

1. DATE 15 Feb 1973	2. FISCAL YEAR 1974	3. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION LINE ITEM DATA (Continued)	4. DEPARTMENT NAVY	5. INSTALLATION VARIOUS
6. LINE ITEM NUMBER		7. LINE ITEM TITLE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS		
		<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	
<u>CALIFORNIA</u>				
MCSC Barstow		Install grounded electric outlets in kitchens and baths, 300 units; construct covered patios, 74 MEMQs	\$ 136,000	
MCB Camp Pendleton		Install new stainless steel kitchen sinks, dishwashers and garbage disposers, 512 units	321,000	
NWC China Lake		Convert 68 one and three bedroom units to 34 four-bedroom MEMQ units including modernization of kitchens and utility rooms and heating system. Provide carports and storage, driveways, privacy fencing, widen roads and provide curbs, gutters and sidewalks. (2nd increment of 2)	337,000	
NPGS Monterey		Modernize kitchens 213 MOQ's Wherry; add baths, 58 three-bedroom units; modify closets 28 two-bedroom units.	702,000	
NCS San Francisco		Modernize baths 5 MOQs and 35 MEMQs	61,000	
MCB Twentynine Palms		Improvements to MOQ #1 (Separate DD 1391 attached).	17,000	
<u>CONNECTICUT</u>				
NSB New London		Construct carports 986 units and storerooms 490 units	1,282,000	
<u>FLORIDA</u>				
NAS Whiting Field		Install dishwashers 329 units; patios, fencing, storeroom lights, walkways, and landscaping 100 units	168,000	
<u>GEORGIA</u>				
NAS Atlanta		Modernize kitchens 5 MOQs and 5 MEMQs	37,000	

1. DATE 15 Feb 1973	2. FISCAL YEAR 1974	3. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION LINE ITEM DATA (Continued)	4. DEPARTMENT NAVY	5. INSTALLATION VARIOUS
6. LINE ITEM NUMBER		7. LINE ITEM TITLE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS		
<u>DESCRIPTION</u>				<u>AMOUNT</u>
<u>HAWAII</u>				
Camp H. M. Smith	Install louvered glass windows for lanais, 168 units	\$ 205,000		
<u>ILLINOIS</u>				
PWC Great Lakes	Modernize kitchens 15 MOQs; increase electric service 642 units and install garbage disposer, dishwashers, double hung windows with storm sash, 144 units (1st increment)	590,000		
<u>LOUISIANA</u>				
NAVSUPACT New Orleans	Renovation, alterations and improvements, Quarters B, C, D and E (Separate DD 1391 attached)	119,600		
<u>MARYLAND</u>				
NOS Indian Head	Modernize kitchens and baths 10 MOQs; install thermostatic heat controls for 226 units	262,000		
<u>MISSISSIPPI</u>				
NAS Meridian	Install dishwashers, gutters and downspouts, 320 units	143,000		
<u>NEW MEXICO</u>				
NOMTF White Sands	Modernize kitchens 71 units	76,000		
<u>NORTH CAROLINA</u>				
MCB Camp Lejeune	Modernization of kitchens and bathrooms 400 MEMQs (1st increment)	1,165,000		
MCAS Cherry Point	Provide fire protection facilities, Wherry Housing	183,000		
<u>SOUTH CAROLINA</u>				
NH Beaufort	Add bath to 50 units	125,000		

200

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
15 Feb 1973	1974	NAVY	VARIOUS
5. LINE ITEM NUMBER		6. LINE ITEM TITLE	
		FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS	
<u>DESCRIPTION</u>			<u>AMOUNT</u>
<u>VIRGINIA</u>			
PWC Norfolk	Install garbage disposers and bathroom fixtures for roughed-in powder room, 114 MEMQ's	\$	70,000
MCB Quantico	Construct patios and relocate clothes dryers, 418 units		234,000
<u>OVERSEAS</u>			
PWC Guam, M. I.	Air condition 356 MEMQs at NAS Agana (1st increment)		1,629,000
NS Galeta, C. Z.	Air condition 56 units		143,000
<u>FOREIGN</u>			
PWC Guantanamo Bay	Construct exterior storage buildings and terrace 642 units		450,000
NCS Londonderry, N. I.	Relocate and Modernize kitchens, 33 units		155,000
PWC Subic Bay, P.I.	Air condition 196 units (3rd increment)		989,400
<u>VARIOUS LOCATIONS</u>			
	Construct community buildings, 5 locations*		1,000,000
	*PWC Newport, R. I. (1 building)		
	PWC Pearl Harbor (Radford, Halsey and Monalua Terrace (2 buildings)		
	NAS Quonset Point, R. I. (1 building)		
	NAVSTA Keflavik (1 building)		
			\$10,600,000

## FLAG OFFICER HOUSING

Mr. SIKES. You are requesting the alteration of four flag officers quarters in New Orleans at a cost of \$29,900 each. Have you considered leasing quarters as an alternative solution? How are the present quarters being used now?

Captain REED. Considering the required social function for officers of flag rank, leasing of satisfactory family housing units is not practicable within current allowable leasing costs.

Two of these units are occupied by captains. One unit is occupied by a vice admiral and one unit which has just been vacated was occupied by a captain.

Mr. SIKES. You have another flag officer quarters improvement project at Twenty-Nine Palms, Calif. Provide for the record the total amount in the fiscal year 1974 program and the two previous programs devoted to flag officers quarters.

[The information follows:]

The amount contained in improvement projects devoted to flag officer quarters for fiscal year 1974 and the two previous programs is as follows:

Fiscal year :	[Dollars in thousands]	
1974 -----		\$136,000
1973 -----		None
1972 -----		None

## AGE OF UNITS BEING MODERNIZED

Mr. SIKES. Generally to what extent are you improving older units versus units recently constructed?

Captain REED. Our objective is to upgrade older quarters first. Of the total program of \$10.6 million for fiscal year 1974, only \$128,000 or 1.2 percent is being applied to units constructed within the last 5 years. The \$128,000 is proposed for 86 quarters at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School where we will add a bath unit and modify a closet. The bath will satisfy a requirement deleted at the time of construction, while by modifying an existing large closet we will provide separate study space.

## COMMUNITY CENTERS

Mr. SIKES. Discuss your program to construct community buildings.

Captain REED. At many Navy activities, family housing developments are constructed in areas that are remote from the main part of the station. Construction is purposely planned this way to provide married personnel with an atmosphere similar to conditions which prevail in most civilian communities.

The location of housing developments severely restrict the use of existing "on base" facilities to occupants of family housing. Also these facilities are heavily used by single personnel. Community organizations, such as wives' clubs, teen clubs, scouts, community athletic groups must compete with activity mission training, et cetera, in obtaining suitable indoor assembly areas to conduct community affairs. Because of this competition and distant location of existing facilities, many needed and deserving community functions are curtailed and in some cases nonexistent.

In 1971 we established a program which envisions the construction of 41 community centers at various activities, worldwide. The intent of the program is to provide a community meeting/assembly hall, social function center for families who reside in our larger isolated complexes of family housing. The basic criteria requires that the housing is so located that immediate access to basic clubs, messes, teen centers, chapels, et cetera, is not available.

Ten buildings were included in the fiscal year 1973 improvement program. Contracts have been awarded for five, two are awaiting bids and three are in the final design stages. The experience gained from the fiscal year 1973 program design and costs will be applied in future construction. Our fiscal year 1974 program includes five buildings with programing of the remaining requirements in subsequent years dependent on the availability of construction funds.

#### MINOR CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SIKES. Place page 64 in the record.  
[The page follows:]

1. DATE 15 Feb 1973		2. FISCAL YEAR 1974		3. DEPARTMENT NAVY			4. INSTALLATION VARIOUS CONTINENTAL AND OVERSEAS						
5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION \$ 800,000			6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION P.L.		7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER		8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		9. STATE/COUNTRY VARIOUS				
10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION \$ 800,000				11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER		12. LINE ITEM NUMBER		13. LINE ITEM TITLE MINOR CONSTRUCTION					
SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF LINE ITEM					SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES								
14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION		16. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY				20. PRIMARY FACILITY		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
a. PERMANENT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	a. NO. OF BLDGS.	b. NO. OF STORIES	c. LENGTH	d. WIDTH	MINOR CONSTRUCTION				\$	\$ 800.0		
b. SEMI-PERMANENT		e. DESIGN CAPACITY	f. GROSS AREA			a. NAVY		( )	( )	( )	( 640.0 )		
c. TEMPORARY		e. COOLING CAP.	COST (\$ )		b. MARINE CORPS		( )	( )	( )	( )	( 160.0 )		
15. TYPE OF WORK		19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE				c.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
a. NEW FACILITY		Minor alterations, additions, expansions, extensions and replacements to properties included in the Defense Family Housing property account including such things as family dwelling units, non-dwelling units, roads and utility systems serving family housing units, ground areas and other supporting facilities.				d.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
b. ADDITION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES		e.		( )	( )	( )	( )
c. ALTERATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					a.		f.		( )	( )	( )	( )
d. CONVERSION						b.		g.		( )	( )	( )	( )
e. OTHER (Specify)						c.		h.		( )	( )	( )	( )
16. REPLACEMENT						i.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
17. TYPE OF DESIGN						j.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
a. STANDARD DESIGN						k.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
b. SPECIAL DESIGN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					l.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
c. DRAWING NO.						m.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						n.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						o.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						p.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						q.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						r.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						s.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						t.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						u.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						v.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						w.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						x.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						y.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						z.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						aa.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ab.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ac.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ad.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ae.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						af.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ag.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ah.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ai.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						aj.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ak.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						al.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						am.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						an.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ao.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ap.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						aq.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ar.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						as.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						at.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						au.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						av.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						aw.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ax.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ay.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						az.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ba.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bb.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bc.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bd.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						be.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bf.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bg.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bh.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bi.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bj.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bk.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bl.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bm.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bn.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bo.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bp.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bq.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						br.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bs.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bt.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bu.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bv.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bw.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bx.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						by.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						bz.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ca.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cb.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cc.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cd.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ce.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cf.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cg.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ch.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ci.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cj.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ck.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cl.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cm.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cn.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						co.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cp.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cq.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cr.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cs.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ct.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cu.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cv.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cw.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cx.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cy.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						cz.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						da.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						db.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dc.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dd.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						de.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						df.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dg.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dh.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						di.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dj.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dk.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dl.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dm.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dn.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						do.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dp.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dq.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dr.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ds.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dt.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						du.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dv.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dw.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dx.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dy.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						dz.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ea.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						eb.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ec.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ed.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ee.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ef.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						eg.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						eh.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ei.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ej.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ek.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						el.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						em.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						en.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						eo.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ep.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						eq.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						er.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						es.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						et.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						eu.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ev.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ew.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ex.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ey.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ez.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fa.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fb.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fc.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fd.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fe.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ff.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fg.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fh.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fi.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fj.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fk.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fl.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fm.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fn.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fo.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fp.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fq.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fr.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fs.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ft.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fu.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fv.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fw.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fx.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fy.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						fz.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ga.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						gb.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						gc.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						gd.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						ge.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						gf.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						gg.		( )	( )	( )	( )		
						gh.		( )	( )				

Mr. SIKES. To what extent could you usefully use carryover balances from prior programs in minor construction?

Captain REED. Well, sir, this committee has given us such excellent support in minor construction I would have to honestly say we are catching up in that field.

As you know, that is for the small project that gives us the little amenities and things that can be immediately done on a small scale. If we had available funds, I would suggest putting them in the improvement program rather than minor construction.

Mr. SIKES. Have you used all the money the committee provided last year?

Captain REED. Yes, sir, it is 100 percent obligated.

Mr. SIKES. Do you need more than you have in this program?

Captain REED. No, sir, as I said, I would recommend it as an improvement program.

#### PLANNING

Mr. SIKES. Insert page 65 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 3 Oct. 1973		2. FISCAL YEAR 1974		3. DEPARTMENT NAVY		4. INSTALLATION VARIOUS CONTINENTAL AND OVERSEAS					
5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION \$ 200,000		6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION P.L.		7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER 711		8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		9. STATE/COUNTRY VARIOUS			
10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION \$ 200,000		11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER		12. PROJECT NUMBER		13. PROJECT TITLE PLANNING		NM	CM	RM	
SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT						SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES					
14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION		15. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY				20. PRIMARY FACILITY		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
a. PERMANENT		a. NO. OF BLDGS	b. NO. OF STORIES	c. LENGTH	d. WIDTH	a.	( )	( )	( )	\$ 200.0	
b. SEMI-PERMANENT		e. DESIGN CAPACITY		f. GROSS AREA		b.	( )	( )	( )	( )	
c. TEMPORARY		g. COOLING CAP.		COST (\$ )		c.	( )	( )	( )	( )	
15. TYPE OF WORK		19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE				21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES				\$	
a. NEW FACILITY		These funds are required for Architect-Engineer services, surveys, fees, etc., in connection with advance planning and design of family housing dwelling units and properties included in or proposed for the Defense Family Housing Property Account.				a.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b. ADDITION						b.	( )	( )	( )		
c. ALTERATION						c.	( )	( )	( )		
d. CONVERSION						d.	( )	( )	( )		
e. OTHER (Specify)						e.	( )	( )	( )		
f. REPLACEMENT						f.	( )	( )	( )		
17. TYPE OF DESIGN						g.	( )	( )	( )	( )	
a. STANDARD DESIGN						h.	( )	( )	( )	( )	
b. SPECIAL DESIGN						i.	( )	( )	( )	( )	
c. DRAWING NO.						j.	( )	( )	( )	( )	
						22. TOTAL PROJECT COST					
						\$ 200.0					
SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT											
23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M <u>N/A</u> )						25. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT					
a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT						The appropriated funds requested in this item are necessary to procure architect-engineer services to make site and utility investigations; for the preparation of design, plans, drawings, and specifications; and for other services and fees in connection with the preparation of advance plans for future year housing programs and for such effort on proposed projects which subsequently may not be included in approved construction programs.					
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD ( )											
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE											
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY											
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (c + d)											
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION											
g. INCLUDED IN FY _____ PROGRAM											
h. DEFICIENCY (a - e - f - g)											
i. _____											
24. RELATED PROJECTS											

Mr. SIKES. Is this request adequate for your purposes?  
 Captain REED. Yes, sir, it is.

RENTAL GUARANTEE HOUSING

Mr. SIKES. Insert page 66 in the record.  
 [The page follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
 FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FY 1974 BUDGET

RENTAL GUARANTEE HOUSING

Under the authority of section 507, Public Law 88-174 as amended, for the purpose of providing housing in foreign countries, the Secretary of Defense may enter into agreements to guarantee builders or other sponsors of family housing a rental return not to exceed 97 percent of gross income expectancy. No such agreement may extend for a period of more than 10 years, nor may the average guaranteed income exceed \$210 per unit, per month, including the cost of operation and maintenance.

Under the terms of the Rental Guarantee Agreement for new construction, the sponsor agrees to provide the land and construct the specified number and types of family housing units thereon, in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Government. The sponsor further agrees to manage, maintain, and operate the units in accordance with specified standards, and to make the housing available to tenants designated by the Government at stipulated rentals. Under Rental Guarantee Agreement for existing housing, the sponsor agrees to the same terms except those pertaining to construction. In return, the Government guarantees up to 97 percent of gross rental income expectancy for a period of up to 10 years.

The Department of the Navy executed in June 1967 a Rental Guarantee Agreement for construction of 250 unit project to serve the U.S. Naval Station, Rota, Spain. The project was completed and accepted in December 1969. Average rent for the project is \$150.67 per unit, per month, exclusive of utilities, and the Government guarantees 97 percent of gross rental income expectancy for a period of 10 years. The sponsor is obligated to hold the housing for use of tenants designated by the Government during the guarantee period and, at the option of the Government, for up to 10 years thereafter.

A rental Guarantee Agreement was executed by the Navy in October 1968 for 20 units of existing family housing to serve the U.S. Navy Security Group Activity at Todendorf, Germany. The average rent is \$156.68 per unit, per month, exclusive of utilities, and the Government guarantees 97 percent of gross rental expectancy for a period of 5 years. The sponsor is obligated to hold the housing for use of tenants designated by the Government during the guarantee period and, at the option of the Government, for up to 10 years thereafter.

The U.S. Air Force, as DOD agent for Rental Guarantee Housing in the United Kingdom, has executed agreements for construction of 250 units of Rental Guarantee Housing for the Navy at Holy Loch, Scotland. The first agreement for 136 units was executed in April 1971. Estimated completion date is July 1973. The second agreement for 114 units was executed in August 1972. Estimated completion date is August 1974. The Government guarantee will be 97 percent of gross rental income for a period of 10 years. Average rent for the project will be \$181.75 per unit, per month, exclusive of utilities.

This is a contingent liability, with payment in arrears subject to occupancy over specified periods. It is expected that the guaranteed occupancy will be maintained.

Mr. SIKES. Is the Navy not planning any further rental guarantee projects overseas at the present time?

Captain REED. That is correct, sir. The average guaranteed monthly rental may not exceed \$225, and allowance for rent escalation precludes initial rents of over \$200. These limits are too low and have caused such locations as Okinawa, Bermuda, and Sigonella to be financially infeasible. The requirement for a civilian residual market has also excluded possible projects in the Philippines. Other problems we have

encountered include nonavailability of land, clearances by foreign government agencies, and particularly, the time consumed from inception of projects to beneficial occupancy which has been 5 to 6 years.

#### OTHER GUARANTEE HOUSING

Mr. SIKES. Insert page 67 in the record.  
[The page follows:]

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

#### FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET

#### OTHER GUARANTEE

1. *Section 809 Housing.*—Section 809 housing authorized by Public Law 574, 84th Congress, provides family housing constructed by private developers for sale to permanent civilian employees at military research and development installations, and financed by means of FHA-insured mortgages which the FHA may require the Department of Defense to guarantee.

The Navy has DOD approval for 630 units of section 809 housing at NWC China Lake. As of September 19, 1972, 289 certificates of eligibility had been issued and 341 were still available; 298 of these are being held for housing being developed on 116 acres of land exceded and sold to a developer in December 1969 for \$769,000. Under the terms of this sale, the purchaser is required to construct 300 homes for sale to employees of NWC China Lake. The Navy guaranteed to issue certificates of eligibility to purchasers of these homes under the section 809 program. The remaining 43 certificates held by NWC will be issued to purchasers of homes in the general community development in the adjacent city and county. Current status of housing developed on the exceded Navy land consists of 29 built and sold and another 39 units out for bids.

The Navy also has DOD approval for 50 units of section 809 housing for employees of the Naval Weapons Laboratory (NWL), Dahlgren, Va. As of September 19, 1972, NWL has issued a total of nine certificates of eligibility. Of these, five certificates have been endorsed by FHA, four are pending issuance to FHA. Need for certificates has diminished due to increase in use of rental housing and personnel purchasing outside the area under other than section 809.

#### DEBT PAYMENTS

Mr. SIKES. Turn to debt payments. Insert pages 68 through 73 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

15 February 1973

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET

DEBT PAYMENTS - CAPEHART

(Owned as of 1 July 1973)

<u>Location</u>	<u>#Units Acquired</u>	<u>Original Mortgage</u>	<u>Amount Owed as of 1 July 1973</u>	<u>Payments Required in FY 1974</u>
MCAS Yuma, Ariz.	60	\$ 990,000	\$ 670,172	\$ 67,081
NAS Alameda, Calif.	200	3,160,340	2,340,532	214,523
NWC China Lake, Calif.	500	8,243,126	5,584,085	558,541
NF Ferndale, Calif.	24	387,259	232,292	26,285
NAS Lemoore, Calif.	1,300	20,845,584	13,899,577	1,412,228
NPGS Monterey, Calif.	150	2,341,140	1,584,812	158,632
Former AFB Okinawa, Calif.	315	4,619,867	2,689,283	304,551
NAMTC Point Mugu, Calif.	560	8,708,021	5,272,470	570,830
NF Point Sur, Calif.	24	392,251	238,326	26,600
NS San Diego, Calif.	947	15,095,314	9,591,785	1,021,856
MCB Twentynine Palms, Calif.	250	4,124,295	2,833,004	279,558
NSB New London, Conn.	1,250	20,244,687	14,080,937	1,372,715
NS Key West, Fla.	500	8,231,710	5,696,860	558,077
NS Mayport, Fla.	540	7,989,010	5,703,438	541,818
NAS Whiting, Fla.	229	3,715,000	2,469,478	252,118
MCSC Albany, Ga.	160	2,623,375	1,339,727	168,150
NAS Albany, Ga.	630	10,170,942	6,671,954	683,330
NAS Glynnco, Ga.	225	3,708,978	2,493,107	251,315
NAS Barbers Point, Haw.	1,140	18,762,537	11,454,938	1,237,715
MCAS Kaneohe Bay, Haw.	650	10,509,374	6,225,532	675,263
NAD Luualalei, Haw.	34	551,391	310,393	35,422
Camp H.M. Smith, Oahu, Haw.	168	2,629,553	1,506,903	168,926
NAD Oahu, Haw.	80	1,242,615	712,098	79,827
NB Pearl Harbor, Haw	650	10,301,540	6,263,712	662,402
NTC Great Lakes, Ill.	533	8,703,247	5,592,833	577,565
NF Nantucket, Mass.	19	312,942	213,724	21,204
Operation Bellview, Md.	20	329,672	221,173	22,338
NAS Brunswick, Me.	277	4,567,642	2,866,228	309,200
NRS Cutler, Me.	33	544,407	363,582	36,888
Former AFS Topsham, Me.	177	2,917,209	1,957,880	197,670

209

15 February 1973

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGETDEBT PAYMENTS - CAPEHART

(Owned as of 1 July 1973)

<u>Location</u>	<u>#Units Acquired</u>	<u>Original Mortgage</u>	<u>Amount Owed as of 1 July 1973</u>	<u>Payments Required in FY 1974</u>
NSGA Winter Harbor, Me.	20	\$ 327,858	\$ 177,363	\$ 21,119
Former NAS Grosse Ile, Mich.	26	405,800	180,824	44,106
NAS Meridian, Miss.	320	5,277,693	3,513,736	357,562
NS Guam, M.I.	220	4,414,808	2,762,885	299,707
NAS Fallon, Nev.	106	1,729,866	1,163,213	117,546
MCB Camp Lejeune, N.C.	800	13,193,173	8,852,649	871,649
NF Cape Hatteras, N.C.	27	445,400	252,281	29,344
MCAS Cherry Point, N.C.	849	12,829,300	7,356,544	824,414
MCAF New River, N.C.	435	7,176,150	3,766,440	460,504
NF Coos Head, Ore.	24	392,487	246,184	26,569
NB Philadelphia, Pa.	400	6,180,286	4,549,279	419,516
NRS Fort Allen, P.R.	150	2,362,617	1,675,657	160,192
NS Roosevelt Roads, P.R.	676	11,154,000	6,562,713	716,745
NS Newport, R.I.	500	8,181,862	5,616,676	554,577
MCAS Beaufort, S.C.	1,100	17,815,591	10,095,307	1,144,635
NS Charleston, S.C.	740	11,366,348	7,895,100	770,521
NAS Memphis, Tenn.	250	3,844,174	2,687,068	260,682
NAS Chase Field, Beeville, Tex.	225	3,515,601	1,967,061	225,598
NB Norfolk, Va.	300	4,931,650	3,621,080	334,759
MCS Quantico, Va.	450	7,407,400	5,112,877	502,206
NF Pacific Beach, Wash.	30	500,355	315,441	33,871
NAS Whidbey Island, Wash.	550	9,032,188	5,713,063	611,421
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b><u>19,843</u></b>	<b><u>\$319,447,635</u></b>	<b><u>\$205,164,276</u></b>	<b><u>\$21,279,871</u></b>

Rounded to: \$21,280,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET

DEBT PAYMENTS - WHERRY HOUSING

SUMMARY

WHERRY HOUSING: This provides for the payment of principal, interest and mortgage insurance premiums resulting from assumption by the Government of mortgages on Wherry Housing acquired by the Navy. Total appropriated funds in the amount of \$9,386,000 are requested for this program for fiscal year 1974. Detailed requirements by location are listed on the pages that follow. The following is a summary of fiscal year 1974 debt payment requirements for Wherry Housing owned as of 1 July 1973:

	<u>#Units</u> <u>Originally Acquired</u>	<u>Original Mortgage</u>	<u>Amount Owed</u> <u>as of 1 July 1973</u>	<u>Payments Required</u> <u>in FY 1974</u>
TOTALS	22,162	\$150,013,669	\$93,832,525	\$9,386,000
			FY 1974 Appropriation Request	<u>\$9,386,000</u>

15 February 1973

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET

DEBT PAYMENT - WHERRY  
(Owned as of 1 July 1973)

<u>Location</u>	<u>#Units</u> <u>Originally Acquired</u>	<u>Original Mortgage</u>	<u>Amount Owed</u> <u>as of 1 July 1973</u>	<u>Payments Required</u> <u>in FY 1974</u>
MCSC Barstow, Calif.	337	\$ 2,009,881	\$1,400,930	\$138,399
MCB Camp Pendleton, Calif.	1,562	10,961,983	7,429,226	709,036
NWC China Lake, Calif.	600	3,510,811	2,367,890	218,081
NAF El Centro, Calif.	70	463,261	330,789	32,330
MCAS El Toro, Calif.	571	4,109,711	2,496,267	244,049
NFGS Monterey, Calif.	519	4,090,075	2,472,561	248,066
NCBC Port Hueneme, Calif.	326	2,119,886	1,287,114	124,897
NB San Diego, Calif.	1,791	12,486,434	7,792,194	758,921
MCB Twentynine Palms, Calif.	493	3,115,827	2,059,455	196,247
NSB New London, Conn.	450	3,687,880	2,382,483	227,819
NB Key West, Fla.	1,000	6,657,616	4,018,174	425,120
NAS Whiting Field, Fla.	96	507,271	304,641	32,502
NAS Albany, Ga.	270	1,515,614	899,290	85,772
NAS Barbers Point, Haw.	615	4,567,371	2,692,244	278,428
NB Pearl Harbor, Haw.	1,462	11,792,373	7,237,465	705,031
NTC Great Lakes, Ill.	1,000	7,587,302	4,473,719	471,825
NAS New Orleans, La.	90	627,570	451,409	42,620
First ND HDQTRS, Boston, Mass.	150	1,273,811	821,150	77,911
NAVACAD Annapolis, Md.	396	2,467,705	1,553,017	175,625
NTC Bainbridge, Md.	740	4,618,888	3,301,551	310,726
NOS Indian Head, Md.	379	2,656,935	1,665,109	160,245
NAS Brunswick, Me.	232	1,836,183	1,196,546	108,995
MCB Camp Lejeune, N.C.	2,108	13,521,849	7,883,490	824,577
MCAS Cherry Point, N.C.	1,421	7,889,094	4,572,560	481,944
NAS Lakehurst, N.J.	230	1,508,654	1,037,046	105,741
Mitchel Manor, Hempstead, N.Y.	628	4,274,332	2,810,427	300,952
NB Newport, R.I.	356	2,914,929	1,706,225	181,534
NAS Quonset Point, R.I.	350	2,686,743	1,739,549	168,206
MCRD Parris Island, S.C.	85	534,120	321,016	32,182
NAS Memphis, Tenn.	540	3,097,639	1,924,477	202,528

212

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET

DEBT PAYMENT - WHERRY  
(Owned as of 1 July 1973)

<u>Location</u>	<u>#Units Originally Acquired</u>	<u>Original Mortgage</u>	<u>Amount Owed as of 1 July 1973</u>	<u>Payments Required in FY 1974</u>
NAS Corpus Christi, Tex.	340	\$ 2,014,560	\$ 1,384,531	\$ 133,628
NAB Little Creek, Va.	400	2,306,814	1,392,640	139,356
Monogram Gardens, Driver, Va.	20	129,742	78,531	7,852
NE Norfolk, Va.	916	5,083,712	3,364,834	331,153
Northwest Gardens, Northwest, Va.	26	159,384	96,471	9,646
NAS Oceana, Va.	554	3,978,026	2,457,995	236,458
NSY Portsmouth, Va.	159	1,005,523	659,959	66,080
MCS Quantico, Va.	450	3,161,560	1,891,919	203,443
NWS Yorktown, Va.	130	952,393	582,993	56,526
NAS Whidbey Island, Wash.	300	2,130,207	1,294,638	131,131
TOTALS	<u>22,162</u>	<u>\$150,013,669</u>	<u>\$93,832,525</u>	<u>\$9,385,582</u>
			Rounded to:	\$9,386,000

15 February 1973

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
 FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET

SERVICEMEN'S MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

In accordance with authority contained in Section 222 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, this program provides for the payment of premiums due on mortgage insurance provided by the Federal Housing Administration for mortgages on housing purchased by military personnel on active duty and for continuing payments in those cases where a serviceman dies while on active duty and leaves a surviving widow as owner of the property. In the latter case, payments extend for a period of two years beyond the date of the servicemen's death or until the date the widow disposes of the property, whichever occurs first. The maximum amount insurable by FHA is \$33,000. The premium rate is  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1% of the unpaid balance of the mortgage. Total funds in the amount of \$1,265,000 are requested for this program for fiscal year 1974. This amount is \$25,000 less than the fiscal year 1973 request due to a decrease in the estimated number of mortgages to be insured.

	FY 1972 ACTUAL			FY 1973 ESTIMATE			FY 1974 ESTIMATE		
	NAVY	MARINE CORPS	TOTAL	NAVY	MARINE CORPS	TOTAL	NAVY	MARINE CORPS	TOTAL
Number of Mortgages Insured	13,125	1,958	15,083	12,782	1,783	14,565	12,606	1,689	14,295
Average Payment Amount	\$97.30	\$102.65	\$97.99	\$86.06	\$106.58	\$88.57	\$86.06	\$106.58	\$88.49
Total Premium Payments	\$1,277,000	\$201,000	\$1,478,000	\$1,100,000	\$190,000	\$1,290,000	\$1,085,000	\$180,000	\$1,265,000

214

## CAPEHART AND WHERRY HOUSING TO BE EXCESSED

Mr. SIKES. How many of the Wherry and Capehart units will be given up by the Navy as a result of base closures and realignments?

Captain REED. Mr. Chairman, we have a total of 576 Wherry and 225 units of Capehart housing which will be exceeded specifically as a result of the base realignments and closures. They are located as follows: 187 Wherry at Brenton Village, Newport; 119 Wherry at Naval Gardens in Newport; 270 Wherry at Albany, Ga., and 225 Capehart at Glynco, Ga. There are also 505 units of Wherry which were previously reported as excess to the Congress at Bainbridge, Md., but we do not consider them to be a part of the present realignment actions.

Mr. SIKES. Could you give us what information you have on the remaining useful life of each of these projects, as well as your estimate of what market there will be for them?

Captain REED. Yes, sir; let me cover them one at a time. In Newport, at both Brenton Village and Naval Gardens, the Wherry units would have been declared inadequate until we learned they would be excess. It had been our intent to operate them on a reduced BAQ forfeiture basis until they could be demolished and replaced. The cost to improve them would be above the amount considered as an economic investment by OSD. They have, in effect, passed their useful life as adequate units. At Brenton Village, we understand that the local community wants to acquire the land where the units are located for a park, and if they do, the housing could be demolished. This is something the community would have to work out with the General Services Administration. Although it is possible, I do not believe there is much of a market for the Brenton Village units, because of their physical location. As for the Naval Garden, I think there might be a market for them, but it is difficult at this time to measure the impact on community housing which our realignment will cause.

At Albany, the Wherry units which are known as Turner City are in good condition and might be expected to remain useful for 20 or more years. They are located within 5 miles of the center of the city. Our local people indicate that it appears likely that a market for these units will exist, as the city of Albany is growing rather rapidly.

The Capehart units at Glynco are in excellent condition and with care should last 30 years or more. The local real estate market is currently extremely soft with many homes for sale and no buyers. The vacancy rate is high and some new construction has to be halted. The county is making an effort to attract more industry which could create a housing market, but it has not occurred yet.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have an estimate you can provide of the market value of these units?

Captain REED. We have not made an estimate because established procedures require that once the Navy has declared the units excess and has offered them to other components of DOD and reported them to the Congress, the units then go to the General Services Administration who have the responsibility for performing an appraisal of the market value of the units and subsequently disposing of them for the best possible price.

## REMAINING LIABILITY

Mr. SIKES. What is your total remaining liability for Capehart and Wherry housing?

Captain REED. The total remaining liability as of July 1, 1973, is \$205,164,276 for Capehart and \$93,823,525 for Wherry housing.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Mr. SIKES. Insert pages 74 through 80 in the record.  
[The pages follow:]

15 February 1973

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET

OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, INCLUDING LEASING

(THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1972 Actual			FY 1973 Estimate			FY 1974 Estimate		
	NAVY	MARINE CORPS	TOTAL	NAVY	MARINE CORPS	TOTAL	NAVY	MARINE CORPS	TOTAL
Operating Expenses	\$45,459	\$ 9,195	\$ 54,654	\$ 56,467	\$10,972	\$ 67,439	\$ 63,544	\$12,961	\$ 76,505
Leasing	7,082	-0-	7,082	9,900	-0-	9,900	11,639	-0-	11,639
Maintenance	47,230	10,093	57,323	53,843	10,877	64,720	63,273	12,882	76,155
Total Operation & Maintenance	\$99,771	\$19,288	\$119,059	\$120,210	\$21,849	\$142,059	\$138,456	\$25,843	\$164,299
Less: Reimbursements	-2,148	- 98	-2,246	-2,598	-167	-2,765	-2,492	-175	-2,667
Plus: Transfers Among Accounts	+ 631	-200	+ 431	--	--	--	--	--	--
Unobligated Balance Lapsing	+ 114	+ 67	+ 181	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total Appropriation Request	\$98,368	\$19,057	\$117,425	\$117,612	\$21,682	\$139,294	\$135,964	\$25,668	\$161,632 <sup>1/</sup>

<sup>1/</sup> The appropriation request for operation and maintenance is in lump sum for the Department of Defense. The amount footnoted is within that total.

217

15 February 1973

FAMILY HOUSING DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
FY 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE

EXCLUDES LEASED UNITS &amp; COSTS

	FY 1972 ACTUAL		FY 1973 ESTIMATE		FY 1974 ESTIMATE	
<b>A. INVENTORY DATA</b>						
Units in Being Beginning of Year	69,193		67,261		70,391	
Units in Being at End of Year	67,261		70,391		73,918	
Average Inventory for Year Requiring O&M Funding:						
a. Conterminous U.S.	48,034		49,024		51,261	
b. Outside U.S.	20,194		19,815		21,033	
c. Total	68,228		68,839		72,294	
<b>B. FUNDING REQUIREMENT</b>	TOTAL EST.	UNIT COST	TOTAL EST.	UNIT COST	TOTAL EST.	UNIT COST
	(\$000)	(\$)	(\$000)	(\$)	(\$000)	(\$)
<b>1. OPERATIONS</b>						
a. Operating Expenses						
(1) Administration	\$ 7,523	\$ 110	\$ 8,994	\$ 131	\$ 9,519	\$ 132
(2) Services	4,346	64	4,907	71	5,438	75
(3) Utility Operations	30,066	440	35,761	519	40,665	562
(4) Furnishings	3,524	52	6,805	99	7,922	110
Subtotal - Gross Obligations	\$45,459	\$ 666	\$ 56,467	\$ 820	\$ 63,544	\$ 879
Less: Anticipated Reimbursements	2,148	31	2,598	38	2,492	34
Subtotal, Operations (Appropriated Funds)	\$43,311	\$ 635	\$ 53,869	\$ 782	\$ 61,052	\$ 845
<b>2. MAINTENANCE</b>						
a. Maintenance & Repair of Dwellings	\$39,131	\$ 574	\$ 45,220	\$ 657	\$ 53,315	\$ 737
b. Maintenance & Repair of Other Real Property	7,680	112	8,123	118	8,878	123
c. Alterations & Additions	419	6	500	7	1,080	15
Subtotal, Maintenance (Appropriated Funds)	\$47,230	\$ 692	\$ 53,843	\$ 782	\$ 63,273	\$ 875
<b>3. GRAND TOTAL O&amp;M EXPENSES (Incl. Reimbursements)</b>	\$92,689	\$1,358	\$110,310	\$1,602	\$126,817	\$1,754
<b>4. GRAND TOTAL O&amp;M (1&amp;2 above) (Appropriated Funds)</b>	\$90,541	\$1,327	\$107,712	\$1,564	\$124,325	\$1,720

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET  
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE JUSTIFICATION

NAVY FAMILY HOUSING

1. *Narrative description*

a. *Operation.*—The operation portion of the family housing program includes expenses incident to: administration and management of the housing at the installation level, including off-base housing referral services; providing such communal services as refuse collection and disposal, custodial services, street sweeping, snow removal, and in certain instances police and fire protection; providing such utility services as electricity, water, heat, sewage, but excluding telephone service; providing initial furniture for housing, maintenance, repair, replacement, shipment, warehousing, and handling of furniture and movable equipment as authorized by administrative policy, conducting the annual family housing survey; preliminary planning for the housing construction program; supervision, inspection and overhead (SIOH) for new housing construction other than military construction (MCON). The operation portion also covers authorization to obligate and expend funds made available from sources other than the "Family housing management account, Navy" as reimbursements for authorized work performed or services delivered.

b. *Maintenance.*—The maintenance portion includes maintenance and repair of dwelling units, buildings, roads, driveways, walks, exterior and interior utility systems, and grounds care as authorized by administrative policy, maintenance repair, and replacement of fixtures and other equipment which are integral components of a dwelling unit. Also includes projects for incidental improvement (alteration or additions-extensions-expansions) provided that:

(1) No such improvement project shall exceed \$10,000.

(2) The total expenses of such improvements within a fiscal year shall not exceed \$500 for any one family unit in any case, and (a) an average of \$100 per family unit for each installation having 10 or more family units, or (b) \$1,000 for each installation having less than 10 family units.

(3) These incidental improvements are not occasioned by, or made in conjunction with, a separate undertaking which exceeds the above specified limitation.

c. *Special consideration.*—In certain instances, it is necessary to reimburse local municipalities for direct services rendered to Government housing projects, such as police and fire protection, street maintenance and lighting, sewage disposal, and so forth. Funds for this purpose are included in the total amount requested for the Department of the Navy housing. This is consistent with previous practice.

2. *Program Justification*

(a) Total appropriated funds in the amount of \$124,325,000 are requested to support fiscal year 1974 operation and maintenance expenses, excluding leasing. This amount is \$16,613,000 or more than the total funds requested in fiscal year 1973.

(b) Major increases/decreases in fiscal year 1974 compared to fiscal year 1973 as follows:

(1) *Operations*—(a) *Operating expenses (less furnishings) + \$6,066,000.*—The increase in this area is due to the expense of operating an additional 3,455 units in fiscal year 1974 along with an increase in operating costs, utility rates and consumption. In addition, an increase in the amount of \$71,000 is included for additional staffing for operation of off-base referral offices.

(b) *Furnishing + \$1,117,000.*—The increase in this area is due to the expense of maintaining authorized household equipment in an additional 3,455 units in fiscal year 1974 and the need to procure furniture for overseas locations where a weight limitation is being imposed on the shipment of occupant-owned furnishings. Increases are also requested for the repair and moving and handling of overseas furnishing. Decreases for conus furnishing are in line with a continually diminishing total inventory.

(2) *Maintenance*—\$9,430,000.—This increase will provide for the maintenance of 3,455 additional units in fiscal year 1974 as compared to fiscal year 1973 and compensate for increases in material and labor costs. Additionally, it is estimated that the request will allow application of \$4,500,000 to the backlog of deferred maintenance.

(c) *Reimbursements*—\$106,000.—Reimbursable authority in the amount of \$2,492,000 requested for fiscal year 1974. A decrease of \$106,000 below the amount of \$2,598,000 requested in fiscal year 1973 is due to the disposal of housing units occupied by Coast Guard at San Juan, Puerto Rico and Kodiak, Alaska.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (TRANSFER TO MARINE CORPS)  
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET

	FY 1972 Actual		FY 1973 Estimate		FY 1974 Estimate	
<b>A. INVENTORY DATA</b>						
Units in Being Beginning of Year	18,419		18,263		18,948	
Units in Being at End of Year	18,263		18,948		19,598	
Average Inventory for Year Requiring O&M Funding:						
a. Conterminous U.S.	16,820		16,925		17,333	
b. Outside U.S.	1,523		1,682		1,942	
c. Total	18,343		18,607		19,275	
<b>B. FUNDING REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>Total Est.</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Total Est.</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>	<b>Total Est.</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>
<b>1. OPERATIONS</b>	<b>(\$000)</b>	<b>(\$)</b>	<b>(\$000)</b>	<b>(\$)</b>	<b>(\$000)</b>	<b>(\$)</b>
<b>a. Operating Expenses</b>						
(1) Administration	1,433	78	1,693	91	1,964	102
(2) Services	1,338	73	1,508	81	1,725	90
(3) Utility Operations	5,513	301	6,003	323	6,706	348
(4) Furnishings	911	57	1,768	95	2,566	133
Subtotal-Gross Obligations	9,195	502	10,972	590	12,961	673
Less: Anticipated Reimbursements	98	5	167	9	175	9
Subtotal, Operations (Direct Obliga.)	9,097	497	10,805	581	12,786	664
<b>2. MAINTENANCE</b>						
a. Maintenance & Repair of Dwellings	7,779	424	8,133	437	10,082	523
b. Maint. & Repair of Other Real Property	2,305	126	2,694	145	2,750	143
c. Alterations & Additions	9	0	50	3	50	2
Subtotal, Maintenance (Direct Obliga.)	10,093	550	10,877	585	12,882	668
<b>3. GRAND TOTAL O&amp;M EXPENSES (Incl. Reimb.)</b>	<b>19,288</b>	<b>1,051</b>	<b>21,849</b>	<b>1,175</b>	<b>25,843</b>	<b>1,341</b>
<b>4. GRAND TOTAL O&amp;M (1&amp;2, above) (Direct Obliga.)</b>	<b>19,190</b>	<b>1,046</b>	<b>21,682</b>	<b>1,166</b>	<b>25,668</b>	<b>1,332</b>

Excluding Leased Units & Costs

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (TRANSFER TO MARINE CORPS) FAMILY HOUSING  
DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE JUSTIFI-  
CATION

1. NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

(a) *Operation.*—The operation portion of the family housing program includes expenses incident to: administration and management of the housing at the installation level; providing such services as refuse collection and disposal, custodial services, street sweeping, snow removal, and in certain instances, police and fire protection; provided such utility services as electricity, water, heat, sewage, but excluding telephone service; providing maintenance, repair, replacement, moving and handling of furniture and movable equipment as authorized by administrative policy. The operation portion also covers authorization to obligate and expend funds made available from sources other than the "Housing management account" to reimburse for authorized work performed or services delivered.

(b) *Maintenance.*—The maintenance portion includes maintenance and repair of housing units, buildings, roads, driveways, walks, exterior utility and interior utility systems; grounds care as authorized by administrative policy. Also includes projects for incidental improvement (alterations and additions) provided that:

(1) No such alteration or addition-expansion-extension shall exceed \$10,000.

(2) The total expenses for these alterations and additions-expansions-extensions within a fiscal year shall not exceed \$500 for any one family unit in any case, and (1) an average of \$100 per family unit for each installation having 10 or more family units or (2) \$1,000 for each installation having less than 10 family units.

(3) These incidental alterations and additions-expansions-extensions are not occasioned by or made in conjunction with a separate undertaking which exceeds the above specified limitations.

2. PROGRAM JUSTIFICATION

(a) Total funds in the amount of \$25,843,000 are needed to support the fiscal year 1974 family housing operation and maintenance expenses. The appropriation request of \$25,668,000, and reimbursements of \$175,000 will meet this need.

(b) In fiscal year 1974, 700 additional units are scheduled to enter the inventory. Two hundred of these units will be constructed at the Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, as a part of Naval Complex Oahu construction plan.

(c) Major increases/decreases in the fiscal year 1974 estimate, as compared to fiscal year 1973, are as follows:

(1) *Operations*: +\$1,989,000.

(a) *Operating expense* (less furnishings): +\$1,191,000. This increase is required to support an average of 19,275 units in fiscal year 1974, as well as significant increases in operating costs, utility rates, and consumption.

(b) *Furnishings*: +\$798,000. Provide funds to support pay increases, nominal increases in moving and handling, initial procurement of furnishings for newly acquired units overseas and for procurement of furnishings for use within mandatorily assigned quarters. Also provides for a continuation of an orderly replacement and repair program for furnishings within present inventories as authorized by current directives.

(2) *Maintenance*: +\$2,005,000.

Provides funds to support wage board increases and increased repair requirements from the normal deterioration of age. The increase will be applied to recurring maintenance and repair to prevent further degradation of the current inventory and still permit an estimated \$900,000 reduction in deferred maintenance during fiscal year 1974.

HOUSING OPERATION COST

Mr. SIKES. What types of costs cause the increase in your operating expenses from year to year? Is there any published index to which your experience corresponds?

Captain REED. The largest cause of increase in the operating expenses is the cost of utilities. Both the cost of supplying utilities and the consumption rate have increased rapidly in the past 3 years and indications are this trend will continue for at least 3 more years. Consumption rate increases are due in part to more extensive use of electrical equipment including items such as home air-conditioners, dishwashers, and garbage disposals. In fact the Navy's new construction program includes air-conditioning and many additional units are being air-conditioned through family housing projects.

Increase cost of trash collection, police and fire protection, and other type services has also contributed to the increase in operating expenses.

Navy's experience in increasing operating expenses in the family housing area is similar to the increase in housing operation cost as published in the Consumer Price Index. This index is published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and shows rapidly increasing cost in housing operations.

#### BACKLOG OF MAINTENANCE

Mr. SIKES. What effect will base closure actions have on the size of the backlog of essential maintenance and repair?

Captain REED. It is reducing it by \$500,000, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Do you think you will actually be able to reduce BEMAR by as much as 15 percent during fiscal year 1974?

Captain REED. We are estimating we will reduce it by 10 percent, which is about \$2 million in addition to the \$500,000 resulting from the basic closure actions.

#### LEASING

Mr. SIKES. Insert pages 81 through 87 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET, LEASING

	Fiscal year 1972 actual average		Fiscal year 1973 year-end estimate		Fiscal year 1974 year-end estimate	
	Units	Cost (thousands)	Units	Cost (thousands)	Units	Cost (thousands)
Domestic (50 states).....	3, 103	\$6, 504	3, 944	\$8, 700	3, 944	\$9, 939
Foreign.....	109	578	273	1, 200	438	1, 700
Total.....	3, 212	7, 082	4, 217	9, 900	4, 382	11, 639

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET

#### LEASING

Narrative description and justification:

#### A. Domestic Leasing

##### 1. Authority.—

a. Section 515. Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended.

b. The Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1973 (Public Law 92-545 dated October 25, 1972) further amended the above basic legislation by providing the following criteria. Where there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near military installations, and (1) there has been a recent and

substantial increase in the personnel strength assigned to such military installation and such increase is temporary, or (2) the permanent personnel strength of such military installation is to be substantially reduced in the near future, or (3) the number of military personnel assigned to such military installation is so small as to make the construction of family housing uneconomical, or (4) family housing is required for personal attending service school academic courses on permanent change of station orders, or (5) family housing has been authorized but is not yet completed or a family housing authorization request is in a pending military construction authorization bill.

c. Dollar limitations: Public law 92-545 restricts average cost per unit month in the United States (other than Hawaii), Puerto Rico and Guam to \$210 including maintenance and operation costs, and utilities and \$255 per unit per month in Hawaii. Public law 92-545 also restricts total charges for any one unit to \$290 per month in the United States (other than Hawaii) Puerto Rico and Guam and \$300 per month in Hawaii.

## 2. Costs.—

The increase of \$1,239,000 in the fiscal year 1974 domestic leasing budget over fiscal year 1973 is due to the requirement of budgeting all 3,944 units for a full-year rental costs.

3. The line entries are keyed to the following identifiers: (1) Substantial but temporary increase. (2) Substantial reduction in the near future. (3) Too small requirement for economic construction. (4) Eligible students on PCS orders. (5) Leasing as interim relief pending completion of an authorized military construction program.

## B. Foreign Leasing

1. *Authority.*—Title 10, United States Code, section 2675.

2. *Department of Defense Policy.*—It is the policy to lease privately owned family housing only for military personnel in ranks 0-6 and above, and only (1) where it has been determined that such leasing is for the benefit of the United States and (2) when Government quarters commensurate with the positions of the officers are not available. If specifically approved by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), family housing may be leased in foreign countries for civilians and for military personnel in grades 0-5 and below provided criteria (1) and (2) above are clearly applicable. Family housing leased in accordance with these criteria shall be designated public quarters and occupants shall forfeit basic quarters allowances.

3. *Costs.*—The increase of \$500,000 in the fiscal year 1974 foreign leasing budget is due to the increase in numerical requirements in the Naples, Italy, and La Maddalena areas. The proposal will continue to provide funds to continue to lease in such areas as Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Djakarta, Indonesia and Manila, the Republic of the Philippines.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

### FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET—LEASING

	Footnote code	End year fiscal year 1974 estimate	
		Units	Cost
1. Domestic (50 States):			
(a) California:			
NAS, Alameda.....	(9)	55	\$138,000
Long Beach complex.....	(9)	80	202,000
NPGS, Monterey.....	(9)	40	101,000
NAVSCOL, Mare Island, San Francisco.....	(9)	100	224,000
NAVSCOL, Treasure Island, San Francisco.....	(9)	22	55,000
San Diego complex.....	(9)	20	50,000
(b) Connecticut: NBS, New London.....	(9)	200	504,000
(c) District of Columbia: Washington, D.C. complex.....	(9)	100	200,000
(d) Florida:			
NTC, Orlando.....	(9)	40	100,000
NAS, Jacksonville.....	(9)	50	125,000
NAS, Pensacola.....	(9)	100	233,000
(e) Georgia: NSCS, Athens.....	(9)	63	140,000
(f) Hawaii: Oahu complex.....	(9)	560	1,646,000
(g) Illinois:			
NAS, Glenview.....	(9)	40	101,000
NTC, Great Lakes.....	(9)	70	176,000
NAVSCOL, Great Lakes.....	(9)	45	113,000

	Footnote code	End year fiscal year 1974 estimate	
		Units	Cost
(h) Mississippi:			
CBS, Gulfport.....	(9)	200	415,000
NSS, Pascagoula.....	(9)	90	200,000
(i) New Jersey: NAS, Lakehurst.....	(9)	40	101,000
(j) Pennsylvania: Warminster-Willow Grove complex.....	(9)	50	025,000
(k) Rhode Island:			
CBC, Davisville.....	(9)	25	63,000
NAVBASE, Newport.....	(9)	170	428,000
NAS, Quonset Point.....	(2)	50	126,000
(l) Miscellaneous small activities (Navy) (various locations):			
Naval Recruiting Service.....	(9)	780	-----
Naval Reserve Training Service.....	(9)	100	2,379,000
Other miscellaneous small naval activities.....	(9)	64	-----
(m) Miscellaneous small activities (Marines): Various locations.....	(9)	790	1,991,000
Domestic summary:			
Major installations.....		2,210	5,569,000
Miscellaneous small activities Navy.....		944	2,379,000
Miscellaneous small activities Marine Corps.....		790	1,991,000
Domestic totals.....		3,944	9,939,000
Foreign:			
(a) Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (these units are for staff members of the Field Detachment Unit of the U.S. Navy Medical Research Unit No. 3).....		14	80,000
(b) Bahrain (this unit is for the commander, Middle East Forces).....		1	11,000
(c) Greece (1 unit for the commanding officer, U.S. Naval Communication Station, Nea Makri; 1 unit for the commander, Carrier Division 2/Carrier Task Force).....		2	18,000
(d) Gibraltar (this unit is for the U.S. naval liaison officer, Gibraltar).....		1	4,000
(e) Indonesia (5 units are for staff members of the Field Detachment Unit of the U.S. Navy Medical Research Unit No. 2; 1 unit for Naval Intelligence Command personnel).....		6	40,000
(f) Italy (Navy is administrative agent): Naples (112 units are for personnel assigned to the naval support activity, of which 1 unit each will be for the following: (1) Commander, Naval Air Forces, Mediterranean (Navy); (2) Chief of Staff, Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe (Army); (3) Assistant Chief of Staff, Logistics, Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe (Navy); (4) Assistant Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations, Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe (Army); (5) Deputy Commander, Naval Striking and Support Forces, Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe (Navy); (6) Commander, U.S. 6th Fleet (Navy); (7) Commander, U.S. Submarine Flotilla No. 8 (Navy); (8) Commander, Allied Air Forces, Southern Europe (Air Force); (9) Deputy Commander, Allied Air Forces, Southern Europe (Air Force); (10) Commanding Officer, Headquarters, Naval Support Activity (Navy); (11) Deputy Commander, Anti-Submarine Warfare Force 6th Fleet (Navy); (12) Deputy Commandant, NATO Defense College, Rome (Navy)).....		112	464,000
(g) Italy: La Maddalena (Det) (206 units for personnel homeported at La Maddalena).....		206	681,000
(h) Philippines (these 82 units include 2 non-MAP and an 80-unit triservice program in Manila).....		82	375,000
(i) Thurso, Scotland (these 10 units are for personnel at the naval radio station).....		10	12,000
(j) Unassigned.....		4	15,000
Other foreign totals.....		438	1,700,000

Mr. SIKES. Are you requesting that the leasing criteria in the United States be expanded?

