

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1974**

JOINT HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEES ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

AND THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 11459

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

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1973

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana, *Chairman*

WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Wisconsin

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas

Chairman, Ex Officio

RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania

CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Maryland

HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma

MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota

Ex Officio

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

JOHN TOWER, Texas

HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada

VORLEY M. REXROAD, *Clerk*

JOEL E. BONNER, *Minority Staff Member*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina

HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada

HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., Virginia

JOHN TOWER, Texas

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina

PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado

GORDON A. NEASE, *Professional Staff Member*

SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE

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

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1974

MONDAY, AUGUST 6, 1973

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Sheridan, you may proceed.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FAMILY AND BACHELOR HOUSING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. \$1.9 billion.

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. It changed.

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. That would be about—

Mr. SHERIDAN. \$43 million.

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. This was 1966 or 1967?

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

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

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

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

Admiral LALOR. Aye, aye, sir.

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. No, sir.

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. You say the remaining projects?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. What are the remaining projects?

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Why did you want to do that?

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. They are basically Vietnamese.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much did you pay them?

Mr. SHERIDAN. We take bids on that.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much was it to complete it?

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Less than \$40 million.

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

[See p. 8.]

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Why did you do that?

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you say that again?

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Why would it drag on for years?

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Did they ask you to do it?

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

Admiral LALOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERIDAN. And they accepted.

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you supply it for the record?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

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

Senator SYMINGTON. You say: "As well as the balance of the primary highway upgrade programs and dependent shelter program."

Was that work that was being done under this company?

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. And how much was that?

Mr. SHERIDAN. We will have to furnish that.

[See p. 8.]

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you do that, sir?

Admiral DILLON. Yes, sir.

[See below.]

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. That is partially correct.

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

Admiral DILLON. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And who did that?

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

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

Admiral DILLON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. And have you reviewed those records?

Admiral DILLON. I have in the past, yes.

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

Admiral DILLON. Yes, sir.

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you supply it for the record?

Admiral DILLON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

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

[The information follows:]

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Here in Washington or out in Saigon?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Here.

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. It sure is.

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. It sure is.

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. To page 14.

Installation and activity reductions and realignments.

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

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

TURNKEY CONSTRUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. How much?

Mr. SHERIDAN. It is now \$100 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is in the 1974 budget?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Nothing.

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Further along in what?

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

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

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

AIR INSTALLATIONS COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

[Mr. Sheridan's statement follows:]

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

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

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

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

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

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

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		
	1973 request	1973 enacted	1974 request
Army.....	\$593.4	\$558.8	\$660.1
Navy.....	540.9	515.7	630.1
Air Force.....	341.6	284.2	303.2
Defense agencies.....	16.4	15.5	17.1
Secretary of Defense contingency.....	30.0	17.5	-----
Family housing.....	1,057.3	1,050.7	1,250.6
Reserve components.....	97.2	107.2	109.7
Total.....	2,686.8	2,549.6	2,970.8

PROGRAMMING

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

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

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

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

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

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

FAMILY AND BACHELOR HOUSING

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

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

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

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

RESERVE COMPONENTS

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

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

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

STATUS OF VIETNAM CONSTRUCTION

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

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

REAL PROPERTY SURVEYS

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

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

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

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

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

INSTALLATION AND ACTIVITY REDUCTIONS AND REALIGNMENTS

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

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

TURNKEY CONSTRUCTION

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

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

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

HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

AIR INSTALLATIONS COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Enclosures:

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

FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

[In millions of dollars]

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

Defense agencies-----	\$17. 1
Family housing-----	1, 250. 6
Reserve forces-----	109. 7
Subtotal -----	1, 377. 4
Grand total-----	2, 970. 8

Enclosure 1.

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

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION IN MAJOR CATEGORIES OF FACILITIES

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

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

Operational and training \$286.2 million

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

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

	<i>Million</i>
Army-----	\$102. 3
Navy-----	123. 5
Air Force-----	60. 4

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

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

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

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

Maintenance and production facilities \$184.0 million

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

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

	<i>Million</i>
Army -----	\$16.4
Navy -----	130.7
Air Force -----	36.9

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

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

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

Research and development facilities \$48.0

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

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

	<i>Million</i>
Army -----	\$11.2
Navy -----	26.8
Air Force -----	10.0

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

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

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

Supply facilities \$21.9 million

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

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

	<i>Million</i>
Army -----	\$8.1
Navy -----	2.1
Air Force -----	11.7

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

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

Hospital and medical \$137.0 million

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

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

	<i>Million</i>
Army -----	\$35.0
Navy -----	65.3
Air Force -----	36.7

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

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

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

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

Administrative facilities \$51.5 million

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

	<i>Million</i>
Army -----	\$2.8
Navy -----	17.6
Air Force -----	31.1

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

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

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

Housing and community facilities \$625.5 million

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

	<i>Million</i>
Army -----	\$453.4
Navy -----	104.0
Air Force -----	68.1

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

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

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

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

Utilities and grounds improvements \$203.1 million

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

	<i>Million</i>
Army -----	\$28.2
Navy -----	152.9
Air Force -----	22.0

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

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

[Dollar amounts in millions]

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

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

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

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

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

Real estate \$36.2 million

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

	<i>Million</i>
Army -----	\$2.7
Navy -----	7.2
Air Force -----	26.3

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

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

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

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

Defense Agencies (title IV) \$171 million

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Enclosure 3.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Sheridan.

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

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

NATO

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. That is correct, sir.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Yes, sir.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Over the formal rate?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Over the formal rate.

OFFSET AGREEMENT

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Where are those kaserenes located?

Mr. SHERIDAN. They are scattered through the country.

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. We use their money.

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. That is right, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

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

Senator SYMINGTON. You mean the 183 million?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There have been preliminary discussions, but nothing formal.

Senator SYMINGTON. When did those negotiations start, roughly?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Those discussions started early this year.

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

Admiral DILLON. No, sir.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes sir.

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. How do you mean?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Other than the rehabilitation of barracks.

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. No.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then how can they do it?

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. They could.

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you repeat that, please?

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

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

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. That is correct, sir.

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Right, sir.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BERGOLD. Yes.

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

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

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

Mr. BERGOLD. Definitely not.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. That is right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. For dependents?

Mr. FLIAKAS. That is correct.

Senator SYMINGTON. And what is their answer to that?

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

GERMAN REAL ESTATE TAXES

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

Is that correct?

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

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

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

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

What do these taxes amount to, anyway?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Do you have any idea?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So that is some of the thrust of these questions.

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

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

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

I presume there are local governments involved.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. I would not argue about that.

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

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

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

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

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

I will repeat the question.

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Partly.

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Who can answer?

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

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

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

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

Mr. BERGOLD. Yes, sir.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

GREECE—HOME PORT

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

So they recommended that we establish a base at Athens.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, Admiral.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[The information follows:]

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

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

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

DEAR GENERAL:

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

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

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

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

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

Do you know that letter?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

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

[The letter of August 3 follows:]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,

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

COMPARISON OF NAVY ESTIMATES

[In millions of dollars]

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

¹ Costs are insignificant.² Included in logistics costs.

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

Do you have any thoughts on that?

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Commitments to whom?

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Reasonably successful?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Of \$13.7 million?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What are your intentions insofar as providing a pier for the carrier? How will it be funded?

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

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

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

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

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

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

ICELAND

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

BASE CLOSURES

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. How much more do you contemplate?

Mr. SHERIDAN. None, in fiscal year 1974.

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

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

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

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Is that in the 1975 program?

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

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

Installation, State, and item

<i>Army :</i>	<i>Cost</i>
Fort Rucker, Ala. : Upgrade airfield facilities-----	\$534, 000
Fort Wainwright, Alaska :	
Relocation of activities to south post-----	1, 965, 000
BOQ modernization -----	750, 000
Atlanta Army Depot, Georgia : Security fencing-----	119, 000
Memphis Defense Depot, Tennessee : Medical equipment, main- tenance facility -----	456, 000
Fort Eustis, Va. : Supply and administrative facilities-----	680, 000
Total -----	<u>4, 504, 000</u>

Navy:

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

Air Force

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

*April 17, 1973, base realignment list**Service and installation**Relocation plan*

Army:

Fort Wainwright (north portion) Fairbanks, Alaska.	Consolidate on southern portion of post.
Valley Forge General Hospital, Pennsylvania.	To Fort Detrick, Md., and other Army hospitals. To be determined.
Charleston Army Depot, Charles- ton, S.C.	Contingency supply packages and petro- leum stock missions to Anniston Army Depot, Ala., and rail stock stor- age mission to New Cumberland Army Depot, Pa.
Fort Wolters, Mineral Wells, Tex.--	Helicopter training to Fort Rucker, Ala.

April 17, 1973, base realignment list—Continued

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

April 17, 1973, base realignment list—Continued

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

AICUZ

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. How much is that total, roughly?

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

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

Mr. ROCHE. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

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

BOLLING/ANACOSTIA COMPLEX

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

Will you comment on this?

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

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

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

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

Why do you need Bolling?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you furnish that for the record?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. Furnish that for the record.

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. That is right.

[The information follows:]

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

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

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

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

DEFENSE AGENCIES—TITLE IV

Title IV, the requirements for the defense agency.

Will you summarize that for us?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

I have statements which I would like to have your permission to place in the record by the Director of each one of the agencies.

Senator SYMINGTON. Without objection.

[The statements referred to follow:]

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

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

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

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

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

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

We appreciate this opportunity to appear before you.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FAMILY HOUSING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PREPARED QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR SYMINGTON

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

Will you comment on that?

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

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

These are new provisions.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

[The questions are as follows:]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Why is the increase proposed this year necessary?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Would you explain the need for this?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D.-MONTANA)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

MARSHALL WRIGHT,
*Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.*

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

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

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

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

FAMILY HOUSING

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

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

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

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

You will note that the trend and growth pattern are significant. The fiscal year 1974 authorization request of \$1,250.6 million compares with \$1,050.7 million for fiscal year 1973, an increase of \$199.9

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

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

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

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

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

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

I would like, sir, to express my appreciation for your continuing support for the Department of Defense family housing program. And I am available to answer any questions that you may have, sir.
[Mr. Fliakas' statement follows:]

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

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

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

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE—SUMMARY OF SELECTED AUTHORIZED AMOUNTS

[Dollars in thousands]

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

¹ Includes 430 units for \$11,070,000 for Safeguard sites enacted in the DOD Appropriations Act, Public Law 92-204.

² Includes 218 units for Safeguard site authorized in Public Law 92-435, but which are to be financed from savings and for which no appropriation was made.

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

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

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

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

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

PROGRAMMING

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

CONSTRAINT ON PROGRAMMING 2-BEDROOM UNITS

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

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

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

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

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

INCREASED SPACE LIMITATIONS—SECTION 509

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

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

COST LIMITATIONS—SECTION 502

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BASE CLOSURE IMPACT ON FAMILY HOUSING

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

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

AMENDMENTS

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

FORT RUGER EXCHANGE

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

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

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

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

CONCLUSION

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

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

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

Thank you.

Enclosure: Proposed FY 1974 Space Criteria.

PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1974 SPACE CRITERIA

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

¹ Includes senior NCO's.

² Administrative control.

³ E-6's and below.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. What is the definition of a unit?

Mr. FLIAKAS. Family housing unit.

Senator SYMINGTON. A family housing unit?

Mr. FLIAKAS. Yes, sir.

KEFLAVIK

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

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

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

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

NAVAL TRAINING CENTER, ORLANDO, FLA.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FLIAKAS. That is correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FLIAKAS. No, sir.

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. How much?

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

Mr. SHERIDAN. \$50 or \$60 million.

Mr. FLIAKAS. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. \$50 or \$60 million?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLIAKAS. At least that much, sir.

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

Mr. FLIAKAS. I will, sir.

[The information follows:]

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

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

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

BASE CLOSURES—HOUSING

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

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

Senator SYMINGTON. What percentage?

Mr. FLIAKAS. I can furnish that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[The information follows:]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PREPARED QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR SYMINGTON

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

Mr. FLAKAS. All right, sir.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>In millions of dollars</i>
Army -----	278
Navy -----	147
Air Force -----	324
Marine Corps -----	36
 Total -----	 785

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

At the present time there is no statutory limitation on the number of overseas leases. Back in FY 1968 this Committee did request that foreign leases be held to a maximum of 4,525 units. Now in fact this year you asked for and was granted authority to increase your overseas leasing by 500 to take care of a certain emergency situation.

(a) Will you explain the need for additional overseas leases, and how many have you budgeted for this year?

(b) What would you consider to be a minimum average cost and a maximum cost for any one unit overseas?

(c) Considering you have budgeted this year for 7,262 houses, what do you feel is an adequate unit limitation for overseas comparable to the \$10,000 for the United States?

(d) I understand that the Department of Defense presently has under lease overseas some 276 units of housing costing in excess of \$500 per month. A review of these leases revealed they range, including operation and maintenance costs, from a little over \$6,000 per year to as high as \$38,665 per annum.

(1) Just how will these be handled if we decide to establish a reasonable average rental cost?

(2) Frankly, this program overseas seems to be out of hand, and prompt steps should be taken to reduce the number of these expensive leases. We all recognize the need for a certain number of representational quarters, and the lack of adequate suitable housing in other high cost areas, but some of these leases seem to be completely out of line.

(3) The Defense Intelligence Agency seems to be the worst offenders, and have 154 of the total 276 high-cost leases, many of which are occupied by junior grade officers and enlisted men. Will you comment on this?

(4) I would like for you to submit for the record a list of these leases by Services.

(5) I will ask you to work with the staff to prepare the necessary provision to set the proper limitation on overseas leasing. I want the provision liberal enough to care for your legitimate needs, but firm enough to eliminate, in a proper manner, the excessive number of high-cost leases.

Answer. (a) Foreign leasing of family housing is authorized under 10 USC 2675. Until recently units were leased primarily for persons occupying representational type positions or to alleviate undue hardship cases. It has now been determined that leasing, and particularly lease-construction agreements in selected overseas locations, represents a viable potential for producing adequate housing for military families in foreign countries with limited risk for the United States Government. Accordingly, the Military Departments in budgeting for 7,262 units of foreign leased family housing in the FY 1974 program identified several locations where there currently is an opportunity to lease housing in existence or under construction or there is an opportunity for a favorable lease-construction arrangement. This expanded leasing program would produce housing primarily for enlisted personnel and junior officers.

(b) Excluding certain high cost leases for representational positions, foreign leases in general should require on the average no more than \$325 per month; in any event, none should exceed an individual cost of \$625 per month.

