be adapted for use as a Naval Home at a reasonable cost."

In conducting a study on the possible relocation of the U.S. Naval Home the Navy reviewed all Navy real property holdings throughout the United States, GSA Executive Order 11508 surveys of Air Force and Army installations; and the excess Government real property list. After completing this study, the Secretary of the Navy recommended to the congressional committees that annex No. 3, Keesler Air Force Base, Gulfport, Miss., be the future site for the Naval Home. The committees advised the Navy that this selection was satisfactory.

This decision to move the Naval Home from Philadelphia to Gulfport, Miss., was made after the fiscal year 1973 military construction authorization bill was submitted to the Congress, but the Senate Armed Services Committee by amendment to the House bill, added \$3,300,000 for constructing the first phase of the Naval Home at Gulfport, Miss. This amendment was accepted in conference.

NAVY HOME PLANS

Mr. TAYLOR. In the fiscal year 1972 program the Navy requested funds to modernize the existing Naval Home at Philadelphia. However, it was suggested that possibly we should look for another location in a more suitable spot. Therefore, a portion of the funds in 1972 were allocated for the Navy to look to start construction at a new location.

In 1973, \$3,300,000 was approved in funding for the second increment of the Naval Home. The program before you requests \$9,-444,000 which will complete our requirements for the Naval Home for 600 residents located in Gulfport, Miss.

Mr. PATTEN. Are you saying the project which is before us will complete the requirements for a new Naval Home for 600 residents? Captain TAYLOR. Yes, sir; it will.

Mr. PATTEN. To what do you attribute the growth in cost of this facility?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. I don't believe there has been a growth. I think this is not exactly what the original estimate was. It is within the same general area.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman?

The Army has a home here in Washington?

Are there any others of these homes for the old sailors or soldiers?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Just these two.

NAVAL HOME AND SOLDIERS HOME

Mr. McEWEN. Does the Army take Navy personnel here?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir.

Captain TAYLOR. It takes Army and Air Force.

Mr. McEWEN. You don't take anyone else other than Navy?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. Do you ever run into a situation where a man wants to be in a certain area because he has friends or relatives or some ties there?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I am not aware of any, Mr. McEwen, but I will ask and try to find out for you.

Mr. SIKES. For the purpose of the record, have you explained the difference in the operation of the Soldiers' Home and the Naval Home?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. we have not.

Mr. SIKES. Do that for the record.

[The information follows:]

OPERATION OF HOMES

The primary difference in the operation of the Soldiers' Home and the Naval Home is in the method of funding. The operation and maintenance of the Naval Home is supported by appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury. The operation of the Soldiers' Home is funded by fines and forfeitures adjudged against Army personnel and by the deduction of 10 cents per month from the pay of every active duty enlisted member of the Army.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I know in my home community we had a home for elderly of a fraternal order that worked out very well until the membership of the order was from another area. For many they didn't want to be away from where their friends and family were, and that is why I wondered if one home and one location was adequate. I wondered if there was any exchange between the services on this. For instance, a former officer or enlisted man in the Navy that wanted to be in the Washington area, could he get in the home here for the Army?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. The matter the chairman brought up regarding the difference between the operation of the Navy Home and the Army home would help explain why. There is a definite

difference in approach by the Army. It involves money coming from troopers as opposed to Government funding, appropriated funding, and various things. It makes a big difference in what we are talking about.

Mr. PATTEN. May I say at this point, in our HEW hearings we heard the appropriation request for the Soldiers' Home here in Washington, and a year or two ago, partly at your bidding, we went into this in depth. We went out there and visited and made the comparison and it received major attention from the chairman and members of the committee.

That whole study is worth reading, and it is worth taking a ride to the Soldiers' Home to meet some of the people and learn some things. If all our veterans knew of it, that place would be 50 times as large as it is today. It is a good deal and a fellow would probably want to know a little more about it.

In connection with our hearings for the 1972 budget, that study was made in depth and a comparison was made with the Navy Home. That led to this discussion we have had here today.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Patten is quite correct in what he has said. The Soldiers' Home in Washington is very well managed. The facilities are good and the personnel are apparently adequate for the job, and it seems to be a successful operation. I do recommend a visit there. By comparison, the Naval Home at Philadelphia was allowed to get rundown, and it is in a bad part of town. It was a question of whether to try to revitalize it there or move it elsewhere. It seemed impossible to do anything with it there. The Senate proposed that it be in Mississippi, a very good location, and I think it is entirely proper it be rebuilt totally.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The Navy did do a study of possible locations. Admiral MARSCHALL. That was provided last year.

FLEXIBILITY OF NEW HOME

Mr. PATTEN. What is the acreage at the new site?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It is 35.65 acres.

Mr. PATTEN. Is that readily expandable in case the Naval Home grows in future years?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, this site is expandable from the 600 we are trying to achieve at this point, to 1,200 or double the capacity we are presently programing for it.

Mr. SIKES. What is the capacity at Philadelphia?

Mr. TAYLOR. Around 250. I will provide the exact figure for the record.

[The information follows:]

At the present time, there are 256 beneficiaries accommodated by the Naval Home. The total capacity of the facility is rated at 350. This figure, however, is based on an existing net living space of approximately 63-72 square feet per person.

Mr. TAYLOR. The present home is not capable of being expanded. That is one of the reasons that the Navy was interested in a new site.

Mr. SIKES. I think the Philadelphia location was not very inviting to the average person seeking a retired home.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is true. It was not expandable.

Mr. PATTEN. You are proposing to build a high-rise structure. Is this desirable in view of the age and the infirmity of many of the occupants?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, we are providing plenty of access by way of elevators et cetera for personnel to use, so it makes sense to provide them with a high-rise structure. It limits the amount of movement they have to go outside by compressing everything into one location that is readily accessible by use of elevators rather than having to travel some distance by foot.

Mr. PATTEN. Is this wise? In my hometown we are going to open a 12-story building for the elderly right on our main street. I urged the United Auto Workers to sponsor the project under our HUD program. We will open for occupancy on September 1. It is right on the main street and the supermarket is 50 feet away, near the theater, Knights of Columbus, YMCA, and the churches. We put all old citizens right downtown. We don't want them on a hill out on the farm where they cannot see anybody. They can walk out of the building, meet the people on the street, go to a restaurant, visit their relatives, or go to a bingo game. All the people in the business claim this is how to do it, keep them together and make it possible for them to meet a lot of people and be able to take advantage of the community activities, as against putting them 10 miles out of town in some isolated spot. They have to meet people and be encouraged to walk and to get out.

Mr. LONG. Will the gentleman yield?

Your description of how you do it in your community is exactly the opposite of ours. It would cause an upheaval beyond belief to propose such a thing in my area. They don't dare stick their noses out of a door, for fear of violent crimes. If they go out on the street, they are almost sure to get robbed or hurt, almost everywhere in the downtown portion of our community. That is the difference between communities.

Mr. PATTEN. If you talk to the people in HUD, you will find out they don't want these people put on the farms. We have senior citizen facilities at Woodbridge, right on the main street next to the movies, and near to shopping centers, and they love it. An 8-story building for our senior citizens has been occupied 5 years. In Woodbridge Center, our senior citizens are right on the main street next to the bank. Everything is there; they don't need an automobile. They go down to the beauty shop or any place, and it's all within a block. It is ideal; they love it. We have no security problems in the building. Security is minimum as far as the inside goes.

Mr. MCKAY. Would you yield?

I think the gentleman is making a very good point. My question is, in the planning of your structure and location, have you taken into consideration studies from gerontologists? They now have gerontology studies which reverse old ideas of what they have done, which was to put them in and keep them warm and healthy; that is, warm and fed. There are other things they find are more essential than some of those things. Is the Navy taking into consideration those gerontology special studies?

Admiral MARSCHALL. In answer to your specific question, I don't know. As a corollary to that, we did have a great deal of medical input from our Navy physicians, and I assume that this was all considered.

Mr. McKAY. Because they are doctors doesn't mean they understand old age.

Admiral MARSCHALL. That is right. That is why I said I can't answer your question.

Mr. McKAY. We have a gerontology center and social studies from various universities and they are coming up with some startling things contrary to popular belief about how to keep people happy. That is why I suggested if you have not done this, consideration should be given to doing so before a final decision is made.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. All these factors have to be considered. The problems Congressman Long mentioned are reasons why we favor moving the Navy Home out of this area of Philadelphia.

NAVAL HOME PROJECTIONS

What are your projections in terms of the possible growth of the Naval Home in future years?

Mr. TAYLOR. As I mentioned, we are projecting by the time this facility is completed we will need a residency for 600 occupants. Looking to the future, if the situation should arise, we could expand this facility to double that, or 1,200.

Mr. PATTEN. Upon what factors do you base your estimate?

Mr. NICHOLAS. When I visited the Naval Home several years ago their projections for the year 2000 were well over 2,500 people. They did it on the basis of the retired population from World War II, and they anticipated a tremendous increase in the workload.

Mr. PATTEN. If you ever tell the sailors what you have to offer, you will need a capacity of 2,500.

Mr. NICHOLAS. That was one of the points they made.

Admiral MARSCHALL. One of the problems is that the basic experience in the Naval Home has not been very worthwhile because of just the reasons we are moving from it. We have projected and there are figures which we can provide for the record and which I have seen, but which we don't have here, of a steady growth up to about the year 2000, say. It peaks before 2000 and starts going down, but there are so many factors involved in the eligibility, funding, success of this home, that it is a difficult thing to predict.

Our figures show that there will be steady growth within this century.

Mr. PATTEN. Admiral, in your survey you have to consider also what the States are doing. We have a State home for veterans in Vineland, N.J., which is beautiful. We have the State home at Menlo Park near the Edison Memorial. What a waiting list there is! If you have a fellow with no family and you want him to be a little comfortable, try to get him into the New Jersey State Soldiers Home! It's full.

We have 250 more beds at the soldiers' home in Menlo Park than we had 5 years ago. It was a godsend for many people. We moved about 100 out of our veterans' hospital into the soldiers' home—fellows with no place to go who were in the hospital. The hospital gained some beds by getting these fellows quarters in the soldiers' home. The only reason they stayed in the veterans' hospital is because there was no one to care for them and they had no place to go.

Mr. SIKES. I would assume that State homes for veterans or retired personnel would be an exception rather than the rule. I know of only a few.

Mr. PATTEN. We had one in our county. These men don't have their own cars. They ride the bus to their own church or to see their families and visit, and then go back home for the night. We are not talking about hospitals but we are talking about fellows that use it as a home.

In connection with that, there are facilities which are not quite up to snuff. Yet, these men are not injured and don't need operations and are not hospital cases.

Will your home meet the requirements for rapid evacuation of the population in event of fire?

FIRE SAFETY

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir. All our facilities are constructed with that in mind—to get them out.

Mr. PATTEN. Did you hear the radio this morning about the fire in St. Louis at the records center?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir. I heard about that.

Mr. PATTEN. It was supposed to be a fireproof building. The insurance rate on a building I have an interest in, and which is fireproof or fire resistant, is 0.006. There are metal window frames, floors are concrete, and it is fire resistant as well as fireproof. Despite all kinds of hazards, such as fires in the neighborhood or terrific explosions, nothing ever happened to our 10-story office building. It is well built. I was surprised to hear there was a fire on the eighth floor. Papers burned and files burned. If you get enough heat, the paint on those file cabinets will go.

To what extent have you been able to make use of existing buildings at this location?

USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We have several existing buildings, Mr. Chairman, that will be adapted for chapel, hobby shop, laundry, and general stores use. Three or four of them that will be used.

Mr. SIKES. For what are they being used now?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. The Army is using them, but they are permanent construction.

Mr. SIKES. Can they be adapted without too much cost?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Is that contained in this appropriation?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir, it is in the total appropriation we are asking for this year. We have a program specifically for that.

Mr. SIKES. What is the amount for renovation?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. \$534,000.

Mr. SIKES. Will it meet all the requirements?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What are you going to do with the Philadelphia establishment?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. That is to be excessed.

Mr. PATTEN. Have you reexamined the location of this facility in view of the recent base realignment decisions?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Specifically, no, we have not, because we have already acquired the facility and started work on it.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

Mr. DAVIS. Where does this appropriation for the operation of this home come in? Is that the O. & M.?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have ever happened to run into this situation.

Could you give me some idea as to the criteria for admission, waiting list, things of that kind?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We can do that for the record.

[The information follows:]

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

The eligibility criteria for admission to the Naval Home is that an applicant must have served honorably during wartime, must be unable to earn a living through manual labor, and must meet minimal physical and mental standards (not infirm nor senile and without chronic medical problems). With a present population of 256 beneficiaries, there is no waiting list for admission.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. Any other questions?

[No response.]

Mr. SIKES. Gentlemen, the committee will reconvene at 2 o'clock. Thank you very much.

AFTERNOON SESSION

NAVAL COASTAL SYSTEMS LABORATORY, PANAMA CITY, FLA.

Mr. SIKES. The committee will come to order.

We will turn to Panama City. Insert page I-107 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 17 APR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			5. INSTALLATION NAVAL COASTAL SYSTEMS LABORATORY						
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL			6. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 2130-600			8. STATE/COUNTRY PANAMA CITY, FLORIDA							
7. STATUS ACTIVE		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1943		9. COUNTY (U.S.) BAY		10. NEAREST CITY 10 MILES EAST TO PANAMA CITY							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS This Laboratory is the principal Navy RDT&E center for the application of science & technology associated with military operations carried out primarily in the coastal region, and performs investigations in related fields of science and technology. <u>Major Functions:</u> NCSL establishes and maintains the primary in-house R&D capability for the following Navy & Marine Corps systems, sub-systems & technologies: <u>Inshore Warfare</u> (less ordnance); Amphibious & Riverine Operations Support, Harbor & Riverine Defense (less vehicles); Swimmer Defense, Counterin-surgance Systems; Bridge Defense; Barrier Sensor (Continued Below)				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)		
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)		CIVILIAN (8)	
				a. AS OF 31 December 1972	17	118	605	0	0	0	0	0	740
				b. PLANNED (END FY 1977)	25	183	583	0	0	0	0	0	791
13. INVENTORY				LAND		ACRES (1)	LAND COST (\$000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)	TOTAL (\$000) (4)				
				a. OWNED	640		255	15,057	15,312				
				b. LEASE AND EASEMENTS	17* - 13#		1* - 0#	52* - 0#	52				
				c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72					15,364				
				d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					8,627				
				e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM					3,463				
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								250					
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								27,704					
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS													
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT DESIGNATION			TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM					
	PROJECT TITLE b					SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h				
310.86	EXPERIMENTAL DIVING FACILITY			/	SF	16,000	1,363	16,000	1,363				
310.89	SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT & TEST FACILITY			/	SF	38,400	2,100	38,400	2,100				
310.90	DEEP OCEAN ENGINEERING PRESSURE BUILDING - AMENDMENT FOR ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION (PL 90-408 (FY 1969) PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED \$7,411,000)			/	LS	-	-	-	1,986				
	11. Major Functions (Cont'd)					TOTAL	3,463		5,449				
	Systems; Mine, Ordnance & Booby Trap Counter Measure Systems Coastal Tech: Coastal Geodesy, Shallow Water Oceanography, Deployable Short Range Nav Systems, Environmental Cond. Prediction Naval Diver & Swimmer Delivery & Life Systems, Salvage Support, Acoustic Countermeasures.												

689

Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, FL., \$5,449,000

This laboratory is the principal Navy RDT&E center for application of science and technology to coastal region military operations. This includes RDT&E responsibility for Navy diving, swimming and undersea salvage operations.

The experimental diving facility project will provide laboratory space and recompression chambers required by the relocation of the Navy experimental diving unit from the Washington, D. C. Navy Yard. Existing available space is substandard and inadequate.

The systems development and test facility project will provide a building with characteristics capable of supporting the development and testing of large systems components and equipment used to support military operations in coastal environments. Existing facilities are dispersed, substandard and totally inadequate to meet this need.

The deep ocean engineering pressure building project will provide the additional authorization and funding required to complete the ocean simulation facility approved by P.L. 90-408. This amendment is required to provide for material certification of hyperbaric chambers and to pay approved contractor claims.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through Fiscal Year 1973 \$ -0-
 Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual) -0-
 Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated) -0-

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Experimental diving facility	\$70,150	5
Systems development and test facility	89,700	40
Deep ocean engineering pressure building	(95,330)	100

Mr. PATTEN. Discuss the effect of relocations on requirements for projects at this installation. Provide costs, savings, and construction details for the record.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, we are relocating from the Washington area the Experimental Diving Unit consisting of about 72 military and 7 civilian personnel. In order to accommodate them at Panama City we are providing the experimental diving facility in this year's program. Essentially that project will accommodate the relocations to Panama City.

[The information follows:]

Military construction costs resulting from relocation of Navy Experimental Diving Unit, Panama City amount to \$1,363,000. This action will reduce the Navy's annual expenditure by an estimated \$425,000.

NAVAL COASTAL SYSTEMS LABORATORY, PANAMA CITY, FLA.—MCON PROJECTS, CURRENT AND PROPOSED

Fiscal year and title	Cost (thousand)	Remarks.
1974:		
Deep ocean engineering pressure facility.....	\$1,986	Fiscal year 1969 project amendment.
Systems development and test facility.....	2,300	Initially submitted for \$2,100.
Experimental diving facility.....	1,363	
1975: Ship wastewater collection ashore.....	100	Pollution abatement.
Unprogramed:		
Berthing utilities.....	367	
Riverine test facility.....	620	
Anechoic pressure tank facility.....	1,100	
Fire alarm system.....	64	

Note: There are no MCON projects proposed for Panama City which are required as a result of the shore establishment realignment study.

Mr. SIKES. The request is \$5,449,000 for an experimental diving facility, a systems development and test facility, and an amendment on the deep ocean engineering pressure building.

You are requesting a systems development and test facility. Tell us what it is that you are requesting and explain the requirement.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND TEST FACILITY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, this facility essentially combines laboratory and administrative support space with adjacent high bay, industrial and assembly space. This laboratory is sorely needed in conjunction with new missions it was assigned in February of 1972, and presently has fragmented facilities not suitable for this mission, and this facility would give them a much improved capability.

Mr. SIKES. Is the cost estimate still considered valid?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. No, sir, we have a proposed change in the budget office adding \$200,000 to this for additional work, providing parking aprons and test facilities. We expect it to be cleared very soon.

Mr. SIKES. Essentially it is an updating of the request, is it not?
Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes.

DEEP OCEAN ENGINEERING PRESSURE BUILDING

Mr. SIKES. There was a cost overrun on the deep ocean engineering pressure building. Explain the reason for that.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. That is due to two principal factors. One is the chamber certification situation. When the Navy got into the chamber certification business several years ago it was a new item, and we found it was much more costly to certify and conduct tests. The other was due to the state-of-the-art advances, and we moved into the project quite rapidly and found it cost a little more money than the additional certification cost.

Mr. SIKES. This building has a great deal of potential insofar as its contribution to the Navy and the Nation. Is the building going to be adequate for the job? In other words, are we doing enough at this time?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir. From the construction standpoint, yes, sir.

SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND TEST FACILITY

Mr. DAVIS. In your proposed revision of the systems development and test facility, you do refer to providing aprons and parking areas which were apparently not in your original justifications at all.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. DAVIS. How did this come about?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. This was an additional requirement for testing of the air-cushion vehicle which was brought to our attention by the major user of the facility several months ago, and we have submitted a request to increase the price by \$200,000, which has been approved by Secretary of Defense and is currently in the Office of Management and Budget with expected approval in the next few days. Once we have that clearance we, of course, will submit a new form 1391 that will show that change.

Mr. DAVIS. Is this the one we were talking about in connection with another project yesterday or the day before? This will be the only facility of its kind; is that right?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, I think this is the only one of its kind in the Navy.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It is related to other hyperbaric chambers.

Admiral MARSCHALL. This is not the hyperbaric chamber. This is systems development and test facility. This is a one of a type kind.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation on the adequacy of the facilities for a gymnasium here?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory (NCSL) currently has a gymnasium of 9,490 square feet which is of permanent construction and is fully usable. Therefore, it is considered that the present gymnasium is adequate for the foreseeable future for the 135 military personnel assigned.

NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLA.

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla. Place in the record page I-112.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 5 MAR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. PROJECT DESIGNATION FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		5. INSTALLATION NAVAL AIR STATION									
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING			6. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 1452,-736		8. STATE/COUNTRY FLORIDA										
7. STATUS ACTIVE			9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1914		10. COUNTY (U.S.) ESCAMBIA		11. NEAREST CITY 9 MILES NORTHEAST TO FENSACOLA								
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of the Naval Training Command, aviation activities, and units of the Naval Air Training Command				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (3)			
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)				
				a. AS OF 31 December 72		1,186	4,621	8,137	1,242	649	497	1,261	60	17,653	
				b. PLANNED (End FY 1974)		1,107	4,256	8,115	997	860	233	1,006	60	16,634	
				13. INVENTORY											
				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
a. OWNED		12,134		591		78,838		79,429							
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		2,457# - 930#		20* - 162#		1,000* - 0#		1,162							
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land part) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72										80,591					
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY										20,514					
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM										2,699					
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS										10,642					
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)										114,446					
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
CATEGORY CODE NO. a		PROJECT DESIGNATION PROJECT TITLE b			TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM SCOPE e		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	FUNDING PROGRAM SCOPE g		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h			
141.40	AIR OPERATIONS BUILDING ADDITION			/	SF	4,100	199	3,454		199					
171.35	OPERATIONS FLIGHT TRAINER BUILDING			/	SF	17,952	791	17,952		791					
890.90	NAVAL AVIATION MUSEUM SUPPORTING FACILITIES			/	LS	-	299	-		299					
851.10	ENTRANCE AND ARTERIAL ROADS (2ND INCR)			/	MI	4.4	1,410	4.4		1,410					
							TOTAL	2,699		2,699					

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, FL., \$2 699,000

This station supports Naval Training Command, Naval Air Training Command, Naval Aviation Schools Command, Training Squadrons Four, and Ten and Twenty-Nine, Training Aircraft Carrier (USS LEXINGTON) and the Naval Air Rework Facility.

The air operations building addition projects will provide facilities to house aircraft operations and associated flight operational activities. Presently, these activities are in crowded, inadequate space with no room for radar air traffic control equipment which is to be added to the complex.

The operations flight trainer building project will provide space to house two operational flight trainers and related equipment for jet pilot training. This will allow the concept of single basing to be more fully realized.

The Naval Aviation Museum supporting facilities project will provide the support (all utilities, roads and parking) facilities required by the construction of the new museum.

The entrance and arterial roads project will provide the second of a 3 increment program to improve on station roads in phase with off station highway programs.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	\$72,547,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	69,117,157
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	71,056,431

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Air operations building addition	\$ 5,000	29
Operations flight trainer building	14,255	37
Naval aviation museum supporting facilities	17,940	15
Entrance and arterial roads (2nd Incr.)	24,000	10

Mr. SIKES. The request is for \$2,069,000 for an air operation building addition, an operation flight trainer building, Naval Aviation Museum supporting facilities, and the second increment for entrance and arterial roads.

Provide for the record the information on functions to be relocated here and the costs and savings involved as well as construction required and avoided as a result of these moves.

[The information follows:]

RELOCATION IMPACT

The projects requested are not required because of relocated functions, but are in support of ongoing activities at NAS Pensacola. The naval flight officer training from NAS Glynco will be relocated here, but will be accommodated by existing facilities. Previously we advised that there would be three projects required in the fiscal year 1975 MILCON program for the relocation of the naval flight officer school to NAS Pensacola. A recent evaluation disclosed that there will not be a requirement for additional facilities at NAS Pensacola.

The closure of NAS Glynco involves the relocation of functions to FCDSTC Dam Neck and NAS Memphis as well as NAS Pensacola. The "estimated annual savings" of \$9,260,000 resulting from the closure of NAS Glynco with the resultant elimination of certain civilian and military positions and the elimination of operating and maintenance costs. Similarly the "one-time closure cost" at NAS Glynco of \$21,111,000 cannot realistically be distributed to the other gaining activities because of such expenses as severance pay and facility preservation costs.

The value of the "military construction avoided," of \$9,109,000 at NAS Glynco does not relate directly to any of the gaining activities. The projects that were planned for construction included such general purpose facilities as: bachelor quarters, a maintenance hangar and a commissary.

As previously mentioned there will be no "military construction required" at NAS Pensacola as a result of base realignment actions in either fiscal year 1974 or fiscal year 1975.

OPERATIONS FLIGHT TRAINING

Mr. SIKES. I realize you may not be the proper witnesses to ask, but if you have this information, tell me the status of the development of the new trainer. Would you discuss the present stages of development of the modernization of the trainer?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir. Originally we started out procuring approximately six trainers to put at each of our flight training bases to conduct student training of pilots. We have modified the existing contract to get a new trainer which includes six degrees freedom of motion. We have delivery date scheduled which I can discuss at each activity as we come to the project which will provide the facilities to house these trainers. I'll provide information on the new flight trainer for the record.