Captain REED. Not this year, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Do you expect to use the additional leases you are requesting?

Captain REED. Yes, sir, we do.

#### ADDITIONAL LEASES IN ITALY

[Additional information follows:]

Increases over fiscal year 1973 in your foreign lease are an additional 100 units at Naples, Italy, and 250 units at La Maddalena, Sardinia, which were approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee in March 1973.

The units at La Maddalena are being obtained through lease construction—our first use of this procedure in housing. In Naples we are utilizing the conventional lease method.

The rent cost for the units in Naples will average \$250 per month per unit, and those in La Maddalena will run \$325 per month. Both prices include utilities.

These are all we can obtain within the currently authorized allocation. Our additional current requirements total approximately 650 and are located at Sigonella, Holy Loch, London, St. Mawgan, Barbados, Grand Turk, and Singapore.

We estimate the total cost for that portion of fiscal year 1974 for which we could execute the leases would be approximately \$1.2 million.

Mr. SIKES. How much of the proposed program increase will you be able to achieve with the dollars you have?

Captain REED. We have dollars in this budget for those units shown in the budget.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The point of that question was, if lease costs are going up overseas, are you going to be able to achieve as many lease points as you had anticipated when you put the budget together? Could you supply that for the record?

Captain REED. Yes, sir, I will.

[The information follows:]

To the best of our knowledge, the dollars in the budget will enable us to achieve the lease units anticipated, with the exception of La Maddalena. For La Maddalena, we slightly underestimated the cost and will absorb the difference through other accounts in O. & M.

Mr. DAVIS. Are these figures now up to date? Do they reflect the base closures and other things?

Captain REED. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Further questions?

Very well, gentlemen, thank you very much for your cooperation. This has been a good hearing.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 1973.

## MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

### WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. M. R. REILLY, DIRECTOR OF CIVIL ENGINEERING  
H. P. RIETMAN, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, CIVIL ENGINEERING  
COL. JOHN E. CATLIN, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING  
LT. COL. E. D. SCHEIDEMAN, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING  
A. R. JONKERS, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING  
MAJ. WILLIAM R. SIMS, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING  
A. A. JOHNSTON, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING  
LT. COL. L. W. REED, DIRECTORATE OF AEROSPACE PROGRAMS  
LT. COL. B. B. BALLIF, DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL PLANNING  
LT. COL. TOM M. SHOOK, DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL PLANNING  
MAJ. FREDERICK MUISE, DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL PLANNING  
CAPT. ALAN FORKER, DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL PLANNING

Mr. PATTEN. The committee will come to order. We will take up Air Force family housing. Insert page 1 in the record.

[The page follows:]

*Department of the Air Force, family housing, defense—Fiscal year 1974 budget program and financing*

	<i>Thousands</i>
Construction of new housing-----	\$55,501
Mobile home facilities-----	2,000
Improvements-----	23,750
Minor construction-----	400
Planning-----	300
<b>Total construction-----</b>	<b>81,951</b>
Operating expenses-----	108,112
Leasing-----	13,577
Maintenance-----	97,547
<b>Total operation and maintenance-----</b>	<b>219,236</b>
Debt interest and other expenses-----	31,340
<b>Total-----</b>	<b>332,527</b>
Less:	
Reimbursements:	
O. & M-----	-1,025
Debt-----	-3,997
Available from other years:	
(Brought forward) debt-----	-2,626
Plus:	
Redemption of agency debt-----	+3,400
<b>Budget authority-----</b>	<b>328,279</b>
Budget authority:	
Appropriation:	
Construction-----	81,951
Operation and maintenance-----	<sup>1</sup> 218,211
Debt payment-----	<sup>1</sup> 62,521
<b>Total appropriation-----</b>	<b>382,683</b>
Less:	
Portion applied to debt reduction-----	-54,404
<b>Appropriation (adjusted)-----</b>	<b>328,279</b>

<sup>1</sup> The appropriation requests for debt payment, and for operation and maintenance, are in lump sum for the Department of Defense and not restricted by military department or defense agency. Amounts footnoted are within those totals.

Mr. PATTEN. General, I see you have a statement. How would you like to proceed?

General REILLY. I will read it if you please.

Mr. PATTEN. You may proceed.

#### GENERAL STATEMENT

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a pleasure to again appear before you. We are here today to present the Air Force fiscal year 1974 military family housing program. As in past years, our program reflects our deep concern for the welfare of our military families. We are very grateful to the chairman and members of this committee for the assistance which has been given to the Air Force and the other services in meeting the housing needs of

military families. I refer especially to the section 236 provisions of the Housing Act of 1968, increases in military pay and basic allowances for quarters; added appropriations in the fiscal year 1973 program for improvements to existing quarters, and authority to declare as inadequate additional substandard housing units.

The total request for this year is \$382,683,000. Of that amount, \$218,211,000 is for the operation and maintenance of our housing resources; \$81,951,000 is for the construction of new units, mobile home spaces and improvements to existing quarters; and \$82,521,000 for the annual increment of debt payment on homes constructed in prior years.

Our operations and maintenance request represents an increase of \$23,700,000, or roughly 12 percent, over the amount appropriated last year. This increase is required to accommodate additional housing units coming into the inventory, as well as increased cost of labor and materials. This increase will also allow us to hold the backlog of deferred maintenance and repair to a manageable level.

Our new construction request is for 1,800 units, 1,100 to be constructed at six installations in the continental United States and 700 units at two locations overseas. Of the 1,800 units, 1,798 are for airmen families and construction will be almost exclusively 4-bedroom units.

The new construction portion of our request also includes \$2 million to develop 415 spaces at 8 locations to accommodate mobile homes owned by Air Force personnel. This construction will materially assist our young married airmen who desire to purchase and live in mobile homes.

The improvement of existing family housing units remains a matter of major concern to the Air Force. Our inventory of housing units was acquired over many years. While the standard of accommodations varies widely, the forfeiture of quarters allowance by grade is the same as long as the quarters are classified as adequate. The \$23,750,000 we are requesting for fiscal year 1974 represents a 100-percent increase over our program of a year ago. We feel this major increase is appropriate and thoroughly justified in view of the very large deficiency which exists today. In addition, we will more effectively manage and execute the improvements program through emphasis on fewer but larger projects. This will permit us to secure better cost competition as well as satisfying the total improvements requirement at a number of locations.

The planning for the new construction and improvements included in this program is progressing satisfactorily, and we expect to be able to place all projects under contract by June 30, 1974.

Mr. Chairman, with these brief opening comments, we are now ready to present our program and respond to your questions.

Sitting to my immediate left is Mr. Andrew A. Johnston of my office who has appeared before this committee many times in support of our family housing requirements and to his left Mr. Harry P. Rietman, my associate director of civil engineering. I also have with me other personnel of my office and headquarters Air Force who are prepared to assist us as backup witnesses.

Mr. PATTEN. Thank you. Are there any questions on the statement?

Mr. DAVIS. General Reilly, apparently this program that we have before us is all from the allocation to you by the office of the Secretary of Defense.

General REILLY. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS. In other words, you do not supplement the Defense Department allocation as the Navy and the Army have done in their budget?

General REILLY. No, sir. For this particular program there has been no subsidizing by the remainder of the Air Force budget.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

#### DEFICITS

Mr. PATTEN. Could you tell us the size of your deficits, based on the Air Force's projected force levels as follows:

- (a) Programable deficit for eligible personnel.
- (b) Programable deficit for "ineligible" personnel.
- (c) Total deficit, all Air Force military personnel.

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, our programable deficit for eligible personnel is approximately 20,000 units. For ineligibles it is roughly 18,000 units. Our total requirements, discounting the 10 percent that the Office of Secretary of Defense does not allow us to consider, are about 80,000 units.

Mr. DAVIS. What do you mean by the 10 percent which you are not permitted to consider?

General REILLY. Against our total requirements, which in our case is some 400,000 people who need to be housed, the OSD permits us only to program to 90 percent of that amount. This is a figure they have adopted which is designed, I think, to take care of people who would be transferring from one station to another and to provide a safety factor due to unforeseen mission changes and things of that nature.

Mr. DAVIS. When you speak of the deficit for ineligible personnel, what do you mean?

General REILLY. We are speaking of the E-3's and below who are not by today's criteria allowed to receive family housing.

Mr. PATTEN. What effect have pay raises and the marital factor had on the size of your deficit as compared to what you projected last year?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, it has had an effect. As you may recall, we were speaking in terms of a deficit of around 40,000 units at this time last year. Increased pay and allowances, making additional community assets available to our people at a price they can pay, together with the inclusion this year of the E-4's for programing purposes, and a lower marital factor have tended to materially reduce our requirements.

Mr. PATTEN. Is the annual level of 1,800 new units which you are requesting this year sufficient to meet your deficit in a reasonable time period?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we feel within the restraint of our annual budget roughly 2,000 units a year in terms of new construction is a reasonable program measured against the reduced deficiency I just mentioned.

Mr. PATTEN. What did the Air Force request?

General REILLY. We requested, as I recall, 2,050 units from the Office of Secretary of Defense this year. We were reduced to the 1,800 we now have in the program.

[Additional information follows:]

AIR FORCE OSD MHF UNIT REQUEST

We lost 200 units at Elmendorf AFB, Alaska, and the Andrews AFB, Maryland, project was reduced from 350 to 300 units.

Mr. PATTEN. Did the Air Force shift any funds into the family housing program in the fiscal year 1974 budget?

General REILLY. No, sir; we did not.

MOBILE HOME SPACES

Mr. PATTEN. What are the Air Force's long-term requirements in the area of mobile home spaces?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we see a continuing need for mobile home facilities on our bases, especially to accommodate our younger airmen who fall in the ineligible category and who elect to buy these homes and want to live in them. We have at the present time something over 4,000 spaces on our bases; maybe another 4,000 units are required. At least we have the requirement for several thousand more units and plan to include each year in our program a modest request for additional mobile home spaces.

Mr. PATTEN. You are asking for 415 spaces this year. How fast are you meeting these needs?

General REILLY. We have been proceeding in the neighborhood of 500 units a year. We have not had any major increase or reduction in our mobile home request.

IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. PATTEN. What is your total backlog in improvements?

General REILLY. We estimate roughly \$300 million, Mr. Chairman. Two-thirds of that amount is in our older Wherry housing units.

Mr. PATTEN. Is this year's level of \$23 million adequate, or could you use more?

General REILLY. It is certainly an increase, as I mentioned, over what we have had in prior years. Yes, we could use more. Recognizing the deficit just mentioned, we could use more and hopefully beginning in fiscal 1975 we can get our improvements program up to maybe \$40 million a year. Our basic plan is to do \$200 million worth of work in this area over a 5-year period.

Mr. PATTEN. Five times forty?

General REILLY. Yes. We would like to increase it up to about \$40 million.

Mr. PATTEN. You are liable to get it. All my life I have handled real estate. I think it is a sin not to use a brush where you need some paint to take care of a house. You say you have a \$300 million backlog and and you are very grateful for a 100-percent increase of \$23 million. I can't tolerate a leaky faucet or a broken toilet or other things that need repair.

General REILLY. The \$23 million is not for maintenance and repair. We spend many millions in addition.

Mr. PATTEN. I know you distinguish between repairs and minor construction.

General REILLY. This is to alter many of our older units to make them livable by today's standards.

Mr. PATTEN. Are they all items over \$500,000?

General REILLY. \$26,500 to \$5,787,000.

Mr. PATTEN. If additional improvement funds were allowed, could you use them without vacating too many of your units?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, I think we could and I think we are in a position to undertake the necessary planning and design to accomplish that.

#### USE OF SUBSTANDARD UNITS

Mr. PATTEN. To what extent do you plan to keep your existing substandard units in the Air Force inventory to house ineligible personnel?

General REILLY. We have some 10,000 of these units at the present time. We envision them being with us for quite a few years to come.

Mr. PATTEN. Will there be a shift of eligible personnel out of the Air Force's substandard units in the near future?

General REILLY. We think there will be a gradual shift, Mr. Chairman. At the present time here in the United States most of our inadequate quarters are occupied by eligible personnel, and we see them shifting out of these, especially in view of the additional adequate units becoming available for eligible personnel in the community.

Mr. PATTEN. How many of the units which have been declared inadequate will you replace in the next 5 to 10 years?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we have only a couple of bases where we feel inadequate units must be replaced in the rather near future. I am speaking of Elmendorf in Alaska and Hickam Air Force Base in Hawaii. Maybe 1,000 units within the next 5 to 10 years is all we can foresee at the present time.

Mr. PATTEN. What is your policy on programing new units where you have a sufficient total number of adequate units and Air Force-owned inadequate units to meet your requirements?

General REILLY. So long as the inadequate units are voluntarily occupied we class them as adequate for programing purposes. They do not count against our deficiency.

#### HOUSING OF INELIGIBLES

Mr. PATTEN. Do you expect to eventually build replacement units to house the "ineligibles"?

General REILLY. Our objective is to provide housing for our ineligible. To satisfy the objective, we foresee using a mix of construction at our bases together with the support that can be obtained from the community. Our objective is to house all of them.

#### REPLACEMENT OF AIR FORCE HOUSING

Mr. PATTEN. You have 1,800 as the number of units you are going to have here. That is not much muscle is it?

General REILLY. Not at the present time, no, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. In fact you have 400,000 families. Many of them are in Air Force houses. Your allowance for deterioration during the current year would be about 1 percent if you are asking for 1,800 new units. Your deterioration rate must be 4 percent or better, so you are not taking care of your deterioration especially when part of your

inventory is Wherry housing of 20-year vintage. Do you think that is a fair statement?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir. We are improving the Wherry units up to current day standards to the extent possible. As long as we continue upgrading the units we feel they will remain in the inventory. We have 152,000 family housing units in our inventory now, sir, and we are not losing any of these by attrition at this particular time. We are keeping them in use.

Mr. PATTEN. You can do this with numbers of units of automobiles or anything else. Certainly in business we give a building a certain life for income tax purposes. We give a lot of frame buildings a 30-year life as a business proposition. So you take 3 $\frac{1}{3}$  percent a year depreciation. I don't care how you look at it, you have depreciation somewhere along the line, with all due respect.

Mr. JOHNSTON. With all due respect, we still have structures built in 1880 in use at Warren Air Force Base.

Mr. PATTEN. This is not necessarily bad. On some of the construction we had after the war they used one nail where they should have used four, and they were using green lumber and one thing or another.

I well remember the policy was with all the demobilization we didn't know where to paint, what to fix, what to let go, and a lot of things were let go until we saw which way the wind blew.

In 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951 from the things that I saw there was hardly a brush put on anything.

Mr. McEWEN. On the question of age of buildings, I would like to observe that I was looking at material given to me on a building at Plattsburgh Air Force Base. Of course that base goes back to the War of 1812. This building was constructed in 1838, and it was used by the Air Force up until just a few years ago and now has been declared surplus to Air Force needs.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. McEWEN. Actually it is a magnificent stone building and is just as true and solid as the day it was put up in 1838. At that time it was an Army barracks.

Mr. PATTEN. I slept in a house over July 4 built in 1872 in a town in New Hampshire. We just loved it. Of course you don't need any air conditioning. If they have a foundation I don't know about it. But there must be something good about it. They must have some good lumber in there. They built a barn and then an outhouse, and it has probably six additions. Everybody loves them. In the area there are a lot of houses 200 years old or close to it. That doesn't determine whether they are livable. If you want to know whether they are or not, just price some of them. They must have some merit.

#### HOUSING STANDARDS FOR INELIGIBLES

But to go back to housing for "ineligibles," would you propose to provide these to the same standards as current construction?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I think if we were to construct for the ineligible—they would be young fellows, most with small families—probably two bedrooms would be required. I think we would build to a standard which is basically comparable to the house we are building today for our lowest grade eligible personnel. Something in the 950 to 1,000 square foot space range.

Mr. PATTEN. In the event you build to current standards for these lower grade personnel, will you be providing them with better housing than people of a similar pay level and level of responsibility in the civilian community can obtain?

General REILLY. I don't think we would, Mr. Chairman. I think we envision two bedroom apartments, large numbers of them, for these ineligible people and think they would be quite comparable to what their civilian counterparts would be living in.

Mr. PATTEN. Yesterday I voted no, one of three persons who did, on extending the VA mortgage loan law. I just rebel at giving them the power to allow veterans to buy housing at 8½ percent interest. But I don't have the heart to tell a fellow to buy a house at 8½ percent interest. I think it is criminal. I financed thousands of VA mortgages at 4 percent.

The idea of 8½ percent interest shocks me. I just made a little protest vote. The realistic thing is they are out of the market.

When you are going to make comparisons, it depends on where you are. In my community housing is the most critical problem I have. We just don't have any. There is no hope for senior citizens and for others of low income. You can't make a comparison. I think we will have to put up tents or barracks or something.

Now you know we have 50 million more people in this country than we had 15 years ago. So when you try to compare in areas where you have had a busy growth of industries and everything else, really we have not kept up on housing.

Take the District of Columbia as an example. When you think of people of low income in the District, in my 10 years in Congress, I don't see where anything has been done. In my lifetime in my town I don't think anyone built a house for the purpose of renting it, which is what low-income people normally would do. Nobody does it. Nobody builds a house for an investment today unless you are talking about an apartment house. On the whole it has been owners building for themselves. We are not getting any place. Maybe in a State which has lost population you might find some vacancies.

General REILLY. For our Air Force personnel who are in a transient status the high interest, if offset by easy mortgage money and low down payment, doesn't present such a tremendous problem. When a guy gets ready to move and hasn't invested much in the house other than high monthly payments, he can sell the house. However, what is happening now where there is not only high interest rates but requirements for a very large down payment presents a serious problem.

Mr. PATTEN. You are not old enough. In the twenties and thirties I never heard of a 30-year mortgage. If you got a 15-year mortgage you were doing good. Twenty years was the limit. On the post-World War II legislation we talked about 30- or 40-year mortgages. I can remember a good banker telling me it was socialism. Yet I think the average time a mortgage after World War II was paid off was 7 years. The 30 years enabled a smaller monthly payment.

Now we are talking about 50-year mortgages in some of the HUD programs. That seems forever to me.

We didn't even pass a housing act in the Congress last year. To properly answer that question about comparing it with other standards we could write a book I guess.

## EFFECT OF BASE CLOSURES ON HOUSING REQUIREMENTS

What effect have the recently announced base closures had on the Air Force's total housing construction requirements?

General REILLY. It has had very little overall effect, Mr. Chairman. While we have closed some bases or reduced the missions and changed some of our missions, it hasn't created any particular problems at our bases. Generally the reductions have just about kept up with the influx of new people due to the changed missions.

Mr. PATTEN. What effect will they have on the BAQ required to be paid from the military personnel accounts?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, the BAQ as it applies to payment of rental allowance is an experience factor based on strength. Since many of these actions will not materialize until late in fiscal year 1974 we have made no reductions in our budget or any changes in our budget for fiscal year 1974. It may be possible that in fiscal year 1975 there will be some changes required.

Mr. PATTEN. Provide details for the record.

[The information follows:]

## EFFECT OF BASE CLOSURES ON MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS FOR BAQ

Impending base closure actions during fiscal year 1974 present a potential loss of 6,656 family housing units to the Air Force inventory. While this loss, viewed in isolation, would ordinarily cause increased BAQ funding, the overall BAQ budget for married personnel in fact declines in fiscal year 1974 to \$532.2 million from \$592.9 million in fiscal year 1973 due to force reductions. Also, it is probable that many of the housing units at closing bases will remain available for military occupancy throughout fiscal year 1974 and beyond pending final disposal actions.

Mr. PATTEN. Have all of the projects requested in this bill been checked to ensure that they will still be required at this scope after the base realignment actions take effect?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; they certainly have.

Mr. PATTEN. In which areas will there be an increased need for family housing as a result of the realignments?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, at a few of the bases the changes that we are speaking about will cause some net increases in personnel. I mentioned we don't foresee any major problems with family housing. It may have some influence on our requirements. I think we will have to wait until the next survey to really see what the impact is.

## UTILIZATION OF FUNDS FROM CANCELLED PROJECTS

Mr. PATTEN. In which areas have you cancelled funded projects?

General REILLY. The committee is aware I am sure of the fiscal year 1973 project, for 200 units, at Laredo Air Force Base which had been approved. That will not be constructed. I think we have several hundred thousand dollars in improvements projects which will not be constructed.

Mr. PATTEN. What funds are available and what projects could be feasibly undertaken this year, in addition to those already requested in fiscal year 1974, in order to meet total Air Force housing needs?

General REILLY. Of course with our stated deficiency we have a number of bases where we require additional houses, and we could undertake the necessary design and planning to build those houses. I think

we could more readily accommodate any add-ons to the program or increases at this time in our improvements area.

Mr. PATTEN. What funds are available?

General REILLY. We don't have any.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You have the assets from Laredo?

General REILLY. Yes. However, as we look at our fiscal year 1973 program and with the cost increases we have experienced, I think we are going to need at least portions of funding for that project to place under contract the houses at the other locations.

Mr. NICHOLAS. There is a limit of \$24,000, inside the United States, on the Air Force housing program.

General REILLY. That is correct.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Do you have less money in your fiscal year 1973 program than the average cost limit would have allowed?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The limit on stateside bases is \$24,000 per unit. We have two projects overseas, one in Incirlik, Turkey and one in San Vito, Italy, in which we are anticipating large price increases. We would have to utilize some Laredo funds against these two projects.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You would still get them within the average overall?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You haven't been funded up to that level?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Provide details for the record.

[The information follows:]

#### PROGRAMING COST INCREASES IN FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROJECT

There were 2,818 stateside units in the program at an average cost of \$23,765 and a total cost of \$66,972,000 including Laredo's 200 units which will not be constructed. There are 350 units at foreign locations at an average cost of \$25,862 and a total cost of \$9,052,000. This is an over all total of \$76,024,000.

We intend to construct 2,618 stateside units at an average cost of \$24,000 and a total cost of \$62,832,000 which leaves \$4,140,000 excess from the stateside units.

Of the \$4,140,000, we will have to apply some \$2,068,000 to the overseas units, increasing their average to \$31,771 per unit. This increase is necessary due to our intention of constructing relocatable units utilizing one-step procurement methods and to support dollar devaluation during the past year.

The \$2,072,000 remaining will be used as follows: \$1,254,000 to relocate some units from Chitose AS to Misawa AB, Japan and \$818,000 to increase the Bolling AFB project funding to the fiscal year 1974 statutory average of \$27,500 per unit.

#### SHORTAGE OF FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROJECTS

Mr. NICHOLAS. Also there is an indication that, to some extent, there may be a slipping of projects into the fiscal year 1974 time frame. After the fiscal year 1974 authorization bill is enacted and brings in with it a new higher overall average, if you expect to apply that average to some of your earlier projects, that will have a funding effect. Can you provide that for the record.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir; we certainly will.

[The information follows:]

#### IMPACT OF FISCAL YEAR 1974 MFH AUTHORIZATION BILL ON PRIOR YEAR PROJECT FUNDING

We expect to apply the new higher overall average to the fiscal year 1973 projects at Andrews, Bolling, and Hill Air Force Bases. This will require an increase in authorization of \$2.1 million and an increase in appropriations of \$3.3 million for the fiscal year 1973 program.

Mr. PATTEN. On these things you might do if you had some money left over from base closures, do you have the land available?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; we have quite a number of bases where we have housing deficiencies and where we do have land available. At other bases any new construction will require additional land. That is one of our problems.

#### WIVES' OPINIONS

Mr. PATTEN. What have been the Air Force's impressions as a result of the recent survey you made of Air Force wives?

General REILLY. In the surveys that were conducted together with our own internal surveys of the feelings of the housewives, the women have been quite outspoken in stating some of their opinions. They feel, of course, that air conditioning is extremely important, and that is something we are providing whenever it is authorized in our new construction as well as putting it in under our improvements program.

They stress the need for greater privacy, especially where there are children in the family, fenced yards and places where the kids can play. Also, they want better soundproofing where we have duplexes or townhouses.

Mr. PATTEN. Is noise generally a problem?

General REILLY. Yes.

Mr. PATTEN. It was No. 1 on one of the lists.

General REILLY. Then there is additional storage space. The military family travels and has an awful lot of stuff that has to go with them, and they feel increased storage is a high priority item. We are addressing these very points in our new program but not to the degree we would like to in some instances. But certainly we are getting the air-conditioning and we are improving the insulation qualities of our houses. We are now providing, we feel, adequate storage. And we will get fences around backyards to the degree that we can afford them.

#### ADEQUACY OF HOUSING REQUIREMENTS SURVEYS

Mr. PATTEN. The GAO has raised some pertinent questions about the manner in which housing surveys are conducted. What improvements do you feel are needed in this area?

General REILLY. Our survey procedure has been generally one of providing questionnaires to people who require housing, and the answers you get are very subjective. I think this is one of the problems. You need some system which could take out the subjectivity that inherently comes in when people make a statement regarding the adequacy of their housing, whether it be on base or in the communities.

It has also been an extremely large workload because so much of it has to be done manually. Some automated procedures could certainly serve to our advantage.

Mr. PATTEN. Would you say that commanders of some bases did a 100 percent better job in conducting a survey than commanders of other bases? They all didn't grab the ball, did they?

General REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. Let's start with that as a premise. If we get into how to conduct a survey, there would be much more to talk about.

General REILLY. Yes, sir. For all of our projects in this program, as for the other services, there is a requirement to have an FHA cer-

tification of the need in the community. It is possible they could help us to a greater degree in determining our adequacy.

Mr. PATTEN. Of course their record is a little spotty too from my personal observation. I don't want to make a point of it. There, too, it depends on who made the survey, how much interest they had, and how much elbow grease they put into it.

Are there instances where the Air Force has, in making these surveys, classified off-base units as inadequate even though the occupants reported them as adequate?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In the present OSD criteria on conducting a survey, if the individual states on the questionnaire that his house is adequate it stays adequate. We do not tinker with it.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Would you investigate that and see whether in some instances in conducting the survey this is the way it was carried out? GAO has indicated that that hasn't syphoned down to all bases. Apparently some of them are conducting a survey and then marking it up.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have conducted workshops in the headquarters with representatives of major commands and bases, and this has been very clearly explained to them. If an individual fills out a questionnaire and says it is adequate, they have no authority to change it. They do have authority to go out and investigate the ones declared inadequate and make adjustments if they see fit, but not to change adequate units.

Mr. NICHOLS. Would you look it up for the record, particularly with regard to the GAO's comments?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

[The information follows:]

#### ADEQUACY OF SURVEYS AT AIR FORCE BASES

A recent GAO report dated February 14, 1973 indicated some irregularities in conducting the yearly survey at Maxwell/Gunter, Ala. and Hill AFB, Utah. Only at Hill AFB did they report that base officials had reclassified as inadequate units considered adequate by military occupants. Hill AFB has been advised officially that this action was improper and necessary action was taken to prevent this situation from happening in the future.

General REILLY. We are aware of their comments.

Mr. PATTEN. The GAO has suggested that the housing referral offices, which are familiar with housing situations in the community, might play a larger role in conducting or monitoring these surveys. This appears to be a useful suggestion. Will you explore it?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

#### ROLE OF HOUSING REFERRAL OFFICES IN CONDUCTING SURVEYS

The Air Force does use the housing referral office in conducting yearly surveys. We depend upon it for the number of adequate vacant units in the local area, the number of units firmly planned or under construction, the inadequate quarters determination and general offbase housing conditions. This office also makes recommendations to the base commander whether an on-base housing project is needed, and it also is most useful in the Air Force leasing program. We feel this office is playing a large role in our yearly family housing surveys.

Mr. PATTEN. Has the Air Force made every effort to screen its fiscal year 1974 request to delete projects for which the community can provide support?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

## DISCUSSIONS WITH FHA AND COMMUNITY

Mr. PATTEN. What efforts has the Air Force made to explain its housing programs to interested persons in the community and to obtain their support for its program?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, in each instance at our direction base officials have met with officials of the nearby community, heads of the realty boards, mayors, city groups, and discussed our fiscal year 1974 housing projects. In all instances for the new construction projects we are reporting this year we have, we feel, the support of the community. At the Grand Forks project there has been some concern but we are confident we will have full community support in the very near future.

Mr. PATTEN. Have you received FHA certification for all of the units in your fiscal year 1974 request?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, with the exception of half of the units at Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota. Again we feel there is no problem here, that they will give us the necessary certification. It will take a little study.

Mr. DAVIS. Certification of what, General?

General REILLY. Of the need for the housing. The FHA certifies that adequate housing is not available within the community and the Air Force should construct on its own.

## STATUS OF PRIOR PROGRAMS

Mr. PATTEN. Tell us about the status of prior-year Air Force family housing programs.

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, our fiscal year 1971 and prior programs are essentially complete, everything under contract and practically all of it usable.

The fiscal year 1972 program of construction is underway on 2,285 units at this time. Two additional projects amounting to 500 units will be under contract in August and September.

Mr. PATTEN. When you say they will be under contract, do you mean you have gotten favorable bids?

General REILLY. Yes; we have bids in now and are confident they can be awarded within this time period.

Two projects in the 1972 program, the 400 units at Bolling Air Force Base, you know, are involved along with the Navy's housing units in the overall Bolling Anacostia development. We just don't know when they are going to go to contract. Hopefully, I think we can solicit bids by the first of the year. The remaining project in the 1972 program, we bid the Air Force Academy project and the cost was just too high. We are restudying it to see what can be done to get the quality houses we need there within the funds that are available.

In the fiscal year 1973 program, consisting of 2,968 units, bids are open on two projects involving 500 units. We think we will have all of the projects under contract by the end of this calendar year, with the possible exception of the housing at Incirlik, Turkey, where we are studying the use of relocatable houses versus conventional construction. What we get worked out with the Turkish Government will have a lot to do with how quickly we can put this one under contract.

Mr. PATTEN. What problems have you had with siting, cost limits, et cetera? You gave one illustration of high costs at the Air Force Academy. Are there other instances where you ran into problems?

#### INDUSTRIALIZED HOUSING

General REILLY. Yes, sir. We have had problems obtaining the \$24,000 average cost which applies to the fiscal year 1972 and 1973 programs. The committee has been advised of our attempt to secure modular, relocatable, industrially built houses in the 1972 program which we were not able to do. We lost time, and as a result we have had to take a number of different procurement approaches. It has been nip and tuck to place the 1972 program under contract within the money we have.

Mr. PATTEN. Was it the Air Force which built the factory out in California at Apple Valley?

General REILLY. In connection with the George Air Force Base and later the Norton projects a factory was built at Apple Valley. Both of those projects have been completed and are now occupied.

Mr. PATTEN. Near me are some prefabs put up by one of your big national merchandising outfits, a name familiar to all of us in the room. They were put up in the thirties and they are beautiful and still holding. I don't see any great changes, no great breakthroughs in prefabs. Everybody is getting into the act.

You didn't have a report here on the George Air Force project. Apparently the factory didn't turn out to be a bonanza.

General REILLY. At the George project which is a research and development project, certainly we achieved the objectives we set out to achieve in demonstrating the feasibility of factory-built homes. We proved that a quality house can be built through industrial processes and that truly relocatable houses are feasible. However, we found that for the immediate application of what we did at George and Norton, the housing industry was just not quite ready for us at that time on a nationwide basis. We still think the industrial approach has great merit just in the fact that the labor rates are going up much slower for in-factory personnel as opposed to skilled labor onsite.

Mr. PATTEN. There were people in the private sector deeply involved in this 3 or 4 years ago. Are you aware of what success they have had? Some of our largest industries thought this was the wave of the future. At the time you started your facility at George, they were in the business too. I don't see much coming of it. There are no easy answers I guess.

General REILLY. That is true.

Mr. PATTEN. And you are not burdening us here with any financial report on George. The last time we took a look, it was over \$30,000 a unit.

General REILLY. The cost of the George house, if you exclude the R. & D. overhead, is about \$24,000, which we think is not at all out of reason for the product. But it was a one-time project, a small project, and it had large overhead, mobility, and mobilization costs.

## COST LIMITS

Mr. PATTEN. Will you be able to award satisfactory projects at the current cost limits?

General REILLY. \$24,000. Yes, sir, we are still hopeful of getting all of our remaining projects under that limit.

Mr. PATTEN. If we pass the fiscal year 1974 authorization limit, which is requested, you may get a breather.

General REILLY. Yes, and even before the passage of the bill we are hopeful of placing additional projects in the 1972 and 1973 programs under contract.

Mr. PATTEN. Provide for the record a listing of prior projects and show what deducts you have had to make.

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

## LISTING OF PRIOR YEAR MFH PROJECTS

The fiscal year 1972 projects which have been awarded are Andrews, Ent-Peterson, Shaw, Cannon, Homestead, and Offutt. Typical major deductives which we have exercised at one or several of these projects are on the following list:

Carports or garages; six general officer units (Andrews); vanities; landscaping; privacy fencing; patios; street lights between intersections; storm windows; tub and shower doors; partial brick veneer; community area walkways; concrete driveways (in lieu of asphalt); and sidewalks on second side of street.

Mr. PATTEN. Let's discuss it a bit.

General REILLY. The items we haven't been able to include?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes.

General REILLY. First I should say that we only include those deductive items which we are willing to lose if necessary.

Mr. PATTEN. Is that the privacy and the backyards and things the women want?

General REILLY. We can't afford to lose all of those. The things we have principally not been able to build in some projects, are covered parking either in terms of garages or carports. We had to just provide a hard surface pad for the parking of the car offstreet.

We have had to provide narrower streets than we would desire instead of being able to have parking on both sides with two-way traffic. We have only been able to put sidewalks on one side of the street as opposed to both sides. We have had to eliminate privacy fencing. Those are the major deductive items that we have had to take out of the contracts.

Mr. NICHOLAS. What do you expect as the year goes on and as construction prices continue to creep upward or whatever they are doing? Do you expect to be able to get the size house and number of bathrooms and the space you are asking?

General REILLY. Yes, I think so. Of course it varies by location. Because of the nature of the houses we are building and geographical locations and bidding conditions we can get more of these things one place than we can at other locations.

## SELF-HELP

Mr. PATTEN. You ought to see these young people who own their own homes. To get them under a roof at their price, a lot of these things are left out. It is impressive what they have done at the end

of 5 years with their own muscle in terms of a garage and in terms of paving the driveway, the sidewalks—not to mention shrubbery and things of that type.

General REILLY. Yes.

Mr. PATTEN. You don't get the benefits of that when they don't own their own home, do you? For instance, they wouldn't put up a fence?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Some of them do.

General REILLY. We try to foster a pride in home ownership attitude to the people that occupy our quarters. They are permitted to make improvements.

Mr. PATTEN. Do they put their own money in for a fence?

General REILLY. Sure.

Mr. PATTEN. You find that?

General REILLY. We have to pass judgment on the fence before they build it. If you short the quarters with storage space invariably the occupants will go out and buy Sears and Roebuck sheds that are all sizes and shapes, and the first thing you know you have a terrible situation. Or they will take scrap lumber and build sheds.

#### REQUESTED COST LIMITS

Mr. PATTEN. Do you feel that the cost limits requested for fiscal year 1974 will be adequate?

General REILLY. It is not any too much money by any means, Mr. Chairman. The \$27,500 represents about a 15-percent increase over the \$24,000 allowed for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. PATTEN. Where do you come off with the change of the dollar value outside the United States?

General REILLY. That has had a serious impact on us. Fortunately we are not programing houses in Germany and other places at this time. But the increase to \$27,500 will help keep pace with growing construction costs as well as helping to pay for the increased space allowances we are requesting in the 1974 program. I still think we are going to be short in some instances of the things that we have just been talking about that should go with a house.

#### TURNKEY

Mr. PATTEN. What fiscal year 1973 and 1974 projects will utilize turnkey?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, in the fiscal year 1973 program, 8 out of 10 projects will be turnkey. In the fiscal year 1974 program three out of six projects.

Mr. PATTEN. Is the Air Force satisfied with the results of this technique for housing construction?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; we have been very successful, especially with the so-called one-step turnkey which we are now using.

Mr. PATTEN. What are its limitations?

General REILLY. The turnkey concept, which embodies design and construction by the same firm, is based upon the availability, you might say, of local designs or houses that are in production that can meet our requirements.

That minimizes the design problem for the proposer, permits him to provide facilities, we feel, at more reasonable cost to the Government.

However, there are some localities where these conditions don't exist and conventional plans and specifications of construction are more advantageous.

Mr. PATTEN. You know, General, you sit here and I think of you as living in an ivory tower. Yet you are talking like a general specialist, giving all the answers. I was wondering if any of these other fellows are a little closer to the problem and know some of the hardships and pitfalls. You have to supervise it or meet the people involved. Maybe this is not a fair analogy, but I have a banker who last year loaned out \$200 million. He doesn't get out of the office. He knows what people tell him, but he is not actually on the job.

So knowing the other hat you wear, it is fascinating to hear you rattle off all this housing stuff. I just wonder if you are speaking from your own knowledge and experience or just how close you are to it?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, in the family housing program in the Air Force we administer the program ourselves. It is not a terribly large program. My office is deeply involved in it. As to the people that are with me here today, there is hardly a day which passes that we are not into all of these problems, so it is something I live with pretty much the year round.

People like Mr. Johnston and other people I have here with me are the people who actually execute the program.

Mr. PATTEN. You have 400,000 families.

General REILLY. Yes.

Mr. PATTEN. And it is an enormous undertaking.

General REILLY. Yes.

Mr. PATTEN. If you put the services together, I would say you are easily the largest landlord in America. Does anyone handle more people than the services, the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force put together? I can't think of anyone.

You are probably the biggest real estate operator there is, with all the other duties in construction that are involved?

#### HUD HOUSING

Mr. PATTEN. What is the status of the Air Force's 236 military set-aside program?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have been allocated 3,500 units in fiscal year 1971 and 1972, and all of those except 422 are under construction.

The freeze has caught 422 units and we have attempted in dealing with HUD to try to get them released but so far we have not. We have requested 4,100 units in fiscal year 1973 and have been allocated that many by OSD. However, there has been no action taken by HUD on these units.

Mr. PATTEN. What are your proposals for legislation or administrative measures that would provide better HUD support for Air Force personnel off base? Do you have anything new to offer?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Our lower grade enlisted personnel can get in the regular HUD 236 housing. However, because of the wage limitations and restrictions a lot of our people do not meet the criteria to move

into them. If we could get the criteria increased whereby military people with increased income could move into the units it might help us.

#### TOWNHOUSES

Mr. PATTEN. Where is the Air Force proposing to build townhouses in fiscal year 1974?

General REILLY. At two locations, Mr. Chairman, out of our eight projects. At Andrews Air Force Base here in Maryland and at Hickam Air Force Base in Hawaii.

Mr. PATTEN. Are you limited in the acreage available in these two instances?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, in both instances.

Mr. PATTEN. And you won't get further complaints on a noise problem?

General REILLY. No, sir; I hope we have enough sound attenuation in the walls to avoid that.

Mr. PATTEN. You know, as somebody said about the privacy of row-housing, it may provide a greater measure of privacy, if that is what you are looking for. I am in an apartment house and, believe me, I can't tell you who is in the next apartment, and his head is probably no more than six feet from my head because I think the bedrooms are adjoining. I couldn't tell you who is on either side of me.

What effect will the new OSD density requirements have on your ability to provide adequate housing?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The new criteria will only allow us to build five or six units per acre and we feel that this doesn't hinder us too much. Where we have available land OSD has usually allowed us to build duplex units. It is normally where we have a land problem that we have to go to townhouses, or in cases where we are building two-bedroom units that OSD requires us to build in a townhouse configuration.

#### LEASE AND RENTAL GUARANTEE PROGRAMS

Mr. PATTEN. Discuss the progress of your lease and rental guarantee program overseas.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Air Force has an allocation of 2,690 leased units in overseas locations. We have approximately 2,500 of these under contract. We are contemplating another project in the Netherlands of about 150 to 175 units and this will just about take care of our complete overseas lease allocations.

Mr. PATTEN. Do you expect to be able to make more use of leasing in fiscal year 1974?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have requested only an increase of 300 additional leases at Torrejon, Spain, an overseas area, in 1974.

Mr. PATTEN. How many of your current leasing points are unused?

Mr. JOHNSTON. About 300 points in the States, in the United States, are not used and approximately 200 in overseas areas. We are working on trying to get these leases executed.

Mr. PATTEN. Well, that is the end of my questioning of your presentation, of the overall problem. Do you have any questions?

Mr. LONG. Perhaps some of these questions I am about to ask have been answered. If they are just tell me.

#### TERMS OF LEASE

How long do these leases last?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The overseas leases, or the domestic leases?

Mr. LONG. Any lease.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The leases in the United States usually are executed for us by the Corps of Engineers. They have a standard lease that runs for 5 or 10 years. However, it has a 30 or a 60 or a 90 day-cancellation clause so we could cancel anytime under those conditions.

In the overseas area it is usually a firm term, 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, or up to 5 years.

Mr. LONG. Do you have an option for renewal?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir, we do have an option for renewal.

Mr. LONG. At the same rent or—

Mr. JOHNSTON. Usually at renegotiated rates.

Mr. LONG. When you say renegotiated, what do you mean?

A person can say, "I want triple the amount," and you give it to him?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, sir. It is subject to negotiation. In other words, we start discussion with them and they will present a price and we will present one of ours and try to negotiate it out at a reasonable rate and take into consideration the escalation in cost of the materials, labor, and so forth.

Mr. LONG. Are there situations in which you have them over a barrel. You know, if you decide you didn't want it again and they couldn't use it for anything else, you could almost set your own terms; right?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir. We have had a situation in Spain. In this particular case we have a project with 862 units in it. We have to renew in accordance with the country-to-country agreement so we don't get stuck with lease costs.

Mr. LONG. There must be other situations in which they have you over a barrel. How do you work it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Well, we have to sit down and work it out mutually, sir.

Mr. LONG. But I mean, do you protect yourself in cases like this in your leases?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We protect ourselves to the extent that for the firm term of the lease we get it for the set cost. If we are going to extend the lease agreement for another 3, 4, or 5 years and everything in the country is escalating, then we anticipate there will be some price escalation in the contract.

Mr. LONG. I understand that, but what I am trying to get from you is the way in which you protect yourself in your leases to make sure that you aren't taken for a ride in the renewal itself.

I mean, do you have a price escalation clause whereby you can renew at a certain percentage of increased rent based on the cost of living? Do you have the option to renew for not more than a certain percentage increase?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Generally our options to renew would be for maybe a similar period of time. In other words, if we had a 3-year firm term

lease we might run an option to extend an additional three. We could put a condition or clause in.

Mr. LONG. An option isn't worth anything if you don't have a price in there. How do you handle it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would have to go back and research some of our leases. We don't keep too many of them on file, but I think there are options in the leases whereby we can execute a continued lease at a percentage increase in cost that we can apply.

Mr. LONG. That is what I am trying to get at. Apparently you are not now prepared to tell me.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I don't have copies of all the leases here.

Mr. LONG. No, but I assume you are very familiar with the way in which it is done.

Mr. JOHNSTON. In the rental guarantee areas, we have specifically this clause in the contract whereby rents can be only increased in comparison to the cost index of the respective countries.

[The information follows:]

#### LEASES

In our renewal options for leases, we have various conditions. Some options are to extend at no increased costs, others are for percentages up to 5 percent and some are based on cost indexes in certain countries. All our lease agreements are reviewed and approved by competent lawyers or legal experts for sufficiency and to see that the interest of the Government is protected.

Mr. LONG. How long has this leasing been going on as a practice?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have been leasing since the 1962-63 time period. This is just a continuation of the program that has increased since those days.

Mr. LONG. The people who build the places for you for lease are obviously not going to build a place for a 5-year rental. They must expect some better horizon than that, don't they?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Normally, the places where we can get good lease units are in locations where there is a good residual value to the property, yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. So if you don't want it, someone else can use it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Right, sir.

Mr. LONG. In that case, why don't you build instead of lease?

Mr. JOHNSTON. You are speaking in the overseas locations; right, sir?

Mr. LONG. Well, anywhere for that matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Overseas, we feel that it is more economical to go into a lease program rather than a build program when our tenure could change.

In other words, when you tie yourself up into a 5-year—

Mr. LONG. The point is: If the other party can liquidate and sell it readily, why can't you? You say people usually aren't going to build their houses unless they have some good residual value that they can sell it for when it is all over. That would hold good for you people, too.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We don't feel we are in the real estate business in the service, building units in the overseas area where we intend to eventually sell them. We prefer to take the limited funds we get in the construction program and apply it to the stateside bases.

## GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REVIEW OF OVERSEAS LEASING

Mr. LONG. Has the General Accounting Office ever looked into your leasing arrangements?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Have they been approved?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have had studies done by the General Accounting Office in the family housing programs overseas in which their recommendations were that the most economical way to obtain housing for units that went for less than 20 years was to lease first, use rental guarantee second, and build with military construction funds, third.

Mr. LONG. This is a device that is used for economic reasons and not just to get away from appropriations?

Mr. JOHNSTON. This is correct.

Mr. LONG. You know, we lease a lot of post offices in this country. In my opinion, it is done mostly to keep away from floating the bonds, selling bonds, and increasing the national debt, and there is some question as to whether we benefit from it. I don't know.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Ours is primarily economics.

Mr. LONG. You do save money? You feel this is an economical way and this has been corroborated by the GAO?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. That is all I have.

Mr. PATTEN. One of our big political investigations was to criticize our unemployment office in the State under the previous administration. They made leases. We used that in the political campaign, but it came to haunt us because we came into a rising market. We found out we couldn't do as well, whether we built or whether we leased or what we did, and you know with the rising market in 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, those leases with the State taking ownership after 20 years were really beautiful, so as we look back now, it was one of the smartest things we ever did.

Mr. LONG. It depends on the lease.

Mr. PATTEN. We didn't have the money. The reason they did it was they didn't have the money. The reason the post office did it was the Congress or the administration did not give them \$4 billion they needed. I well remember their saying that with the country growing, they needed \$4 billion for capital improvements, and you are old enough to remember Jim Farley as Postmaster in the WPA days in 1934.

The finest building all over the country was the new post office. That was to make jobs and employment. Now they are all antiquated on account of population growth.

But you left out a few things about why we leased. We leased in some cases because it was good public relations to let the locals in on it a little bit. You did it because the local builders could do something that you couldn't do under our standards.

Also, in some cases, it is on account of their laws. In Vietnam, you couldn't own land when we went into Vietnam in 1965. We didn't own a square foot of land. We ran up against their traditions. There were many factors that made leasing attractive other than bare economics.

In fact, the truth is we had expected more leasing in the various services, especially around the Mediterranean. The Navy is going into

housing some of their people in Italy. They are making a home on some island. I have been fearful their estimates are too low on account of the dollar, you know, and a lot of other factors.

But my recollection is that, for a lot of other reasons besides economy, the leasing arrangement looked attractive. Who could say you were going to be there in 10 years or 20 years? That was a factor.

Are there any other questions?

#### TURNKEY PROCUREMENT

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. You used the term "One-step turnkey." What are you referring to there?

General REILLY. We have used one step and two step. Maybe I should explain two step first.

In the two-step procurement procedure we request technical proposals against more or less a performance specification, proposals without price. We evaluate those proposals and with those proposers who are judged to be in compliance with the specifications then go into the second step, which is the submission of competitive bids, and we award to the lowest responsive bidder.

In the one-step procurement situation we request a proposal, both a technical proposal and a price, against specifications. We then evaluate the proposal based upon some evaluation scale and relate that to the cost he has given us and our objective is to get the maximum technical points that we can at the lowest cost. We then arrive at a proposer whom we feel gives us the most for our money. He may not necessarily be the lowest bidder. We then enter into negotiations with him and hope to consummate a contract.

The advantages we see of the one step is there is a real incentive on the part of the proposers to provide us the highest quality they can within the price. In the two step they are more inclined to give us the lowest quality, which, of course, is related to cost, and still meet the specifications.

The word "turnkey" simply means a single firm doing both design and construction.

Mr. DAVIS. Is that what you are using consistently now?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, for the 1974 program we propose to use either the one step or conventional. We do not propose to use the two step.

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

Mr. McEWEN. General Reilly, what are the situations where you find that turnkey does not work well?

General REILLY. If you have a design that, you might say, is not common, is one of a kind, not in keeping with what industry or local firms or producing, we are probably better off to simply design and go the conventional route. However, if industry or builders are producing products which we feel will meet our requirements with very little modification, we are then able to capitalize on the fact that they are already in production, have most of their engineering already accomplished, and know their suppliers. This should be fed back to us in terms of quality at lower cost.

Mr. McEWEN. Is it usual then in the turnkey that the successful proposer has built that type of unit, or something very similar, prior to that?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. Do you ever use turnkey where all of the proposals come from proposers who, if they were builders, have gone out and obtained architects, where they are all drawing up their own plans, and none of the units had been built by any of the proposers prior to that? Do you ever have that situation?

General REILLY. I call on Major Sims to answer that one please, sir.

Major SIMS. There may be cases where the actual total design had not been precisely duplicated previously but portions of it, for example: details, structural components, windows, and so forth—the type of architecture—are consistent with what they had produced elsewhere.

Mr. McEWEN. The usual situation is that those making and submitting the proposals have built units very similar to the ones they are proposing to build for the Air Force? They have already built them?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. In the construction, in the cost, and knowing who their suppliers are, and so forth?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, and therefore they are able to submit a proposal without a great deal of cost.