(c) A numerical ceiling on foreign leases at 8,000 would afford us the flexibility required for the program. This would include about 300 units for representational positions, and cases of undue hardship.

(d) (1) As we discussed above, we could except about 300 units from the general cost limitations in order not to distort a general picture of normal foreign leasing with the inclusion of high cost leases for incumbents of representational positions, and hardship cases.

(2) and (3) It is true that we have in existence 272 leases which are estimated to cost more than \$6,000 per year. Most of these are representational positions or are located in areas of the world where the cost of housing is extremely high. However, in the latter case, even though the units are occupied by junior officers or enlisted men, the quarters so leased are not considered ostentatious but the minimum needed to obtain suitable housing commensurate with the grade of the incumbent.

(4) A listing of foreign leases exceeding \$6,000 per annum is attached.

(5) We will be happy to work with the Committee staff to establish meaningful statutory controls on the program.

Attachment.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING FOREIGN LEASING PROGRAM—LEASES WITH TOTAL COST OF \$6,000 OR MORE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

Country and grade of occupant	Service of occupant	Position of occupant	Annual rent	Annual O. & M. cost	Total cost
Argentina:					
0-7	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	\$10,200	\$800	\$11,000
0-6	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	8,100	800	8,900
0-6	Navy	Chief, Navy Section	9,240	650	9,890
0-6	Army	Chief, Army Section	7,680	450	8,130
0-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	8,400	3,000	11,400
0-6	Army	Army Attaché	8,640	2,640	11,280
Australia: GS-15	Civilian	Senior U.S. Liaison Officer, Melbourne	7,000	1,500	8,500
Bahrain: 0-8	Navy	Commander, Mid East Forces	6,700	4,300	11,000
Belgium:					
0-9	do	Deputy Chairman, NATO Military Committee	24,369	14,296	38,665
0-9	Army	Deputy Director, NATO Integrated Communications Management Agency	13,109	5,594	18,703
0-10	Air Force	U.S. Representative Military Committee, NATO	15,954	5,530	21,484
0-8	Navy	Deputy Defense Adviser, U.S. Mission to NATO	14,598	8,263	22,861
0-8	do	Deputy Chief of Staff, U.S. Representative NATO Military Committee	15,423	5,126	20,549
GS-18	Civilian	Defense Adviser, U.S. Mission to NATO	19,175	10,000	29,175
0-6	Army	Commander, NATO Support Activity	6,999	1,287	8,286
0-10	Air Force	Chief of Staff, SHAPE	13,908	18,298	32,206
0-8	Navy	Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff (Plans and Programs SHAPE)	6,779	2,834	9,613
0-8	Air Force	Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff (Operations) SHAPE	6,682	7,469	14,151
0-7	Army	Chief, Nuclear Activity, SHAPE	5,397	3,930	9,327
0-6	do	Commander, 196th Station Hospital	5,487	1,000	6,487
0-8	Air Force	Special Projects Officer, SHAPE	7,077	8,389	15,466
0-7	do	Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff (Live Oak) SHAPE	7,775	5,492	13,267
Brazil:					
0-6	Navy	Deputy Chief, Navy Section	8,640	960	9,600
0-6	do	Adviser, National War College, Brazil	10,200	720	10,920
0-5	Army	Project Director, Inter-American Geodetic Survey (IAGS)	8,580	960	9,540
0-6	Air Force	Deputy Chief, Air Force Section	7,800	720	8,520
0-7	do	Chief, Air Force Section	16,560	1,200	17,760
0-6	Army	Deputy Chief, Army Section	11,376	960	12,336
0-9	Navy	Chief, Navy Section	16,200	960	17,160
0-8	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	13,800	1,200	15,000
0-5	do	Engineer Adviser	6,475	1,200	7,675
0-5	Marine	Senior Marine Officer	6,564	1,800	8,364
0-5	Army	Military Adviser	8,911	1,600	10,511
E-7	do	Administrative Noncommissioned Officer (NCO)	4,400	1,600	6,000
0-6	Air Force	Chief, Joint Section, Joint Brazil-U.S. Military Committee	7,776	1,600	9,376
E-8	Army	Administrative NCO	4,754	1,400	6,154
E-7	Navy	do	6,000	1,100	7,100
E-7	do	do	6,000	1,100	7,100
E-7	Air Force	Staff personnel, DIA	6,573	2,500	9,073
0-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	7,704	2,400	10,104
E-7	Air Force	Staff personnel, DIA	7,206	2,500	9,706
E-7	do	do	7,080	2,000	9,080
Burma:					
W-4	Army	do	4,050	4,000	8,050
E-7	Navy	do	4,200	4,600	8,800
Chad:					
W-2	Army	do	9,796	9,026	18,822
E-5	Air Force	do	7,347	9,026	16,373
E-5	do	do	12,734	7,958	20,692
0-3	do	Assistant Air Attaché	7,837	7,970	15,807
E-6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	6,707	9,026	15,733
0-4	do	Air Attaché	4,725	8,894	13,619
Chile:					
0-6	Army	Chief, Army Section	6,600	1,200	7,800
0-5	do	Officer in Charge, IAGS Project Officer	6,000	1,200	7,200
0-6	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	6,600	1,200	7,800
0-6	Navy	Commander, U.S. Military Group	6,000	1,200	7,200
0-6	Army	Army Attaché	7,200	2,566	9,766
0-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	5,300	2,566	7,866
0-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	7,200	2,568	9,768
Colombia:					
0-6	do	Chief, Navy Section	5,434	800	6,234
0-6	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	5,242	800	6,042
Czechoslovakia:					
0-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	15,048	3,900	18,948
0-6	Army	Army Attaché	12,516	3,900	16,416

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING FOREIGN LEASING PROGRAM—LEASES WITH TOTAL COST OF \$5,000 OR MORE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974—Continued

Country and grade of occupant	Service of occupant	Position of occupant	Annual rent	Annual O. & M. cost	Total cost
Dominican Republic:					
0-5	Navy	Navy Attaché	\$5,400	\$2,784	\$8,184
0-4	Army	Army Attaché	4,800	2,784	7,584
0-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	4,800	2,784	7,584
Ecuador:					
0-5	Army	Project Director, IAGS	5,820	600	6,420
0-6	do	Army Attaché	5,400	2,360	7,760
England:					
FS0-2		Political Advisor to CINCUSNAVEUR, London	6,060	3,440	9,500
GS-17	Civilian	Senior U.S. Liaison Officer (SUSLO), London	5,092	1,050	6,142
0-7	Navy	Chief of Staff, CINCUSNAVEUR	4,810	4,030	8,840
0-7	do	Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and operations, NAVEUR	5,033	3,825	8,858
GS-15	Civilian	Operations Officer, SUSLO	6,125	1,150	7,275
0-6	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	5,420	2,300	7,720
Ethiopia:					
GS-15	do	Naval Medical Research Unit No. 3	4,750	1,840	6,590
E-6	do	do	4,450	1,840	6,290
E-7	do	do	4,560	1,670	6,230
0-4	do	do	4,160	1,840	6,000
0-3	do	do	4,160	1,840	6,000
E-8	do	do	4,160	1,840	6,000
E-6	do	do	4,160	1,840	6,000
0-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	5,607	3,250	8,857
E-7	do	Staff personnel, DIA	4,030	2,900	6,930
E-6	do	do	4,293	2,850	7,143
0-6	Army	Army Attaché	7,506	3,000	10,506
E-8	Air Force	Staff personnel, DIA	4,614	3,000	7,614
Germany:					
0-7	Army	Assistant Division Commander, 1st Armed Division	5,901	5,154	11,055
0-6	do	Commander, 56th Artillery Group	5,912	8,302	14,214
0-9	do	Commander, U.S. Theater Army Support Commander, Europe	10,755	7,090	17,845
0-8	do	Deputy Commander, U.S. Theater Army Support Command, Europe (area support)	9,036	6,388	15,424
0-7	do	Deputy Commander, U.S. Theater Army Support Command, Europe (tactical support)	9,036	6,974	16,010
Ghana:					
E-7	do	Staff personnel, DIA	3,320	3,200	6,520
0-6	do	Army Attaché	5,798	3,650	9,448
W-1	do	Staff personnel, DIA	4,532	3,300	7,932
Greece:					
0-7	Navy	Commander, Carrier Division No. 2, Athens	10,350	1,750	12,100
0-6	Air Force	USAF 7206 Commander, Athens	4,000	2,189	6,189
0-5	Army	USA 558 Artillery Commander	4,483	1,530	6,013
Guatemala:					
0-6	do	Commander, U.S. Military Group	7,200	720	7,920
0-6	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	5,700	720	6,420
0-5	Navy	Chief, Navy Section	5,400	800	6,200
0-6	Army	Army Attaché	4,800	2,064	6,864
Honduras:					
0-6	do	Commander, U.S. Military Group	6,480	500	6,980
0-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	3,600	2,764	6,364
Hong Kong:					
0-6	Army	Army Attaché	10,800	2,635	13,435
0-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	12,000	2,690	14,690
0-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	11,500	2,875	14,375
E-5	do	Staff personnel, DIA	5,760	2,387	8,147
0-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	9,780	2,363	12,143
E-7	Navy	Staff personnel, DIA	7,680	2,450	10,130
W-2	Army	do	7,630	2,450	10,080
E-5	Air Force	do	7,920	2,350	10,270
E-5	do	do	6,720	2,350	9,070
0-5	do	Assistant Air Attaché	9,600	2,452	12,052
E-5	do	Staff personnel, DIA	6,000	2,350	8,350
0-4	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	9,120	2,550	11,670
E-8	do	Staff personnel, DIA	7,630	2,450	10,080
0-5	Marine	Assistant Navy Attaché	8,640	2,650	11,290
0-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	8,160	2,550	10,710
Hungary: W-2					
	do	Staff personnel, DIA	5,314	2,568	7,882
India:					
0-4	do	Assistant Army Attaché	2,842	3,700	6,542
0-4	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	3,158	3,300	6,458
W-2	do	Staff personnel, DIA	2,842	3,700	6,542
0-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	3,316	3,400	6,716
0-4	do	do	3,947	3,500	7,447

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING FOREIGN LEASING PROGRAM—LEASES WITH TOTAL COST OF \$6,000 OR MORE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974—Continued

Country and grade of occupant	Service of occupant	Position of occupant	Annual rent	Annual O. & M. cost	Total cost
Indonesia:					
E-7	Navy	Naval Intelligence Command	\$7,000	(1)	\$7,000
E-7	do	Naval Medical Research Unit No. 2	4,170	\$2,830	7,000
E-5	do	do	4,170	2,830	7,000
O-6	do	do	3,600	3,000	6,600
O-3	do	do	3,600	3,000	6,600
E-7	do	do	3,600	3,000	6,600
W-3	do	Staff personnel, DIA	4,500	2,000	6,500
E-7	Marine	do	4,500	2,000	6,500
E-7	Navy	do	4,500	2,000	6,500
E-7	do	do	4,500	2,000	6,500
O-5	Air Force	Assistant Air Attaché	5,500	2,000	7,500
O-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	5,500	2,000	7,500
O-6	do	Army Attaché	8,400	2,000	10,400
O-4	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	4,800	2,000	6,800
O-3	do	do	4,500	2,000	6,500
O-3	Marine	do	4,800	2,000	6,800
O-6	do	Navy Attaché	7,000	2,000	9,000
O-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	5,000	2,000	7,000
O-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	8,000	2,000	10,000
Israel: O-4	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	6,000	2,700	8,700
Italy:					
O-9	do	Commander, Sixth Fleet, Gaeta	6,300	10,400	16,700
O-9	Army	Chief of Staff, CINCSOUTH, Naples	6,780	6,060	12,840
O-7	Navy	Commander, Submarine Flotilla No. 8, Naples	6,500	6,020	12,520
O-8	do	Commander, Fleet Air Medical, Naples	6,500	5,860	12,360
O-7	do	Deputy Commander and Chief of Staff, ASWFOR 6th, Naples	9,440	2,710	12,150
O-9	Air Force	Commander, Air South, Naples	6,780	4,970	11,750
O-7	Army	Assistant Chief of Staff (P. & O.) CINCSOUTH, Naples	8,500	3,230	11,730
O-6	Navy	Commander Officer, Naval Support Act, Naples	6,970	4,310	11,280
O-7	do	Deputy Commander NATO Defense College, Rome	8,680	2,320	11,000
O-7	do	Assistant Chief of Staff, Logistics, CINCSOUTH, Naples	7,500	3,200	10,700
O-7	do	Deputy Commander, STRIKE Forces South, Naples	5,850	3,650	9,500
O-8	Air Force	Chief of Staff, Commander Air South, Naples	6,200	2,400	8,600
O-6	do	USAF 49th Group Commander, Aviano	4,950	2,370	7,320
Italy:					
O-6	do	Assistant Army Attaché	7,025	2,300	9,325
O-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	7,280	2,300	9,580
O-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	7,280	2,300	9,580
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	7,280	2,300	9,580
Ivory Coast:					
O-6	do	do	10,617	5,477	16,094
O-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	8,000	5,477	13,477
Japan:					
O-6	do	do	9,000	4,700	13,700
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	11,000	4,000	15,000
E-7	Navy	Staff personnel, DIA	9,100	3,750	12,850
O-5	do	Assistant Navy Attaché	10,000	3,500	13,500
E-6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	8,000	3,100	11,100
O-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	12,000	4,200	16,200
Jordan:					
W-1	do	Staff personnel, DIA	3,882	3,550	7,432
O-4	do	Assistant Army Attaché	3,106	3,650	6,756
O-6	do	Army Attaché	7,454	4,200	11,654
Liberia:					
O-5	Navy	Navy Attaché	5,500	5,896	11,396
O-3	Air Force	Air Attaché	4,400	4,540	8,940
E-7	Navy	Staff personnel, DIA	4,300	4,948	9,248
E-8	do	do	3,700	4,468	8,168
E-6	do	do	4,300	4,324	8,624
Malagasy:					
O-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	6,600	4,340	10,940
O-4	do	Assistant Air Attaché	5,335	4,200	9,535
E-5	do	Staff personnel, DIA	4,280	3,670	7,950
E-6	do	do	4,540	3,670	8,210
E-5	do	do	4,280	3,670	7,950
E-6	do	do	4,280	3,670	7,950
Malawi:					
E-7	Army	do	4,110	1,926	6,036
O-5	do	Army Attaché	5,875	2,188	8,063

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING FOREIGN LEASING PROGRAM—LEASES WITH TOTAL COST OF \$6,000 OR MORE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974—Continued