[The information follows:]

TRAINER IMPROVEMENTS

To explain the improvements of the new trainer over the existing ones, we can start with a basic description of possible kinds of motion. Basically, motion consists of translation or rotation. Translation is accomplished by moving back and forth, turning right or left, and going up or down. Rotation occurs when spinning around an axis, either a horizontal longitudinal axis, a horizontal perpendicular axis, or a vertical axis.

The existing trainers are limited to three degrees of freedom of rotational motion. They can only roll, pitch, or yaw. The new improved trainers add the three degrees of freedom of translational motion, back and forth, right and left, and up and down. The full six degrees of freedom of motion provides unlimited combinations of simulated motion to which the student pilot can be subjected.

Mr. SIKES. When will the new trainers be available?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. May of 1975 with regard to Pensacola.

FLIGHT TRAINER BUILDING

Mr. SIKES. Why don't you give us some information on the purpose of the operation flight trainer building.

Mr. TAYLOR. The operations flight trainer building is to house one of these new six degree motion trainer devices that we mentioned previously. Delivery is scheduled in May of 1975.

In addition, this will house one trainer that is being relocated from Chase Field, Tex. which will give us our single jet pilot training capability at NAS Pensacola.

BENEFITS AND SAVINGS FROM USE OF TRAINER

Mr. SIKES. Would you tell us something about the benefits you anticipate from increased emphasis on simulation in flight training?

Mr. TAYLOR. By placing increased emphasis on simulation we can save money through not having to fly as many flight hours in the aircraft. As you know it is much cheaper to give an individual training in a training device than it is to operate an aircraft. We can eliminate up to approximately 15 hours of flight training in the aircraft itself by using simulation instead.

Mr. SIKES. Of course you have many students in training. Is this trainer building adequate for the purpose and will it give the men the time they require?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; it sure is.

Mr. SIKES. Can you spell out the actual savings you anticipate from facilities such as the one in this request?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not have it specifically calculated. I would like to provide it for the record.

Mr. SIKES. Provide it and provide the total costs for the program. [The information follows:]

FLIGHT SIMULATOR PROGRAM

At NAS Pensacola, 120 pilots will be trained in fiscal year 1975. Each of these pilots will receive about 15 hours of training in a simulator in lieu of actual flight in an aircraft. The cost of \$68.90 per hour for operating an airplane times 15 hours for 120 pilots amounts to a savings of approximately \$124,000 per year at NAS Pensacola.

The fiscal year 1974 Military Construction costs to provide space to house the simulators consists of \$791,000 at NAS Pensacola, \$525,000 at NAS Meridian, \$986,000 at NAS Kingsville and \$575,000 at NAS Chase Field for a total MCON cost of \$2,877,000. The acquisition cost of the seven flight simulators (Device 2F101), one for NAS Pensacola, and two each for NAS Meridian, NAS Kingsville, and NAS Chase Field will be \$14,900,000. As improvements are developed, additional equipment will be acquired to expand the capabilities of these devices. The space included in the fiscal year 1974 MCON projects at these four activities will be sufficient to accommodate the additional equipment.

PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE AND COST

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the schedule and cost for procurement of simulators involved in this program. Show the equipment delivery schedule and facility construction schedule as currently anticipated for fiscal year 1974 and subsequent military construction projects.

[The information follows:]

SCHEDULE AND COSTS

As indicated previously, the total cost of the seven flight trainer devices will be \$14,900,000, or approximately \$2,130,000 each.

The schedule for delivery of the trainers and the beneficial occupancy date (BOD) of the buildings will be as follows:

Activity	Trainer deliveries	Building BOD
NAS Chase Field.....	November 1973 and May 1975.....	January 1975.
NAS Meridian.....	May 1974 and June 1975.....	Do.
NAS Pensacola.....	November 1974.....	December 1974.
NAS Kingsville.....	April 1975.....	January 1975.

NAVAL AVIATION MUSEUM

Mr. SIKES. I think it would be well to discuss the requirements for the Naval Aviation Museum supporting facilities and you might spell out a little something about the Naval Aviation Museum and its historical importance. Is anyone prepared to do that?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Naval Museum Association has collected funds to provide this Navy Aviation Museum as the fountainhead of Naval aviation really. It is a private organization which has been good enough to provide funds for the structure. The Secretary of the navy has accepted this facility on behalf of the Navy, and at the present time there is a \$1,388,000 contract underway which was awarded in January of this year and which will complete the building in about March of 1974. The contract for this particular building is managed by the donor, and the particular facilities requested here are those to provide utilities to the building which the Secretary of the Navy has accepted.

Mr. SIKES. The new building itself will be provided by the Naval Aviation Museum Association from non-Government funds. Is that correct?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. Private contributions have made up the total of this donation.

ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. SIKES. Tell us something about the progress of the road improvements project. We funded this in fiscal 1973. Is that program under way?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir, it is under way.

Mr. SIKES. Are the bids satisfactory?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Sir, the bids have not been taken. The design is to be completed later this year.

Mr. SIKES. Would you put details in the record. I am surprised it would take so long to get a road project under construction.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We will.

Mr. SIKES. Is there any reason for what appears to be an unusual delay?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We will investigate it and provide it for the record.

[The information follows:]

The first increment of the entrance and arterial roads project at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, was an introductory item and started late into the planning and design cycle. A contract for preparation of the final design was awarded on December 8, 1972, following enactment of the Military Construction Authorization and Appropriation Acts. The design was further delayed by necessity of performing certain planning functions that would normally be done before the program submittal to Congress. These included studies of traffic patterns and volume, studies of proper road alignments through the historical fort areas and the Coast Guard's lighthouse area and a study by the Interior Department to assure that no historical items on the road right-of-way would be destroyed. The design of the second increment of the project was awarded on March 14, 1973, to the same architect-engineer firm. The two increments are at the same state of development and are both scheduled for completion on December 16, 1973. A single construction contract will be awarded in January 1974. The construction will be phased to provide for the minimum disruption possible to the flow of traffic at the activity.

Mr. SIKES. It is a new program in proper sequence. We don't want to appropriate money that can't be used. Is it appropriate to provide this money for the second increment at this time?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir. We don't anticipate any difficulties in proceeding with it. We have discussed the access road portion of this with the Federal and State highway authorities. There was a meeting earlier this week. We don't have the results yet. All indications are we can move together with the highway officials.

Mr. SIKES. The new road program is very important, of course, from a number of standpoints. It was needed even before the Gulf Islands National Seashore Park was established and the old forts were made a part of the park. Now, with the visitors going in to see the old forts and lighthouse and other facilities you are going to have a very serious highway traffic problem unless we can expedite this.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We are expediting it, Mr. Chairman. As you remember, the road itself was a late starter and it took some time to get the design under way.

Mr. SIKES. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. It appears that personnel levels, both permanent and trainee at Pensacola, are projected to drop rather substantially in the future. Are we building for current load or are we building for projected load?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We are building for both, Mr. Davis. At the present time with the new single phasing concept for pilot training we have a basic figure of people at Pensacola, and Pensacola takes up the surges in the system from the other bases within the training command. So we require what we are asking for in order to take care of this surge which occurs periodically.

Mr. DAVIS. Are we going to be overbuilt here 5 years from now?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I don't think so, sir, because with these surges we occupy the least desirable spaces for the surges, and we keep those handy. We have brought the bulk of the facilities there up to modern standards now.

Mr. DAVIS. I note an item here of \$140,000 for a gatehouse. What is involved here that would run the cost that high?

Mr. TAYLOR. It might be well to take just a moment to explain to you what we are doing with these increments of roads.

I have before me a map. The red area indicates the first increment approved last year. The purpose of this road was to relieve congestion through the operational area of the air station, this area here. As the

road presently exists they bring it around. The second increment will come from our gatehouse, which is here, and this becomes a new main entrance to the station. It is an entrance now but it is not a complete main entrance. With a new State highway here providing access to allow personnel to come in we anticipate quite an increase in visitors as a result of the establishment of the national seashore area.

Also you will note we are siting the new air museum in such a location that visitors to the national seashore can readily have access to our air museum. So the gatehouse gives us a new main entrance to the station through this way and completes hooking on to our road that bypasses our main operational area where we don't want people just wandering around unescorted.

Admiral MARSCHALL. More than a gatehouse, this will be a pass office and a place for security control.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is right. It controls the visitors to the station.

Mr. DAVIS. This isn't especially a fancy gatehouse?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No. It is 4,000 square feet and will house security personnel and pass office and things of that sort.

FUTURE PROJECTS

Mr. SIKES. I want to discuss very briefly a couple of projects which are needed at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola.

One, an increase in electric power capacity. This has been programed for inclusion in the fiscal year 1976 public works center programs. Are you familiar with this, or do you have witnesses prepared to discuss this matter. Admiral?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. Let me suggest that a member of your staff work with this staff to study the material I have on the need for these facilities as soon as possible and hopefully before 1976.

Admiral Marschall. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. Then I have also information that the aircraft cleaning and disassembly facility which was originally programed for fiscal 1972 was slipped to fiscal 1975, and now it appears that it may be slipped even further because of competition with other programs. Do you have anyone prepared to discuss that?

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that this project is being discussed in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations at this present time.

Mr. SIKES. I would hope we would not get too far off schedule with follow-on construction of this type which supplements other construction already in progress and which is very much needed. Will you keep the committee advised on the progress?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We will. I do know it is in fact under active consideration.

[A short recess was taken.]

NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING CENTER, PENSACOLA, FLA.

Mr. SIKES. We will take up Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Fla. Insert page I-117 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 19 FEB 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. INSTALLATION NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING CENTER											
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 2485-600		6. STATE/COUNTRY PENSACOLA, FLORIDA										
7. STATUS ACTIVE			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1927		9. COUNTY (U.S.) ESCAMBIA		10. NEAREST CITY 5 MILES NORTHEAST TO PENSACOLA								
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Provide basic and advanced training for cryptologic officer and enlisted personnel in order to prepare them for duties in their designated specialty and rating (such training is provided not not only to appropriate personnel of the Department of the Navy but also to selected personnel of other services and agencies); provide basic and advanced training for officers and enlisted men of the Navy in the Electronic Warfare specialty to prepare them as technicians and operators of various equipment, systems and vessels.				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL		
				OFFICER		ENLISTED	CIVILIAN		OFFICER	ENLISTED	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN		
				(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)			
				a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972		49	566	61	22	1,132	0	0	0	0	1,830
				b. PLANNED (End FY1977)		67	991	0	258	3,096	0	89	0	0	4,501
13. INVENTORY															
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)							
a. OWNED		938		10		8,553		8,563							
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		0# - 1#		0# - 1#		0		1							
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rem)		AS OF 30 JUNE 1972						8,564							
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								4,998							
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								9,859							
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								7,609							
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								31,030							
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
PROJECT DESIGNATION															
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b				TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM						
		SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h										
171.20	ELECTRONICS WARFARE TRAINING BUILDING				/	SF	55,333	3,982	55,333	3,982					
722.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS				/	SF	188,400	5,877	188,400	5,877					
		TOTAL	9,859							9,859					

Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, FL., \$9,859,000
This center provides training for officers and enlisted men of the Navy to prepare them as technicians and operators of various cryptologic and electronic warfare equipment and systems.

The electronics warfare training building project will provide training spaces for advanced electronics warfare and Naval Flight Officer. Training is now conducted in limited space diverted from other training, resulting in an unfavorable impact on long range training.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living spaces for 1,200 men.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	\$9,096,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	3,916,263
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	6,417,739

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Electronics warfare training building	\$144,483	16
Bachelor enlisted quarters	96,323	7

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NCTC Pensacola

1. Effective BEQ requirement	3121
2. Adequate Assets	856
Installation	824
Community	32
3. Deficit	2265
4. Fiscal Year 1974 project	<u>1200</u>
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	1065

Mr. SIKES. The request is for \$9,859,000 for an electronics warfare training building, and bachelor enlisted quarters.

Provide for the record the impact of realignments upon this installation.

[The information follows:]

REALIGNMENT IMPACT

These projects are not required because of the shore establishment realignment, but to support the new mission of electronic warfare training. The decision to locate this new training mission at Corry Field was made last year prior to the shore establishment realignment. Electronic warfare billets in the Navy were only 25 percent manned and there was no school in existence which could train the number of personnel required. Corry Field was chosen as the location for electronic warfare (EW) training because the ongoing communications training at Corry has similar characteristics to EW training. The present personnel loading compared with the personnel loading after EW training is established is as follows:

	Staff			Students	
	Officer	Enlisted	Civilian	Officer	Enlisted
Present.....	49	566	61	22	1,132
After EW.....	67	991	0	258	3,096

Mr. SIKES. Also provide details on the costs and savings and the military construction and family housing avoided and required as a result of these actions.

[The information follows:]

Since this construction supports a new mission, there will be no cost avoidance or savings associated with establishing this new electronic warfare training.

Will the project for an electronics warfare training building complete the requirements?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, it will. As you will remember last year we had the first increment of the new electronics warfare training school at Orlando in the program, and that was to provide basic training for our personnel. This project will provide space for specialized electronic warfare training for advanced enlisted personnel, electronic warfare officers and NFO's. And this will complete the requirement for training space.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

NAVAL AIR STATION, MERIDIAN, MISS.

We will take up Naval Air Station, Meridian, Miss. Insert page I-124 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 5 MAR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. PROJECT TITLE FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		4. INSTALLATION NAVAL AIR STATION							
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 1452-580		6. STATE/COUNTRY MERIDIAN, MISSISSIPPI								
7. STATUS ACTIVE		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1961		9. COUNTY (U.S.) LAUDERDALE		10. NEAREST CITY 18 MILES SOUTHWEST TO MERIDIAN							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and materials to support operations of Aviation activities and units of the Naval Training Command and other activities and units. Major Activities Supported Four jet training squadrons Naval Technical Training Center (NTTC) Major Functions: Provide jet aircraft training and enlisted aviation training. (Enlisted Technical Training Schools scheduled to commence training 1973)				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		13. INVENTORY							
				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 1972				325	1,630	584	235	0	13	24	0	2,811	
b. PLANNED (END FY 1977)				376	2,859	584	330	1,096	13	79	0	5,337	
a. OWNED		b. LEASE AND EASEMENTS		c. INVENTORY TOTAL (EXCEPT LAND REM) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72		d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY		e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM		f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS		g. GRAND TOTAL (a + d + e + f)	
10,124		15* - 408#		52,505		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING (\$2,206,000))		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING (\$0))		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING (\$0))		81,954	
1,915		0/YR* - 23#		12,632		4,808 1/2		12,009					
50,528		39*											
52,443		62											
15*													
12,632													
4,808 1/2													
12,009													
81,954													
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS													
PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY		UNIT OF MEASURE		AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b					SCOPE c	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) e	SCOPE d	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f				
171.35	FLIGHT TRAINING DEVICE BUILDING ADDITION			/	SF	11,286	525	11,286	525				
550.10	DISPENSARY AND DENTAL CLINIC			/	SF	40,600	2,500	40,600	2,500				
	<u>NAVAL TECHNICAL TRAINING CENTER</u>												
610.10	ADMINISTRATION BUILDING			/	SF	20,900	675	20,900	675				
740.43	GYMNASIUM			/	SF	21,000	832	21,000	832				
	1/ INCLUDES \$276,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT					TOTAL	4,532		4,532				

Naval Air Station, Meridian, MS., \$4,532,000

This Station supports the jet aircraft pilot training program of the Training Command.

The flight training device building project will provide an addition to the flight training building for new flight simulator equipment having six degrees of freedom. Existing space cannot accommodate this equipment.

The dispensary and dental clinic project will replace the existing clinic which is undersized and functionally inadequate.

The Administration building project will construct a facility in the schools complex for the Commanding Officer and 114 supporting personnel charged with administering the several schools at the station.

The gymnasium project will provide a new facility. With the increased base loading imposed by the schools complex, the existing gymnasium is too small to support the physical education program.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973		\$61,332,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)		51,084,299
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)		55,398,041

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Flight training device building addition	\$28,874	21
Dispensary and dental clinic	33,333	17
Administration building	35,561	10
Gymnasium	1,834	47

Mr. SIKES. Your request is for \$4,532,000 for a flight training device building addition, a dispensary and dental clinic, an administration building, and a gymnasium. Your long-range population figures for this station have increased from 4,338 shown last year to 5,337 shown on the sheet before us. What is the explanation?

CLERICAL TRAINING CONSOLIDATION

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the result of the establishment of the new naval technical training center at Meridian and bringing approximately 1,000 additional students into this new Center.

Mr. SIKES. This would represent a consolidation then from where to where?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, Meridian is being established as our core center for clerical skilled training. Students are coming from three locations. They are coming from Memphis, from San Diego, and a very few from Orlando.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the reasons for this consolidation. [The information follows:]

CLERICAL TRAINING CONSOLIDATION AT MERIDIAN

Shortly after the Naval Training Command was established in mid-1971, concerted efforts were begun to examine the training shore establishment as a whole, and determine how and where existing activities could be consolidated, collocated, or closed so as to realize greater training efficiencies, reduce duplication of training resources, and improve the quality of student output. Among those activities examined was NAS Meridian.

An early plan for the new Naval Air Technical Training Center at Meridian was to relocate there several clerical schools from NATTC Memphis, plus the aviation ordnanceman school from NATTC Jacksonville. When viewed in isolation this plan appeared satisfactory, for it provided an acceptable Meridian base loading and permitted the relocation of schools from substandard World War II vintage temporary buildings at Memphis and Jacksonville into new, modern, and permanent buildings at Meridian. When compared to other plans being developed by the Chief of Naval Training, however, it became apparent that the Meridian plan did not support CNT's long-range facilities planning goals; i.e., maximize common coring and minimize duplication of training equipments and facilities.

Consequently, the plan was revised: The aviation ordnanceman schools are being moved to Memphis vice Meridian and collocated with other aviation technical (equipment-oriented) schools, which will capitalize on the potential for common coring and minimize the duplication of training resources. San Diego clerical schools would be collocated at Meridian with the clerical schools being relocated there from Memphis. A follow-on action would move Orlando yeoman and personnelman schools to Meridian. The result would be the establishment of a Center for clerical training in which maximum common coring of instructional curricula could be realized.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the list of projects which you say are to cost \$12,009,000 which you have programed over the next 4 years.

[The information follows:]

Estimated Authorization—Next 4 Years

<i>Project description</i>	<i>Cost (thousands)</i>
Fiscal year:	
1975:	
NCO/EM club addition.....	\$466
Land acquisition—target range.....	446
Target range facilities.....	376
1976: Runway.....	8, 224
1977: Extend East runway.....	2, 396
1978: Cut tree line.....	101
Total.....	12, 009

FISCAL YEAR 1974 REQUEST

Mr. SIKES. Tell us about your need for an administration building. What are you now using, what will be done with it, and why do you need a new one?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, at Meridian when we established the new Naval Technical Training Center we had originally planned to have the administration as part of one of the training buildings. However, it seems that it would be better to separate our administrative function from our training function. So therefore we are requesting an administration building to house the administration for the new center. There presently is none in existence.

Mr. SIKES. Give the same information for the gymnasium.

Mr. TAYLOR. As a result again of increasing the base loading at Meridian the existing gymnasium is just too small to meet the needs of the activity. Therefore we are proposing to build a new gymnasium for the activity with the old one being taken over as storage for the exchange which has quite a deficiency in storage space.

Meridian is remotely located and the provision of proper athletic facilities on the station is a real necessity.

Mr. SIKES. Is the situation on the flight training device building similar to the one previously discussed for Pensacola?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, it is. We have two training devices of the 6° freedom of motion to be installed within this facility. They will be delivered, the first unit in March of 1974, the second one June of 1975.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the total amount of administrative space at the technical training center?

[The information follows:]

ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE

At the present time the Naval Technical Training Center at Meridian has no administrative space. The requested project for 20,900 square feet will complete the center's requirement for administrative space.

DEFICIENCY IN FISCAL YEAR 1972 PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Is there a requirement for increased authorization for the 1972 program?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir, there is.

Mr. SIKES. Is it reflected in this request for funds also?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It is reflected in the request currently pending before OMB.

Mr. SIKES. Provide the details for the record.

[The information follows:]

AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED

Recent proposed changes to the Navy's fiscal year 1974 program, including an amendment and funding increase in the amount of \$593,000 for the Naval Air Station, Meridian, Miss., were cleared with the Office of Management and Budget on July 13, 1973. [Details of this amendment were provided to the staff of the committee.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM Increase in Prior Years Authorization		Command CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING			
		Installation Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi			
Authorization Public Law For Which Increase is Requested		Authorization Required		\$ 3,859	
P.L. 92-145 (FY 1972)		Current Authorization		\$ 3,266	
		Authorization Increase Request		\$ 593	
BASIS FOR INCREASE					
ITEM		Current Authorization		Revised Auth. Request	
		Units	Cost (\$000)	Units	Cost(\$000)
<u>Awarded Items</u>					
Status					
Mess Hall	70%	5,910 SF	561	LS	604
Outdoor Recreation Facilities	100%	LS	188		168
			749.		772
<u>Not Awarded</u>					
Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	Contract Award Pending	576			
Enlisted Men's Club	Design 95% Complete	MN(87,552 SF)	1,803		2,373
		12,600 SF	714		714
			2,517		3,087
			3,266		3,859
<u>Remarks</u>					
<p>An amendment is required to the Installation Total to permit award of the Enlisted Mens' (EM) Club. Although the BEQ project was the project which created the requirement for an amendment, the relative need is greatest for the Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (BEQ). Therefore, a decision was made to proceed with the BEQ Construction and defer the EM Club.</p> <p>Bids were first received for the BEQ project on 31 August 1972. The low bid of the six bids received significantly exceeded the authorized amount for the project.</p> <p>The Meridian BEQ design was value engineered to the lowest possible cost.</p> <p>Since there was also a Bachelor Enlisted Quarters project authorized in FY 1973 for the Naval Air Station, Meridian, a decision was made to rebid the FY 1972 project combined with the FY 1973 project in order to reduce common costs such as mobilization/demobilization, supervision and contractor overhead.</p> <p>The combination Bachelor Enlisted Quarters contract received two competitive bids. The current working estimates for the FY 1972 and FY 1973 project are \$2,373,000, and \$1,923,000 respectively. Based on this bid experience, it is not believed that a reduction in cost may be obtained for the Bachelor Enlisted Quarters without a significant reduction in quality or scope.</p> <p>The basic reasons for the higher cost are: cost escalation associated with the delay in placing the project under contract and the fact that the Area Cost Factor for the Meridian area is not representative of current bid experience.</p> <p>Since there is a firm and valid need for the Enlisted Mens' Club, an amendment is requested this year.</p>					

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

NAVAL STATION, CHARLESTON, S.C.

Mr. SIKES. We will turn to Naval Station, Charleston, S.C. Place in the record page I-131.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 17 APR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. PROGRAM FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		5. INSTALLATION NAVAL STATION							
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU COMMANDER, IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET			6. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 6029-205		8. STATE/COUNTRY CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA								
7. STATUS ACTIVE			9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1959		9. COUNTY (U.S.) CHARLESTON		10. NEAREST CITY 5 MILES SOUTHEAST TO CHARLESTON						
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Provide, as appropriate, logistic support to the Operating Forces of the Navy, and for dependent activities and other commands as assigned. Major Activities Supported: Mine Force, Atlantic Fleet Headquarters Navy Schools Mine Warfare Minecraft Support Units Fleet Units homeported at Charleston, S.C. Explosive Ordnance Disposal Units				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)	
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)		
				a. AS OF 31 December 72	1,447	12,873	8,819	103	357	108	456	0	24,163
				b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	1,686	17,767	8,819	103	357	108	456	0	29,296
				13. INVENTORY				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)	
a. OWNED				1.024		452		46,469		46,921			
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS #				15* - 1#		0* - 0#		675* - 0#		675			
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Exempt land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72										47,596			
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY										6,958			
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM										1,498			
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS										30,706			
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)										86,758			
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS													
PROJECT DESIGNATION													
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b				TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM				
	SCOPE e		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g			ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h						
131.50	COMMUNICATION FACILITY POSEIDON				26	LS	-	1,321	-	1,321			
730.35	SUBMARINE DEPLOYED CREW STORAGE				1	SF	5,000	177	5,000	177			
							TOTAL	1,498	1,498				

Naval Station, Charleston, S.C., \$1,498,000.

This station provides logistic support to 26 commands and activities, including commander mine warfare, submarine flotilla 6, cruiser-destroyer flotilla 6, and service forces, Atlantic and serves as homeport for approximately 70 ships.

The communication facility project will provide a transmitter building and antenna to replace existing facilities built in 1941.

The submarine deployed storage project will provide an environmentally controlled storage area for personal effects of crew members of deployed nuclear submarines. Presently, there are no comparable military or civilian facilities available and personal effects must either be sent home or possibly be damaged by mildew and rot while stored in the present spaces.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973.....	\$29, 665, 000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual).....	25, 741, 339
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	27, 489, 008

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Communication facility.....	\$23, 859	24
Submarine deployed crew storage.....	810	32

Mr. SIKES. The request is for a communication facility and for submarine deployed crew storage.