Now, if they have to associate themselves with an architect-engineer and go through a lengthy design procedure it is very costly to them. So it is usually when that engineering has already been done and something is in production or very close to it that we get the advantages.

Mr. McEWEN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

## CONSTRUCTION

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to construction.

Insert pages ii through iv in the record.

[The pages follow:]

### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET—TABLE OF CONTENTS DOMESTIC (UNITED STATES AND POSSESSIONS)

State and installation	Page	Units	Estimated cost
<b>A. CONSTRUCTION</b>			
<b>I. New housing construction:</b>			
Arkansas: Blytheville AFB.....	2-5	100	\$2,762,000
Florida:			
Avon Park AAF.....	5a-5b	50	1,315,000
Eglin AFB.....	6-9	250	6,380,000
Hawaii: U.S. Air Force installation Oahu.....	10-13	400	14,301,000
Maryland: Andrews AFB.....	14-17	300	8,700,000
North Dakota: Grand Forks AFB.....	18-21	200	5,710,000
Texas: Sheppard AFB.....	22-25	200	5,383,000
Guam: Andersen AFB.....	26-29	300	10,950,000
<b>Total new housing construction.....</b>		<b>1,800</b>	<b>55,501,000</b>

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET—TABLE OF CONTENTS  
DOMESTIC (UNITED STATES AND POSSESSIONS)—Continued

State and installation	Page	Number of spaces	Estimated cost
<b>2. Mobile home facilities:</b>			
Alaska: Eielson AFB.....	30-31	70	\$630,000
Arizona: Davis-Monthan AFB.....	32-33	50	200,000
Delaware: Dover AFB.....	34-35	50	205,000
Michigan: Wurtsmith AFB.....	36-37	58	255,000
Mississippi: Columbus AFB.....	38-39	50	180,000
New Hampshire: Pease AFB.....	40-41	33	150,000
Texas:			
Laughlin AFB.....	42-43	54	195,000
Reese AFB.....	44-45	50	185,000
Total mobile home spaces.....		415	2,000,000
<hr/>			
Installation(s) and location	Page	Units	Estimated cost
3. Improvements to existing quarters: Various locations.....	46-51	LS	\$23,750,000
4. Minor construction: Various locations.....	52	LS	400,000
5. Advance planning and design: Various locations.....	53	LS	300,000
Total construction appropriation request.....			81,951,000

Mr. PATTEN. The request for new construction calls for 1,800 new units at 8 locations at a cost of \$55,501,000.

**BLYTHEVILLE AIR FORCE BASE, ARK.**

Let us turn to Blytheville Air Force Base, Ark.

Insert page 2 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION Blytheville Air Force Base									
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Strategic Air Command		5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER BWKR		6. STATE/COUNTRY Arkansas									
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1942/1955		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Mississippi		10. NEAREST CITY Four miles northwest of Blytheville, Arkansas 65 miles north of Memphis, Tennessee							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Heavy Bombardment Wing				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			TOTAL (9)						
				PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED				
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)		
				a. AS OF 31 Jan 72	441	2430	523	0	0	---	---	---	3396
				b. PLANNED (End FY 77)	402	2457	394	0	0	---	---	---	3253
				13. INVENTORY									
				LAND		ACRES (1)	LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)		
a. OWNED		3,071	247		50,187		50,434						
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		642	23		0		23						
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72							50,457						
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY Excludes MCP (\$1,182)							0						
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM Excludes MCP (\$140)							2,762						
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS Excludes MCP (\$3,500)							0						
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)							53,219						
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS													
PROJECT DESIGNATION													
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM							
				SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h						
711	Family Housing		FA	100	2,762	100	2,762						
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.		FA	100	2,762	100	2,762						

Mr. PATTEN. The request here is for 100 units. Do you anticipate coastal base studies will result in changes in base loading here?

General REILLY. No, sir, we do not.

Mr. PATTEN. You propose to build all four-bedroom units. This emphasis is also reflected in other requests this year. Does this represent a change in Air Force policy?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, it represents our desire to eliminate some of the deficiency that we have in four-bedroom units. We have been building some four-bedroom units. However, we have a general shortage of them and this particular program is directed toward airman family housing and the locations where we program we have a shortage of four-bedrooms; no real change in Air Force policy.

Mr. PATTEN. Have you ever tried to rent a four-bedroom unit in Washington? It is impossible to find a four-bedroom unit.

General REILLY. We have the same experience. Normally our people can have a much better chance of renting or buying a two- or three-bedroom house than a four-bedroom.

Mr. PATTEN. Are there any questions?

Mr. McEWEN. How many units in this, General?

General REILLY. At Blytheville, 100 units.

Mr. McEWEN. All four-bedroom units?

General REILLY. All four-bedroom units, yes, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. What is the deficiency there now?

General REILLY. The deficiency is 307 units.

Mr. McEWEN. So that after these are constructed you will still have a deficiency of 207 units?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. When you say deficiency, that is the deficiency of units on base for those that are eligible for on-base housing; is that correct?

General REILLY. What it relates to is the total housing requirements and then we subtract from that the available houses on base and the adequate units that can be supplied by the community and the difference then of those two assets versus the requirement is our deficiency.

Mr. McEWEN. But you do consider the available units in the local economy?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. In this particular instance we have an effective housing requirement of 1,724 units. We have on the base 830 units. The community is able to provide 587 units, leaving us a deficit of 307.

AVON PARK AUXILIARY AIRFIELD, FLA.

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to Avon Park Auxiliary Airfield, Fla.

Insert page 5A in the record.

[The page follows:]

1 DATE 15 Feb 73		2 DEPARTMENT AF		3 INSTALLATION FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			Avon Park Auxiliary Airfield								
4 COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU TAC			5 INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER ASPQ			6 STATE/COUNTRY Florida									
7 STATUS Active			8 YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1942		9 COUNTY (U.S.) Highlands		10 NEAREST CITY Six miles NNE of Highland, Florida								
11 MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Combat Support Group Communications Group (Air Force Communications Service)				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH					TOTAL						
				PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		(9)				
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)		CIVILIAN (8)			
				a. AS OF 31 Jan. 72				2	64	0	-	-	-	-	66
				b. PLANNED (END FY)				5	234	4	-	-	-	-	243
				13. INVENTORY											
				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
a. OWNED		5,181		36		2,592		2,628							
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		-		-		-		-							
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (EXCEPT LAND RENT) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972									2,628						
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY									0						
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM									Excludes MCP (\$925)						
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION NEXT 4 YEARS									Excludes MCP (\$193)						
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)									3,943						
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT DESIGNATION			TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM							
	PROJECT TITLE b					SCOPE e	ESTIMATED CCST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h						
711	Family Housing				FA	50	1,315	50	1,315						
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere				FA	50	1,315	50	1,315						

252

Mr. PATTEN. Your request is for 50 units. Why is it you haven't built housing here since you occupied this facility in 1942?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, our people stationed there—there are not large numbers of them—have been able to secure housing in the local communities. We are now experiencing a buildup in the activity at Avon Park related to the range there and the small town of Highlands and the neighboring communities just cannot support our people.

We have a map to show where Avon Park is located. It is a large range used by our tactical Air Forces and they are introducing into that range an electronic environment which gives more realistic conditions for training with an increase in personnel.

Mr. PATTEN. In 1942 you wouldn't find any housing around there. That was just farmland.

Where does your family population at this base live now?

General REILLY. The family population attempt to find housing at Sebring and Highland, Fla. Housing in this area is very scarce.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the reason for the increase in enlisted personnel expected over the next few years?

General REILLY. The increase is due to a change in mission at Avon Park, from a regular gunnery range to a more sophisticated range including electronic countermeasure environmental facilities which gives more realistic conditions for training. This new equipment requires additional personnel for the operation and maintenance of this equipment.

Mr. PATTEN. On page 5b of your justification, you say these homes will provide quarters for part of the 723 airmen families. Yet you show a total base loading now of only 66 and an out-year projection of 243. Where are the rest of these people?

General REILLY. We regret that the 723 figure is a mistake. The number should be 115 families.

EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to Eglin.

Insert page 6 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION Eglin Air Force Base											
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Air Force System Command				5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER FTFA/FTEV		6. STATE/COUNTRY Florida									
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1953		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Okaloosa, Walton, Santa Rosa		10. NEAREST CITY Six miles northeast of Fort Walton Beach, Florida, forty miles east of Pensacola, Florida									
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Tactical Fighter Wing (Tactical Air Command) Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Wing (Military Airlift Command) Special Operations Wing (Tactical Air Command) Aerospace Defense Squadron (Aerospace Defense Command) Armament Development Test Center Air Force Armament Laboratory				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			13. INVENTORY								
				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 Jan 72			2111	10,482	3448	605	601	--	--	--	17,247
				b. PLANNED (End FY 77)			2203	11,197	3590	759	683	--	--	--	18,432
				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
a. OWNED		464,162		1,738		222,993		224,731							
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		346		6		0		6							
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				224,737				334							
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY Excludes MCP (\$12,475)				6,380				0							
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM Excludes MCP (\$7,039)				0				0							
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS Excludes MCP (\$18,200)				231,451				0							
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				231,451				0							
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
PROJECT DESIGNATION				FUNDING PROGRAM											
CATEGORY CODE NO. e	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM									
				SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h								
711	Family Housing		FA	250	6,380	250	6,380								
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.		FA	250	6,380	250	6,380								

Mr. PATTEN. You are requesting 250 units. These are all four-bedroom units. Are they all to go on Eglin, or are some going to be built at Eglin No. 9?

General REILLY. One hundred and fifty units will be built at Eglin main, 100 units at auxiliary 9, or the Hurlburt Field, which is down the road west of Eglin.

## DEFICIT

Mr. PATTEN. What is the deficit at Eglin 9?

General REILLY. The deficit is 1,603 units.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Do you have them broken down by Eglin 9 and main? Could you for the record?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The deficit?

Mr. NICHOLAS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, sir; we don't have the deficit.

General REILLY. We can provide the breakout for the record.

[The information follows:]

## BREAKDOWN OF HOUSING DEFICIT AT EGLIN

The deficit at Eglin main is 1,180 units and at Eglin auxiliary 9 is 423 units.

Mr. PATTEN. Do you feel you need 250.

General REILLY. In view of the approximately 600-unit deficiency we feel that 250 are required.

Mr. PATTEN. Would there be any difficulty in building 150 at Eglin main and 100 at field 9?

General REILLY. No great problems. It simply means two projects, two project locations. We will bid them as a single project; no major difficulty.

Mr. PATTEN. Do you already have a housing project at 9?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, we do.

Mr. LONG. How are these people living now?

General REILLY. The people are now living in the community, in housing which is not considered to be adequate either in terms of quality or cost.

Mr. LONG. Well, who says?

General REILLY. This is based on a survey, Mr. Long.

In the survey the people answer questions as to the adequacy of their housing. They show what they pay and how far they have to drive, and all of these things add up to a facility being adequate within their income and rental allowance or it isn't.

Mr. LONG. Is this going to be a case where they pay a lot less, the Government pays a lot more but no—

General REILLY. The Government, of course, will bear the cost of providing the house and maintaining it.

Mr. LONG. Of course, anybody is going to like that.

General REILLY. His total rental allowance will be withheld.

Mr. LONG. Anybody is going to like that, of course. If word is passed that the Government is going to greatly increase the standard of living at Government expense, that is the answer that you are going to get.

General REILLY. A fellow getting, let us say, \$250 a month rental allowance may be able to rent or at least to own and pay for a house that meets his needs for that. In other instances he can't.

Mr. LONG. What is the average duration of stay of these people when they go to a community?

General REILLY. I would say roughly 3 years, sir, or less.

Mr. LONG. Three years.

General REILLY. We think in terms of a 3-year tour at a base. It can be much less than that, sometimes a little longer.

Mr. LONG. Your theory is, it is kind of hard for them to keep turning these over?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. To buy a house and live in it 3 years and resell it, sometimes it works out fine. Sometimes it is a good investment. Other times it poses a severe hardship to him or he is forced to rent at a price which is more than he can afford to pay, and, of course, in renting you get no break at all.

Mr. LONG. Well, would this take care of the whole requirement, or are there still going to be a lot of people—

General REILLY. No, sir; there will still be approximately a 1,300 deficit after this construction at Eglin.

Mr. LONG. Why not take care of all of them or none of them? I don't quite understand why the 250. What is the reason for the 250?

General REILLY. It is with the objective of easing the housing situation. Of course we would like to eliminate the whole deficiency but it would be very costly to do that so in our program within the restrictions we have to try to alleviate the conditions at a number of locations. We will still have deficiencies remaining.

Mr. LONG. Is this a rapidly growing community apart from the military?

General REILLY. Oh, yes. The Fort Walton Beach area has been increasing in population tremendously.

Mr. LONG. So this won't do very much to ease the local supply situation?

General REILLY. Not a great deal; no, sir, and I was in a position to report to the chairman that the officials of Eglin Air Force Base have met with the local city officials, the realty board, and the community down there is thoroughly in favor of this and recognizes the need to build Government housing.

Mr. LONG. Who gets these houses? You have a long list of people who want them. How do you make your decisions as to who gets them?

General REILLY. These are all airman houses.

Mr. LONG. This is done on the basis of rank?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; 174 of them are being designed for the criteria for the E-4's through the E-6's, and 76 of them will be built for the more senior noncommissioned officers.

Mr. LONG. This is all enlisted housing?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Okay.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATTEN. Yes.

#### FAMILY HOUSING SURVEYS

Mr. McEWEN. Would this be a proper point to develop this? I wonder if General Reilly could enlighten us a little more on how you arrive at a deficiency and decide whether housing is actually deficient? Is a questionnaire sent to the families themselves; is that correct?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. Asking the size of their family, how many bedrooms? Would this be correct? Asking how much is your rent?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. What sort of facilities, utilities, and so forth you have?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. How far is it removed from base?

General REILLY. Yes.

Mr. McEWEN. Then the Air Force applies standards of distance removed from base, of number of bedrooms per size of family; is that correct?

General REILLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir. The questionnaire asks all the pertinent information. If the individual fills out on his questionnaire that this housing is adequate it is counted as an adequate asset.

Mr. McEWEN. If he states this in his opinion?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If he states it is an adequate asset, it is an adequate asset. If he states it is an inadequate asset, we will check a certain percentage and if we reverse any of them then we apply that percentage to all the ones declared inadequate. Then we add up all the units that we have on base. Then we take our end mission strength figures and add a marital factor to it. It is developed over 3 years.

In other words, we take a 3-year officer marital factor and apply it to the officers. We take a 3-year enlisted marital factor of the eligible personnel and apply that to the eligible enlisted personnel and that gives us our gross requirement.

Then we deduct from that amount the voluntary separated families. We don't need a house for these people because they wouldn't bring their families there under any condition. That gives us a net requirement. We deduct or subtract the assets. That gives us our net deficit.

Mr. McEWEN. In other words, in many cases you are relying on the statements of the people in that questionnaire? If they say it is adequate in their opinion, then it is adequate?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Right, sir; except the on-base houses.

Now, the on-base houses are always carried in the classification that they are held in. If the on-base house is considered an adequate house it is adequate under any condition.

Mr. NICHOLAS. In some cases you do check the off-base houses to see if they are inadequate?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If they are indicated to be inadequate we check a percentage of those and any we reverse we apply that factor to all of them.

Mr. McEWEN. You apply a percentage?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. In other words, it is really a sampling test?

General REILLY. Yes.

#### STANDARDS OF HOUSING ADEQUACY

Mr. McEWEN. General, I ask this because I think that housing—we touched on it earlier—is terribly important, but I am not at all satisfied that we really have the most careful methods and standards to determine the adequacy or inadequacy of the housing.

It is so important, and yet I am not sure that we get the correct picture. If somebody feels they are a little too remote from base, they say the housing is inadequate and that may stand. Maybe it is only a mile or two. I don't know what the standards of the Air Force may be on what is adequate in regard to distance from base. Maybe it is only a slight bit more than that.

General REILLY. We think 1-hour driving time is about the difference between adequate and inadequate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. One hour driving time.

General REILLY. But it has been, and we acknowledge this, a somewhat imprecise system.

Mr. McEWEN. Forgive me, General. I am about to be very parochial because I am thinking about an air base in my own district where we have severe winter weather. If you have a deficiency in the size of a unit, a family with three or four children trying to live in a two-bedroom unit or a three-bedroom unit, where they should have three or four bedrooms, I think that is aggravated some in a situation where you can't turn the kids outdoors as you can down at Eglin, Fla., the year round.

I just wonder if these factors are considered. We consider the warm climates as needing air-conditioning, and understandably those bases in cooler climates aren't considered as needing air-conditioning and I don't argue with that; but I wonder if there aren't factors the other way, such as severe climatic conditions aggravating the situation where there is a lack of space, where they are confined to those family quarters?

Possibly you can furnish a little more for the record on just how this is determined, but I am not at all satisfied that this is as carefully done as it might be or possibly should be.

General REILLY. We will be happy to provide more on that, sir.

[The information follows:]

The size of family housing units which we construct are controlled by public law. We have recognized that some of our units are small for the northern area of the country. We are hopeful that the increased square footage limitations proposed in the fiscal year 1974 authorization bill will help in your area of concern. When we design units we do consider the location carefully and add amenities according to the climate. In the Southern States we include in the design air conditioning, screens, carports, and materials used in local areas so that our houses conform to local standards. In the Northern States we design a sturdier house, hope to get garages which children can use in the winter when the car is in use, storm sash, better heating, and a basement if possible. These units also will be similar to those in the local area.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, Mr. Davis.

#### NUMBER OF BEDROOMS

Mr. DAVIS. I am curious about all of these being four-bedroom units. Does this mean that for a period of years we haven't been providing four-bedroom units: or what is the situation on that?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The situation is we have not been providing many four-bedroom units in the past. As you will recollect, this committee has recommended in the past that we not build too many two-bedroom units.

In recent surveys, and as a result of the changing trends in our military people, we find our deficiencies are beginning to show up in two- and four-bedroom units.

In other words, we are beginning to find that the requirement for the three-bedroom units is leveling off and our deficiency is primarily in the two- and four-bedroom areas. We don't feel we should be building two-bedroom units because these are the type units a family can find in the local community a lot more readily than the four-bedroom units; so where we have the requirement to build units at all and we have a requirement to build four-bedroom units we would prefer to build four-bedroom units because these are the types of units our people can't find on the economy.

Mr. DAVIS. When does a serviceman become eligible for a four-bedroom unit?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He becomes eligible for a four-bedroom unit when the number of his children predicated upon age and sex require a four-bedroom unit. An OSD standard establishes bedroom standards. In some cases where the sex is the same and the children are younger we put two of them to a room, so it is predicated upon the size of the family, the number of children.

Mr. DAVIS. And I would suppose then that if you had two younger boys and two younger girls the requirement would then be for a three-bedroom unit?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir; but when you get up to the age of 12 and 13 if you have one girl 13 and one boy 12, you would still then require a three-bedroom unit.

We could provide the guidelines established by OSD for the children, ages, and sexes required for a four-bedroom requirement.

Mr. DAVIS. All right, if you would.

[The information follows:]

#### OSD GUIDELINES FOR FOUR-BEDROOM ELIGIBILITY

The following is the OSD guideline used in determining the bedroom requirements for families:

Number of dependents (excluding wife) :	No. of bedrooms
None -----	1
1 -----	2
2, except as follows -----	2
1 10 years or over -----	3
1 6 years or over and other opposite sex -----	3
3, except as follows -----	3
2 10 years or over -----	4
1 10 years or over and other 2 opposite sex with 1 6 years or over --	4
4, except as follows -----	3
1 10 years or over -----	4
1 6 years or over and all of the other 3 opposite sex of the 1 -----	4
2 6 years or over of opposite sex and other 2 same sex -----	4
2 10 years or over and other 2 opposite sex with 1 6 years or over --	5
3 10 years or over -----	5
5, except as follows -----	4
2 or more 10 years or over -----	5
1 10 years or over, with 1 6 years or over and the opposite sex of the other 3 -----	5

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

U.S. AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS, OAHU, HAWAII

Mr. PATTEN. We will turn to U.S. Air Force Installations, Oahu, Hawaii.

Insert page 10 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION U. S. Air Force Installations, Oahu								
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Pacific Air Forces (Zone of Interior)			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER KNMD		6. STATE/COUNTRY Hawaii							
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1937		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Honolulu		10. NEAREST CITY Six miles west of Honolulu, Hawaii						
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Airborne Command Control Squadron Fighter Interceptor Squadron (Air National Guard) Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron (Military Airlift Command) Systems Test Group (Air Force Systems Command) Pacific Air Forces Headquarters				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH			TOTAL					
				PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 Jan 72				1855	7491	2892	0	0	---	---	---	12,238
b. PLANNED (End FY 77)				1615	7345	2938	0	0	---	---	---	11,808
13. INVENTORY												
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)				
a. OWNED		4,175		1,179		136,488		137,667				
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		340		14		7,475		7,489				
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Excludes land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72												
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY Excludes MCP (\$4,330)												
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM Excludes MCP (\$7,331)												
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS Excludes MCP (\$32,000)												
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)												
159,457												
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS												
PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM		
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b			c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h			
711	Family Housing				FA	400	14,301	400	14,301			
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.				FA	400	14,301	400	14,301			

Mr. PATTEN. Are these units to be built at Hickam Field?

General REILLY. Yes, they are, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATTEN. The request is for four-bedroom units. What is the deficiency in four-bedroom houses?

General REILLY. The deficiency is 851 four-bedroom units.

Mr. PATTEN. Why is this a special design?

General REILLY. I don't think it is any special design.

Major SIMS. Not special design. You mean townhouses?

Mr. PATTEN. You indicate on the 1391 that it is a special design, but provide the answer for the record.

General REILLY. Yes.

[The information follows:]

#### SPECIAL DESIGN FOR HICKAM PROJECT

It is only a special design because the Hickam and Andrews Air Force Base projects are proposed to be townhouses.

#### USE OF TURNKEY IN HAWAII

Mr. PATTEN. Are you considering the use of turnkey for this project at Hickam Field?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, we have been looking both at turnkey and conventional construction for this particular project. It now appears, based upon our latest discussions, that probably conventional construction will be employed as opposed to turnkey, although we have been considering turnkey.

Mr. PATTEN. It is not definite?

General REILLY. No; and we think it is going to be conventional now.

#### ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MD.

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to Andrews Air Force Base, Md.

Insert page 14 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION Andrews Air Force Base											
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Headquarters Command			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER AJXF		6. STATE/COUNTRY Maryland										
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1943		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Prince Georges	10. NEAREST CITY Eleven miles southeast of Washington, DC										
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Airborne Command Control Squadron Helicopter Squadron Military Airlift Special Mission Wing (Military Airlift Command) Tactical Airlift Wing (Reserve) Tactical Fighter Wing (Air National Guard) Headquarters Air Force Systems Command Support Functions for Air Force Headquarters				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH											
				PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL		
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)			
				a. AS OF 31 Jan 72	1732	6447	4325	0	0	--	--	--	12,504		
				b. PLANNED (End FY 77)	2144	7238	3348	0	0	--	--	--	12,730		
13. INVENTORY															
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)							
a. OWNED		6959		1720		169,443		171,163							
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		650		114		0		114							
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72								171,277							
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				Excludes MCP (\$2,548)				17,780							
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				Excludes MCP (\$16,935)				8,700							
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				Excludes MCP (\$13,000)				0							
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								197,757							
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						
711	Family Housing				FA	300	8,700	300	8,700						
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.				FA	300	8,700	300	8,700						

Mr. PATTEN. You are requesting 300 units.

Why is it that, in view of force reduction and plans to move activities out of the Washington, D.C., area, you show an increase in base population in the fiscal year 1977 time period?

General REILLY. At Andrews AFB our requirement for housing is 6,296 units. Including existing on-base assets, those under construction from the fiscal year 1972 and fiscal year 1973 programs and some 2,150 units in the community we have a total of 3,928 adequate units. This leaves a sizable deficit of 2,368 units. Andrews AFB is not being considered for force reductions as it is the main support base for the executive and legislative branches of the Government as well as a prime Air Force operating base. The increase in population at Andrews results from our family housing survey technique. Navy personnel were not included in the January 31, 1972, total strength figures because they were not surveyed. They are included in end fiscal year 1977 figures because the Air Force provides housing for their personnel.

Mr. PATTEN. Have you surveyed the community to determine if four-bedroom units can be built by private enterprise?

General REILLY. Yes, we find very few builders who are willing to construct four-bedroom units on a rental basis. Rental rates for such units would be much more than our enlisted personnel could afford to pay.

Mr. PATTEN. Have you conducted a survey of housing at Andrews since the February 1972 figures you provided the committee? If so, provide current figures for the record.

[The information follows:]

#### CURRENT MFH SURVEY AT ANDREWS

A survey was conducted at Andrews in January and February 1973 and is presently being evaluated. The new survey reflects a requirement for 6,213 units. Including existing under construction and approved onbase plus the 300 units in the program and some 2,415 community support units, we have a total of 4,487 assets. This leaves a deficit of 1,726 units which is a reduction from 2,368 reflected after the calendar year 1972 survey.

#### GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE, N. DAK.

Mr. PATTEN. Let us go to Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak.  
Insert page 18 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. PROGRAM FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		4. INSTALLATION Grand Forks Air Force Base								
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Strategic Air Command			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER JFSD		6. STATE/COUNTRY North Dakota									
7. STATUS Active			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1960		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Grand Forks		10. NEAREST CITY Sixteen miles west of Grand Forks, North Dakota							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Heavy Bomardment Wing  Strategic Missile Wing (Minuteman)  Fighter Interceptor Squadron (Aerospace Defense Command)				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL		
				OFFICER		ENLISTED		CIVILIAN		OFFICER		ENLISTED		CIVILIAN
				(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)
a. AS OF 31 JUN 72				963		5024		498		0		0	6,485	
b. PLANNED (End FY '77)				870		5273		517		0		0	6,660	
13. INVENTORY				LAND		ACRES		LAND COST (\$000)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000)		TOTAL (\$000)		
				(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)				
a. OWNED				7,040		1,098		297,276		298,374				
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS				16,856		(1) 752		12		764				
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972				72						299,138				
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				Excludes MCP (\$1,812)						0				
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM										3,710				
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				Excludes MCP (\$6,700)						0				
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)										304,848				
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		e		f		
711		Family Housing						FA		200		5,710		
										200		5,710		
		Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.						FA		200		5,710		

Mr. PATTEN. The request is for 200 units of four-bedroom housing. What is the deficit in four-bedroom quarters at Grand Forks?

General REILLY. There is a deficit of 370 four-bedroom units.

Mr. PATTEN. You list 112 Government-owned trailers as substandard. Are they really substandard, or do you categorize all mobile homes as substandard?

General REILLY. The 112 trailers are approximately 16 years old, were used in the Minuteman Missile Construction program and contain some 642 square feet. They are definitely substandard. All Government-owned mobile homes are categorized as substandard. Privately owned mobile homes are considered adequate housing if the occupant states that it is adequate for his needs.

Mr. PATTEN. You show projected officer housing at 111.7 percent of requirement. Are any of these excess units four-bedroom units? Are you using them for enlisted personnel?

General REILLY. Yes, there are some four-bedroom company grade officer units listed as overages. We have a total of 306 onbase units categorized as Company Grade Quarters and 130 of them are occupied by enlisted personnel, many of which are four-bedroom units.

SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Mr. PATTEN. Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex.

Insert page 22 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER Sheppard Air Force Base						
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Air Training Command				5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER VNVP			6. STATE/COUNTRY Texas						
7. STATUS Active				8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1971/1978			9. COUNTY (U.S.) Wichita		10. NEAREST CITY Three miles north of Wichita Falls, Texas				
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Technical Training Center  School of Applied Aerospace Science  Health Care Science School  USAF Regional Hospital  Undergraduate Pilot Training School (German Air Force)  Undergraduate Pilot Training School (MAP)  Heavy Bombardment Wing (Satellite) SAC				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH									
				12. INVENTORY									
				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 Jan 72	1051	4076	2440	568	8028	---	---	---	16,163
b. PLANNED (End FY 77)	894	4464	2503	266	7405	---	---	---	15,533				
13. INVENTORY													
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)					
a. OWNED		4,533		628		133,684		134,312					
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		1,693		127		146		273					
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72													
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY Excludes MCP (\$5,074)													
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM Excludes MCP (\$2,753)													
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS Excludes MCP (\$25,000)													
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)													
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS													
PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND		AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM					
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b			c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h				
711	Family Housing				FA	200	5,383	200	5,383				
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.				FA	200	5,383	200	5,383				

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

General REILLY. The area cost factor is 0.93.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the deficit in four-bedroom units?

General REILLY. There is a deficit of 402 four-bedroom units.

Mr. PATTEN. Provide the committee with a map showing where the housing will be sited.

[The map was provided for the committee's files.]

Mr. PATTEN. What is the community support situation here?

General REILLY. Community support is good and provides some 2,809 units. These include 1,407 owned homes, 546 mobile homes, 744 rental units, and some 112 units which are available or due to become available in the near future.

#### ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE, GUAM, MARIANA ISLANDS

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, Mariana Islands.

Insert page 26 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM Andersen Air Force Base										
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Strategic			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER AJJY		6. STATE/COUNTRY Guam, Mariana Islands									
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1945		9. COUNTY (U.S.) N/A		10. NEAREST CITY Eleven miles northeast of Agana, Guam								
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Heavy Bombardment Squadron  Weather Reconnaissance Squadron (Military Airlift Command)  Military Airlift Support Squadron (Military Airlift Command)  Strategic Air Division				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. ... of 31 Jan 72		436	3447	822	0	0	---	---	---	4,699
				b. PLANNED (End FY 77)		472	3336	791	0	0	---	---	---	4,599
				13. INVENTORY										
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)						
a. OWNED		16,158		445		144,269		144,714						
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		243		0		0		0						
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972								144,714						
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								Excludes MCP (\$800) 0						
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								10,950						
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								Excludes MCP (\$17,500) 0						
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								155,664						
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					
711	Family Housing				FA	300	10,950	300	10,950					
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.				FA	300	10,950	300	10,950					

Mr. PATTEN. There seems to be a shortage of community support. Why is this?

General REILLY. Guam is not heavily populated. Andersen you can see is located at the extreme northeast corner. There are just very, very small communities around it, limited community support.

Mr. PATTEN. There is a community down there to the south, isn't there?

General REILLY. Yes. A lot of facilities in the community just aren't adequate for our people.

Mr. PATTEN. Are your population projections here firm?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, we think they are.

Mr. PATTEN. What are your plans for meeting the future housing requirements at this base?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We will continue to consider additional housing at this particular base in accordance with the priorities of other bases in future years' programs.

Mr. PATTEN. What are the jobs of the key civilians who occupy on-base housing?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Guam is considered as overseas location and we do allow certain key and essential civilian personnel to occupy on-base housing.

Mr. PATTEN. Do they occupy officer or enlisted housing?

Mr. JOHNSTON. They would occupy the housing according to their grade. If they are in the equivalent officer grade they would be assigned officer housing and if of equivalent airman grade would be assigned airman housing.

Mr. PATTEN. You should probably embellish that for the record.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

#### CIVILIANS OCCUPYING ON-BASE HOUSING, ANDERSEN

For family housing purposes, key and essential civilians will normally be considered as equivalent to military grades in accordance with the following schedule:

Military grade group	Civilian grade groups		
	GS and NAF	WB	WB-S
0-6 and above.....	15 and above.....		
0-4 and 0-5.....	13-14.....		14-19.
0-1 through 0-3 and W-1 through W-4.....	10-12.....	12-15.....	8-13.
E-4 through E-9.....	4-9.....	9-11.....	3-7.
E-1 through E-3.....	1-3.....	1-8.....	1-2.

#### MOBILE HOME FACILITIES

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to mobile home facilities.

Insert pages 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, and 44 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	3. INSTALLATION									
15 Feb 73	AF	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM									
Elilson Air Force Base											
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU		5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY								
Alaskan Air Command		FTQW	Alaska								
7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY								
Active	1946	Fourth Judicial District	Twenty six miles southeast of Fairbanks, Alaska								
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS	12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL		
Weather Reconnaissance Detachment (Military Airlift Command) Strategic Reconnaissance Wing (Strategic Air Command) Tactical Fighter (Forward Alert) Air Refueling Squadron (Rotation) (Strategic Air Command) Tactical Reconnaissance Squadron (Rotation)		OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OFFICER	ENLISTED	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
		A. AS OF 31 Jan 72	276	2423	578	0	0	---	---	---	3277
		D. PLANNED (END FY 77)	303	2927	481	0	0	---	---	---	3711
13. INVENTORY											
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
A. OWNED		19,949		0		196,645		196,645			
B. LEASES AND EASEMENTS				0		0		0			
C. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72								196,645			
D. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				Exclusive of MCP (\$3,793)				0			
E. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				Exclusive of MCP (\$1,557)				630			
F. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				Exclusive of MCP (\$3,400)				0			
G. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								197,275			
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) (1)	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) (2)				
711	Mobile Home Facilities		Spaces	70	630	70	630				
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.		Spaces	70	630	70	630				

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			Davis-Monthan Air Force Base							
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Strategic Air Command			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER FENV			6. STATE/COUNTRY Arizona								
7. STATUS Active			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1927			9. COUNTY (U.S.) Pima		10. NEAREST CITY Four miles southeast of Tucson, Arizona						
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Strategic Missile Wing (Titan) Strategic Reconnaissance Wing Tactical Fighter Wing (Tactical Air Command) Military Aircraft Storage and Disposition Center (Air Force Logistics Command) Strategic Missile Division Headquarters				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)		
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)			
				A. AS OF 31 Jan 72		1212	7658	1857	0	0	---	---	---	10,727
				B. PLANNED (END FY 77)		1151	7263	1843	0	0	---	---	---	10,257
13. INVENTORY														
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)						
A. OWNED		7,096		553		205,515		206,068						
B. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		8,594		(6)		4,852		4,852						
C. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19		72						210,920						
D. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY										Exclusive of MCP (\$2,097) 9,378				
E. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM										Exclusive of MCP (\$232) 200				
F. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS										Exclusive of MCP (\$17,000) 0				
G. GRAND TOTAL (C + D + E + F)								220,498						
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS														
PROJECT DESIGNATION														
CATEGORY CODE NO. a		PROJECT TITLE b			TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM SCOPE e		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	FUNDING PROGRAM SCOPE g		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h		
7.1		Mobile Home Facilities				Spaces	50		200	50		200		
		Total excludes construction justified elsewhere..				Spaces	50		200	50		200		

272

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION Dover Air Force Base									
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Military Airlift Command			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER EJXT		6. STATE/COUNTRY Delaware								
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1941/1951		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Kent	10. NEAREST CITY Four miles southeast of Dover, Delaware								
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Military Airlift Wing Military Airlift Group (Reserve-Associate)				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH									
				PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL		
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)	
				A. AS OF 31 Jan 72	631	4444	1386	0	0	---	---	---	6,461
				D. PLANNED (END FY 77)	545	4434	1580	0	0	---	---	---	6,559
13. INVENTORY													
LAND		ACRES (1)	LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)						
A. OWNED		2830	831		124,684		125,515						
B. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		1616	52		0		52						
C. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972							125,567						
D. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY		Excludes MCP (\$5,958)						6,909					
E. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM		Excludes MCP (\$3,387)						205					
F. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS		Excludes MCP (\$12,500)						0					
G. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								132,681					
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				
711	Mobile Home Facilities				Spaces	50	205	50	205				
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.				Spaces	50	205	50	205				

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION Wurtsmith Air Force Base						
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Strategic Air Command		5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER ZJXD		6. STATE/COUNTRY Michigan						
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1926/1951		9. COUNTY (U.S.) IOSCO						
10. NEAREST CITY Three miles northwest of Oscoda, Michigan										
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Heavy Bombardment Wing  Fighter Interceptor Squadron (Aerospace Defense Command)		12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH								
		PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL	
		OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 Jan 72		515	3303	367	0	0	---	---	---	4185
b. PLANNED (End FY 77)		412	2662	411	0	0	---	---	---	3485
		13. INVENTORY								
		LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST (\$000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
a. OWNED			1,903	622	74,733		75,355			
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS			3,315	0	12,235		12,235			
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72		87,590								
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY		Excludes MCP (\$1,278)								
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM		Excludes MCP (\$616)								
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS		Excludes MCP (\$3,100)								
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)		87,845								
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS										
PROJECT DESIGNATION										
CATEGORY CODE NO. a		PROJECT TITLE b			TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
							SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h
711		Mobile Home Facilities				Spaces	58	255	58	255
		Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.				Spaces	58	255	58	255

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION Columbus Air Force Base							
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Air Training Command		5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER REPZ		6. STATE/COUNTRY Mississippi							
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1941		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Lowndes							
10. NEAREST CITY Ten miles NNW of Columbus, Mississippi.											
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Undergraduate Pilot Training School											
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 Jan 72		384	2260	690	552	0	---	---	---		3886
b. PLANNED (END FY 77)		386	1888	526	722	0	---	---	---		3522
13. INVENTORY											
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
a. OWNED		4,608		73		62,057		62,130			
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		1		(1)		133		133			
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land cost) AS OF 30 JUNE 72								62,263			
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								0			
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								180			
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								0			
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								62,443			
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		
711	Mobile Home Facilities				Spaces	50	180	50	180		
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.				Spaces	50	180	50	180		

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION Pease Air Force Base						
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Strategic Air Command				5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER SZDT						
7. STATUS Active			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1956		9. STATE/COUNTRY New Hampshire					
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Medium Bombardment Wing  Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron (Military Airlift Command)  Tactical Airlift Squadron (Air National Guard)  Strategic Air Division			12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		10. NEAREST CITY Buckingham Three miles west northwest of Portsmouth, NH					
		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 Jan 72		568	3522	662	0	0	---	---	---	4752
b. PLANNED (End FY 77)		520	3368	513	0	0	---	---	---	4401
13. INVENTORY										
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)		
a. OWNED		4,320		1,369		94,402		95,771		
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		57		40		0		40		
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972								95,811		
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								Excludes MCP (\$8,128) 0		
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								Excludes MCP (\$526) 150		
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								Excludes MCP (\$6,400) 0		
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								95,961		
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	
711	Mobile Home Facilities				Spaces	33	150	33	150	
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.				Spaces	33	150	33	150	

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION Laughlin Air Force Base									
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Air Training Command		5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER MXDP		6. STATE/COUNTRY Texas									
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1942/1952		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Valverde									
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Undergraduate Pilot Training School		10. NEAREST CITY Seven miles east of Del Rio, Texas											
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 Jan 72		432	1870	674	495	0	---	---	---	3471			
b. PLANNED (END FY 71)		407	1614	642	386	0	---	---	---	3049			
13. INVENTORY		LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
a. OWNED				3,925		107		38,042		38,149			
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS				572		(40)		8		26			
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72										38,183			
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY										Excludes MCP (\$711)			
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM										Excludes MCP (\$4,635)			
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS										Excludes MCP (\$5,700)			
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)										38,378			
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS													
PROJECT DESIGNATION													
CATEGORY CODE NO. a		PROJECT TITLE b				TENANT COMMAND c		UNIT OF MEASURE d		AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM e		FUNDING PROGRAM f	
								SCOPE g		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h		SCOPE i	
711		Mobile Home Facilities						Spaces		54		195	
								Spaces		54		195	
		Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.						Spaces		54		195	

1. DATE 15 Feb 73		2. DEPARTMENT AF		3. INSTALLATION Reese Air Force Base					
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Air Training Command				5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER UBNY					
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1942/1949		9. STATE/COUNTRY Texas					
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Undergraduate Pilot Training School		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Lubbock		10. NEAREST CITY Six miles west of Lubbock, Texas					
12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL (9)
		OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	
A. AS OF 31 Jan 72		490	1645	716	497	0	---	---	3348
B. PLANNED (End FY '77)		402	1504	678	384	0	---	---	2968
13. INVENTORY									
LAND		ACRES (1)	LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)		
A. OWNED		2,402	397		28,391		28,788		
B. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		603	(2) 29		0		29		
C. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72								28,817	
D. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				Excludes MCP (\$4,293)				0	
E. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				Excludes MCP (\$4,211)				185	
F. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				Excludes MCP (\$5,400)				0	
G. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								29,002	
14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS									
PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND c	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
711	Mobile Home Facilities				Spaces	50	185	50	185
	Total excludes construction justified elsewhere.				Spaces	50	185	50	185

Mr. PATTEN. You are requesting 70 spaces at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, at a cost of \$630,000. In view of the weather, are mobile homes satisfactory for use in Alaska?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir. Many of our families bring mobile homes to Alaska. This particular project is going to replace 49 deteriorated mobile home spaces presently in existence. We are going to have to abandon that particular site and move to another site and we have included 21 additional new spaces for our people.

Mr. PATTEN. Why do you need to replace 49 spaces? When were they constructed? Can they be upgraded?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The present mobile home court of 138 is filled to capacity; 49 of these spaces are on a wooden utilidor. This utilidor is in an advanced stage of deterioration. The presence of sewer gas and the threat of cave-ins form a real hazard. It is considered uneconomical to repair and upgrade these spaces because of their condition and they are too small to accommodate the large present day mobile homes. The original existing 49 spaces were constructed in 1955 as a self-help project and slight improvements were made in follow-on years.

Mr. PATTEN. The request at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Arizona is for 50 spaces. These spaces will cost less than half the cost of those in Alaska. Is this because of the cost factor, or is it due to the difference in weather conditions and the resultant difference in construction requirements?

#### COST OF MOBILE SPACES, DAVIS-MONTHAN VERSUS EIELSON

General REILLY. The cost factor for Eielson is 1.9 and for Davis-Monthan 1.1. The difference in cost is due both to cost factors and the difference in the type of construction requirements between the two locations.

Mr. PATTEN. Is there any way to get the local owners of trailer spaces to upgrade them? Surely they should be able to see the advisability of providing adequate facilities.

Mr. JOHNSON. Our housing referral offices constantly contact the local mobile home park owners and we do attempt to get them to improve their trailer spaces. In some cases we will even put local trailer courts off limits because they won't upgrade their trailer spaces.

Mr. PATTEN. What standards do you impose on mobile home spaces, and how do your standards differ from the local codes or regulations?

General REILLY. In our on-base mobile home courts, we attempt to provide a complete usable facility consisting of the following items: A stabilized pad on which to place the mobile home, utility line connections/distribution, streets, parking, sidewalks, and lighting, a storage shed or building for storage, a concrete patio, and community facilities/including laundry facilities.

It is almost impossible to compare our standards with those of local courts because of the various codes and regulations imposed in many different localities.

Mr. PATTEN. At Dover Air Force Base, Del., your request is for 50 spaces. Is there a trend toward more families owning mobile homes and, if so, are you building facilities fast enough?

General REILLY. Yes. In recent years there has been a trend among the military toward mobile home ownership. We feel we are building

facilities at a reasonable rate. Many families do find suitable facilities in the local communities. It is OSD policy to build onbase facilities only when offbase facilities are not available within reasonable distances and costs.

Mr. PATTEN. In each instance in your requests, you cite long waiting lists and excessive cost. What is the average cost for a space? How does this compare with housing allowances? Do families living in mobile homes get an offbase housing allowance the same as those who rent or buy houses?

General REILLY. An individual occupying an onbase space will pay between \$15 to \$23 for the space, depending upon the cost of the space to the Government. We amortize the cost over 15 years. A space which cost \$1,800 some years ago rents for \$15, and a new space costing \$4,000, rents for \$23 per month. On top of that, the occupants pay utilities which range from \$10 to \$20 per month, depending upon location. Total cost of a space—from \$25 to \$43 per month.

This cost is well below the housing allowance, but we must remember that the occupant is providing the home, and his mortgage payments on it will run from \$75 to \$125 per month.

Yes; families in mobile homes do get the same housing allowance as those who rent or buy homes.

Mr. PATTEN. At Laughlin Air Force Base, Tex., the request is for 54 replacement spaces. Why were the present spaces constructed in an unacceptable location? When were they built and at what cost?

General REILLY. The existing 545 spaces were built as a self-help program in 1955 at a cost of approximately \$2,000. In follow-on years another \$13,442 was spent to keep them in operation. The present spaces are some 1,000 feet from a usable taxiway. When the trailer spaces were constructed the taxiway did not exist and they were far enough from the runway according to criteria.

Mr. PATTEN. Please provide the committee with a map showing the proposed location.

[The map was provided for the committee's files.]

#### IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING PUBLIC QUARTERS

Mr. PATTEN. Turn to improvements to existing public quarters. Insert pages 46 through 51 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

1. DATE 15 Feb 1973	2. FISCAL YEAR 1974	3. DEPARTMENT AF		4. INSTALLATION Various
5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION \$23,750,000		6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION P.L.	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER Various	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 880110
10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION \$23,750,000		11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER P713	12. PROJECT NUMBER	9. STATE/COUNTRY U. S. and Foreign
SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT				13. PROJECT TITLE Improvement to Existing Public Quarters

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT				SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES					
14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION	18. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY				20. PRIMARY FACILITY	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
A. PERMANENT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	a. NO. OF BLDGS	b. NO. OF STORIES	c. LENGTH	d. WIDTH	Improvements	LS		\$23,750
B. SEMI-PERMANENT		e. DESIGN CAPACITY	f. GROSS AREA						
C. TEMPORARY		g. COOLING CAP.	h. COST (\$)						
15. TYPE OF WORK		19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE Projects include all work necessary to improve livability in 4545 units by providing such amenities as air conditioning; modern kitchens with garbage disposers, dishwashers, etc., and adequate storage space; additional modern bathrooms; privacy features such as soundproofing, patios, and landscaping; parking; site improvements; etc. Included are two General Officer Quarters requiring extensive modifications. Program consists of 11 projects at 10 installations.				21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES			
A. NEW FACILITY									
B. ADDITION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
C. ALTERATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
D. CONVERSION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
E. OTHER (Specify)									
16. REPLACEMENT									
17. TYPE OF DESIGN									
A. STANDARD DESIGN									
B. SPECIAL DESIGN									
C. DRAWING NO.									
						22. TOTAL PROJECT COST			
						\$23,750			

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT		
23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M)		
a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT		
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD		
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE		
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY		
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (C + D)		
	AUTHORIZED	FUNDED
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION		
g. INCLUDED IN FY PROGRAM		
h. DEFICIENCY (e - g - f - D)		
24. RELATED PROJECTS		
25. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT PROJECT: This request is to provide \$23,750,000 to accomplish improvement work on family housing facilities. REQUIREMENT: To improve, upgrade and equalize the livability of family housing units in the Air Force inventory. CURRENT SITUATION: Units in the Air Force inventory vary in age from 1 to 80 years. The majority were constructed since the early 1940's using various construction and design criteria, with different type equipment and at varying costs. As a result, the units vary in size, materials, installed equipment, appliances, livability and appearance. The improvement and standardization of these units are of a major concern to the Air Force. Currently over 100 million dollars worth of projects have been identified as being required to upgrade all of our units to current national standards. Houses on the same base should be of a comparable standard and contain the same amenities.		