Country and grade of occupant	Service of occupant	Position of occupant	Annual rent	Annual O. & M. cost	Total cost
Malaysia:					
E-6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	\$4,000	\$3,610	\$7,610
O-6	do	Army Attaché	5,500	4,120	9,620
E-6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	3,500	3,610	7,110
GS-7	Civilian	do	3,000	3,450	6,450
O-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	7,000	4,700	11,700
Mexico: O-7	Army	Army Attaché	6,900	4,500	11,400
Morocco:					
O-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	9,318	2,846	12,164
E-7	do	Staff personnel, DIA	5,083	2,384	7,467
Nepal:					
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	4,300	2,400	6,700
E-7	do	Staff personnel, DIA	3,390	3,100	6,490
Nicaragua:					
O-5	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	8,400	940	9,340
O-5	Army	Chief, Army Section	6,600	940	7,540
O-4	do	MP Advisor	6,000	900	6,900
O-4	do	Engineer Advisor	6,000	900	6,900
Nigeria:					
E-6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	5,710	2,900	8,610
O-4	do	Assistant Army, Attaché	12,280	3,200	15,480
E-8	do	Staff personnel, DIA	5,833	3,200	9,033
O-6	do	Army Attaché	9,210	4,100	13,310
Norway: O-8	Air Force	Deputy Chief, Air Force North, Oslo	5,500	1,500	7,000
Pakistan:					
O-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	2,909	3,600	6,509
O-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	3,394	3,900	7,294
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	3,394	4,000	7,394
O-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	3,636	3,800	7,436
Panama: O-6	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	8,580	840	9,420
Paraguay:					
O-5	do	Project Director, IAGS	4,200	1,900	6,100
O-5	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	4,400	1,900	6,300
O-6	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	6,600	1,900	8,500
O-5	do	Chief, Army Section	4,200	1,900	6,100
Peru:					
O-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	6,916	2,700	9,616
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	6,000	2,700	8,700
O-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	6,000	2,700	8,700
Poland:					
W-2	Army	Staff personnel, DIA	4,195	2,600	6,795
E-6	do	do	4,445	2,600	7,045
Romania:					
O-6	do	Army Attaché	10,188	1,200	11,388
O-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	11,747	1,275	13,022
Saudi Arabia:					
O-5	Army	Army Attaché	4,820	6,350	11,170
E-6	do	Staff personnel, DIA	4,685	4,000	8,685
E-6	do	do	4,820	4,000	8,820
Senegal: O-5	Navy	Navy Attaché	8,685	4,950	13,635
Singapore:					
O-5	Air Force	Air Attaché	12,500	2,650	15,150
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	9,500	2,300	11,800
E-6	Navy	Staff personnel, DIA	6,000	2,000	8,000
O-4	do	Assistant Navy Attaché	9,000	2,000	11,000
E-7	do	Staff personnel, DIA	6,500	1,800	8,300
E-6	Army	do	6,000	1,800	7,800
South Africa:					
O-4	Air Force	Assistant Air Attaché	3,408	2,700	6,108
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	4,260	2,700	6,960
Sweden:					
O-6	do	Army Attaché	6,689	1,250	7,939
O-5	Air Force	Assistant Air Attaché	5,351	1,250	6,601
O-4	Navy	Assistant Navy Attaché	5,909	1,200	7,109
O-6	do	Navy Attaché	7,492	1,700	9,192
O-4	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	6,154	1,600	7,754
Taiwan:					
O-8	Air Force	327th Air Division Commander	6,000	1,500	7,500
O-7	do	Chief of Staff	5,500	1,500	7,000
O-5	do	Assistant Air Attaché	3,526	2,500	6,026
O-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	3,789	2,608	6,397
O-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	5,053	2,352	7,405
O-6	Army	Army Attaché	5,053	2,404	7,457

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING FOREIGN LEASING PROGRAM—LEASES WITH TOTAL COST OF \$6,000 OR MORE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974—Continued

Country and grade of occupant	Service of occupant	Position of occupant	Annual rent	Annual O. & M. cost	Total cost
Thailand:					
0-10	Air Force	Commander, U.S. Support Advisory Group	\$10,660	\$3,900	\$14,560
0-8	Army	Deputy Commander, U.S. Support Advisory Group.	6,260	1,200	7,460
0-7	Air Force	Assistant Chief of Staff, J-2 (Intelligence) U.S. Support Advisory Group.	10,600	2,710	13,370
0-7	Army	Assistant Chief of Staff, J-4 (Logistics) U.S. Support Advisory Group.	9,950	1,870	11,820
0-6	do	U.S. Army Support Group	6,800	2,730	9,530
0-7	Unassigned	U.S. Support Advisory Group	9,230	2,480	11,710
0-7	do	do	6,430	2,210	8,640
Turkey:					
0-8	Air Force	Commanding General, The U.S. Logistics Group (TUSLOG).	4,143	2,107	6,250
0-6	do	TUSLOG Vice Chief, Ankara	4,143	2,107	6,250
0-6	do	USAF Detachment 26 Commander, Ankara	4,142	2,107	6,249
0-7	Army	Chief of Staff, LANDSOUTHEAST	4,285	5,500	9,785
0-6	Air Force	Air Attaché	5,929	3,200	9,129
0-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	6,667	2,800	9,467
0-6	Army	Army Attaché	6,800	2,800	9,600
Uruguay:					
0-5	Navy	Chief, Navy Section	6,600	1,200	7,800
0-5	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	6,000	1,200	7,200
0-6	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	6,600	1,200	7,800
0-5	do	Chief, Army Section	6,600	1,200	7,800
0-6	Navy	Navy Attaché	7,200	3,000	10,200
Venezuela:					
0-6	Army	Commander, U.S. Military Group	6,696	900	7,596
0-6	Navy	Chief, Navy Section	8,200	880	9,080
0-6	Air Force	Chief, Air Force Section	8,768	1,100	9,868
0-6	Army	Chief, Army Section	8,369	800	9,160
Yugoslavia:					
0-5	Navy	Navy Attaché	6,500	3,000	9,500
0-6	Army	Army Attaché	5,100	3,000	8,100
Zaire:					
E-7	Air Force	Staff personnel, DIA	3,674	3,200	6,874
0-5	do	Air Attaché	5,816	4,200	10,016
0-3	Army	Assistant Army Attaché	6,123	4,200	10,323
0-3	do	do	6,024	4,200	10,224
0-6	do	Army Attaché	4,800	4,200	9,000
Classified location: GS-15.	Civilian	National Security Agency/Central Security Service Europe Representative.	6,000	1,000	7,000

Question. Section 508 will extend the rental guaranty program another year, but will increase the maximum rental from \$225 to \$275 per month.

(a) What success are you having with this program at the present time?

(b) Why do you feel you need to increase the average rental cost?

(c) Does this rental figure include the cost of maintenance and operation of these units—the amount seems inconsistent with the \$325 monthly average you are requesting under the foreign leasing program?

Answer. The present ceiling of \$225 was authorized last year, based in a DoD request to raise the ceiling to \$275 based on construction cost increases and dollar revaluations through 1971. Inflationary trends and currency revaluations during 1972 and early 1973 indicate that the \$275 figure is the minimum needed if the program is to remain viable. Recent experience by the Army in attempting to place an 1,800 unit plus project under contract met with no success. Potential bidders indicated to Army that average rental would have to be between \$275 and \$320 per month; this data was made known to us subsequent to introduction of the bill now under consideration by the Committee. Overall costs of the leasing and rental guarantee programs are comparable. Rental guarantee monthly cost limitations are somewhat lower inasmuch as cost of utilities are not part of the dollar limitation as is the case in costs associated with foreign leasing.

Question. Section 509. You propose under this section to increase the maximum limitation on space allowances from the lowest enlisted personnel (E-1) through the rank of colonel. No proposal is made for increasing the space allowance of general officers.

(a) What is your objective in increasing the space allowance? Is it simply to provide larger rooms, or does it provide for additional rooms?

(b) Can you give us some specific examples? For instance, you would increase the space for a colonel by 30 square feet, and in the case of a three-bedroom house for enlisted men grades E-7 through E-9, the increase would be 270 square feet. Just what will these increases provide?

(c) Will you submit for the record a chart showing a comparison of the space allowance and what you are proposing?

(d) What does this mean dollarwise insofar as your program is concerned, as well as your projection for the future?

(e) What is your order of priority—increased space or more units of housing?

Answer. The information follows in the same order as the subparagraphs above:

(a) The objective is to provide improved overall livability in military family housing by appropriately increasing the sizes of various spaces to eliminate problem areas found as a result of the recently completed survey of occupants and tri-service analysis of existing space. The proposed increases are intended to provide for larger rooms and improved circulation.

(b) In the case of the colonel's unit, the additional 30 square feet requested will be used to improve circulation by providing the opportunity to slightly increase hallway, entry foyers, and stair widths. Such increases to permit easier access to prime living areas and provide more convenient moving of furniture on change of occupancy. The increase proposed for enlisted grades E-7 through E-9 will provide the same size units for company grade officers and senior enlisted personnel and larger size rooms commensurate with needs of these grades. While the primary aim of this change is to improve the living environment of these key personnel, it offers the additional advantage of providing a greater degree of standardization in housing types and flexibility in assignment of the company grade inventory. Changes requested will provide for appropriate increases in the size of dining rooms, secondary bedrooms and the bathroom area to permit two full baths on the second floor of three-bedroom, two-story units in lieu of one and one-half now permitted, the appropriate circulation space required to support the enlarged areas and additional interior storage.

(c) Proposed FY 1974 Space Criteria Floor Areas by Grade Current Versus Proposed

	Current statutory limit net	OSD proposed	Percent Increase statutory limit net (percent)
General officers.....	2,100	(1)	-----
Senior grade.....	1,670	1,700	2
Field grade:			
3-BR.....	1,400	(1)	-----
4-BR.....	1,400	1,550	11
Company grade: ²			
2-BR.....	950	950	-----
3-BR.....	1,250	1,350	8
4-BR.....	1,400	1,450	4
5-BR.....	1,400	1,550	11
Enlisted: ⁴			
2-BR.....	950	950	-----
3-BR.....	1,080	1,200	11
4-BR.....	1,250	1,350	8
5-BR.....	1,400	1,550	11

¹ No change.

² To include senior NCO's.

³ Administrative control.

⁴ To be limited to E-6's and below.

(d) The dollar impact on the FY 1974 program of the proposed space increase and the new standards for senior enlisted units is estimated to be \$12.9 million. Assuming that future programs are at the same program level, it is expected that this dollar value will increase only by the cost growth in the applicable program year.

(e) The proposed new space standards take priority over more units at this time. However, if we have difficulty in implementing these across the board

because of more cost growth than predicted, we will build the senior NCO units to the new standards for other enlisted personnel.

Question. Section 510 authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to settle a claim in the amount of \$41,221.92, resulting from certain repairs and improvements to family quarters at the F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming. Will you submit for the record the details concerning this matter?

Answer. The details are as follows:

Background.—Francis E. Warren AFB, Wyoming, has 156 historically significant family housing units built between 1880 and 1933. The units vary in size, amenities, construction details, and materials. The Air Force decided in 1963 to rehabilitate these units through repair and improvements. The feasibility study and design work for all 156 units were accomplished and cost estimates were prepared. Limited resources dictated funding the construction work in three fiscal year increments. Work on the first 42 units was done as part of the 1965 program.

This Project.—Plans and specifications were revised to reflect experience, the second project for 62 units was advertised, and 11 bids were received. Globe Construction Company of Aurora, Colorado, was the low acceptable bidder and was awarded the contract on July 21, 1967. Contract completion was scheduled for August 18, 1968. In general, Globe's performance was considered unsatisfactory in a number of ways. On three separate occasions "show cause" letters were given Globe, and on May 14, 1968 the contract was terminated for default at about 56% job completion. The base, with Contractor's Surety, secured a completion contractor and the work was completed on September 25, 1968.

The Claims.—Globe then filed 27 claims with the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals (ASBCA). These included 7 for ordered changes, 5 for ordered extra work, 10 for discovered changed conditions, 4 for time extensions and 1 for impact and disruption or excess performance costs. ASBCA Decision No. 13316 of September 10, 1971 changed the cause of termination from default to convenience of the Government, approved 25 of the 27 claims and remanded the case to the Contracting Officer to determine and negotiate the amounts due Globe on a total cost basis, including unpaid subcontractor claims then pending in U.S. District Court, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

The Settlement.—Settlement was delegated to a Defense Supply Agency Termination Contracting Officer (TCO). Total costs incurred by Globe were verified by the Defense Contract Audit Agency and the TCO then negotiated the total amount due Globe. The final settlement agreement was reached on December 19, 1972 in the gross amount of \$934,516.71. Globe had previously received \$378,910.68 leaving a balance of \$555,606.03 due. On January 15, 1973, Globe was paid \$514,384.11, the maximum legally payable without violating the applicable \$20,000 per unit limit on rehabilitation in Section 609, Public Law 87-57. Payment of the \$41,221.92 balance due Globe awaits enactment of the proposed waiver included in the Military Construction Authorization request for 1974. A summary of pertinent financial data is attached.

Discussion.—Before settlement on December 19, 1972, project costs were well within all applicable legal limits. The project current working estimate (CWE) based on the settlement agreement totaled \$1,225,436.02, including \$17,580.99 in design costs and \$157,933 in settlement costs. Analysis of the balance, \$1,049,922.03, by type of housing using proration based on the contract bidding schedule indicates four instances in which rehabilitation costs exceeded the applicable limit on new construction, requiring notification of both Armed Services Committees before rehabilitation, and two instances in which rehabilitation costs exceeded the absolute limit of \$20,000 for rehabilitation of any one unit. Applicable limits are in Section 609 of P.L. 87-57.

Rehabilitation work was complete before the extremely high costs were known. Trial date of the subcontractors' claims against Globe had been set for January 15, 1973 and the Court would not grant further delay. In view of these facts, on advice of Counsel, the January 1973 payment noted above was made to avoid increased settlement costs, because the law permits payment of costs exceeding new construction costs, and compliance with the pre-conditional notification was impossible. Globe paid the subcontractors, thus cancelling the pending trial.