EFFECT OF REALINEMENTS

Provide for the record information on the activities and personnel to be relocated here. Also show the construction and family housing impact.

[The information follows:]

RELOCATION IMPACT

Approximately 160 officers and 2,700 enlisted men will be relocated to the naval base as part of the Shore Establishment realignment. The major increase in personnel results from the relocation of 10 ships from the Newport, R.I., complex, to Charleston, S.C. There are no projects in the fiscal year 1974 or fiscal year 1975 program associated with these relocations. The PRE-SER deficit for family housing at the Charleston Naval Base was 259 units for eligible personnel. After realignment, this deficit is estimated to increase to approximately 2,000 family units.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the outyear program in the amount of \$30,663,000 for this installation.

[The information follows:]

PROPOSED PROGRAM

Construction programmed for the out year program for the next 4 years is as follows:

<i>Project description</i>	<i>Estimated cost (thousands)</i>
Fiscal year:	
1975:	
Cold iron berthing.....	\$2, 510
Additional berthing.....	6, 851
Ship wastewater collection ashore.....	6, 700
Bainbridge Avenue extension.....	1, 107
Total	17, 168
1976:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	2, 272
Engine shop and test facility.....	353
Acquisition of land.....	167
Total	2, 792
1977:	
Collimation array.....	226
Relocate East Osprey St.....	116
Improve parking area NX.....	134
Total	476
1978:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	-----
Petty officers mess.....	-----
Helo facility 2d increment.....	¹ 10, 270
Total	20, 270
Grand total.....	30, 706

¹ Navy is reevaluating the entire requirement for development of helicopter facilities in Charleston.

COLD IRON PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Would the cold iron berthing and the additional berthing proposed in the fiscal year 1975 program be required whether or not the additional ships were relocated here?

Captain WATSON. Yes, sir. The cold iron program for Charleston is not being driven by base closure. It is required whether additional ships are put in Charleston or not.

Mr. SIKES. When do you propose to provide facilities to support the additional ships?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Tentatively scheduled in 1977, sir, but our program is being reviewed now and it might be slightly different. That is the cold iron facilities.

Mr. SIKES. I understand.

COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY

Let's turn to the communications facility. How does the project for a communication facility fit into the total communications picture? What is the size and function of this communication facility?

Mr. MURPHY. At the Naval Station, Charleston, we have a communications department. It is not a full-fledged communications station as such. They have a limited responsibility in communicating with the fleet homeported in Charleston. They can broadcast about 1,000 miles out. Predominantly, however, they handle the traffic when it gets close into the Charleston Harbor, and they control the traffic locally. This project addresses itself only to a portion of that department, transmitting part only.

Mr. SIKES. Is there any possibility that you are overbuilding communication facilities?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Navy recently conducted a joint survey with the Coast Guard of the overall communications needs in the Charleston Harbor area. This survey shows our present plan to move only the Navy transmitter may not offer the best solution. Also a joint project on a cost-sharing basis might offer the most economical approach to a new communications facilities here. The present project emphasizes high frequency equipment and antennas. It now appears most needs can be met with VHF and UHF equipment, and small band transmitter and received can serve the high frequency needs.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

NAVAL AIR STATION, MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tenn. Place in the record pages I-136.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 17 APR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. INSTALLATION NAVAL AIR STATION									
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 1452-570		6. STATE/COUNTRY MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE								
7. STATUS ACTIVE		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1942		9. COUNTY (U.S.) SHELBY		10. NEAREST CITY 10 MILES SOUTHWEST TO MEMPHIS							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Naval Training Command.				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH									
				PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL (9)
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)		
				a. AS OF 31 December 1973	346	3,732	1,968	84	8,355	99	281	0	14,865
				b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)	528	4,091	1,986	192	8,231	30	22	0	15,080
				13. INVENTORY									
				LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST (\$000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)	TOTAL (\$000) (4)					
a. OWNED	3,455	447	78,911	79,358									
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	64* - 1#	2* - 1#	0	1									
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72									79,359				
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY									19,496				
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM									4,478 1/				
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS									19,166				
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)									122,499				
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS													
PROJECT DESIGNATION					AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM						
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b				TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h			
171.20	APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING				1	SF	92,925	4,478	92,925	4,478			
1/ INCLUDES \$593,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT													

713

NAVAL AIR STATION, MEMPHIS, TENN., \$4,478,000

This station supports operations, activities, and units of the Naval Training Command.

The applied training building project will provide a facility to conduct air traffic control and ground control approach training courses being relocated from the Naval Air Station, Glynco, Ga.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973.....	\$56,409,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual).....	42,547,591
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	49,282,313

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Applied instruction building.....	\$214,940	0

Mr. SIKES. The request is for \$4,478,000 for an applied instruction building.

TRAINING REALINEMENTS

What projects will be required here because of relocation and what missions are you losing because of relocation?

Admiral MARSCHALL. In the 1974 program the project required because of the base realignment is this applied instruction building. In 1975 we anticipate a bachelor-enlisted quarters requirement.

Mr. SIKES. What courses are being relocated to Memphis from Glynco?

Mr. TAYLOR. The air traffic control schools division is being relocated from Glynco to Memphis. It entails approximately 435 military, plus 31 civilian billets.

Mr. SIKES. How do these courses tie in with those already being taught at Memphis?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, Memphis is our center for teaching of enlisted personnel who are going to air-related skills in the fleet, and this training is also air-related and fits in very nicely with our other courses presently being taught there for our airmen type personnel.

Mr. SIKES. You have transferred activities from Memphis and you transferred activities into Memphis. I realize Memphis is not the only place where this is being done. But is this a realistic thing to do? What do you gain from it?

Admiral MARSCHALL. What we gain, sir, is a common coring at an individual training base. This is part of Admiral Cagle's realignment of the whole naval training structure so we may have centers of excellence at each of six different training centers.

Mr. SIKES. The committee is generally familiar with this but expand on it for the record.

[The information follows:]

COMMON CORE TRAINING

"Common core" is a term used to describe those knowledge and skill areas that are common for two or more ratings. Three examples of common core are:

<i>Course</i>	<i>Family of ratings</i>
Basic electricity and electronics . . .	Technician: Electronic, data systems, interior communications, electronics warfare, sonar fire control, communications, electrician's mate, torpedoman's mate.
Avionics	Technician: Aviation electronics, aviation fire control, aviation antisubmarine warfare.
Aviation mechanical fundamentals .	Aviation machinist's mate, aviation structural mechanic, aviation support equipment technician.

A summary of the commonality of three "family of ratings," electronics, administration and engineering, demonstrates that common core training would be desirable:

Family of ratings	Number of ratings	Average course length	Estimated commonality	
			(In weeks)	(Percent)
Electronics	18	23.6	12.4	53
Administrative	8	8.4	2.3	27
Engineering	3	11.7	4.6	39

Common-coring provides many advantages and economies. A significant reduction of effort will result from developing courses and training material for one large group vice several small groups. There will be savings realized in printing and handling a large number of a single set of training materials vice a small number of many publications. There will be a reduction in instructor and staff personnel requirements. Common-core courses are particularly adaptable to self-paced individualized instruction, which produces further training efficiencies.

Mr. SIKES. Provide details for the record on the courses, personnel, and student load associated with this relocation. Also, if substantial increases or decreases in this training load are expected, project these for the record.

[The information follows:]

TRAINING LOAD PROJECTIONS

The relocation of Air Traffic Control (ATC) and Ground Control Approach (GCA) training from NAS Glynco to NAS Memphis involves courses in Air Controlman Class "A" and Class "B", Air Traffic Control Officer, Ground Control Approach Controller, Carrier Air Traffic Control Center Controller (CATCC), GCA Maintenance Courses, CATCC Maintenance Courses, and Marine Corps ATC courses. Personnel transferred will be 31 civilians, 439 military permanent party staff, and an average on board student training load of 505. It is not anticipated that this training load will significantly increase or decrease.

Mr. SIKES. Also provide for the record the costs and savings associated with this move, including the military construction and family housing impact.

[The information follows:]

COSTS AND SAVINGS

The training activities at NAS Glynco, Ga., are to be relocated to three locations. The naval flight officer training will be relocated to Pensacola, Fla., the Combat Information Center Training will be relocated to Dam Neck, Va., and, the air traffic control training will be relocated to Memphis, Tenn. The disestab-

ishment of NAS Glynco will result in an annual savings of \$9,260,000 and a reduction of 61 military and 308 civilian billets. The one time closure costs will be \$21,111,000. Military construction avoided will amount to \$11,609,000 and military construction required will be \$10,437,000. There will be no impact on family housing.

For the past several years, prior to the shore establishment realignment, Navy has been programing moves of training functions to Memphis associated with the closure of the Naval Air Technical Training Center, Jacksonville, Fla. This resulted in the relocation of Aviation Electronics and Aviation Ordnance training from Jacksonville to Memphis involving 2,302 personnel. From Memphis, Marine aviation storekeeper, data processing and aviation maintenance administration training, involving 334 personnel will be transferred to NAS Meridian as part of the plan to establish Meridian as a core center for administrative and clerical training.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

ATHENS, GA., LAND REQUIREMENTS

Before I leave this naval district there has, from time to time, been a discussion of the Navy's potential requirement for additional acreage at the Naval Supply Corps School in Athens, Ga. Is anyone here familiar with the projects?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Taylor is.

Mr. SIKES. As I understand it, there is land available adjacent to the school, and there is considerable concern that it will be needed within a reasonable time but that it won't be available unless it is obtained now. That is the background.

Can you tell us if the Navy really has serious concern about this matter, and whether it is planned that acquisition will be in any program in the near future. Can you give us that information?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, we have been looking at that piece of property—

Mr. SIKES. For quite a while.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir. And apparently the developer is making some overtures as to wanting to develop that interest.

Mr. SIKES. You mean he wants to build private facilities?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; put private facilities on it. However, as of this point we haven't been able to establish enough requirements for it to obtain a high enough priority to make a Navy program.

Mr. SIKES. The Navy knows its requirements. I am not at all certain, Admiral, that this is a sound decision. The land in Athens, Ga., is not going to get any cheaper and if some housing projects are built on it or commercial development takes place, it is going to be out of your reach. It would appear you ought to take a very close look at situations of this kind to determine if there is sufficient justification to try to acquire the land when it is available at lower cost.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Mr. SIKES. Turn to 8th Naval District. Place page I-138 in the record.

[The page follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

<u>Installation and Project</u>	<u>Authorization</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>	
	<u>Project Amount</u>	<u>Installation Total</u>	<u>Project Amount</u>	<u>Installation Total</u>
<u>EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT</u>				
<u>State of Louisiana</u>				
<u>Naval Hospital, New Orleans (BUNED)</u>				
P-600A Nursing Unit Addition (510.10-150 Beds)(40,376 SF)	3,386	3,386	3,386	3,386
<u>Naval Support Activity, New Orleans (CNO)</u>				
P-036 Administrative Complex (610.10-306,960 SF)	8,490		8,490	
P-026 Armed Forces Exam and Entrance Station (690.90-LS)	1,288		1,288	
P-009 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters with Mess(721.10-211 Mn)	1,779		1,779	
P-035 Employees Parking Building (730.80-LS)	2,323		2,323	
		13,880		13,880
<u>State of Texas</u>				
<u>Naval Air Station, Chase Field (CNT)</u>				
P-192 Flight Training Device Building (171.35)(10,800 SF)	575		575	
P-014 Dispensary and Dental Clinic (550.10-30,200 SF)	2,300		2,300	
		2,875		2,875
<u>Naval Air Station, Kingsville (CNT)</u>				
P-193 Flight Training Device Building (171.35-18,225 SF)	986		986	
P-080 Dispensary and Dental Clinic (590.10 - 27,175 SF)	2,054		2,054	
		3,040		3,040
TOTAL - EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT		23,181		23,181

NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. SIKES. We will turn to Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, La. Place in the record page I-141.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE		2. DEPARTMENT		3. INSTALLATION					
5 MAR 1973		NAVY		NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY					
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER		6. STATE/COUNTRY				
CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS			6202-505		NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA				
7. STATUS			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY		9. COUNTY (U.S.)				
ACTIVE			1849		ORLEANS				
10. NEAREST CITY									
WITHIN CITY									
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS									
Provides logistic support to Commandant 8th Naval District and other tenant activities including Naval Hospital and crews for destroyer escorts under construction at Avondale Shipyard.									
12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH									
PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL (9)
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	
a. AS OF 31 December 72	173	533	1,210	9	0	14	71	61	2,071
b. PLANNED (END FY 1977)	231	659	1,667	30	50	24	95	61	2,817
13. INVENTORY									
LAND		ACRES (1)	LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)	TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
a. OWNED		164	403		21,342	21,745			
b. LEASE AND EASEMENTS		4* - 20#	0* - 0#		0	0			
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72						21,745			
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY						919			
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM						13,880			
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS						4,192			
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)						40,736			
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS									
PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM				FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO.	PROJECT TITLE	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000)	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000)		
610.10	ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLEX	/	SF	306,960	8,490	306,960	8,490		
690.90	ARMED FORCES EXAM AND ENTRANCE STATION	/	LS	-	1,288	-	1,288		
721.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS WITH MESS	/	SF	59,625	1,779	59,625	1,779		
730.80	EMPLOYEES PARKING BUILDING	/	LS	-	2,323	-	2,323		
				TOTAL	13,880		13,880		

Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, LA., \$13,880,000

This activity provides logistic support to Commander, Eighth Naval District and more than 19 tenant activities, including the Naval Hospital and pre-commissioning crews for destroyer escorts under construction.

The administrative complex project will provide facilities for consolidation in New Orleans for the following organizations: Personnel Management Information Center, Naval Reserve Personnel Center, and Enlisted Personnel Distribution Offices.

The armed forces exam and entrance station project will convert existing warehouse space to administrative space for offices that will move from downtown New Orleans.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living quarters with mess for 211 men who are currently living in inadequate WW II temporary barrack.

The employees parking building will provide parking spaces to accommodate the personnel being relocated to the activity under the administrative complex project and the armed forces exam and entrance station project.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	\$544,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	477,942
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	492,723

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Administrative complex	\$407,520	1
Armed forces exam and entrance station	7,260	16
Bachelor enlisted quarters w/mess	53,607	14
Employees parking building	111,504	1

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NSA, New Orleans

1. Effective BEQ requirement	285
2. Adequate Assets	48
Installation	-0-
Community	48
3. Deficit	237
4. Fiscal Year 1974 project	<u>211</u>
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	<u>26</u>

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I will have quite a few questions on this when you feel it would be appropriate for me to ask them.

Mr. SIKES. Let's spell out the program, first.

The request is \$13,880,000 for an administrative complex, an Armed Forces examination and entrance station, bachelor enlisted quarters with mess, and an employee's parking building.

Now we will hear your question on the hospital, Mr. Long.

NEW ORLEANS HOSPITAL ADDITION

Mr. LONG. Is this a hospital or a nursing home?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It is a hospital addition.

Mr. LONG. And this is a 150-bed addition?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. And the cost for this nursing unit addition is only \$3,386,000 for a 150-bed addition to a 100-bed hospital. Is that right?

Admiral MARSCHALL. An addition to a previously authorized hospital.

Mr. LONG. But there is a 150-bed hospital, right?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, but the basic hospital structure was authorized and funded last year. This is an addition to that.

Mr. LONG. So what is the total cost of the 250 beds? The whole hospital will be 250 beds, right?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. What is the total estimated cost of the 250-bed hospital?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It is about \$15 million, sir.

Mr. LONG. I would like to call the committee's attention to that; \$15 million for a 250-bed hospital and West Point is asking for \$25 million for a 100-bed hospital. We will keep that in the record for some future time.

CONSOLIDATION—NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY, NEW ORLEANS

Mr. SIKES. Could you provide for the record the functions which are currently located on the east and west banks of Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, and show those that are being consolidated on the east bank? Briefly show what are you doing here?

[The information follows:]

Present tenants on the East Bank of NSA New Orleans include:

- U.S. Army Construction Office, Atlantic Gulf outpost
- USAF Water Port Logistic Officer
- U.S. Coast Guard
- Defense Contract Audit Agency
- Defense Personnel Support Center
- Military Sealift Command, Gulf
- General Services Administration
- Panama Canal Company
- Navy Printing & Publications Office
- U.S. Postal Service
- New Orleans Project Officer, Ft. Worth District Engineer
- New Orleans District Corps of Engineer
- Navy Electronic Activity
- U.S. Post Office
- Navy Recruiting Station
- U.S. Marshal's Office
- Department of Agriculture

Defense Contract Administrative Services
119th U.S. Army Terminal Unit
NOPE Credit Union
Thrift Shop

Branch Office, District Passenger Transportation Office

Future tenants on the East Bank will include in addition to the above:

Armed Forces Exam and Entrance Station
Chief of Naval Reserve
Personnel Management Information Center
Enlisted Personnel Distribution Office
Naval Reserve Personnel Center
Marine Air Wing

Present tenants on the West Bank of NSA New Orleans include:

Commandant, Eighth Naval District
Navy Information Office
Supervisor, Ship Building, Eighth Naval District
Navy Investigative Service Office
New Orleans Branch and ROICC Southern Division, Naval Facilities
Engineering Command
Commissary Store
Exchange
Pre-Commissioning Crews
USS PUTNAM
Coastal River Division 22
U.S. Post Office
Marine Corps District Eight
All Hands Credit Union
Fleet Introduction Team

Future tenants on West Bank will include in addition to the above:

Hospital

Because of its central location and the availability of vacant Navy owned facilities, New Orleans has been selected as the site for the consolidation of functions presently scattered along both coasts. Although the advantages of this arrangement are not readily adaptable to an economic cost analysis, the long range benefits in improved planning coordination will produce significant operational and economic benefits for the Navy.

Consolidations at New Orleans include:

(a) The Marine air wing presently located at NAS Glenview, Ill., will be co-located with the Chief of Naval Reserve.

(b) The Personnel Management Information Centers presently located at Bainbridge, Md., Norfolk, Va., and San Diego, Calif., will be consolidated and headquartered in New Orleans.

(c) The Naval Reserve Personnel Centers presently located in Washington, D.C., Bainbridge, Md., and Omaha, Nebr., will be consolidated and located in New Orleans; and

(d) The Enlisted Personnel Distribution Offices presently located in Washington, D.C., Norfolk, Va., and San Diego, Calif., will be consolidated and located in New Orleans.

This will increase the population by approximately 1,600 personnel.

Mr. SIKES. What will be the cost of the proposed consolidation? What will be the savings as a result?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The total cost is expressed on page 141, Mr. Chairman. Is this with respect to the Naval Reserve?

Mr. SIKES. This is with respect to the functions located on the east and west banks of the naval support facility at New Orleans being consolidated on the east bank. Do you have that information? If not, provide it for the record.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Let us do that.

[The information follows:]

CONSOLIDATION COSTS

The expenditures required for consolidation at New Orleans are as follows:

(a) Total MILCON and MCNR costs including design-----	\$15, 278, 000
(b) Total one-time relocation costs-----	4, 695, 000
(c) Total Urgent Minor Construction Costs-----	1, 422, 000

Estimated annual savings from consolidation are \$2,342,000 from O. & M appropriations. This figure includes the reduction of 138 military and 161 civilian billets. In addition, although not readily adaptable to an economic analysis, the long-range benefits in improved planning coordination will produce significant operational benefits for the Navy.

REALINEMENTS

Mr. SIKES. What is the requirement for an administrative complex? What are you using now? What will you do with the present facility?

Captain WATSON. Mr. Chairman, the consolidation will consist of a naval personnel center consisting of Naval Reserve Manpower Center at Bainbridge, the naval officer support activity at Omaha, Nebr., and also some individuals from BuPers in Washington. Additionally we will consolidate the personnel management information center, personnel accounting machine installation consisting of Tamiland in Norfolk, a unit in Bainbridge, and a unit in San Diego. Additionally we will combine the enlisted personnel detail offices from Norfolk, San Diego, a group from personnel in Washington, and the records will be brought from the records depot at St. Louis.

The personnel will consolidate 66 officers, 325 enlisted, 482 civilians, for a total of 872 personnel.

Mr. SIKES. What are you using now, and what will be done with the present facilities?

Captain WATSON. Presently the facilities are located in Bainbridge, Omaha, some office space in Washington, the Bureau of Personnel, the office at Norfolk, San Diego, and the records depot in St. Louis. These spaces will be made available for other activities.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Omaha will be declared surplus. I think the Army has some intention of taking over a portion of it.

Mr. SIKES. I would like the answer completed as to what you will do with the facilities to be vacated.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

In 1947, 82.5 acres were transferred from the Army to the Navy at Fort Omaha. The Navy will now excess 72 acres. The Naval Reserve Center unit will retain 6.65 acres. The naval recruiting center will retain 1.3 acres and the Army will retain 3.57 acres. The facilities to be vacated by the Chief of Naval Surface Reserve are on the land to be excessed.

The facilities vacated by the 4th Marine Air Wing at Glenview, Ill., will be used by the Marine Communication Center and the Navy's recruiting office.

Facilities occupied by the personnel accounting machine installation (PAMI) and the Naval Reserve Personnel Center (NRPC) at Bainbridge, Md., are on land to be declared excess by the Navy. The facilities occupied by the PAMI's in San Diego and Norfolk will revert to the host activities.

The enlisted personnel distribution offices vacated at San Diego and Norfolk will also revert to the host activity.

The BuPers personnel leaving the Greater Washington area will relieve overcrowding in the present buildings.

EMPLOYEE'S PARKING

Mr. SIKES. You are requesting an employee's parking building at a cost of \$2,323,000. How many acres are there at the east bank site? How many parking spaces are there at the present time?

Captain WATSON. Parking spaces on the east bank, Mr. Chairman, are 422 presently. The additional parking spaces from the building will be 600 for a total of 1,042 parking spaces.

Mr. SIKES. How many acres do you have?

Mr. TAYLOR. We have 25.33 acres of Government-owned and 4.59 acres leased on the Naval Support Activities bank.

Mr. SIKES. Then you don't have land for the parking area?

Captain WATSON. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Is there land available in the area at a modest or reasonable price?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir, there is not. It is a highly built-up area.

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation on public transportation to the east bank portion of the naval support facility?

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is excellent, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Could you reduce the scope of the parking complex in view of this situation?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think not, Mr. Chairman, because people are rather spread out in that area. Many people live on the other side of the river, which is sort of a bedroom community for New Orleans, requiring transportation across the bridge, and public transportation on the west bank is not particularly good.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

GAO REPORT CITED

Mr. LONG. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I have a number of questions in connection with the naval support activity at New Orleans. I just had the GAO look into this. I have a number of quotes, and I would like to get your response to them.

A staff member of the President's Property Review Board advised the General Accounting Office that "the decision to declare most of Bainbridge excess was made without any knowledge of any Navy study of this installation as a possible site for the consolidated activity."

I am reading from the General Accounting Office report.

Captain OTTO. I cannot attest to their knowledge, sir. I can bring to your attention this set of facts. I conducted the study for the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and I can only tell you that before we had hardly gotten started, we received the announcement on the closure. It would appear from that, that that statement might well be correct.

Mr. LONG. I am quoting here again from the Naval Reserve Personnel Center document which is quoted in the General Accounting Office report to me. It reads as follows:

A highly detailed study of the Bainbridge site was conducted. However, since the time at which the survey was undertaken, it has been announced that the site will be declared excess to the Navy. Hence, the survey findings are not discussed here. Analysis indicated that moving to Bainbridge was the lowest cost option examined and the most favorable from the standpoint of establishing the Naval Reserve Personnel Center, and beginning the PIMI consolidation

immediately, achieving the intended reorganizations without interruption of NRMC services or the relocation of PIMA Conus and the completion of the entire project within 1 year.

The General Accounting Office goes on to say:

This statement indicated to us that the President's decision which declared most of Bainbridge excess, and the chief of Naval Personnel's decision to exclude Bainbridge from further consideration of site consolidation of personnel activities might not have been based upon considerations of all pertinent information.

I gather that you agree with that?

Captain OTTO. Dr. Long, my response thereto would be it is perfectly understandable if taken in context. Since I dealt face to face with the GAO people concerned, I would suggest to you, sir, it is not properly in context in terms of the quotation provided. Costs of moving was what we were addressing, sir. In other words, it was not a thorough economic analysis in terms of the building that would have been necessary at Bainbridge for these new combined activities.

We were addressing only the costs of moving people, and, of course, the fact that two of the major personnel elements were already located at Bainbridge indicated patently that Bainbridge would be the cheapest move, sir. We are talking about organizational moving, not the analysis of the building required.

Mr. LONG. We will get into that later. The GAO goes on to say:

In view of its relevancy to our review, we tried to get further details. We have not been able, however, to obtain any documentation on the Bainbridge study other than the study noted above.

Why couldn't the GAO, in response to my request, get the necessary information?

Captain OTTO. There was nothing to give them, sir. The rough worksheets and what we call butcher-paper charts, preliminary, first-visit sort of work, was all we ever completed. Due to the time at which they began, there was no formalization involved, ever. There was nothing to give them, in fact. I was giving the initial briefing to the Chief of Naval Personnel and began to talk about this, about our work as far as it had progressed at Bainbridge, when the announcement of the President's decision came in.