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	3. DEPARTMENT		4. INSTALLATION
15 Feb 1973	1974	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)		AF
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
		Improvement to Existing Public Quarters		
19. Description of work to be done (Continued)				
<u>STATE AND INSTALLATION</u>		<u>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>CURRENT WORKING ESTIMATE</u> (\$000)	
Alaska	Elmendorf AFB	Alter Family Housing, Building 5-504 (Separate DD Form 1391 attached)	\$	35.8
Arizona	Williams AFB	Improve 500 Wherry Housing Units		2,000.0
California	Travis AFB	Consolidated Improvements for 1581 Units		2,633.7
	Travis AFB	Consolidated Exterior Improvements		1,922.9
Florida	Eglin Auxiliary #9	Alter 126 Airmen Units		1,090.0
Maine	Loring AFB	Improve 358 Wherry Housing Units, Phase I of III (Separate DD Form 1391 attached)		3,866.4
New Mexico	Cannon AFB	Install Hoods, Dishwashers and Air Conditioning in 761 Units		1,657.3
Ohio	Wright-Patterson AFB	Improve 643 Wherry Housing Units (Separate DD Form 1391 attached)		5,787.0
Texas	Carswell AFB	Improve 363 Wherry Housing Units		2,831.4
	Kelly AFB	Improve 211 Wherry Housing Units, Phase II of II		1,899.0
<u>OVERSEAS INSTALLATION</u>				
Germany	Ramstein AB	Alter Building 1013 (Separate DD Form 1391 attached)		26.5
			TOTAL	\$ 23,750.0

1. DATE 15 Feb 1973	2. FISCAL YEAR 1974	3. DEPARTMENT AF			4. INSTALLATION Elmendorf Air Force Base
5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION \$ 35,800		6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION P.L.	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER 711-141	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 880110	9. STATE/COUNTRY Alaska
10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION \$ 35,800			11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER P 713	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE Alter Family Housing

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT				SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES			
14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION	15. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY			20. PRIMARY FACILITY	U/M	QUANTITY	COST (\$000)
A. PERMANENT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	B. NO. OF BLDGS	C. NO. OF STORIES	Alter Family Housing	LS		\$ 32.2
B. SEMI-PERMANENT		D. LENGTH	E. WIDTH				
C. TEMPORARY		F. DESIGN CAPACITY	G. GROSS AREA				
		H. COOLING CAP.	I. COST (\$)				
16. TYPE OF WORK	17. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE			21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES			\$ 3.6
A. NEW FACILITY	ALTERATION:			a. Design	LS		2.0
B. ADDITION	All partition, finish, electrical, structural, and mechanical work necessary to provide a single staircase;			b. Supervision, Inspection, Overhead	LS		1.6
C. ALTERATION	combine double kitchen; relocate powder room; modify master bedroom and bath; increase upstairs storage; and relocate entryway in Bldg 5-504.			c.			
D. CONVERSION	AREA INCLUDES:			d.			
E. OTHER (Specify)	Present - 1st floor: 2 dining rooms, 2 kitchens, 1 living room, powder room. 2nd floor: 6 bedrooms, 4 baths. After alteration - 1st floor: 1 dining room, 1 informal dining room, 1 kitchen, 1 living room, powder room. 2nd floor: 3 bedrooms, 4 baths, 2 dressing rooms.			e.			
18. REPLACEMENT				f.			
19. TYPE OF DESIGN				g.			
A. STANDARD DESIGN				h.			
B. SPECIAL DESIGN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			i.			
C. DRAWING NO.				j.			
				22. TOTAL PROJECT COST			\$ 35.8

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT		
23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M)	24. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT	
A. TOTAL REQUIREMENT	PROJECT: Project provides interior alterations to general officer's quarters to accommodate military and diplomatic protocol functions.	
B. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD	REQUIREMENT: These alterations are required to arrange the interior configuration to provide for comfort and convenience of occupants and guests.	
C. EXISTING ADEQUATE	CURRENT SITUATION: This housing unit was constructed in 1942 as a duplex for field and company grade officers. The duplex configuration of this facility is not functional for present usage as a single family, general officer's quarters. Food preparation, storage, and delivery areas are too small to accommodate the volume of activity associated with protocol functions. Present room arrangement is confusing to visitors - entry to dining room from living room is either through kitchen or outer entry; powder room opens directly into dining-living room; duplex stairways are dark and lead to old duplex portions of upstairs area. Some of the existing rooms and spaces are exceedingly small.	
D. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY	ADDITIONAL: This project will complete the known requirement for work on this family housing unit. No concurrent maintenance and repair work is to be done.	
E. ADEQUATE ASSETS (C + D)		
F. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	AUTHORIZED	FUNDED
G. INCLUDED IN FY PROGRAM		
H. DEFICIENCY (A - B - I - D)		
24. RELATED PROJECTS		

1. DATE 15 Feb 1973		2. FISCAL YEAR 1974		3. DEPARTMENT AF			4. INSTALLATION Loring Air Force Base					
5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION \$ 3,866,400				6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION P.L.		7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER 711-121		8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 880110				
9. STATE/COUNTRY Maine				10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION \$ 3,866,400			11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER P 713		12. LINE ITEM NUMBER Improve 358 Wherry Units			
SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF LINE ITEM						SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES						
14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION		18. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY				20. PRIMARY FACILITY		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
A. PERMANENT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		A. NO. OF BLOCS		B. NO. OF STORIES		Improve 358 Wherry Units		IS		\$10,200	\$3,651.6	
B. SEMIPERMANENT		C. LENGTH		D. WIDTH		A.						
C. TEMPORARY		E. DESIGN CAPACITY		F. GROSS AREA		B.						
D. COOLING		G. CAP.		H. COST (\$)		C.						
15. TYPE OF WORK		19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE				21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES						
A. NEW FACILITY		Project provides for the improvement of Wherry Housing and will result in 358 units after improvement, combination and required demolition. Work includes improving the kitchen layout; providing amenities; modernizing bathrooms; providing a powder room on first floor; providing interior and exterior storage; and providing new garages adjacent to living areas. Improvements will be accomplished in conjunction with major repairs required to existing systems.				A. Design		IS			\$ 214.8	
B. ADDITION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						B. Supervision, Inspection, Overhead		IS			124.2	90.6
C. ALTERATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						C.						
D. CONVERSION						D.						
E. OTHER (Specify)						E.						
16. REPLACEMENT		F.		F.								
17. TYPE OF DESIGN		G.		G.								
A. STANDARD DESIGN		H.		H.								
B. SPECIAL DESIGN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		I.		I.								
C. DRAWING NO.		J.		J.								
						22. TOTAL LINE ITEM COST \$3,866.4						
SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT												
23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M)						25. REQUIREMENT FOR LINE ITEM						
A. TOTAL REQUIREMENT						The Wherry Housing at Loring AFB presents a dismal picture of long blocks of row houses containing up to 29 units per building. With 20 years of age, many of the existing systems have failed or are failing. The differential in time and life styles since these units were constructed has created extensive inequities between these housing units and the Capehart and MCP houses on base. The high density of the Wherry area creates numerous problems, including snow removal which is a major seasonal problem. The kitchens are extremely small and the units lack virtually all the conveniences which have become standard in DOD criteria and in the local community. The occupants have little or no exterior storage and the existing garages are small and in poor condition. The repairs required for these units must be accomplished in any event, and the most economical approach to resolution of the problem for upgrading is doing the work in combination. This project will be Phase I of III. The total combined cost of the improvement and repair work is \$15,000 per unit. Total project cost is \$5,370,000 (Repair - \$1,503,600 - Improvements \$3,866,400).						
B. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD												
C. EXISTING ADEQUATE												
D. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY												
E. ADEQUATE ASSETS (C + D)												
F. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION												
G. INCLUDED IN FY PROGRAM												
H. DEFICIENCY (B - C - F - D)												
24. RELATED LINE ITEMS												
Repair 358 Wherry Units												
(\$4,200 per unit) \$1,503,600												



1. DATE 15 Feb 1974		2. FISCAL YEAR 1974		3. DEPARTMENT MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA			4. INSTALLATION AF		5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION \$26,500		6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION P.L.		7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER 711-161		8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 880110		9. STATE/COUNTRY Germany																										
10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION \$26,500				11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER P 713				12. PROJECT NUMBER				13. PROJECT TITLE Add to and Alter Family Housing (Bldg. 1013)																															
SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT												SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES																															
14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION												15. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY								20. PRIMARY FACILITY																							
16. PERMANENT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>												a. NO. OF BLOCS								Add to and Alter Family Housing								U/M		QUANTITY		UNIT COST		COST (\$000)									
17. SEMI-PERMANENT												b. NO. OF STORIES 2								c. LENGTH								d. WIDTH															
18. TEMPORARY												e. DESIGN CAPACITY 1 Family								f. GROSS AREA								g. Alteration								IS							
19. TYPE OF WORK												h. COOLING None								CAP.								i. GROSS AREA															
20. NEW FACILITY												j. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE								k. COST (\$)																							
21. ADDITION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>												22. ADDITION: Concrete slab on grade, masonry walls and peaked tile roof to match existing construction.																															
23. ALTERATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>												24. ALTERATION: Required work to connect new construction to existing structure and systems. Rearrangement of interior partitions in master bedroom to improve functional layout.																															
25. CONVERSION												26. AREA INCLUDES: Living room, master bedroom, dressing room, study, library.																															
27. OTHER (Specify)																																											
28. REPLACEMENT																																											
29. TYPE OF DESIGN																																											
30. STANDARD DESIGN																																											
31. SPECIAL DESIGN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																																											
32. DRAWING NO.																																											
SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT												23. TOTAL PROJECT COST								\$ 26.5																							
23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M)												24. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT								PROJECT: Enlarges the living room, study/library and master bedroom, CURRENT SITUATION: Because of the poor functional layout the existing facility is totally inadequate to serve the military, diplomatic and social requirements placed on the Commander in Chief USAFE. Completion of the FY 73 project, which enlarges the dining room, will provide only minor relief as both the living and dining room must be used concurrently to accommodate the number of people normally attending the frequent social functions hosted by the CINC. The library/study is indispensable for the CINC to conduct private talks with visiting dignitaries and allied country diplomatic visitors as well as for the extensive amount of work which he must accomplish at home. The master bedroom/dressing area require enlargement/alteration to provide adequate space and functional arrangement commensurate with accepted standards for prestige quarters. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Failure to accomplish this project will seriously degrade the fulfillment of diplomatic and social obligations incumbent with the CINC of a major command in a foreign country. No concurrent maintenance and repair work is to be done.																							
25. TOTAL REQUIREMENT												AUTHORIZED								FUNDED																							
26. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD																																											
27. EXISTING ADEQUATE																																											
28. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY																																											
29. ADEQUATE ASSETS (a + d)																																											
30. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION																																											
31. INCLUDED IN FY PROGRAM																																											
32. DEFICIENCY (a - b - c - d)																																											
33. RELATED PROJECTS																																											
FY 73 P-713 Project, Add to and Alter Family Housing - \$9.9																																											

Mr. PATTEN. The request is for \$23,750,000 to improve 4,545 units of family housing at 10 installations. In addition you are requesting \$400,000 for minor construction. How does this compare to the amount provided for improvements and minor construction last year?

General REILLY. In fiscal year 1973 we requested and obtained \$11,955,000 for improvements. For minor construction, we requested \$1 million, and the committee gratuitously provided \$5,400,000.

In fiscal year 1974 we are requesting \$23,750,000 for improvements and \$400,000 for minor construction.

Mr. PATTEN. At Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, you propose to alter the general's quarters at a cost of \$35,800. Would it not make more sense to build the general a new house and make this duplex available to two other families?

General REILLY. No. In Alaska we couldn't build a general officers' unit within the current statutory limitation. Since this house has already been combined, we feel it is more logical and economical to continue with this approach.

Mr. PATTEN. Where will the general live while this work is going on? Do you have a vacant house for him that is adequate?

General REILLY. At about the time we would start work on the unit we would hold either a vacated general or senior officer unit for interim occupancy by the commander. A vacant unit is not available now.

Mr. PATTEN. At Williams Air Force Base, Ariz., you are requesting \$2 million to improve 500 Wherry housing units. What exactly do you propose to do?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In this particular project we intend to improve 500 Wherry units by providing additional storage, a second bath in the three-bedroom units. We are going to modernize the kitchens to provide disposers and dishwashers, provide patios with privacy screens in the rear of the units, and add carports.

We figure this work will bring these units up to comparable condition of other existing units on base and in the area.

Mr. PATTEN. Are you or have you consulted with the wives to determine if these improvements meet the requirements?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir, we have discussed it with the wives and you may notice that some of the wives' recommendations are included in the particular project.

Mr. PATTEN. At Travis Air Force Base, Calif., you are requesting funds for what you call consolidated improvements and exterior improvements. Exactly what do you mean?

General REILLY. These projects are consolidations of the identified deficiencies in all the housing units at Travis AFB. Housing at Travis consists of Wherry, MCP, and Capehart, and the specific work varies with each housing area. The objective is to eliminate all deficiencies and make all of the housing equally acceptable to the occupants.

Mr. PATTEN. Provide details for the record on unit cost and the work to be done.

[The information follows:]

#### LIST OF UNIT COST AND WORK TO BE DONE AT TRAVIS AFB

*Interior Improvements.*—\$1,666 per unit: Work consists primarily of modernizing kitchens, including installation of dishwashers and garbage disposers, modernizing bathrooms, and providing additional bathrooms where appropriate.

*Exterior Improvements.*—\$1,216 per unit: Work consists of improving the storm drainage system, providing patios and privacy areas.

Mr. PATTEN. You are proposing to alter 126 airmen units at Eglin Auxiliary No. 9, Fla. What work will be done on these units?

General REILLY. The proposed project will add a half bath, modernize the kitchen, provide adequate dining space, utility area, and interior/exterior storage areas.

Mr. PATTEN. Is this part of a continuing program, or is this a new project?

General REILLY. This is a new project.

Mr. PATTEN. At Loring Air Force Base, Maine, you propose to improve 358 Wherry units. What is the current situation? Do you have any pictures?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, sir; we have no pictures. These are Wherry units. They are some of our borderline cases but we feel they should be improved and kept in the inventory and this particular work includes improving the kitchen layouts, providing amenities, modernizing the bathrooms, providing bath and powder room on the first floor, providing interior and exterior storage, and providing new garages in an area where they are really needed, adjacent to living areas.

They also include some of the amenities recommended by the wives.

Mr. PATTEN. You say this is the first of three phases. What will the next two phases encompass?

General REILLY. The next two phases will accomplish the same work on additional housing units. There are approximately 1,600 Wherry units at Loring, and phasing the work permits accomplishment of the project in an orderly manner without compromise, since the construction period will extend over several years.

Mr. PATTEN. Is this a solid base?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Loring? Yes, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. What are your present and projected base loading levels? Supply that for the record.

[The information follows:]

#### PRESENT AND PROJECTED BASE LOADING LEVELS

The present base loading for military personnel is 3,865 and the projected strength for the end of fiscal year 1978 is 3,785.

Mr. PATTEN. How many Wherry units are you converting to arrive at the 358 acceptable units?

Mr. JOHNSTON. At Loring? All 358. We are not reducing the inventory at Loring.

Mr. PATTEN. At Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, you propose to convert 900 units into 643 units. Can you show us how you plan to do this?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We don't have drawings for this, Mr. Chairman, but at Wright-Patterson, we have an exceptionally large number of row housing. In other words, six to eight units, and a number of our end units are three-bedroom units or four-bedroom units and in between those units are two-story units, upstairs and downstairs, and what we propose to do is to reconfigure the two-bedroom units between the end units and come up with some good three- and four-bedroom units.

Mr. PATTEN. Do you think they will be fully acceptable?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir, they will be fully acceptable. This will be adequate housing and kept in our inventory for a long time.

Mr. PATTEN. At Ramstein Air Base, Germany, you propose an improvement to the quarters of the commander-in-chief of USAFE. Would it not be more economical to build him a new house and turn his present quarters over to someone with fewer social demands? That way you would have two houses instead of one.

General REILLY. We could not build a general officer unit in Germany within the current statutory limitation. We feel that the alteration to this unit is the most economical way to provide the CINCUSAFE an adequate set of quarters.

#### MINOR CONSTRUCTION

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to minor construction.

Insert page 52 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 15 Feb 1973	2. FISCAL YEAR 1974	3. DEPARTMENT AF		4. INSTALLATION Various Locations		
5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION \$400,000		6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION P.L. 10 USC 2674	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER N/A	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 880-110	9. STATE/COUNTRY	
10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION \$400,000		11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER P 713	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE Minor Construction		
SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT			SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES			
14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION	15. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY		20. PRIMARY FACILITY Minor Construction	U/M	QUANTITY	
a. PERMANENT	a. NO. OF BLDGS	b. NO. OF STORIES			LS	
b. SEMI-PERMANENT	c. LENGTH	d. WIDTH	a.		\$	
c. TEMPORARY	e. DESIGN CAPACITY	f. GROSS AREA	b.		\$400	
	g. COOLING CAP.	COST (\$)	c.			
18. TYPE OF WORK	19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE		d.			
a. NEW FACILITY	Provides for minor improvements, additions, expansions, extensions, conversions, and replacements to such properties as family dwelling units, non-dwelling structures, ground areas, road and utility systems serving family housing facilities, and other property included in the Defense Family Housing Account under the authority of 10 USC 2674.		e.			
b. ADDITION			21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES			\$
c. ALTERATION			a.			
d. CONVERSION			b.			
e. OTHER (Spec/Ob)			c.			
16. REPLACEMENT			d.			
17. TYPE OF DESIGN			e.			
a. STANDARD DESIGN			f.			
b. SPECIAL DESIGN			g.			
c. DRAWING NO.			h.			
			i.			
			j.			
			22. TOTAL PROJECT COST		\$400	
SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT						
23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M _____)			23. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT			
a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT			These funds are required to provide a means for accomplishing minor improvement work needed to satisfy requirements which arise during the year and that are so minor in scope individually that inclusion in a regular military family housing construction program is not feasible. Also included are funds required to satisfy immediate and urgent military family housing facilities requirements which arise during the year and cannot await inclusion in the next year's regular military family housing construction program.			
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD						
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE						
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY						
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (C + D)	AUTHORIZED	FUNDED				
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION						
g. INCLUDED IN FY _____ PROGRAM						
h. DEFICIENCY (e - f - g)						
24. RELATED PROJECTS						

Mr. PATTEN. To what extent could the Air Force usefully use carry-over balances to supplement the \$400,000 requested this year for minor construction?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have been real grateful to the committee for increasing our minor construction funds in the past, sir. However, this year we felt we wanted to put as much money as we could into the improvements program. We increased it to \$23 million.

Additional funds could be put into this particular category and do smaller urgent projects but our present policy is that we are trying to do large projects at a few bases and completely upgrade the units at those particular bases. Additional funds could be utilized in this particular area.

Mr. PATTEN. Have you used all the money we gave you last year?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir.

#### PLANNING

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to planning.

Insert page 53 in the record.

[The page follows:]



Mr. PATTEN. Is this amount sufficient? Do you need it all?

General REILLY. During the past fiscal year we did in fact use the total amount. However, typically in other prior years we did not use the entire amount. We feel we need the full amount of \$300,000 this year. Although we anticipate no unusual conditions, we believe it is necessary in case we design some projects which might encounter difficulties and not be constructed.

#### DEBT PAYMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Turn to debt payment.

Insert pages 54 through 64 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

February 15, 1973

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET  
DEBT PAYMENT

NARRATIVE JUSTIFICATION:

In FY 1974, the appropriation of \$82,521,000 is required for the debt payment program which includes:

1. Monthly payments directly to mortgagees for 437 Capehart and 100 Wherry housing projects;
  2. An annual payment as agent for the Department of Defense to the Commodity Credit Corporation to liquidate the dollar equivalent of foreign currencies spent to provide family housing overseas;
  3. Mortgage insurance premiums to Federal Housing Administration on Capehart and Wherry housing, most of which are paid directly instead of through the mortgagees;
  4. Mortgage insurance premiums on behalf of Servicemen on private homes they are purchasing.
- Authority has been enacted (Section 501(b) of P.L. 87-554, as amended) providing for use of the net proceeds of sales and handling of excess military family housing for the purpose of debt service. Income from sales and handling has been, and continues to be, generated. Some mortgages have been retired, and some accelerated payments are being made with this income. In cases where the best interests of the Government are served, prepayments are expected to continue.

February 15, 1973

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
 FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET  
 DEBT PAYMENT

	(\$000)		
	FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
<u>TOA</u>			
Interest & Other Expenses:			
Capehart	25,718	24,229	22,626
Wherry	6,724	6,458	6,056
Subtotal	<u>32,442</u>	<u>30,687</u>	<u>28,682</u>
<u>MIP:</u>			
Capehart	948	894	834
Wherry	258	250	234
Servicemen's Insurance Premium	1,679	1,600	1,590
Subtotal	<u>2,885</u>	<u>2,744</u>	<u>2,658</u>
Total Obligations	<u>35,327</u>	<u>33,431</u>	<u>31,340</u>
<u>FINANCING ADJUSTMENTS</u>			
Advance Principal Payments:			
Capehart	+ 1,904	+2,750	+ 3,150
Wherry	+ 1,198	+ 250	+ 250
Subtotal	<u>+ 3,102</u>	<u>+3,000</u>	<u>+ 3,400</u>
Less: Reimbursements			
Capehart Rentals	- 358	- 297	- 297
Sales & Handling	- 7,927	-3,300	- 3,700
Total Reimbursements	<u>- 8,285</u>	<u>-3,597</u>	<u>- 3,997</u>
Unobligated Balance Start of Year	- 7,310	-8,167	- 2,626
Reprogramming from Prior Years	- 15	-	-
Plus: Available for Other Years	+ 8,167	+2,626	-
BUDGET AUTHORITY	<u>30,986</u>	<u>27,293</u>	<u>28,117</u>
Budget Authority:			
Appropriation	81,428	80,076	82,521 1/
Transfers among Accounts	-	- 68	-
Portion Applied to Debt			
Capehart	-35,246	-36,884	-38,172
Wherry	- 9,196	- 9,831	-10,232
Surplus Commodity	- 6,000	- 6,000	- 6,000
Subtotal	<u>-50,442</u>	<u>-52,715</u>	<u>-54,404</u>
Appropriation (Adjusted)	<u>30,986</u>	<u>27,293</u>	<u>28,117</u>

<u>FY 1974 Appropriation</u>	
<u>Recapitulation</u>	
Capehart	\$58,659
Wherry	16,272
Surplus Comm	6,000
Mortgage Ins.	
Premiums	<u>1,590</u>
	\$82,521

1/ The appropriation request for Debt Payment is in lump sum for the Department of Defense. The amount footnoted is within that total.

NOTE: Detail on Debt Payment pages may not add to totals due to roundings.

February 15, 1973

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET  
DEBT PAYMENT - CAPEHART HOUSING

Fund requirements of \$58,659,000 for Capehart Housing costs have been estimated on the basis of mortgage payments and related expenses for housing constructed under the provisions of Title IV, P.L. 345, 84th Congress as amended by Title V, P.L. 1020, 84th Congress (Capehart Housing).

The following table shows the data in support of debt payment requirements for Capehart Housing:

The number of Capehart units owned as of 1 July 1973; the original mortgage, the amount owed as of 1 July 1973; the estimated payments required for FY 1974; net financing adjustments; and the total amount required for FY 1974.

296

February 15, 1973

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE  
DEBT PAYMENT - CAPEHART HOUSING

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ORIGINAL NUMBER OF UNITS</u>	<u>ORIGINAL MORTGAGE</u>	<u>ESTIMATED AMOUNT OWED AS OF 1 JULY 1973</u>	<u>ESTIMATED FY 1974 REGULAR PAYMENTS</u>
Adair AFS, Oregon	150	\$ 2,440,738	\$ 1,433,259	\$ 160,898
Altus AFB, Oklahoma	700	10,732,599	6,078,046	689,476
Amarillo AFB, Texas	500	7,932,969	2,028,954	515,711
Andersen AFB, Guam, M.I.	1,050	20,278,676	12,054,944	1,343,802
Barksdale AFB, Louisiana	200	3,288,000	2,017,201	216,975
Beale AFB, California	1,200	19,696,628	12,557,391	1,306,366
Blytheville AFB, Arkansas	830	12,566,400	7,450,091	842,242
Brooks AFB, Texas	170	2,800,341	1,908,510	189,739
Chanute AFB, Illinois	450	7,400,402	4,283,592	475,412
Charleston AFB, South Carolina	950	15,631,785	9,483,724	1,024,619
Clinton-Sherman AFB, Oklahoma	800	13,097,715	7,729,239	859,370
Columbus AFB, Mississippi	820	13,171,865	7,607,656	864,989
Custer AFS, Michigan	169	2,780,844	1,632,978	183,319
Dover AFB, Delaware	1,250	19,825,048	11,489,416	1,301,036
Dow AFB, Maine	1,010	16,303,832	6,172,905	830,754
Duluth ANG, Minnesota	240	3,957,884	2,376,538	260,911
Dyess AFB, Texas	1,000	13,554,700	6,613,876	870,478
Edwards AFB, California	778	12,828,980	7,532,668	845,712
Eglin AFB, Florida	500	6,726,800	3,265,218	431,166
Ellsworth AFB, South Dakota	910	14,961,901	10,654,230	1,015,730
England AFB, Louisiana	300	4,843,361	2,525,065	310,801
F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming	100	1,649,547	1,136,385	111,771
Fairchild AFB, Washington	314	5,077,331	2,970,147	329,820
Forbes AFB, Kansas	1,054	16,924,314	9,458,336	1,097,799

297

February 15, 1973

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE  
DEBT PAYMENT - CAPEHART HOUSING

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ORIGINAL NUMBER OF UNITS</u>	<u>ORIGINAL MORTGAGE</u>	<u>ESTIMATED AMOUNT OWED AS OF 1 JULY 1973</u>	<u>ESTIMATED FY 1974 REGULAR PAYMENTS</u>
Geiger Field AI, Washington	228	\$ 3,689,111	\$ 2,208,970	\$ 243,194
Glasgow AFB, Montana	960	15,789,017	10,056,630	1,056,810
Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota	1,414	23,263,474	15,503,692	1,557,662
Griffiss AFB, New York	730	11,933,777	7,134,351	781,682
Grissom AFB, Indiana	930	14,469,075	8,035,403	935,872
Hamilton AFB, California	550	8,214,694	5,042,712	541,962
Hancock Field, New York	216	3,554,294	2,226,354	234,548
Hickam AFB, Hawaii	600	9,700,712	5,611,845	622,764
Holloman AFB, New Mexico	400	6,579,830	3,816,227	433,942
Homestead AFB, Florida	1,255	20,465,642	11,590,024	1,314,740
James Connally AFB, Texas	366	5,986,410	2,300,230	389,168
K.I. Sawyer AFB, Michigan	1,395	22,996,318	14,512,143	1,531,370
Keesler AFB, Mississippi	530	8,718,282	5,906,014	590,703
Kincheloe AFB, Michigan	995	16,392,379	10,813,541	1,110,446
Kingsley Field, Oregon	290	4,784,886	2,652,309	307,055
Kirtland AFB, New Mexico	703	11,562,775	6,797,259	762,241
Langley AFB, Virginia	500	7,952,920	4,831,092	524,531
Larson AFB, Washington	530	8,637,874	5,437,078	579,157
Laughlin AFB, Texas	500	7,919,649	4,556,739	508,769
L.G. Hanscom ARC, Massachusetts	395	6,507,300	3,750,942	418,038
Lincoln AFB, Nebraska	600	9,849,302	4,156,184	623,859
Little Rock AFB, Arkansas	1,535	22,506,200	12,277,827	1,444,234
Lockbourne AFB, Ohio	400	6,596,800	3,982,724	434,874
Loring AFB, Maine	178	2,915,334	1,783,625	193,661
Luke AFB, Arizona	725	11,116,701	6,622,813	714,429

298

February 15, 1973

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE  
DEBT PAYMENT - CAPEHART HOUSING

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ORIGINAL NUMBER OF UNITS</u>	<u>ORIGINAL MORTGAGE</u>	<u>ESTIMATED AMOUNT OWED AS OF 1 JULY 1973</u>	<u>ESTIMATED FY 1974 REGULAR PAYMENTS</u>
Malmstrom AFB, Montana	710	\$ 11,695,418	\$ 7,818,015	\$ 788,269
Mather AFB, California	450	7,311,506	4,582,194	488,901
McChord AFB, Washington	600	8,729,325	5,105,810	575,454
McClellan AFB, California	540	8,695,942	5,227,732	573,254
McConnell AFB, Kansas	490	7,869,400	4,483,164	505,541
McCoy AFB, Florida	668	10,416,075	6,669,851	705,102
McGuire AFB, New Jersey	1,750	28,866,559	18,013,815	1,936,093
Medina Army Base AI, Texas	125	1,985,501	1,202,523	135,955
Minot AFB, North Dakota	1,462	23,943,892	15,014,214	1,594,472
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho	570	9,328,505	5,935,358	623,931
Myrtle Beach AFB, South Carolina	800	12,181,405	6,886,910	783,865
Nellis AFB, Nevada	200	3,282,512	1,954,800	216,390
Niagara Falls ANG, New York	290	4,782,431	2,871,288	315,424
Offutt AFB, Nebraska	1,516	24,982,436	17,039,709	1,682,241
Olmsted AFB, Pennsylvania	140	2,296,800	0	0
Patrick AFB, Florida	999	16,383,358	9,110,956	1,051,328
Pease AFB, New Hampshire	1,100	16,654,311	9,431,611	1,069,895
Plattsburg AFB, New York	1,685	27,799,717	15,715,105	1,784,035
Richards Gebaur AFB, Missouri	610	10,041,630	5,886,821	644,788
Robins AFB, Georgia	423	6,861,781	4,014,579	444,957

299

February 15, 1973

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE  
DEBT PAYMENT - CAPEHART HOUSING

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ORIGINAL NUMBER OF UNITS</u>	<u>ORIGINAL MORTGAGE</u>	<u>ESTIMATED AMOUNT OWED AS OF 1 JULY 1973</u>	<u>ESTIMATED FY 1974 REGULAR PAYMENTS</u>
Schilling AFB, Kansas	735	\$ 10,778,682	\$ 6,006,463	\$ 702,962
Selfridge AFB, Michigan	380	6,239,862	3,973,567	422,187
Sewart AFB, Tennessee	87	1,431,276	483,138	90,658
Seymour-Johnson AFB, North Carolina	1,500	21,722,400	11,631,121	1,392,871
Sheppard AFB, Texas	500	7,832,100	4,585,676	516,308
Sioux City AFS, Iowa	235	3,873,120	1,205,569	251,786
Stead AFB, Nevada	302	4,489,638	1,259,437	284,375
Suffolk County AFB, New York	220	3,528,200	2,084,850	232,586
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma	268	4,420,000	2,473,097	283,633
Travis AFB, California	1,148	17,926,695	11,229,298	1,187,315
Truax ANG, Wisconsin	170	2,532,195	1,781,692	171,735
Tyndall AFB, Florida	420	6,877,034	3,609,577	441,303
USAF Academy, Colorado	1,200	19,387,419	11,162,172	1,245,473
Vance AFB, Oklahoma	230	3,785,932	2,210,553	249,576
Vandenberg AFB, California	1,805	26,482,791	15,538,683	1,735,924
Webb AFB, Texas	460	6,789,747	3,851,298	435,921
Westover AFB, Massachusetts	490	7,958,672	5,044,008	530,158
Whiteman AFB, Missouri	504	8,296,323	5,695,882	564,175
Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan	948	15,591,215	9,963,584	1,038,449
Mortgage Payments Sub-Total	\$59,100	\$944,627,221	\$552,821,217	\$61,631,897
Net Financing Adjustment				-2,972,897
FY 1974 Appropriation Request				\$58,659,000

300

February 15, 1973

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1973 BUDGET  
DEBT PAYMENT - WHERRY HOUSING

Fund requirements of \$16,272,000 for Wherry Housing are estimated on the basis of average amount per unit required to cover mortgage payments and related expenses of Wherry Housing acquired by the Air Force.

The attached table shows the number of Wherry units by location owned as of 1 July 1973; the original mortgage; the amount owed as of 1 July 1973; and the payments required for FY 1974.

February 15, 1973

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE  
DEBT PAYMENT - WHERRY HOUSING

LOCATION	ORIGINAL NUMBER OF UNITS	ORIGINAL MORTGAGE	ESTIMATED	ESTIMATED
			AMOUNT OWED AS OF 1 JULY 1973	FY 1974 REGULAR PAYMENTS
Barksdale AFB, Louisiana	692	\$ 5,012,808	\$ 2,737,311	\$ 311,704
Bergstrom AFB, Texas	480	3,748,596	2,107,627	230,451
Biggs AFB, Texas	800	6,365,414	3,497,693	390,903
Carswell AFB, Texas	600	3,988,231	2,380,346	280,989
Castle AFB, California	700	5,382,269	3,113,342	327,609
Chanute AFB, Illinois	800	6,145,694	3,387,479	372,485
Craig AFB, Alabama	225	1,637,368	973,375	99,916
Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona	550	3,998,540	2,515,387	247,620
Edwards AFB, California	1,350	9,330,161	5,473,945	571,569
Eglin AFB, Florida	750	5,469,541	3,060,149	332,921
Ellsworth AFB, South Dakota	891	7,159,052	4,238,750	429,835
F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming	500	3,612,949	2,032,219	225,804
Fairchild AFB, Washington	1,000	7,843,490	4,340,608	480,191
George AFB, California	650	4,026,300	2,170,179	253,012
Hamilton AFB, California	505	3,695,756	2,078,982	225,845
Hill AFB, Utah	350	2,639,319	1,595,984	153,575
Holloman AFB, New Mexico	600	4,877,002	3,028,492	288,145
Keesler AFB, Mississippi	858	6,122,084	3,412,755	376,553
Kelly AFB, Texas	592	4,206,004	2,375,695	275,233
Kirtland AFB, Texas	760	6,042,202	3,420,775	374,034

February 15, 1973

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE  
DEBT PAYMENT - WHERRY HOUSING

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ORIGINAL NUMBER OF UNITS</u>	<u>ORIGINAL MORTGAGE</u>	<u>ESTIMATED AMOUNT OWED AS OF 1 JULY 1973</u>	<u>ESTIMATED FY 1974 REGULAR PAYMENTS</u>
Lackland AFB, Texas	600	\$ 4,570,344	\$ 2,637,741	\$ 279,071
Larson AFB, Washington	800	6,166,016	3,501,878	364,663
Lockbourne AFB, Ohio	500	4,044,707	2,563,622	244,095
Loring AFB, Maine	1,500	13,867,253	8,679,588	813,761
Lowry AFB, Colorado	480	3,505,296	2,010,032	217,243
MacDill AFB, Florida	800	5,913,567	3,235,234	373,289
Malmstrom AFB, Montana	592	4,121,647	2,382,275	248,322
March AFB, California	644	3,961,176	2,227,262	249,055
Mather AFB, California	750	5,944,109	3,366,618	365,723
Maxwell AFB, Alabama	250	1,138,686	621,066	76,180
McClellan AFB, California	105	828,160	473,036	50,317
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho	500	4,221,439	2,694,604	253,350
Nellis AFB, Nevada	800	6,346,470	3,755,990	389,531
Offutt AFB, Nebraska	611	4,493,249	2,512,041	276,230
Patrick AFB, Florida	680	5,237,385	3,047,676	315,725
Perrin AFB, Texas	300	2,161,950	1,354,338	131,676
Presque Isle AFB, Maine	192	1,847,994	1,179,655	110,539
Ramey AFB, Puerto Rico	995	7,922,844	4,902,267	473,653
Randolph AFB, Texas	612	4,511,700	2,698,177	287,002
Reese AFB, Texas	418	2,936,530	1,803,279	176,299
Robins AFB, Georgia	500	3,448,089	1,936,449	209,061

February 15, 1973

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE - FY 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE  
DEBT PAYMENT - WHERRY HOUSING

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ORIGINAL NUMBER OF UNITS</u>	<u>ORIGINAL MORTGAGE</u>	<u>ESTIMATED AMOUNT OWED AS OF 1 JULY 1973</u>	<u>ESTIMATED FY 1974 REGULAR PAYMENTS</u>
Scott AFB, Illinois	1,000	\$ 7,654,967	\$ 4,267,656	\$ 474,188
Selfridge AFB, Michigan	511	3,803,584	2,198,491	215,258
Sewart AFB, Tennessee	600	4,449,454	1,291,720	265,083
Shaw AFB, South Carolina	900	6,555,292	3,906,804	401,560
Sheppard AFB, Texas	612	4,201,454	2,430,453	254,384
Travis AFB, California	980	7,628,965	4,260,453	465,370
Tyndall AFB, Florida	450	3,465,463	1,907,487	213,181
Walker (former AFB), Roswell, New Mexico	801	6,104,811	3,378,277	384,329
Westover AFB, Massachusetts	1,150	9,272,771	5,302,630	568,289
Williams AFB, Arizona	500	2,940,957	1,623,805	185,332
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	<u>2,000</u>	<u>15,232,565</u>	<u>9,406,726</u>	<u>971,871</u>
Mortgage Payments Sub-Total	\$35,786	\$269,801,674	\$155,498,423	\$16,522,024
Net Financing Adjustment				- 250,024
FY 1974 Appropriation Request				<u>\$16,272,000</u>

304

## WHERRY AND CAPEHART HOUSING TO BE GIVEN UP DUE TO CLOSURES

Mr. PATTEN. How many of these Wherry and Capehart units will be given up by the Air Force as a result of base closures and realignments? What is the remaining useful life of these units?

General REILLY. There will be 5,299 encumbered units, including 2,762 Capehart and 2,537 Wherry, given up by the Air Force.

The remaining useful life of these units is about 20 years. Some 2,017 of these units will be transferred to other services. The remaining, we hope, will be sold and used to meet housing needs in the local areas.

Mr. PATTEN. Do you have an estimate of the market value of these units?

General REILLY. The market value of the 5,299 units is estimated at \$79 million, using a \$15,000 average value.

## REMAINING LIABILITY

Mr. PATTEN. What is your total remaining liability for Capehart and Wherry housing?

General REILLY. The total remaining liability as of July 1, 1973, for Wherry housing is \$155,498,423, for Capehart housing \$552,821,217, for a total of \$708,319,640.

## SURPLUS COMMODITY HOUSING

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to surplus commodity housing.

Insert pages 65 through 68 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974  
BUDGET, DEBT PAYMENTS—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Funds in the amount of \$6 million are requested to provide for payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation in fiscal year 1974. The Department of the Air Force is the fiscal agent of the Department of Defense for this payment.

The surplus commodity credit housing program was designed to obtain family type public quarters in foreign countries. Section 411 of Public Law 968-84 authorized the use of foreign currencies collected under international agreements between those countries and the United States resulting from the sale of surplus U.S. agricultural products. Section 508 of Public Law 174-88 requires the Department of Defense to pay the Commodity Credit Corporation an amount not to exceed \$6 million a year until the amount of foreign currency is liquidated.

The attached table shows the number of surplus commodity housing units for the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force by location and the dollar equivalent of the original investment for each project; the net total amount for all projects owed the Commodity Credit Corporation as of July 1, 1973; and the total payment planned for fiscal year 1974.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET, DEBT PAYMENTS—  
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Location	Number of units acquired	Dollar equivalent original investment
Japan.....	251	\$4, 219, 155
Italy.....	493	8, 110, 155
Korea.....	60	1, 839, 710
France.....	2, 401	49, 046, 323
Subtotal.....	3, 205	63, 215, 343

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET, DEBT PAYMENTS—  
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Location	Number of units acquired	Dollar equivalent original investment
Japan.....	297	\$2,981,806
Spain.....	380	3,518,639
Finland.....		144,439
Subtotal.....	677	6,544,884

<sup>1</sup> Represents design costs only. Housing was never constructed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET, DEBT PAYMENTS—  
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Location	Number of units acquired	Dollar equivalent original investment	Amount owed CCC July 1, 1973
Azores.....	108	\$1,518,166	
England.....	2,830	39,846,788	
Iceland.....		141,290	
Japan.....	552	6,355,792	
Morocco.....	140	7,328,224	
Pakistan.....	100	1,327,501	
Spain.....	1,921	11,702,708	
Turkey.....	250	2,047,932	
Subtotal.....	5,901	70,168,401	
Total (DOD).....	9,783	139,928,627	\$53,214,502
Total payment to CCC—fiscal year 1974.....			6,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Planned project cancelled. Initial planning costs only expense incurred.

Mr. PATTEN. Would you discuss the surplus commodity housing program. Tell us how it worked.

General REILLY. The surplus commodity credit housing program was designed to obtain family type public quarters in foreign countries. Section 411 of Public Law 968-84 authorized the use of foreign currencies collected under international agreements between those countries and the United States resulting from the sale of surplus U.S. agricultural products.

These funds were used to construct family housing units to U.S. specifications for use by military and civilian personnel assigned to installations in those countries.

Mr. PATTEN. Why are we still paying for it?

General REILLY. Section 508 of Public Law 174-88 requires the Department of Defense to pay the Commodity Credit Corporation an amount not to exceed \$6 million a year until the amount of foreign currency is liquidated. The Air Force requests the appropriations to make this payment for all DOD components.

Mr. PATTEN. To what extent are the services still using these surplus commodity units or the replacements for them? Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

#### USE OF SURPLUS COMMODITY UNITS

There were 9,783 units constructed with Surplus Commodity Funds. A total of 5,569 are still in use by the Services. The Army still uses 693 units in Korea, Japan, England and Italy. The Navy uses 833 units in Italy, Japan, Spain and the United Kingdom. The Air Force uses 4,043 units in the Azores, England, Spain and Japan. Units have been lost primarily in France, Morocco, Pakistan and Spain.

#### SERVICEMEN'S MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums.

Insert page 69 in the record.

[The page follows:]

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET, DEBT PAYMENT—SERVICEMEN'S MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Section 124, Public Law 560, 83d Congress, the Housing Act of 1954, aids in providing homes for members of the Armed Forces of the United States and their families through a system of FHA mortgage insurance specially designed to assist such members in financing the construction or purchase of homes.

Public Law 90-448, August 1, 1968 (Housing and Urban Development Act) section 301 liberalized mortgage insurance premiums for servicemen and their widows by not restricting the insurance premiums only to new mortgages and it authorized the Secretary of Defense to continue making premium payments for a widow of a serviceman who dies in the service for 2 years after his death or until she sells the house, whichever occurs sooner. The National Housing Act was amended January 26, 1970 and increased the maximum amount of a loan from \$30,000 to \$33,000.

While the number of cases has declined, the average cost per account has increased. This reflects greater loan values for homes remaining in the program. The rate of increase is too variable to suggest an average; therefore, projection of \$1.61 per year is used and is based on the most recent data available. Subjective reasons for the case decline are: Enlisted personnel are attracted to the new section 235 rent and mortgage subsidy program; sellers have been attracted to conventional financing because of discounts applied to FHA financed homes and have therefore offered fewer FHA homes; and, VA in-service loans are more attractive than FHA to military buyers because of smaller down payment requirements.

Fiscal year	Number	Average payment	Amount
1972 actual.....	24,705	\$67.96	\$1,679,000
1973 estimate.....	23,000	69.57	1,600,000
1974 estimate.....	22,338	71.18	1,590,000

Mr. PATTEN. Can you explain how this program works?

General REILLY. In accordance with authority contained in section 222 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, this program provides for the payment of premiums due on mortgage insurance provided by the Federal Housing Administration for mortgages on housing purchased by military personnel on active duty and for continuing payments in those cases where a serviceman dies while on active duty and

leaves a surviving widow as owner of the property. In the latter case, payments extend for a period of 2 years beyond the date of the serviceman's death or until the date the widow disposes of the property, whichever occurs first. The maximum amount insurable by FHA is \$33,000. The premium rate is one-half of 1 percent of the unpaid balance of the mortgage.

Mr. PATTEN. Is this still a usable program?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums; yes, sir. We are anticipating assisting the buyers in the mortgage insurance in this particular program and we expect to take care of approximately 22,000 members so the program stays about steady each year, usually about 22,000 families.

Mr. PATTEN. Could it be expanded or should it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think it is about on a satisfactory working level right now, sir.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Mr. PATTEN. Let us turn to operation and maintenance.

Insert pages 70 through 80 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Fiscal year 1972 actual	Fiscal year 1973 estimate	Fiscal year 1974 estimate
Operating expenses.....	\$74,971	\$95,651	\$108,112
Leasing.....	9,995	12,217	13,577
Maintenance.....	90,875	87,399	97,547
Total, operation and maintenance.....	175,841	195,267	219,236
Adjustments:			
Reimbursements.....	-1,133	-1,013	-1,025
Unobligated balance lapsing.....	+429		
Budget authority.....	175,137	194,254	218,211
Budget authority:			
Appropriation.....	176,967	194,532	1 218,211
Transfers among accounts (net).....	-1,830	278	
Appropriation (adjusted).....	175,137	194,254	218,211

<sup>1</sup> The appropriation request for operation and maintenance is in lump sum for the Department of Defense, and not restricted by military department or defense agency. The amount footnoted is within that total.

February 15, 1973

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
FY 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE

## EXCLUDES LEASED UNITS &amp; COSTS

	FY 1972 ACTUAL		FY 1973 ESTIMATE		FY 1974 ESTIMATE	
<b>A. INVENTORY DATA</b>						
Units in Being Beginning of Year	148,145		147,845		149,784	
Units in Being at End of Year	147,845		149,784		152,711	
Average Inventory for Year Requiring O&M Funding:						
a. Conterminous U.S.	111,315		112,848		115,577	
b. Outside U.S.	36,681		36,816		36,554	
c. Total	147,996		149,664		152,131	
	TOTAL EST. (\$000)	UNIT COST (\$)	TOTAL EST. (\$000)	UNIT COST (\$)	TOTAL EST. (\$000)	UNIT COST (\$)
<b>B. FUNDING REQUIREMENT</b>						
1. OPERATIONS						
a. Operating Expenses						
(1) Administration	5,968	40	8,137	54	10,661	70
(2) Services	9,732	66	14,145	95	17,183	113
(3) Utility Operations	46,781	316	53,404	357	56,990	375
(4) Furnishings	12,490	84	19,965	133	23,278	153
Subtotal-Gross Obligations	74,971	506	95,651	639	108,112	711
Less: Anticipated Reimbursements	1,133	8	1,013	7	1,025	7
Subtotal, Operations (Appropriated Funds)	73,838	498	94,638	632	107,087	704
2. MAINTENANCE						
a. Maintenance & Repair of Dwellings	75,416	510	71,884	480	79,726	524
b. Maintenance & Repair of Other Real Property	14,627	99	14,450	97	16,598	109
c. Alterations & Additions	832	6	1,065	7	1,223	8
Subtotal, Maintenance (Appropriated Funds)	90,875	615	87,399	584	97,547	641
3. GRAND TOTAL O&M EXPENSES (Includes Reimbursements)	165,846	1,121	183,050	1,223	205,659	1,352
4. GRAND TOTAL O&M (1&2, above) (Appropriated Funds)	164,713	1,113	182,037	1,216	204,634	1,345

309

FAMILY HOUSING DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, OPERATION AND  
MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET ESTIMATE

I. NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

*A. Operation.*—The operation portion of the family housing program includes the initial outfitting of furniture, maintenance, repair, and replacement of furnishings, and other personal property; utility services, except telephone service; other services such as refuse collection and disposal, custodial services, handling and moving of Government-owned furnishings; police and fire protection; and other administrative and support-type services at installation level; and leasing of family housing facilities by the Government.

*B. Maintenance.*—The maintenance portion includes maintenance and repair of buildings, roads, driveways, walks, exterior and interior utility systems, and grounds care. Also includes projects for incidental alterations and additions—expansions—extensions provided that:

1. No such alteration or addition—expansion—extension project shall exceed \$10,000.

2. The total expenses for these alterations and additions—expansion—extensions within a fiscal year shall not exceed \$500 for any one family unit in any case, and (a) an average of \$100 per family unit for each installation having 10 or more family units or (b) \$1,000 for each installation having less than 10 family units.

3. These incidental alterations and additions—expansions—extensions are not occasioned by or made in conjunction with a separate undertaking which exceeds the above specified limitations.

II. PROGRAM JUSTIFICATION

*A. Operations*

1. The level of funding reflected in the operations portion of the fiscal year 1974 budget estimate is required to efficiently and economically support the housing program which will be in being at that time. This estimate includes a furnishings program that will support the 2,000-pound weight limit areas overseas and private rental quarters furnishings. Leased units and costs are justified separately.

2. Detailed comparison:

(a) The average number of Government-owned housing units to be supported in fiscal year 1974 is 152,131 as compared to the average number in fiscal year 1973 of 149,664, an increase of 2,467 units.

(b) Total appropriation funding required for fiscal year 1974 operations, exclusive of anticipated reimbursements, totals \$107.1 million as compared to \$94.6 million in fiscal year 1973. This increase reflects the growth in inventory, normal inflation, increased civilian manning, and the new requirement to pay overhead costs.

(1) Administration, services and utilities:

	<i>(In thousands)</i>
Fiscal year 1973.....	\$74, 673
Fiscal year 1974.....	83, 809
Increase .....	+9, 136

(2) Furnishing:

Fiscal year 1973.....	19, 965
Fiscal year 1974.....	23, 278
Increase .....	+3, 313

The furnishings program supports the housing inventory in being, overseas units coming into the inventory and private rental quarters overseas.

*B. Maintenance*

1. The level of funding reflected in the maintenance portion of the fiscal year 1974 budget estimate is required to properly maintain and repair housing real property. These funds are necessary to provide essential maintenance to facilities, utilities systems, and grounds.

2. Detailed comparison: Total appropriation funding required for fiscal year 1974 maintenance totals \$97.5 million as compared to \$87.4 million for fiscal year 1973. This represents an increase of \$10.1 million. This increase is primarily to cover the new requirement to pay overhead costs and normal inflation.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1974 LEASING PROGRAM

The leasing of housing is authorized under the provisions of sec. 515, Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, and title 10, United States Code, section 2675.

a. *Domestic Leasing.*—The fiscal year 1971 Military Construction Authorization Act (Public Law 91-511 dated October 26, 1970) restricts the use of domestic leases (United States, Puerto Rico, and Guam) to those locations where "(1) there has been a recent and substantial increase in the personnel strength assigned to such military installation and such increase is temporary, or (2) the permanent personnel strength of such military installation is to be substantially reduced in the near future, or (3) the number of military personnel assigned to such military installation is so small as to make the construction of family housing uneconomical, or (4) family housing is required for personnel attending service schools, academic courses on PCS orders, or (5) family housing has been authorized but is not yet completed or a family housing authorization request is in a pending Military Authorization Construction bill and charges for such units including contract rent, maintenance and operations costs, and utilities may not exceed an annual average of \$210 per unit per month for each military department with no individual leased unit exceeding \$290 per unit per month, except Hawaii where the average cost has been established at \$255 average and \$300 individual.

b. *Foreign Leasing.*—Leasing of family housing in foreign countries is authorized under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 2675. In foreign countries it is the policy to lease privately owned family housing only for military personnel in ranks O-6 and above, and only (1) where it has been determined that such leasing is for the benefit of the United States and (2) when Government quarters commensurate with the positions of the officers are not available. If specifically approved by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (I. & H.) family housing may be leased in foreign countries for civilians and military personnel in grades O-5 and below provided criteria 1 and 2 above are clearly applicable. Family housing leased in accordance with these criteria shall be designated Public Quarters and occupants shall forfeit all housing allowances. Any alterations, repairs, and all additions shall be limited to work necessary to provide adequate living accommodations and shall be in consonance with DOD Instruction 4165.45, Determination of Family Housing Requirements, but in no event shall the cost of such work exceed 25 percent of the first year's annual rental without prior approval of the Secretary of the military department concerned.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE—FISCAL YEAR 1974 LEASING PROGRAM

	End fiscal year 1972		End fiscal year 1973		End fiscal 1974	
	Units	Amount	Units	Amount	Units	Amount
Leasing expenses:						
Domestic.....	2,356	\$5,031,000	2,815	\$6,350,000	2,815	\$6,710,000
Foreign.....	1,818	4,964,000	2,390	5,867,000	2,690	6,867,000
Total.....	4,174	9,995,000	5,205	12,217,000	5,505	13,577,000

Note: The domestic leasing proposed for Fiscal Year 1974 reflects no increase over the number of requested in Fiscal Year 1973. The units are primarily for small locations where the construction of housing is not proposed and for personnel on independent assignments in highly populated areas, especially for personnel assigned to the recruiting service in order to make the service attractive so that the all volunteer program can be implemented. The foreign leasing proposed will allow continuance of the program in Spain, England, Germany, and other locations in overseas areas. The attached listings provide for an average of 2,815 domestic leased units and 2,690 foreign leased units.