The Air Force intended to comply with all legal requirements, but ASBCA action could not be controlled by Air Force. The decision to change cause of termination allowed Globe to claim costs not permitted if default has been sustained.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE, IMPROVE AND REPAIR 62 UNITS—F. E. WARREN AFB, WYO., COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	Contract award CWE Feb. 21, 1967	Job comple- tion CWE Sept. 25, 1968	Settlement CWE Dec. 19, 1972	Paid to date	Due
Improvements.....	\$334,866	\$334,866	\$633,952.42	\$609,280.02	\$24,672.40
Repairs.....	205,549	205,549	389,135.61	372,586.09	16,549.52
Subtotal, contract.....	540,415	540,415	1,023,088.03	981,866.11	41,221.92
Contingency.....	6,412				
Supervision and inspection.....	9,862	26,834	26,834.00	26,834.00	
Subtotal, construction costs ¹	556,689	567,249	1,049,922.03	1,008,700.11	41,221.92
Design.....	17,581	17,581	17,580.99	17,580.99	
Settlement costs.....			157,933.00	157,933.00	
Total cost.....	574,270	584,830	1,225,436.02	1,184,214.10	41,221.92

¹ See analysis by type of unit below.

Note: CWE—Current working estimate.

Number of units (type and description)	Improvements cost	Repair cost	Total cost	Average cost per unit	Limit on new construction
Contract award CWE, July 21, 1967:					
I—6-4BR SGO.....	\$46,001.00	\$29,262.00	\$75,263.00	\$12,543.83	\$19,800
IV—6-4BR FGO.....	44,914.00	28,914.00	73,828.00	12,304.66	17,600
V—14-3BR FGO.....	83,177.00	50,363.00	133,540.00	9,538.57	17,600
VI—10-5BR FGO.....	62,385.00	27,972.00	90,357.00	9,035.70	17,600
XX—22-3BR airmen.....	89,904.00	58,361.00	148,265.00	6,739.31	13,200
XXV—4-2BR airmen.....	24,759.00	10,677.00	35,436.00	8,859.00	13,200
Total.....	351,140.00	205,549.00	556,689.00		
Job completion CWE, Sept. 25, 1968:					
I—6-4BR SGO.....	47,384.00	29,262.00	76,646.00	12,774.33	19,800
IV—6-4BR FGO.....	46,264.00	28,914.00	75,178.00	12,529.66	17,600
V—14-3BR FGO.....	85,679.00	50,363.00	136,042.00	9,717.28	17,600
VI—10-5BR FGO.....	64,260.00	27,972.00	92,232.00	9,223.20	17,600
XX—22-3BR airmen.....	92,609.00	58,361.00	150,970.00	6,862.27	13,200
XXV—4-2BR airmen.....	25,504.00	10,677.00	36,181.00	9,045.25	13,200
Total.....	361,700.00	205,549.00	567,249.00		
Settlement CWE, Dec. 19, 1972:					
I—6-4BR SGO.....	86,556.09	55,397.43	141,963.52	1 23,660.58	19,800
IV—6-4BR FGO.....	84,519.79	54,738.61	139,258.40	1 23,209.73	17,600
V—14-3BR FGO.....	156,525.00	95,344.84	251,869.84	2 17,990.70	17,600
VI—10-5BR FGO.....	117,396.71	52,955.26	170,351.97	17,035.20	17,600
XX—22-3BR airmen.....	169,185.60	110,486.28	279,671.88	12,712.36	13,200
XXV—4-2BR airmen.....	46,593.23	20,213.19	66,806.42	2 16,701.61	13,200
Total.....	660,786.42	389,135.61	1,049,922.03		

¹ Exceed limits on new construction and absolute limit of \$20,000.

² Exceed limits on new construction.

Note: SGO—senior grade officer; FGO—field grade officer.

Question. In December 1970, at the request of the Army, the Congress passed a bill (P.L. 91-564) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Hawaii approximately 57 acres of land, comprising a part of the Fort Ruger Military Reservation in exchange for approximately 259 acres of land to be acquired by the State adjacent to the Tripler Army Hospital.

The Fort Ruger property we estimated to be worth between \$4½ and five million, as compared to about \$1 million for the land adjacent to the Tripler Hospital. The difference was to be made up by the State in preparing the site to be occupied by the Army suitable for family housing construction.

It subsequently developed that the Tripler site was not suitable for family housing and the Army is desirous of still conveying the Fort Ruger property to the State of Hawaii and using the proceeds for site preparation work in the Aliamou Crater, which property is owned by the Army. It is understood that the Aliamou property can accommodate several hundred units of housing. Rather than amending P.L. 91-564 by separate legislation, it has been suggested

that the necessary language may be included in the military construction authorization bill.

Will you comment on this, please?

Answer. Section 512 repeals P.L. 91-564 which authorized the Secretary of the Army to convey approximately 57 acres of land and improvements at the Fort Ruger Military Reservation, Hawaii, to that State in exchange for the conveyance by the State of Hawaii to the United States of approximately 259 acres of land adjacent to the Tripler Army Hospital. The land adjacent to the Tripler Hospital was to be used as a site for additional family housing. Because of the difference in land values of parcels involved in the exchange, the Act also provided for the State to do certain site preparations on the land to be conveyed to the United States.

Subsequent evaluations determined that development of land to be conveyed to the United States was too costly for military housing; therefore, Section 512 as proposed would continue to permit the Secretary of the Army to convey the Fort Ruger properties to the State of Hawaii, but in lieu of the State conveying land to the United States as heretofore provided, the State would provide for, convey or pay to the United States, either in facilities and services or money, or a combination thereof, a sum equal to the appraised fair market value of the Fort Ruger property to be available for site preparation for military family housing at the Defense-owned Aliamanu Military Reservation, Oahu. The cost of the site preparation, roads and streets, utilities and other support facilities borne by the State would not be considered in arriving at the average cost of any family housing units or the cost of any single family housing unit to be constructed within the boundaries of the Aliamanu Military Reservation, Oahu, Hawaii.

Because the military family housing development at the Aliamanu Military Reservation is to be for tri-service utilization and will provide 2500 to 3000 family housing units, the Office of the Secretary of Defense will insure that the application of the funds from the State of Hawaii will be equitable and appropriately utilized in the proposed housing development.

Question. Since the bill was submitted to the Congress you have proposed two amendments affecting the homeowners assistance program.

(a) First, you ask for additional authorization of \$7 million for the purpose of aiding both military and civilian employees who were affected by the base closures, in the disposal of their homes. Will you explain why this is needed, and the magnitude of this program; that is, how many families are affected, et cetera?

(b) Secondly, you have proposed an amendment to include certain personnel not now covered by the program, but who will be affected by the base closures. Will you explain the need for this provision and the scope of it?

Answer. (a) An additional authorization of \$7 million for the Homeowners Assistance Program is needed in Fiscal Year 1974 because the funds in the Program available from the previous year and revenue anticipated in Fiscal Year 1974 will be insufficient to provide for the continuing needs of the Program and especially for the considerable impact from the April 17, 1973 Base Realignment Announcement. It is estimated that a program of \$46.4 million is necessary in FY 1974 to provide assistance payments of \$13.7 to 2,800 affected homeowners, for the assumption of 1,775 mortgages of affected homeowners in the amount of \$27.2 million, and for operating costs of \$5.5 million for the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Executive Agency for the Program, and especially for the Federal Housing Administration which maintains and disposes of the homes acquired under the Program.

(b) There is a need for a limited expansion of the Homeowners Assistance Program to cover otherwise eligible personnel currently not assisted by the Program, who are assigned or employed at or near an installation which is being realigned but are in an organization not directly involved in the realignment, and who will relocate because of normal reassignment or routine transfer. They are not currently eligible for the Program since the existing statute, applicable to the United States, requires that a causal relationship exist between the termination of assignment or employment and a realignment action. Nevertheless, they can sustain the same losses in disposing of their homes as the personnel covered by the Program at the realigned installation.

The limited expansion applies to the 50 States and the District of Columbia because a similar limited expansion of the Program for areas other than the 50

States and the District of Columbia was provided for by Section 601 of Public Law 92-545, October 25, 1972.

It is estimated that 170 applications will be received under the expanded Program and benefits in the amount of \$750,000 will be paid. It is anticipated that the major portion of the funds will be expended in FY 1974.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Fliakas. You always give us a lot of information. But this business of building very expensive new units and scrapping older units, especially considering the very limited reduction of bases allowed, is not just going over very well with a lot of Members of Congress.

Mr. SHERIDAN. I realize that.

Senator SYMINGTON. Including me.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLIAKAS. For the record, sir, with respect to family housing, I do not believe our record has been so bad. Of the 15,000 units or so that are affected, more than half of them will be retained either by the using service or by another service, the Coast Guard, for example, is interested in some. And I think it also speaks well that of those to be excessed, less than a thousand of them have been built within the last 10 years.

Senator SYMINGTON. You could have come in and asked for a lot more bases, a lot more family housing. How many are you short in this country today?

Mr. FLIAKAS. We have a deficit of some 60,000 units for eligible personnel.

Senator SYMINGTON. And yet, you do not feel that inasmuch as you have that heavy deficit that you could pass over these thousands of units that you in turn are passing over to GSA or the local community?

Mr. FLIAKAS. It is also a question of distribution, sir, location.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

Mr. FLIAKAS. Thank you, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. At this point I will submit for the record a letter received from the National Association of Home Builders.

[The information follows:]

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1973.

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the National Association of Home Builders, I should like to request that this letter be included in the Committee's hearing record on military construction authorization.

The National Association of Home Builders is the trade association of the home building industry. Its membership totals more than seventy-one thousand throughout the fifty states and Puerto Rico.

Our Association believes that the private home building industry is capable of supplying the housing needs of military families more efficiently and at a lower cost to the Federal Government than if such housing is built by direct Federal funding. I am attaching resolutions adopted by NAHB's Board of Directors last October and in January of this year. These elaborate our position that, with a realistic quarters allowance system, the home building industry, operating in a highly competitive field, is the best instrument for meeting the needs of our service families in the most economical manner.

Current housing allowances are not realistic in many parts of the country in terms of present economic conditions, in that they do not bear a realistic relationship to the average rentals prevailing in the community. Nor do they bear

any relation to the actual cost to the government of directly funded construction and maintenance. We urge the Committee to deplore the relationship of housing allowances to the actual cost of land acquisition and construction. We believe that such an investigation would show that, with an economically realistic housing allowance and private industry constructing the housing, housing our military families would be far less costly, in the long run, than the present system.

Another aspect of the present method of providing military family housing is that it fails to utilize most effectively the one industry best equipped and developed to produce housing. As a general rule, only very large general contractors are employed by the services to produce on-base housing and such contractors do not ordinarily have the experience or expertise to produce this housing at the lowest possible cost. They are more accustomed to constructing commercial and industrial type installations.

Two factors operate to exclude the average home builder from competing with the general contractor in an area the home builder knows best. One is that military housing construction contracts generally require various types of bonds which only the large contractor has the financial capacity to obtain. Another is that the larger contractor is able to outbid the smaller employer for the available labor, with resultant unrealistic higher wage rates which often have damaging effects on the local labor market. Thus, incentives to the larger contractor to keep costs as low as possible are frequently absent.

I should like to urge the Committee also to consider the economic multiplier effect on local economies of privately owned housing. Such housing pays full taxes and bears a full share of the costs of various municipal services as compared with directly funded housing situated on government-owned land, whose occupants nevertheless enjoy the benefits of such municipal services. Impact aid for federally connected school children does not begin to replace the tax revenues and other monies cities would receive if military family housing was privately built and owned.

We respectfully urge the Committee's consideration of these factors as it considers the Defense Department's request for authorization and funding of its military family housing operations.

Sincerely,

GEORGE C. MARTIN,
President.

Enclosures.

NAHB RESOLUTION

HOUSTON, TEX., *January 7, 1973.*

THE NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

MILITARY HOUSING

Whereas, the President of the United States is conducting an economy move to eliminate waste in government and to hold spending to \$250 billion in fiscal year 1973, and

Whereas, there is a great deal of waste and unnecessary spending in military housing programs which could be eliminated in achieving the President's goal.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that NAHB reaffirm its position that there be developed a realistic system of quarters allowances that recognizes actual costs or rentals of housing developed by private developers and that it urge that the military housing program be immediately recast in this time of financial stringency to effectuate this more efficient private enterprise system of meeting the housing needs of our military families at a much lower total cost to the Federal Government.

NAHB RESOLUTION

PORTLAND, OREG., *October 9, 1972.*

HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF VIRGINIA

MILITARY HOUSING

Whereas, the military is engaging in construction and development of apartments and housing throughout the United States and operating them in competition with private industry, and

Whereas, private industry is and always has been capable of providing necessary housing for the military, and

Whereas, the basic problem is the fact that the quarters allowances for military personnel in the lower grades or rankings are too low and becoming inadequate because of inflationary conditions, and

Whereas, an increase in quarters allowance would be more than offset by the savings in construction and maintenance costs incurred by the military when it is in competition with private industry.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the appropriate committees in Congress conduct an investigation and study of quarters allowances with the aim of developing a realistic system that recognizes actual costs or rentals of housing developed by private developers in the locations in which the housing is sought.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

Senator SYMINGTON. Next, we would like Mr. Harrington.

You are the Acting Director on the Reserve components?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you have a statement?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Yes, sir, I have.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you present it?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I have a one-page summary of that three-page statement.

Mr. Chairman, for fiscal year 1974 the Department of Defense is requesting a total of \$109,658,000 in authorization of training facilities for the Reserve components.

Within the total requested, and in accordance with the usual lump-sum authorization procedures, specific projects within the total request can only be tentatively identified at this time. However, current indications are that \$39,031,000 would be used to construct or expand 69 Army Reserve centers and Army National Guard armories, and \$26,769,000 would be used for 59 projects to provide aviation support, vehicle maintenance, and miscellaneous summer training and other non-armory facilities. Similarly, \$8,971,000 would be required for seven joint-use Reserve centers for Naval and Marine Corps reservists, and \$9,887,000 for aviation maintenance facilities, personnel support, berthing and storage facilities. The remaining proposed authorization for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve would provide \$11,100,000 for aviation operational facilities; \$9,900,000 for maintenance projects; \$3,300,000 for training facilities, and \$700,000 for general support facilities and real estate acquisition.

We will be pleased to attempt to answer any questions you may have on the facility programs or the Reserve components generally.

[Mr. Harrington's statement follows:]

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I am pleased and honored to again have the privilege of appearing before this Committee to present the Reserve Forces Facilities Program of the Department of Defense for Fiscal Year 1974.

This is my fourth appearance before this distinguished Committee in support of a continuing program which, in my opinion, is one of the most essential within the Department of Defense in contributing toward a strong and credible National Defense posture.

During the last three years, and due largely to the sustained interest and support of this and other Committees of the Congress, we have seen the Reserve Facilities Program grow steadily as a reflection of the joint Congressional and

Department of Defense concern that our Guard and Reserve Forces be brought to a maximum readiness capability.