BASIS OF DECISION

Mr. LONG. You are saying that the President made the decision without asking the Navy, and that you never had a chance to comment on the decision, and that by the time I got involved, it was really irrelevant to provide information to the GAO; is that what you are saying?

Captain OTTO. I, of course, can't speak to the President's decision, but I can tell you about the circumstances. There was nothing to give the GAO people because there it was never formalized. We never put it down in writing. We just got started when the announcement was received, sir.

Mr. LONG. To me, that means we are entitled to draw the conclusion that the decision was not based on information provided by the Navy but simply made independently by the President?

Captain OTTO. Not from the CNP studies.

Admiral MARSCHALL. The decision may have been made on other studies or other information given by the Navy. I think Captain Otto

is speaking purely and simply from the standpoint of the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

Mr. LONG. Would the Navy make available to this committee the Bainbridge analysis and supporting documents? I gather from you there are no such documents?

Captain OTTO. That is affirmative, sir.

RELOCATION OF NAVAL CORRESPONDENCE COURSE CENTER

Mr. McEWEN. Would you yield? Would this be true of the facility up at Scotia, N.Y.? Was there any study on that?

Captain OTTO. In connection with the BuPers activity consolidation?

Mr. McEWEN. Yes.

Captain OTTO. Yes, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. Correspondence?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Ellison Field. The one we discussed this morning.

Captain OTTO. In connection with this relocation, sir, that we are talking about here, the Naval Reserve Personnel Center and the PAMI, which is the personnel accounting machine installation, 21 locations were investigated in that preliminary work, and that particular location was not included in this particular work.

Admiral MARSCHALL. With respect to your question, Mr. McEwen, I think that you are talking about the correspondence moving from Scotia to Ellison Field. Here again it was based primarily on the desire of the Chief of Naval Training to put like functions together. There is, as you know, a large military presence in the Scotia area, Schenectady, and we were tenants at Scotia. We did not own the facility, and by moving these people from Scotia down to Ellison Field and combining them with like activities, the Chief of Naval Training hopes to achieve a great deal more efficiency. Also there is an advantage in having these people close at hand to his headquarters.

Mr. McEWEN. Was there a study on that?

Admiral MARSCHALL. A study? I will have to answer that for the record, Mr. McEwen. I talked to Admiral Cagel today and he expounded at great length concerning his desire to have these people brought into this central activity so that they could feed on each other. Whether there was an economic study I don't know, but I will find out for the record.

Mr. McEWEN. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

The disestablishment of Naval Correspondence Course Center, Scotia, N.Y., will result in an annual savings of \$200,000 and a reduction of six military and nine civilian billets. The one-time closure cost to implement this action totals \$549,000.

Mr. McEWEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

STUDIES OF SITES FOR NAVAL RESERVE PERSONNEL CENTER

Mr. LONG. The GAO found that the Navy's figures showed a lower one-time cost at Bainbridge than for New Orleans. That is on page 15. Would you like to comment on that? Based on your own studies, a lower one-time cost at Bainbridge.

Captain OTTO. I am unable to understand that, sir.

Mr. LONG. This is the Navy's comparison of one-time costs for seven alternative sites: Naval Shipyard, Boston, sites A and B; another naval station, Naval Station, Boston; former Naval Ordnance Plant, Illinois; Port of New Orleans; Port of Embarkation, Seattle; and North American Rockwell building, Laguna.

Captain OTTO. Yes, sir, those are included in the 21 locations looked at. Bainbridge was not, as we mentioned earlier.

Admiral MARSCHALL. There was no total cost information developed on Bainbridge for that particular exercise.

Mr. LONG. The thing that intrigued me about your statement, Captain, is that you know of no cost studies of the Navy on which the President's decision was made to move the installations or to choose New Orleans instead of Bainbridge as was decided? By the time the decision came to you, the studies were irrelevant and, so far as any others are concerned, you don't know about them?

Captain OTTO. Whereas under normal circumstances one of our initial alternatives would be one of the locations such as Bainbridge, that is involved in the consolidation action, it was not in this case. There were 21 candidates, of which you mentioned most at this point in time, and Bainbridge was not an alternative because it was in effect taken out of our hands, sir.

Mr. LONG. By whom?

Captain OTTO. The President's decision. We had not completed the costing work on Bainbridge at all.

Mr. LONG. So far as we are concerned, we have a mystery here, and we have no way of knowing whether Bainbridge might not be the best site, as the decision was made without information on this alternative. This is what I felt and have said all along, that the decisions to move against Bainbridge were political decisions, and, as such, had nothing to do with the economics of the situation. I assume they are political since they were not based on tangible economic data, since they were neither gathered nor furnished to the President.

The decision on Bainbridge had been made and costs had nothing to do with it. I think this is a pretty sorry commentary on what the country was told when these base realignments were made, that they were made for economy reasons, when the economics and the costs were never looked into, or at least were not looked into for all the possible sites.

BAINBRIDGE CLOSURE STUDY

Admiral MARSCHALL. Dr. Long, in the base closure study which had to do with closing the Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Md., estimated annual savings were listed as \$7,038,000. One-time closure costs amounted to \$2,759,000. I am now reading from a document which I passed to you this morning concerning the closure of bases in this most recent realignment.

Mr. LONG. These came along later?

Admiral MARSCHALL. These data were given to the base realignment group when it was investigating the studies, investigating the closure of all bases.

Mr. LONG. By this time the decision had been made?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think these studies predated the President's decision.

Mr. LONG. Why weren't they given to the GAO and why weren't they made available to the committee?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The GAO study concerned itself with the move to New Orleans or to wherever. The information desired from Captain Otto was to tie in with the move of these facilities. As he points out, they made no analysis in the Bureau of Naval Personnel concerning the costs at Bainbridge simply because they were overtaken by events. The base realignment group had investigated the closure of the total complex at Bainbridge. These figures of \$7 million per annum saving with a \$2.7 million closure cost were used in their deliberations. It was going on before the President's decision to close Bainbridge. It would have justified the President's decision to close Bainbridge.

Mr. LONG. Captain Otto was not able to tell the GAO?

Admiral MARSCHALL. He was representing only the Chief of Naval Personnel. He was not aware of this base closure group concerning Bainbridge because of the nature of the base closure exercise. That was extremely closely held. I am not surprised that he didn't know there were these considerations here.

Mr. LONG. This really means that one important part of the Navy—I assume Captain Otto to be an important man—doesn't know what is going on. Information is closely held. How do you make sound decisions on base locations or consolidations without important people? You don't deny that you are an important man?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think Captain Otto is a very important man. The nature of the GAO study, title of the study itself is an inquiry into the proposed relocation of certain Navy activities from the Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Md. What I am discussing when I say there is a saving of \$7 million annually is the total base itself. We will, as you know, keep the Naval Academy preparatory—

Mr. SIKES. This is what you tell us now. You were not able to tell the Bureau of Naval Personnel that or the GAO this?

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

Captain OTTO. I believe that I can put this all together, sir, to your satisfaction and relate all the events. When my people went to work at Bainbridge and at the other sites, we were aware of the Chief of Naval Training plans regarding the whole installation. It was his installation. When I went on board I was concerned with basically two organizations on that installation, the Naval Reserve Manpower Center, 256-person organization, and the Personnel Accounting Machine Continental United States, 130 people. The organizational studies I just completed. They were involved. I am looking at these two installations. I am well aware of the overall installation plan and its relation to SER at this time.

If I may venture a judgment on this, I feel that the GAO excerpts placed this work somewhat in a different context than it actually was. That other work I am referring to did precede the decision.

Mr. LONG. You didn't know that at the time?

Captain OTTO. I didn't anticipate the decision, sir, by the President. I knew what the Navy's plans were; yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. It gives me a very unhappy feeling. When we speak out against these base closures, you people say, "Why don't you be a statesman and recognize that we are trying to save money by closing down bases, and consolidating them." Then we find an admission that before you ever had a chance to gather information on this particular thing, you were overtaken by events and the President's decision was made. Maybe later you can come up with data for justification. I suppose you could always find ways of doing that. I wouldn't have any trouble figuring out things. I have worked with figures all my life, and when you want to justify a decision, told what it is, you can usually come up with figures, and probably, in the end, believe them if you work at them long enough and it is perfectly justified. I think it is one of the reasons why our defense posture is costing so much; so much of our national defense does not defend.

LAGUNA NIGUEL LAND EXCHANGE

I would like to ask about the exchange of land at the proposed California site of the Laguna Niguel, which was also considered before the New Orleans site was chosen. How was it worked? What caused the Navy's proposal to exchange certain lands with GSA? What caused the proposal to fail, or fall through?

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is my understanding that this Laguna Niguel site is still not available and probably will not be.

Captain OTTO. At one point in time, Laguna was considered a leading candidate based upon GSA obtaining custody and what was then a proposed swap of Federal property with, I believe, North American Rockwell, that completed this installation. It looked particularly attractive initially because it was new construction and it had a minimal cost for preparation of our necessary computer space. Then the legislation came along which indicated beginning in fiscal year 1975, I believe, GSA operated buildings which charged something approximating 90 percent of the going commercial rate for space to Government occupants. This changed our protracted cost picture sizably. It was at that time—

Mr. LONG. You withdrew the proposal to exchange the land?

Captain OTTO [continuing]. No, sir. It came to an untimely death because GSA didn't acquire custody, and part of our savings in these consolidations is get-on-with-it. All we could foresee was delays with no real promise it would ever come into GSA's custody. The last I heard it was in the Justice Department.

Mr. LONG. It was not because you didn't go ahead and build. The Laguna Niguel was abandoned and it was situated in New Orleans because the land proposal fell through?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There were several reasons. First of all, GSA didn't acquire the Laguna site and our studies originally—

Mr. LONG. Had they acquired the site, you would have chosen that?

Admiral MARSCHALL. If they had acquired the site, it ceased to be a good proposition after the first 5 years based on our having to pay rent to GSA. In other words, we were looking at a real gift horse in the days when GSA would acquire the building and give it to us rent free as they had in the past. With this new industrial funding type thing which has been made the law of the land with respect to GSA buildings,

we now have to pay for that on a fair rental basis, as Captain Otto pointed out, up to 90 percent of the fair rental value. Our economic studies showed then after 5 years this was a loser.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, I applaud that. I do think that these costs ought to be brought out in the open.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We have no objection to that, Dr. Long. The funding will be arranged. The point is that our studies at the time added a free item, and this ceased to be the case.

Mr. LONG. Do you believe anything in life is free?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir, I don't. I am talking only about Navy appropriations vis-a-vis the GSA. Nothing is free.

Mr. LONG. We ought to look at this from the perspective of the cost to the entire Government and not between one pocket of the Government and another pocket of the Government. Would you agree with that?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I quite agree. On the basis of having to pay fair market value for Niguel, it is not a winner.

NEW ORLEANS DECISION

Mr. LONG. We were given another study, which said that the decision was made to go to New Orleans because New Orleans was going to be the headquarters of the Chief of Naval Reserve. How big a factor was that?

Captain OTTO. Dr. Long, that point—

Mr. LONG. I am a little puzzled. On the one hand we are told the proposed land exchange at Laguna Niguel fell through and on the other hand we are told headquarters of the Chief of Naval Reserve was the reason. Which was it?

Captain OTTO. If you take them in the sequence in which they occurred, sir, they do, I think, make sense. Laguna, as I said, was most attractive and then it fell out for the reasons we have already cited. Then the Secretary of the Navy's decision to site the new combined field headquarters of the Naval Reserve at New Orleans was made. Then there were all kinds of advantages from an efficiency, communications and various other standpoints to centralize all reserve management activities.

Mr. LONG. I have no further questions. Thank you.

NAVAL AIR STATION, CHASE FIELD, TEX.

Mr. PATTEN. Turn to Naval Air Station, Chase Field, Tex.

Insert page I-146 in the record.

[The information follows:]

1. DATE 17 APR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. INSTALLATION FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			4. INSTALLATION NAVAL AIR STATION							
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 1452-198			6. STATE/COUNTRY CHASE FIELD, TEXAS								
7. STATUS ACTIVIE			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1943			9. COUNTY (U.S.) BEE		10. NEAREST CITY 5 MILES NORTHEAST TO BEEVILLE						
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and materials to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Naval Training Command.				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)			
				PERMANENT			OFFICER		ENLISTED			CIVILIAN		
							(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
				a. AS OF 31 December 1972			266	1,837	529	211	0	0	0	0
b. PLANNED (End FY 1973)			351	2,519	685	225	0	0	0	0	3,780			
13. INVENTORY														
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)						
a. OWNED		2,995		716		43,775		44,491						
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		5,615* - 1,029#		(15* - 28#)		179* - 250#		457						
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972								44,948						
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$0)							0			
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$0)							2,875			
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$3,025,000)							3,255			
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)											51,078			
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				
171.35	FLIGHT TRAINING DEVICE BUILDING				-	SF	10,800	575	10,800	575				
550.10	DISPENSARY AND DENTAL CLINIC				-	SF	30,200	2,300	30,200	2,300				
							TOTAL	2,875						

731

NAVAL AIR STATION, CHASE FIELD, TEX., \$2,875,000

This station supports the jet pilot training program of the Naval Training Command.

The flight training building project will provide space to house new flight simulator equipment having 6 degrees of freedom. Existing facilities cannot accommodate the new equipment.

The dispensary and dental clinic project will replace the existing facility which is housed in a temporary WW II wood structure that is deteriorated, overcrowded and functionally inadequate and poorly located near a runway and taxiway.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973.....	\$37,513,000
Cumulative obligations, December 31, 1972 (actual).....	33,097,738
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	33,154,992

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Flight training device building.....	\$32,978	3
Dispensary and dental clinic.....	38,800	6

Mr. PATTEN. Is the flight training device building here similar to that requested at Pensacola?

Captain TAYLOR. Yes; it is. This is to house 2 new freedom-of-motion trainers to be delivered in 1974.

NAVAL AIR STATION, KINGSVILLE, TEX.

Mr. PATTEN. Turn to Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Tex.

Insert page I-149 in the record.

[The information follows:]

1. DATE 19 FEB 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			5. INSTALLATION NAVAL AIR STATION														
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING			6. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 1452-525			6. STATE/COUNTRY KINGSVILLE, TEXAS															
7. STATUS ACTIVE			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1942		9. COUNTY (U.S.) KLEBERG		10. NEAREST CITY 2 MILES WEST TO KINGSVILLE														
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and materials to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Naval Training Command.				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)										
				PERMANENT			OFFICER		ENLISTED			OFFICER		ENLISTED							
				OFFICER (1)			ENLISTED (2)		CIVILIAN (3)		OFFICER (4)		ENLISTED (5)								
				OFFICER (6)			ENLISTED (7)		CIVILIAN (8)		OFFICER (6)		ENLISTED (7)								
				CIVILIAN (3)			OFFICER (4)		ENLISTED (5)		OFFICER (6)		ENLISTED (7)								
				CIVILIAN (8)			OFFICER (6)		ENLISTED (7)		OFFICER (6)		ENLISTED (7)								
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972				258		2,212		319		155		0		0		0		0		2,944	
d. PLANNED (thru FY1975)				260		1,843		319		182		0		0		0		0		2,604	
13. INVENTORY				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)									
a. OWNED				4,828		792		39,922		40,714											
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS				0* - 970#		0* - 19#		0		19											
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 18				72		40,733															
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$0)				340																	
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$0)				3,040																	
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$5,088,000)				2,542																	
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				46,572																	
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												
171.35	FLIGHT TRAINING DEVICE BUILDING			-	SF	18,225	986	18,225	986												
550.10	DISPENSARY AND DENTAL CLINIC			-	SF	27,175	2,054	27,175	2,054												
							TOTAL	3,040	3,040												

NAVAL AIR STATION, KINGSVILLE, TEX., \$3,040,000

This station supports jet pilot training program of the Naval Training Command.

The flight training device building project will provide space to house new flight simulator equipment having 6° of freedom. Existing facilities are located in a WW II, wooden temporary structure with poor insulation and in a deteriorated condition.

The dispensary and dental clinic project will replace the existing WW II facility with a modern clinic needed to provide proper medical support to eligible personnel.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973.....	\$34,797,000
Cumulative obligations, December 31, 1972 (actual).....	30,327,818
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	30,459,022

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Flight training device building.....	\$55,158	1
Dispensary and dental clinic.....	95,800	32

Mr. PATTEN. Why is this training device building more expensive than the one at Chase Field?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is larger. It is 18,225 square feet as compared with the one at Chase Field, 10,800 square feet. It is housing two trainers as opposed to Chase Field, where one is going in the addition.

Mr. PATTEN. Are both Chase Field and Kingsville firm installations?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. Do they have modern facilities?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, we have been upgrading these facilities over the years until they are both very fine naval training air stations.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Mr. PATTEN. Turn to the 9th Naval District and insert page I-152 in the record.

[The information follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974

(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

<u>Installation and Project</u>	<u>Authorisation</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>	
	<u>Project Amount</u>	<u>Installation Total</u>	<u>Project Amount</u>	<u>Installation Total</u>
<u>NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT</u>				
<u>State of Illinois</u>				
<u>Naval Complex, Great Lakes</u>				
<u>Naval Hospital, Great Lakes (HUMED)</u>				
P-329 Hospital Modernization and Upgrade (510.10 - LS)	2,800		2,800	
<u>Naval Training Center, Great Lakes (CNT)</u>				
<u>Administrative Command</u>				
P-161 Dispensary and Dental Clinic (550.10 - 50,941 SF)	4,259		4,259	
<u>Recruit Training Command</u>				
P-086A Medical/Dental Processing Facility (530.10 - 31,464 SF)	1,923		1,923	
<u>Service School Command</u>				
P-166 Machinist/Boilermens Instruction Building (171.20 168,000 SF)	6,166		6,166	
P-282 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (722.10 - 876 MN)(137,532 SF)	4,760		4,760	
		19,908		19,908
TOTAL - NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT		19,908		19,908

Mr. PATTEN. We have discussed some of these items with Dr. Etter with regard to the medical facilities.

CLOSURE OF ELECTRONICS SUPPLY OFFICE

Would you discuss the closure of the electronics supply office at Great Lakes and its relocation to Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, the announcement of April 17, announced that the electronics supply office would be consolidated at Mechanicsburg. This produces estimated annual saving of \$2.2 million, and to support we envisage no military construction required to accomplish that move. The timing of the move is being addressed at the moment. Exactly when it will be accomplished I could provide for the record.

[The information follows:]

RELOCATION DATE

Relocation of the electronics supply office, Great Lakes, Ill., is scheduled to be completed by December 31, 1974.

Mr. PATTEN. Why was the electronics supply office located with the ships parts control center rather than vice versa?

Mr. MURPHY. The facilities at Mechanicsburg exist in which to accommodate these functions. There is an aviation supply office activity close by in this area of Pennsylvania. It will offer some advantages.

Mr. PATTEN. Provide the costs and savings for this action for the record; also show the military construction and family housing implications.

[The information follows:]

COSTS AND SAVINGS

Proposed relocation of the electronics supply office, Great Lakes, Ill., will result in annual savings of \$2,219,000. One time costs are expected to total \$5,118,000. This action will have an estimated \$300,000 military construction impact, and will not create an additional requirement for family housing.

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, McALESTER, OKLA.

Mr. PATTEN. Discuss the increase in the total cost of the modernization of the bomb-loading plant at McAlester, Okla.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. The increased cost is due to updated explosive safety criteria that has come out from the Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board.

Mr. PATTEN. Can you provide for the record a summary of an up-to-date cost analysis for this project?

[The information follows:]

McALESTER COST DATA

An up-to-date summary of the increased cost estimate for the bomb-loading plant modernization project at the Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla., is as follows:

Primary facility	Unit of measure	Quantity	Unit cost	Cost
Plant modernization	Square feet.....	208,179	\$28.75	\$5,985,000
Supporting facilities:				
Electrical distribution system	Lump sum.....			119,000
Water distribution system	do.....			11,000
Gas distribution system	do.....			101,000
Steam distribution system	do.....			201,000
Railroad tracks and barricades	do.....			1,532,000
Roads and parking area	do.....			215,000
Pollution control	do.....			224,000
Total project cost.....				8,388,000

Mr. PATTEN. When will the closure of the other bomb-loading facilities take place?

Mr. MURPHY. Upon completion of the McAlester facility. The three other facilities would be placed in a standby status for mobilization use only.

NAVAL COMPLEX, GREAT LAKES, ILL.

Mr. PATTEN. Turn to Naval Complex, Great Lakes, Ill. Insert page I-153 in the record.

[The information follows:]

1. DATE 5 MAR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. INSTALLATION FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			4. INSTALLATION NAVAL COMPLEX												
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU VARIOUS			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER VARIOUS			6. STATE/COUNTRY GREAT LAKES, ILLINOIS													
7. STATUS ACTIVE			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1906		9. COUNTY (U.S.) LAKE		10. NEAREST CITY 2 MILES SOUTHEAST TO NORTH CHICAGO												
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Provide facilities, services, and material to support operations of Naval activities in the Great Lakes area.					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 DEC 1972		858	4,115	3,577	11	16,414	34	1,837	0				26,847	
					b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)		830	4,370	3,577	21	16,753	35	1,920	0				27,506	
					13. INVENTORY					LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)	
					a. OWNED							1,865		1,102		581,225		582,327	
					b. LEASE AND EASEMENTS							133*-0#		44*-0#		158*-0#		202	
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72													582,529						
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY									(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$13,100,000)				27,654						
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM									(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$0)				19,908						
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS									(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING \$0)				44,037						
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)													674,128						
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS																			
PROJECT DESIGNATION																			
CATEGORY CODE NO.		PROJECT TITLE			TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM										
a		b			c	d	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h									
510.10		NAVAL HOSPITAL HOSPITAL MODERNIZATION AND UPGRADE			-	LS	-	2,800	-	2,800									
550.10		NAVAL TRAINING CENTER ADMINISTRATIVE COMMAND DISPENSARY AND DENTAL CLINIC			-	SF	50,941	4,259	50,941	4,259									
530.10		RECRUIT TRAINING COMMAND MEDICAL/DENTAL PROCESSING FACILITY			-	SF	31,464	1,923	31,464	1,923									
171.20		SERVICE SCHOOL COMMAND MACHINIST/BOILERMEN INSTRUCTION BUILDING			-	SF	168,000	6,166	168,000	6,166									
722.10		BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS			-	SF	137,532	4,760	137,532	4,760									
							TOTAL	19,908											

738

Naval Complex, Great Lakes, IL., \$19,908,000

Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, IL.,

This hospital provides general clinical and hospitalization service for eligible personnel in the Great Lakes area.

The hospital project will modernize and upgrade existing hospital utilities to meet current National Fire Protection Association regulations by providing an emergency generator system, grounding circuits and an alternate primary service feeder.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, IL., \$17,108,000

This center provides basic recruit training for enlisted personnel and primary, advanced, and specialized training for office and enlisted personnel.

The dispensary and dental clinic project will provide a consolidated medical care facility to replace the existing dispersed, WW II, deteriorated facilities.

The medical/dental processing facility project will replace the existing facility which is a substandard, temporary structure with poor heating and sanitary facilities.

The machinist/boilermen instruction building project will provide classroom space for providing training associated with 1,200 PSI propulsion plants

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living quarters for 876 men currently living in overcrowded quarters.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973.	\$19,778,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	16,868,334
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	16,868,334

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Hospital modernization and upgrade	\$134,400	1
Dispensary and dental clinic	205,198	48
Medical/dental processing facility	38,000	21
Machinist/boilermen instruction building	277,240	10
Bachelor enlisted quarters	159,646	21

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NC, Great Lakes, Illinois

1. Effective EEQ requirement	18,861
2. Adequate Assets	17,180
Installation	16,831
Community	349
3. Deficit	1,681
4. Fiscal Year 1974 project	876
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	805

INSTRUCTION BUILDING

Mr. PATTEN. What are you currently using for a machinists/boilermen instruction building? What is your training workload in this area?

Captain WATSON. Mr. Chairman, currently we are using two old converted hangars. They are large World War II wooden construction. They are in pretty deteriorated condition and with a number of students, class A MM school has an average on board of 1,200 students. Class A BT school, 448 students. The Class A MM nuclear school, 181 students in these old deteriorated buildings. I have pictures of the classroom which help show the type of facilities and some of the conditions that exist.

Mr. PATTEN. That explains the training workload?

Captain WATSON. Yes, sir. This project complements a fiscal year 1971 propulsion plant being installed, a 1,200-pound boiler. The school also has a 600-pound boiler installation. This is the classroom and hands-on training for those two plants.

BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS

Mr. PATTEN. You give the bachelor enlisted quarters here a priority of 76 in the bottom 20 percent of your program. I note that you have a requirement for 18,861 spaces, with 17,180 existing adequate and 1,513 which can be upgraded. This leaves you only 168 spaces short versus some 876 you are requesting. Had you not better take another look at this project?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can explain that. The problem is that within these numbers we have included our recruit spaces. Recruits are only entitled to open-bay dormitory-type spaces. At the moment we have an excess of 2,000 recruit spaces. These cannot be used to serve our service school command requirement, where there are higher rated enlisted men and deserve the amenities we are trying to provide in our modern facilities. Therefore, if you take the recruits out of this figure, our project is well justified and we still have a large deficiency to serve the service school command.