February 15, 1973

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
FY 74 LEASING PROGRAM

DOMESTIC

<u>Comd</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>End Year No. of Units</u>	<u>Total Cost (\$000)</u>	<u>Comd</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>End Year No. of Units</u>	<u>Total Cost (\$000)</u>
ATC/AU/ HQ COMD	Montgomery, Ala	10	23	ATC/AU/ HQ COMD	Manchester, NH	10	23
	Fayetteville, Ark	10	23		Newark, NJ	25	58
	Little Rock, Ark	10	23		New York, NY	50	117
	Azusa, Calif	12	28		Scotia, NY	12	28
	Los Angeles, Calif	60	140		Syracuse, NY	25	58
	Palo Alto, Calif	20	47		Upper NY State	25	58
	San Bernardino, Calif	15	35		Charlotte, NC	12	28
	San Francisco, Calif	50	118		Raleigh, NC	15	35
	Boulder, Colo	3	7		Albuquerque, NM	10	23
	Denver, Colo	25	58		Cincinnati, Ohio	13	30
	New Haven, Conn	20	47		Cleveland, Ohio	38	89
	Jacksonville, Fla	15	35		Columbus, Ohio	30	70
	Miami, Fla	25	58		Toledo, Ohio	15	35
	St Petersburg, Fla	10	23		Oklahoma City, Okla	24	56
	Tallahassee, Fla	10	23		Portland, Ore	32	75
	Atlanta, GA	30	70		New Cumberland, Pa	9	21
	Pullman, Idaho	4	9		Philadelphia, Pa	35	82
	Chicago, Ill	60	141		Pittsburgh, Pa	35	82
	Indianapolis, Ind	35	82		Nashville, Tenn	20	47
	South Bend, Ind	10	23		College Station, Tex	5	12
	Des Moines, Iowa	30	70		Dallas, Tex	25	58
	Louisville, Ky	20	47		Houston, Tex	20	47
	New Orleans, La	20	47		San Antonio, Tex	15	35
	Boston, Mass	30	70		North Texas Area	15	35
	Detroit, Mich	45	105		Salt Lake City, Utah	20	47
	Duluth, Minn	4	9		Richmond, VA	20	47
	Minneapolis, Minn	38	89		Roanoke, Va	15	35
	Kansas City, Mo	20	47		Seattle, Wash	25	58
	St Louis, Mo	46	108		Tacoma, Wash	15	35
	Omaha, Nebr	34	79		Charleston, W. Va	12	28
	Hanover, NH	2	5		Milwaukee, Wisc	35	82
					Subtotal ATC, AU, HQ COMD	1,380	3,223

312

FEBRUARY 15, 1973

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
 OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE  
 FY 74 LEASING PROGRAM

DOMESTIC

<u>Comd</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>End Year No. of Units</u>	<u>Total Cost (\$000)</u>	<u>Comd</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>End Year No. of Units</u>	<u>Total Cost (\$000)</u>
ADC	Almaden AFS, Calif	10	23	ADC	Atlantic City, NJ	20	47
	Cambria AFS, Calif	24	56		Gibbsboro AFS, NJ	46	108
	Ft MacArthur AFS, Calif	30	70		Hancock Field, NY	50	117
	Fresno AFS, Calif	25	59		Montauk AFS, NY	15	35
	Mt Laguna AFS, Calif	52	123		Ft Fisher AFS, NC	30	70
	Pt Arena AFS, Calif	10	23		New Hanover APT, NC	20	47
	Ent AFB, Colo	213	499		Finley AFS, ND	15	35
	Lamar Comm Site, Colo	13	30		Fortuna AFS, ND	14	33
	Key West AFS, Fla	20	47		Hector AFS, ND	5	12
	Bucks Harbor AFS, ME	10	23		Mt HeLo AFS, Ore	15	35
	North Truro AFS, Mass	30	70		North Bend AFS, Ore	17	40
	Calumet AFS, Mich	26	61		St Albans AFS, Vt	20	47
	Phelps-Collins APT, Mich	25	59		Blaine AFS, Wash	5	12
	Pt Austin AFS, Mich	30	70		Othello AFS, Wash	30	70
	Baudette AFS, Minn	16	37		Walla Walla AFS, Wash	20	47
	Duluth IAP, Minn	50	117		Antigo AFS, Wisc	16	37
	Havre AFS, Mont	30	70		Osceola AFS, Wisc	5	12
	Logan Field, Mont	22	51		Volk Field, Wisc	30	70
	Fallon AFS, Nev	40	94				
					Subtotal ADC	1,049	2,456

313

## OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1974 LEASING PROGRAM

Command and installation	End year number of units	Total cost (thousands)
<b>Domestic:</b>		
PACAF: Hawaii.....	200	\$600
Subtotal PACAF.....	200	600
<b>SAC:</b>		
Holbrook RBS, Ariz.....	11	25
Vandenberg, Calif.....	100	232
Wilder RBS, Idaho.....	15	35
Bayshore RBS, Mich.....	26	60
Silver Creek GS, Nebr.....	10	23
Bismarck RBS, N. Dak.....	12	28
St. George RBS, Utah.....	12	28
Subtotal SAC.....	186	431
Total domestic leasing.....	2,815	6,710
<b>Foreign:</b>		
AFSC: Formosa.....	2	12
MAC: Embassy Route.....	6	40
PACAF: Taiwan.....	2	15
<b>USAFE:</b>		
Italy.....	3	.....
Germany.....	250	.....
Turkey.....	4	.....
Pakistan.....	2	.....
Greece.....	2	.....
Spain.....	1,162	.....
England.....	1,157	.....
Netherlands.....	100	6,800
Total overseas leasing.....	2,690	6,867
Total leasing (worldwide).....	5,505	13,577

Mr. PATTEN. What types of costs cause the increase in your operating expenses from year to year?

General REILLY. Mr. Chairman, our operating expenses are made up of housing administration, various housekeeping services, utilities operations and furnishings. We are experiencing continuing increases in the administration, principally due to increased salaries.

Our service, housekeeping, contractual work, of course, is increasing and we are experiencing major increases in the utilities area.

Mr. PATTEN. Is this year's request sufficient to cover increased costs here and overseas?

General REILLY. Yes, sir. This increase we feel is adequate to offset the cost increases that we project over the next year as well as holding our own with our backlog of maintenance and repair, and keeping it within manageable limits.

Mr. PATTEN. What effect will the basic closure actions have on the size of your backlog of essential maintenance and repair (BEMAR)?

General REILLY. The base closure actions will have very little effect on our backlog of essential maintenance and repair. Although there are some cost avoidances at the six locations announced for closure, the overall (BEMAR) program of the Air Force is expected to increase by some \$2 million.

Mr. PATTEN. Will the Air Force actually be able to reduce BEMAR during fiscal year 1974?

General REILLY. No, sir. In fact we project a small increase in 1974 over 1973.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the estimated BEMAR at this time?

General REILLY. About \$28 million, Mr. Chairman, in 1973. We expect that to increase to about \$30 million in 1974.

#### LEASING

Mr. PATTEN. To what extent are you requesting that leasing criteria in the United States be expanded?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In the 1974 program OSD would not recognize an increase in the domestic leasing program. We feel that we need an increase to an average of somewhere between \$225 and \$235 a month average to continue with our present ceiling of leases.

Mr. DAVIS. Your present ceiling is \$210?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. Do you plan any additional lease-construction overseas?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir; we are looking closely at 150 to 175 units in the Netherlands, at Soesterberg Air Base.

Mr. PATTEN. What do you expect to have to pay for your foreign leases this year?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We expect them to run on the average of about \$3,000 to \$3,200 a year.

Mr. PATTEN. Is the program underfunded?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, sir. There is enough money in our leasing budget to cover the leasing program.

Mr. DAVIS. I assume, in this area, that in practically all the instances where either construction, remodeling, or leasing is involved in foreign countries where the dollar has gone down, we are going to get a budget amendment that will reflect the difference from what it was at the time the justifications were prepared.

General REILLY. Sir, our only overseas family housing or overseas projects are in Hawaii and Guam.

Mr. DAVIS. We have something here—

General REILLY. Oh, you are talking of leases?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. As far as I know there will be no supplemental budget to request additional funds for the leases in the overseas area. I think we are fairly well funded in this particular area for our lease program this year. If there are any great increases or any changes during fiscal year 1974 we will have to ask for an increase in 1975.

Mr. DAVIS. Where are we on your authorization here? Do you have any schedule on that yet at all?

General REILLY. Sir, they started today in the House Armed Services Committee under Congressman Pike with the Department of Defense. They are going to go Navy, Army, and probably a week from today we should be before Mr. Pike.

We understand the Senate Armed Services Committee is ready to also hear us in the near future.

Mr. DAVIS. All of the base closures and reorganizations have been taken into account in the justifications that have been revised?

General REILLY. Yes, sir, they have.

Mr. DAVIS. I believe that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATTEN. Any further questions?

## FAMILY HOUSING PLATTSBURGH AIR FORCE BASE, N.Y.

Mr. McEWEN. I want to ask General Reilly if he has anything to tell me about family housing at Plattsburgh Air Force Base?

General REILLY. I wish we could report a large project in this program, sir. Do you have any specifics?

Mr. McEWEN. Let me ask you, do you have this report from Mr. John Lee?

General REILLY. Mr. Johnston says we have received it, sir.

Mr. McEWEN. Have you any comments to make on his report?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, sir, no general comments. I think what Mr. Lee has reported is factual.

Mr. McEWEN. What do you propose to do? They have wonderful relations between the base and the community, and I am going to be in the community in about 2 weeks and I will certainly hear about it. I am serious. They have great communications between the local community and the base. They have had this request in for I don't know how many years. They have had a request in to add additional bedrooms to some three- and two-bedroom units.

Mr. JOHNSTON. As you know, military strength at Plattsburgh has been in a fluctuating stage for a while but we think it has leveled off now. SAC is going to recommend the project for the 1975 program and I am sure it will be given some serious consideration.

Mr. McEWEN. You are talking personnel?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am talking about the addition to the family housing units at Plattsburgh.

Mr. McEWEN. We have some additional people, as you know, coming in with the KC137's coming from Massachusetts: We don't have a problem with regard to being a coastal area, do we?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Not as far as I know.

Mr. McEWEN. Is that correct, General Reilly?

General REILLY. Certainly in our view no problem at all. It is a firm FB-111 mission there.

Mr. McEWEN. Because that is the FB-111 that is not a problem. Right?

General REILLY. Yes. I think Mr. Johnston is saying we think we can certainly give you support in the 1975 program with this project.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. John Lee, in his report, does speak about density. According to his report he said—

In total there is a deficit of 389 four-bedroom units, of which 337 are airmen and 52 officer units. The demand is satisfied by crowding into on-base three-bedroom units or living offbase in submarginal and expensive housing.

General Reilly, have we had one of these surveys at Plattsburgh Air Force Base?

General REILLY. Yes, sir; we have surveys from all of the bases in the United States this year.

Mr. McEWEN. What is the deficiency figure according to your survey?

General REILLY. I don't have that with me, but as far as I recollect Plattsburgh did not come up with a program of deficiency of family housing in accordance with the DOD criteria. As I recollect for the last 4 or 5 years the Plattsburgh survey hasn't reflected a family housing deficiency overall. It may have reflected a shortage of four-bed-

room units and an average of three-bedroom units or something like that. It hasn't reflected an overall deficiency of housing.

Mr. McEwen. Doesn't size of units create a deficiency, where units are too small?

General Reilly. In this particular case it would fall into the improvements category and not the new units category. In other words, if we have an average of existing houses they wouldn't allow us to build additional houses.

Mr. McEwen. Are you saying you have different standards where you make improvements to correct deficiencies and where you are planning new units?

General Reilly. Right, sir. In this particular case since there is no deficiency of housing, we would have to insert a project into the improvements program to add additional bedroom units.

Mr. McEwen. You have criteria which you apply there?

General Reilly. Yes, sir. And with the additional people going to Plattsburgh we feel the additional bedrooms will be justified and we will be able to include it in the 1975 program.

Mr. McEwen. Going back to Mr. John Lee's report, he said:

The base plan has been to add bedrooms onto and expand the kitchens and living rooms in the three-bedroom units at a cost of about \$5.9 million. However, such a plan would increase present housing density problems. There are other possible solutions such as adding upstairs bedrooms to the multiple unit housing, converting two multiple units into one unit, and building additional housing to satisfy the deficit.

When Mr. Lee speaks about density he is talking, is he not, about number of people per square rod or acre?

General Reilly. This is what he is talking about.

Mr. McEwen. So even if you put a bedroom upstairs or back of the house, it wouldn't change that?

General Reilly. No.

Mr. McEwen. Could you furnish something on whether or not this is a real density problem and, if so, have the people on the base been pursuing the right course or not?

Colonel Shook. I talked to Mr. Lee about that project. What he was after was that the area where the three-bedroom single units are is a high density area already; that is, the number of houses in that area is much greater than the number of houses of the other type he referred to. He was saying if you could add more people to the two-bedroom units the density problem wouldn't be as great as if you added a fourth bedroom unit to the three-bedroom houses. He is not arguing with the need. He says that is another way to approach it.

Mr. McEwen. He says there is a deficiency of 389 four-bedroom units. The answer I would like to get is, what is the best solution? Can you furnish something on that, General Reilly?

General Reilly. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

#### FOUR-BEDROOM UNIT DEFICIENCY

There are several possible solutions to provide additional four-bedroom units at Plattsburgh AFB. There are 362 two-bedroom units that could be combined to form 181 four-bedroom units. Under this solution, we would exceed floor area limitations and have a net loss of 181 units. An additional bedroom and bath could be added to three-bedroom units to meet the four-bedroom requirement.

This could cause overcrowding in the area. Another solution would be a combination of the above proposals. We have requested the Strategic Air Command to study this matter and to determine the most practical solution. Because of density problems, we cannot provide the best solution at this time.

Mr. PATTEN. Gentlemen, I think this completes your family housing hearings.

General REILLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATTEN. I want to thank you and your men. I wish all the presentations were as wonderful and so well received. I think you can catch the air here. We are all relaxed. Isn't that pleasant?

General REILLY. Very pleasant, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. Thank you and all of your associates for a job well done. We appreciate it.

---

THURSDAY, JULY 19, 1973.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD,  
AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. J. MILNOR ROBERTS, CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE

MAJ. GEN. D. V. RATTAN, DEPUTY CHIEF, OFFICE OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

MAJ. GEN. F. S. GREENLIEF, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

MAJ. GEN. L. E. WEBER, DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

L. F. KEENAN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF ARMY BUDGET, OFFICE, COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY

LT. COL. D. P. LARSEN, OFFICE, CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE

LT. COL. JAMES P. LEWIS, OFFICE, CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE

HENRY G. KIRCHNER, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF THE ARMY BUDGET, COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY

LT. COL. CARL T. SCHULER, INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

F. W. ARON, JR., CHIEF, ARMY INSTALLATIONS DIVISION, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

STATEMENT OF CHIEF, OFFICE OF RESERVE COMPONENTS, U.S. ARMY

Mr. SIKES. The committee will come to order.

This morning we will hear first the requirements for construction for fiscal 1974 of the Army Reserve components beginning with the statement of the Deputy Chief, Office of Reserve Components of the U.S. Army, Maj. Gen. D. V. Rattan.

General Rattan, we are very happy to have you with us and we will be glad to hear your statement, but first we will insert your biographical sketch in the record.

[The biographical sketch follows:]

MAJ. GEN. DONALD VOLNEY RATTAN, U.S. ARMY

Donald Volney Rattan was born in Fort Benning, Ga. September 12, 1924. He was graduated from Staunton Military Academy, Staunton, Va., in 1941. and attended Sullivan Preparatory School for 1 year. He received an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., from which he was graduated June 5, 1945, and was commissioned a second lieutenant of infantry.

His initial assignment, after completing a basic infantry course at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., was as a platoon leader in the 86th Infantry Division in the Philippines.

In January 1946, he was transferred to the 11th Airborne Division, which was performing occupation duty in northern Japan. While with the 11th, he completed parachute training, served in the G-3 section, and later commanded the division reconnaissance company.

In May 1948, he joined the 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., serving in the G-3 section and as a rifle company commander in the 504th Airborne Infantry Regiment.

Upon completion of the infantry officer advanced course in 1952, he was assigned to the 32d Infantry Regiment, 7th Infantry Division in Korea, for 1 year. During this period, the regiment was engaged in combat in the Chorwon-Kumhwa areas. While there, he served as a rifle company commander, battalion executive officer, and regimental S-2.

General Rattan returned to Fort Benning in July 1953, and served 3 years with the airborne department of the Infantry School. He was responsible for the development of the first Army Pathfinder course dealing with Army helicopter operations during this assignment.

He attended the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in 1956-57. Following graduation he was retained there as an instructor in the field of airborne operations, and later served as curriculum planner in the Office of the Director of Instruction.

After this 3-year assignment, he attended the Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va., and the NATO Defense College in Paris, France. Following graduation in the summer of 1961, he spent 2 years in the G-3 section of Allied Land Forces Central Europe, Fontainebleau, France. This was followed by a year as a student at the Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa. While there, he also earned a master's degree in international affairs from George Washington University.

In August 1964, he was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison in the Pentagon. The first 4 months on this assignment were spent as chief of a mobile training team in the Republic of Congo. It was during this period that the major rebellion in the Congo took place, and the Belgian paratroop drop was made at Stanleyville. While in legislative liaison, he also served in the plans and projects division, and was Chief of the Senate Liaison Division with offices in the U.S. Senate Building.

General Rattan reported to the Republic of Vietnam in April 1967, and assumed command of the 1st brigade, 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile). He participated in combat operations at Bong Son, Dak To, and at Quang Tri during the 1968 Tet offensive.

Upon his return to Fort Bragg in May 1968, he was assigned as executive officer, U.S. Army Special Warfare School, for 3 months, and then became Chief of Staff of 18th Airborne Corps, August 12, 1968, serving in that position until February 26, 1970. On February 27, 1970, he became assistant division commander, support, 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N.C.

From August 15, 1970, to May 23, 1972, General Rattan was commanding general, 8th Infantry Division, USAREUR, with station at Bad Kreuznach, Germany. On June 12, 1972, he reported to the Army Staff, Washington, D.C., as deputy chief, Office of Reserve Components.

#### EDUCATION

Staunton Military Academy, Staunton, Va., 1941.  
 U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., B.S., 1945.  
 The Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., 1952.  
 Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1957.  
 Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va., 1961.  
 NATO Defense College, Paris, France, 1961.  
 Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., 1964.  
 George Washington University, M.A., International Affairs, 1964.

## CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF PROMOTIONS

Rank	Temporary (AUS)	Permanent (RA)
2d lieutenant.....		June 5, 1945
1st lieutenant.....	Sept. 27, 1946	June 5, 1948
Captain.....	Oct. 17, 1950	Mar. 18, 1952
Major.....	May 31, 1953	June 5, 1959
Lieutenant colonel.....	Apr. 22, 1959	June 5, 1966
Colonel.....	Nov. 24, 1965	June 5, 1970
Brigadier general.....	Mar. 8, 1969	
Major general.....	Jan. 1, 1967	

<sup>1</sup> DOR.

## CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF ASSIGNMENTS

Student officer, the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., from June 1945 to November 1945.

Platoon leader, 324th Infantry, Philippines, from November 1945 to January 1946.

Assistant G-3, 11th Airborne Division, Japan, from January 1946 to July 1946.

Reconnaissance company commander, 11th Airborne Division, Japan, from July 1946 to August 1947.

Assistant division football coach, 11th Airborne Division, Japan, from August 1947 to January 1948.

Reconnaissance company commander, 11th, from January 1948 to May 1948.

Combat liaison officer, G-3, 82d Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, N.C., from May 1948 to July 1949.

Assistant post football coach, 82d Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, N.C., from July 1949 to August 1949.

Company executive officer, 504th Airborne Infantry Regiment, Fort Bragg, N.C., from August 1949 to August 1949.

Post football coach, 504th AIR, Fort Bragg, N.C., from August 1949 to December 1949.

Platoon leader, 504th AIR, Fort Bragg, N.C., from December 1949 to March 1950.

Company executive officer, 504th AIR, Fort Bragg, N.C., from March 1950 to October 1950.

Company commander, 504th AIR, Fort Bragg, N.C., from October 1950 to April 1951.

Battalion S1, 504th AIR, Fort Bragg, N.C., from April 1951 to June 1951.

S3, 504th AIR with special duty 82d Airborne Division Jump School, Fort Bragg, N.C., from June 1951 to September 1951.

Student officer (IOAC), the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., from September 1951 to July 1952.

Company commander, 32d Infantry Regiment, Korea, from July 1952 to August 1952.

Battalion executive officer, 32d Infantry Regiment, Korea, from August 1952 to February 1953.

Battalion S3, 32d Infantry Regiment, Korea, from February 1953 to April 1953.

Regimental S2, 32d Infantry Regiment, Korea, from April 1953 to July 1953.

Executive officer, Airborne Department, the Infantry School, Fort Benning Ga., from July 1953 to October 1953.

Training officer, Airborne Department, the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., from October 1953 to August 1955.

Chairman, Advanced Airborne Committee, Airborne Department, the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., from August 1955 to May 1956.

Chairman, Basic Airborne Training Committee, Airborne Army Aviation Department, the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., from May 1956 to August 1956.

Student officer, C. & G.S.C., Fort Leavenworth, Kans., from August 1956 to June 1957.

Instructor, Department of Airborne Operations and Army Aviation, C. & G.S.C., Fort Leavenworth, Kans., from June 1957 to June 1958.

Staff member, Office of Chief, Resident Instruction, C. & G.S.C., Fort Leavenworth, Kans., from June 1958 to August 1960.

Student officer, Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va., from August 1960 to February 1961.

Student officer, NATO Defense College, Paris, France, from February 1961 to July 1961.

Staff officer, operations and training, G-3, Headquarters, Allied Land Forces Central Europe, Fontainbleau, France, from July 1961 to August 1963.

Students officer, Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., from August 1963 to August 1964.

Chief of mobile team, COMISH, Republic of Congo, from August 1964 to December 1964.

Assistant chief and chief, Plans and Projects Division, Office of Chief of Legislative Liaison, Washington, D.C., from December 1964 to January 1966.

Chief, Senate Liaison Division, Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison, Washington, D.C., from January 1966 to April 1967.

Commanding officer, 1st Brigade, 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile), Republic of Vietnam, from April 1967 to April 1968.

Executive officer, U.S. Army Special Warfare School, Fort Bragg, N.C., from May 1968 to August 1968.

Chief of staff, 18th Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, N.C., from August 1968 to February 1970.

Assistant division commander, support, 82d Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, N.C., from February 1970 to August 1970.

Commander general, 8th Infantry Division, USAREUR, from August 1970 to May 1972.

Deputy chief, Office of Reserve Components, DA, Washington, D.C., from June 1972.

#### MILITARY DECORATIONS

Silver Star with Two Oak Leaf Clusters; Legion of Merit; Distinguished Flying Cross; Bronze Star Medal with "V" Device and Two Oak Leaf Clusters; Air Medal with 24 Oak Leaf Clusters; Joint Service Commendation Medal; and Army Commendation Medal with First Oak Leaf Cluster.

#### FOREIGN DECORATIONS

Haile Selassie Medal, and Gallantry Cross with Silver Star.

#### SERVICE MEDALS

American Campaign Medal; Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal; World War II Victory Medal; Army of Occupation Medal (Japan); National Defense Service Medal with First Oak Leaf Cluster; Korean Service Medal; Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal (Congo); Vietnam Service Medal with Two Bronze Stars; and United Nations Service Medal.

#### BADGES

Combat Infantryman Badge (two awards); Master Parachutist Badge; General Staff Identification Badge; and Army Aviators Badge.

#### PERSONNEL DATA

*Born.*—September 12, 1924, Fort Benning, Ga.

*Parents.*—Colonel, U.S. Army (retired) and Mrs. W. V. Rattan, Columbus, Ga.

*Married.*—Jane Pratt Rattan of Chicago, Ill. (September 7, 1945).

*Children.*—Jean Ross Rattan (Mrs. William Lee); Nancy Pratt Rattan; Donald McGregor Rattan; and John Sedgewick Rattan.

*Official address.*—Waco Avenue, Cooper, Tex.

*Interest and hobbies.*—Tennis, golf, handball.

*Religion.*—Presbyterian.

General RATTAN. Sir, this is my first appearance before your committee and I am pleased to be here. I am going to make a few general remarks about our construction program, which of course includes the National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve, and then I will be followed by General Roberts of the Army Reserve and General Greenleaf of the National Guard Bureau.

I have been the Deputy Chief of the Army Reserve Components for just over a year. During that period I have had the opportunity of

visiting a large number of Army National Guard and Army Reserve units. On the whole I have found these citizen soldiers to be ready, spirited, and dedicated people who want to succeed.

And especially from the point of view of the Army they have to succeed because nearly half of our Army is composed of the USAR and Guard units. This is against about 18 to 20 percent for the other components.

Facilities do have a significant impact on the readiness and the effectiveness of our forces.

If the facilities are adequate, the troops have a sense of being provided for, being cared for, and the morale, training, et cetera is better.

If they are working in overcrowded or makeshift facilities it contributes to a loss of training time, reduced efficiency, and naturally their morale goes down.

This was recognized back in 1970 and a 10-year plan, which you are familiar with, was developed, which in round figures, amounts to about \$800 million and averages out to \$75 to \$80 million a year for the total of the two components.

We have completed 3 years of the 10-year program and the fiscal year 1974 budgets we are presenting today is the fourth increment of this plan.

Primarily this plan devotes itself to five specific areas—storage space for the greatly increased amounts of equipment that the Reserve components are issued, aviation facilities for our greatly expanding air fleet which has increased from some 800 aircraft a few years ago to nearly 3,000 projected out a couple of years from now, better training areas and facilities, security of our arms rooms in the era that we are living in today, and modern armories and training centers.

Sir, this concludes my formal statement. I would be glad to answer any questions.

#### COMMITTEE POSITION ON RESERVES

MR. SIKES. I think that it would be well if we hear from General Roberts and General Greenleaf and then we will have questions which are directed more at you on the general picture and more at the other two gentlemen on their particular assignments.

I think it would be well to have this entire story before us before we start questions. We are very much interested in this program. You realize that this subcommittee has supported the construction requirements of the Reserve components consistently. We have often urged that you expand, improve, and replace Reserve facilities more rapidly rather than less rapidly.

We know what your problems are in getting your budget sanctioned and trying to get enough money to do the job. Pressures come from every side.

We recognize that now, perhaps more than at any time in history, it is very necessary that you have adequate facilities if you are going to be able to meet your enlistment quotas and to maintain strength levels which are required for the Reserve components.

#### ASSURANCE NEEDED

Before we hear from the other two generals, let me ask if you can give me the type of assurance that I have had from others, particularly at the level of the Chiefs of the services.

As you well know, generally the Reserve components were not utilized during the war in Indochina. The Air Force did make consistent use of the Reserve. A few of the units from the other services were used but these were very few, and by and large this was a great disappointment to the Reserves because they had trained for years in order to contribute their services in time of emergency and they felt more or less neglected and left out when, because of political considerations, it was decided not to use them.

That poses a question for the Congress: Should we continue to fund the Reserves if they are not going to be used? Well, I think that this is another day, and beginning with the statement by Mr. Laird when he was still Secretary and seconded by the Chiefs of each of the services, it appears there is now assurance that it is the intent to use them should there be another emergency.

Is that your understanding?

General RATTAN. Firmly so, sir.

In 1970 Mr. Laird made the announcement that if we were really going to expand and get into another conflict, we were going to use the Reserve components, which is what they are for, and I can assure you that General Abrams is 100 percent for this.

He previously had my job for 3 years. He understands Reserve components and he is really backing us.

Mr. SIKES. Good.

Then shall we hear the other two statements? Then we will have questions.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

### FINANCIAL AND SUMMARY SHEETS

First, insert the financial summary and pages A through G in the record so we can have the Army Reserve request for reference.

[The pages follow:]

#### PROGRAM AND FINANCING (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Budget plan (amounts for construction actions programmed)			Obligations		
	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate
<b>Program by activities:</b>						
1. Major construction.....	29,555	33,500	35,900	24,530	30,700	33,100
2. Minor construction.....	900	2,300	2,500	838	3,100	2,500
3. Planning.....	3,045	2,400	2,300	2,279	3,200	2,400
Total.....	33,500	38,200	40,700	27,647	37,000	38,000
<b>Financing:</b>						
Unobligated balance available, start of year:						
For completion of prior year budget plans.....				-11,575	-17,428	-18,628
Unobligated balance available, end of year: For completion of prior year budget plans.....				17,428	18,628	21,328
Budget authority (appropriation).....	33,500	38,200	40,700	33,500	38,200	40,700
<b>Relation of obligations to outlays:</b>						
Obligations incurred, net.....				27,647	37,000	38,000
Obligated balance, start of year.....				10,062	24,333	37,633
Obligated balance, end of year.....				-24,333	-37,633	-45,333
Outlays.....				13,376	23,700	30,300

## OBJECT CLASSIFICATION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate
Personnel compensation: Permanent positions.....	1,037	741	731
Personnel benefits: Civilian.....	88	78	74
Travel and transportation of persons.....	59	87	88
Printing and reproduction.....	30	44	44
Other services.....	6,838	10,231	10,312
Supplies and materials.....	4	6	6
Lands and structures.....	19,591	25,813	26,745
<b>Total obligations.....</b>	<b>27,647</b>	<b>37,000</b>	<b>38,000</b>

## PERSONNEL SUMMARY

Total number of permanent positions.....	77	47	47
Average paid employment.....	72	50	47
Average GS grade.....	9.4	9.1	9.1
Average GS salary.....	\$14,403	\$14,820	\$15,553

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE, FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROGRAM

Location	Size/type facility	Estimated cost (thousands)
<b>Alabama:</b>		
Huntsville.....	300-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-bay maintenance shop and area maintenance support activity.	\$730
Montgomery.....	400-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with a 3-bay maintenance shop, with a special training facility (fuel system supply point) and area maintenance support activity.	921
<b>Arizona: Phoenix.....</b>		
	Expand 450-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 3-bay maintenance shop to 600-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 4-bay maintenance shop.	572
<b>Arkansas: Fort Chaffee.....</b>		
	Annual training facilities.....	792
California: Oakland.....	600-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with a 4-bay maintenance shop.	1,435
Connecticut: West Hartford.....	Expand 750-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to provide command and control facility and medical addition.	798
Delaware: Dover.....	Expand 150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 300-man U.S. Army Reserve Center.	291
Florida: Lakeland.....	Alter existing center to 200-man criteria and construct 2-bay maintenance shop.	148
Hawaii: Fort Shafter.....	1,000-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with a 5-bay maintenance shop and DS-GS maintenance shop.	2,754
Idaho: Idaho Falls.....	Expand 50-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 100-man U.S. Army Reserve Center.	219
<b>Indiana:</b>		
East Chicago.....	300-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-bay maintenance shop.	841
Evansville (Jt./Nav).....	Expand 300-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 400-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with DS-GS maintenance shop.	507
North Judson.....	Expand 50-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 100-man U.S. Army Reserve Center.	249
Rushville.....	Expand 50-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 1-day maintenance shop to 150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-day maintenance shop.	469
Scottsburg.....	Expand 50-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 1-day maintenance shop to 150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-day maintenance shop.	486
Kansas: Wichita.....	Expand 750-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 1,000-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with command and control facility and medical addition.	995
Kentucky: Ashland.....	150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-day maintenance shop.	695
Louisiana: Bogalusa.....	Expand 50-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 1-day maintenance shop to 150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-day maintenance shop.	436
Maryland: Fort George G. Meade.....	600-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 4-day maintenance shop and command and control addition.	1,466
Massachusetts: Taunton.....	Expand 300-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to a 400-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with medical addition.	523
Michigan: Battle Creek.....	Expand 150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 300-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with DS-GS maintenance shop.	474

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE, FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROGRAM—Continued

Location	Size/type facility	Estimated cost (thousands)
Mississippi:		
Laurel.....	200-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with a 2-bay maintenance shop and area maintenance support activity.	620
Pascagoula.....	100-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 1-bay maintenance shop.	385
Montana:		
Great Falls.....	Expand 150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 200-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with area maintenance support activity.	267
Kalispell.....	Expand 50-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 100-man U.S. Army Reserve Center.	224
Lewistown.....	100-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 1-bay maintenance shop.	459
Nebraska: Fremont (Jt./Nav).....	200-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-bay maintenance shop.	701
North Carolina:		
Fort Bragg.....	400-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with a 3-bay maintenance shop and special training space for parachute packing and repair facility.	1,023
Raleigh No. 2.....	200-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with a 2-bay maintenance shop.	563
Wilson.....	100-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with a 1-bay maintenance shop.	379
North Dakota: Minot.....	100-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with a 1-bay maintenance shop.	537
Oklahoma: Norman.....	Aircraft maintenance hangar.....	1,230
Pennsylvania:		
Altoona.....	Expand 150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 300-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with DS-GS maintenance shop.	521
Edgemont.....	1000-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 5-bay maintenance shop and DS-GS maintenance shop.	2,376
Indiana.....	Expand 50-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 1-bay maintenance shop to 150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-bay maintenance shop.	471
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation.....	Annual training facilities.....	989
Willow Grove.....	600-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with a 4-bay maintenance shop and command and control addition.	1,749
Do.....	Aircraft maintenance hangar.....	1,143
Puerto Rico: Puerto Nuevo.....	Expand military parking area.....	120
Rhode Island: Providence (Jt./Nav).....	600-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 4-bay maintenance shop and medical addition.	1,195
South Dakota: Aberdeen.....	Expand 50-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 100-man U.S. Army Reserve Center.	213
Texas: Paris.....	Expand 50-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 1-bay maintenance shop to 150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-bay maintenance shop.	386
Utah:		
Ogden.....	600-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 4-bay maintenance shop and area maintenance support activity.	1,527
Pleasant Grove.....	Expand 50-man U.S. Army Reserve Center to 100-man U.S. Army Reserve Center.	249
Provo.....	Expand 150-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-bay maintenance shop to 200-man U.S. Army Reserve Center with 2-bay maintenance shop.	251
Virginia:		
Camp A. P. Hill.....	Annual training facilities.....	909
Camp Pickett.....	Annual training facilities.....	907
Wisconsin:		
Camp McCoy.....	Air field improvements.....	348
Do.....	Aircraft maintenance and storage facility.....	357
Total major construction.....		35,900

## STATEMENT OF CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE

Mr. SIKES. General Roberts, are you ready?

General ROBERTS. I am, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Go ahead.

We are very happy to have you back with us.

General ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a pleasure to appear before you to present the Military Construction, Army Reserve program for fiscal year 1974.

Readiness programs for the Army Reserve are well underway. Additional major equipment and improved training and supervision are being provided. Another important element to improve readiness is the availability of adequate training facilities and training areas. This Military Construction, Army Reserve budget provides for construction of such facilities.

Fiscal year 1974 will be the fourth year of the approved 10-year program for provision of adequate and proper home-station training centers for the Army Reserve. With the authorization and financial support of this committee and the Congress, we are steadily overcoming Army Reserve training center deficiencies. More and more units throughout the Nation are receiving improved training in facilities designed for a modern Army Reserve equipped with required quantities of deployable major equipment.

Our facilities program accomplishment rose from \$12 million in fiscal year 1971 to over \$27 million for fiscal year 1972. In fiscal year 1973, we estimated more than \$37 million in obligations. Our actual obligations fell somewhat short of this figure. The major reasons for this shortfall were delays caused by directed deferrals, delays associated with projects selected for SBA negotiated minority contracts, and projects which exceeded original program estimates and required renotification of Congress. In terms of individual projects this means that 72 percent of our major projects were awarded or advertised prior to June 30, 1973. Our minor construction is also well underway and all available funds were committed to projects by end fiscal year 1973.

The fiscal year 1974 program request is a well balanced program combining both home station and training facilities. It includes 19 new training centers, 22 expansions, and 8 special projects. The fiscal year 1974 increment will provide:

Forty-one new criteria centers with unit maintenance shops.

This includes, of course, both the new centers and the expansions.

Five direct support/general support maintenance shops.

Four medical facility additions.

Three command and control facilities.

Four aviation projects.

Four annual training improvements, and

Two special training facilities.

In addition, about 60 minor construction projects will be accomplished, many of which will support our materiel program by providing secure military vehicle parking.

The justification data books which you have been furnished provide detailed information, and support our appropriations and authorization requests. All of these projects are urgently needed for improved training and readiness.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. I am prepared to answer any questions the committee may have.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you, General Roberts.

Let's turn now to the program of the National Guard.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

## FINANCIAL AND SUMMARY SHEETS

Mr. SIKES. Insert pages 2 through 9 in the record.  
[The pages follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD  
PROGRAM AND FINANCING

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget plan (amounts for construction actions programmed)			Obligations		
	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate
<b>Program by activities:</b>						
1. Major construction:						
(a) Armory.....	8,929	13,205	9,926	8,512	11,400	10,100
(b) Nonarmory.....	14,757	20,365	19,974	14,577	19,450	20,200
2. Minor construction.....	3,514	4,330	3,300	2,577	5,350	3,400
3. Planning.....	1,800	2,100	2,000	1,976	2,000	2,000
Total.....	29,000	40,000	35,200	27,642	38,200	35,700
<b>Financing:</b>						
Unobligated balance available, start of year for completion of prior year budget plans.....				-4,908	-6,266	-8,066
Unobligated balance available, end of year for completion of prior year budget plans.....				6,266	8,066	7,566
Budget authority (appropriation).....	29,000	40,000	35,200	29,000	40,000	35,200
<b>Relation of obligations to outlays:</b>						
Obligations incurred, net.....				27,642	38,200	35,700
Obligated balance, start of year.....				16,175	24,407	36,207
Obligated balance, end of year.....				-24,407	-36,207	-34,907
Outlays.....				19,409	26,400	37,000

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—APPROPRIATION,  
FISCAL YEAR 1974

## LIST OF PROJECTS

		<i>Estimated Federal cost (thousands)</i>
<i>Recapitulation</i>		
29	Armory projects.....	\$9,926
50	Non-Armory projects.....	19,974
	Minor construction.....	3,300
	Planning (A/E).....	2,000
	Total.....	35,200

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM APPROPRIATION—FISCAL YEAR 1974, LIST OF  
PROJECTS

Location	Project description	Estimated Federal cost (thousands)	
		Army	Nonarmory
<b>Alabama:</b>			
Ariton.....	1-unit army (type A).....	154	
Montgomery.....	Army aviation support facility.....		1,090
<b>Alaska:</b>			
Anchorage.....	Army aviation support facility.....		2,975
<b>Arkansas:</b>			
Camp Jos. T. Robinson.....	Bachelor officers quarters.....		133
Do.....	Army aviation support facility addition.....		119
Fort Chaffee.....	Training site.....		373
Fort Smith.....	1-unit army (type D).....	230	

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM APPROPRIATION—FISCAL YEAR 1974, LIST OF  
 PROJECTS—Continued

Location	Project description	Estimated Federal cost (thousands)	
		Armory	Nonarmory
<b>California:</b>			
Camp Roberts	Training site		650
Long Beach	Combined support maintenance shop addition		130
Santa Fe Springs	3-unit plus armory	735	
Connecticut: Willimantic	Organizational maintenance shop		133
Delaware: New Castle	2-unit armory	442	
District of Columbia: Bolling AFB	USPFO office and warehouse		517
<b>Florida:</b>			
Camp Blanding	Training facilities		327
Tallahassee	2-unit armory	391	
Do	Organizational maintenance shop		106
Hawaii: Honolulu (Wheeler AFB)	Army aviation support facility		816
Idaho: Gowen Field	Training facilities		325
<b>Illinois:</b>			
Chicago-Midway	Army aviation support facility addition		182
Quincy	1-unit armory (type D)	348	
<b>Indiana:</b>			
Camp Atterbury	Training facilities		125
Portland	1-unit armory (type C)	290	
Shelbyville	Army aviation support facility addition		179
Iowa: Cedar Rapids	Organizational maintenance shop		128
Kentucky: Hickman	1-unit armory (type D)	344	
Louisiana: Baton Rouge	2-unit plus armory	469	
Maine: Camp Keyes	USPFO warehouse, alterations		63
Maryland: Edgewood Arsenal (Weide Army Airfield)	Army aviation support facility		1,094
<b>Massachusetts:</b>			
Northbridge	Organizational maintenance shop addition		95
Springfield	3-unit plus armory	581	
<b>Michigan:</b>			
Camp Grayling	Training facilities		599
Kalamazoo	1-unit armory (type D)	340	
Midland	Organizational maintenance shop		109
<b>Minnesota:</b>			
Camp Ripley	Training facilities		321
Hutchinson	1-unit armory (type D)	346	
Tracy	Organizational maintenance shop		128
<b>Mississippi:</b>			
Camp Shelby	Training site		402
Camp Shelby	Combined support maintenance shop addition		135
Leland	1-unit armory (type B)	177	
Missouri: Joplin	1-unit plus armory	377	
Nebraska: Meade	Organizational maintenance shop		138
Nevada: Carson City	Armory addition	238	
New Hampshire: Manchester	Organizational maintenance shop		162
New Jersey: Salem	1-unit armory (type C)	326	
New Mexico: Taos	1-unit armory	169	
<b>New York:</b>			
Camp Drum	Training facilities (inactive Army camp)		1,272
Huntington Station	Organization maintenance shop		171
Lockport	do		117
New York City (Bronx)	Organizational maintenance shops (2)		128
<b>North Carolina:</b>			
Fort Bragg	Annual training equipment pool		619
New Bern	1-unit armory (type D)	247	
North Dakota: Bismarck	Organizational maintenance shop addition		61
<b>Ohio:</b>			
Don Scott Field	Army aviation support facility		272
Toledo	4-unit plus armory	813	
Do	Organizational maintenance shop		124
<b>Oklahoma:</b>			
Claremore	1-unit armory (type D)	207	
Norman	Army aviation support facility		1,409
Oregon: Albany	1-unit armory (type D)	267	
<b>Pennsylvania:</b>			
Carbondale	1-unit armory (type D)	408	
Hershey	1-unit plus armory	418	
<b>Puerto Rico:</b>			
Mayaguez	Organizational maintenance shop		128
Salinas Training Area	Training facilities		491
Rhode Island: North Scituate (Providence)	Organizational maintenance shop, conversion		60
South Carolina: Warrenville	1-unit armory (type D)	266	
South Dakota: Pierre	1-unit plus armory	364	
<b>Tennessee:</b>			
Athens	1-unit armory (type D)	365	
Martin	Organizational maintenance shop		141
Smyrna	Helicopter, gun vault and storage		149

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM APPROPRIATION—FISCAL YEAR 1974, LIST OF PROJECTS—Continued

Location	Project description	Estimated Federal cost (thousands)	
		Army	Nonarmy
Texas:			
Brownwood	Organizational maintenance shop		102
San Antonio (Martindale NG AF)	Army aviation support facility		246
Sulphur springs	1-unit army (type C)	205	
Utah: Camp W. G. Williams	Annual training equipment pool		286
Virginia:			
Camp Pickett	Annual training equipment pool		1,437
Do	Organizational maintenance shop		105
Washington: Gray Field	Army aviation support facility expansion		756
West Virginia: Huntington	1-unit army, conversion	156	
Wisconsin:			
Antigo	1-unit army (type C)	253	
Camp Douglas	Organizational maintenance shop		120
Wyoming: Camp Guernsey	Annual training equipment pool		226

STATEMENT OF CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

Mr. SIKES. General Greenlief, we will be glad to hear you. It seems that you are almost a permanent fixture around here. You have been around a good long time.

General GREENLIEF. I consider the statement a compliment.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you.

Will you go ahead.

General GREENLIEF. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege to appear before this distinguished committee to present the fiscal year 1974 military construction, Army National Guard budget request. Today when our active military forces are being reduced, the readiness posture of the Guard has become of even more critical importance. The facilities needed to assemble and administer our Guard units, to store weapons, to maintain vehicles and aircraft, and to accomplish our annual and weekend training assume added importance.

As a result of the increased reliance, which you, sir, referred to, placed on the National Guard for the defense of our Nation, our units have, and are still receiving, additional and more modern equipment. In the last 3 years the value of our equipment inventory doubled and is expected to increase another 50 percent in the next 2 years. Our requirements for maintenance and storage facilities for this equipment have increased proportionately. In addition, training requirements for the Guard have increased so that our units may attain and maintain a high state of combat readiness. This has created a need for more and better training facilities. Because of these increased facility requirements, our construction backlog has increased from \$300 to \$354 million.

The program requested for fiscal year 1974 is \$35.2 million. This amount will provide for most of our critical requirements. With a \$354 million known backlog of construction requirements, the fiscal year 1974 budget of \$35.2 million would allow us to deplete this backlog in about 10 years. This, however, assumes no escalation in construction costs and that we can foresee all of our requirements for the next 10 years.

The \$35.2 million fiscal year 1974 budget plan provides \$29.9 million for major construction and \$5.3 million for minor construction and planning. The major construction consists of \$9.9 million for armories and \$20 million for nonarmory projects.

The justification data books which you have been furnished contain detailed project descriptions which support the construction program. We are proposing 29 armory projects and 50 nonarmory projects for a total of 79 projects in 44 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. All of these projects are urgently needed to support improved training and unit readiness.

Mr. LONG. What is the total cost of that?

General GREENLIEF. Total cost \$35.2 million, sir, \$29.9 million for major construction, and \$5.3 million for minor construction and planning.

Our actual obligations for fiscal year 1972 were \$27.6 million which exceeded our original obligation target by \$4 million. This left us a carryover of \$6.3 million into fiscal year 1973. Our current fiscal year 1973 budget plan of \$40 million provides an obligation target of \$38.2 million.

We now have the approximate end June figures and we find that in fiscal year 1973 we actually obligated \$43.2 million, so our carryover into 1974 will only be \$3.1 million and that represented obligating 94 percent of the available funds.

We plan to obligate \$35.7 million during fiscal year 1974.

[Additional information follows:]

Due to us exceeding our obligation goal in fiscal year 1973 by \$5 million and thus carrying over into fiscal year 1974 \$5 million less than programmed, our planned carryover into fiscal year 1975 will be \$4 million.

Our obligation figures include minor construction and planning funds as well as major construction.

I again wish to express my appreciation for your understanding and continuing support of our efforts to provide adequate facilities for our 400,000-man Army National Guard force.

Sir, this concludes my prepared statement. If there are any questions, I will be pleased to furnish any information that you may require.

## ARMY RESERVE COMPONENTS

### FUND SUFFICIENCY

Mr. SIKES. Thank you very much.

General, how do the figures that you have given us compare with your requests for funds? Did you get the amount that you asked for?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir.

This is the figure in the 5-year financial plan. We believe that it represents reasonable progress.

Mr. SIKES. And for Army Reserve?

General ROBERTS. Yes, sir. We have the money that was requested and we made significant advances in our total 10-year program.

### ACCURACY OF COST ESTIMATES

Mr. SIKES. What is the bid situation generally? Are you, in the fiscal 1973 program and fiscal 1972 program, getting bids that are within the funds available?

General ROBERTS. In the case of the Army Reserve, sir, during this past year our average award figure was 98 percent of the estimate. We had some as high as 138 percent, which we obviously couldn't go without other considerations, and we had some as low as 74 percent.

Mr. SIKES. And the Guard?

General GREENLIEF. On the average in the Guard construction program our bids came in at 2.7 percent less than the estimated cost. There had been some examples of some projects going over the bid and we have either had to redesign or readvertise the project.

Mr. SIKES. Then the situation is not abnormal insofar as the bids are concerned?

General GREENLIEF. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Are you doing about as well as you would expect?

General GREENLIEF. Our cost estimates have been quite accurate.

#### IMPACT OF FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. General Rattan, you state that facilities have a significant impact on Reserve morale. Do you feel that the expenditure of money on armory facilities has as significant an impact on the morale of the average enlisted reservist as would increased spending for higher pay or more meaningful training?

If you had to choose, do you think they are of equal significance or is one more important than the other?

General RATTAN. It is hard to put these in an order of priority. Most people like you and I are looking for job satisfaction, what they do, or training if you want to call it that. They are, of course, interested in money they receive because of the obvious results of that and they also have an impact on the environment in which they work which is your armory and facilities, so you can't really separate them.

But it certainly ranks with the other two. If you put a man in a bleak, rundown establishment it is hard to recruit him to start with and once he is there he is a little disgruntled because he spends time in it.

I would hate to have to line them up in order of priorities because usually training requirements are a kind of a necessity, have to come first because if you can't train you can't fight. It is kind of hard to train if their base of operations is deteriorating.

[Additional information follows:]

The question requires a multiple answer. Adequate facilities, modern equipment, meaningful training, and pay and allowances all impact on the morale, dedication, and esprit of the citizen-soldier. Bonuses and full-time serviceman's group life insurance are essential if we are to retain our personnel. Earlier entitlement to retired pay and improved medical, dental, and death benefits will do much to increasing the attractiveness of the National Guard and Army Reserve service. Therefore, the molding of all of these resources together in appropriate balance will insure that our goal of individual and unit readiness is achieved. To train our personnel in modern facilities, using modern equipment and techniques, coupled with meaningful training, will give the soldier a sense of being cared for, and we believe that all of these factors should help to improve our recruitment and retention.

Mr. SIKES. Whose responsibility is it to see that the appearance of the armories is maintained in the best possible status, the grounds well kept, some shrubbery planted and growing, and the building painted?

I have seen some that looked pretty seedy and some that obviously had very good care. Someone should have overall responsibility for that.

General GREENLIEF. In the National Guard, it is a State responsibility. They fund for it and do the maintenance work.

General ROBERTS. In the Army Reserve, sir, the money for such work comes out of operation and maintenance Army reserve funds, which is directed by the designated support installation, and the senior reserve headquarters has the responsibility of making appropriate reports where this work is needed.

Mr. SIKES. Where does the responsibility lie? With the local commander?

General ROBERTS. Yes, sir. We have a senior Reserve officer who is the center commander in each instance. He has a center committee consisting of all commanders of the units located there.

They have periodic meetings and discuss problems of this nature. His responsibility and his end report are to his next senior headquarters.

#### EQUIPMENT AND MAINTENANCE

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have a few words from each of you on the amount, modernization, and maintenance of equipment.

Generally we are told that the Reserve components are receiving adequate equipment and the most modern equipment in history. Do you find that is true?

General RATTAN. That is affirmative, sir. In the last 3 years they have received some, I guess, about \$2.5 billion worth of equipment. They are up now to where the majority of the units are up in the 75 percent bracket, have enough equipment that they can accomplish the necessary training. Despite the improvement, we still have significant equipment shortages, particularly in the area of standard tanks, radars, and tactical radios. These are examples.

Mr. SIKES. What tanks do they have? How modern is the equipment?

General RATTAN. Some of our units we have the M-60 tank, while others have M-48's.

General GREENLIEF. M-60 and M-48A3.

Mr. SIKES. Some of them, you say. Are there some that don't have equipment even as modern as the M-48?

General ROBERTS. Not in the Army Reserve, sir.

General GREENLIEF. In some of our low priority units, our armored units are equipped with the M-48A1. The M-48A3 is a deployable item and we have the M-60 in some of our high priority units.

General ROBERTS. To give you an idea, Mr. Sikes, I just came back from the 157th brigade which is a high priority unit. They have about 95 percent of the equipment they should have and it is all first rate equipment, classes A and B.

They have the M-48A3 tank in their tank battalion. Overall, the Army Reserve has a high percent of its MTOE equipment which means the full equipment deployable. In many units you don't need every last item to effectively train people.

So I would say our equipment posture is healthy and getting better right along.

Mr. SIKES. And what is the situation on maintenance? Do you have enough technicians to have fully satisfactory maintenance?

General ROBERTS. Yes, sir. I would say that the maintenance capability is surprising. It exceeds our expectations. We are handling this

infusion of equipment very well and we have been given more technicians year by year for this purpose.

Mr. SIKES. Guard?

General GREENLIEF. In the Army National Guard our mobilization requirement for equipment is \$6 billion. We have a training requirement stated at \$4.5 billion. We actually have on hand about \$3 billion worth of PEMA type equipment and of that \$2.27 billion is standard A or B fully acceptable in the Army and deployable and that leaves us \$.78 billion that are contingency and training equipment.

It does meet our training equipment even though it is not a deployable asset. To give you an idea of the growth of this program, in fiscal year 1969 the value of the PEMA type equipment issued to the Guard was \$103.2 million. Then the figures run like this: \$221.6 million, \$592 million, \$853 million, \$500-plus million in 1973, and we anticipate \$750 million in fiscal year 1974, which is not to say we don't have shortages.

Our principal shortages are in the armored vehicle launch bridges, radar equipment, some self-propelled artillery, the tanks that you discussed, and new family radios.

The Army National Guard maintenance program has kept abreast of this. Our requirement for technicians continues to grow as the inventory grows. Thus far we have not had a problem of maintaining supporting equipment. It will require continued growth of the technician program: At some point in time the ceiling on the number of technicians could start to impact unfavorably. It has not yet been a problem in the Army Guard.

#### UNIT STRENGTH

Mr. SIKES. The problem of strength of units, personnel, is becoming increasingly difficult. There are a number of measures before Congress which are intended to help in that situation by giving to the members of the Reserve components advantages and benefits they have not previously had.

One, there is insurance which already has passed the House. Of the others, I think probably most of them will be approved by Congress. Will this enable you, in your opinion, to obtain enough enlistments to have realistic training programs?

General GREENLIEF. Mr. Chairman, I am completely confident that, if the bonus incentive is provided, the Army National Guard will make its authorized strength. Our strength today is 385,600. We had a net loss each month on the order of 1,000 to 1,500 from January through May coincident with the final termination of the draft.

However, in June we had a net increase of 2,180. Our people are working hard. Some States, notably in the Deep South, are over-strength. In the main and across the board in the country I am convinced that with the provision of the bonus incentive we will make the authorized strength.

Mr. SIKES. That is a very good picture.