During previous testimony by the Secretary of Defense, he emphasized the Departments current policy and intent that the Guard and Reserve Forces be considered the primary source of Active Force augmentation in lieu of the now expired draft. This policy, which as never before brings the Reserve Components into a full partnership with the Active Forces, requires a common sharing of many military missions if the Total Force Concept is to succeed. Similarly, this policy not only reflects the high regard which characterizes the Departments appreciation of the Guard and Reserve Capabilities, but also the realistic assessment that if we are to be successful in maintaining a strong Defense posture within the constraints of increasing pressure for lower Defense budgets, we must achieve maximum use of our relatively low cost Guard and Reserve potential.

The increased responsibilities of the Reserve Components carries with it a corollary requirement that we make every effort to insure that the Reserves and Guard are so trained and equipped that they will in every sense, fully merit the title of Minutemen in their capability for quick mobilization and deployment. One of the key elements in the matrix of total equipment and training needs is the provision of modern and effective Training Centers and Armories, and the Weekend Training sites for field training of individuals and units. The program we propose in FY 1974 is a substantial step toward achieving an adequate annual increment of these requirements.

For FY 1974 the Department of Defense is requesting a total of \$109,658,000 in authorization of training facilities for the Reserve Components. This amount would be divided as follows :

Army National Guard.....	\$29, 900, 000
Army Reserve.....	35, 900, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.....	18, 858, 000
Air National Guard.....	16, 000, 000
Air Force Reserve.....	9, 000, 000
Total.....	109, 658, 000

This year's request compares favorably with prior years and represents an increase of approximately 13 percent over the \$97.3 million requested in FY 1973, and some 37 percent higher than the \$80.3 million requested in FY 1972.

Within the total requested, and in accordance with the usual lump sum authorization procedures, specific projects within the request can only be tentatively identified at this time. However, current indications are that \$39,031,000 would be used to construct or expand 69 Army Reserve Centers and Army National Guard Armories, and \$26,769,000 would be used for 59 projects to provide aviation support, vehicle maintenance, and miscellaneous summer training and other non-armory facilities. Similarly, \$8,971,000 would be required for seven joint-use Reserve Centers for Naval and Marine Corps reservists, and \$9,887,000 aviation maintenance facilities, personnel support, berthing and storage facilities. The remaining proposed authorization for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve would provide \$11,100,000 for aviation operational facilities; \$9,900,000 for maintenance projects; \$3,300,000 for training facilities, and \$700,000 for general support facilities and real estate acquisition.

Mr. Chairman, I have with me representatives of the Military Departments who are prepared to discuss their individual Reserve facilities programs in more detail if the Committee so desires. We will pleased to attempt to answer any questions you may have on the facility programs or the Reserve Components generally.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Harrington, would you put your State list in the record?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I will be happy to do so, sir.

[The State list follows:]

RESERVE FORCES, TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

(Thousands of dollars)

State	ARNG	USAR	N&MCR	ANG	AFR	Total
Alabama	1,244	1,651		950		3,845
Alaska	2,975					2,975
Arizona		572			181	753
Arkansas	855	792		1,162		2,809
California	1,515	1,435				2,950
Colorado				230		230
Connecticut	133	798		170		1,101
Delaware	442	291				733
District of Columbia	517			1,350		867
Florida	824	148			982	1,954
Georgia			529	984	296	1,809
Hawaii	816	2,754				3,570
Idaho	325	219				544
Illinois	530		2,036	725	1,088	4,379
Indiana	594	2,552	923		180	4,179
Iowa	128					128
Kansas		995		610		1,605
Kentucky	344	695				1,039
Louisiana	469	436				905
Maine	63					63
Maryland	1,094	1,466			174	2,734
Massachusetts	676	523	300			1,499
Michigan	1,048	474	518		935	2,975
Minnesota	795			465		1,260
Mississippi	714	1,005		1,334	375	3,428
Missouri	377			350	518	1,245
Montana		950				950
Nebraska	138	701		311		1,150
Nevada	238			410		648
New Hampshire	162					162
New Jersey	326			350		676
New Mexico	169					169
New York	1,688		481	926	175	3,270
North Carolina	866	1,965		1,200		4,031
North Dakota	61	537				598
Ohio	1,209					1,209
Oklahoma	1,616	1,230		882	199	3,927
Oregon	267					267
Pennsylvania	826	7,249	2,820	352	1,927	13,174
Puerto Rico	619	120				739
Rhode Island	60	1,195	2,039	140		3,434
South Carolina	266					266
South Dakota	364	213				577
Tennessee	655			605		1,260
Texas	553	386	9,212	922	1,751	12,824
Utah	286	2,027			135	2,448
Vermont						
Virginia	1,542	1,816				3,358
Washington	756			675		1,431
West Virginia	156			325		481
Wisconsin	373	705			154	1,232
Wyoming	226					226
Various Locations				1,572		1,572
Subtotal	29,900	35,900	18,858	16,000	9,000	109,658
Minor construction	3,300	2,500	300	2,000	200	8,300
Planning and design	2,000	2,300	1,142	2,000	800	8,242
Total	35,200	40,700	20,300	20,000	10,000	126,200

1 Andrews AFB, Md.

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, ARMY RESERVE

Location, project, and cost

	Thousands
Alabama:	
Huntsville—300-man center with 2-bay shop and area maintenance support activity	\$750
Montgomery—400-man center with 3-bay shop, area maintenance support activity, and fuel system supply point training facility	921
Arizona, Phoenix—Expand 450-man center with 3-bay shop to 600-man center with 4-bay shop	572
Arkansas, Fort Chaffe—Annual training facilities	792
California, Oakland—600-man center with 4-bay shop	1,435
Connecticut, West Hartford—Expand 750-man center for command and control facility and medical addition	\$798

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, ARMY
RESERVE—Continued

Location, project, and cost

	<i>Thousands</i>
Delaware, Dover—Expand 150-man center to 300-man center-----	\$291
Florida, Lakeland—Alter existing 200-man center with 2-bay shop-----	148
Hawaii, Fort Shafter—1,000-man center with 5-bay DS/GS shop-----	2, 754
Idaho, Idaho Falls—Expand 50-man center to 100-man center-----	219
Indiana :	
East Chicago—300-man center with 2-bay shop-----	841
Evansville (Jt. with Navy)—Expand 300-man center to 400-man center with DS/GS shop-----	507
North Judson—Expand 50-man center to 100-man center-----	249
Rushville—Expand 50-man center with 1-bay shop to 150-man center with 2-bay shop-----	469
Scottsburg—Expand 50-man center with 1-bay shop to 150-man center with 2-bay shop-----	486
Kansas, Wichita—Expand 750-man center to 1,000-man center with com- mand and control facility and medical addition-----	995
Kentucky, Ashland—150-man center with 2-bay shop-----	695
Louisiana, Bogalusa—Expand 50-man center with 1-bay shop to 150-man center with 2-bay shop-----	436
Maryland, Fort Meade—600-man center with 4-bay shop and command and control addition-----	1, 466
Massachusetts, Taunton—Expand 300-man center to 400-man center with medical addition-----	523
Michigan, Battle Creek—Expand 150-man center to 300-man center with DS/GS shop-----	474
Mississippi :	
Laurel—200-man center with 2-bay shop and area maintenance sup- port activity-----	620
Pascagoula—100-man center with 1-bay shop-----	385
Montana :	
Great Falls—Expand 150-man center to 200-man center with area maintenance support facility-----	267
Kalispell—Expand 50-man center to 100-man center-----	224
Lewistown—100-man center with 1-bay shop-----	459
Nebraska, Fremont (Jt. with Navy)—200-man center with 2-bay shop----	701
North Carolina :	
Fort Bragg—400-man center with 3-bay shop and parachute packing and repair facility-----	1, 023
Raleigh (No. 2)—200-man center with 2-bay shop-----	563
Wilson—100-man center with 1-bay shop-----	379
North Dakota, Minot—100-man center with 1-bay shop-----	537
Oklahoma, Norman—Aircraft maintenance hangar-----	1, 230
Pennsylvania :	
Altoona—Expand 150-man center to 300-man center with DS/GS shop	521
Edgemont—1,000-man center with 5-bay shop and DS/GS shop-----	2, 376
Indiana—Expand 50-man center with 1-bay shop to 150-man center with 2-bay shop-----	471
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation—Annual training facilities---	989
Willow Grove—600-man center with 4-bay shop and command and con- trol addition-----	1, 749
Aircraft maintenance hangar-----	1, 143
Puerto Rico, Puerto Nuevo—Expand military parking area-----	120
Rhode Island, Providence (Jt. w/Navy)—600-man center with 4-bay shop and medical facilities-----	1, 195
South Dakota, Aberdeen—Expand 50-man center to 100-man center-----	213
Texas, Paris—Expand 50-man center with 1-bay shop to 150-man center with 2-bay shop-----	386
Utah :	
Ogden—600-man center with 4-bay shop and area maintenance sup- port activity-----	1, 527
Pleasant Grove—Expand 50-man center to 100-man center-----	249
Provo—Expand 150-man center with 2-bay shop to 200-man center with 2-bay shop-----	251

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, ARMY
RESERVE—Continued

Location, project, and cost

	<i>Thousands</i>
Virginia :	
Camp A. P. Hill—Annual training facilities.....	\$909
Camp Pickett—Annual training facilities.....	907
Wisconsin, Camp McCoy—Airfield improvements.....	348
Aircraft maintenance and storage facility.....	357
Subtotal	35,900
Minor construction.....	2,500
Planning and design.....	2,300
Total	40,700

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, NAVAL AND
MARINE CORPS RESERVES

Location, project, and cost

	<i>Thousands</i>
Georgia, NAS Atlanta—Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	\$529
Illinois :	
Peoria—Naval and Marine Corps Reserves center.....	1,445
Quincy—Naval Reserve addition to existing Army Reserve center.....	591
Indiana, Evansville—Naval and Marine Corps Reserve center.....	923
Massachusetts, NAS South Weymouth—Aircraft corrosion control facility.....	300
Michigan :	
NAF Detroit—Taxiway extension.....	345
(Selfridge ANG Base)—Ground support equipment shop.....	173
New York, N&MCRC Brooklyn (Floyd Bennett Field)—Berthing facilities.....	481
Pennsylvania :	
Allentown—Naval Reserve center.....	1,138
NAS Willow Grove—Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	1,214
Warehouse.....	468
Rhode Island, Providence (Jt. with/Army Res.)—Armed Forces Reserve center.....	2,039
Texas :	
Austin—Naval and Marine Corps Reserve center.....	1,058
NAS Dallas—Naval and Marine Corps Reserve center.....	1,777
Aircraft parking apron.....	1,982
Maintenance hangar.....	4,395
Subtotal	18,853
Minor construction.....	300
Planning and design.....	1,142
Total	20,300

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AIR NATIONAL
GUARD

Location, project, and cost

	<i>Thousands</i>
Alabama :	
Dannelly Field—Composite squadron operations facility.....	\$600
Martin ANG Station—Reserve Forces communications/electronics training facility.....	350
Arkansas :	
Fort Smith—Composite squadron operations facility.....	527
Little Rock—Avionics shop, Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop.....	275
Colorado, Greeley ANG Station—Automotive maintenance shop/aerospace ground equipment shop.....	230
Connecticut, Orange ANG Station—Aerospace ground equipment shop.....	170
District of Columbia, Andrews AFB (ANG)—Avionics shop.....	350
Georgia, Dobbins AFB (ANG)—Conversion of hangar.....	984

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AIR NATIONAL
GUARD—Continued

Location, project, and cost

Thousands

Illinois, Capitol MAP—Composite squadron operations facility-----	\$725
Kansas, McConnell AFB (ANG)—Composite squadron operations facility_	610
Minnesota, Duluth ANG Base—Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop_	330
Avionics/weapons system shop (addition/alteration)-----	135
Mississippi:	
Key Field—Reserve Forces communications/electronics training	
facility -----	514
Avionics/nondestructive inspection shop-----	300
Avionics/nondestructive inspection shop-----	300
Gulfport MAP—Reserve Forces communications/electronics training	
facility -----	520
Missouri, Lambert Field (St. Louis)—Avionics/nondestructive inspection	
shop -----	350
Nebraska, Lincoln ANG Base—Convert/alter main hangar leanto to	
avionics shop, general purpose shop, squadron and base operations,	
and combat operations center-----	311
Nevada, Reno MAP—Avionics/nondestructive inspection shop-----	410
New Jersey, McGuire AFB (ANG)—Aircraft engine inspection and	
repair shop-----	350
New York, Schenectady Airport—Composite aircraft maintenance fa-	
cility -----	636
Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop with propellor shop----	290
North Carolina, Douglas MAP—Composite aircraft maintenance facility_	800
Taxiway/runway access-----	400
Oklahoma, Tulsa MAP—Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop----	300
Composite maintenance facility-----	582
Pennsylvania, NAS Willow Grove—Automotive maintenance shop/re-	
fueling vehicle shop-----	352
Rhode Island, North Smithfield ANG Station—Automotive maintenance	
shop -----	140
Tennessee, Alcoa ANG Station—Add to and alter reserve forces communi-	
cations/electronics training facility-----	605
Texas, Ellington AFB—Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop-----	307
Automotive maintenance facility-----	148
Refueler maintenance/POL operations-----	62
Avionics shop-----	405
Washington, Spokane—Composite squadron operations facility-----	675
West Virginia, Kanawha County Airport—Aviation fuel operating storage	
facility -----	325
Various locations:	
(5)—Power check pad with suppressor-----	952
(8)—Aircraft arresting systems (BAK-12/14)-----	620
Subtotal -----	16,000
Minor construction-----	2,000
Planning and design-----	2,000
Total -----	20,000

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM,
AIR FORCE RESERVE

Location, project, and cost

Thousands

Arizona, Luke AFB—Parachute and dinghy repair shop-----	\$181
Florida, Eglin AFB (Aux No. 3)—Aerospace ground equipment shop-----	154
Aircraft engine inspection and repair shop-----	278
Aircraft corrosion control-----	100
Assault landing strip-----	450
Georgia, Dobbins AFB—Nondestructive inspection shop-----	150
Aerospace ground equipment shop-----	146
Illinois, Chicago—O'Hare IAP—Nondestructive inspection shop-----	149
Fuel system maintenance dock-----	939
Indiana, Grissom AFB—Reserve Forces communications/electronics	
training facility-----	110

TENTATIVE FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM,
AIR FORCE RESERVE—Continued

Location, project, and cost

	<i>Thousands</i>
Maryland, Andrews AFB—Aerospace ground equipment shop.....	\$174
Michigan, Selfridge ANG Base—After fuel system maintenance dock....	185
Composite aircraft maintenance shop.....	750
Mississippi, Keesler AFB—Maintenance hangar (addition).....	375
Missouri, Richards-Gebaur AFB—Alter fuel system maintenance dock..	171
Squadron operations.....	347
New York, Niagara Falls IAP—Alter fuel system maintenance dock....	175
Oklahoma, Tinker AFB—Power check pad with suppressors.....	199
Pennsylvania :	
Greater Pittsburgh IAP—Aerial port training facility.....	322
Nondestructive inspection shop.....	145
Aerospace ground equipment shop.....	205
Parachute and dinghy repair shop.....	200
Willow Grove ARF—Fuel system maintenance dock.....	930
Reserve Forces communications/electronics training facility....	125
Texas, Ellington AFB—Automotive maintenance facility.....	832
Extend runway overrun.....	133
Land fee purchase.....	100
Composite refueler maintenance and petroleum operations building..	248
Aircraft organizational maintenance shop.....	86
Perpetual restrictive land easement.....	352
Utah, Hill AFB—Power check pad with suppressor.....	135
Wisconsin, Gen. Billy Mitchell Field—Nondestructive inspection shop...-	154
Subtotal.....	9,000
Minor construction.....	200
Planning and design.....	800
Total	10,000

Senator SYMINGTON. May I say that as the Volunteer Army problem becomes increasingly evident, the voluntary military problem, not just Army, I think we are going to have to depend more on the Reserves and the National Guard, and I personally am quite sympathetic with the request to build this up at this time.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HARRINGTON. If I may, sir, I have with me statements of the commanding officers of the five Reserve components. I would like to submit these for the record if the chair will permit.