Mr. PATTEN. Are there any questions?

Mr. NICHOLAS. Will you provide a breakdown of that for the record?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

BEQ BREAKDOWN

Bachelor housing requirement at Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.:

	Recruits	All others
Total requirement.....	8,840	10,021
Existing substandard.....	0	16,131
Existing adequate.....	10,800	4,988
Funded, not in inventory.....	0	1,392
Adequate assets.....	10,800	6,380
Deficiency.....	-1,960	3,641

¹ Includes 1,513 which can be upgraded.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Mr. SIKES. Turn to the 11th Naval District.
Insert in the record pages I-159 through I-161.
[The information follows.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

<u>Installation and Project</u>	<u>Authorization</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>	
	<u>Project</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Installation</u>
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT</u>				
<u>State of California</u>				
<u>Naval Weapons Center, China Lake (CNM)</u>				
P-160 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (722.10-406MN) (70,992 SF)	2,946		2,946	
P-176 Electrical Distribution System Improvements (812.10-IS)	217		217	
		3,163		3,163
<u>Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach (CNM)</u>				
P-077 Service Group Building (213.56-193,800 SF)	6,808		6,808	
		6,808		6,808
<u>Naval Hospital, Long Beach (BUMED)</u>				
P-069 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Addition (722.10- 128 MN) (22,428 SF)	878		878	
		878		878
<u>Naval Air Station, Miramar (CINCPACFLT)</u>				
P-302 Applied Instruction Building (171.20-21,333 SF)	1,123		1,123	
P-301 Avionics Shop Addition (211.37-7,000 SF)	331		331	
		1,454		1,454

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
 (ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

<u>Installation and Project</u>	<u>Authorization</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>	
	<u>Project</u> <u>Amount</u>	<u>Installation</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>Project</u> <u>Amount</u>	<u>Installation</u> <u>Total</u>
<u>ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT CONT'D</u>				
<u>State of California (Cont'd)</u>				
<u>Naval Air Station, North Island (PACFLT)</u>				
P-488 Applied Instruction Building (171.20-LS)	476		476	
P-302 Avionics Facility (211.37-32,504 SF)(Auth PL92-545, FY 1973)	-		1,640	
P-190 Transbay Water/Sewer Lines (842.10-5,500 LF)	1,185		1,185	
<u>Naval Air Rework Facility</u>				
P-159 Maintenance Hangar Addition (211.70-16,000 SF)	754		754	
	2,415		4,055	
<u>Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Pacific, San Diego (CNT)</u>				
P-008 Academic Instruction Building (171.10-26,300 SF)	1,118		1,118	
	1,118		1,118	
<u>Naval Electronics Laboratory Center San Diego (CNM)</u>				
P-052 Electronics Development and Test Laboratory (1st Increment) (310.34-39,000 SF)	3,518		3,518	
	3,518		3,518	
<u>Naval Station, San Diego (PACFLT)</u>				
P-182 Berthing Pier (151.20-2,960 FB)	10,000		10,000	
P-141 Pier Utilities (812.30-LS)	1,996		1,996	
	11,996		11,996	

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

<u>Installation and Project</u>	<u>Authorization</u>		<u>Appropriation</u>	
	<u>Project Amount</u>	<u>Installation Total</u>	<u>Project Amount</u>	<u>Installation Total</u>
<u>ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT CONT'D</u>				
<u>State of California (Cont'd)</u>				
<u>Naval Training Center, San Diego (CMT)</u>				
<u>Administrative Command (CMT)</u>				
P-164 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (722.10-79,128 SF, 504 MN)	2,944	2,944	2,944	2,944
		2,944		2,944
<u>Navy Public Works Center, San Diego (CNM)</u>				
<u>Naval Station</u>				
P-020 Steam Distribution (1st Increment) (822.22-11,920 LF)	2,471	2,471	2,471	2,471
		2,471		2,471
<u>Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego (PACFLT)</u>				
P-028 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (722.10,73,476 SF) (468 MN)	2,667		2,667	
P-999 Pier Utilities (812.90-LS)	1,253		1,253	
		3,920		3,920
<u>Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach (CNM)</u>				
P-058 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters with Mess (721.10-90 MN) (18,290 SF)	721		721	
<u>Fallbrook Annex</u>				
P-059 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters with Mess (721.10-82 MN) (20,892 SF)	807	1,528	807	1,528
		42,213		43,853
TOTAL - ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT		42,213		43,853

744

Mr. SIKES. The request is for \$43,853,000.

Which of the projects requested in this year's program for the 11th Naval District are required as a result of the shore establishment realignments?

PROJECTS REQUIRED DUE TO REALIGNMENT

Admiral MARSCHALL. In the 11th Naval District we have several changes as a result of shore establishment realignment. Naval Station, San Diego, will receive 31 additional ships from Long Beach. This generates a need, for the 1974 program, of a \$10 million berthing pier project. It will mean the moving of 632 officers and 10,445 enlisted. The relocation of the underwater swimming school from Key West, which includes 41 military and 6 civilians, does not generate any requirements for 1974 projects. At NAS, Miramar, the relocation of carrier airborne early-warning squadrons from Naval Air Station North Island generates a need for two projects in this year's program, the avionics shop addition at \$331,000 and applied instruction building for \$1,123,000. This will cause a move of 48 civilians and 1,003 military.

The move of the fleet helicopter squadrons from NAS, Imperial Beach, to North Island triggers the need to move carrier airborne early-warning squadrons from North Island to Miramar. There will be four projects additionally in fiscal year 1975. At Naval Air Station, North Island, the relocation of the fleet helicopter squadrons from Imperial Beach generates a need for an applied instruction building, but this building would have been required had we remained at Imperial Beach.

Mr. SIKES. Provide details for the record on the construction which will be required in the 11th Naval District in future years as a result of these realignments.

[The information follows:]

REALIGNMENT CONSTRUCTION

The following projects will be required in the 11th Naval District in fiscal year 1975 as a result of realignment actions:

Activity	Project	Cost (thousands)
NS, San Diego, Calif.....	Applied instruction building (diving).....	\$476
	Bachelor enlisted quarters (100 men).....	500
NAS, Miramar, Calif.....	Electrical distribution.....	1,800
	Aircraft hangar.....	3,669
	Aircraft apron.....	1,123
	Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	822
NAS, North Island, Calif.....	Aircraft facility.....	3,663
	Aircraft hangar.....	4,700
	Enlisted men's club.....	300

Note: No other projects will be required in subsequent years.

PERSONNEL INCREASES

Mr. SIKES. What will be the impact of personnel increases on installations in this naval district?

Mr. TAYLOR. Personnel increases due to SER within the 11th Naval District occur only at NS San Diego, NAS Miramar, and NAS North Island.

Provided the above mentioned fiscal year 1974 and fiscal year 1975 MILCON projects are authorized and funded, no adverse impact will be experienced at the affected bases.

Mr. SIKES. How are you planning to provide the necessary bachelor and family housing for the personnel being relocated in this region?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We have the two projects mentioned to take care of personnel moving into the San Diego area.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Shipboard personnel primarily are involved in the move from Long Beach to San Diego. The rest of it is generally all within San Diego.

HOUSING NEEDS

Mr. SIKES. What can you tell us about the net increase in bachelor and family housing units required?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. The total personnel being relocated to the San Diego area is a result of shore establishment realignment with approximately 858 officers and 13,904 enlisted. This yields an increase of 6,259 families in the San Diego area over the number already there. As the majority of the increase results from ship personnel bachelors will essentially live on board. As was mentioned a moment ago, the 1974 family housing survey indicates that prior to the arrival of the personnel there was a surplus, a slight surplus of family housing. We expect that most of the new families will find adequate quarters in the San Diego area.

Admiral MARSCHALL. This is a combination of both Navy and community assets. It is probable that, highly likely that, we will conduct a new survey when these people are there.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have anything scheduled in the next 2 or 3 years for additional housing and community support facilities?

Admiral MARSCHALL. At the present time, no, sir. We are looking into that.

Mr. SIKES. If you are going to transfer that many families, it is almost certain that you will need additional housing, community support schools, et cetera.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. We have 1,500 units of housing coming on the line just about that time, Mr. Chairman, from the fiscal year 1971 and 1972 programs.

Mr. SIKES. If you don't know what construction you are going to require as of this time, you could not have taken all the costs into account in your estimate of cost and savings resulting from the realignment, could you?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Chairman, we did investigate this. The shore realignment study group did investigate the requirement for houses. What I am saying now is that we don't have a specific program for San Diego for this year. We may possibly have one next year. We did it en gros as opposed to in detail. I think when we come to you for housing we want to have it in detail.

LONG BEACH/SAN DIEGO REALINEMENT

Mr. SIKES. What can you tell us about the costs and the savings, in particular in connection with the move from Long Beach to San Diego?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Estimated annual saving of the move from Long Beach is \$11,426,000. One-time closure costs amount to \$16,389,000.

Mr. SIKES. For the record break down both types.
[The information follows:]

COSTS DETAILED

The estimated annual savings resulting from the reductions at the Long Beach complex cannot be distributed to the other gaining activities. The savings pertain only to the cessation of certain functions at Long Beach with the resultant elimination of certain civilian and military positions and the elimination of operating and maintenance costs.

The one-time closure costs are difficult to distribute to the other gaining activities because of such expenses as severance pay and facility preservation costs. However, the cost can be statistically prorated between the gaining activities in accordance with the numbers of military personnel being transferred. The costs are also based upon using an average relocation cost per person regardless of destination. On this basis, the closure cost of \$16,389,000 is prorated as follows :

Naval Station, San Diego, Calif.....	\$11,177,000
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.....	2,524,000
Naval Station, Alameda, Calif.....	1,901,000
Navy Shipyard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Wash.....	574,000
Naval Station, Charleston, S.C.....	213,000

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the bachelor situation there will be a need for BEQ at Miramar in the 1975 program. That is the only bachelor requirement in this program.

CONCENTRATION OF FORCES

Mr. SIKES. Is there a danger of overconcentration of Navy ships and support facilities in the San Diego complex? That question is not original with this committee. It has concerned members of the California delegation and others that you may be overconcentrating.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Chairman, concentration of fleet units was a factor in the deliberations of the establishment realignment group, a factor. It was felt that the overwhelming economies which could be affected in our shore realignment were so necessary in this time of money shortages that we had to make economic factors much more important than the concentration factor. Again, many of our ships—

Mr. SIKES. Is that not an invitation to disaster which would be infinitely more costly, for instance the cost of several capital ships?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, we do have many of our ships at sea most of the time. I have figures here for San Diego. In 1973 we had 104 ships homeported there, and by 1978 we will have 129 ships homeported there. In port in San Diego in 1973, 64 ships, give or take a few on the average in port, and in 1978, 80 ships in port. This is generally, as Captain Watson points out, on a weekend.

OPEN SEA ACCESS

Mr. SIKES. Do you have a map showing the access to the open sea from the two locations?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Captain WATSON. Mr. Chairman, the ships, submarines primarily, are berthed at Dallas Point, and submarine support facility. The carriers and larger ships will be berthed at North Island. Key wall piers, J and K, or possibly India, and the naval station handles the rest of the ships with the Reserve Fleet.

Mr. SIKES. What is the distance from the naval station to the open sea?

Captain Watson. The distance is 5 miles.

Mr. SIKES. What is the distance at Long Beach?

Captain WATSON. Long Beach distance, 3 miles.

Mr. SIKES. Compared to 5?

Captain WATSON. For those ships at the naval station, yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. For most of the ships the distance would be approximately the same or possibly even less than San Diego?

Captain WATSON. The larger ships, the distance is slightly less. Three miles.

Mr. SIKES. Are there any problems associated with the channel which might make San Diego less than ideal as a base as compared to Long Beach? Is the San Diego Channel more susceptible to blockage from sunken ships or from a natural disaster such as an earthquake or from enemy attack?

Admiral MARSCHALL. You can look at the map——

Captain WATSON. Except from the breakwater in.

Admiral MARSCHALL. That is a tight exit in from behind the breakwater, and it is wider than San Diego.

Captain WATSON. The channel in San Diego is good. This is the width of the carrier, and the smaller ships pass on the other side of the buoys. It is not necessary for them to stay in the channel.

Mr. SIKES. What is the answer to the question, which channel is more susceptible to blockage?

Captain WATSON. I would say you have a longer channel than San Diego. If that were the case, then I would have to say possibly San Diego.

Mr. SIKES. Comparing this with the other major naval bases, does the situation at San Diego present any cause for serious apprehension?

Captain WATSON. No, sir. San Diego has many advantages to concentrating the fleet here from an operational standpoint, from a berthing standpoint.

Mr. SIKES. Outline those for the record.

[The information follows:]

OPERATIONAL AND BERTHING ADVANTAGES AT NAVSTA, SAN DIEGO

- (1) Major fleet training activities are located at San Diego.
- (2) The Commander of Pacific Amphibious Forces is located at San Diego where practice landing beaches are abundantly available.
- (3) San Diego Naval Station already has about 19,700 feet of berthing pier, whereas Long Beach Naval Station has only 4,682 feet of berthing pier.
- (4) Logistics support available at San Diego is far greater than Long Beach at present. There are already in existence more facilities to store and issue needed supplies to the fleet like repair parts and fuel or general supplies.

Mr. SIKES. I am thinking about getting those ships safely out. From the standpoint of blockage, is the channel at San Diego more vulnerable than the average major fleet facility.

Captain WATSON. No, sir. Compared to Norfolk?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Captain WATSON. Compared to Mayport, that has a shorter run. It is a tighter harbor. Norfolk has a long run to the sea. Bremerton and San Francisco are very open. Charleston is very tight. With the two larger concentrations of ships, Norfolk and San Diego, I would say they are both about the same. Neither one being any worse or better than the other.

Mr. SIKES. Where do you propose to build the new dock?

Captain WATSON. The new dock will be down here. Pier No. 7, between 6 and 8.

Mr. SIKES. What about the Coronado Bridge; does it represent any problem such as potentially blocking the harbor exit or clearance problems with ship superstructures?

Captain WATSON. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Where is the bridge?

Captain WATSON. The bridge is right here [pointing].

Mr. SIKES. It would affect only a part of the ships?

Captain WATSON. Yes, sir. The bridge is of such construction that I couldn't imagine it being able to block the channel. It is a rather clean design.

Mr. SIKES. It is a high-rise bridge?

Captain WATSON. Very high rise and graceful.

Mr. SIKES. There are no problems with ships' superstructures?

Captain WATSON. The only ships that couldn't get down there wouldn't be sent down there anyway. The carriers couldn't get under there.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Long Beach can't get under there either. It will have a berth at North Island.

Captain WATSON. All ships that would use the naval station can make it.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

MOBILE HOME USE

Mr. PATTEN. How many people in the San Diego area live in mobile homes?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I don't know specifically, Mr. Patten.

Mr. PATTEN. I think it is a large number.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We do have quite a few trailer lovers. I think we can give you that for the record.

[The information follows:]

There are presently 1,171 families living in mobile homes in the San Diego area.

TOTAL COSTS AND SAVINGS

Mr. SIKES. I think question 10 has been asked but we will put it in the record to be doubly sure I have all the facts:

Can you provide for the record the total savings and the total costs involved in the Long Beach closures and relocations?

[The information follows:]

Long Beach Complex

Estimated annual savings-----	\$11, 426, 000
One-time closure costs-----	16, 389, 000
Military construction avoided-----	37, 036, 000
Military construction required-----	10, 300, 000

NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER, CHINA LAKE, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Turn to the Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, Calif.
Place in the record page I-162.
[The information follows:]

1. DATE 19 FEB 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. PROGRAM FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		4. INSTALLATION NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER							
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 6700-200		6. STATE/COUNTRY CHINA LAKE, CALIFORNIA								
7. STATUS ACTIVE		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1944		9. COUNTY (U.S.) KERN, INYO SAN BERNARDINO		10. NEAREST CITY 114 MILES SOUTHWEST TO BAKERSFIELD							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS This activity is the principal Navy RDT&E Center for air warfare and missile weapons systems. Major Activities Supported: NAF China Lake				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)	
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)		
				a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	81	623	4,519	0	0	52	220	296	5,791
				b. PLANNED (END FY 1975)	69	619	4,575	0	0	49	216	288	5,816
				13. INVENTORY									
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)					
a. OWNED		1,086,457		1,625		219,342		220,967					
b. LEASE AND EASEMENTS		7* - 17#		4* - 0#		492* - 0#		492					
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Exclpt land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72								221,459					
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								2,718					
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								3,163					
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								10,515					
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								237,855					
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS													
PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM					
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b					SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h				
722.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS			1	SF	70,992	2,946	70,992	2,946				
812.10	ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS			79	LS	-	217	-	217				
TOTAL							3,163		3,163				

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, CA., \$3,163,000

This center conducts a program of warfare analysis, reasearch, development, test, evaluation, systems integration, and fleet engineering support in naval weapons systems, principally for air warfare, and conducts investigation in related fields of science and technology.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living spaces for 406 men currently living spaces in WW II substandard barracks.

The electric distribution system project will provide improvements to the systems and supplement existing feeders and transformer capacity to relieve current overloading of these systems.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	\$36,218,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	36,626,509
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	36,952,571

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Bachelor enlisted quarters	\$108,896	18
Electrical distribution system improvements	10,416	18

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NWC, Great Lakes, California

1. Effective BEQ requirement	434
2. Adequate Assets	-0-
Installation	-0-
Community	-0-
3. Deficit	434
4. Fiscal Year 1974 project	406
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	<u>28</u>

Mr. SIKES. The request is for \$3,163,000 for bachelor enlisted quarters and an electrical distribution system improvement. We have discussed the mission of this activity and its relationship to other activities.

Do you have a map of China Lake?

Bring one with you tomorrow. We will pass over this project until we have a map.

LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Take up Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

Insert in the record page I-165.

[The information follows:]

1. DATE 17 APR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. INSTALLATION LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD								
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU NAVAL SHIP SYSTEMS COMMAND		5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 5867-250		6. STATE/COUNTRY LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA								
7. STATUS ACTIVE		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1943		9. COUNTY (U.S.) LOS ANGELES		10. NEAREST CITY WITHIN CITY						
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS This Shipyard provides logistic support for assigned ships including conversions, overhaul, repair, alterations and drydocking of surface ships; support for weapons systems anti-air warfare and anti-submarine warfare; support for ships homeported in Southern California of approximately 140 ships. Major Function: Maintenance and overhaul of surface ships with heavy emphasis on unscheduled repair workload (up to and including attack carriers)				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH								
				PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL		
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972				47	2	6,715	0	0	10	75	150	6,999
b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)				46	21	7,640	0	0	10	75	150	7,942
				13. INVENTORY								
LAND				ACRES (1)	LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
a. OWNED				246	1,385		55,770		57,155			
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS (1* - Off)				4* - Off	1* - Off		0		0			
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				57,155								
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				23,997								
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				14,202 1/								
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				30,971								
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				126,325								
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS												
PROJECT DESIGNATION												
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b			TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM e		FUNDING PROGRAM f				
213.56	SERVICE GROUP BUILDING			7	SF	193,800	6,808	193,800	6,808			
1/ INCLUDES \$7,394,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT												

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Cal., \$6,808,000.

This shipyard provides overhaul, repair and conversion of all types of surface ships up to carrier size, but primarily antisubmarine and anti-aircraft types. This shipyard also provides homeport logistic support for the majority of Pacific Fleet ships.

The service group building project will replace and modernize the woodworking shop, paint shop, riggers shop, and temporary services shop.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973-----	\$39, 571, 000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)-----	38, 977, 864
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)-----	38, 977, 864

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Service group building.....	\$255, 750	16

Mr. SIKES. The request is for \$6,608,000. What is a service group building?

SERVICE GROUP BUILDING

Captain GINN. Mr. Chairman, this facility in the modern industrial building is designed specifically to consolidate the shops that comprise the service group of the shipyard. The building will provide unique space configuration and special features to house the rigging shop, temporary service shop, mill shop, boat shop, and the plastic shop. It also will take into consideration sail loft, pattern shop, and office space to run this complex.

Mr. SIKES. Have you looked at existing buildings at the adjacent naval supply center to determine if they can be utilized or modified for this purpose?

Captain GINN. We anticipated the possibility of excess facilities being available as a result of the SER actions, and we have examined in detail all of the potential structures on Terminal Island.

The structure at the naval station are basically personnel support type that are used for berthing, messing, and recreational facilities. It was clear that none of them would be large enough or suitably structured to be used for functions that would be required. The other building that would be available was a naval supply center. Although they are more of a permanent type of construction, they did not supply the kinds of high-bay sections we need or the ground-level operations. We could find no buildings on Terminal Island of a size that could be changed or was configured to supply the requirements needed to satisfy the requirement.

Mr. SIKES. When was this survey taken?

Captain GINN. Prior to the beginning of these hearings and prior to or just after the SER announcements were made.

Mr. SIKES. You are saying there are no existing buildings which could be satisfactorily used?

Captain GINN. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. What savings, if any, can be shown from the project itself?

Captain GINN. Mr. Chairman, I do not have that.

Mr. SIKES. Provide it for the record.

[The information follows:]

SAVINGS

The service group project was not justified on the basis of economics, even though there is a considerable predicted savings. The predicted savings is based on a 10-percent increase in productivity and does not fit the cashflow requirements of a DOD economic analysis. When the program cost estimate for the service group project was made, the contractor made an amortization analysis using the 10-percent increased productivity data and the project amortized in a period of 4.9 years.

FUTURE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record a project listing for the \$30,971,-000 program over the next 4 years.

[The information follows:]

PROPOSED PROGRAM

<i>Title</i>	<i>Cost (thousands)</i>
Fiscal year: 1975; Pier E conversion.....	\$6, 145
1975 total.....	6, 145
1976:	
Salt water improvements.....	2, 426
Electric systems improvement (1st increment).....	4, 848
Crane track, drydock no. 1.....	695
Compressed air improvements.....	1, 535
1976 total.....	9, 504
1977:	
Sheetmetal shop extension.....	791
Machine shop extension.....	4, 061
Propeller shop.....	1, 867
Industrial support building.....	1, 399
1977 total.....	8, 118
1978:	
Pier 3 improvement.....	3, 057
Waterfront protection.....	290
Drydock No. 2 improvements.....	1, 968
Central tool shop.....	131
Pipe shop improvements.....	878
Cafeteria 2 replacement.....	880
Fiscal year 1978 total.....	7, 204
4 year total.....	30, 971

REALINEMENT IMPACT

Mr. SIKES. What will be the impact on Long Beach Shipyard for the recently announced shore establishment realignment?

Captain GINN. It will increase in employment levels by about 1,000 civilian employees.

Mr. SIKES. How much will the workload increase?

Captain GINN. By about 1,000 man-years per year.

Mr. SIKES. What additional construction will be required at Long Beach as a result of these actions?

Captain GINN. There will be no construction required in Long Beach as a result of the SER actions. We have in the long-range modernization program continuing follow-on items, but they are not related to SER.

Mr. SIKES. What activities are you moving to the Long Beach Shipyard? Can you show us on your map?

Captain GINN. The Long Beach Naval Shipyard occupies this portion of Terminal Island in the inner harbor.

Mr. SIKES. What activities will be transferred to Long Beach?

Captain GINN. Other shipyard functions?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Captain GINN. We will move into Long Beach out of the closing yard in San Francisco. The overhaul of the sealed transmissions for our high line delivery systems will have an increased workload flowing through the pump and valve facility. They will be assigned responsibility for the overhaul of the S-band radars and antennas.

There probably will be other minor things, but those are the major ones.

Mr. SIKES. Are there existing facilities on Terminal Island or elsewhere which can be used in lieu of additional construction at Long Beach?

Captain GINN. Are you relating this to the service group building or future projects? If you are speaking of future projects, as far as we know now the types of facilities that we are asking for are industrial facilities for shipyards, and the answer then would have to be "no."

We will cancel a requirement for an industrial supply building due to the shrinking of the supply department, of the supply center in Long Beach. We will be able to substitute this building for one that we are going to have to build.

EXCESS PROPERTY

Mr. SIKES. Will the Navy have surplus property at Long Beach because of the transfer of functions to San Diego?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I would have to provide the amount of land for the record. There will be some surplus property.

Mr. SIKES. Generally in what area would it be?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, this is an area of the naval station right up here we have from the city of Los Angeles which will revert back to the city of Los Angeles. I think the remaining property we will retain.

Captain GINN. There will be one shift. At the moment, Pier E property on the eastern side of the shipyard is on the plant account of the naval station. This is being, or has already been, transferred to plant account of Long Beach because this is where we are doing our industrialization now. And this year in our program the service group building is on this pier. In the previous program the management engineering building is on that pier, the new boiler plant is on that pier, and in following years, next year you will have the industrialization of this western face of the pier. This is where we put on the relieving platform to carry the big freight.

Mr. SIKES. I would like for the record, the investment in the property which you expect to excess.