General ROBERTS. For the Army Reserve, sir, presently we are between 90 and 91 percent strength. Our strength during the past fiscal year has held its own. We ended fiscal year 1973 almost exactly where we were at end of fiscal year 1972 despite the end of the draft, and this is due to a tremendous amount of work on the part of our units and to provision of the necessary recruiting force.

However, unless we do have the incentives which you have mentioned, I seriously doubt that we can maintain the enlisted strength and I would suggest that the implementation of the bonus which we hope will pass is at least as important as the bonus itself, that is, the authorization for it, and I hope that sufficient funds are provided to attract and retain the required personnel.

There has been some discussion of a \$600 enlistment bonus for a 6-year enlistment. I feel that there is good reason to doubt if this is enough, and this would be under the amount provided for in the legislation.

Mr. LONG. Is this payment to get into the Guard?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

General ROBERTS. Yes, sir. At the present time the bonus measure provides for authorization to pay up to \$2,200 for an enlistment or reenlistment in a critical skill and up to \$1,100 for enlistment or reenlistment in a noncritical skill.

However, the amount of money which the Department of Defense is currently discussing for implementation of the bonus if and when authorized would not permit the Army to pay this amount of money and this is what bothers me at the present time.

#### ADEQUACY OF FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. Are there any requests before us for Army Reserve components facilities where strength figures are becoming critical, or where you may have difficulty carrying on a satisfactory program?

General ROBERTS. In the case of the Army Reserve, sir, our requests for facilities are those where we are overcrowded. We have many, many instances of 150-percent utilization of center space or even more. We have many facilities that were built for the old cadre type structure of the early 1950's which are totally unrealistic today, and I feel that none of our requests is in that category where we can't anticipate good utilization.

General GREENLIEF. We have no facilities planned for any location that we believe there is any reason to doubt their full utilization.

Mr. SIKES. What priority do you give facilities modernization in your overall program to improve Reserve morale and readiness?

General RATTAN. Facilities modernization ranks equally with the availability of combat serviceable equipment, appropriate training under enthusiastic leaders, and adequate numbers of dedicated personnel. While the overall preparedness of the Reserve components is probably the highest ever achieved in peacetime, availability of sufficient resources to maintain the highest possible level of proficiency is necessary. One of the fundamental resource requirements is the availability of adequate, functional, self-sustaining facilities. All Reserve component units occupy some type of facility, however, they range from permanently constructed National Guard armories and Army Reserve centers to leased structures of varying adequacy. Our long-range construction plan was developed to insure that, with the issue of modern equipment which reached over \$1 billion in fiscal year 1972, more than \$600 million in fiscal year 1973, and estimated at \$800 million in fiscal year 1974, adequate facilities to store, maintain, and train with the equipment were made available.

Mr. SIKES. What is the average life expectancy of an armory facility?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, in the National Guard we build for a 25-year life which is the duration of the Federal-State use agreement for the armory.

In actual fact I would anticipate that we would get 50 years from them.

General ROBERTS. Sir, in answer to your question about the life of these facilities, our estimated life is the same, 25 years. However, in practice we can exceed this.

As a matter of fact, many of the expansions of centers we are now discussing here are centers that are presently over 20 years old and so with some additional space and modernization we can use them for, I would say, 50 years.

General RATTAN. What they do at the end of about 25 years, sir, is take a hard look at the building to see if it is worth it to keep pouring money into repairs, and if so continue; if not, put a clamp on such repairs and do something else about the condition.

Mr. SIKES. Is your situation about the same, General Greenlieff?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What percentage of Army facilities are considered permanent construction?

General Greenlieff. Sir, in the Army Guard all of the armory facilities are permanent construction.

Mr. SIKES. And the Army Reserve?

General ROBERTS. Yes, sir. However, we do have a number of leased facilities which of course would not be in this category, but anything we are constructing is of a permanent nature.

Mr. SIKES. To what extent are your maintenance and storage facilities inadequate to handle the new equipment units have received? Is your problem in the volume of equipment or in special requirements of the modern equipment? Cite some examples (other than aircraft) of the types of problems you are running up against.

General RATTAN. The problem is in total volume of equipment. Our inventory today is far greater than at any time in the past. As you know, in recent years equipment issues have increased significantly so that today the total inventory on hand amounts to \$4.24 billion, compared to \$2.3 billion at the end of fiscal year 1970, as an example. The two components have increased their minor construction programs in order to expand existing maintenance and storage facilities to accommodate this large volume of equipment. The Army National Guard is currently placing emphasis on nonarmory facilities in order to meet this requirement. The Army Reserve includes maintenance facilities at every Reserve center. At the same time additional equipment concentration sites are being established at installations where training is conducted.

Mr. SIKES. What active installations have the Army Reserve components been assigned in the last 5 years, General, and what was the value of the facilities at these installations?

General RATTAN. The Reserve components do not normally acquire entire military installations that are being disposed of by the active services, as we do not have the capability of manning and operating sizable posts, camps, or stations. For the most part, we attempt to

acquire buildings, ranges, and field training areas to satisfy stationing and training requirements. There are exceptions to this concept. The National Guard currently operates Fort Irwin, Calif., valued at \$36 million, including improvements and land, and Camp Roberts, Calif., valued at \$28 million. The inactive camps that are retained for mobilization and Reserve component training are manned by the Active Army, however, maintenance, repair and construction costs are borne by the Reserve components. Over the past five years the Reserve components have acquired buildings, structures, ranges, field training areas or land for construction of facilities at more than 40 installations throughout the United States. The value of these facility improvements and land areas based upon current land and building values is estimated in excess of \$150 million.

#### FIELD TRAINING LEVELS

Mr. SIKES. At what strength level are you now conducting field training involving the Reserve components, General Rattan? Brigade?

General RATTAN. Sir, as you know in the past the training has kind of been really pegged at company level. Units are really entering into multiple level training now, where you can train the battalion staff at the same time the companies are training.

I would say from the visits I made this summer that we are achieving a combination of company level of course, much more battalion level training, and some brigades. I would say it probably averages out somewhere along the battalion level which is a multiple level training concept. It really isn't going to get down the road to where we see some significant results probably until the end of next summer.

The level has risen, though.

Mr. SIKES. I know that has been your objective.

General RATTAN. Right, sir.

General GREENLIEF. In terms of utilization of facilities, however, sir, in the Guard we have key divisions that are going to field training as a division. Most of our brigades attend field training as a full brigade.

General ROBERTS. Our primary problem is in connection with inactive duty training areas for training of battalion-sized units and we have some deficiencies in this area.

#### RESERVE TRAINING AREAS

Mr. SIKES. That is what I want to talk about now, the situation of reserve training areas.

Are population pressures around the areas where the units train forcing you out of areas that you previously utilized, or do you still have adequate reserve training areas?

General RATTAN. Answering it across the board, sir, in 1970 CONARC made a survey of 400 mixed USAR-National Guard battalion sized units and they found about 75 out of the 400 didn't have adequate facilities. CONARC went through the process again to see if they couldn't locate adequate areas, either a government facility or have the local units put a little more attention to acquiring sites. Through these efforts, the 75 was cut in half, so we still have, out of that representative 400, about 35 or so that we still have problems.

The problem is concentrated primarily in the heavily populated Northeastern part of the United States. As far as the President's desire to acquire areas for recreation we pay a great deal of attention to this in the Army and Department of Defense. I would honestly say that across the board, although a lot of the survey reports have come in which stated that land was excess, of those that we really needed to retain for the Reserve components use, we have been fairly successful in keeping.

Mr. SIKES. That is a good summary. Of course it is essential to have training areas. Classroom training is important. It is necessary. But without field training a man hasn't learned his job.

General RATTAN. That is true.

Mr. SIKES. And he can't possibly know what is expected of him in combat unless he has had field training. Are there any areas where you are being pushed out because of inadequate training areas?

General RATTAN. I know of no significant one and I do sit on the Army's Senior Review Board, sir. There are a few decisions that aren't final yet. I can't give you specifics but my impression from residing on the Board is we have been doing pretty well retaining what we want.

Mr. SIKES. Is the principal difficulty in the heavily populated Northeast?

General RATTAN. Yes, sir.

#### STRENGTH FIGURES USED IN PLANNING

Mr. SIKES. What is the current, actual onboard level for the Army Reserve components as compared to your authorized strength? What is the trend in this area?

General RATTAN. The current, actual onboard level for the Army Reserve components as of June 30, 1973, is 621,106 as compared to a mandated strength of 663,633. I might add that the June 30 report is our flash, or telephonic report, from the field. The final, official figure may vary ( $\pm$ ) 100. We have maintained an average of 622,052 for the past fiscal year with a variation of less than one-half a percent of that number during the year.

Mr. SIKES. In determining your \$800 million facilities requirements overall, are you programing at 100 percent of expected authorized strength?

General RATTAN. Yes, sir.

The USAR and National Guard Armories or Centers, as we call them, are programed really for a company size unit. It isn't always designed specifically for a tank company, for instance.

We aren't sure that the tank company is going to be stationed there 7 years hence, so it is programed at about 90 percent for the people and somewhat less for the vehicles. As most of the tanks are at equipment pools, a lower percentage of tank storage requirements at home station is required.

Wheeled vehicles, I think we count on 75 to 80 percent of them being available in the local armory.

Mr. SIKES. Are you being assigned any active Army facilities as a result of the base closures or Army restructuring?

General ROBERTS. Sir, in the case of the Army Reserve, we have pending acquisition four locations from the Air Force—Westover

Field, Mass.; Hanscom Field, Mass.; McCoy Air Force Base in Florida; Hamilton Air Force Base in California.

That is not to say we could take over the complete installation, but we have requests in for construction and various acreage at these places. In addition to that, from the Navy we are looking to get some land from the Naval Support Activity at Omaha and from the Boston Naval Annex in Boston, 19 acres.

Mr. SIKES. Are those requests reflected in this budget?

General ROBERTS. Yes, sir, in that this will give us a construction cost avoidance of \$3.5 million in fiscal year 1975 and later year programs.

General GREENLIEF. Sir, in the Army Guard not as a part of the most recent closure but demonstrating the point you are concerned about, we have taken over the operation of Camp Roberts in California and Fort Irwin in California, former major training centers of the Active Army that are now operated by the California National Guard and funded by the National Guard Bureau.

This saves construction funds but does result in increasing the size of the Guard operation and maintenance budget. Of the recent closures we are proposing to relocate an aviation facility from Fitchburg, Mass. to Hanscom Air Force Base. We are considering now a relocation possibility for both Army Guard aviation units and Air Guard aviation units into Quonset Point in Rhode Island.

The closing of Forbes Air Force Base in Kansas is something we are very much involved in at the moment although it is not yet resolved. That is for both Army Guard and Air Guard aviation facilities.

Whenever a facility closes, where we have a need we seek to utilize it as opposed to adding costs to this construction budget.

General RATTAN. Sir, within the Army, any time consideration is given to closing down a facility, the three of us have an opportunity at looking at it. In recent base closures by the Army, the Air Force, and Coast Guard received those listings and picked up nine that we expect to do something about.

#### CONSOLIDATION OF FORCES

Mr. SIKES. From time to time there has been discussion of possible advantages if some consolidation of Reserve and National Guard structures took place. This committee recognizes the problems that this would entail.

The National Guard is both State and Federal-oriented. The Reserve is all Federal-oriented. But are there possibilities of a consolidation within the Reserve and National Guard structures which could reduce operating costs and facilities requirements?

General RATTAN. Sir, I know of no plan at the present time to basically change the structure of the National Guard and USAR.

Occasionally to get our force structure into alignment the National Guard might gain an engineer battalion and USAR gain an artillery battalion, that type of swap-off, but a substantial change in the structure of the Guard and Reserve at this time I would not contemplate.

Mr. SIKES. Do you think that the possibilities have been adequately studied, or is it just one of these "don't touch" situations?

General RATTAN. Sir, as you know, that problem has been studied and restudied for many years and people think about it all the time but at the present time—

Mr. SIKES. You don't think there is any practical advantage?

General RATTAN. Not at the present time, no, sir.

General ROBERTS. Sir, were you asking about joint utilization of centers?

#### JOINT USE OF FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. I was going to get to that next. That again has been something of interest to this committee and not much progress has been made in joint use of facilities, but tell us what the situation is at this time.

General GREENLIEF. Sir, in the Army National Guard we had one project in the 1972 program, Lewiston, Maine. There was none in fiscal year 1973. In fiscal year 1974 we have a joint facility with the USAR in New Bern, N.C. Each project must be screened by the State Facilities Board which represents all the active services, and all of the Reserve components.

That judgment is reviewed at D.A. level and DOD level to insure that we are in fact making maximum utilization of joint construction and joint utilization. An area where much of this occurs but we really haven't said much about it in the past is in the very area you are talking about, in the training facilities.

For example, the Guard operates training facilities at Irwin and Roberts that I mentioned, Camp Shelby in Mississippi, Camp Grayling in Michigan, Camp Ripley in Minnesota, Blanding in Florida. Those facilities, even though operated by the Guard, do provide training facilities for the USAR. Over 50 percent of the Guard trains at active Army facilities in the summer. These active facilities train Active Army, Guard and Reserve troops, so in the training facility area there is much joint utilization.

The armory joint utilization is at the level I indicated which is about the level of progress you have been in previous years, sir.

General ROBERTS. For USAR, sir, we have two projects in the current budget and they are joint with Navy, Evansville, Ind., and Fremont, Nebr. I think it is of interest to the committee to know that 18 percent of all of our Reserve centers are joint usage.

Of those, 85 are with the Navy Reserve, 64 with the National Guard, 27 with the Air Force Reserve, 4 with the Marine Reserve, and 3 with the Coast Guard Reserve, and this number has been slowly advancing in the last few years.

Mr. SIKES. That has been our concern. It seems to have been advancing more slowly than desirable and that there should be more joint use. General Rattan, what is your response to that?

General RATTAN. Sir, we go through the screening process that General Greenleaf described. The problem frequently is that facilities just aren't in the same area. I was recently in Mississippi. That State is really checkerboarded with National Guard units and I would say the average size is companies or less and they are all over the State. You just don't team up that frequently with the USAR units.

We could provide you some more detail for the record.

[The information follows:]

As of the end of fiscal year 1973, there are 2,747 ARNG armories and 1,019 USAR centers throughout the United States. Of these facilities, 78 National Guard armories and 189 Army Reserve centers are utilized jointly with other Reserve or Active components. Facilities are also shared with activities of the Civil Service Commission, Office Equal Opportunity, Selective Service Commission, Defense Supply Agency, municipal governments, and colleges (including ROTC buildings). The Department of Defense procedures which were established several years ago to (1) assure maximum joint construction and/or utilization of facilities in fulfilling Reserve component requirements and (2) to provide recommendations and other pertinent data to assist the Department of the Army and the Office of the Secretary of Defense in making required determinations concerning the acquisition and utilization of Reserve component facilities, have been strengthened to insure compliance with the intent of Congress to emphasize joint construction. State Reserve Forces Facilities Boards, established in each State, serve as the media for collaboration of facility requirements among the Reserve components of the Armed Forces at the field level. These Boards, with members from each military department, the Army National Guard and the Coast Guard, where appropriate, maintain a facility inventory within each State as well as current short and long range facility requirements. They review each proposed new Reserve component construction project and submit recommendations relative to potential joint construction and/or joint utilization aspects to the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military departments. These recommendations include consideration as to the possible use of available space in existing Reserve component facilities or those of the Active Forces. The recommendations are submitted through and reviewed at each echelon of command both in the active establishment and the National Guard. Appropriate comments and recommendations are provided to the Chief, National Guard Bureau and the Chief, Army Reserve. The Office of Reserve Components consolidates the comments of the two components and submits the final recommendations to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Projects to be included in each annual Reserve forces military construction program are reviewed by the respective State Boards, in sufficient time to permit Board recommendations to be entered on DD form 1390's when budget programs are submitted each year. Every project is reviewed and updated by the State Boards and the military departments annually until it is approved for construction. By these procedures, a determination can be made as to the feasibility of joint construction in advance of the preparation of the annual military construction programs.

General ROBERTS. I think, sir, in answer to your question that because of the surrender of some areas by the other services our numbers will be increasing in this category.

The ones I mentioned earlier, Hanscom and Westover, are just typical examples.

#### RESERVE AIRCRAFT

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation on the aircraft population of the Army Reserve components?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, in the Army National Guard our authorization is 2,405 aircraft. We have on hand 1,800-plus, almost all modern first line aircraft.

The fixed-wing aircraft are almost out of our system. Pilotwise we are authorized 4,300 pilots and we have something like 4,100 pilots on board now. This is the fastest growing, most modern program in the Army Guard.

Mr. SIKES. What aircraft are you getting?

General GREENLIEF. In the Army Guard, sir, we are getting Hueys. We have CH-54, CH-47, OH-6's, OH-58's. We have one battalion plus one additional troop of OV-1's, the Mohawk. They are modern aircraft. We will be 100 percent filled on pilots at the end of this fiscal year. Aircraft filled will be perhaps the end of this fiscal year, if not by next.

On the Air Guard side, which I can address, or perhaps you would rather have me address—

Mr. SIKES. Go ahead. Let us get it all in the same place.

General GREENLIEF. Sir, in the Air Guard starting in fiscal year 1971 and completing in fiscal year 1974 we will have converted over 70 percent of the Air Guard, more modern aircraft.

We are now flying F-105's, F-4's, RF-4's. We still have RF-101's and F-101's in the Air Defense System.

We are phasing into the F-106 with the air defense fighter that the Air Force has. This year we will be converting three squadrons of F-100D's to A-7's with additional squadrons in the outyears.

The modernization program has been so rapid that it has been like drinking from a firehose. We have had major problems in conversion. I am proud to say, though, that of the 90 flying units in the Air National Guard that are rated on active Air Force ORI's only 16 are not now combat ready, and they will be as we complete the conversion process.

Mr. SIKES. Very good.

General ROBERTS. For the Army Reserve, sir, we are now authorized just under 500 aircraft. The great majority of these are rotary wing. Our fill is about 90 percent and the only reason it isn't higher is because we have had a little delay in getting the maintenance facilities which have been part of these budget requests.

We are equipped with the most modern Army aviation, the late model Hueys, the OH-58 observation type helicopter and the CH-47 Chinook and as far as personnel are concerned, we have 2,500 people in Army Reserve aviation units and in detachments that are part of other units.

We have three assault helicopter companies and three Chinook companies. We have a number of medical detachments that are evacuation type. We also have eight aircraft maintenance companies. I would say that we have made tremendous strides in aviation in the Army Reserve in the last 3 or 4 years since these assets have become available.

Mr. SIKES. What are your major air operating bases? Do you expect to expand to additional bases in the near future?

General RATTAN. The Reserve components do not normally operate major air bases, but as tenants do participate in base operations. We use whatever hangar and aviation support facilities can be made available at Active Army, Navy, and Air Force bases. As exceptions, we have three airfields namely Olathe Naval Air Station, Kans.; Los Alamitos Naval Air Station, Calif., and Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn. As we have the only flight activity on these bases, we perform all flight line operations. In all, the Army Reserve has 34 flight facilities and the National Guard has 81 facilities throughout the United States. We recently have submitted requests for portions of nine Air Force and Navy air bases to satisfy some of our aviation requirements.

Mr. SIKES. To what extent are you utilizing Air Force or Navy assets for this purpose?

General RATTAN. With the accelerated issues of aircraft to the Reserve components, availability of adequate airfields became essential. Naturally, our units must be located near potential source of aviation personnel which, to some degree, relates to the mass popu-

lation areas. We have resolved some of our airfield requirements by acquiring space at the following airfields: Olathe Naval Air Station, Kans.; Dobbins Air Force Base, Ga.; Twin Cities Naval Air Station, Minn.; Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.; Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio; Los Alamitos Naval Air Station, Calif.; Dallas Naval Air Station, Tex.; Selfridge Air Force Base, Mich.; Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Pa.; Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo.; Mather Air Force Base, Calif.; Wheeler Air Force Base, Hawaii; Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn.; and Bangor Air Force Base, Maine. In addition, negotiations are underway to acquire facilities at the following locations: Otis Air Force Base, Mass.; Glenview Naval Air Station, Ill.; Scott Air Force Base, Ill.; Quonset Point Naval Air Station, R.I.; Forbes Air Force Base, Kans.; Hanscom Field, Mass.; McCoy Air Force Base, Fla.; Westover Air Force Base, Mass.; and Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif.

#### USE OF RESERVES IN COMBAT

Mr. SIKES. I would like, General Rattan, to have a summary of the participation and contributions of the Reserve components during the Korean war, the last time that major utilization was made of your resources.

General RATTAN. The Korean war?

Mr. SIKES. The last time utilization was made of your resources.

General RATTAN. We had about 20,000 involved in Vietnam.

Mr. SIKES. I want you to give us a summary for the record.

Mr. PATTEN. His question was Korea but you said Vietnam.

General RATTAN. I realize he wants a summary for Korea. I was just volunteering that we had about 20,000 in Vietnam.

Mr. SIKES. I want that also, but your last major participation was in Korea. I want you to tell us what you did then and then follow it with a summary of what you did in the Vietnamese war.

General RATTAN. Right, sir.

[The information follows:]

The partial mobilization of U.S. Army Reserve component units after the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in 1950 resulted in approximately 380,000 personnel being called to active duty. Between June 30, 1950, and June 30, 1952, a total of 138,600 Army National Guard personnel (including 8 divisions, 3 regimental combat teams, and combat support and combat service support units for a total of 714 company-sized units) were mobilized. During the same period the Army Reserve mobilized 240,500 personnel (including 969 combat, combat support, and combat service support units and many thousands of individual reinforcements, both commissioned and enlisted). The major units deployed overseas from those Army Reserve component units which were mobilized were four Army National Guard Divisions, with two serving in Korea and two stationed in Germany.

As a result of the Vietnam conflict approximately 20,000 Army Reserve component personnel were mobilized to provide additional units for deployment to Vietnam, to reinforce the Strategic Army Force (STRAF), and to reduce personnel turbulence in the Conus forces. The Army National Guard provided 34 units which included 2 infantry brigades and 12,234 personnel. The Army Reserve provided 1 infantry battalion, 41 other smaller units and filler personnel for a total of 7,640 Reservists mobilized. Of the 76 Army Reserve component units mobilized, 43 units (35 Army Reserve; 8 National Guard) were selected for deployment to Vietnam. The remaining 33 units (7 Army; 26 National Guard) were used in Conus to fill gaps in the STRAF.

## ARMY RESERVE PROGRAM JUSTIFICATION

Mr. SIKES. General Roberts, tell us briefly about the requirements for command and control facilities. Are these replacements or new requirements?

General ROBERTS. Sir, with regard to the request for command and control facilities, these are needed for proper utilization of our senior headquarters. One illustration in particular is the 76th Division Headquarters in Connecticut which is now cramped in space in an old armory in which they are using some of their administrative offices in locker rooms and even a boiler room, and this is just not suitable for a command headquarters which has the responsibility which our headquarters have today.

And the others requested are along that line.

Mr. SIKES. Could you lease these facilities?

General ROBERTS. Yes, sir, they could be leased, but in our judgment it would be more economical to expand what we have now or construct new because the lease cost over a period of years would amount to quite a sizable amount of money.

Mr. SIKES. To what extent have you surveyed the base closure actions to see if your requirements for this type of space could be met by the utilization of existing assets?

General ROBERTS. We have always carefully screened all closure and excessing actions. Some past examples were Fort Totten, N. Y., Caven Point, N. J., Olathe Naval Air Station, Kans., Los Alamitos Naval Air Station, Calif., and Sand Point Naval Air Station, Wash. We look not only for existing facilities but future construction sites and training areas. Naturally, we have not always received everything we ask for, but in most cases where our requirements are fully justified and specific, we do obtain the necessary facilities or land areas. In the most recent base closure announcements we have identified our requirements and these are being evaluated at this time. In this area I would like to add that if we are successful, and I believe we will be, we will eliminate several million dollars in our long-range construction requirements.

Mr. SIKES. Could you discuss the requirements for additions to medical facilities?

General ROBERTS. Our current construction provides training centers for nonspecific units. These centers will accommodate most units at about 85 percent efficiency. Since our units are frequently reorganized—4- to 5-year cycle—this appears prudent. If we designed 100 percent for the original occupying unit, we would be down to the 85 percent level on the first or second reorganization anyway. However, some units just don't fit the standard. Medical units and command and control units are good examples. We have developed special facility additions for these special units.

In the case of medical units, the space allows the typical medical equipment from their training sets to be placed in a training area and used. While the Medical Corps personnel are professionally qualified, they do need hands-on training on the Army peculiar equipment which would be used in a field or station hospital. A bonus we obtain

from the medical additions is that physicals for the Reserve can be accomplished wherever we have a USAR hospital. Another potential major advantage is that the medical addition coupled with the normal Reserve center provides an emergency treatment facility in time of natural disaster. This latter point is of great significance.

Mr. SIKES. In a great many locations you are requesting facilities which will, in many cases, double the manpower capability of the Reserve center. Is this indicative of hopes that the Reserve forces will continue to grow?

General ROBERTS. First let me provide a little background. During 1969 and 1970 all existing USAR centers were rerated reflecting actual capability to accommodate a training load. In many cases centers were determined to be grossly overloaded. For example a 50-man center might have a 135-man unit assigned. We have been modernizing and expanding these centers since that time. Since we are attempting to solve our most critical problems and accommodate our highest priority units, many existing centers will be markedly increased in capacity. This work is necessary to accommodate our current mandated strength and no more. Our big task is to overcome our inadequate facilities rather than develop a base for expansion.

Mr. SIKES. In locations where you propose to construct a new center, are you replacing an existing facility, or are you building a new Reserve center where none now exists? Provide details for the record.

General ROBERTS. The Army Reserve construction program was initiated in 1950. Our oldest constructed center is about 22 years old. To date none of our constructed centers have required replacement. Construction was just one of several sources of acquisition. The other sources were purchase, donation, transfer, permit, and lease. When a massive program is initiated, many less than desirable facilities are acquired in order to get the show on the road. Our current facilities range from modern centers to pre-Civil War buildings. We are replacing the most inadequate facilities on a priority basis. Essentially, we consider inadequacy, cost of operation, mobilization priority of occupying unit, and other factors both tangible and intangible. As a general rule, all new construction is in the local area of the facility to be replaced. The only exception would be for a unit which cannot maintain strength. In this case the flag might be relocated to a more successful recruiting area.

Mr. SIKES. At several locations you request aircraft facilities. What aircraft activities are included in the Army Reserves? How many flying units are there, and how many men are involved?

General ROBERTS. In the Army Reserve structure we have 11 flying units, the 12th is authorized for activation, and we also have 108 aviation sections which are part of larger units (e.g., aviation section of infantry brigades). In the flying units there are about 1,300 people and in the sections there are about 1,200 people involved. These flying units and sections have their aircraft located in 34 flight facilities, at which they are operated and maintained. The request for flight facilities is to provide, at those particular locations, more security for the aircraft and adequate training and maintenance space for those involved.

Mr. SIKES. Can you identify savings in connection with any of these projects, such as leased space which will no longer be needed?

General ROBERTS. Yes, we can identify savings for leased space and in some cases it is significant, however, in most areas it is a case of having to accept "Hobson's choice" and lease whatever is on the market when we initially organize a Reserve unit. Many of these buildings were marginally adequate in the 1950's when we had cadre and half strength units with only token equipment. The vast majority were clearly identified as totally inadequate when the 1960's saw significant numbers of full strength units. Again, the end of Vietnam allowed nearly full equipment issues and compounded our facility problems. Our situation is that the facility we occupy may be all that is locally available and totally inadequate for our present needs and it may be quite inexpensive in terms of rent. The point is that lease savings are only one of several points to be considered.

#### ARMY NATIONAL GUARD PROGRAM JUSTIFICATION

Mr. SIKES. General Greenlief, have you acquired all of the necessary sites for the projects which you propose?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir; the States have acquired all the sites.

Mr. SIKES. Yes, we understand that.

#### PROGRAM CHANGES

To what extent has your fiscal year 1973 program differed from that which was presented to the committee last year? Which were the major projects which were deleted and substituted?

[The information follows:]

Major projects deleted are as follows:

Alaska : Saint Marys Mission, one-unit scout armory-----	69
California :	
Camp Roberts, annual training equipment pool-----	100
Palm Dale, 1-unit armory-----	284
Illinois :	
Marseilles, organizational maintenance shop-----	144
Marseilles, 25-meter range-----	99
Decatur, Army aviation support facility-----	640
Indiana : Indianapolis, motor vehicle storage compound-----	52
Michigan : Lapeer, 1-unit armory-----	259
New Jersey :	
Sea Girt, 2-unit armory-----	566
Sea Girt, organizational maintenance shop-----	149
North Dakota : Cavalier, 1-unit armory-----	201
Oregon :	
Camp Withycombe, training facility-----	73
Grants Pass, organizational maintenance shop-----	125
Pennsylvania :	
Hershey, 1-unit armory-----	317
New Brighton, 1-unit armory-----	322
Tennessee : Dickson, 1-unit armory-----	280
Vermont : Brattleboro, 1-unit armory-----	275
Wisconsin :	
Antigo, 1-unit armory-----	219
Madison, armory addition-----	114

Major projects added are as follows :

California :	
Camp Roberts, training facilities (increment 3)-----	384
Mather, Army aviation support facility-----	613
Florida : Camp Blanding, training facility (sewer)-----	80

Massachusetts: Ayer, combined support maintenance shop (rehabilitation) -----	83
New Jersey:	
Merce County, 2-unit armory -----	453
Mercer County, Army aviation support facility -----	1, 706
Mercer County, organizational maintenance shop -----	130
North Dakota: Mandan, 1-unit armory -----	258
Oregon: Medford, organizational maintenance shop -----	125
Pennsylvania: Muir (Indiantown Gap Military Reservation), Army aviation support facility -----	2, 491
South Carolina: Greenville, organizational maintenance shop -----	118
Tennessee: Centerville, 1-unit armory -----	280
Wisconsin: Monroe, 1-unit armory -----	225

#### VALIDITY OF REQUESTS

Mr. SIKES. Do you feel there is a valid requirement for all of the projects requested this year and that you can award a majority of them by July 1, 1974?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir; I consider all the projects valid. Based on our obligation performance, of 94 percent of the total money available in fiscal year 1973. I feel confident we will award practically all of these projects during fiscal year 1974.

Mr. SIKES. At several locations you describe the project as a "one unit plus armory" or "two unit plus armory." Please explain exactly what this means.

General GREENLIEF. A one unit plus armory is an armory that has one company size unit assigned plus a portion of another unit. A two unit armory plus two company size units assigned plus a portion of another unit.

Mr. SIKES. What is the difference between a type A armory and other types? Provide details for the record.

[The information follows:]

A type A armory is an armory that has a platoon sized strength of 55 to 70 personnel, is a subordinate element of another unit and does not include the unit headquarters. Other type armories are designed for strengths greater than 55 that include the headquarters element of the unit. For example.

<i>One unit armory</i>	<i>Design strength</i>
Type A, Platoon (subordinate elements) -----	55-75
Type B -----	55-75
Type C -----	75-100
Type D -----	Over 100

A one unit plus armory indicates that there is a company size unit assigned plus a portion of another unit.

Mr. SIKES. You propose to build bachelor officers quarters at Camp Joseph T. Robinson, Ark. Are these for Regular or Reserve officers? Do you usually provide such quarters out of the National Guard budget?

General GREENLIEF. These are two 20-man officer barracks for use of National Guard and Army Reserve officers during annual training periods. They are of the same austere type design and construction as officer barracks provided at major State operated National Guard training sites out of the National Guard budget.

Mr. SIKES. Most of the projects are for armories, maintenance facilities, et cetera. Are your training camp facilities in acceptable condi-

tion, or is there work which needs to be done? How much will such work cost, and when do you plan to request it?

Provide details for the record.

[The information follows:]

Most facilities that exist are in an acceptable condition. However, more are needed to be constructed to accommodate our needs. Construction requirements are now estimated at approximately \$62 million. We plan to ask for some of this construction each year and to complete the program within the next 8 years.

#### BACKLOG

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Davis, do you have general questions?

Mr. DAVIS. Tell us how you develop the backlog figures.

General RATTAN. The backlog figures?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

General RATTAN. In 1970, through the cooperation of the Guard Bureau, the Chief of Army Reserve, and CONARC they made a survey of all the facilities in the Guard and in the Reserve and what they needed in order to bring it up to acceptable standards.

That was the basis of developing the 10-year program. On an annual basis since then we tried to refine the data, and then programed requirements out to a 10-year program. That is the way it was accomplished. It was done on an actual survey of the locations.

Mr. DAVIS. Where did the input come from?

General RATTAN. It came from the National Guard Bureau through the various States and it came through CONARC and the engineer structure in the Active Army for the USAR facilities.

Mr. DAVIS. I would assume that this is something that does need periodic updating, doesn't it? Is this constantly being done?

General ROBERTS. Constant updating. I think a little background would be helpful. Prior to World War II there simply were no Reserve units other than pretty much paper organizations. There were officers assigned but there were no facilities for them and after World War II it was decided to provide for units in the Army Reserve with enlisted personnel and physical plant.

Certainly it took awhile to get this going and so in the very earliest days, of which I am an experienced man, we had to meet in very unfortunate situations, in whatever space somebody would give us, occasionally in a post office, or in a Federal courtroom. I am talking about the early days of the Army Reserve.

So finally we began to get some money for some construction, and those earliest buildings started in 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, are now the ones that we are asking for expansions of. But we are way, way short of what we needed.

As a matter of fact, there was a hiatus in the late 1960's in which there was no new construction authorized for the Army Reserve.

So this whole picture has been one of evolution and one which needs to be upgraded, and the 10-year plan was studied very carefully and is constantly being reevaluated in the light of new developments.

In other words, where we can get a facility from some other service we will take it but the whole backlog has been studied out very well.

Mr. DAVIS. So that each year prior to submitting a construction request, you are saying there has been a screening and an updating process that has taken place?

General ROBERTS. Yes, sir; there have been instances where projects which were visualized have been scrapped completely because of changes in the situation where some other Government building may become available.

#### JOINT USE

Mr. DAVIS. Just pursuing a little more the concept that the chairman raised, I think it is not too difficult to understand some of the problems of joint use of administrative facilities or headquarters facilities, but when you get into the training area it may be different. Let me see if I can put my finger on it by using an example that I know a little bit about.

Let us take the Wisconsin situation where you have Camp McCoy, you have Camp Douglas, and you have Volk Field, all up in that same area.

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. To what extent are those jointly used, and to the extent that they are not jointly used, why couldn't they be more so?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, Camp McCoy of course is an inactive Army training center used jointly by Guard and Reserve. Camp Douglas is the location of the USPFÖ for Wisconsin. There are limited training facilities there and they certainly are available to——

Mr. DAVIS. PFO?

General GREENLIEF. U.S. Property and Fiscal Office. I am sorry. The Federal officer on active duty that is carried on the table of distribution allowances of the National Guard Bureau. He is the State officer on active duty. It is the location of our supply operation and maintenance operation also in Wisconsin.

Some limited training facilities there are certainly available to USAR or any other component when not used by the Guard.

Volk Field is the Air Guard base in Wisconsin. It is an annual training site. It is utilized by Air National Guard fighter units from all over the country. The bombing ranges there would be available to any U.S. Air Force Reserve unit whose unit was scheduled for that type of training.

General ROBERTS. I would like to add a little bit on Camp McCoy. It is funded entirely by USAR, both the military construction and the O. & M.

It is known as an inactive installation. However, that increasingly is becoming an incorrect term because it is being used all year round not only as a logistical base for the Army Reserve in about five States up there but also for inactive duty training throughout the year.

Increasingly we are putting people in on weekends to such installations as McCoy. It is used heavily by the Guard as well as the Army Reserve and in some instances in the wintertime by special units of the Active Army.

I would say that McCoy is one of the best examples of good utilization of training areas in the country and we are very proud of it.

General RATTAN. Another thing to consider, even if you are talking about a facility that is owned or operated by the National Guard, such as Camp Blanding in Florida, is mission training. In the last couple of years we have emphasized the mission concept during their

summer training. As you know, the USAR has the majority of the support-type units and the National Guard the tactical units, and you will find almost invariably at these camps that commanders have gotten together and planned their summer program so that they are using the USAR support units to support the National Guard tactical units.

You will find the USAR truck companies working at the support facilities. USAR unit personnel are issuing the rations to both USAR and National Guard units. They have people checking the troops in, issuing their clothes, and performing many other post support activities. This is getting to be a very common practice and worthwhile training. They work together as they would in an actual situation and it is of benefit to both.

#### FEDERAL AND STATE RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. DAVIS. In terms of operations what are the responsibilities of the State, and in terms of facilities what are the responsibilities of the State, with respect to the National Guard?

General GREENLIEF. In the armory program the State provides 25 percent of the cost of the building under approved Federal criteria. If they want to build a building in excess of the Federal criteria, they fund 100 percent of that. The State enters into a contract with the Federal Government in which the State agrees to equip and maintain the armory for 25 years. In return for this the State receives title to the facility.

With reference to the training facilities, such as Camp Roberts and Fort Irwin, those are cases where the property is owned by the U.S. Army, licensed to the State for the operation of a training site that supports many other States and all components. In those cases the National Guard Bureau funds the operation 100 percent. The States do provide some State employees and they provide the management, control, the maintenance, and run the operation.

We have a different situation in Camp Ripley in Minnesota, your neighbor there. Camp Ripley is entirely State owned. The land had been purchased by State appropriations. Much of the construction work there in the past was all State. There are a number of State employees who operate it.

We, however, fund for 100 percent of the operation and maintenance costs, opening and closing costs relating to the camp. But again, we service not just Minnesota but many, many other States and all components. That generally is the operational mode, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. When you say "equips", are you speaking of an armory?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir, with chairs, dining tables, speaker systems, the interior furnishings of the armory. They provide such things as dishes and some additional mess equipment.

The actual cost of a National Guard armory really comes out more 50-50 than 75-25 when you consider all of the facts including that the State donates the real estate.

Mr. DAVIS. These figures that we have before us when we are talking about National Guard facilities, are we talking simply about the Federal portion of the funding?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir. We are talking Federal portion only, and these figures that you see on each of the armory projects you add to that 25 percent for the State cost plus the land free, and no maintenance costs at all to the Federal Government.

Mr. DAVIS. So when we are talking about the Guard construction program—take your actual figures—you have a what size program?

General GREENLIEF. We have a \$40 million program, and we are talking about \$53 million worth of bricks and mortar.

#### ATTRACTION OF MANPOWER

Mr. DAVIS. I understand you fellows are competing with each other for personnel. Assume we have one available man. Why would he go into the Reserves or why would he go into the Guard?

General GREENLIEF. I would be happy to provide you the "sales pitch" designed to achieve just exactly that.

Mr. DAVIS. I suppose we would have to give General Roberts equal time.

General ROBERTS. Yes, we need equal time.

General GREENLIEF. As a matter of fact we went on about the same thing with the House Armed Services Committee.

General ROBERTS. Mr. Nedzi asked the same question.

Generally speaking I would say there are three times as many Guard armories as Reserve centers.

So in many instances there is no competition there. Where there are both Reserve and Guard facilities in the same community, the units are different. The Guard, of course, is heavily combat oriented, although we have combat units as well. We have many things to offer a young person that may not be available in the community in the Guard and vice versa.

General GREENLIEF. I think it is fair to say all components of all services are competing for this available body of manpower. The reasons that attract a man to one program as compared to another depend an awful lot on his interests, what skill he wants trained in, and whether he wants to be a civilian or full-time soldier or airman. We all present our views and our sales points.

In the Guard the strongest thing we have to offer is the very, very close tie with community and State which provides the opportunity to be of service to the State. We are extremely proud of that. We find that is something that attracts young people today.

Mr. DAVIS. When a Governor of a State calls up the National Guard, who pays for that?

General GREENLIEF. The State does, sir. They pay the personnel and operational costs.

General ROBERTS. I think you would be interested to know the Army Reserve is also heavily involved in community action which does tie these units into their home community more than was true in the past.

We have the great majority of our units doing various jobs for the community. Insofar as possible these are related to their military assignments, such as the transportation unit that will remove derelict cars from the streets of a town where they get beyond the city fathers' capability.

Mr. LONG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

#### UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER

Mr. LONG. My son was a captain in a transportation company at Curtis Bay for several years. He had a morale problem of having to load and offload dummy cargo because the unions wouldn't let them load real cargo, which I think is deplorable. Anytime the unions tell the military how to conduct training operations I think they are stepping way out of line. Anyway, that is the way it was.

So my son, who certainly ran a fine unit, got his people out cleaning up the neighborhood. He ran into great problems. In the first place, there wasn't any place to dump the trash. He had to pay \$10 a load out of his own pocket to dump a load, so he hauled it down to Fort Meade.

After a while, for some reason, the higherups got sick of that and stopped the whole thing.

I really don't think your problem is in buildings. I think your problem is to keep men busy doing things they feel are meaningful in terms of our national defense. There, in my opinion, is the big problem. It may vary greatly from one area to another.

My son has joined the National Guard, and I think they have fine commanders in Generals Warfield and Ogletree. They are first-rate people. You have a great problem not only in the Army but in the Air National Guard. I can give you a number of cases.

#### COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Mr. SIKES. I am glad you brought up the question of community support. Let me comment on that.

I had understood that you were getting the Reserves more actively engaged in community support programs as a means of enlisting community interest and support, and as a means of giving the local units more of an opportunity for community support. Will you tell us something about that?

General ROBERTS. Yes, sir. We have a very fine program going, and we have isolated problems. There is no question about that. Generally speaking, our units are involved in hands-on training of one of three types on their weekend training. First of all, it is hands-on training with good modern equipment which we didn't have before, strictly military and military training.

Second, it can be military equipment which is being used to train the military skills but concurrently provide for community benefits. This has to do with engineers for one thing. Our engineer battalions are working every weekend all over the United States doing a tremendous job of work in public parks, youth camps, other recreational areas which are approved. Incidentally all of these projects are cleared with the unions and the contractors before we get involved in planning and doing the work.

Mr. SIKES. Is this being done generally?

General ROBERTS. Generally, definitely.

Mr. SIKES. I wish you would expand this for the record because I

think it is a very important thing. We won't take the time here. I want to be sure it is being done everywhere.

General ROBERTS. We have a record of community achievement here which we are very proud of. We have it very well documented and will be glad to submit it for the record.

Mr. SIKES. Very good.

[The information follows:]

During the last 4 years the Army Reserve has been selected three times for national honors by the Public Relations Society of America, winning the coveted "Silver Anvil Award." The members in the Army Reserve's more than 3,400 units and hundreds of thousands of citizen-soldiers are dedicated to service in 2 ways. They serve the Nation by staying ready to defend its freedom against external threats, and they serve the more than 1,000 communities in which they live, work, and train by acting on the increasing number of problems these communities face. Their community efforts are, in most instances, related to their training missions. In addition, much of the time spent on these improvement projects is volunteered by individuals. Their community concern—and action—is growing steadily both in the number and duration of the projects in which they take part. The Army Reserve's community involvement programs give young men and women an opportunity to improve the places in which they live. Areas of particular emphasis in the program include abating air and water pollution, recycling of waste materials, conservation programs, general cleanup campaigns, construction and improvement of recreational facilities for youth groups, and other socially positive or humanitarian activities.

#### ROLE OF STATE GOVERNORS

Mr. DAVIS. Outline for us, if you would, the relationship of the Governors of the various States to the National Guard. We have the State adjutant generals and so forth. How does that relationship fit in?

General GREENLIEF. By Constitution and law the Governor is commander of the National Guard in inactive duty status. To accomplish his purpose, he appoints a cabinet level adjutant general. The adjutant general's qualifications for appointment depends on State law. If, as is the case in most all cases, the adjutant general is fully qualified as a general officer, and he is federally recognized by the National Guard as a member of the Army or Air National Guard of the United States, which is a Federal component of the Army or the Air Force.

The adjutant general exercises the command for the Governor. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau has a long list of functions prescribed in Army regulations, but in essence I would describe it as though the Chief of the National Guard Bureau is expected to achieve results as if he had commands which he does not.

Mr. PATTEN. You are speaking of yourself?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir, and my predecessors and successors.

If you were to design a system, sit down and build a Reserve component, I don't believe that today anybody would conceive of a system such as the National Guard. The National Guard system is a direct reflection of the earliest founding of our country. That is what the system was. The best thing I can say for the National Guard system, it has been worked for 300 years, it has produced outstanding results. I anticipate somebody like me 600 years from now being able to say it has been a great organization for 900 years.

I guess the straighter answer to your question, sir, is we do it by a combination of persuasion, reasoning, coercing, threatening, whatever

it takes. I am delighted to say the system works because of the people in the system.

Mr. PATTEN. As a practical matter, do most of the Governors seek your recommendations for the adjutant general?

General GREENLIEF. Very few, sir. There really isn't any reason why he should. The Governor is the elected representative of the people of his State and is in a much better position to know the people of his State than I am, and it is a State responsibility. I think the results have been outstanding. They select good people. It is a big important job. He is going to rely on that man to be able to produce the troops to meet the emergencies that he, the Governor, needs to submit them to. They don't indulge in political hanky-panky in the process of selecting them. They select people who can and will do the job.

Mr. LONG. Certainly in Maryland.

General GREENLIEF. I think that is a very good statement considering that General —?

Mr. LONG. He is an outstanding man, probably as outstanding a National Guard general officer as ever existed.

General GREENLIEF. I would say he is a man of towering integrity and now General Warfield. Gen. George Gelston, now dead, did an outstanding job in the interim.

Mr. LONG. If you have the same tradition in other States, I applaud it.

General GREENLIEF. In the period of time I have been involved, which, as your chairman suggested, has been a long time, I can tell you that there has been a vast improvement in the military qualifications of the adjutants general.

Mr. SIKES. When you spoke of the next 600 years, I just wondered what you personally had in mind?

General GREENLIEF. I am talking about the many fine Guardsmen coming down the pike, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Speaking of outstanding National Guard officers, I have to put in a word for Florida, of course, with Henry McMillan, who is president of the National Guard Association, of whom we are very proud.

General GREENLIEF. I would say Henry McMillan is probably the Milton Record of today.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate that because I have the highest regard and respect for him.

#### QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS

Mr. DAVIS. Let's take a case of an out-and-out unqualified, ineffective appointment. Is there anything you can do about it?

General GREENLIEF. I know of none like that.

Mr. DAVIS. You have told us you knew of none. Let's assume that were to happen.

General GREENLIEF. If there were such a case. I am sorry I misunderstood you. If a Governor appointed somebody that I considered to be totally ineffective, I would recognize that the law gave him that authority and it was his responsibility, and I would do nothing about

that. I would, however, insure that the National Guard units continued to perform to Federal standards. If they did not, I would first put them on probation. If they did not improve, I would withdraw Federal recognition and therewith goes all of the Federal support. That is a very big stick that I keep behind my back. I don't need to show that often. Everybody in the Guard knows it is there.

Mr. SIKES. That statement, General Greenlief, I think puts you securely in the category of distinguished and strong National Guard leaders also.

General GREENLIEF. Thank you, sir.

Mr. LONG. Have you ever used that stick?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir. Not as bluntly as I have just described it.

Mr. LONG. Have you ever withdrawn recognition from a State National Guard?

General GREENLIEF. In the National Guard we are doing everything possible to maintain the strength mandated by the Congress and desired by us and needed by the Army. Recently a number of States were failing to produce the strength that we believed they should. I proposed to them that since they were failing in strength, we inactivate some units and relocate them in other States. We are in the process of doing that now.

That is not a case where they had already failed to the point that we would withdraw Federal recognition. It was a case where we could see it coming and we moved it someplace else.

If a unit fails in its annual general inspection, the immediate result is that it is put on probation. If it does not——

Mr. LONG. How many currently are on probation?

General GREENLIEF. Out of the 3,265 units not more than 10, I believe. When a unit goes on probation the problems get resolved or the State proposes to relocate the unit.

Mr. DAVIS. Who, within a State, selects your local unit commanders?

General GREENLIEF. Of the officers?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

General GREENLIEF. Sir, the selection is done by the chain of command that exists, the organizational structure, starting with the adjutant general, division commander, brigade commander, battalion commander. Starting right out at company level, our officers come from either ROTC, State Officer Candidate School or Active Army Officer Candidate School. They are screened based on their performance. Enlisted men must be members of the Guard a year before they go to OCS. They pass the screening board. Their promotional requirements are dependent upon a combination of time in grade, physical and mental qualification, and, most stringent of all, the military educational requirement. For promotion in the National Guard, the officers must meet the Department of the Army military education standards which are very strict and very difficult.

It is interesting to note to my knowledge there are no such requirements imposed on Active Army officers as a matter of regulation. The selection boards of course in the Army produce the same thing.

The officer is boarded. He is considered by a board of active Army officers and National Guard officers. If the Active Army member

votes no, the officer is not federally recognized. Those procedures come to my office. They are screened where we assure that they in fact do meet the Federal requirements, and we federally recognize them.

Mr. DAVIS. Then he must be certified or recognized by the National Guard?

General GREENLIEF. By the Army, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. All right. Is his designation as commanding officer of that unit made then by the State adjutant general?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir. The Constitution preserves the appointment and promotion of the officers to the Governor of the State. If they assign somebody who is not qualified, we would react. It comes to us and we would be aware because we have his file. We would go back and say sorry about that, he is not qualified. They don't do it because they know that would occur, and they have the desire to have the best qualified people also.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Ewen.

#### CONSTRUCTION DECISIONS

Mr. McEWEN. In looking through the books, I notice that sometimes in the Reserve program and sometimes in the Guard there is construction at various posts. How is it determined, General Greenlief, whether it is to be in the National Guard's construction program or regular Army or Reserve?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, I would guess about 6 years ago when General Abrams was Vice Chief of Staff of the Army he directed that the inactive Army posts be surveyed to determine what component was the majority user and that that component would from that point on become responsible for the major construction. The Guard's part of that was Camp Drum, Fort Chaffee, and Camp Roberts at that time. Roberts is now a National Guard facility.

Other than that, in the Guard you have sites that are State-owned and operated. That obviously then is a Guard requirement.

General ROBERTS. USAR picked up Indiantown Gap, A. P. Hill, Camp Pickett, and Camp McCoy for construction responsibility.

Of course we are putting Reserve centers on some active installations here and there where the land is available and it seems to suit your requirements. We fund for it.

Mr. McEWEN. General Roberts, earlier you spoke of the period right after World War II when Reserve outfits used post offices or whatever they could find.

General ROBERTS. Yes.

Mr. McEWEN. I recall that period of time in my own community when at one time the Reserve outfit was using space at the post office.

What I wondered about then, and have wondered about since, and I have the opportunity today, at long last, to ask the question, why this happened when we had a National Guard armory that was built—maybe 50 or 60 years ago, a massive old stone building. It has been well maintained, used by the New York National Guard 1 night a week for drill. Why hasn't a facility like that then and why couldn't it now be used by the Reserve?

General ROBERTS. As I indicated a little while ago we have a joint

utilization with a number in National Guard armories. However, it is a small percentage. I think the principal reason is simply physical space. It is not how often people meet there, it is now increasingly the amount of equipment that they have and different type units, and also increasingly the number of full-time people.

A typical small armory in a county seat just can't handle both for several reasons.

General GREENLIEF. I might take the big old stone armory you referred to as an example, and not knowing specifically which one you are talking about I can't be specific. But I can describe for you what the problems are.