Senator SYMINGTON. Without objection. We welcome them.

[The statements follow:]

STATEMENT BY MAJOR GENERAL DONALD V. RATTAN, DEPUTY CHIEF, OFFICE OF
RESERVE COMPONENTS U.S. ARMY

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION,
ARMY RESERVE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee. I will provide some general remarks on the achievements and the stated goals of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve Military Construction Programs.

Major General Francis S. Greenleaf, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and Major General J. Milnor Roberts, Chief, Army Reserve, are here and will follow me to discuss the details of their respective programs.

I have been the Deputy Chief of the Army Reserve Components for just over a year. During that period I have had the opportunity of visiting a large number of Army National Guard and Army Reserve units. On the whole I have found these citizen soldiers to be ready, spirited, and dedicated people who want to succeed. That they succeed is of primary importance, for the citizen soldiers of our Reserve Components make up nearly half (44%) of our total Army force.

Facilities do have a significant impact on the effectiveness and readiness of the Reserve Components.

If the facilities are adequate, the troops have a sense of being provided for—of being needed and being appreciated of—and the morale, training and readiness are improved, often in direct ratio to the adequacy of available facilities.

Overcrowded and makeshift facilities contribute to a loss of training time, reduced efficiency, and a concurrent decrease in morale and esprit de corps.

Recognizing this, in 1970, a Reserve Component 10-year, long range construction plan totalling 628 million dollars was approved. The first increment on this program was included in the FY 71 annual budget.

The 10-year plan was designed to provide adequate facilities to the Reserve Components in a sustained, orderly, and economical manner. The plan included both new facilities and renovations or additions to existing facilities. Because of cost escalation, this 10-year program currently is more than \$800 million.

The military construction authorization requests being presented today will assist in continuing the progress already made and represent the fourth increment of the 10-year program. The FY 71 to FY 73 increments provided for 365 projects, all of which have been completed or are in varying stages of design, contract award or construction. The authorization requests to be discussed by Generals Greenleaf and Roberts total \$55.8 million.

Facilities improvements are concentrated in five specific areas to provide—

Storage space and security for the large volume of equipment being issued to Reserve Component units.

Adequate aviation facilities for the greatly expanded air fleet.

Better training areas and facilities.

Intrusion detection devices in all arms rooms.

Modern, adequate armories and centers.

This concludes my formal statement, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned earlier, Generals Greenleaf and Roberts are here to present details of their respective programs. I'll be pleased to answer any questions that you may have or provide additional information, if desired.

STATEMENT BY MAJOR GENERAL J. MILNOR ROBERTS, CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

Honorable Chairmen and Members of the Joint Committees: It is a pleasure to appear before you to present the Military Construction, Army Reserve Program for FY-1974.

Readiness programs for the Army Reserve are well underway. Additional important equipment and improved training and supervision are being provided. Another important element to improve readiness is the availability of adequate training facilities and training areas. This Military Construction Authorization provides for construction of such facilities.

Fiscal Year 1974 will be the fourth year of the approved 10-year Program for provision of adequate and proper home-station training centers for the Army Reserve. The actual results of our initial program years FY-71 and FY-72 are for the most part complete. These modern, efficient centers are tangible proof that the emphasis on the Army Reserve is real. More and more units throughout the Nation are receiving improved training in facilities designed for a modern Army Reserve equipped with required quantities of deployable equipment.

Our Construction Program awards rose from \$12 million in FY 1971 to over \$27 Million in FY 1972 and is approximately \$24 Million this year. In addition, \$10 Million is now being advertised or negotiated. Another \$6 Million is currently ready for advertisement but will require renotification.

The FY 1974 appropriation request includes \$35.9 million for major construction, \$2.5 million for minor construction and \$2.3 million for advanced planning. The FY 1974 authorization request for \$35.9 million in major construction includes 49 major projects in 30 states.

The FY 1974 Program is well balanced, combining both home-station and training facilities. It includes 19 new centers, 22 expansions and eight special projects. This actually provides:

- 4 modern training centers with unit maintenance shops;
- 5 direct support/general support maintenance shops;
- 4 medical facility additions;
- 3 command and control facilities;
- 4 aviation projects;

- 4 annual training site improvements; and
- 2 special training facilities.

These projects and the 60 minor construction projects which we will accomplish will markedly improve our facilities.

I might add that these minor projects are used to expand equipment storage areas to accommodate the major equipment issues.

Another aspect of our Construction Program worth highlighting is our Intrusion Detection Systems. We have installed IDS in all centers with arms storage. This has resulted in a major reduction in forced entry weapons thefts. We are improving the construction of our arms vaults and using acrylics for windows throughout the building. This latter item makes it almost impossible to throw a rock or missile through a window.

Our design effort is well underway with 33 projects currently authorized to proceed to final design, six other projects are ready to be authorized final design, and the remaining 10 are in various stages of pre-design. We have adequate real estate to execute the program, and foresee no major problem areas.

The Justification Data Books which you have been furnished provide detailed information and fully support our Authorization Request. All of these projects are urgently needed for improved training and readiness.

This concludes my statement. I am prepared to answer any questions the Committee may have.

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. FRANCIS S. GREENLIEF, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU,
DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: It is a privilege to appear before this distinguished committee to present the fiscal year 1974 military construction, Army National Guard budget request.

Today when our active military forces are being reduced, the readiness posture of the guard has become of even more critical importance. The facilities needed to assemble and administer our guard units, to store weapons, to maintain vehicles and aircraft, and to accomplish our annual and weekend training assume added importance.

As a result of the increased reliance placed on the national guard for the defense of our Nation, our units have, and are still receiving, additional and more modern equipment. In the last three years the value of our equipment inventory doubled and is expected to increase another 50% in the next two years. Our requirements for maintenance and storage facilities for this equipment have increased proportionately. In addition, training requirements for the guard have increased so that our units may attain and maintain a high state of combat readiness. This has created a need for more and better training facilities. Because of these increased facility requirements, our construction backlog has increased from \$300 to \$354 million.

Today we are requesting an authorization for \$29.9 million and appropriations of \$35.2 million for the construction of urgently needed facilities. This budget level of \$35.2 million is a decrease of \$4.8 million over the current year, fiscal year 1973. Reason for this decrease is that in fiscal year 1973 we received additional funds for "people oriented projects" which were not received in fiscal year 1974. With a \$354 million known backlog of construction requirements, the fiscal year 1974 budget of \$35.2 million would allow us to deplete this backlog in about 10 years. This, however, assumes no escalation in construction costs and that we can foresee all of our requirements for the next 10 years.

The \$35.2 million fiscal year 1974 budget plan provides \$29.9 million for major construction and \$5.3 million for minor construction and planning. The major construction consists of \$9.9 million for armories and \$20.0 million for non-armory projects.

The justification data books which you have been furnished contain detailed project descriptions which support the construction program. We are proposing 29 armory projects and 50 non-armory projects for a total of 79 projects in 44 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. All of these projects are urgently needed to support improved training and unit readiness.

Our actual obligations for fiscal year 1972 were \$27.6 million which exceeded our original obligation target by \$4 million. This left us a carry-over of \$6.3 million into fiscal year 1973. Our current fiscal year 1973 budget plan of \$40 million provides an obligation target of \$38.2 million. We expect to reach this target; therefore, we should have a carry-over of \$8.1 million into fiscal year 1974. We

plan to obligate \$35.7 million during fiscal year 1974 which would then give us 7.6 million to carry into fiscal year 1975. A carry-over of about this size will enable us to distribute our workload throughout the year and in many cases to take advantage of off-season construction prices. Our obligation figures include minor construction and planning funds as well as major construction.

I again wish to express my appreciation for your understanding and continuing support of our efforts to provide adequate facilities for our 400,000-man Army National Guard force.

Sir, this concludes my prepared statement. If there are any questions, I will be pleased to furnish any information that you may require.

STATEMENT OF VICE ADMIRAL DAMON W. COOPER, USN, CHIEF OF
NAVAL RESERVE

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee: I am pleased to appear before you today for the purpose of presenting the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve military construction requirements for fiscal year 1974.

The request, totaling \$20.3 million of lump sum authority, provides \$18.9 million for specific projects and \$1.4 million for continuing authority. This is a modest sum when compared to total requirements, yet it is consistent with budget limitations and the Navy's overall priorities. The projects to be accomplished under the lump sum authority are urgently needed to enhance the training and mobilization readiness and the recruiting and retention effort of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.

Currently, there are 364 sites throughout the country supporting the Naval Surface Reserve: the Marine Corps Reserve is co-located with the Navy in 126 of these sites. In addition, the Marine Corps Ground Reserve is located at 44 other sites separate from the Naval Reserve. In fiscal year 1974, there will be 63 reserve force ships located at ports convenient to reserve personnel. Additionally, we operate six Naval Air Stations, one Naval Air Facility and 36 other Naval and Marine Corps Air Reserve sites.

We are continuing to emphasize a cost-effective policy of joint utilization. Of the 451 naval and marine corps reserve sites currently in use, 259, or over 57%, are jointly utilized with one or more other services—and that percentage is increasing annually. In the FY 74 NCR program before you, two projects are for the construction of naval and marine corps reserve centers, and four are for joint construction of armed forces reserve centers. Eight of the remaining ten projects are on sites which are already jointly utilized, and five of those will directly benefit other services. All the projects are designed to improve personnel support and operating facilities critical to both navy and marine corps mobilization objectives. The projects presented are of definite and continuing importance in building the readiness and responsiveness of our naval and marine corps reserve. The program has been carefully screened and contains only projects of greatest urgency.

The naval reserve has an urgent need for this funding to replace or modernize obsolescent facilities—particularly in view of the increased emphasis on the reserve. We appreciate your past support and earnestly seek it for the urgent projects included in this year's program.

This concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman. I shall be pleased to answer any questions or provide further information as desired.

STATEMENT BY MAJOR GENERAL FRANCIS S. GREENLIEF, CHIEF, NATIONAL
GUARD BUREAU, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committees: I deeply appreciate these committee's action in adding \$5.5 million to our FY 73 Budget. Your timely action has permitted us to provide urgently needed funds to support some of our units which have converted to newer aircraft. Even so, the funding levels available for the past few years have not allowed the Air National Guard to keep pace with its annual requirements.

The Air National Guard Military Construction Appropriation request for fiscal year 1974 totals \$20.0. Of this amount, \$4.0 million is proposed for planning and minor construction. The remaining \$16.0 million is available for the construction of major facilities at both flying and non-flying Air National Guard Bases.

As you are aware, the Air National Guard is undergoing a tremendous modernization program of the flying units with assignment of high performance aircraft and associated support equipment being received from the Air Force. Over seventy percent of our Air National Guard flying units will have converted to later model aircraft by the end of fiscal year 1974. Also, our non-flying units are being expanded and modernized with newer, more powerful radars, more complex communications systems and better support equipment.

This modernization program has, and is, creating extensive requirements for more and more complex support facilities, such as aircraft arresting systems, power check pads with sound suppressors, avionics shops, flight simulator facilities, weapons release shops, bearing inspection shops, nondestruct inspection facilities, reconnaissance photographic laboratories, etc. Almost our entire request is for operational and maintenance type facilities to support the aircraft conversion program and the expansion of the nonflying mission.

To support the aircraft conversions and expanded mission in the operational and maintenance areas, alone, we have identified essential facilities requirements in excess of \$100 million. These facilities are required now to enable the converted/new units to achieve a "combat ready" status at the earliest possible date and to maintain this status.

With our requirements far exceeding available funds, we have been forced to limit new facilities to those with the most critical and immediate need.

It is to be noted that a great number of Air National Guard units are at present housed in facilities constructed during or before World War II, and have, or are, rapidly approaching the end of their economical lives. It is estimated that these facilities are deteriorating at the annual rate of \$11.0 million. Considering an immediate \$54 million deficiency requirement, and a grand total deficiency of approximately \$280 million, an annual level-of-effort of approximately \$30 million is necessary for the next five years to bring the Air National Guard facilities up to a reasonable level of adequacy.

At this time, the fiscal year 1974 construction program is under design, and can be awarded upon receipt of enabling legislation. Again, this past year, we have had several instances where the states served as the construction agency. Through their services, we were able to incur an average project savings of approximately 15%. This savings is primarily the result of reduced design and construction supervision costs, along with making maximum use of local area conditions, materials and labor skills. In light of these construction dollar savings, we plan, where feasible, to increase this method of operation.

Because construction costs have increased significantly during the past years, limitations now in effect are no longer realistic. We feel that these committees should consider increasing the limitation for Reserve Forces Minor Construction, P 341 funds, from \$50,000 to \$150,000. This compares to a limitation of \$300,000 approved for the active forces two years ago.

As the Air National Guard continues in its role as a full partner in the Defense establishment, we will, within the limits of available authorization and funds, provide facilities to support our new complex aircraft and other equipment.