Captain GINN. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. And its value for other purposes if that information is available.

[The information follows:]

PROPERTY TO BE EXCESSED

The Department of the Navy will report to the General Services Administration (GSA) as excess five parcels of fee-owned land, totaling approximately 149 acres, together with improvements thereon, at five offsite components of the Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif. Four of the five sites contain substandard housing units. The fifth parcel is unimproved. The acquisition value of the land and the improvements thereon is \$215,980 and \$2,793,917, respectively.

The Department of the Navy has not proposed what use the land may have for other purposes. The Department of the Army has indicated a requirement for the unimproved parcel of land that is within the quantity safety distance of NIKE Site No. 43.

EMERGENCY USE OF LONG BEACH

Mr. SIKES. Earlier in our hearings it was mentioned that Long Beach would be used as an emergency fleet support base. What does that mean, and which facilities will be retained for this purpose?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think, sir, as mentioned earlier, the Navy is intending to keep most of this area we have here.

Mr. SIKES. That is the reason for keeping the property?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir. It can be used in an emergency situation to berth ships rather than some other location.

Mr. SIKES. Other than an emergency support base, what would its use be?

Mr. TAYLOR. The only other use would be the naval shipyard. Plus we do have a couple of reserve ships that will remain tied up at this location.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

Mr. PATTEN. I have one question. On this list of things that you have requested you didn't mention the storage area and the fence. You included a lot of other details. Is this going to be outside storage, open air storage?

Captain GINN. Yes, sir.

NEED FOR SECURITY FENCE

Mr. PATTEN. You were going to put a lot of things in there and you have 600-some feet of security fence?

Captain GINN. Yes.

Mr. PATTEN. And the justification indicates it is going to be a fenced in storage area with your pattern shop and boatshop and joiner shop. You didn't mention the storage in your statement.

Will the fence be around the buildings?

Captain GINN. Yes, sir. The temporary services, many of the temporary service items stay outdoors, they don't go inside.

Mr. PATTEN. I mention that because there is a tremendous increase in stealing from storage spaces. We are having a terrible experience in our area.

Captain GINN. You also must remember, sir, that it is fenced to start with. We have a security fence around the shipyard. That is first.

Mr. PATTEN. It won't be in the area to be given back to the city?

Captain GINN. No, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. What are they likely to do with that surplus property? Is it good for recreation or industry?

Captain GINN. Off the top of my head, the city of Los Angeles has been trying to get their hands on this property for some time, and they are building very rapidly a whole new harbor area to match Long Beach's harbor area. It is a situation between the two cities.

Mr. SIKES. By they, do you mean Los Angeles?

Captain GINN. Yes, sir, through this area.

Mr. SIKES. The committee will resume at 10 in the morning with the Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.

FRIDAY, JULY 13, 1973

NAVAL AIR STATION, MIRAMAR, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. The committee will come to order.

The first base we will consider is the Naval Air Station at Miramar in California.

We will insert page 169 in the record.

1. DATE 17 APR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. INSTALLATION FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		5. INSTALLATION NAVAL AIR STATION						
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CINCPACFLT			6. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 1451-606		8. STATE/COUNTRY MIRAMAR, CALIFORNIA							
7. STATUS ACTIVE		9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1943		9. COUNTY (U.S.) SAN DIEGO		10. NEAREST CITY 16 MILES SOUTH TO SAN DIEGO						
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and materials to support operations of Aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations. Major Activities Supported: Commander, Fleet Air Miramar 3 Carrier Air Wings, 1 Airborne Early Warning Wing Naval Reserve Detachment 3 Instrument & Replacement Training Squadrons Major Functions: Master Jet Air Station, Homeport of West Coast Fleet Fighter, Photo, and Composite Squadrons				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	
a. AS OF 31 December 71				797	6,880	1,534	121	329	18	12	0	9,691
b. PLANNED (END FY 1975)				983	7,178	1,579	276	335	74	331	0	10,756
13. INVENTORY				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (3)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (4)		TOTAL (\$000) (5)
a. OWNED						15,437		9,814		75,171		84,985
c. LEASES AND EASEMENTS				0# - 76#				0# - 31#		0		31
d. INVENTORY TOTAL (EXCEPT (1)&(2) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72												85,016
e. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY												12,790
f. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM												1,454
g. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS												14,830
h. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)												114,090
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS												
PROJECT DESIGNATION												
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b		TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM			FUNDING PROGRAM				
					SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h				
171.20	APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING		/	SF	21,333	1,123	21,333	1,123				
211.37	AVIONICS SHOP ADDITION		/	SF	7,000	331	7,000	331				
					TOTAL	1,454		1,454				

NAVAL AIR STATION, MIRAMAR, CALIF., \$1,454,000

This master jet air station supports all Navy west coast F-4 and F-8 fleet fighter squadrons, photo, and two Reserve squadrons the E-1 and E-2 Airborne Early Warning Aircraft. It will be the introduction site for the new F-14 weapons system.

The applied instruction building project will provide a facility for operational and maintenance training needed for the E-1 and E-2 Airborne Early Warning Aircraft being transferred from the Naval Air Station North Island

The avionics shop addition will provide a facility for intermediate level maintenance of the Airborne Early Warning Aircraft.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973-----	\$78,296,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)-----	74,156,561
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)-----	76,058,465

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Applied instruction building-----	\$53,900	0
Avionics shop addition-----	15,880	0

Mr SIKES. The request is for \$1.454 million for an applied instruction building, and an avionics shop addition.

INCREASE TO APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING

Whenever the committee sees a term such as "applied instruction," we wonder whether you are talking about a gymnasium building or an administration building or something else that needs a little dressing up for approval. What is this one?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I would like Mr. Taylor to dress this up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, we use the term "applied instruction building" when the facility contains primarily mockups or training devices. This differentiates it from an academic training facility, which is primarily just classrooms.

In other words, to compare it to a civilian institution, an applied training building would be the laboratories, sort of, in a college, and the academic training facility is just the regular classroom space.

Mr. SIKES. I think you dressed it up very well.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be well to note at this point that this project will be increased to \$1.542 million at the time that our letter from OMB is received by the committee. It is an adjustment upward of \$419,000.

Mr. SIKES. For what reason?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Again, it is a better estimate, but I think Mr. Taylor has the details.

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, at the time this project was originally conceived, to give a little bit of history, this is involved with the relocation of squadrons from NAS North Island to NAS Miramar. When this project was originally conceived, we had one training device which was going to be installed at NAS North Island. As a result of the squadrons move to NAS Miramar, we now need to increase this project to accommodate the installation of that training device.

Mr. SIKES. All right.

Will you show us a map of Miramar?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, we do not go quite far enough on this map to have Miramar, but it would be located in about this section just north of the city of San Diego.

Mr. SIKES. All right.

RELOCATIONS

What missions are being relocated here, and what facilities will be required to support these missions? Provide details for the record.
[The information follows:]

MISSION RELOCATION

The mission being relocated from NAS North Island to NAS Miramar is support of the E-2 Airborne Early Warning Aircraft. The support must be provided to a training squadron and six fleet operational squadrons which deploy with carriers. These 7 squadrons will total about 33 aircraft and approximately 1,000 men. Three MILCON projects are required for E-2 support. NAS Miramar P-301, Avionics Shop Addition (7,000 ft²; \$331,000) and P-302, Applied Instruction Building (25,741 ft²; \$1,542,000), are requested for the fiscal year 1974 program. NAS Miramar P-186, Maintenance Hangar (116,502 ft², \$6,583,000), will be requested in the fiscal year 1975 program.

4-YEAR PLAN REVISED

Mr. SIKES. I am informed that the amount of \$14.830 million shown as anticipated for the next 4 years is in error. The Navy has provided a sheet listing a total of \$26.385 million in projects planned for the next 4 years with the statement that these are changes necessitated by the shore establishment realignment. These figures do not add up to the total amount of the projects which are said to be required as a result of the realignment.

Can you explain this now, or will it be necessary to do so for the record? Explain it briefly and give us complete details for the record.

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, a complete analysis was not finished at the time the data sheet was originally inserted in our books. Since, we have looked at what will definitely be required as a result of the shore establishment realignment and we have included two projects in the fiscal year 1975 program, a maintenance hangar and a bachelor enlisted quarters, which will be required as a result of the shore establishment realignment.

We will provide further details for the record.

[The information follows:]

REALIGNMENT IMPACT

The shore establishment realignment necessitated substantial changes in the fiscal year 1974 MILCON program, at NAS Miramar and other stations. The stringent budgetary ceilings on MILCON dictated that many vitally needed projects be deferred to the fiscal year 1975 and later programs.

The present anticipated out year military construction program at NAS Miramar is as follows:

	Cost (thousands)
Fiscal year 1975:	
P-158.... AICUZ easements (LS).....	\$5,000
P-163.... Electrical distribution system improvements (LS).....	1,890
P-178.... Bachelor enlisted quarters (563 MN).....	3,155
P-182.... Acoustic enclosures (aircraft engine test) (LS).....	1,090
P-186.... Maintenance hangar (116,502 SF).....	6,583
P-175.... Dispensary addition and alteration (LS).....	2,314
Fiscal year total.....	20,032
Fiscal year 1976: P-167.... Jet fuel storage (1,134,000 GA).....	672
Fiscal year 1977:	
P-071.... Aircraft fixed start system (64 OL).....	3,228
P-092.... BOQ addition and modernization (165 MN).....	1,860
Fiscal year total.....	5,088
Fiscal year 1978:	
P-132.... Small arms range (outdoor) (16 FP).....	57
P-014.... Shed storage (supply) (19,300 SF).....	268
P-115.... Firefighting training facility (3,450 SF).....	268
Fiscal year total.....	593
Grand total.....	26,385

Mr. NICHOLAS. The project listing which I have here lists four projects: electrical distribution system improvements, an aircraft hangar for \$3.669 million, an aircraft apron for \$1.123 million, and bachelor enlisted quarters.

Of those, you mentioned two, the aircraft hangar and bachelor enlisted quarters.

Mr. TAYLOR. The electrical distribution system is a longstanding deficiency which has become critical as a result of the shore establishment realignment.

The maintenance hangar has doubled in cost.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. This also includes some updating in programming information. All of the projects are not tied in exactly with the SER requirement.

Mr. NICHOLAS. There is some discrepancy with respect to the scope of the maintenance hangar. The relocation would require \$3.7 million and you have in your long-range requirements \$6.6 million.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir. This could be a combination of the SER requirement with other normal requirements and we would prefer to unscramble that as well as the other for the record.

[The information follows:]

OUT-YEAR PROGRAM

The variance between the list totaling \$26,385 and referenced above and the \$14,830 shown in block f of the DD form 1390 is due primarily to the inclusion of projects associated with the shore establishment realignment and the noise pollution abatement program. The \$26,385 list of out year military construction projects is shown below with projects that are necessitated by the shore establishment realignment, marked with an asterisk:

Project	Project number	Thousands
Fiscal year::		
1975 AICUZ easements.....	158	\$5,000
1975 Electrical distribution system improvements.....	163	1,890
1975 Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	178	3,155
1975 Acoustic enclosures (aircraft engine test).....	182	1,090
1975 Maintenance hangar.....	186	6,583
1975 Dispensary addition and alteration.....	175	2,314
1976 Jet fuel storage.....	167	672
1977 Aircraft fixed start system.....	071	3,228
1977 BOQ addition and modernization.....	092	1,860
1978 Small arms range (outdoor).....	132	57
1978 Shed storage (supply).....	014	268
1978 Firefighting training facility.....	115	268
Total.....		26,385

1 Related to shore establishment realinement.

The project mentioned in the testimony above for an aircraft apron, \$1,123,000, is no longer required. A reevaluation of the project has shown that the requirement can be satisfied by existing assets.

The aircraft maintenance hangar project mentioned in the testimony above at a cost of \$3,669,000 was a preliminary cost estimate. The revised cost of \$6,583,000 is a more realistic estimate of the cost based upon more detailed engineering.

The cost of \$3,155,000 for the bachelor enlisted quarters is due primarily to existing deficiencies in bachelor housing; however, as previously furnished the committee staff, \$822,000 is due to Shore Establishment realinement requirements. This project may be deferred to a later program due to budgetary constraints.

Mr. SIKES. Does this also indicate that there have been further realinements since the base closure package came out, or that you are continuing to make shifts which were not included in the base closure package?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, Mr. Chairman, we have not.

Mr. SIKES. This is for construction requirements which were not known, not projected at the time that the budget was formulated, is that correct?

Admiral MARSCHALL. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. But it is in keeping with the base closure announcement?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You have here a project for an applied instruction building, \$1.123 million, and a pending requirement for an additional \$1.542 million. That is not correct, is it?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. The addition is \$419,000.

Mr. SIKES. You will explain for the record the details of that addition.

Mr. NICHOLAS. And the requirement for the original project?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

JUSTIFICATION FOR INCREASE

The NAS Miramar, CA project for an applied instruction building was originally sized to accommodate those maintenance and operational trainers presently located in buildings at NAS North Island, CA.

Concurrent with the phase-in of the E-2C aircraft at NAS Norfolk and the forthcoming shift of Norfolks' E-2B aircraft to the Pacific Fleet, a training device at NAS Glynco Georgia is scheduled to be moved to Miramar.

North Island also has an E-2B weapon system trainer mounted in trailers which will be updated and completely refurbished by the training device manufacturer. The refurbishing will include reconfiguring the trainer for installation in a building, at Miramar.

Consequently the project had to be increased in scope and cost to accommodate these two additional training devices.

Mr. SIKES. Can the committee be assured you are requesting what you will need as a result of the realignment, no more, no less?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. For 1974, yes, sir.

AVIONICS SHOP ADDITION

Mr. SIKES. Discuss the requirement for an addition to the avionics shop.

Mr. TAYLOR. The present avionics shop at NAS Miramar is sized to support only the station's loading of fighter aircraft.

The SER program will increase the station's loading by an E-2 training squadron and six E-2 fleet squadrons, totaling approximately 33 aircraft.

The additional avionics workload at Miramar due to these E-2 aircraft, with their complex radar, navigation, identification, communication, and other electronics equipment, cannot be met without an addition to the station's avionics shop.

PERSONNEL INCREASE

Mr. SIKES. What is the military population increase at Miramar as a result of these realignments, and how will they be housed?

Mr. TAYLOR. NAS Miramar is expected to gain 32 military personnel from NAS Imperial Beach. A fiscal year 1972 MCON project for an 852-man BEQ is approaching completion and will help to alleviate the impact of these transfers. The balance of the personnel will be housed on the civilian economy and paid quarters allowance.

UTILIZATION OF AIRFIELD

Mr. SIKES. In view of the apparent ability of Naval Air Station, Oceana, to handle both fighter and medium attack squadrons on the east coast, is Naval Air Station, Miramar, fully utilized without having the west coast medium attack squadrons stationed here?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, it is most definitely fully utilized and will continue to be so in the future as a result of our relocating these five VAW squadrons, plus an RAG squadron from North Island. This will fully utilize the airfield.

We have there presently around 350 aircraft, of which approximately one-third are deployed at any one time. Our facilities are not completely adequate to accommodate this number at the present time. We are continuing a program to upgrade them.

Mr. SIKES. For the record, I want to know how many aircraft in total will be stationed here and how many runway operations a day you are projecting. Compare that with 1970, and tell us how, in each instance, it compares to Oceana.

[The information follows:]

AIRCRAFT LOADING ON-BASE

The total number of aircraft stationed at NAS Oceana and NAS Miramar, for fiscal year 1970 and planned for fiscal year 1975, is as follows :

	Fiscal year—	
	1970	1975
NAS Oceana.....	297	
NAS Miramar.....	480	

The average daily aircraft operations for NAS Oceana and NAS Miramar for fiscal year 1970 and projected for fiscal year 1975 are as follows :

	Fiscal year—	
	1970	1975
NAS Oceana.....	206	
NAS Miramar.....	362	

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

Mr. DAVIS. I have just two catchup questions.

Number 1, why is there no 7th naval district?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The 7th naval district was disestablished shortly after World War II, Mr. Davis, and consolidated into the 6th naval district with headquarters at Charleston.

Mr. DAVIS. That was the one headquartered at New Orleans?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir; that is the eighth. The seventh was down in Florida headquartered at Jacksonville, I believe.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. DAVIS. In connection with Miramar, you used the term "master jet airport." What does that connote?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, we have certain air stations throughout the Navy which house one particular type of aircraft.

For example, Miramar is our West coast base for more of our fighter-type aircraft. You go on to Lemoore, it is our master station for attack-type aircraft. It sort of refers to them having a primary mission with one type of aircraft.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you.

NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER, CHINA LAKE, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Now we will return to China Lake, which we passed over yesterday.

[See page 751 for justification sheet.]

Mr. SIKES. The request is \$3.163 million for bachelor enlisted quarters and electrical distribution system improvements.

Now, will you show us the location of China Lake on your map and orient it with other principal cities and installations?

Mr. MURPHY. This roadmap is a good method of showing its relationship to the nearest large city, Los Angeles. It is 155 miles north-east to the China Lake site. The orange areas indicate the two test ranges that are available there.

TEST RANGES

Mr. SIKES. How many acres are contained in those test ranges?

Mr. MURPHY. In round figures, 1 million acres, 2,000 square miles. The center of operations, the airfield and support complex of China Lake is located here. There is an adjoining community called Ridgecrest. That makes up the population center for many hundreds of miles in the surrounding area.

These two ranges are used extensively for aerial weapons flights, aerial dropping and firing of ordnance as well as surface launching of ordnance at aerial targets.

Mr. SIKES. As distance problems become aggravated, weapons become more sophisticated and testing requires more space, do you interchange; in other words, do you launch flights over one area for impact in another area? You have two areas shown.

Mr. MURPHY. No, sir. Both areas are instrumented individually and they have proved adequate. This is approximately 40 miles distance north-south on the range. It has proved adequate.

LAND ACQUISITION

We have one shortcoming which we are working on in anticipating programing and that is acquisition of an approach corridor of about 13 miles by which the aircraft, in beginning their run up-range with their weapons, come over what is now becoming a built-up area. We are expecting to acquire a 1 mile by 13 mile strip to protect that as they run in.

Mr. SIKES. In what year?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Tentatively planned for 1976.

Mr. SIKES. Is this property developed?

Mr. MURPHY. Most of it is in possession of the Bureau of Land Management. Some areas are developed and we would be expecting to acquire the interest.

Mr. SIKES. It will not get any cheaper, you understand that?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I raise the question because of the gulf coast at Eglin; we have rather substantial ranges, but it now is necessary to use over-water ranges because of distance requirements.

The ranges at Eglin are not very different from those at China Lake. How long do you think the ranges at China Lake will be adequate?

WEAPONS TESTED

Mr. MURPHY. For the ordnance development at the moment, the availability of a 40-mile release distance, the most naval air-launched naval ordnance would be adequate for at least the next 10 years.

Mr. SIKES. Particularly if you get the approach zone?

Mr. MURPHY. If we get the approach zone, we expect, we will be in a good position for the foreseeable future for testing.

Mr. SIKES. What are you testing there?

Mr. MURPHY. It is known as the home of the Sidewinder missile. They developed the Sidewinder there. Many others, the Zuni, the 5-inch rocket, the three Ts, Terrier, Tartar and Talos surface-launched weapons are all developed and tested here.

OTHER SERVICES ALSO USE THE RANGE

Mr. SIKES. You know the trend is toward stand-off weapons with greater range. For the type of weapons that you listed, I can see that this range would have a longtime requirement.

Other than the approach zone which you have indicated, are there any other plans to acquire additional property?

Mr. MURPHY. No, sir, there are none at the moment. There is an adjoining area controlled by the Army. It is approximately here, Fort Erwin. I am not exactly familiar with what they do there, but that is owned in fee by the Army as these are mostly owned in fee by the Navy.

Mr. SIKES. That, as I understand, is primarily a National Guard training area at this time.

Mr. MURPHY. I would point out for our long standoff things like the Phoenix, that go out to 60, 80 miles, the F-14 program is presently underway and we are firing Phoenix on our Point Mugu range here on the Pacific missile range, which encompasses a wide area here.

To a large extent that is complementary to our ground firings here.

Mr. SIKES. I am sure that you realize that the future of Fort Erwin may be somewhat conjectural because it is now primarily being used for National Guard training as an artillery range. If it should be found surplus to Army requirements, it may be something the Navy would be interested in, Admiral.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, we will make a note to check on that.

Mr. MURPHY. We are looking and keeping close watch on the plans of the development of the Palmdale Intercontinental Airport to serve Los Angeles at this location. The potential patterns out of that should be developed and we are watching that carefully.

Mr. SIKES. We have already discussed somewhat the mission of the activity at China Lake and its relationship to other Navy R. & D.

FUTURE CONSTRUCTION PLANS

What are the major projects which are included in the \$10.515 billion shown as estimated authorization for the next 4 years?

Tell us briefly and provide the details for the record.

LASER RESEARCH—KIRKLAND AIR FORCE BASE

Admiral MARSCHALL. In 1975 there is a BOQ at a cost of \$704,000. In 1976 a communications facility of \$499,000, and land acquisition of \$542,000. In 1977 there is a laser systems research and development laboratory at \$3,896,000.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Could I ask a question there?

Have you thoroughly investigated the Air Force's capabilities at Kirkland Air Force Base with regard to laser ranges and other material?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, this laser facility would be worked in conjunction with our ranges here. In essence, it would provide space for scientific work now in progress in the Michelson Laboratory facility, which is the principal research facility we have, and also in scattered, makeshift facilities.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Given the fact that the atmosphere and so forth is quite similar at China Lake and at the Air Force facility, is there

any type of testing you would be doing which the Air Force could accomplish on their existing ranges or facilities?

Can you check into this?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We certainly shall check into it.

As you can see, this is in the 1977 program, Mr. Nicholas, rather far out at the moment. As we come closer on the range, we investigate much more carefully. Then again in 1978, aircraft ordnance loading apron of about \$1.5 million, and in 1979, the Michelson Laboratory addition, first increment, for \$3.374 million. That is total of the one-year program, Mr. Chairman.

[The information follows:]

The Navy, Air Force, and Army laser research programs are highly coordinated efforts including joint participation in many areas. The total program is coordinated by a formal Director of Defense Research and Engineering Laser Review Group. Specifically, the Superintendent of the Optical Sciences Division at the Naval Research Laboratory is a member of the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board for laser research at Kirkland Air Force Base. Also PMO-405, the Navy Program Office for such laser research, has had a Navy representative stationed physically at Kirkland Air Force Base for the last year and a half for in-depth technical and managerial coordination. The Navy will thoroughly investigate use of existing or planned Air Force facilities before proceeding with contraction for laser research facilities.

BACHELOR HOUSING

Mr. SIKES. What is the bachelor housing situation here? To what activities are the majority of these enlisted bachelors assigned? Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

Status of housing

	<i>Men</i>
Total bachelor housing requirement-----	434
Existing substandard space-----	¹ 936
Existing adequate space-----	0
Deficiency -----	434

¹ Cannot be made adequate.

These bachelor enlisted military personnel are assigned to the Naval Air Facility attached to the Naval Weapons Center in support of the flying mission here.

ELECTRICAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. SIKES. You rate the electrical distribution system improvements which you are requesting, in the amount of \$217,000, as having a priority of 79 in the bottom 20 percent of your program. That would place some question on the requirement, not the need, but the requirement. How often has the electric load exceeded the capacity of the distribution system in the past year?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, that project is in two parts. The transformer portion is for a transformer at the Salt Wells area of the complex, roughly out here. That transformer now at 1,500 kilowatts, has been right up to that maximum for the past two summers, when we have had to go to cooling fans and ice packing in order to keep that transformer from tripping out. It feeds a vital research complex.

The second part, which is replacing copper conductors on a feeder here in the central complex area, the current carrying ability of those

copper conductors is being overtaxed, they are overheating, with the result we get a drop in our current-carrying capacity. The new capacity will serve the laboratory area.

So in both portions of the project, for the past two summers we have been encountering full loads and partial overloads.

Mr. SIKES. Could you avoid this problem with closer attention to scheduling tests which may require high loads and testing at those times when the usage is low?

Mr. MURPHY. I would say no, sir, in that these are our daily, normal demands generated by the scientific spaces here at Salt Wells, as well as out at our propulsion area, and in the Michelson Lab.