The big old stone armory utilized at that point in time probably has 1 drill night a week if there were only one unit therein. If there were more, you have multiple usage and multiple nights. True the classrooms and drill floor would be unused, but the offices, the supply rooms, the arms vault, the maintenance shop would be fully utilized all the time. So to bring in additional units, you then have to add offices, supply rooms, shops, and all of the ancilliary features of an armory.

In that type of building it might be as expensive or more expensive to expand it and add to it as it would be for General Roberts to have built a new facility. Or you may well have a real estate problem as we have had in New York City where the armory occupies all of the available land and you couldn't expand it for lack of real estate.

Those kinds of problems are the things that limited our ability to accommodate the USAR as they began to build after World War II. As we have all said, there are many cases where that sort of thing has occurred.

#### CAMP DRUM SITUATION

Mr. McEWEN. I am thinking of my own area that I am familiar with in northern New York. We have a lot of fine old National Guard armories. You have constructed in small communities new Reserve centers. At the same time there is another facility in that area where there are about 100,000 Guard and Reserve troops that come annually for training. I am referring to Camp Drum. Now we are in the season when we are getting all of the distinguished visitors, the Governors will soon be giving out press releases to our papers about the deplorable conditions and lack of facilities.

We got a new one in it now, a State senator. He said Vernon Downs—Vernon Downs is a racetrack in the area—"Vernon Downs provides better housing for its horses than the Government is providing for its men on camp on 2-week Reserve duty."

He is just warming up in that opening statement.

Mr. SIKES. I would say he wasn't planning to be a State senator always.

Mr. McEWEN. He said welfare recipients in this State live under better conditions than they do. He mentioned uncomfortable cots, shabby condition of buildings, poor water heaters as well as screenless doors as conditions that should be corrected. Then he went on to raise the question of what the State might do to improve things and to improve recruiting efforts.

I have thought, gentlemen, as I look at these Reserve facilities that we have for drill 1 day a week and where a man does return to his

home after that period of drill, he can put up with some inconvenience. Then we have a facility, such as Camp Drum, where he is obliged to live for 2 weeks where the housing is inadequate, messing facilities are less than adequate, et cetera.

By the way, I am delighted to see general mention of a new switchboard in the building at Camp Drum for the telephone center. Mr. Chairman, they have a 1941 operation up there. I just hope no one on the committee ever gets an urgent call as Mr. Patten has had with some constituents to get communications through up there. It is totally inadequate.

Mr. PATTEN. We voted a lot of money a couple of years ago to improve the telephone system.

Mr. McEWEN. I don't know what happened. There is still equipment sitting around in crates that never did get installed.

General GREENLIEF. I can agree with most of what you have said about Camp Drum. It hasn't been a resort area in any manner of speaking. Certainly the housing conditions were deplorable. Some of it still is. I think probably the messhalls being part of the most deplorable part. That very condition is a primary reason that led General Abrams to this decision I mentioned earlier.

In fiscal year 1969 the Army National Guard put \$619,600 into Drum. In fiscal year 1970, \$737,000; in 1971, \$174,000; in 1972, \$138,000; in 1973, \$376,000 for an ammunition storage igloo, plus \$1,280,886 to rehab building 82.

Mr. McEWEN. At that point, it is about the beginning of facilities for the troops. Up until then it is mostly ranges, ammunition storage, things needed for field training. Right?

General GREENLIEF. Yes. The reason is twofold. No. 1, users who trained at Camp Drum in stating their requirements put the highest priority on the training facilities. CONARC and FORSCOM establish construction priorities at Drum. Even though we fund it they are responsible for the training. So the actual project was based on the requirements as stated by the using unit as evaluated by CONARC and FORSCOM.

The first and foremost problem was the sewage plant which was certainly harmful to the community and the sewage it was dumping into the river.

In fiscal year 1974, responding directly to your concern about the buildings, in the budget we are now addressing we are spending \$1,272,000 on Camp Drum. Of that \$875,000 is for the rehabilitation of 50 enlisted barracks, \$20,000 for the rehabilitation of one officer barracks, \$105,000 for the rehabilitation of 14 messhalls and \$272,000 for the telephone exchange.

Mr. SIKES. On that happy note let me ask the witness to be sure Mr. McEwen has that list for whatever use appears appropriate.

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir. And we can identify for you specifically in the project book you have, which we will do.

Mr. McEWEN. Is there anything on replacement of the hospital lost by the fire?

General GREENLIEF. The hospital was a problem for a number of years.

I will ask what the status of it is.

Mr. ARON. The one ward that burned down is not being replaced. They have used another facility within the hospital complex.

General GREENLIEF. We did rehab the hospital though, did we not?

Mr. ARON. Yes.

General GREENLIEF. It cost approximately \$300,000.

Mr. SIKES. Is it adequate at the present time?

General GREENLIEF. I believe it is, sir. Primarily the hospital facility we are providing is not hospitalization, but a dispensary-type operation where a man sick or injured is treated long enough to either return him to his unit for duty or move on to a modern hospital for long-treatment care.

Mr. SIKES. You are not planning to replace the hospital because there is not a requirement for the hospital facility?

General GREENLIEF. We do not, sir. We don't have a requirement for a station hospital type.

Mr. SIKES. But you have rehabbed the building as a dispensary type. Do you consider it adequate?

General GREENLIEF. My memory is yes, that is correct. I do consider it adequate.

Mr. SIKES. Will you provide more details to the committee on it?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

In the fiscal year 1966 Military Construction, Army National Guard program we had five projects at Camp Drum totaling \$2,221,069. These included work on messhalls, latrines, range facilities, maintenance facilities, and the hospital. The hospital project was awarded September 1969 and completed April 1970 at a cost of \$280,500. It involved rehabilitating 19 buildings, putting heat in 6 buildings and latrines in one ward. After the project was completed, one of the buildings that was rehabilitated and used to house the X-ray equipment burned down. Another building has been used for X-ray and the remains of the burnt building torn down.

The so-called hospital complex serves as health and dental clinics for the Active Army and their dependents stationed at Camp Drum and the National Guard and Army Reserve troops. In addition to this complex, most of the battalion areas each have a dispensary which are operated by either the National Guard or Army Reserve units. The health and dental clinics are backup for the local dispensaries, but do not act as a hospital as such. If sick or injured, a Guardsman or Reservist could spend a few days in the health clinic but would be evacuated to a hospital if he requires more extensive care.

#### COOPERATION WITH STATES

Mr. PATTEN. Having served at the State level for 8 years, General, and your captain is a good friend of General Cantwell, I want to say we feel the Jersey National Guard is No. 1.

General GREENLIEF. I am delighted you do.

Mr. PATTEN. I just want to confirm earlier statements that there are real, very visible tie-ins with the work you gentlemen are doing back in our communities.

It is really a pleasure to see, because I felt when I first came to this committee the fellows who came over from the Reserve and National Guard had been put out to pasture.

Mr. SIKES. That was under my command.

Mr. PATTEN. You know, some organizations look for a place with no debt, no school, very little population, and very beautiful. Then, they give their leaders the rest cure.

Our files are full of newspaper articles on Camp Drum. We had papers that ran a series. They sent reporters up there. I got nowhere, believe me. I kept sending the stories over to the Pentagon and I kept talking to the fellow that had your job; they came over here in low gear and it seemed to me they eventually came to a complete stop. To see your enthusiasm here and the increased morale of you fellows is really a pleasure because I think it is god.

There is no use giving my impressions of the National Guard. I will conclude with one question.

How many of your adjutants general or heads of National Guard are members of the Governor's cabinet, as is Cantwell in New Jersey? You were aware he was in the cabinet, and you knew you headed the National Guard.

General GREENLIEF. As to the precise definition in State legislation that says whether they are a cabinet member or not—I cannot answer that for you. I know of at least a half a dozen who are. As a matter of practicality in terms of how they operate I believe there are only two States that have any sort of a State officer between the adjutant general and the Governor. So my answer would be that 50 of them at least operate at the cabinet level.

Mr. PATTEN. Jim wore several hats, the adjutant general, and chief of staff to the Governor.

General GREENLIEF. Today very few of the adjutants general function in the role of a military aide. However, the Governors do rely on their adjutant general in matters of ceremonial protocol because ceremonies is a part of professional military business. They do accompany them. Most of the Governors take their adjutants general with them to the annual Governor's Conference, not I hope just to see somebody with shoulder boards but because the National Guard business is so very much a part of the Governor's Conference.

The Guard is so much for real today that there is not as much as shall we say pomp and circumstance as there might have been in the past years. Governors do rely on the adjutant general's office as opposed to he as an individual for protocol and ceremonial matters.

#### INCENTIVE FOR ENLISTMENT

Mr. PATTEN. I think in answering the question as to why a fellow would join the Guard or why a fellow would want to stay with the U.S. Army Reserve, you men didn't do justice to it. I think you ought to embellish it for the record because the truth is, as a matter of pride, a fellow wants to be with it, he wants to be in the swim. For example, there is something exotic about being an Air National Guard. Right?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. But the increased benefits the Congress has voted also are factors, are they not?

General ROBERTS. There is no question about this.

Mr. PATTEN. No one has said a word about that. Let's tell the whole story about what moves a man to stay with you. I believe today's benefits compared to those Korean veterans had or compared to almost anything else make your organization very attractive. We ought to say it as it is.

General GREENLIEF. There is just no question but what the incentives that have been provided are of tremendous value. Without them we wouldn't be where we are.

To demonstrate what they accomplished, both those incentives and our own hard work, in the Army National Guard in a period of just 2½ years, we have increased the retention rate of the 6-year man, the REP, from almost zero to 20 percent. The retention rate of the active serviceman who joined us, the prior serviceman, is now running about 32 percent. Our careerist Guardsmen average 87 percent. Overall we are retaining over 50 percent of our Guardsmen at the time of the expiration of their term of service. In terms of what we have produced in terms of the prior service personnel, where the old figures used to be on the order of about 6,000 a year, in fiscal 1972 we recruited 13,367 from the Active Army for a total of 38,000 prior service enlistments. In fiscal 1973 we recruited almost 40,000 prior service individuals. We expect to repeat those kinds of numbers.

The shortfall that is occurring is in the procurement of nonprior service personnel. We are procuring about 2,000 a month. Our requirement runs more like 4,000 a month.

Of all of the incentives provided, and I don't for a minute mean to discount pride and patriotism because that is really the gut issue behind it, the pay rise is today a very significant item. I can assure you we are grateful for that.

I would also say while General Roberts and I declined to give Mr. Davis our full repertoire of recruiting bits, I really didn't think any of you might enlist, but I can assure you there are good and solid reasons and we would be delighted to provide it for the record.

Mr. PATTEN. We have some people on the floor that may not share our background.

General GREENLIEF. I understand.

Mr. PATTEN. It wouldn't hurt one bit to put this in perspective.

General GREENLIEF. We will be delighted to see it in the record here as it is in the record of the House Armed Services Committee.

[The information as stated to the HASC is as follows:]

General GREENLIEF. "You are an intelligent young man, a man on the way up in your community. We think that you have a great deal to offer your community. We would like to offer you a way to offer even more because, while you are performing your job in your community, we can also give you a job that will provide you satisfaction in doing something for your State and your town and country at the same time.

Now, we are going to put some demands on you. We are going to ask you to go away for 5½ months of training.

During that time we will pay you. You are just out of high school and you do not have a job. Here is the time to get some initial income now. When you return home with the training which will help you, and we will teach you skills in the Army that will improve your ability to get a job right here in your State. We will continue to pay you while you perform for 1 week end a month. We will work you hard and we will teach you something.

Now, you will be doing something that you will be proud of and that your neighbor will be proud of. You are going to be in a position to perform a very real service to your hometown. We are just asking you to sign up for 6 years. During that period we will ask you to go to training 48 times during the year, plus 2 weeks during the summer.

Further, you can progress in this program. We will give you the opportunity and the training to go forward with it, to really give you the opportunity to develop and demonstrate your leadership capability. This will help you right here at home.

Mr. NEDZI. What will you give me that General Roberts will not give me?

General GREENLIEF. I am giving you a better opportunity, a more frequent opportunity. I could leave it at that, but I do enjoy or did enjoy giving this pitch, this presentation.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I think that, General, you should touch on why you have a National Guard and a Reserve in competition, in that it started with George Washington as a State militia man, as such. The State guardsmen are primarily, or they used to be—well, this was to help the Governors and to help to protect the local people. Now they are a backup for the regular military forces.

General GREENLIEF. You are giving me a beautiful lead to follow on. We will give you a better opportunity to serve your community and State. The National Guard is the only reserve component with a dual mission, both State and Federal. You are very much a part of the State organization and the State government and you will perform service at the call of the Governor. That is, providing the Governor pays for it." \* \* \* .

General ROBERTS. You look like a bright individual to me. In our preliminary conversation you indicated that you are interested in law enforcement. The Army Reserve in your area has the 300th Military Police Command, one of the specialized units of the Army which exists in the Army Reserve. It will offer you education and training to move on into law enforcement. The training that has been received by other young men in this area has enabled them to get good jobs in this all-important law enforcement category.

Now, Bill Jones around the corner is a patrolman on the force, and he is part of our military police unit. In his extra time he works for us in national defense. He gets extra pay and he has the opportunity for meeting many other young individuals with broad interest in the program. This is a tremendous opportunity for him.

Now, if you are inclined to get into the medical field, we have a 1,000 bed hospital outside your town where we can train you in medical skills.

If you are inclined to be a licensed practical nurse, and some young men are because the pay is so good, the Army will train you to be a LPN completely at their expense. They will pay you for doing this. You can get a job as an LPN and serve in the Army unit and contribute to the national defense and your community.

Our hospital units are doing community service also. This is a wonderful opportunity for you. Now, I could go on. If you were a young woman and ask if we have all the skills open in the Army to women, all but 48 MOS's are open to women. We are moving, however, in this area to get the girls in uniform to help the men with equal responsibility and benefits.

Mr. PATTEN. I can't let Florida and Maryland be the only States to be given applause. When I was a youngster, General Sharpe of the National Guard in New Jersey lived in my hometown. His father owns a big department store. I know him very well.

It has been said how wonderful Maryland is and how wonderful Florida is. What about my pal, General Sharpe?

General GREENLIEF. I have been a personal friend and acquaintance of General Sharpe for 13 years when we were first generals. At the time, I had a tremendous admiration for him and it has only increased since that time.

[Discussion off the record.]

General ROBERTS. One other aspect is the fact the infusion of equipment, in addition to the financial part of it, has a tremendous effect on our ability to retain and get people. That is the business of this committee because some of the money we are asking for has to do with housing more equipment, more facilities, and that is not to be overlooked.

#### USE OF MEN AND FACILITIES

Mr. LONG. General, I would like to have a report on the matter that I raised, of transportation reserve units loading and off-loading dummy cargo. I think the chairman agrees.

General ROBERTS. Would you like it for the record?

Mr. LONG. Yes, I would definitely like it for the record. I want to know just why this is done, how much it is done, and who is responsible for it.

Mr. SIKES. Who authorized this policy?

Mr. LONG. Who authorized this policy, and what unions have asked for this?

General ROBERTS. We will be glad to do that.

Mr. LONG. And, why the Defense Department feels unions should be allowed to interfere with training exercises of Reserve or military units.

Mr. SIKES. And to what extent that is the practice.

Mr. LONG. Right.

General ROBERTS. We will provide it for the record.

[The information follows:]

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-76, August 30, 1967, expresses the Federal Government's policies against military competition with private enterprise. These policies are implemented by Department of Defense (DOD) Directive 4100.15, July 8, 1971, and DOD Instruction 4100.33, July 16, 1971.

In keeping with these policies and directives, the Army contracts with civilian firms for necessary supply and transportation services. The Army's port operations inside the continental United States are accomplished through such contracts and, therefore, Army Reserve or Active Army port operating elements and units are not allowed to conduct training operations in competition with these firms. However, these policies and directives do not preclude Reserve or Active units from handling actual cargo when in direct support of special military training exercises and maneuvers.

The Army and Army Reserve port and terminal units are located and train on Government property and utilize Government vessels for cargo-handling training. Dummy cargo is generally used for such training, is considered satisfactory and effective for training, and avoids the additional expense which would be involved in providing actual cargo for training purposes only. Where the use of dummy cargo does not provide for adequate training, authorization exists for units to requisition unserviceable items of military equipment.

Mr. LONG. Do you have any figures on what percentage of Reserve buildings are in use?

General ROBERTS. I don't know if we have exact figures on the utilization. I can tell you that all of the buildings are being used every week and every business day because we have full-time people in all of them. We have more full-time people in some centers than others.

Mr. LONG. I can think, for example, of the one at Fort McHenry. There are some offices there being used by four or five people. But the floor, the big part of the building, probably isn't in use except on weekends.

General ROBERTS. We customarily have people there every weekend—different units rotating. We also have people there most nights during the week, many times on administrative meetings for which they are not being paid. USAR schools, as a class, usually meet on evenings rather than on weekends, although they meet some weekends as well.

Mr. LONG. I know that the National Guard buildings are used for a great many community purposes which have nothing to do with the National Guard, but as a matter of courtesy they are turned over to various community organizations for use. I don't know whether they are free or not, but at least some community use is made of them, which I applaud.

Is everything done to encourage that as much as possible?

General ROBERTS. We have some utilization by nondefense agencies in Reserve centers, but it is somewhat limited. We can give you a report on that for the record as well.

Mr. LONG. However, I can't think offhand of any community use made of the Reserve units. Maybe there is.

General ROBERTS. We have a number of instances in which non-troops are using Reserve centers. During the Christmas holidays, for example, some Reserve centers are used by the Postal Department to take care of their overflow. This is a Federal operation. But the rest of the year there is some use being made by nonmilitary groups. It is not as much as, perhaps, I would like to see.

Mr. LONG. Why do we have to have both the Reserve and the National Guard? It does seem to me the National Guard serves a very useful function under the States. It serves for riot duty and that kind of thing. But why both a Reserve and a National Guard?

General ROBERTS. We have in the Army Reserve a wide variety of units, some of which do not exist in the Regular Army and do not exist in the National Guard, and we have a force in the U.S. Army Reserve which is totally responsive to the Federal Government.

#### CALLUP OF TROOPS

Mr. LONG. I can understand that. On the other hand, the realities are such that you do not really make much use of the Reserve in time of war unless it is a total war of the kind we had in World War II or World War I. You just don't use them. In Korea and Vietnam very little use was made of them. Isn't that true?

General ROBERTS. No, sir, not in the case of Korea. There were 200,000 or 300,000 reservists used in Korea. During the Berlin emergency there were reservists called up.

Mr. LONG. What percentage?

General ROBERTS. A percentage; 75,000, which would be 12 or 14 percent I guess.

Mr. LONG. Why go out and draft and haul in young kids, make them postpone their college when you have people in the Reserve and that is what they are there for?

General ROBERTS. I suggest if you had a vote on the part of Reserve leaders as to whether or not they would be used in Vietnam it would have been overwhelmingly yes, use them.

Mr. LONG. Why weren't they used?

General ROBERTS. The decision not to use the Reserve Forces in Vietnam per se was a decision made by the administration in power at that time.

Let me say also that a very high percentage of the people in Vietnam were reservists. In other words, you had Reserve officers over there in very large numbers.

Mr. SIKES. They were men on extended active duty. You did not call up units?

General ROBERTS. That is right.

Mr. LONG. I am not talking about extended active duty reservists. That has nothing to do with Reserves we are talking about.

General ROBERTS. It has a lot to do because now we are using these people as kind of the guts of our units, experienced NCO's and we have combat leaders.

Mr. LONG. You can have what you are talking about without having all of these Reserve units around.

General ROBERTS. Let's face it. If there were no plans to use the Reserve in wartime we might as well forget it. I couldn't agree more with that. You have to have a Reserve Force well trained, well equipped to back up the Active Force, but if you have it you have to use it.

Mr. LONG. We certainly didn't use it in Vietnam, and it led to a great deal of bitterness. On the other hand, I am sure it wasn't your fault; I am sure it was a political decision. My guess is, if you had started hauling up middle-aged people 28, 30, 35 with a couple of kids and sent them to Vietnam, you would have had a real riot on your hands. That is probably why the administration told you not to. But that doesn't alter the fact still; why have a Reserve?

General GREENLIEF. I think I should point out the Congress certainly had expressed its views on the matter because there was, and has been for a long time, a law on the books that says that whenever the active Army or the Air Force needed to be expanded—I paraphrase as opposed to quoting—that the National Guard and such other Reserve components as required for a balanced force would be mobilized. That law was not carried out in policy.

Starting with Mr. Laird, he restated what the Congress intended as law and made it an important tenant of the Department of Defense policy and administration policy, and the Congress has since restated it in law.

There is no question that I would agree with the very problems that you address. It has been a problem to the Guard and the Reserve to explain why we were not mobilized. The administration has currently firmly stated its policy that it will use the Guard and the Reserve as the first means of expanding the services and that Congress has stated it in law again.

I would expect that what you desire will certainly occur the next time, at least based on current policy and current law.

Mr. LONG. I think you are going to be up against two political pressures—the young kids who don't want to be hauled out of school to go, and the middle-aged people who don't want to have to interrupt their lives to go. It does seem to me the people that have been paid for this all the time, and getting training and everything, have a higher obligation to go.

General ROBERTS. I would say also that during the Vietnam callup of the limited Reserve Forces we did have there was only 2 percent who resisted going, and they made a lot of noise and got a lot of headlines. But 98 percent of the people ordered to duty went. Our instructions now are most clear—anybody who can read and is in the Reserve knows that if we have an emergency he is going to be used.

Mr. LONG. Of course that sounds good on paper, but I know as a practical Congressman if you ordered up the Reserves you would hear many individuals who think it is their duty to go, but their particular family situation is such it couldn't happen.

General ROBERTS. Send the letters over to us and we will answer them.

Mr. LONG. It does seem we are wasting a lot of money if we are not doing it, and that is partly why the morale is low; because these fellows didn't go to Vietnam, have to load and unload dummy cargo, and can't perform a useful function. Consequently, they sit around.

General ROBERTS. I would like you to go with me occasionally and see some other units and see the morale is quite high in many of them.

Mr. SIKES. I might comment here that I have seen these training programs in progress, I have participated in them, and I have expended sweat in doing it. I recommend you go out in the field and watch them.

Mr. LONG. I think probably once they are out in the field they are sweating.

General ROBERTS. I could take you to a transportation company in Salt Lake City, Utah, where every weekend they train. They take their 5,000-gallon tankers out to a railhead, fill them up with POL, jet fuel, haul them for use by either Air Force Reserve or Air Guard airplanes, other military usage. They are used all of the time. The morale is very high, and the reenlistment rate is quite good. This is being duplicated in many places around the country. I think it would be useful for you to see some of this.

Mr. LONG. I have always found the best way to learn what happens is not to go out and watch parades and watch people but talk to the ordinary guy who tells me about his experience. People you know well and so on. They tell me of an awful lot of sitting around reading newspapers and not knowing what the hell to do.

General ROBERTS. No question there has been that in the past and we are making progress toward eliminating this.

Mr. LONG. I hope you will. Everybody wants to spend what we need to defend this country, but we don't need to spend a lot of money for a bunch of goldbrickers.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Patten.

#### RECORD OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

Mr. PATTEN. General Roberts, before we get away from it, you might want to consider emphasizing the record of community service by the Reserve. In New Jersey we greatly admire Colonel Kelly, head of the U.S. Reserve. I happen to know of many things he has done on his own time.

I want to point out another thing. Because he was head of our State police department, he has been right in the middle of everything. When we had the Newark riots, Kelly was there along with the mayor and Governor and they looked to him for leadership and guidance.

General ROBERTS. Right.

Mr. PATTEN. I could give you 10 cases like that. To help curb the crime and aid law enforcement, the Governor called on Kelly and he in turn called on the trained U.S. Reserves. Some of this is published and some of it isn't.

Consider the drug problem. Because of the unique training your men have, when the Governor has a problem and he has a fellow in the U.S. Reserves like Colonel Kelly, he can use the Reserves in many ways.

I don't have to tell you. Even on educational problems the Governor felt Kelly was the best fellow to send out. I know they just loaded him with duties far from the field. I don't know if this is common.

General ROBERTS. Yes, sir, it is.

Mr. PATTEN. We have been talking about picking up debris or doing a neighborhood project, but we should recognize the usefulness of the men who are trained at the State level—although Kelly might be unique because he is in the Reserves and is also head of the State police force.

I could mention many projects not directly in line of duty as a Reserve or head of the State police where the Governor felt Kelly was the best man to send out on the problem.

I think if we are going to talk about the quality or the value of the Reserves maybe the full contribution can be told.

We mentioned Cantwell. I could talk an hour on what he did unrelated to the National Guard in this same manner. He was the best man to send to do the job. It might only be maintenance of some State facilities, but if you were the Governor, who would you send out? You send the best man for the job.

These things are not in the book. If you can tell the people about your community service using examples such as General Kelly, you should tell it because it is a service that should be in the record.

General ROBERTS. General Rockefeller is in fact running the 78th Division at the present time. General Kelly medically retired but did a tremendous job. We have General Louderback in Trenton.

Mr. PATTEN. Rockefeller is my pal out of Rutgers.

General ROBERTS. Anyway we will be glad to submit this for the record.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. McEwen.

[Discussion off the record.]

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

### WITNESSES

**MAJ. GEN. FRANCIS S. GREENLIEF, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU**

**MAJ. GEN. I. G. BROWN, DIRECTOR, AIR NATIONAL GUARD**

**BRIG. GEN. JOHN J. PESCH, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, AIR NATIONAL GUARD**

**COL. WILLIAM L. DENEKE, CHIEF, CIVIL ENGINEERING DIVISION, DIRECTORATE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD**

**COL. WILLIAM D. MUIR, CHIEF, COMPTROLLER DIVISION, DIRECTORATE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD**

**JOHN H. LEE, DIRECTORATE OF BUDGET, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE**

Mr. SIKES. General, we are now ready to consider the military construction requirements of the Air National Guard. Insert pages VI through VIII and pages XVI through XIX in the record.

[The pages follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD  
PROGRAM AND FINANCING (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Budget plan (amounts for construction actions programmed)			Obligations		
	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate
<b>Program by activities:</b>						
1. Major construction.....	9,556	14,345	16,000	11,721	14,100	15,700
2. Minor construction.....	825	775	2,000	591	1,000	1,700
3. Planning.....	690	980	2,000	611	1,000	1,800
Total.....	11,071	16,100	20,000	12,923	16,100	19,200
<b>Financing:</b>						
Unobligated balance available, start of year for completion of prior year budget plans.....				-5,296	-2,973	-2,973
Reprogramming from (-) or to prior year budget plans.....	-471					
Unobligated balance available, end of year for completion of prior year budget plans.....				2,973	2,973	3,773
Budget authority (appropriation).....	10,600	16,100	20,000	10,600	16,100	20,000
<b>Relation of obligations to outlays:</b>						
Obligations incurred, net.....				12,923	16,100	19,200
Obligated balance, start of year.....				7,227	10,492	20,392
Obligated balance, end of year.....				-10,492	-20,392	-25,992
Outlays.....				9,658	6,200	13,600
<b>Department of the Air Force:</b>						
Other services.....				400	800	1,000
Lands and structures.....				7,505	10,800	13,700
Total, Department of the Air Force.....				7,905	11,600	14,700
<b>Allocation accounts:</b>						
Other services.....				300	300	300
Lands and structures.....				4,718	4,200	4,200
Total, allocation accounts.....				5,018	4,500	4,500
Total, obligations.....				12,923	16,100	19,200
<b>Obligations are distributed as follows:</b>						
Defense—Military:						
Army.....				2,175	2,000	2,000
Navy.....				2,843	2,500	2,500
Air Force.....				7,905	11,600	14,700

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR  
FISCAL YEAR 1974

*Appropriation: Military construction—Air National Guard*

<b>Program:</b>	
Program 310, planning.....	\$2,000,000
Program 320, major construction.....	16,000,000
Program 340, minor construction.....	2,000,000
Total program.....	20,000,000

## AIR NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1974

State/base project	Scope	Appropriation request (thousands)
<b>Alabama:</b>		
Dannelly Field, composite squadron operations facility.....	19,702 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	\$600
Martin ANG station, reserve forces communications—electronics training facility.....	8,224 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	350
<b>Arkansas:</b>		
Fort Smith MAP, composite squadron operations facility.....	15,202 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	527
<b>Little Rock AFB (ANG):</b>		
Avionics shop.....	10,500 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	360
Aircraft engine I. & R. shop.....	10,000 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	275
<b>Colorado:</b>		
Greeley ANG Station, auto maintenance shop/aerospace ground equipment shop.....	7,668 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	230
<b>Connecticut: Orange ANG Station, aerospace ground equipment shop.....</b>		
District of Columbia: Andrews AFB (ANG) avionics and weapons system release shop.....	4,320 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	170
	10,500 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	350
<b>Georgia: Dobbins AFB (ANG), convert hangar.....</b>		
Illinois: Capital MAP, composite squadron operations facility.....	136,014 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	984
	19,238 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	725
Kansas: McConnell AFB (ANG), composite squadron operations facility.....	18,186 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	610
<b>Minnesota:</b>		
<b>Duluth IAP (ANG):</b>		
Aircraft engine I. & R. shop.....	10,000 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	330
Add/alter avionics/weapons system shop.....	10,500 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	135
<b>Mississippi:</b>		
<b>Key Field:</b>		
Reserve forces communications electronics training facility.....	14,400 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	514
Avionics shop/NDI lab.....	12,100 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	300
Gulfport MAP: Reserve forces communications electronics training facility.....	17,472 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	520
<b>Missouri: Lambert Field, avionics/weapons systems shop/NDI lab.....</b>		
Nebraska: Lincoln ANG Base, convert/alter main hangar lean-to avionics shop, general purpose shop, squadron and base operations, and combat operations center.....	9,928 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	350
	40,858 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	311
<b>Nevada: Reno MAP, avionics/NDI shop.....</b>		
New Jersey: McGuire AFB (ANG) aircraft engine I. & R. shop.....	12,100 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	410
	8,000 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	350
<b>New York: Schenectady County Airport (ANG):</b>		
Aircraft engine I. & R. shop w/ propeller shop.....	10,400 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	290
Composite A/C maintenance facility.....	25,011 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	636
<b>North Carolina: Douglas MAP:</b>		
Taxiway runway access.....	18,000 yd <sup>2</sup> .....	400
Composite aircraft maintenance facility.....	27,100 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	800
<b>Oklahoma: Tulsa IAP (ANG):</b>		
Aircraft engine I. & R. shop.....	10,000 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	300
Composite maintenance facility.....	17,330 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	582
<b>Pennsylvania: Willow Grove NAS (ANG), automotive maintenance shop/refueling vehicle shop.....</b>		
Rhode Island: North Smithfield ANG Station, automotive maintenance shop.....	7,396 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	352
	4,862 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	140
<b>Tennessee: Alcoa ANG Station, add to and alter reserve forces/communications/electronics training facility.....</b>		
	28,175 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	605
<b>Texas: Ellington AFB (ANG):</b>		
Composite refueling vehicle shop/petroleum operation.....	6,400 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	62
Aircraft engine I. & R. shop.....	12,000 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	307
Automotive maintenance facility.....	24,890 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	148
Avionics/weapons systems shop.....	12,000 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	405
<b>Washington: Spokane IAP, composite squadron operations facility.....</b>		
West Virginia: Kanawha County Airport (ANG), aviation fuel operating storage facility.....	19,100 ft <sup>2</sup> .....	675
	100,000 gal.....	325
<b>Various locations:</b>		
Power check pad w/suppressor.....	Lump sum.....	952
Aircraft arresting system (BAK 12/14).....	do.....	620
<b>Total.....</b>		<b>16,000</b>

## STATEMENT OF CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

Mr. SIKES. We will be glad to hear the statement of General Greenlief, Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

General GREENLIEF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have with me General John Pesch, Deputy Director of the Air National Guard. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. Since I covered the mission of the Air National Guard, force modernization, achievement, and future forces in my presentation of the National

Guard personnel, Air Force appropriation, I will not repeat them here. I will only address the program and financial requirements of the Air National Guard military construction appropriation for fiscal year 1974.

As the Air National Guard continues in its role as a full partner in the Defense Establishment, it will, within the limits of available funds, provide facilities to support new, more sophisticated aircraft and equipment.

I deeply appreciate this committee's action in adding \$5.5 million to our fiscal year 1973 budget. Your timely action has permitted us to provide urgently needed funds to support some of our units which have converted to newer aircraft. Even so, the funding levels available for the past few years have not allowed the Air National Guard to keep pace with its annual requirements. The Air National Guard total facility deficiencies are approximately \$280 million.

The \$20 million in our fiscal year 1974 budget will provide funding for only a portion of the essential requirements to support the total Air National Guard Force. The conversion of 70 percent of our flying units to more modern weapon systems over the past 3 years has resulted in a severe deficiency in specialized shops which support higher performance engines and fire control systems, in storage and maintenance facilities for new armament and weapons, in training facilities such as flight simulator buildings, and in directed environmental control projects.

Our nonflying units also have similar types of requirements. Air Guard Tactical Control units have received the 407L equipment from the production line. These new computerized control systems require additional maintenance and support facilities not now available.

#### STATUS OF FUNDS

During fiscal year 1972, the Air National Guard contracted projects amounting to approximately \$12.9 million. This was based on an availability of \$15.8 million, comprised of \$5.2 million carryover of prior year funds and an appropriation of \$10.6 million in fiscal year 1972. This was an 82 percent obligation rate, which is the best that the Air National Guard has ever had. The funds were used for the construction of maintenance, operation, and support facilities, and various minor construction projects.

In fiscal year 1973, \$19 million was available for obligation. This included the \$2.9 million carryover from fiscal year 1972 plus our fiscal year 1973 appropriation of \$16.1 million. During the first 9 months of fiscal year 1973, \$5.6 million was obligated. In addition, we advertised contracts amounting to \$8.3 million, for obligation by the end of the fiscal year. This program provided for maintenance and operation facilities, aircraft arresting systems, water and air pollution abatement projects, and power check pads with sound suppressors. The inclusion of the environmental projects complies with the executive order, as directed by the Secretary of Defense.

The estimated unobligated carryover of \$5.1 million will be obligated during the first quarter of fiscal year 1974.

The fiscal year 1974 military construction program totals \$20 million. Of this amount, \$2 million is proposed for planning and \$2 mil-

lion for minor construction. The remaining \$16 million is available for the construction of major facilities at both flying and nonflying Air National Guard bases. As in fiscal year 1973, only the most urgent and highest priority facilities can be constructed. The Air National Guard will accomplish the best possible construction program within these dollar limitations.

In summary, the construction program for fiscal year 1974 will meet only a portion of the Air National Guard's most urgent needs. The total deficiency is \$280 million, with \$54 million being immediate hard-core requirements vital to maintenance, operation, and flying safety. With additional requirements being generated by future conversions, and the need for replacement of inadequate facilities, all indications are that these deficiencies will increase. The continued support and confidence of this committee is sincerely appreciated. This statement has been limited to highlighting the most significant aspects of the construction program. However, I will be happy to spend as much time as the committee desires in reviewing the details.

This concludes my presentation in support of the Air National Guard fiscal year 1974 military construction appropriation program.

#### ADEQUACY OF PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Thank you very much, General Greenlief. You seem to indicate a need for considerably more funding than is in the program. What did you request?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, in preparation of the fiscal year 1973 budget we asked for an annual program of \$54 million. The Air Force, considering its overall requirements, concluded that it could only fund at about the level of \$10 million. The Congress added \$5.5 million to it. This year our request is the request we made for the 5-year defense program and that is the \$54 million level.

The Department of Air Force and Department of Defense have added an additional \$3 million-plus to our fiscal year 1973 program, increasing it to \$20 million.

In essence, we have stated our requirements in our requests in the 5-year defense program at about the \$54 million level.

Mr. SIKES. Will the \$20 million provide for your most serious needs, or is there still a shortfall comparable to that of a year ago?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, it will provide for our most serious needs because that is the way we have programed the construction. It will not meet all of our urgent needs this year.

Mr. SIKES. What would you consider the necessary level of funding for the most urgent projects which are not included in this program?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, I do not have a specific listing of projects. Based on my review of what our requirements are, I would believe that it would take about \$10 million additional to meet the projects that I consider most urgent and in direct support of the conversion program.

Mr. SIKES. Why is it that the Air National Guard seems to be in greater difficulty on funding than the other Reserve components?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, I am not conversant enough with the conversion program of the Air Force Reserve to address that with great competence but our deficiency was generated almost directly as a result of the really tremendous conversion program that we have accomplished.

Mr. SIKES. Do you mean modernization?

General GREENLIEF. Modernization. Most of our requirements result from having converted from old, obsolescent aircraft to very complex aircraft with much more complicated engines, power systems, and the electronic black boxes to support the weapons control systems, together with the new weapons themselves.

Mr. SIKES. General Greenlief, you are requesting an appropriation of \$20 million this year. How does this compare to the amounts which the Air National Guard has received in the past 5 years?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, the \$20 million for fiscal year 1974 compares to an average of \$11.2 million appropriated for the past 5 years. However, the impact of increased requirements due to force modernization, along with the decreased purchasing power because of cost escalation has resulted in a sharp increase to the backlog of essential facilities.

#### FACILITY DEFICIENCIES

Mr. SIKES. You stated that there is a \$280 million facility deficiency in the Guard base structure. How much of this is for facilities not now available to permit you to support Guard missions? How much is to replace facilities you now have but for one reason or another you do not believe to be adequate to support Guard missions?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, of the \$280 million deficiency, \$132 million is required for new facilities not now available, and \$108 million is necessary for the replacement of older facilities that are no longer adequate because of the physical configuration or advanced deterioration. However, the older buildings that are in sound condition will be retained to support other essential requirements. The remaining \$40 million is required for planning and a large backlog of minor construction.

Mr. SIKES. Furnish a listing, by base and project, showing the makeup of the \$54 million which you stated are hardcore requirements vital to maintenance, operations and flying safety.

[The information follows:]

AIR NATIONAL GUARD FACILITY DEFICIENCIES  
HARD-CORE ITEMS

	CWE (\$000)		CWE (\$000)
<u>BIRMINGHAM MAP, ALABAMA</u>		<u>ORANGE ANG STATION, CONN</u>	
Fuel System Repair Dock/Corrosion Control Facility	230	Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	170
Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	200	<u>ANDREWS AFB, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</u>	
<u>DANNELLY FIELD, ALA</u>		Avionics/Weapons/System Release Shop	
Composite Squadron Operations Facility	600	350	
Fuel System Repair Dock/Corrosion Control Facility	230	<u>DOBBINS AFB, GEORGIA</u>	
Dining Hall	300	Convert Hangar to Composite Facility	984
<u>MARTIN ANG STATION, ALA</u>		Power Check Pad w/Suppressor	130
Communications-Electronics Training Facility	350	Rocket Storage/Assembly/Check-out Facility	130
<u>KULIS ANG BASE, ALASKA</u>		<u>MACON ANG STATION, GEORGIA</u>	
Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	330	Composite Auto Maintenance/Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	280
Refuel Vehicle Repair Shop	200	<u>HICKAM AFB, HAWAII</u>	
Composite Maintenance Shop	800	Composite Maintenance Facility	825
<u>TUCSON IAP, ARIZONA</u>		<u>BOISE AIR TERMINAL, IDAHO</u>	
Relocate Avfuel Storage Facility	500	Base Supply Administration/Warehouse Facility	620
<u>SKY HARBOR IAP, ARIZONA</u>		Aircraft Engine Inspection and Repair Shop	300
Communications-Electronics Training Facility	770	<u>CAPITAL MAP, ILLINOIS</u>	
Alter Hangar to Composite Maintenance Facility	420	Composite Squadron Operations Facility	725
<u>FORT SMITH MAP, ARKANSAS</u>		Fuel Systems Repair Dock/Corrosion Control Facility	260
Composite Squadron Operations Facility	527	Auto Maintenance/Refuel Vehicle Repair Shop	390
Avionics/Non-Destructive Inspection Shop	330	<u>O'HARE IAP, ILLINOIS</u>	
Rocket Storage/Assembly/Check-out Facility	125	Communications-Electronics Training Facility	900
Fuel System Repair Dock/Corrosion Control Facility	250	Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	570
<u>LITTLE ROCK AFB, ARKANSAS</u>		<u>BAER FIELD, INDIANA</u>	
Avionics Shop	360	Base Supply Administration/Warehouse	480
Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	275	Auto Maintenance Shop	380
<u>BUCKLEY ANG BASE, COLORADO</u>		<u>DES MOINES IAP, IOWA</u>	
Flight Simulator Facility	260	Fire Station	200
Weapons/Release/Gun Service Shop	450	<u>GREELEY ANG STATION, COLORADO</u>	
<u>GREELEY ANG STATION, COLORADO</u>		Composite Auto Maintenance/Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	230

	CWE (\$000)		CWE (\$000)
<u>SIoux CITY MAP, IOWA</u>			
Avionics/Non-Destructive Inspection Shop	400	<u>GULFPORT PFTS, MISSISSIPPI</u>	
Power Check Pad w/ Suppressor	190	Communications-Electronics Training Facility	520
Rocket Storage/Assembly/ Check-out Facility	140	Rocket Storage/Assembly/ Check-out Facility	150
<u>FORBES AFB, KANSAS</u>			
Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	250	<u>KEY FIELD, MISSISSIPPI</u>	
		Communications-Electronics Training Facility	514
		Avionics Shop/Non-Destructive Inspection Shop	300
		Auto Maintenance/Refuel Vehicle Repair Shop	400
		Base Supply Administration/ Warehouse	500
<u>McCONNELL AFB, KANSAS</u>			
Composite Squadron Operations Facility	610	<u>LAMBERT-ST LOUIS IAP, MISSOURI</u>	
Power Check Pad	150	Avionics/Weapons System Shop/ Non-Destructive Inspection Shop	350
Extend Fire Protection System Add to/Alter Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	110	Communications-Electronics Training Facility	700
		<u>ROSECRANS MEMORIAL APRT, MISSOURI</u>	
		Taxiway Widening/Lighting	800
<u>STANDIFORD FIELD, KENTUCKY</u>			
Fuel System Repair Dock/ Corrosion Control Facility	260	<u>GREAT FALLS IAP, MONTANA</u>	
Avionics Shop	400	Aircraft Shelters	350
		Auto Maintenance/Refuel Vehicle Repair Shop	450
		Power Check Pad w/Sup- pressor	190
		Avionics/Non-Destructive Inspection Shop Addition	100
<u>NEW ORLEANS NAS, LOUISIANA</u>			
Avionics Shop	300	<u>LINCOLN ANG BASE, NEBRASKA</u>	
		Convert/Alter Hangar to Composite Facility	311
		Fuel System Repair Dock/ Corrosion Control Facility	260
		Addition to Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	100
<u>OTIS AFB, MASSACHUSETTS</u>			
Convert Hangar to Composite Facility	750	<u>RENO MAP, NEVADA</u>	
		Avionics/Non-Destructive Inspection Shop	410
<u>BARNES MAP, MASSACHUSETTS</u>			
Fuel System Repair Dock/ Corrosion Control Facility	260	<u>PEASE AFB, NEW HAMPSHIRE</u>	
Warm-up Pad	280	Convert Hangar to Composite Facility	600
Avionics/Non-Destructive Inspection Shop	300	Base Supply Administration Warehouse	570
<u>KELLOGG AIRPORT, MICHIGAN</u>			
Convert Hangar to Composite Maintenance Facility	250	<u>ATLANTIC CITY NAFEC, NEW JERSEY</u>	
		Base Supply Administration/ Warehouse	450
		Add to Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	100
		Add to General Purpose Shops/ Non-Destructive Inspec- tion Shop	200
<u>SELFRIDGE ANG BASE, MICHIGAN</u>			
Avionics Shop	350		
<u>DULUTH IAP, MINNESOTA</u>			
Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	330		
Add/Alter Avionics/Weapons System Shop	135		
<u>MINNEAPOLIS-ST PAUL IAP, MINNESOTA</u>			
Fuel System Repair Dock/Cor- rosion Control Facility (Joint Facility with AFRES)	400		

	CWE (\$000)		CWE (\$000)
<u>McGUIRE AFB, NEW JERSEY</u>		<u>GREATER PITTSBURGH AIRPORT, PENNSYLVANIA</u>	
Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	350	Avfuel Transfer/Storage Facility	800
Alter/Convert Aircraft Shelter to Fuel System Repair Dock	100	Base Supply Administration/ Warehouse	775
<u>KIRTLAND AFB, NEW MEXICO</u>		Water Pollution Abatement	300
Avionics Shop	500	<u>WILLOW GROVE NAS, PENNSYLVANIA</u>	
Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	240	Auto Maintenance/Refuel Vehicle Repair Shop	352
<u>SCHENECTADY COUNTY APRT, NEW YORK</u>		Composite Squadron Opera- tions Facility	500
Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop w/Propeller Shop	290	<u>PUNTA SALINAS AC&amp;W STATION, PUERTO RICO</u>	
Composite Aircraft Maintenance Facility	636	Water Pollution Abatement	100
Convert Hangar to Squadron Operations/Aerial Port Facility	450	<u>SAN JUAN IAP, PUERTO RICO</u>	
Base Supply Administration/ Warehouse	480	Avfuel Operations Storage Facility	600
<u>WESTCHESTER COUNTY APRT, NEW YORK</u>		Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	430
Auto Maintenance Shop	500	Power Check Pad w/Suppressor	190
<u>SUFFOLK COUNTY APRT, NEW YORK</u>		<u>NORTH SMITHFIELD ANG STATION, RHODE ISLAND</u>	
Convert Warehouse to Composite Facility	200	Auto Maintenance Shop	140
<u>DOUGLAS MAP, NORTH CAROLINA</u>		<u>JOE FOSS FIELD, SOUTH DAKOTA</u>	
Taxiway/Runway Access	400	Fuel System Repair Dock/ Corrosion Control Facility	300
<u>HECTOR FIELD, NORTH DAKOTA</u>		<u>ALCOA ANG STATION, TENNESSEE</u>	
Aircraft Shelters	300	Add to/Alter Communications- Electronics Training Facility	605
Fuel System Repair Dock/ Corrosion Control Facility	250	<u>McGHEE-TYSON APRT, TENNESSEE</u>	
<u>SPRINGFIELD MAP, OHIO</u>		Communications-Electronics Training Facility	540
Composite Squadron Operations Facility	675	Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	250
Avionics/Weapons/Systems Release Shop	450	<u>ELLINGTON AFB, TEXAS</u>	
<u>MANSFIELD-MAP, OHIO</u>		Composite Refueling Vehicle Repair Shop/Petroleum Operations Facility	62
Warm-up Pad	100	Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	307
<u>TOLEDO EXPRESS APRT, OHIO</u>		Automotive Maintenance Shop	148
Composite Squadron Operations Facility	675	Avionics/Weapons Systems Shop	405
Avionics/Weapons/Systems Release Shop	450	Alter Corrosion Control Facility	80
<u>TULSA IAP, OKLAHOMA</u>			
Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	300		
Composite Maintenance Facility	582		
Composite Squadron Operations Facility	675		

	CWE (\$000)
<u>GARLAND ANG STATION, TEXAS</u>	
Add to Communications- Electronics Training Facility	400
Auto Maintenance/Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	330
<u>KELLY AFB, TEXAS</u>	
Aircraft Engine Inspection & Repair Shop	300
<u>SALT LAKE CITY MAP, UTAH</u>	
Replace Aircraft Parking Apron	900
<u>FOUR LAKES ANG STATION, WASHINGTON</u>	
Auto Maintenance/Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	230
<u>SEATTLE ANG STATION, WASHINGTON</u>	
Auto Maintenance/Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	210
<u>CAMP MURRAY, WASHINGTON</u>	
Communications-Electronics Training Facility	770
Auto Maintenance/Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	230
Mobility Storage Facility	60
Site Preparation/Utilities	250
<u>SPOKANE IAP, WASHINGTON</u>	
Composite Squadron Operations Facility	675
<u>KANAWHA COUNTY APRT, WEST VIRGINIA</u>	
Avfuel Operation Storage Facility	325
Civil Engineer Maintenance Facility	300
<u>VOLK FIELD, WISCONSIN</u>	
Fire Station	290
<u>CHEYENNE MAP, WYOMING</u>	
Alter Hangar	200
<u>VARIOUS LOCATIONS</u>	
Power Check Pads w/Suppressors	1,352
Aircraft Arresting Systems (BAK 12/14)	1,770
<u>MARTINSBURG MAP, WEST VIRGINIA</u>	
Alter Hangar	200
TOTAL	\$54,160

Mr. SIKES. Does your facilities deficit reflect 100-percent manning and equipment levels? Is this realistic?

General GREENLIEF. Our facility requirements are based primarily on the type of mission, the type and number of aircraft, and the number of vehicles and other major items, such as radar and communication equipment. The majority of our deficits are in the operational, maintenance and supply categories which support the operation of this equipment and are reflected in our requirements which, of necessity, must accommodate a 100-percent equipment level. Our manning levels have only a small impact on the overall Air Guard construction program. We believe that this is a realistic program.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record a listing of your deficiencies by construction category.

[The information follows:]

<i>Deficiencies by construction category</i>	
Facility category :	<i>Thousands</i>
Operational -----	\$74, 610
Maintenance -----	79, 393
Training -----	39, 211
Supply -----	22, 079
General support (medical, personnel support, real estate, environmental pollution) -----	24, 967
Planning -----	23, 692
Minor construction -----	16, 154
Total -----	280, 106

#### TROOP UTILIZATION IN EMERGENCIES

Mr. SIKES. I assume that our previous conversation with regard to Army Reserve components and their use in emergencies would apply to the Air Guard as well. Is that correct?

General GREENLIEF. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Mr. SIKES. Can you provide for the record the contributions of the Air Guard in the Korean and Vietnam wars?

[The information follows:]

At the time of the Korean war 22 Air National Guard wings, consisting of 66 tactical fighter and light bomber squadrons, and 45,000 officers and airmen were mobilized. The majority of our pilots flew combat missions in Korea, or were assigned to the NATO forces in Europe.

In 1961, 11 of our Air National Guard units were mobilized at the time of the Berlin crisis. More than 200 Air Guard jet fighter and reconnaissance aircraft deployed to Europe, and over 21,000 guardsmen served on active duty in Conus and in Europe.

During the Vietnam war a total of 14 units and 10,511 air guardsmen were called to active duty. Four F-100 units were deployed to Vietnam, two F-100 units deployed to South Korea. Three RF-101 units were deployed on a TDY rotational basis to Japan. The remaining units were employed in the Conus with individuals assigned worldwide to meet Air Force personnel needs. The Air Guard lost six officers in combat, and two pilots were listed as missing in action.

#### EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation of the Air Guard with regard to your ability to maintain the new equipment you are receiving? Do you need more technicians?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, we have an extremely high skill level in our air technician force with the technical capability to maintain current and future weapon systems in a fully combat ready status. However, the unprecedented modernization program, requiring the maintenance of aircraft equipped with more complex engines, and fire control systems, has increased the number of technicians necessary to support the Air Guard force.

In August 1971, Congress enacted Public Law 92-119 which increased the air technician manning ceiling to 22,550, or to 100 percent of our known requirements. Subsequent to this legislation, our requirements increased from 22,550 to 24,203 air technicians. The manning limitations have and will continue to have a severe impact on our capability to maintain our units in the required readiness posture.

#### TROOP STRENGTH

Mr. SIKES. How does your current on-board strength compare to your authorized strength.