This concludes my presentation to the Committees in support of the Air National Guard Military Construction Program for the fiscal year 1974. My Staff and I are ready to entertain any questions you may have regarding our construction program.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

STATEMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM J. CRANDALL, DEPUTY TO THE CHIEF OF AIR FORCE RESERVE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to meet with you and present our military construction request for Fiscal Year 1974. Our request for new authorization and obligational authority for major construction totals \$9 million.

I would like to take a few moments to give you a report on our Fiscal Year 1973 program. Of the eighteen projects in our original Fiscal Year 1973 program, fourteen are under contract. The remaining projects will be awarded over the next few weeks. Our uncommitted balance of Fiscal Year 1973 and prior authorization is \$100,000. We consider this a reasonable amount to provide contingencies for on-going projects and future bid openings.

The recently announced Air Force base realignment actions for Westover AFB, Massachusetts have resulted in some adjustments in our Fiscal Year 1973 and Fiscal Year 1974 programs. The planned transfer of Westover AFB to the Air Force Reserve will make additional facilities available for our use. As a result, we have cancelled an Aerial Port Training Facility in our Fiscal Year 1973 program and the Aeromedical Evacuation Training Facility in our Fiscal Year 1974 program for Westover. To provide timely obligation of the Fiscal Year 1973 funds released by the cancellation of the Aerial Port Training Facility, we have moved four alteration projects for which design was well advanced from our Fiscal Year 1974 program to the Fiscal Year 1973 program. The projects involved are the Alter Non-destructive Inspection Shop projects at Minneapolis-St Paul International Airport, Minnesota; Niagara Falls International Airport, New York; Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio, and Willow Grove Air Reserve Facility, Pennsylvania. To fill the void in the tentative Fiscal Year 1974 list, we have added an Assault Landing Strip project for Eglin AFB, Auxiliary Field Number 3, Florida. I have a revised tentative project listing for our Fiscal Year 1974 request which I would like to have inserted in the record.

Our Fiscal Year 1974 request places primary emphasis on maintenance facilities. The revised tentative list includes thirty-two (32) projects at sixteen (16) locations in fifteen (15) states. The projects in this request are primarily for locations which have tactical airlift and tactical fighter missions which have experienced equipment conversions in recent years. One new unit is also involved. This is a C-130 Tactical Airlift unit at Keesler AFB, Mississippi. The detailed justification for each project and manpower statistics for each unit involved are included in the backup books provided to your committee.

Our Fiscal Year 1974 program is requested under the lump sum funding and programing procedures utilized since Fiscal Year 1963. Planning and design actions for our 1974 program are well advanced. Advertising is scheduled for January and February of Calendar Year 1974. My efforts to provide the most economic facilities to enhance the training capability and operational readiness of the Air Force Reserve will continue during Fiscal Year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my general statement in support of the Air Force Reserve Fiscal Year 1974 Military Construction Program. I appreciate the consideration and support which our programs receive from your committee. Do you have any questions?

Senator SYMINGTON. At this point I will submit for the record a statement received from the National Guard Association of the United States.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MAJOR GENERAL HENRY W. McMILLAN, PRESIDENT,
NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: The National Guard Association of the United States welcomes the opportunity to file this statement for the consideration of the Senate Armed Services/Appropriations Joint Subcommittee on Military Construction.

The NGAUS and ANG is indebted to this Committee for the \$5.5M add-on to the FY '73 MOP which allowed construction of 15 additional projects in ten states.

I realize that this Committee fully recognizes the intense competition within the Department of Defense for Defense dollars and that many agencies are forced by the budgetary process to ask for only those amounts which fall within restrictive guidance given them. It is basically for this reason that the National Guard Association of the United States welcomes this occasion to furnish some thoughts and opinions not bound by the restraints of the budget development process.

While there are many areas in the National Guard program where we would like very much to see additional funding which we feel necessary to assure maximum efficiency, we would like especially to bring to the attention of the Committee the serious funding deficiency in the Air National Guard construction program with emphasis on additional funding needed to modernize Air National Guard facilities to accommodate the modern aircraft which are being assigned to Air National Guard units.

The Air National Guard role in national defense today is even more important than in the past. In certain mission areas it is, and has been, the first line of defense of our Reserve forces, while at the same time playing a vital role in the several States during civil disturbances and disasters.

In this era of competitive military budgets, the National Guard Association of the United States suggests that proper attention and logic be focused on the inadequate facilities on a majority of Air National Guard bases. The Air National Guard, over the years, has fallen behind in construction due to austere funding. The total Air National Guard deficiency in construction is approximately \$280 million; yet, only \$10.6 million was programmed for FY '72 and only \$16.1 million was provided for FY '73. Only \$20 million is programmed for FY '74. The \$20 million for FY '74 is even misleading; actually, it equates to only \$16 million for major construction after planning and minor construction are deducted.

By the end of FY '74, the ANG Force Structure will have changed 70% since 1969. Because only \$10.6 million was provided for FY '72 and \$16.1 million for FY '73, the backlog continues to grow. Consequently, the Air National Guard flying units are receiving modern equipment such as the A-7 and F-106 without modern facilities needed for operations, training, maintenance, storage, security, ground safety and flying safety. Also, the ANG non-flying units have received new computerized Tactical Control systems which require new maintenance and support facilities.

Many Air National Guard units still have World War II vintage facilities which are deteriorating at a rate of \$11.0 million annually. It is estimated that \$30 million per year will be required over the next six years to provide adequate facilities.

The final report of an Interservice Audit of Military Construction of Facilities of Reserve and Guard Forces dated 13 April 1973 stated that the Military Construction Program (MCP) for Air National Guard (ANG) has been underfunded in relation to the 10-year program approved by OSD in 1970 to bring the deficiency backlog to a manageable level. Of particular concern was the increase of 12 percent over the backlog concurred in by OSD in 1970.

The constraints placed on the Air National Guard due to lack of construction appropriations cause delays in attaining combat-readiness of units.

The National Guardsman is much better off today in regard to pay but the attractiveness of his job is relative. Today's Air National Guardsmen should not have to train in makeshift facilities.

Specifically, it is our conviction that the related funding in the budget for ANG Construction is not adequate to attain and maintain the posture of military readiness expected of the Air National Guard. We therefore, respectfully request that this Committee act to provide adequate facilities to support our new modern weapons systems.

Thank you for giving the NGAUS the opportunity to file this statement in behalf of the Air National Guard.

Senator SYMINGTON. Are the Army representatives here?

Thank you Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Fliakas, and Mr. Harrington.

General, we are working against time here. Would you be good enough just to supply your statement for the record and let us ask a few questions?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[Statement follows:]

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. KENNETH B. COOPER, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR LOGISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am Major General Kenneth B. Cooper, Director of Installations, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Department of the Army.

It is a privilege to appear before this Committee and to present the Department of the Army's portion of the Military Construction Authorization request.

We have structured our budget to reflect the Army reorganization and realignment actions announced in January and April 1973.

For fiscal year 1974, the Army is requesting \$660,139,000 in new authorization for military construction. Also, we are requesting amendments to three prior authorizations, in the amount of \$1,186,000.

Of the total request \$548,558,000 is for construction with the United States and \$108,581,000 is for construction outside the United States, including NATO Infrastructure (\$80,000,000) and projects in Europe, Korea, Panama, Puerto Rico, the Marshall Islands, and U.S. Army Security Agency and U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command sites. We have requested \$3,000,000 under section 102.

As the core of this year's program, we are continuing to emphasize facilities which benefit the soldier: where he lives, where he plays and where we treat him when he is sick. Over 84 percent of our new authorization request for construction, excluding NATO, is in these categories. I will discuss this in more detail in a moment.

The construction planned for the Army outside of the United States, excluding NATO, is approximately five percent of our program. This overseas program is similar to fiscal year 1973, providing for only a limited number of operational facilities and a few projects in support of troop welfare, all at locations where we expect to stay in our long range planning. Also, as in fiscal year 1973, we are requesting no authorization or funds for construction in the Republic of Vietnam.

Continuing the procedure established in fiscal year 1968, the fiscal year 1974 program contains \$80,000,000 to support the United States' share of Infrastructure construction for NATO. This is approximately twelve percent of our total program. We propose to provide detailed support for this request at a later session.

Our fiscal year 1974 request includes \$14,094,000 to provide facilities for air and water pollution abatement at various Army installations in the United States. This is lower than in recent years. The fiscal year 1972 and fiscal year 1973 programs were the peak years and provided nearly \$131,300,000 to satisfy the requirements of Executive Order 11507 as best we could determine. The fiscal year 1974 program will satisfy newly identified requirements derived from increasingly more stringent standards and accomplish projects deferred from earlier programs for technological reasons. We are beginning to learn the magnitude of the requirements which will result from the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. We feel certain that we will need some sizable dollar amounts for pollution abatement projects in future MCA requests.

We are not requesting any funds for the SAFEGUARD program.

Before discussing the highlights of our program, I would like to call your attention to the following tables which give summaries of the program. Table I shows the distribution of the authorization request of \$660,139,000 among major commands in the United States and overseas.

TABLE I—PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY AUTHORIZATION

SECTION 101—INSIDE THE UNITED STATES	
<i>Command</i>	<i>Cost</i>
U.S. Continental Army Command ¹ -----	\$413, 281, 000
First Army-----	(66, 891, 000)
Third Army-----	
Fifth Army-----	
Sixth Army-----	
U.S. Army Materiel Command-----	58, 649, 000
U.S. Army Security Agency-----	287, 000
U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command-----	8, 226, 000
United States Military Academy-----	30, 145, 000
U.S. Army Medical Department ² -----	1, 997, 000
Office Chief of Engineers-----	597, 000
Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service-----	2, 113, 000
U.S. Army, Alaska-----	8, 344, 000
U.S. Army, Hawaii-----	10, 825, 000
Various locations, air pollution abatement facilities-----	7, 295, 000
Various locations, water pollution abatement facilities-----	6, 799, 000
Total inside the United States-----	548, 558, 000

¹ Reorganized into Forces Command (FORSCOM) and the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) on 1 July 1973.

² The Army Health Services Command was organized, effective 1 April 1973, to command medical field activities.

SECTION 101—OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<i>Command</i>	<i>Cost</i>
U.S. Army Forces, Southern Command-----	\$8,095,000
United States Army, Pacific-----	1,568,000
Puerto Rico-----	517,000
Kwajalein Missile Range-----	2,353,000
U.S. Army Security Agency-----	1,434,000
U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command-----	2,097,000
U.S. Army, Europe-----	92,517,000
Germany-----	(12,517,000)
NATO Infrastructure-----	(80,000,000)
Total outside United States-----	108,581,000

OTHER

Section 102 (classified project)-----	3,000,000
Total new authorization requested-----	660,139,000

Table II shows the construction categories in which the funds are requested and the percent of the construction dollars in each category. This table illustrates the emphasis being placed on facilities supporting our soldiers.

TABLE II—PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY
AUTHORIZATION SUMMARY BY CONSTRUCTION CATEGORIES

	Total	Percent of total excluding NATO
Operational and training facilities-----	\$22,301,000	3.8
Maintenance and production facilities-----	16,418,000	2.8
Research, development, and test facilities-----	11,183,000	1.9
Supply facilities-----	8,101,000	1.4
Hospital and medical facilities-----	34,977,000	6.0
Administrative facilities-----	2,835,000	0.5
Housing and community facilities-----	543,391,000	78.2
(Troop housing)-----	(405,213,000)	(69.9)
(Community facilities)-----	(48,178,000)	(8.3)
Utilities and ground improvements-----	28,227,000	4.9
(Air pollution abatement facilities)-----	(7,295,000)	(1.3)
(Water pollution abatement facilities)-----	(6,799,000)	(1.2)
(Other)-----	(14,133,000)	(2.4)
Real estate-----	2,706,000	0.5
NATO-----	80,000,000	12.1
Total new authorization requested-----	660,139,000	100.0

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

THE ARMY MODERN HOUSING PROGRAM

The priority element of our soldier oriented program this year, as with last year, is that portion directed to bringing our Army housing to adequate and modern standards. We first presented the Army's housing program for the Seventies in the fiscal year 1972 budget. Our program goal is to provide modern housing for all bachelor soldiers and families. We are controlling both the programing and execution phases to assure that we get the right type of housing, in the right place, and at the best design and cost we can manage. Since this presentation covers our general MCA program which provides for the bachelor housing support, my remarks will be directed to that portion of the housing program. Subject to your approval, the family housing portion will be covered within the Department of Defense overall family housing presentation.

BACHELOR HOUSING

The fiscal year 1974 program provides for construction of 24,553 new enlisted barracks spaces and 285 bachelor officer spaces in the United States and overseas. Included in these are 3,935 enlisted and 100 officer spaces for the Women's Army Corps and 380 enlisted spaces programed for semi-permanent construction overseas. In locating this new construction, emphasis has been placed on those troop stations which have the largest deficits in bachelor housing and which are included in the Army's long range planning. We are requesting \$242,577,000 for this year's new construction portion of the bachelor housing program.

In our fiscal year 1974 budget request we are asking for \$146,311,000 to modernize 46,896 enlisted barracks spaces and 528 officer spaces. Of the barracks spaces, 45,397 are in the United States (including 3,587 for enlisted women) and 1,499 are overseas. All officer spaces are in the United States.

Recent changes in criteria for new construction and modernization have had a great impact on the Army's barrack assets insofar as their classification into "adequate" or "substandard" is concerned. Those we now classify as not meeting current standards may vary from pre-World War I buildings on some of our older posts, to relatively new barracks from our MCA programs of the 1960's. The amount of work required to bring these various buildings to current standards varies widely from a matter of internal partitioning to subdivide the open bays into rooms for one, two or three men to total renovation required for some of the older buildings.

I would like to cite some statistics to illustrate the status in adequately housing all of our soldiers and the size of the task still to be accomplished.

Requirements.—Based on the long-range (FY 1978) strength projection, it is presently estimated that housing will be required for approximately 497,000 soldiers of whom 60,000 will be trainees. It will also be necessary to house an estimated 34,000 bachelor officers.

Assets.—Including construction and modernization in progress or already approved in fiscal year 1973 and earlier programs, the Army has approximately 397,000 permanent barracks spaces and 27,000 bachelor officer spaces world-wide. Both in the United States and overseas we have a wide variety of permanent buildings, semi-permanent, and temporary structures being used for troop housing. As indicated earlier, except for trainee barracks in the United States, recent changes in housing criteria such as air conditioning where required and semi-private or private rooms have caused approximately 40 percent of these existing permanent assets to be classified as inadequate under currently accepted standards.