NAVAL AIR STATION, NORTH ISLAND, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Naval Air Station, North Island, California, Place page 1-172 into the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 17 APR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. PROJECT FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			4. INSTALLATION NAVAL AIR STATION								
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET				5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 1451-808		6. STATE/COUNTRY NORTH ISLAND, CALIFORNIA									
7. STATUS ACTIVE				8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1917		9. COUNTY (U.S.) SAN DIEGO		10. NEAREST CITY 0.5 MILE SOUTH TO CORONADO							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Support aviation activities and other fleet operating forces through the provision of all necessary services, material, facilities, training and maintenance. <u>Major Functions:</u> Seaport Industrial Air Station Homeport for Aircraft Carriers <u>Major Activities Supported</u> Fleet ASW, Utility and Helicopter Squadrons Fleet Training Activities & Reserve Training Units Several Major Commands Naval Air Rework Facility <u>Major Programs Supported:</u> (NARF) Aircraft: F-4, F-8, E-2, C-2, H-3, H-46, H-53 Engines: J-79, T-58, T-64				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)		
							OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)		ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)
				A. AS OF 31 December 1972			1,556	12,442	9,055	115	178	29	30	0	23,405
				B. PLANNED (END FY 1979)			1,945	16,464	8,198	81	111	20	20	0	26,839
				13. INVENTORY											
				LAND			ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)		
				A. OWNED			2,866		14,872		117,572		132,444		
B. LEASES AND EASEMENTS			10,208* - 10#		4* - 1#		2* - 666#		669						
C. INVENTORY TOTAL (EXCEPT (EXC) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972)					72				133,113						
D. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY									39,989						
E. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM									2,642						
F. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS									46,223						
G. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)									221,967						
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
PROJECT DESIGNATION															
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b				TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM						
							SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h					
171.20	APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING				1	LS	-	476	-	476					
211.37	AVIONICS FACILITY				1	SF	32,504	-	32,504	1,640					
842.10	TRANSBAY WATER/SEWER LINES				1	LF	5,500	1,185	5,500	1,185					
<u>NAVAL AIR REWORK FACILITY</u>															
211.70	MAINTENANCE HANGAR ADDITION				32	SF	16,000	754	16,000	754					
							TOTAL	2,415		4,055					
1/ INCLUDES \$227,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT															

771

Naval Air Station, North Island, CA., \$4,055,000

This station is the Seaport Industrial Air Station for the San Diego area Naval Complex. It supports Fleet Anti-submarine Warfare and utility squadrons. The station has been designated the West Coast site and homeport for the new S-3A weapon system beginning in 1974. This station also supports the Naval Air Rework Facility. With the transfer of all helicopter activities from the Naval Air Station Imperial Beach, the station will become the homeport for all rotary wing aircraft squadrons.

The applied instruction building project will provide an addition to the existing training building for a Light Airborne Multi-Purpose System (LAMPS) operational flight trainer, and modifications to the existing building to accommodate helicopter operational and maintenance trainers.

The avionics facility project will provide a facility for maintaining the avionics equipment on aircraft now supported and for support of the new S-3A aircraft scheduled for Fleet introduction in 1974.

The transbay water/sewer lines project will remove old lines and replace them with new lines located at a greater depth to allow for dredging of the harbor.

At the Naval Air Rework Facility, the maintenance hangar project will provide an addition to the E-2 Rework hangar to accommodate the increased workload which has been generated by the move of complex electronic systems installed in the E-2 aircraft.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	\$89,203,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	72,205,414
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	79,887,908

Project	DESIGN INFORMATION	
	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Applied instruction building	\$22,850	0
Avionics facility	97,925	95
Transbay water/sewer line	47,282	33
Maintenance hangar addition	35,758	28

Mr. SIKES. The request is for an applied instruction building, for \$476,000; an avionics facility, for \$1,640,000; a trans-bay water/sewer line, at \$1,185,000; and an addition to the maintenance hangar at the Naval Air Rework Facility, for \$754,000.

REDUCTION OF NAVAL AIR STATION, IMPERIAL BEACH

Now I would like to have someone discuss the closure of the Naval Air Station at Imperial Beach. You have vigorously supported the need for Imperial Beach for several years and have now dumped it, we find. So tell us what was involved there, tell us about the costs and the savings, if any, of relocating to Naval Air Station, North Island. Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. TAYLOR. From the Naval Air Station, Imperial Beach, we are relocating to the Naval Air Station, North Island, 132 aircraft with 3,013 military personnel and 48 civilian personnel.

Mr. SIKES. Show it to us on the map.

Mr. TAYLOR. Imperial Beach is located about here, approximately 10 miles south of the city of San Diego. The air station at Imperial Beach will be retained by the Navy for use as an outlying landing field for the helicopters operating out of Naval Air Station, North Island. So it will still continue in operation as an outlying field requiring just less people to operate it.

Mr. SIKES. How many personnel are there now? How many will be there under the new function?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, we are relocating 3,013 military and 48 civilians. I would estimate that it would require around 100 personnel to man the tower, the fire crash equipment, et cetera.

Mr. SIKES. Most of the facilities will not be required?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most of the facilities will not be, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What are you going to do with those?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most of the facilities at Imperial Beach are World War II type structures. We have never been able to modernize the station. This is one of our reasons for selecting it for closure. Therefore, we would anticipate just not using them.

Mr. SIKES. Will they be put in standby for possible future emergencies?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir. They will be kept in a standby status for possible future use should the need arise.

Mr. SIKES. All right.

BASE CLOSURE SAVINGS

Admiral MARSCHALL. On this particular base closure, Mr. Chairman, the estimated annual savings are \$3.290 million, as opposed to a one-time closure cost of \$2.237 million.

We are not walking away from the facility, as Mr. Taylor has indicated.

Mr. SIKES. How does it come to be excess to your needs?

Do you have a smaller training program, is that it?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. It is not that there is a smaller training program. The training will remain about the same.

However, as I indicated earlier, we have such minimal facilities—speaking of vertical construction now—in the manner of training buildings, hangars, et cetera, and there are three facilities available at North Island and it just made sense to fully utilize North Island to its maximum potential and keep this as an outlying landing field to continue conducting our training operation.

Mr. SIKES. Will there be a requirement for new construction elsewhere as a result of the transfer of personnel?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir, there will.

Mr. SIKES. How much?

Admiral MARSCHALL. In the 1974 program, Mr. Chairman, there is a figure of \$1.454 million, and beyond that, in 1975, \$15.777 million.

Mr. SIKES. Has that been weighted against the cost of continuing to operate at Imperial Beach?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, it has.

Mr. SIKES. What you are saving, I presume, is not the cost of facilities which would have to be constructed sooner or later at either place, but the cost of administration, is that it?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Basically that is what we are saying, Mr. Chairman, because in our figures here there is a military construction cost avoided at Imperial Beach of \$18.999 million; as you can see, the total military construction required as a result of this move is approximately \$17 million. So we are saving some of our projected military construction costs.

Mr. SIKES. Do you propose to excess any property at Imperial Beach?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Not at the air station at Imperial Beach, no, sir.

LAND ACQUISITION AT IMPERIAL BEACH

Mr. SIKES. There was a land acquisition program in progress. Was that completed?

Mr. MARKON. This program is 99-percent complete. We have only one small easement outstanding.

Mr. SIKES. What did you do with the newly acquired land?

Mr. MARKON. It was acquired to provide an additional buffer zone for the helicopter operation around the facility. Since it will still be used, the land is still necessary.

Mr. SIKES. For the continued operation of the base, you would still require the land for which you are completing the acquisition?

Mr. MARKON. That is right, sir.

CONSTRUCTION REQUIRED DUE TO REALIGNMENT

Mr. NICHOLAS. You mentioned a figure of \$15 million in connection with the closure of Imperial Beach. Now, very little of that construction will actually occur at the Naval Air Station, North Island; is that correct?

The majority of it would occur at Miramar, which receives most of the missions from North Island?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Right.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Where else?

This fact sheet says "NAS, San Diego."

Commander KIRKPATRICK. There are four projects at Miramar in the 1975 program; there are two projects at Miramar in the 1974 program, and at Naval Air Station, North Island, there are two projects in the 1975 program.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Would you spell those out for the record?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

PROJECTS TO FACILITATE TRANSFER OF NAS IMPERIAL BEACH MISSIONS

The following projects have been requested in the fiscal year 1974 program to facilitate the planned closure of Naval Air Station, Imperial Beach, Calif.:

Location and project

NAS Miramar, Calif., avionics shop addition.....	\$331
NAS Miramar, Calif., applied instruction building.....	1, 542
NAS North Island, Calif., applied instruction building.....	476

The fiscal year 1975 projects mentioned in the testimony above and shown in the listing previously provided the committee staff have been reevaluated and result in the projects listed below:

Location and project

NAS Miramar, Calif., aircraft hanger.....	\$6, 583
NAS Miramar, Calif., bachelor enlisted quarters.....	¹ 822
NAS North Island, Calif., hangar alterations.....	1, 750
NAS North Island, Calif., intermediate level maintenance facility.....	1, 534

¹Partial requirement due to shore establishment realignment. Full requirement is \$3,155,000.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Could we go off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. NICHOLAS. Thank you.

Mr. SIKES. How many military personnel will be relocated to North Island from Imperial Beach with the transfer of the Fleet Aviation Specialized Operational Training Group, the Naval Aviation Maintenance Training Detachment, fleet helicopter squadrons, and Reserve units, including a helicopter squadron?

How many military personnel will be moved out as a result of the relocation of the carrier airborne early warning squadrons from North Island to Miramar?

What type and how many aircraft are involved? Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

Three thousand thirteen military personnel are being transferred from NAS Imperial Beach to NAS North Island.

One thousand three military personnel are being transferred from North Island to NAS Miramar, leaving North Island with a net gain of 2,010 military personnel.

The fiscal year 1973 base loading at North Island is approximately 137 aircraft. Of these, approximately 20 are E-2B aircraft which will be transferred to Miramar. The fiscal year 1973 base loading at Imperial Beach, all of which will transfer to North Island, is approximately 132 aircraft, all helicopters. The projected fiscal year 1978 base loading for North Island is approximately _____ aircraft.

Mr. SIKES. I note that last year the current onboard strength as of December 31, was shown as 28,287 versus 23,405 shown a year later. Likewise, the long-range strength here was shown last year to be projected at 30,104; this year you are projecting 26,839. How do you explain this? Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

The decrease between fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972 is due to the decommissioning of one ASW aircraft carrier, the CVS-14—*Ticonderoga*—one CVA aircraft carrier, CVA-63—*Kitty Hawk*—undergoing selected restricted availability at Hunters Point and to decreases in NARF strength occasioned by workload decreases. The decrease in projected strength between fiscal year 1974 and fiscal year 1975 is due to the reduction in the number of supported personnel and to anticipated further decreases in NARF personnel. However, when NARF North Island, fully absorbs the T-79 engine workload due to the closure of NARF Quonset Point, a personnel increase can be expected. Such an increase was not considered at the time the fiscal year 1974 personnel data sheet was prepared.

Mr. NICHOLAS. At North Island, could you provide details in the record showing exactly what the force levels are and how they are changed?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Surely.

[The information follows:]

PROJECTED FORCE LEVELS

The past, present, and projected force level for NAS North Island are as follows:

	Dec. 31, 1971	Dec. 31, 1972	Dec. 31, 1974
Permanent:			
Officer.....	1, 777	1, 556	1, 860
Enlisted.....	14, 782	12, 442	13, 918
Civilian.....	9, 656	9, 055	9, 100
Student:			
Officer.....	155	115	124
Enlisted.....	480	178	247
Supported:			
Officer.....	437	29	29
Enlisted.....	1, 000	30	30
Civilian.....			45
Total.....	28, 287	23, 405	25, 353

Note: The decrease between 1971 and 1972 is due to the decommissioning of 1 ASW aircraft carrier, CVS-14, *Ticonderoga*. The increase between 1972 and 1974 is due to personnel being relocated from NAS Imperial Beach.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR CARRIER AIRCRAFT

Mr. SIKES. Were projected strengths shown last year based on keeping more Navy aircraft in inventory than would be supportable by a 12-carrier force level?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. The projections that we showed you last year, as well as those this year, are based upon a 12-carrier force level.

Mr. NICHOLAS. In our committee's hearing last year, and I suppose this is unclassified now, there was a statement which said that the Navy was not programming its construction for aircraft on a 12-carrier force level because it was considered unrealistic.

I believe at that time, and it is in the record, the construction program was based on a higher force level for the carrier aircraft than would have been justified by the number of carriers projected.

Could you double-check that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will double-check it.

I know the Navy has resisted going to the 12-carrier force. However, we have been told that we are going to a 12-carrier force. Therefore, we have all along used this in our planning factor for our future years.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Could you double-check that, because the statement was made in the record last year that it would be unwise to reduce military construction based on the lower force level.

Admiral MARSCHALL. In this committee?

Mr. NICHOLAS. In this committee's hearing there was a statement to the effect that you were not basing your military construction planning on the lower force level.

Mr. TAYLOR. Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. NICHOLAS. Check what was supplied for the record last year and supply the information.

[The information follows:]

The military construction appropriations for 1973 hearings held Friday, March 10, 1972, contain information (pages 43 and 44, part II, Navy hearings) provided for the record pertinent to the carrier and tactical air force levels.

A review of the original classified document provided for the record show a future force level of 12 carriers. It further shows slight reduction in carrier aircraft levels.

This year information provided for the record also shows a planned 12 carrier force and reiterates the Navy's plans to reduce carrier aircraft levels, keeping carrier aircraft levels compatible with carrier levels.

However, the base structure and numbers of carrier aircraft upon which the Navy based its fiscal year 1973 military construction program were not commensurate with a 12 carrier force level.

AIRCRAFT AT NORTH ISLAND

Mr. SIKES. Is the number of aircraft here increasing or decreasing?

Mr. TAYLOR. The number of aircraft at this activity will be increasing, sir, as a result of the realinement from Imperial Beach. We will be adding 132 aircraft to our existing 94.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the numbers of squadrons of each type and the numbers of aircraft which you have had at North Island for the last 3 years, and compare this to the projections based upon the shore establishment realinements.

[The information follows:]

AIRCRAFT LOADING

The base loading at NAS North Island for the last 3 years is as follows:

Fiscal year 1971:

Station.....	22 mixed aircraft.
Early warning.....	6 squadrons with 43 E-1, E-2 aircraft.
Carrier ASW.....	7 squadrons with 56 S-2 aircraft.
Reserve.....	2 squadrons with 31 P-2, S-2 aircraft.
Miscellaneous.....	1 composite squadron with 13 mixed aircraft.
Total.....	165 aircraft.

Fiscal year 1972:

Station.....	15 mixed aircraft.
Early warning.....	6 squadrons with 40 E-1, E-2 aircraft.
Carrier ASW.....	7 squadrons with 47 S-2 aircraft.
Reserve.....	3 squadrons with 18 E-1, S-2 aircraft.
Miscellaneous.....	2 composite squadrons with 9 mixed aircraft.
	5 C-1, H-46 aircraft assigned to homeported ships.
Total.....	134 aircraft.

Fiscal year 1973:

Station.....	15 mixed aircraft.
Early warning.....	6 squadrons with 43 E-1, E-2 aircraft.
Carrier ASW.....	7 squadrons with 52 S-2 aircraft.
Reserve.....	3 squadrons with 18 E-1, S-2 aircraft.
Miscellaneous.....	1 composite squadron with 6 mixed aircraft.
	3 C-1 aircraft assigned to homeported ships.
Total.....	137 aircraft.

The planned fiscal year 1978 base loading is:
 [The information was classified.]

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. Do you plan to accommodate the Reserve Forces at Imperial Beach?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, the Naval Air Reserve units with 8 helicopters and some 100 active duty and 300 reservists will relocate to North Island as well from Imperial Beach. They will use Imperial Beach as an OLF in their training.

Mr. SIKES. Will they require facilities and construction that were not listed in the previous discussion.

Mr. MURPHY. No, sir, they will use the facilities as available.

Mr. NICHOLAS. To the extent that they are using existing facilities, hangars, and so forth, which might be used by the Active Forces had the Reserves not been relocated here, is that going to increase your requirement for hangars and have you taken that into account?

Mr. TAYLOR. Just for your information, we have existing Reserve Forces at North Island to fly the fixed-wing-type aircraft. The ones coming from Imperial Beach will be able to utilize some of the same facilities that the fixed-wing-type reserve at North Island are presently using.

Mr. NICHOLAS. But you are increasing the total number of reserve aircraft there?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Could you provide details for the record? Also show the facilities which will be required.

[The information follows:]

RESERVE FORCE LEVEL

The Naval Air Reserve forces presently at NAS North Island are as follows:

VS-81—8 aircraft	-----	(S-2)
VAW-88—4 aircraft	-----	(E-1)
VAW-307—3 aircraft	-----	(E-1)

The Naval Air Reserve force to be transferred to NAS North Island from NAS Imperial Beach consists of HS-84, with eight SH-3 helicopters. The hangars at North Island being vacated by the E-2 squadrons will be adequate for the fleet and Reserve helicopter squadrons being relocated.

FUTURE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. What projects will be required at North Island as a result of the relocations?

Provide that and your \$46,223,000 out-year program for the record and indicate which projects are related to relocations.

[The information follows:]

The projects required at NAS North Island as a result of the shore establishment realignment are as follows:

<u>FY</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>(\$000)</u>
1974	Applied Instruction Building	\$ 476
1975	Intermediate Level Maintenance Facility	1,534
1975	Hangar Alterations	1,750

The variances between these projects and the project listings previously provided to the Committee Staff are due to the continuing reevaluation of requirements versus existing assets.

The Shore Establishment Realignment necessitated substantial changes in the FY 1974 MILCON Program at NAS North Island and other stations. The stringent budgetary ceilings on MILCON dictated that many vitally needed projects be deferred to the FY 1975 and later programs. The \$46,223,000 out year program has grown to \$50,503,000. The presently anticipated military construction program at NAS North Island is as follows:

1975	Maintenance Hangar (S-3)	\$5,740
	Aircraft Parking Apron (S-3)	942
	Vapor Collection and Recovery	175
	Intermediate Level Maintenance Facility (SER)	1,534
	Hangar Alterations (SER)	1,750
	Crash Crew Fire Training	250
	Acoustic Enclosure (S-3)	910
	Turbojet Acoustic Enclosures	600
	Engine Parts Coating (NARF)	683
	Pollution Abatement (NARF)	6,904
Acoustic Enclosure (F-4) (NARF)	<u>600</u>	
	FY Total	20,088
1976	Fire/Rescue Facility - San Clemente	1,025
	Water/Air Quaywall	1,842
	Data Processing Center	2,966
	Bachelor Officers' Quarters w/Mess	3,975
	Avionics Facility (2nd Increment) (NARF)	6,719
	Shipboard Equipment Repair Facility (NARF)	<u>1,327</u>
	FY Total	17,854
1977	Applied Training Building	2,076
	Barracks	3,529
	Barracks/Communications Facility SIERE Comp	630
	EM Club	<u>1,657</u>
	FY Total	7,892
1978	Operations Building/Terminal	3,200
	Aviation Support Equipment Maintenance Bldg	580
	Hot Water System (1st Increment)	<u>889</u>
	FY Total	4,669
	GRAND TOTAL	\$50,503

AVIONICS FACILITY

Mr. SIKES. You are again requesting an avionics facility. Is it not possible to utilize space in the NARF avionics facility?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir, it is not.

As a matter of fact, the NARF has a deficiency in avionics space requiring about double the amount they presently have in existence. Therefore, it is not possible to use their space for our requirement.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS FROM QUONSET POINT NARF

Mr. SIKES. Will the transfer of functions from NARF Quonset Point require the construction of additional facilities at NARF, North Island?

Mr. MURPHY. No, sir, Mr. Chairman.

The transfer involves J-79 engine overhaul, which is now performed at North Island. It will be absorbed within those facilities.

SAN DIEGO HARBOR DREDGING

Mr. SIKES. I would like to discuss the transbay water/sewerlines and indicate the status of the Corps of Engineers dredging project.

Would this dredging be required if the relocation of Navy ships from Long Beach were not to take place?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

This is a long-standing Corps of Engineers dredging project which was long before our shore establishment realignment.

The Corps of Engineers is doing their work primarily to accommodate the commercial shipping in the San Diego area.

The corps anticipates awarding a dredging contract in February of 1974, and they will start their dredging. As a matter of fact it would be easier to show it on the map which I have.

The Corps of Engineers dredging extends considerably south of the naval station. They anticipate starting at this southern end and dredging a channel in this manner.

Mr. SIKES. So this has no direct connection with the naval project?

Mr. TAYLOR. No connection whatsoever, sir.

HANGAR SPACE

Mr. SIKES. What is the program for providing hangar space at North Island?

Mr. TAYLOR. We are anticipating, sir, programing a hangar in fiscal year 1975 to accommodate the S-3 aircraft, which will be arriving at North Island beginning in February of 1974. In the interim, we will have to use existing hangars used by the S-2 fixed wing aircraft.

CLOSURE OF QUONSET POINT NARF

Mr. NICHOLAS. Going back for a moment to the naval air rework facility, we have not yet asked for the savings as a result of the closure of the NARF at Quonset Point.

This base, I believe, is the major recipient of those activities, or one of the largest. Include in the record at this point the costs and savings resulting from the closure of the naval air rework facility there.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We will provide it for the record.
[The information follows:]

RELOCATION COSTS AND SAVINGS

The closure of Quonset Point complex will result in the closure of NARF Quonset Point and the transfer of NARF workload to four other remaining NARF's and to commercial rework firms. The principal workload moving to NARF North Island is J-79 engine, marine turbine and H-3 helicopter rework. A recent review indicates that an engine parts coating facility in the amount of \$685,000 may be required in fiscal year 1975 at North Island to support this action. The annual O. & M.N. savings resulting from excessing of the Quonset Point NARF facilities are not individually identified to gaining activities, this amount having been lumped together with overall complex figures. The closure of NARF Quonset Point fosters an overall NARF utilization rate in the vicinity of 88 percent, by assigning work where surplus capacity exists. The closure also fosters accomplishment of the rework mission by consolidating operations so that maximum productivity can be gained within the declining civilian work force ceiling imposed on NARF industrial operations by the Secretary of Defense. No specific savings data is available concerning utilization rate and manpower productivity.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Murphy left something out.

Mr. MURPHY. I checked my notes and would like to correct a statement.

With regard to the move of the J-79 to North Island from Quonset, one project is required, an engine parts coating facility, which will accept the equipment we relocate from Quonset. We will program that cost next year at a cost of about \$700,000. That is the only project.

Mr. SIKES. Is the NARF facility at Quonset Point to be completely closed?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You have been saying for some years that you may have had one NARF facility too many. Does this eliminate that problem?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir; I think it does.

I think the utilization factor on NARF's as a result of this reduction by one will be very, very high for all of the remaining NARF's.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

CORPS OF ENGINEERS DREDGING PROJECT

Mr. DAVIS. One statement, that the Corps of Engineers project had no connection with what we are talking about here has me puzzled.

What is the purpose of that Corps of Engineers project if it has no connection here?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is primarily to accommodate commercial shipping in the San Diego channel.

Mr. DAVIS. It is of no particular benefit to the Navy?

Mr. TAYLOR. It does help the Navy. When we get to the Naval Station, San Diego, we will discuss a \$10 million pier that we have in the program before you.

The benefit is that the Navy does not have to dredge from our naval station out to where the channel is now at the depth we require.

Our project contains only enough dredging to intercept the area to be dredged by the corps.

Admiral MARSCHALL. But the whole basis of that project was to open up and develop lower San Diego Bay to commercial interests.

FLEET COMBAT DIRECTION SYSTEMS TRAINING CENTER
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. DAVIS. Turn to the Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, San Diego.

Place page 177 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 19 FEB 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. INSTALLATION FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		5. INSTALLATION FLEET COMBAT DIRECTION SYSTEMS TRAINING CENTER, PACIFIC									
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING				6. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 3140-800		8. STATE/COUNTRY SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA									
7. STATUS ACTIVE				9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1943		9. COUNTY (U.S.) SAN DIEGO		10. NEAREST CITY WITHIN CITY							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Provide training in operation and employment of specified tactical combat direction and control systems in Naval Warfare, and support operational commanders in evaluation, development, and analysis of Naval Warfare doctrines and tactics.						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 1972	93	424	6	220	400	93	51	110	1,397
						b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	98	379	6	245	435	93	51	125	1,432
13. INVENTORY						LAND COST (\$000)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000)		TOTAL (\$000)					
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)							
a. OWNED		91		40		4,463		4,503							
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		-		-		-		0							
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72								4,503							
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								0							
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								1,118							
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								0							
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								5,621							
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
PROJECT DESIGNATION					TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM						
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b						SCOPE c	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h					
171.10	ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION BUILDING				44	SF	26,300	1,118	26,300	1,118					

Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, Calif., \$1,118,000.

This center provides antiair warfare training for fleet personnel to develop and perfect their skills by the actual operation of tactical command and direction control system in a realistic warfare environment.

The academic instruction building project will provide classrooms and related spaces to support 6 new courses and the installation of new systems and equipment for 13 existing courses. Spaces in seven inadequate obsolete buildings, will be replaced.

Status of funds :

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973-----	\$1,556,336
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)-----	1,556,336
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)-----	1,556,336

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Academic instruction building-----	\$57,646	100

Mr. SIKES. This is for \$1,118,000 for an academic instruction building. This building has a priority of 44. What is the urgency for it?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Captain Watson is prepared to discuss this.

Captain WATSON. This project is to replace several old buildings and alleviate overcrowding in the large permanent present school facility.

The school trains enlisted and officer personnel in the actual operation of tactical command and control systems.

As the new ships come into the fleet, additional systems will be installed in this building and personnel trained on them.

The present facilities are becoming more and more crowded with the added new equipments. This project will provide academic instruction, freeing up space in the present permanent structure for the new equipments that will simulate the LHA and the DD-963 types, for instance.