General GREENLIEF. Sir, the on-board strength as of June 30, 1973, was 20,905 compared to a fiscal year 1973 end strength of 21,784 as displayed in the fiscal year 1974 President's Budget.

Mr. SIKES. Are you requesting any facilities at locations where meeting your strength is or may be a problem?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, the ANG did not have a drill strength problem in fiscal year 1973 and does not anticipate one at locations where facilities are planned in fiscal year 1974. The fiscal year 1973 congressional floor was 87,614 and our actual average strength was 90,379. We are confident that the average strength of 92,291 in fiscal year 1974 can be attained, provided necessary incentives and continued recruiting support are furnished.

#### TRANSFER OF FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. What Air Force or other services' installations have been transferred to the Air Guard in the past 5 years? What is the value of the facilities assets of these installations? Provide this for the record.

[The information follows:]

During the past 5 years nine Air Force installations have been transferred to the Air Guard. The majority of these installations were collocated with existing municipal airports. In most instances, only portions of the USAF operated bases were transferred to the Air Guard. The remaining facilities were incorporated as part of the municipal airports.

Installation and previous service installation	Value of facilities
Selfridge ANG Base, Mich. USAF-----	\$68,290,000
Suffolk County Airport, N.Y., USAF-----	6,008,000
Bangor IAP, Maine, USAF-----	2,221,000
Lincoln MAP, Nebr., USAF-----	5,182,000
Portland IAP, Oreg., USAF-----	10,835,000
Truax Field, Wis., USAF-----	7,061,000
Paine Field, Wash., USAF-----	1,277,000
Memphis MAP, Tenn., USAF-----	2,584,000
Olmsted-State IAP, Pa., USAF-----	1,350,000

Note: Forbes AFB and Otis AFB are currently in the process of transfer to the Air National Guard.

## PERCENT OF PERMANENT FACILITIES IN INVENTORY

Mr. SIKES. What percentage of your existing facilities in the Air Guard are of permanent construction?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, 64 percent of our facilities are of permanent construction.

## PROGRAM CHANGES

Mr. SIKES. Can you provide for the record the changes to the program which you presented last year as the fiscal year 1973 program?

[The information follows:]

The Air National Guard fiscal year 1973 construction program in the President's budget called for 17 projects in 16 States. The Congress added \$5.5 million during committee markup. This allowed us to increase the scope of our program to 30 projects in 25 States.

The Congress has been advised under the provisions of U.S.C. 2233a(1) that the following projects would be undertaken under the authority of Public Law 92-545.

<i>Location and project</i>	<i>Estimated cost (in thousands)</i>
Alabama, Birmingham Municipal Airport: Reconnaissance photographic laboratory -----	\$595
Alaska, Kulis Air National Guard Base: Multipurpose facility-----	990
Arizona, Sky Harbor International Airport (Phoenix): Add to/alter av-fuel operating storage facility-----	455
Arkansas, Fort Smith Municipal Airport: Taxiway improvements-----	275
Indiana, Baer Field: Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop-----	330
Iowa, Des Moines Municipal Airport: Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop-----	332
Louisiana, New Orleans Naval Air Station: Composite squadron operations facility-----	671
Maryland, Andrews Air Force Base: Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop -----	333
Michigan, Selfridge Air National Guard Base: Air pollution abatement--	1, 085
<hr/>	
Missouri, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport :	
Add to/alter aircraft parking apron/corrosion control facility-----	680
Avfuel operating storage facility-----	450
Alter/rehabilitate electrical distribution system-----	500
Total, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport-----	1, 630
Rosecrans Municipal Airport (St. Joseph) : Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop with propellor shop-----	520
Total, Missouri-----	2, 150
<hr/>	
Montana, Great Falls International Airport: missile storage/assembly/checkout facility-----	300
<hr/>	
New Jersey, Atlantic City Airport :	
Composite squadron operations facility-----	644
Atlantic City Naval Facilities Engineering Command, missile storage/assembly/checkout facility-----	300
Total, New Jersey-----	944
New York, Schenectady County Airport: Sewage treatment and disposal system -----	225
North Carolina, Douglas Municipal Airport: Composite aircraft maintenance -----	775
North Dakota, Hector Field (Fargo): Composite squadron operations facility -----	650

	<i>Estimated cost (in thousands)</i>
Ohio, Mansfield/Lahm Airport :	
Add to/alter aircraft engine inspection and repair shop-----	\$205
Toledo Express Airport—Base engineer maintenance facility-----	317
Total, Ohio-----	522
Oklahoma, Tulsa International Airport : Power check pad with suppressor	160
<hr/>	
Pennsylvania, Greater Pittsburgh Airport :	
Maintenance dock, large aircraft-----	950
Aerospace ground equipment shop-----	245
Total, Pennsylvania-----	1,195
Tennessee, Memphis Municipal Airport : Reserve Forces operational mission training facility-----	684
Utah, Salt Lake City Municipal Airport : Avfuel operating storage facility	550
Vermont, Burlington International Airport : Sewage treatment and disposal facility-----	260
Virginia, Byrd Field (Richmond) : Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop-----	306
Washington, Spokane International Airport : Reserve Forces communication/electronics training facility-----	656
<hr/>	
Various locations :	
Aircraft arresting barriers-----	470
Aircraft arresting systems-----	225
Total, various locations-----	695
<hr/>	
Total, all projects-----	15,138

#### JOINT USE OF FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. To what extent are your units located at active Air Force bases where they are able to make joint use of facilities with the Active Forces?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, I can provide you a listing for the record of those cases where we are based at active Air Force bases.

[The information follows:]

Air National Guard flying groups are located at 13 Air Force bases and 3 naval air stations. In addition, there are flying detachments at two Air Force bases, and nonflying communication units at three Air Force installations. The following is a list of the locations :

Location of flying groups on Air Force bases : Little Rock AFB, Ark. ; Andrews AFB, Md. ; Hickam AFB, Hawaii ; Forbes AFB,<sup>1</sup> Kans. ; McConnell AFB, Kans. ; Otis AFB,<sup>1</sup> Mass. ; McGuire AFB, N.J. ; Pease AFB, N.H. ; Kirtland AFB, N. Mex. ; Ellington AFB, Tex. ; Dobbins AFB, Ga. ; Lockbourne AFB, Ohio ; Kelly AFB, Tex.

Location of ANG flying groups on naval air stations : New Orleans NAS, La. ; Willow Grove NAS, Pa. ; Dallas NAS, Tex.

Location of ANG flying detachments on Air Force bases : Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz. Detachment No. 1, 144th Fighter Group (southern air defense). Holloman AFB, N. Mex. Detachment No. 1, 150th Tactical Fighter Group (defense systems evaluation).

Location of ANG nonflying units on Air Force installations : Maxwell AFB, Ala. ; Kingsley AFS, Oreg. ; Langley AFB, Va.

General GREENLIEF. There are many of our units that are based at active Air Force bases, but the bulk of ours are at State facilities, municipal airports, and in some cases Air Guard bases. This stems from the beddown of our unit post-World War II. Wherever we can make the transition to an active Air Force base economical to the Government we are doing it, sir.

<sup>1</sup> Forbes AFB and Otis AFB will be transferred from the Active Force to the Air National Guard in fiscal year 1974.

## PROGRAM JUSTIFICATION

Mr. SIKES. You propose numerous operations facilities in fiscal year 1974. What is the need for so many operations buildings this year? Provide details for the record.

[The information follows:]

## NEED FOR OPERATIONS BUILDINGS

The modernization program in the Air Guard has increased our overall facility requirements, particularly in the aircraft maintenance functions. Presently many of our operations facilities are crowded into maintenance hangars. The construction of squadron operations facilities will provide the necessary room for essential operations functions and also free up space for required maintenance shops. Both are critical for the support of the modern weapons system.

Mr. SIKES. You also are requesting several avionics, NDI shops, and similar facilities. Can you tell us the general condition of such facilities at Air National Guard installations, and how you plan to bring these facilities up to standard?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, transition to advance design weapon systems by most of our units has generated a requirement for additional facilities to house more complex and larger avionics test equipment. The size of our hangar lean-to areas does not normally allow us to expand our present avionics facilities. We must continue to program for new avionics shops to support these newer aircraft.

The nondestruct inspection (NDI) is a relatively new requirement and must be performed as a normal part of the aircraft inspection process. It is vital to safety of flight. The construction of NDI laboratories is required when sufficient space is not available within existing facilities.

## CALL UP OF UNITS

[The following questions were asked by Dr. Long for insertion in the record:]

### READINESS PRIORITY OF D.C. AIR NATIONAL GUARD IN 1968

Dr. LONG. To return to our discussion of how Reserve or National Guard forces may or may not be used in national emergencies, I have some questions pertaining to the most recent activation of some 14,000 Air National Guardsmen in 1968-69.

What was the readiness priority of this unit when it was activated in 1968?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, all Air National Guard units are priority units in event of a mobilization to meet a national emergency. The 113th Tactical Fighter Group at Andrews had a combat readiness rating of C-1 at the time of its activation in 1968.

There are four categories of combat readiness. They are C-1, C-2, C-3, and C-4 and are defined as follows :

C-1—Fully combat ready. A high degree of relative effectiveness. The unit is adequately manned, equipped, and trained and is fully capable of performing its primary mission.

C-2—Combat ready. A lesser degree of capability than C-1. Minor deficiencies exist in personnel, facilities, equipment, training, and so forth.

C-3—Marginally combat ready. A lesser degree of capability than C-2. Major deficiencies exist in personnel, facilities, equipment, training, and so forth.

C-4—Not combat ready. A very low degree of effectiveness. Unit is not capable of performing its combat mission. Major deficiencies exist in personnel, facilities, equipment, training, and so forth.

### READINESS PRIORITY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AIR NATIONAL GUARD AT PRESENT

Dr. LONG. What is the readiness priority for possible activation at this time?

General GREENLIEF. As I previously mentioned, the readiness priority of the District of Columbia Air Guard is the same as all other ANG tactical fighter units. At the present time, the 113th Tactical Fighter Group at Andrews Air Force Base is C-3. They are forecasting C-2 by September 30, 1973.

### LIKELIHOOD OF UNITS ACTIVATED IN THE PAST BEING REACTIVATED

Dr. LONG. Are the units which were called up most recently less likely to be activated the next time than, say, those units which were activated in the Berlin crisis? Would you please list the units activated, respectively, in the Berlin and *Pueblo* crises, and show their current readiness priorities?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, consideration is given to units that were called most recently. However, the nature of the national emergency, the combat ready status of the unit, and the needs of the Air Force are the determining factors. A list of those units mobilized during the Berlin and *Pueblo* crises and their current combat readiness status follows :

## UNITS RECALLED PUEBLO CRISIS

<u>GROUP</u>	<u>HOME LOCATION</u>	<u>TYPE ACFT</u>	<u>ACTIVE DUTY STATION</u>	<u>COMBAT READING RATING</u>
139 Tac Recon Gp	Little Rock AFB, AR	RF-101	Little Rock AFB, AR <sup>1</sup>	N-A
140 Tac Ftr Gp	Buckley ANGB, CO	F-100C	Phan Rang, Viet Nam	C-1
113 Tac Ftr Gp	Andrews AFB, MD	F-100C	Myrtle Beach AFB, SC	C-3
185 Tac Ftr Gp	Sioux City MAP, IA	F-100C	Phu Cat, Viet Nam	C-1
184 Tac Ftr Gp	McConnell AFB, KS	F-100C	Kunsan, Korea	Not Ra
123 Tac Recon Gp	Louisville, KY	RF-101	Richards-Gebaur AFB, MO <sup>1</sup>	C-2
175 Tac Ftr Gp	Baltimore, MD	F-86H	Cannon AFB, NM	C-4 <sup>2</sup>
152 Tac Recon Gp	Reno, NV	RF-101	Richards-Gebaur AFB, MO <sup>1</sup>	C-3
177 Tac Ftr Gp	Atlantic City, NJ	F-100C	Myrtle Beach AFB, SC	C-4 <sup>3</sup>
150 Tac Ftr Gp	Kirtland AFB, NM	F-100C	Tuy Hoa, Viet Nam	C-2
107 Tac Ftr Gp	Niagara Falls, NY	F-100C	Tuy Hoa, Viet Nam	C-3
174 Tac Ftr Gp	Syracuse, NY	F-86H	Cannon AFB, NM	C-4 <sup>2</sup>
121 Tac Ftr Gp	Lockbourne AFB, OH	F-100C	Kunsan, Korea	C-2
171 Aeromed Alft Gp	Pittsburgh, PA	C-121	Pittsburgh, PA	C-4

<sup>1</sup>Rotational TDY at Itazuke, Japan:

<sup>2</sup>Insufficient aircraft as a result of reduction of assets [

<sup>3</sup>Units in various stages of conversion to new weapon system.

## UNITS RECALLED - 1 OCTOBER 1961

## BERLIN CRISIS

UNIT	HOME LOCATION	TYPE ACFT	ACTIVE DUTY STATION	COMBAT READINESS RATING
106 Tac Recon Sq	Birmingham, AL	RF-84F	Dreux AB, France	C-3
160 Tac Recon Sq	Montgomery, AL	RF-84F	Dannelly Fld	C-2
197 Ftr Intercept Sq	Phoenix, AZ	F-104	Ramstein AB, Germany	C-2
184 Tac Recon Sq	Ft Smith, AR	RF-84F	Ft Smith, AR	C-3
115 Air Trans Sq	Van Nuys, CA	C-97	Van Nuys, CA	C-3
195 Air Trans Sq	Van Nuys, CA	C-97	Van Nuys, CA	C-3
120 Tac Ftr Sq	Denver, CO	F-100C	Buckley ANGB, CO	C-1
103Acft Control & Warning	Milford, CT	(Radar Unit)	Mannheim, Germany	C-3
121 Tac Ftr Sq	Andrews AFB, MD	F-100C	Andrews AFB, MD	C-3
169 Tac Ftr Sq	Peoria, IL	F-84F	Peoria, IL	C-3
170 Tac Ftr Sq	Springfield, IL	F-84F	Capitol MAP, IL	C-4 <sup>1</sup>
163 Tac Ftr Sq	Ft Wayne, IN	F-84F	Chambley, France	C-3
113 Tac Ftr Sq	Terre Haute, IN	F-84F	Hulman Fld, IN	C-1
101 Tac Ftr Sq	Boston, MA	F-86H	Phalsbourg, France	C-4 <sup>1</sup>
131 Tac Ftr Sq	Westfield, MA	F-86H	Phalsbourg, France	C-2
109 Air Trans Sq	Minneapolis, MN	C-97	Minn-St Paul IAP, MN	C-3
153 Tac Recon Sq	Meridian, MS	RF-84F	Key Field, MS	C-2
110 Tac Ftr Sq	St Louis, MO	F-84F	Toul-Rosieres, France	C-1
133 Air Trans Sq	Manchester, NH	C-97	Grenier Fld, NH	C-2
141 Tac Ftr Sq	McGuire AFB, NJ	F-84F	Chaumont AB, France	C-4 <sup>2</sup>
119 Tac Ftr Sq	Atlantic City, NJ	F-84F	Atlantic City, NJ	C-4 <sup>1</sup>
136 Tac Ftr Sq	Niagara Falls, NY	F-100C	Niagara Falls, NY	C-3
138 Tac Ftr Sq	Syracuse, NY	F-86H	Phalsbourg, France	C-4 <sup>3</sup>
106 Tac Control Sq	Roslyn, NY	--	Mannheim, Germany	C-2
139 Air Trans Sq	Schenectady, NY	C-97	Schenectady, NY	C-2
108 Acft Control & Warning	Syracuse, NY	(Radar)	Gutersloh, Germany	C-4 <sup>4</sup>
112 Tac Ftr Sq	Toledo, OH	F-84F	Toledo, OH	C-1
166 Tac Ftr Sq	Lockbourne AFB, OH	F-84F	Etain, France	C-2
162 Tac Ftr Sq	Springfield, OH	F-84F	Springfield, OH	C-2
164 Tac Ftr Sq	Mansfield, OH	F-84F	Mansfield, OH	C-3
123 Acft Control & Warning	Blue Ash, OH	(Radar)	Landshut, Germany	C-3
125 Air Trans Sq	Tulsa, OK	C-97	Tulsa MAP, OK	C-4
112 Acft Control & Warning	State Col, PA	(Radar)	Beuchel, Germany	C-3
102 Acft Control & Warning	Cranston, RI	(Radar)	Celle, Germany	C-4 <sup>4</sup>
157 Ftr Intercept Gp	Columbia, SC	F-104	Ramstein AB, Germany	C-2
151 Ftr Intercept Sq	Knoxville, TN	F-104	Ramstein AB, Germany	C-1
149 Tac Ftr Sq	Richmond, VA	F-84F	Byrd Fld, VA	C-2

<sup>1</sup>Units in various stages of conversion to new weapon system.

<sup>2</sup>Insufficient aircraft as a result of delivery to contractor for extensive safety of flight modifications to electrical system.

<sup>3</sup>Insufficient aircraft as a result of redistribution of assets [

<sup>4</sup>Insufficient unit equipment.

USAGE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AIR NATIONAL GUARD UNIT AFTER  
ACTIVATION IN 1968

Dr. LONG. In regards to the District of Columbia Air Guard unit, is it true that this unit was not used as a unit in the 1968 callup; that for several months individuals were assigned to various units within the Andrews Air Force Base Command; and then later most individuals were sent to various locations in Asia and the United States? If so, why?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, after the 1968 activation, the District of Columbia Air Guard remained at Andrew Air Force Base until it was determined that the fighter squadron would not be deployed to Southeast Asia but would be transferred to Myrtle Beach Air Force Base to form the nucleus of a tactical fighter training wing. Prior to this move, District of Columbia Air Guard personnel filled vacancies and provided support to Andrews Air Force Base. After the move, the Air Force did use individuals which were not transferred with the fighter squadron to fill vitally needed personnel requirements both in the CONUS and overseas.

SPLIT-UP OF OTHER AIR NATIONAL GUARD UNITS AFTER 1968 CALL-UP

Dr. LONG. Were any other Air National Guard units so split-up? If so, which ones had such a mission change?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, after activation of the Air National Guard units in 1968, the tactical units were deployed from their home station. The facilities and support available and in place at their deployment base determined the types of skills and number of personnel required from the ANG support units. These personnel were deployed with the tactical units. Those not required at the new base were assigned throughout the world as required by the Air Force manpower needs.

USE OF BUILDINGS CONSTRUCTED UNDER ANG APPROPRIATION IN ACTIVATIONS

Dr. LONG. Can you assure me that the buildings we are asked to construct will be used in the event of an Air National Guard activation? If not, why not?

General GREENLIEF. Sir, the use of Air National Guard facilities during periods of activation depends primarily upon the type of unit mobilized and whether or not the unit is deployed to another location. For example, a tactical fighter unit would probably be deployed but an aerospace defense unit would remain at its home station. Upon release from active duty, units that were deployed would again make full use of their home facilities.

---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

WITNESSES

**MAJ. GEN. HOMER I. LEWIS, CHIEF OF AIR FORCE RESERVE**  
**COL. ZANE G. BREWER, CHIEF, PLANS, PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES**  
**DIVISION, OFFICE OF AIR FORCE RESERVE**  
**COL. ORLANDO LORETTI, CHIEF, COMPTROLLER DIVISION, OFFICE**  
**OF AIR FORCE RESERVE**  
**JOHN H. LEE, DIRECTORATE OF BUDGET, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR**  
**FORCE**  
**CAPT. HERMAN L. STRICKLEN, STAFF CIVIL ENGINEER, OFFICE OF**  
**AIR FORCE RESERVE**

Mr. SIKES. General Lewis, will you please bring your witnesses to the table?

General LEWIS. All right, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Let me thank you on behalf of the committee for your patience in agreeing to our changes in the hearing schedule.

General LEWIS. Not at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. Everybody seemed to have problems about timing and we like to be helpful when we can. You were very cooperative. We appreciate it.

General LEWIS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SIKES. General, we are certainly happy to welcome you before the committee. Of course you and I have enjoyed a very cordial relationship through the Reserve Officers Association for a number of years. I have watched your career with interest and admiration.

General LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have pages vi through viii and pages xvii through xix appear in the record.

[The pages follow.]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE  
PROGRAM AND FINANCING (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Budget plan (amounts for construction actions programed)			Obligations		
	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate
<b>Program by activities:</b>						
1. Major construction.....	7,638	6,410	9,000	8,727	7,600	8,500
2. Minor construction.....	341	200	200	178	300	300
3. Planning.....	576	390	800	561	400	700
Total.....	8,555	7,000	10,000	9,466	8,300	9,500
<b>Financing:</b>						
Unobligated balance available, start of year for completion of prior year budget plans.....				-5,792	-2,907	-1,607
Reprogramming from (-) or to prior year budget plans.....	-1,974					
Unobligated balance available, end of year for completion of prior year budget plans.....				2,907	1,607	2,107
Budget authority (appropriation).....	6,581	7,000	10,000	6,581	7,000	10,000
<b>Relation of obligations to outlays:</b>						
Obligations incurred, net.....				9,466	8,300	9,500
Obligated balance, start of year.....				3,830	7,610	10,410
Obligated balance, end of year.....				-7,610	-10,410	-12,910
Outlays.....				5,685	5,500	7,000
<b>Department of the Air Force:</b>						
Other services.....				2	5	5
Lands and structures.....				415	795	495
Total, Department of the Air Force.....				417	800	500
<b>Allocation accounts:</b>						
Other services.....				549	550	750
Lands and structures.....				8,500	6,950	8,250
Total, allocation accounts.....				9,049	7,500	9,000
Total, obligations.....				9,466	8,300	9,500
<b>Obligations are distributed as follows:</b>						
<b>Defense—Military:</b>						
Army.....				5,765	5,700	6,000
Navy.....				3,284	2,100	3,000
Air Force.....				417	500	500

## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

*Appropriation: Military Construction—Air Force Reserve*

Program :	Program request
Program 310, planning.....	\$800,000
Program 320, inside United States.....	9,000,000
Program 340, minor construction.....	200,000
<b>Total program.....</b>	<b>10,000,000</b>

## CROSS REFERENCE BY STATE—AIR FORCE RESERVE

State, installation and category code	Item	Scope	Cost (thousands)
Arizona—Luke AFB: 218-852.....	Parachute and dinghy repair shop.....	4,400 SF	\$181
Florida—Eglin AFB Aux No. 3:			
218-712.....	Aerospace ground equipment shop.....	4,500 SF	154
211-157.....	Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop.....	10,000 SF	278
116-672.....	Aircraft corrosion control.....	1 EA	100
			532
Georgia—Dobbins AFB:			
211-153.....	Nondestructive inspection shop.....	2,699 SF	150
218-712.....	Aerospace ground equipment shop.....	4,500 SF	146
			296
Illinois—Chicago-O'Hare IAP:			
211-153.....	Nondestructive inspection shop.....	2,699 SF	149
211-179.....	Fuel system maintenance dock.....	17,580 SF	871
			1,020
Indiana—Grissom AFB: 171-447.....	Reserve forces communication—electronic training.	2,160 SF	110
Maryland—Andrews AFB: 218-712.....	Aerospace ground equipment shop.....	4,500	174
Massachusetts—Westover AFB: 171-449.	Reserve forces aeromedical evacuation training facility.	5,200 SF	211
Michigan—Selfridge ANG Base:			
211-179.....	Alter fuel system maintenance dock.....	14,130 SF	185
211-157.....	Composite aircraft maintenance shop.....	17,000 SF	700
			885
Minnesota—Minneapolis-St. Paul IAP:	Alter nondestructive inspection shop.....	2,450 SF	92
211-153.			
Mississippi—Keesler AFB: 211-111....	Add to maintenance hangar.....	8,000 SF	375
Missouri—Richards-Gebaur AFB:			
211-179.....	Alter fuel system maintenance dock.....	24,014 SF	171
141-753.....	Squadron operations.....	8,096 SF	347
			518
New York—Niagra Falls IAP:			
211-153.....	Alter nondestructive inspection shop.....	2,577 SF	90
211-179.....	Alter fuel system maintenance dock.....	1 EA	175
			265
Ohio—Youngstown MAP: 211-153.....	Alter nondestructive inspection shop.....	2,764 SF	100
Oklahoma—Tinker AFB: 116-665.....	Power check pad w/suppressor.....	1,100 SY	199

## CROSS REFERENCE BY STATE—AIR FORCE RESERVE—Continued

State, installation and category code	Item	Scope	Cost (thousands)
<b>Pennsylvania—</b>			
Greater Pittsburgh IAP:			
171-873	Aerial port training facility	7,500 SF	\$332
211-153	Nondestructive inspection shop	2,699 SF	145
218-712	Aerospace ground equipment shop	4,500 SF	201
218-852	Parachute and dinghy repair shop	4,400 SF	187
			855
Willow Grove ARF:			
211-153	Alter nondestructive inspection shop	2,921 SF	98
211-179	Fuel system maintenance dock	17,580 SF	930
171-447	Reserve forces communication-electronic training.	2,160 SF	119
			1,147
<b>Texas—Ellington AFB:</b>			
214-425	Automotive maintenance facility	24,890 SF	832
111-115	Extend paved overrun	7,633 SY	133
911-146	Land fee purchase	11.19 AC	100
121-111/214-425	Composite refueler maintenance/POL operations	6,400 SF	248
211-154	Aircraft organizational maintenance shop	2,500 SF	86
921-177	Perpetual restrictive land easement	213.67 AC	352
			1,751
Utah—Hill AFB: 116-665	Power check pad w/suppressors	910 SY	135
Wisconsin—Gen. B. Mitchell Fld: 211-153	Nondestructive inspection shop	2,699 SF	154
			9,000
Total			

## STATEMENT OF CHIEF OF AIR FORCE RESERVE

Mr. SIKES. General Lewis, we will hear your statement.

General LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to meet with you and present our military construction request for fiscal year 1974. Our request for new obligational authority totals \$10 million. Of this total, \$9 million is for major construction, \$800,000 is for planning and design, and \$200,000 is for minor construction.

I would like to take a few moments to give you a report on our fiscal year 1973 program. Of the 18 projects in our original fiscal year 1973 program, 14 are under contract. The remaining projects should be under contract by the end of July 1973. Our uncommitted balance of fiscal year 1973 and prior authorization is \$100,000. We consider this a reasonable amount to provide contingencies for ongoing projects and future bid openings. We anticipate an unobligated balance of approximately \$2.5 million as of June 30, 1973.

The recently announced Air Force base realignment actions for Westover AFB, Mass., have resulted in some adjustments in our fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 programs. The planned transfer of Westover AFB to the Air Force Reserve will make additional facilities

available for our use. As a result, we have canceled an aerial port training facility in our fiscal year 1973 program and the aeromedical evacuation training facility in our fiscal year 1974 program for Westover. To provide timely obligation of the fiscal year 1973 funds released by the cancellation of the aerial port training facility, we have moved four alteration projects for which design was well advanced from our fiscal year 1974 program to the fiscal year 1973 program. The projects involved are the alter nondestructive inspection shop projects at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, Minn.; Niagara Falls International Airport, N.Y.; Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio; and Willow Grove Air Reserve Facility, Pa. To fill the void in the tentative fiscal year 1974 list, we have added an assault landing strip project for Eglin AFB, auxiliary field No. 3, Fla. I have a revised tentative project listing for our fiscal year 1974 request which I would like to have inserted in the record.

## PROJECT LISTING

Mr. SIKES. It will be inserted in the record.  
[The listing follows:]

*Air Force Reserve, fiscal year 1974 military construction program, revised tentative project listing*

	<i>Amounts</i>
Arizona, Luke AFB: Parachute and dinghy repair shop-----	\$181, 000
Florida, Eglin AFB Auxiliary No. 3:	
Aerospace ground equipment shop-----	154, 000
Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop-----	278, 000
Aircraft corrosion control-----	100, 000
Assault landing strip-----	450, 000
Subtotal-----	<u>982, 000</u>
Georgia, Dobbins AFB:	
Nondestructive inspection shop-----	150, 000
Aerospace ground equipment shop-----	146, 000
Subtotal-----	<u>296, 000</u>
Illinois, Chicago O'Hare International Airport:	
Nondestructive inspection shop-----	149, 000
Fuel system maintenance dock-----	939, 000
Subtotal-----	<u>1, 088, 000</u>
Indiana, Grissom AFB: Reserve Forces communications electronic training-----	110, 000
Maryland, Andrews AFB: Aerospace ground equipment shop-----	174, 000
Subtotal-----	<u>284, 000</u>
Michigan, Selfridge Air National Guard Base:	
Alter fuel system maintenance dock-----	185, 000
Composite aircraft maintenance shop-----	750, 000
Subtotal-----	<u>935, 000</u>
Mississippi, Keesler AFB: Add to maintenance hangar-----	375, 000
Subtotal-----	<u>375, 000</u>
Missouri, Richards-Gebaur AFB:	
Alter fuel system maintenance dock-----	171, 000
Squadron operations-----	347, 000
Subtotal-----	<u>518, 000</u>
New York, Niagara Falls International Airport: Alter fuel system maintenance dock-----	175, 000
Oklahoma, Tinker AFB: Power check pad with suppressors-----	199, 000
Subtotal-----	<u>374, 000</u>

*Air Force, fiscal year 1974 military construction program, revised tentative project listing—Continued*

Pennsylvania:

	<i>Amounts</i>
Greater Pittsburgh International Airport:	
Aerial port training facility.....	\$322, 000
Nondestructive inspection shop.....	145, 000
Aerospace ground equipment shop.....	205, 000
Parachute and dinghy repair shop.....	200, 000
Subtotal.....	872, 000

Willow Grove ARF:

Fuel system maintenance dock.....	930, 000
Reserve Forces communication electronic training.....	125, 000

Subtotal.....	1, 055, 000
---------------	-------------

Texas, Ellington AFB:

Automotive maintenance facility.....	832, 000
Extend paved overrun.....	133, 000
Land fee purchase.....	100, 000
Composite refueler maintenance/POL operations.....	248, 000
Aircraft organizational maintenance shop.....	86, 000
Perpetual restrictive land easement.....	352, 000

Subtotal.....	1, 751, 000
---------------	-------------

Utah, Hill AFB: Power check pad with suppressors.....	135, 000
---	----------

Wisconsin, Gen. Billy Mitchell Field: Nondestructive inspection shop.....	154, 000
---	----------

Subtotal, major construction and authorization.....	9, 000, 000
---	-------------

Various:

Planning and design.....	800, 000
Minor construction.....	200, 000

Total appropriation.....	10, 000, 000
--------------------------	--------------

General LEWIS. Thank you, sir. Our fiscal year 1974 request places primary emphasis on maintenance facilities. The revised tentative list includes 32 projects at 16 locations in 15 States. The projects in this request are primarily for locations which have tactical airlift and tactical fighter missions which have experienced equipment conversions in recent years. One new unit is also involved. This is a C-130 tactical airlift unit at Keesler AFB, Miss. The detailed justification for each project and manpower statistics for each unit involved are included in the backup books provided to your committee.

Our fiscal year 1974 program is requested under the lump-sum funding and programing procedures utilized since fiscal year 1963. Planning and design actions for our 1974 program are well advanced. Advertising is scheduled for January and February of calendar year 1974. My efforts to provide the most economical facilities to enhance the training capability and operational readiness of the Air Force Reserve will continue during fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my general statement in support of the Air Force Reserve fiscal year 1974 military construction program. I appreciate the consideration and support which our programs receive from your committee.

I will be most happy to answer any questions the committee might have.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you, General Lewis, and let me congratulate you on the way in which your planning and design activities have been advanced and the fact that you apparently are fully in control of the problem of procuring construction at the earliest possible date after last year's program was funded and the bill became law.

#### REQUEST

What was your budget request? Did you get the amount of money that you asked for?

General LEWIS. Yes, sir. We requested \$10 million for 1974 and we got every dollar we asked for.

Mr. SIKES. Is that what you need?

General LEWIS. That is what we, in our best judgment and our best management abilities, think we need.

#### RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CHIEF OF THE AIR FORCE RESERVE

Mr. SIKES. What is your responsibility as Chief of a Reserve component?

General LEWIS. As the Chief of Air Force Reserve, I am the principal adviser to the Chief of Staff of the Air Force on all Reserve matters. Operating within departmental policies, my staff meets with other air staff offices to formulate plans and programs for the Air Force Reserve. As an integral part of the air staff, my office is the focal point for all actions or activities that are of concern to or impact upon the Air Force Reserve. I am also responsible for justifying and, through financial management channels, managing the funds appropriated by Congress for the Air Force Reserve personnel, operations, maintenance, and construction programs.

Mr. SIKES. Does this include responsibility for achieving the operational readiness of your units?

General LEWIS. I serve in a dual-hatted capacity as Chief of the Air Force Reserve and as commander of AFRES—the field command. Therefore, I consider that as the adviser to the Chief of Staff for Air Force Reserve matters I am responsible for every facet of the Reserve program. This is, I believe, the intent of the mandate in Public Law 90-168 as reaffirmed at my confirmation before the Senate Armed Services Committee during the 92d Congress. It is also spelled out in current Air Force directives. These directives hold me responsible to the Chief of Staff for the operational readiness and efficiency of the total Air Force Reserve program.

Mr. SIKES. How is readiness validated?

General LEWIS. Readiness is validated by the major gaining commands through operational readiness and management inspections. The same JCS criteria used for determining operational readiness of Active Force units is used in evaluating operational readiness and efficiency of the Air Force Reserve.

Mr. SIKES. Who determines what training is required?

General LEWIS. The wartime gaining commands of Reserve Forces determine what training is required. In other words they establish the training criteria, publish appropriate training manuals and directives, and inspect the Reserve Force units for accomplishment.

Mr. SIKES. Who actually conducts this training?

General LEWIS. For the individual mobilization augmentees, the active major commands conduct the required training. For the unit program, the commander of the local Reserve unit is responsible for the conduct of the training and most of it is accomplished at the local Reserve unit level. This is spelled out in the authority vested in the local Reserve unit commanders and the direction given them to man and train their units.

#### BID EXPERIENCE

Mr. SIKES. What has been your success in bidding for the fiscal 1973 program and the fiscal 1972 program. Are there a sufficient number of bidders to insure strong competition, and are the bids within the estimates?

General LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, our experience in 1973 has been I think very good. I think only four bids in fiscal year 1973 exceed our projections. I don't recall the exact percentage but I can make it complete for the record.

Mr. SIKES. All right.

[The information follows:]

#### BID EXPERIENCE AF RESERVE

Since July 1, 1973, we have opened bids on 19 major projects. The total estimated cost of these projects prior to bid opening was \$6,406,000 whereas the combined low bid cost for these projects is \$6,414,000. While the bids for four projects exceeded our cost estimates, the remainder were slightly below so that the total variation was less than 1 percent.

General LEWIS. But we have had an outstanding year in the bidding arena.

#### PERSONNEL STRENGTH

Mr. SIKES. Very good. Tell me about personnel. Are you having any problems obtaining the required number of personnel?

General LEWIS. Personnel is one of our real challenges. The Air Force Reserve is in difficulty in this area, but not critical. We could still be C-1 in almost every unit with what we have today but the trend is disturbing and manning is a problem, of course.

The biggest problem in our manning is retention because 60 percent, 60, 62 percent, of these young people are the non-prior-service people and they do not have a desire to stay in the program once their 6 years have expired.

The new ones that we are getting we feel will be dedicated reservists joining the program for the right reasons and they will probably stay. So retention is aggravating our manning situation. Accessions are good—could be better, of course—but our problem really is retention.

Mr. SIKES. How do you recruit your personnel?

General LEWIS. We recruit, Mr. Chairman, with a recruiting force, a recruiting effort of our own, the first time we have ever had this. We work very closely with the U.S. Air Force Recruiting Service.

They train our recruiters. We are getting closer and closer to the recruiting service, to help us help ourselves. We do this with a few technicians, not many. We call reservists to active duty on man-days to man this force, approximately 90 to 100 officers and airmen who do this recruiting for us full time.

However, I should remind everybody that our unit commanders being reservists and being in a Reserve community, their primary mission is to man and train. It is their job to man their unit. They can do it better than anyone else. But they are getting an awful lot of assistance now with a full-time recruiting force.

Mr. SIKES. Do you feel that the incentives which have been discussed in connection with other Reserve programs also are essential for the Air Force Reserve?

General LEWIS. I think they are essential and I think that we can do a much better job if we have these bonuses. We are approximately 5,000 people short right now.

Mr. SIKES. Out of how many?

General LEWIS. Out of approximately 49,000. We are right at 10 percent short, and I know that these incentives would help us immeasurably to excite and recruit these young people to our force.

#### FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SIKES. To what extent will you be able to use facilities at Hamilton, Andrews, and Otis, which are being vacated by regular units, to meet present and projected Air Force Reserve facilities requirements?

General LEWIS. Sir, we don't have any facility problems per se at Andrews. We have no units at Otis. At Hamilton and Westover we are in the midst of a very intensive study to determine exactly what will be exceeded. We hope it will be resolved real soon but we don't know exactly which facilities are going to be available yet at Hamilton and Westover.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Is the 459th Wing or squadron out at Andrews?

General LEWIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Is that yours?

General LEWIS. That is ours.

Mr. NICHOLAS. In response to a committee question, there was an indication the Air Force might turn over the current night watch facilities to the Reserve.

We asked, "What will you do with the present hangars?" and they said they will be used by the 459th. Could you check it?

General LEWIS. I better check the reply to that query. I don't remember that we got very involved in that exercise or got very involved at all in any facility problems at Andrews. We have pretty fair facilities out there.

[The information follows:]

#### USE OF FACILITIES AT ANDREWS

The night watch facilities are on the opposite side of the Andrews Airfield from the current facilities of the 459th Tactical Airlift Wing. The current hangar facilities of the 459th are in excellent condition and suitable in number for the C-130 aircraft assigned. The night watch facilities are therefore not required for the Air Force Reserve mission. In addition, their use would result in additional man-hours for travel due to the distance from the other 459th facilities.

## EXCESSING OF FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. What problems, if any, has the Air Force Reserve had with land or facilities being excessed under Executive Order 11508? Have you lost any land that you feel you need for compatible use zones for instance?

General LEWIS. Our installations are being surveyed by the General Services Administration under Executive Order 11508. We have not experienced any problems with these surveys and have not lost any land which we feel we need for compatible use zones.

## UTILIZATION OF FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. Are you requesting facilities for any units for which you feel you may not be able to maintain strength levels?

General LEWIS. With the newer mission aircraft involved and our increased emphasis on recruiting and retention, we do not anticipate manning problems which would prevent combat readiness. This, of course is an area which we monitor constantly and I would never advocate constructing a facility which we would not utilize.

## JOINT USE OF FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. To what extent do you employ joint use of other components facilities? Could you do more in this area?

[The information follows:]

Joint use or use of facilities excess to other components is our first consideration when we identify a facility problem. We currently have flying units at 38 different locations. Of these, 26 are active Air Force bases, seven are municipal airports, one is an Air National Guard base, two are Navy operated installations and two are Air Force Reserve bases. Our two Air Force Reserve bases are also used jointly by other Reserve components. On these joint use bases, most of our support functions are accommodated by facilities operated by the host. Additionally, we are constructing jointly with the ANG an automotive maintenance facility at Ellington AFB, Tex. In the recent past, we have moved two flying units from Bakalar AFB, Ind. and two flying units from Clinton County AFB, Ohio, to the active force bases of Grissom AFB and Lockbourne AFB respectively. These actions allowed us to use jointly the Active Force bases and excess Bakalar and Clinton County. We shall continue to pursue such actions to the maximum extent possible.

## BASES TRANSFERRED TO RESERVE LAST 5 YEARS

Mr. SIKES. What bases have been transferred to the Air Force Reserve in the past 5 years, and what is the value of the facilities?

General LEWIS. Within the past 5 years only the Air Force portion of the facilities at Niagara Falls International Airport, New York have been transferred to the Air Force Reserve. The total value of the facilities at Niagara Falls is \$28.2 million. The Air National Guard is also located at Niagara Falls.

## CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE RESERVE IN COMBAT

Mr. SIKES. Would you provide a statement for the record on the utilization and contributions of the Air Force Reserve during the Korean and Vietnam wars? Also include a statement as to policy on their future use in contingencies.

[The information follows:]

Twenty Troop Carrier Wings and five Bomb Wings were mobilized during the Korean conflict. These mobilizations began on August 1, 1950, and included 97 flying squadrons. This recall involved 28,290 personnel. During the Vietnam conflict two Military Airlift Wings and five Military Airlift Groups were mobilized on January 26, 1968. This recall involved 4,847 personnel. There was an additional mobilization on May 13, 1968, involving one Aerospace Rescue Squadron, three Aerial Port Squadrons, one Tactical Airlift Group, one Medical Service Squadron and one Aeromedical Evacuation Squadron. Six hundred seventy-seven personnel were involved in the May 13, 1968 call up. There were also Reserve mobilizations during the Berlin Airlift, the Cuban crisis, and the national postal workers strike in 1970. The Air Force Reserve has contributed significantly to the USAF mission without mobilization. For example in fiscal year 1972 USAFR units flew 10,078 productive missions in support of almost every major Air Command. The majority of these missions were flown for the Military Airlift Command and Tactical Air Command. Reserve crews logged 43,819 flying hours airlifting 14,781 cargo tons over 25-million-ton miles and 67,589 passengers over 47-million-passenger miles. Reserve crews also airdropped 702 tons of cargo and 48,696 airborne troops.

The total force concept which was promulgated in 1970 continues to be an objective of the military department. The Air Force Reserve has been included in planning the best possible force to meet the national strategy and therefore it would be safe to predict that the Air Force Reserve will be relied upon and used in future contingencies as they have been in the past.

## RESERVE MISSION

Mr. SIKES. To what extent is the Air Force Reserve effort directed at the support of flying units and to what extent in support of nonflying units?

General LEWIS. Our program in fiscal 1974 is practically all flying units. I don't know of any nonflying units involved in our program for fiscal 1974; 100 percent flying.

Mr. SIKES. That has not been true in the past, then.

General LEWIS. Oh, no, sir; we have some very fine nonflying units, very essential.

Mr. SIKES. There would be no nonflying units in the present program. Is that what you said?

General LEWIS. No, sir; in the current construction program there are no funds for nonflying units. All the funds are for flying units.

Mr. SIKES. A recent report by the committee's surveys and investigations staff was critical of the management of Air Force nonflying reserve units. Briefly, it seemed to indicate that certain commands such as SAC and TAC had many more nonflying Reserve units than they would need for any conceivable wartime missions, whereas commands such as MAC, which had a valid requirement for additional nonflying Reserve units, couldn't obtain them.

Would you comment on that?

General LEWIS. Yes, sir. I am not familiar with the nonflying units

in MAC, SAC, or the major air commands, but I am quite conversant on the nonflying units in Air Force Reserve and those gained by MAC.

We have a few in SAC, some in MAC. You are referring to those gaining commands. Our nonflying units are a very vital part of our program, very essential units to meet the requirements for the scenario, for the national strategy, and people have made remarks that they don't really appreciate the service that these people provide.

We couldn't get along without them and I would be glad to address any and each one of them. We only have 138 nonflying units in our program.

We did inactivate 108 medical service units in January 1973, and we inactivated our 10 air postal and courier units, and this was in consonance with the desires of Congress who gave us a few options; those are the options we took. They did not meet the scenario per se but the ones we have left are most vital.

#### PROGRAM JUSTIFICATION

Mr. SIKES. In almost every instance this year, you seek training, maintenance, or shop facilities. Is this because of the newer aircraft you are assigned?

General LEWIS. The reason is primarily the fact that our conversions into more modern weapons systems have given us a real requirement and a demand that these kind of facilities be finished as quickly as possible.

Mr. SIKES. What type of aircraft are you using, and what are you converting to?

General LEWIS. A lot of these are C-130's and F-105 fighter bombers. They are primarily TAC units. There are 130's, 105's, some rescue, and the A-37—the newer weapons. All of our units have been converted to newer weapons systems.

Mr. SIKES. Tell us about the updating of the new weapons systems, aircraft, communications, et cetera. Are you satisfied?

General LEWIS. We are very satisfied. I think we have the most dynamic Air Force Reserve program we have had in the last 6 years. In the last 2 or 3 years most units have and probably within the next year, every one of our units will have converted to a new weapons system.

Our units in the Military Airlift Command have converted to the C-141's and C-5's. We are extremely happy with them.

Mr. SIKES. What about maintenance? Do you do your own maintenance?

General LEWIS. Yes, sir, we do.

Mr. SIKES. Are you satisfied with your maintenance level?

General LEWIS. We have an expertise in the maintenance area probably second to none.

Mr. SIKES. How much deficiency do you have for training, maintenance, and shop facilities?

General LEWIS. In all facilities, it is \$111 million. In the training, maintenance and operation, I don't have that.

Mr. SIKES. Break it down.

[The information follows:]

## DEFICIENCIES TRAINING MAINTENANCE AND SHOP FACILITIES

The deficiency for maintenance and shop facilities is \$19.9 million. The deficiency for training facilities is \$16.2 million.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have any hope of overcoming this deficit within a reasonable time—5 years?

General LEWIS. Yes, sir, we have definitely. We see no obstructions and no problems—of course, hopefully with the assistance of Congress. We have a very modest program and we are on track in everything.

## NEED FOR ASSAULT STRIP

Mr. SIKES. You reported there is a need for an assault landing strip at Eglin No. 3 to serve Reserve forces in the Southeast. I have been familiar with this Reserve unit since its inception. I have been very pleased with the progress that it has made. You have a very fine young officer in command and a very fine group of people in there. I know they have had a serious need for this assault landing strip. I am very glad it is being provided.

General LEWIS. May I comment on that?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

General LEWIS. He is one very fine commander. That unit, by the way, is 100 percent manned. A lot of people said we couldn't do that in northern Florida, and we did it. That is mostly due to our young commander there. There are three real estate areas that are really critical in our business, that we look at almost every day: assault strips, ranges, and drop zones. For quite some time, we have been trying to resolve some of these problems by using regional assault strips where the units in a certain area or region of the country can all go to utilize this one assault strip.

We decided and feel a logical place would be at Eglin No. 3 where we have one unit now, and Keesler, just activated April 1973, is only 20 or 25 minutes away, plus our other 130 units on the east coast. We think this will be a most beneficial asset to the program. We think other units will use it, including the active force.

Mr. SIKES. I think that is true.

Is there need for similar facilities elsewhere in the country?

General LEWIS. In some of our techniques in addressing assault strips elsewhere, we are exploring and marking some runways. Of course, that is not a real physiological or psychological approach to it. But with some base closures and some realignments, assault strips are a problem.

I know at Hamilton, Ellington, and Westover, we are concerned about assault strips.

Mr. SIKES. Are your ramps, runways, and support facilities generally keeping pace with the needs generated because of new aircraft being assigned by the Air Force Reserve?

General LEWIS. I don't know of any areas where we don't have the necessary ramps and runways.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Davis.

## NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION SHOPS

Mr. DAVIS. What is the nondestructive inspection shop? Is that a means of testing for stress and other things without disassembling the plane?

General LEWIS. That is correct, except it is a component. You take a component out of a weapons system, a generator. I couldn't begin to identify all the kinds of systems and components. But you take the whole unit, put it in a shop, and without taking it down and without disassembling it you inspect it. That is nondestructing it.

Mr. DAVIS. This is primarily with respect to the airframe then?

General LEWIS. Or the aids, aerospace, ground equipment, any kind of equipment. Primarily it is weapons systems components, and a part of the aircraft.

Mr. DAVIS. What is AFR-86-12?

General LEWIS. Air Force Regulation 86-12?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, at various installations there is posted a certificate by the commanding officer under that number.

General LEWIS. I think Captain Stricklen is responsible for this innovation. He can address it in detail.

Captain STRICKLEN. It is a regulation that gives the broad guidelines to the field on how to submit and how to justify their military construction, their minor construction and operations maintenance programs; the details of submitting the program to the air staff for approval.

General LEWIS. It is the basic guideline for programing these items in the air staff.

Mr. DAVIS. Is it just for minor construction only?

Captain STRICKLEN. No, sir, major and minor and it also provides the cost limitations for approval level at the field by the air staff.

General LEWIS. That also impacts upon the statement by the base commander that there is no duplication.

Captain STRICKLEN. That is right. The statement by the commander is required by this regulation. It is assurance to us they have explored all possibilities of existing facilities in the field, plus they are going to be able to man that unit, to use those facilities if they are built.

General LEWIS. It is almost a validation at the local level that there are no facilities on the base that could take its place, no other way we could share the facility, and it is a genuine cost effective requirement.

Mr. DAVIS. Let's take Billy Mitchell Airfield. Six airplanes. Do you need a nondestructive inspection shop?

General LEWIS. Yes, sir. There might be just six aircraft, but those are six C-130's, and that is quite an aircraft. Twenty-four engines, plus the spares, and the WRM. That is quite an investment and quite an asset to maintain. and you sure have to inspect it.

We hope to go to eight UE fairly soon, maybe next year.

Captain STRICKLEN. At those locations where we are building them, we are the Air Force's primary agency for this function. For instance, the Guard Bureau at Billy Mitchell will do their NDI inspections in our shop. That will be the only one on the base. Where we are located on Active Force bases, we use the Active Force building. There is only one NDI shop per installation throughout the country.

General LEWIS. There is sharing and no duplication.

Mr. DAVIS. So actually this is essential for more than taking care of six planes?

Colonel BREWER. Our ultimate objective is 16 airplanes in the airlift business everywhere we have airlift units. That doesn't mean we have 16 in every location we have now. Eventually we hope to get a minimum of 16 C-130's in each squadron.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you very much, gentlemen. I want to tell you that this committee admires your enthusiasm, and we are impressed by your attitude and dedication to your job.

General LEWIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a great pleasure.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Patten.

Mr. PATTEN. I just want to say it has been a pleasure to have General Greenleaf with us. It is clear you have put muscle and enthusiasm in this program, and I hope you keep up your good work.

I don't need to comment further except to point out you are looking for \$20 million when you need \$200 million.

General GREENLIFF. Thank you, sir, for the kind compliment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. McEwen.

Mr. McEWEN. Off the record, Mr. Chairman.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. SIKES. Very well, gentlemen.

Thank you very much.

This concludes this portion of the Air National Guard discussion, General Greenleaf and General Pesch. Thank you very much.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

### WITNESSES

VICE ADM. D. W. COOPER, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL RESERVE  
REAR ADM. R. G. ALTMANN, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF NAVAL RESERVE. OP-09RB

COMDR W. E. LEGG, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE. OFFICE, DIRECTOR RESOURCES PROGRAMING DIVISION. OP-09R3

R. J. MURPHY, NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

F. A. PETERLIN, NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

W. A. PETERSON, NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

Y. P. BOSWELL, JR., NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

MAJ. J. E. HERLOCKER, U.S. MARINE CORPS, HEADQUARTERS, MARINE CORPS, OFFICE, ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER GENERAL (FACILITIES AND SERVICES)

LT. COL. J. P. TREHY, HEADQUARTERS. U.S. MARINE CORPS, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF MARINE CORPS RESERVE

CAPT. J. E. PARSONS (CEC), U.S. NAVY, NAVAL AIR RESERVE STAFF

COMDR. D. M. KLEIN (CEC), U.S. NAVY, NAVAL RESERVE STAFF

V. H. DURRANCE, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF NAVAL RESERVE

Mr. SIKES. The committee will come to order.

The committee will now consider the Navy's requirements for military construction of the Naval Reserve for fiscal 1974.

We will insert the financial summary page as well as pages i through vi.