Mr. SIKES. What will you do with the buildings you vacate?

Captain WATSON. The seven vacated buildings will be torn down, 67 buildings will be demolished.

NAVAL ELECTRONICS LABORATORY CENTER, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Naval Electronics Laboratory Center.

Insert in the record page 179.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 19 FEB 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		FY 19 74: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			3. INSTALLATION NAVAL ELECTRONICS LABORATORY CENTER									
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL				5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 2910-600			6. STATE/COUNTRY SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA									
7. STATUS ACTIVE				8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1906			9. COUNTY (U.S.) - SAN DIEGO		10. NEAREST CITY WITHIN CITY							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS The principal Navy RDT&E Center for electronics technology and command control and communications concepts and systems. MAJOR FUNCTIONS: NELC supports the Fleet and Marine Corps for the following electronic systems, sub-systems and technologies: Command control and communications; Electromagnetic surveillance, identification and navigation; Electronic warfare; Shipboard internal communications; Information collection, processing, transmission and display; Electromagnetic propagation; Electro-optics and optics; Computer and software technology; Antennas and antenna systems; Electronic materials, components and circuits; Automatic test and monitoring equipment; Electronic systems effectiveness engineering; Human factors technology; and Bioelectronics.				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 DEC 1972		34	65	1,497	0	0	19	30	647			2,292
				B. PLANNED (END FY 1979)		38	55	1,579	0	0	22	40	757			2,491
						INVENTORY										
13.		LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)						
A. OWNED		148		10		11,682		11,692								
B. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		1* - 0#		0		97* - 0#		97								
C. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72								11,789								
D. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								0								
E. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								3,518								
F. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								5,075								
G. GRAND TOTAL (C + D + E + F)								20,362								
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS																
CATEGORY CODE NO.		PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM						
a		b				PRIORITY	d	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000)	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000)					
								e	f	g	h					
310.34		ELECTRONICS DEVELOPMENT & TEST LABORATORY (1ST INCREMENT)				25	SF	39,000	3,518	39,000	3,518					

NAVAL ELECTRONICS LABORATORY CENTER, SAN DIEGO, CALIF., \$3,518,000

This laboratory is the principal Navy R.D.T. & E. center for electronics technology and command control and communications concepts and systems.

The electronics development and test laboratory project will provide the first increment of a controlled electronics environment with electromagnetic shielding for integration and testing of command control communications and surveillance system. This facility is required for try-before-buy performance testing by early 1976 of electronic systems for new construction DLG's, DD's, LHA's, ocean surveillance information system, integrated combat systems, and anti-submarine warfare force command control communications system.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973.....	\$1,385,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual).....	1,378,775
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	1,378,775

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Electronics development and test laboratory (1st increment),.....	\$168,864	10

ELECTRONICS LABORATORY

Mr. SIKES. The request is for \$2,518,000 for an electronics development and test laboratory. Where are you performing this function now?

Captain WATSON. Presently we are using, Mr. Chairman, underground bunkers, which are at old Fort Roescrantz, and trailers.

We were until recently also using the old aircraft carrier *Bunker Hill*, tied up at North Island. This has since been sold for scrap.

The project is required to support the development or initial assembling of command and control, communications, surveillance-electronics warfare equipments, prior to installation on a ship to insure that the equipments are compatible.

The Navy used the *Bunker Hill* for the mockups for the *Nimitz*. The requirement is for 39,000 square feet of shielded laboratory space. This space would be developed on the seaward side of Point Loma, which would shield it electronically from the city of San Diego.

Mr. Murphy will point to the location.

This laboratory is the only one of its kind that the Navy has and is necessary for new types of ships coming into the fleet.

Mr. SIKES. This is the first increment. What will be the total cost?

Captain WATSON. The total cost will be \$9 million. The first increment is a \$3.5 million project. The second increment is a \$5 million increment, which is being considered for the 1975 program. The third increment is presently unprogramed for \$784,000.

Mr. SIKES. Are there similar facilities in other services in the Department of Defense?

Captain WATSON. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. None?

Captain WATSON. No, sir. This is a facility strictly for assembling the equipment that makes up a command and control installation for a ship, and the location is such that it can be used with preprogramed inputs to the equipments or with the ships at sea, just off the coast at this location.

Mr. SIKES. All right. Questions?

Dr. DAVIS. No questions.

NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Naval Station, San Diego. Place page 181 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 17 APR 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. PROGRAM FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			4. INSTALLATION NAVAL STATION											
5. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET				6. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 6030-690		7. STATE/COUNTRY SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA												
8. STATUS ACTIVE			9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1922		10. COUNTY (U.S.) SAN DIEGO		11. NEAREST CITY WITHIN CITY											
12. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Provides homeport facilities for ships of the Pacific Fleet, including warships, amphibious ships and auxiliaries. Provides exchanges, personnel services athletic and recreational services, messing and berthing, harbor and waterfront services, other logistic services, and security services for ships and commands in the area and for dependent commands.					13. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)				
					OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)						
					A. AS OF 31 December 1972					2,318	29,489	4,453	40	458	10	1,203	0	37,971
					B. PLANNED (End FY 1976)					2,576	36,337	4,453	128	548	10	1,203	0	45,255
14. INVENTORY					LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)					
					A. OWNED		1,486		8,123		40,118		48,241					
					B. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		41* - 0#		0* - 0#		1,893		1,893					
					C. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972									50,134				
					D. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY									12,801				
					E. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM									17,941 1/				
F. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS									25,542									
G. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)									106,418									
15. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS																		
CATEGORY CODE NO. a		PROJECT DESIGNATION PROJECT TITLE b			TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM SCOPE e		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f		FUNDING PROGRAM SCOPE g		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h					
151.20		BERTHING PIER			/	FB	2,960		10,000		2,960		10,000					
812.30		PIER UTILITIES			/	LS	-		1,996		-		1,996					
							TOTAL		11,996				11,996					
1/ INCLUDES \$5,945,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT																		

788

This station provides homeport facilities for ships of the Pacific Fleet; provides personnel services, berthing, harbor services, and other logistic support. The berthing pier project will provide additional berthing space required to accommodate ships being relocated from the Naval Station, Long Beach.

The pier utilities project will provide "cold iron" utilities and structural repairs to pier 5. Existing utilities do not have the capacity required to allow ships to go "cold iron."

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973-----	\$27,738,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)-----	17,583,978
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)-----	22,419,672

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Berthing pier-----	\$48,000	0
Pier utilities-----	45,000	10

Mr. SIKES. The request is for a berthing pier for \$10 million, and pier utilities for \$1,996,000. We have already discussed the shore establishment realignment with regard to San Diego and Long Beach.

Will you show us again on the map where you would provide support for carriers?

Captain WATSON. Mr. Chairman, the carriers are supported at North Island at berths L through P.

PIER FACILITIES LONG BEACH AND SAN DIEGO

Mr. SIKES. Could you have retained North Island as an aircraft carrier support activity and relocated the ships and functions at Naval Station San Diego to Long Beach?

Captain WATSON. No, sir. There is inadequate space for expansion at Long Beach.

The major problem at Long Beach presently is the shortage of pier space for the fleet. If this new pier at the San Diego Naval Station was not built, at least one new pier would be required at Long Beach.

Mr. SIKES. Does that mean it is a standoff? Is it just a matter of where you build the pier?

Captain WATSON. Yes, sir.

In fact, there is only one pier required at the Naval Station, San Diego, whereas these two piers, piers 15 and 16 at Long Beach, would require extension as well as one or two more piers on the quay wall at Long Beach if the fleet remains.

Mr. SIKES. What would be the cost at Long Beach for the pier facilities?

Captain WATSON. Approximately \$20 million, but I would like to correct that for the record.

[The information follows:]

Long Beach pier construction

The following pier construction and modernization projects would be required to continue operations at Naval Station, Long Beach :

Pier 1 extension.....	\$1, 844, 000
New pier 13.....	5, 207, 000
New pier 14.....	4, 621, 000
Replace pier 17.....	2, 694, 000
Increased utilities, pier 15.....	911, 000
Increased utilities, pier 9.....	2, 346, 000
Pier sewerage systems.....	3, 535, 000
Total	21, 428, 000

Mr. NICHOLAS. In answer to the chairman's question you indicated, I think, that the pier at San Diego was required in order to handle the items transferring from Long Beach.

Captain WATSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. What would be required at Long Beach in order to handle all the ships at San Diego in terms of pier facilities?

Captain WATSON. I do not believe we could build enough piers. There is not enough room within the basin to handle all of the ships from San Diego and Long Beach, together.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The long-range development plans at Long Beach, based upon the city of Los Angeles port development plans, anticipated that they might be able to develop pier facilities on the outside of the mole.

Captain WATSON. The city is developing this area presently.

Mr. NICHOLAS. They felt that the city's project provided protection from the sea, therefore they could put berthing spaces on the outside of the mole.

Captain WATSON. This entire space would have to be developed before piers could be built here.

Mr. NICHOLAS. If that were the case, could you accommodate all of them?

Captain WATSON. If the face of this mole could be developed for the ships, I feel, yes, the ships could be moved from San Diego.

Mr. SIKES. What would be the cost?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Let me answer that, please, sir.

Mr. SIKES. All right, sir.

Admiral MARSCHALL. I will quote from Secretary Sanders' earlier statement :

"Simply to retain the present number of ships at Long Beach would require at the minimum the expenditure of \$31 million over the next few years to provide the waterfront and supply support facilities to meet current standards for those ships."

In addition, of course, he points out the desirability of San Diego with respect to the many training facilities there. But the figure of \$31 million for piers and supply support is the figure that he used.

Captain WATSON. That is inside the harbor, without going outside.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the types and numbers of ships based at each of these naval stations.
[The information follows:]

HOMEPORT ASSIGNMENTS

SHIPS HOMEPORTED AT LONG BEACH, END FISCAL YEAR 1973

Two (AD) destroyer tenders; 6 (AO) fleet oilers; 2 (AOE) fast combat support ships; 3 (AOR) replenishment fleet oilers; 1 (AR) repair ship; 1 (CGN) nuclear powered guided missile cruiser; 3 (DD) destroyers; 4 (DD) destroyers—Naval Reserve; 4 (DDG) guided missile destroyers; 11 (DE) escort ships; 1 (DEG) guided missile escort ship; 2 (DLG) guided missile frigates; 2 (DLGN) nuclear powered guided missile frigates; 1 (LKA) amphibious cargo ship; 1 (LPD) amphibious transport dock; 1 (LPH) amphibious assault ship; 3 (LSD) dock landing ships; 3 (LST) tank landing ships; 3 (MSO) ocean minesweepers; 2 (MSO) ocean minesweepers—Naval Reserve; 2 (MSC) coastal minesweepers—Naval Reserve. Total all types: 58.

SHIPS HOMEPORTED AT SAN DIEGO, END FISCAL YEAR 1973

Two (AD) destroyer tenders; 1 (AGSS) auxiliary submarine; 2 (AR) repair ships; 2 (AS) submarine tenders; 2 (ASR) submarine rescue ships; 10 (ATF) fleet tugs; 1 (CG) guided missile cruiser; 1 (CV) aircraft carrier; 1 (CVA) attack carrier; 10 (DD) destroyers; 7 (DDG) guided missile destroyers; 13 (DE) escort ships; 2 (DEG) guided missile escort ships; 8 (DLG) guided missile frigates; 1 (LCC) amphibious command ship; 3 (LKA) amphibious cargo ships; 1 (LPA) amphibious transport ship; 6 (LPD) amphibious transport docks; 2 (LPH) amphibious assault ships; 4 (LSD) dock landing ships; 7 (LST) tank landing ships; 16 (SS) and (SSN) submarines; 2 (DD) destroyers—Naval Reserve; 1 (MSC) coastal minesweeper—Naval Reserve; 1 (MSO) ocean minesweeper—Naval Reserve. Total all types: 106.

Mr. SIKES. I know you have answered this in part. Would Long Beach Naval Station, with an investment of \$10 million in pier facilities, have had sufficient berthing space to handle the ships stationed at Naval Station, San Diego?

Captain WATSON. No, sir. The total number of ships at both the Naval Station Long Beach and the Naval Station San Diego requires approximately 21,000 feet of berthing. If the ships were sent to Long Beach, the 21,000 feet would be required there. Long Beach only has approximately 4,700 feet of berthing. This would leave a deficit of 15,300 feet at a probable construction cost of over \$32 million. This assumes we could use the area outside the mole, which at present we cannot. Then, too, we would need to add other facilities such as warehousing, fuel supply, and other logistics and personnel support facilities. I am certain we would have to spend well over \$100 million for the relocation.

LONG BEACH AND SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND HOUSING INVENTORIES COMPARED

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the family housing inventory and off-base support situation at both San Diego and Long Beach.

[The information follows:]

Inventory of family housing and off-base support as of January 31, 1973

Long Beach, Calif. :	
Military controlled assets :	
Military owned—adequate.....	1, 412
Military owned—inadequate.....	986
Not military controlled :	
Suitably housed in private housing.....	4, 074
Unsuitably housed in private housing.....	1, 269
San Diego, Calif. :	
Military controlled assets :	
Military owned—adequate.....	4, 989
Not military controlled :	
Suitably housed in private housing.....	24, 287
Unsuitably housed in private housing.....	5, 224

EXPANSION CAPABILITIES OF TWO NAVAL BASES

Mr. SIKES. Can you compare the capacity for future expansion of facilities at the naval stations at San Diego and Long Beach?

Captain WATSON. As far as the stations themselves are concerned, there is a similar capability for future expansion. The real problem would be cost of developing outside of the mole at Long Beach which would require a breakwater for protection of the newly formed outer harbor. Then we still would not be able to accommodate all of the logistics functions that are presently available at San Diego. Additionally, we would be moving away from our Fleet training facilities at San Diego where refresher courses and advanced courses are conducted on short term for ships personnel.

PROJECTS REQUIRED AT SAN DIEGO

Mr. SIKES. What projects will be required at Naval Station, San Diego in order to accept the ships and related activities from Long Beach?

Captain WATSON. The only project at the naval station that we will require for the relocation is the one in this year's program for pier 7. San Diego does have existing deficiencies for replacement of many of the old World War II buildings that we will very likely move up in priority. However, we will not need to increase the size of these future projects because they were originally planned for the approximate number of ships we will have in San Diego after the relocation. In addition, we plan to relocate some of the Long Beach ships to Bremerton, San Francisco, and Pearl Harbor partly in an effort to disperse our capabilities, and partly in an effort to avoid new construction because of relocation.

BERTHING PIER

Mr. SIKES. Will the pier which is requested here complete the requirement for berthing space?

Captain WATSON. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, this pier will satisfy our requirements for pier space.

Mr. SIKES. Provide the details on the linear feet of ships and piers for the record.

[The information follows:]

SHIP BERTHING REQUIREMENTS

The total requirement for ships berthing at the Naval Station, San Diego after the move from Long Beach is 20,952 feet of berthing. There are presently 17,972 feet at the station. The new pier No. 7 in this program will satisfy the entire deficit for new pier construction at the naval station.

Mr. SIKES. Can you provide for the record an economic analysis for the pier and the other projects required at San Diego?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

**ECONOMIC ANALYSIS/PROGRAM EVALUATION SUMMARY OF COSTS FOR
FORMAT A-1**

1. Submitting DOD component :	SECNAV.	
2. Date of submission :	June 18, 1973.	
3. Project title :	Reduction and relocation of ships and facilities, Long Beach naval complex.	
4. Description of project objective :	Reduction of Navy operating resource requirements.	
5a. Present alternative :	Continue operations at Long Beach.	
5b. Proposed alternative :	Relocate ships and staffs to San Diego, Pearl Harbor and Alameda with small groups locating to Bremerton and Charleston.	
6a. Economic life, Present alternative :	25 years.	
6b. Economic life, Proposed alternative :	25 years.	
7. Project year.....		1-25
8. Recurring cost:		
(a) Present alternative (A).....	\$234, 526, 000	
(b) Proposed alternative (B).....	\$223, 100, 000	
9. Differential cost.....	(\$11, 426, 000)	
10. Discount factor.....	9. 524	
11. Discounted differential cost.....	(\$108, 821, 000)	
12. Total	(\$108, 821 000)	
13. Present value of new investment:		
(a) Land and buildings and equipment.....	\$10, 286, 000	
(b) Relocation costs.....	\$16, 389, 000	
14. Total present value of new investment (i.e. funding requirements)	\$26, 675, 000	
15. Plus: Value of existing assets to be employed on the project... (none specifically employed)		0
16. Less: Value of assets replaced..... (none specifically employed)		0
17. Less: Terminal value of new investment.....		0
18. Total present value of investment.....	\$26, 675, 000	
19. Present value of cost savings from operations.....	\$108, 821, 000	
20. Plus: Present value of the cost of refurbishment or modification eliminated.....	\$29, 426, 000	
21. Total present value of savings.....	\$138, 247, 000	
22. Savings investment ratio: (line 21 divided by line 18).....		5. 18
23. Source/derivation of cost estimates: CNO shore establishment realinement (SER) project.		
24. Payback period: Approximately 2 years.		

**SUMMARY OF OUTPUTS FOR ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM EVALUATION
STUDIES FORMAT B**

1. Submitting DOD component : SECNAV.
2. Date of submission : June 18, 1973.
3. Project title : Reduction and relocation of ships and facilities, Long Beach Naval Complex.

4. Description of project objective: Reduction of Navy operating resource requirements.

5. Alternative: B.

6. Economic life: 25 years.

7. Outputs: Expected benefits, outputs and indicators of effectiveness.

The planned actions are a part of an overall effort to realine the shore establishment commensurate with programed reductions of the operating units of the fleet. Due to the reduced force levels, capacity exists for ship loading at other locations thereby eliminating the requirement for retaining ship and direct homeporting support activities in Long Beach. Actions within the Long Beach area will result in better utilization of facilities at the relocation bases, fully support fleet requirements, and result in substantial savings.

This action will result in an eventual savings of \$11,426,000 and a reduction of 456 military and 780 civilian manpower billets. One-time cost to implement this action totals \$16,389,000. There will be 140 civilian personnel transferred from the naval supply center to a naval supply annex to be established and located at the naval shipyard. The annex will provide supply support for the shipyard, remaining activities, and ships undergoing repairs at the shipyard.

IMPACT ON HOUSING

Mr. SIKES. I note that your economic analysis shows a present value of investment in buildings and equipment of \$10,286,000. Does this mean that the only construction costs included are the pier and the two smaller out-year projects and that you have not made any allowance for increased investment in bachelor or family housing or community support?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. That is correct. With regard to the bachelor housing we indicated yesterday that we have one BEQ going at Miramar. We feel we have no further requirements for the bachelors because the majority of them will continue to reside aboard ship—

Mr. TAYLOR. The BEQ at Miramar is the result of the realignment of air activities within the San Diego area itself, and satisfies a long-term deficiency in BEQ space in the San Diego area. It is not related to the move from Long Beach to San Diego.

Mr. SIKES. How many families will you move as a result of the transfer?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This should yield an increase of about 6,900 families.

Mr. SIKES. That was my recollection. If you are going to move 6,900 families do you mean to tell me there are no plans in the next 5 years for family housing?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We will have a deficit there, Mr. Chairman, but at this time we have no active plans in our family housing program.

Mr. SIKES. What do you plan to ask for in the next 5 years?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. I would like to defer that until the family housing hearings or provide it for the record. I can tell you the total deficit.

Mr. SIKES. I understand, but I don't think you can move 6,900 families without creating a deficit in housing and coming to this committee for family housing.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We don't intend to convey that impression.

Mr. SIKES. If there is other community support to be required in the next 5 years, I want some estimate on that also.

Provide for the record the population of this base for the last 5 years and that projected for the next 5 years.
[The information follows:]

TOTAL NAVY/MARINE CORPS MILITARY PERSONNEL IN SAN DIEGO COMPLEX

	Total permanent party personnel	Total number of families
1969.....	95,326	38,619
1970.....	81,713	32,965
1971.....	84,972	34,176
1972.....	81,274	34,492
1973.....	70,107	31,660
1978.....	90,756	39,715

Note: The personnel figures shown for 1978 are the end strength, long range planning figures. Buildup is assumed to be gradual, with monthly fluctuations.

DANGER FROM NUCLEAR SHIPS

Mr. SIKES. Is there danger in the home porting of nuclear ships in San Diego channel? Why are your nuclear submarines based so near the ocean?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I know of no danger. Do you, Mr. Taylor?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. We have requested and received authority to home port nuclear-type vessels in this area.

Mr. SIKES. What are the problems and advantages of stationing nuclear submarines near to the ocean?

Captain WATSON. The access to the sea is one of the main reasons for putting the nuclear submarines there. Additionally, it allows the submarines to have their own facility. Locating them at the naval station would be overcrowding the naval station. This pier was built in 1963, when the submarine facility was first developed. This area was the only space left and had the additional advantage of being close to the sea.

COLD IRON REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SIKES. Will you tell us something about pier utilities? Will there be further cold iron requirements at San Diego?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. There are three remaining pier utility projects at San Diego in future years at a cost of approximately \$7.5 million.

Mr. SIKES. In what years?

Admiral MARSCHALL. In 1976 there is a project for \$4,952,000. In 1977 two projects, one for \$1,047,000 and another project for \$1,518,000.

Mr. SIKES. Have all of those costs been included in the total comparison?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. No, sir. These are longstanding requirements for the existing piers.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

NAVAL TRAINING CENTER, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Place in the record page I-184.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 19 FEB 1973		2. DEPARTMENT NAVY		3. INSTALLATION FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		3. INSTALLATION NAVAL TRAINING CENTER							
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU CHIEF OF NAVAL TRAINING			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 6373-930		6. STATE/COUNTRY SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA								
7. STATUS ACTIVE		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1923		9. COUNTY (U.S.) SAN DIEGO		10. NEAREST CITY WITHIN CITY							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Provide basic indoctrination (Recruit Training) for enlisted personnel and primary, advanced and specialized training for officer and enlisted personnel of the Regular Navy and the Naval 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 DEC 1972	229	1,416	878	31	8,932	477	946	304	13,213
				b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	277	2,795	790	23	10,242	156	816	623	15,722
				13. INVENTORY									
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)					
a. OWNED		542		1,369		53,921		55,290					
b. LEASE AND EASEMENT		6* - 0*		0		440		440					
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72										55,730			
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY										1,778			
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM										2,944			
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS										22,607			
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)										83,059			
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS													
PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM					
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b					SCOPE c	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) e	SCOPE d	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f				
722.10	<u>ADMINISTRATIVE COMMAND</u> BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS			/	SF	79,128	2,944	79,128	2,944				

Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif., \$2,944,000.

This center provides basic recruit, primary, advanced, and specialized training for Navy officer and enlisted personnel.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living quarters for 504 men currently living in crowded, open-bay barrack constructed in 1923.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973.....	\$51,843,000
Cumulative obligations, December 31, 1972 (actual).....	51,843,000
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	51,843,000

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	\$98,752	23

Current bachelor enlisted status at NTC, San Diego, Calif. :

1. Effective BEQ requirement.....	11,735
2. Adequate assets.....	8,373
Installation.....	7,829
Community.....	544
3. Deficit.....	3,362
4. Fiscal year 1974 project.....	504
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974.....	2,858

Mr. SIKES. The request is for \$2,944,000, for bachelor enlisted quarters. Will this support the permanent party, or students?

Capt. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, these quarters are for permanent party personnel who are presently berthed in the very old open-bay barracks directly in line with the runways for the city airport.

Mr. SIKES. Is this a part of the realignment requirement?

Captain WATSON. No, sir.

NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Place page I-186 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 19 FEB 1973		3. DEPARTMENT NAVY		FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		5. INSTALLATION NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER							
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND			6. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER 5118-800			8. STATE/COUNTRY SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA							
7. STATUS ACTIVE			9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1963		9. COUNTY (U.S.) SAN DIEGO		10. NEAREST CITY WITHIN CITY						
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS To provide public works, public utilities, public housing, transportation support, engineering services, shore facilities planning support and all other logistic support of a public works nature incident thereto, required by the operating forces, dependent activities and other commands served by the Navy Public Works Center. Major Activities Supported: Naval Station Family Housing Naval Training Center Naval Communication Station Naval Air Station Naval Hospital Naval Supply Center Submarine Support Facility				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (7)
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)		
				A. AS OF 31 DEC 1972				11	5	1,606	0	0	0
B. PLANNED (END FY 1975)				13	10	1,606	0	0	0	0	0	1,629	
13. INVENTORY													
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)					
A. OWNED		1,505		1,335		80,091		81,426					
B. LEASE AND EASEMENT #		0* - 1#		0* - 1#		150* - 0*		151					
C. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19		72						81,577					
D. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								1,966					
E. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								3,155 1/					
F. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								11,757					
G. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								98,455					
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS													
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM				
	PROJECT TITLE b						SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h			
822.22	<u>NAVAL STATION</u> STEAM DISTRIBUTION (1ST INCREMENT)				/	LF	11,920	2,471	11,920	2,471			
1/ INCLUDES \$ 684,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT													

798