Deficits.—Comparison of the assets and requirements indicates that a deficit exists of approximately 100,000 enlisted barracks spaces and about 7,000 bachelor officer quarters spaces. This deficit must be met by new construction. Plus, we must continue to modernize those existing permanent assets, over 158,000 spaces, that are below standards.

Current bachelor housing standards provide a significant departure from the open-bay barracks which have been our standard in the past. We are striving for increased privacy, more comfortable living conditions, and improved security for the soldier's personal possessions. For the lower grades (E2-E4) we are building or modernizing to create two or three man rooms at 90 square feet of living space per man. The new construction will provide a bath with each room as will modernization projects wherever practical. The middle grades (E5-E6) will normally have one or two man rooms at 135 square feet of living space per man and the senior grades (E7-E9) will be authorized a private room with 270 square feet of living space and a private bath. Air conditioning, increased lighting and electrical outlets, improved furniture, and secure storage areas are inherent features in our designs.

For lieutenants and warrant officers we are providing 330 square feet of living space consisting of a private combination living/bedroom, bathroom and pullman type kitchen. Captains and above will have a private suite of approximately 460 square feet. The accommodations will consist of a living room, bedroom, bathroom and kitchen.

The Army considers these standards to be both necessary and just not extravagant. They are in keeping with improved living conditions which prevail in the United States today.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Also of importance to the soldier are the community functions related to his and his family's daily needs. Our request for these items is \$37,448,000 (exclusive of confinement facilities), which provides for a number of diverse facilities including new commissaries at Forts Campbell, Gordon and Polk, chapel centers at Aberdeen Proving Ground and Redstone Arsenal, automotive self help garages at Forts Gordon and Greely, a physical conditioning facility at Carlisle Barracks, a gymnasium at Fort McClellan, outdoor athletic facilities at Fort Riley, a patient visitor facility at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, service clubs at two locations, a post library and gymnasium addition at White Sands Missile Range, a main post office at Fort Eustis, an NCO Open Mess at Yuma Proving Ground, and a billeting office, an Officers Open Mess, and a Provost Marshal facility at Fort Wainwright.

We are including in our request \$12,091,000 to improve the schools for our dependent children in Germany. We plan to build additions at three locations and to construct new facilities at two locations to reduce overcrowding and alleviate substandard conditions. The necessity for improvement of the dependent educational facilities in Germany has been recognized for several years and these projects will continue and expand the Army's efforts to improve the dependent school system.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Our request for \$34,977,000 for medical facilities is about 6 percent of our program. The largest single project in this category is a \$25,000,000 new hospital at the Military Academy. We have included an addition for the permanent hospital at Fort Lee, new dental clinics at Forts Carson, Lewis and Monmouth, and a combined medical and dental facility at Fort Shafter.

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS EXPANSION PROGRAM

An important segment of our request supports the expansion of the Women's Army Corps which will double the size of the Corps by fiscal year 1978. Over \$47,893,000 are allocated to this portion of the fiscal year 1974 MCA program. The key projects expand the housing, training, and administrative facilities at Fort McClellan, the WAC Center. The remaining projects are for housing at various posts, as noted earlier, to provide adequate quarters for the increased WAC population.

AVIATION FACILITIES

This year's request contains eight projects totaling \$19,195,000, related to Army aviation activities. These include two projects at Fort Hood, one at Fort Sherman, Canal Zone, and one in Korea, all in support of Army contingency requirements. Helicopter landing facilities are planned for Fort Belvoir and runway improvements are requested for Fort Holabird in the interest of safety maintenance, and operational efficiency. Improvements are also planned for the airfield facilities at Fort Rucker. The third and final phase of the Tactical Airfield Complex at Fort Campbell is included this year and will complete the project started in fiscal year 1972.

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

This year we are requesting \$30,145,000 for three projects; the new hospital mentioned earlier, utilities expansion, and barracks modernization. These projects have been recommended for approval by the West Point Planning Advisory Board as being necessary and in consonance with the USMA expansion plan. The Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, made up of four U.S. Senators, four U.S. Representatives and six business leaders, strongly indorsed (with one dissent) the need for prompt construction of the new hospital.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Army's total request in this category is \$11,183,000, considerably lower than the \$59,872,000 approved in fiscal year 1973 when we were completing the construction of two major laboratories. The Human Factors Engineering Laboratory at Aberdeen Proving Ground, an addition to the explosive laboratory at Picatinny Arsenal, and the KOFA Range improvements (phase I) at Yuma Proving Ground are the major projects of the Research, Development and Testing program this year. There are seven other smaller, but necessary, projects.

CONFINEMENT FACILITIES

The Army is also requesting two new confinement facilities in fiscal year 1974 as a continuation of our long range program for providing modern facilities for confinement of military personnel accused or convicted of violations of military law. This long range program is based on the Army's modified correctional system. We foresee construction requirements extending into fiscal year 1977, at a dollar level approximating that of fiscal year 1974, to provide the necessary facilities support. The new facilities proposed in the fiscal year 1974 MCA program will be located at Forts Leonard Wood and Lee at a cost of \$10,730,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION ABATEMENT

In support of the national goal of reducing environmental pollution the Army has included \$14,094,000 in the fiscal year 1974 MCA program to improve pollution abatement capabilities at twenty-six installations in twenty-two states. Of the total program cost, \$7,295,000 is for air pollution abatement and \$6,799,000 for water pollution abatement. Our program includes incinerators for explosives and contaminated waste disposal, facilities for treatment of industrial wastes, precipitators on smokestacks, connections to regional sewage systems, air and water pollution monitoring stations, and the upgrading of existing sewage and water treatment plants to conform to local and Federal standards. These projects have been coordinated with other Federal agencies involved in pollution abatement and are in phase with the environmental pollution control program.

As indicated earlier, several of our projects are based on more rigid standards or on technological advancement in pollution control. We expect future requirements to be generated in a similar manner, particularly as the States begin to implement their programs to achieve the goals established in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

ELECTRICAL SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION

This year we are again requesting funds to modernize the electrical systems on a number of our permanent installations, many of which are now inadequate and approaching unsafe conditions. The continuing rise in the demand for electrical power due to changes in communications, modern weapons, training techniques and living standards, especially the desire for air conditioning, has overtaxed the electrical systems on many Army installations. To rectify this situation approval is requested to upgrade the electrical utilities at three installations in the United States at a cost of \$4,079,000. We are again requesting improvement of electrical facilities at various strategic communication sites overseas at a cost of \$2,097,000.

KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE

The Kwajalein Missile Range in the Marshall Islands is a national range for testing various types of equipment in the Nation's missile programs. The continuing development of test facilities in this area and the major testing programs under way make it necessary to request improvements of a variety of facilities. We are asking for a total of \$2,353,000 for three projects.

SUMMARY

In summary, we have designed the fiscal year 1974 MCA program to enhance the welfare of the soldier by improving our bachelor housing, primary medical care facilities, and community facilities. In addition, the Army is continuing its efforts to control environmental pollution and to improve its operational capability. We have given careful consideration to insuring that the projects requested are located at "hard core" installations where the facilities will be fully utilized.

This concludes my presentation of the Army's fiscal year 1974 Military Construction Authorization request. The detailed project justifications supporting the Army request are contained in the book which has been furnished to the Committee. The projects are arranged in command and station sequence. Proposed amendments to prior authorizations are at the end of the book.

I will be pleased to answer any questions the Committee may have or to see that the answers are provided.

Senator SYMINGTON. First I would like to place in the record, at the request of former Congressman Celler, some correspondence that he has sent to me with respect to the Walter Reed Inn. And, without objection, I will place that in the record and ask you to comment on it.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The correspondence follows:]

WEISMAN, CELLER, SPETT, MODLIN & WERTHEIMER,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In an effort to meet the exigencies of the Subcommittee's hearings schedule on S. 1797, a bill authorizing certain construction at military installations, I respectfully request that this letter and enclosures be accepted for consideration by Members of the Subcommittee and for inclusion in the printed hearing record.

Also appended herewith are excerpts from the Report of the House Select Committee on Small Business, "The Impact of Federal Installations on Small Business", (H. Report No. 92-943). The findings, conclusions and recommendations therein underscore the predicament of the owner of the Walter Reed Inn, Washington, D.C., whom we represent, with respect to the proposed construction of a new guest house facility at Walter Reed Medical Center.

We believe that the construction proposed by the Government will work irreparable and unnecessary economic injury to the owner of the Walter Reed Inn. Furthermore, in view of the Inn's proximity to the Medical Center, its history of accommodating those who attend medical or dentistry classes or who visit patients at Walter Reed, the Inn's unused capacity as well as its modern and attractive facilities, a serious question is raised as to whether the additional, costly construction that is proposed is truly in the best interests of the United States.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I had hoped to appear and greet you personally but because I have just returned from abroad, most regrettably, I am unable to be in Washington today. I have asked my colleague, Mr. Benjamin L. Zelenko, to present my statement to you.

I am member of the law firm of Weisman, Celler, Spett, Modlin and Wertheimer with local offices at 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., and want to testify this morning about a project contained in the military construction appropriations request for fiscal year 1974. The project concerns a new 100 unit Patient-Visitor Facility at the Walter Reed Medical Center calling for an appropriation of \$1.997 million.

As I understand it, accommodations at the new Patient-Visitor Facility will be available only to next of kin of patients at the Walter Reed General Hospital and to outpatients expected to be treated for a short period of time. The project also contemplates the demolition of an existing visitor facility containing 28 rooms.

We ask you to carefully review the proposed expenditure and determine whether it really is justified as being in the best interests of the United States. We hope that the Subcommittee will have assured itself with respect to the accuracy of the underlying construction costs and inflation estimates, and as to the availability and adequacy of existing nearby facilities.

Today I appear on behalf of the owner and operator of the Walter Reed Inn, located immediately opposite the Walter Reed Medical Center gate at 6825 Georgia Avenue, N.W. The Inn was constructed in 1967 and completed in 1968 and opened its doors in June of that year. It accommodates among others, military personnel attending classes on temporary duty assignment at the Institute of

Pathology and those pursuing dentistry studies at the Medical Center. It also provides rooms at a reduced rate to visitors of patients at the Walter Reed Hospital who are unable to obtain accommodations or who do not wish to stay at the present visitor facility. Thus, the Inn has come to be a dependable, convenient source of up-to-date accommodations for many of the same persons who would be accommodated at the proposed new Visitor Facility.

The Walter Reed Inn is a four-story and basement brick motel containing 54 guest rooms, garage parking for 46 cars and restaurant facilities. We believe that the Inn provides the United States Army with suitable, modern, convenient facilities at a substantially lower cost than that proposed in the current budget for military construction for fiscal year 1974. Furthermore, a purchase or long-term lease of these premises will result in certain definite savings to the Government in view of the numbers of personnel on temporary duty assignment who regularly use the accommodations at the inn. As I understand it, such temporary duty personnel would be ineligible to stay at the proposed new patient-visitor facility.

In an effort to accommodate the interests of the United States Army and the owner and operator of the Inn, we have offered the premises of the Inn for sale or long-term lease to the Government. Conversations on the subject occurred on June 1, 1973, in the offices of Major General Kenneth B. Cooper, Director of Installations, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. At that time we indicated that the construction of the proposed new 100 unit patient-visitor facility on the grounds of the Medical Center would work a severe economic penalty to the commercial operations of the Walter Reed Inn. In the case of the Inn which contains 54 guest rooms, the difference between a profitable and a marginal operation is the occupancy of five to seven rooms a night. Manifestly, the new visitor facility on the grounds of the Medical Center would drain away essential clientele from the Inn and impose irreparable economic injury.

Two thorough appraisals were conducted in January 1971 and contain further detailed descriptions of the facilities and indicate the market value of the inn at that time at \$1.2 million and \$1.150 million respectively. Copies of these appraisal reports were furnished the Department of the Army. On June 28, 1973, representatives of the United States Corps of Engineers made an onsite inspection of the premises of the Walter Reed Inn and I am advised that they have now completed their report and appraisal which is being considered, although no final decision has been made.

Mr. Chairman, we are hopeful that our proposal to sell or lease on a long-term basis the facilities of the Walter Reed Inn, located immediately opposite the Georgia Avenue gate of the Medical Center will receive favorable consideration by the Department of the Army and that arrangements mutually satisfactory can be consummated. Because of the pendency of this offer and its relationship to the proposed construction of a patient-visitor facility, we believe that this subcommittee should be fully informed in the premises. Moreover, we ask this subcommittee to defer approval of appropriations for the proposed construction of the new patient-visitor facility at Walter Reed Medical Center until it can determine that the proposed construction is in the best interests of the United States.

I shall be pleased to answer any questions which the subcommittee may have. Thank you for the opportunity to present these comments.

Senator SYMINGTON. He is a respected former Member of Congress. We have some questions here. I have one on that subject.

General Cooper, we understand the Army has under study certain base realignments that, if carried out, would affect certain items in this bill. Are you in a position to comment on this at present?

General COOPER. I can comment to the extent that we are still studying them. The final decisions have not been made. It may affect about 10 percent of the items in the budget.

Senator SYMINGTON. Back to the previous subject. You have in the bill \$1,997,000 for a patient-visitor facility for the Walter Reed Hospital. Just what will this facility be used for?

General COOPER. This facility will be used primarily for outpatients that have to come to Walter Reed by referral for treatment or consul-

tation, and also for visitors of seriously ill patients that need to be there during the time of the operation and during the early convalescence. It will replace an existing guesthouse we have which is quite inadequate.

Senator SYMINGTON. Where do the people you have described now find accommodations?

General COOPER. Some of them in the existing guesthouse, sir, and some of them have to go and stay in the nearby motels, including occasionally the Walter Reed Inn, which you referred to earlier.

Senator SYMINGTON. Now we have been informed that the construction of this facility will have a serious effect upon a nearby motel, the Walter Reed Inn and that the owner is willing to sell or lease the motel to the Army in lieu of building the new facility. Can you comment on this?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

The Walter Reed Inn has a total of about 54 rooms, and as such it is not big enough to accomplish the purpose we want. We have been examining the possibility of leasing the Walter Reed Inn to take care of the many people who are there attending courses on temporary duty, and although we have not finished our study, the preliminary indications show that it may be to the best interests of the Army in the saving of TDY pay to lease the Walter Reed Inn.

Whether that is going to be feasible or not remains to be seen.

Senator SYMINGTON. Are we having negotiations about it?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is your comment on the fact that the owner now says it will have a serious effect upon his motel?

General COOPER. He makes that comment on the basis that he now gets some referrals from the existing guesthouse, and that this is the margin between his being solvent, or having a profitable operation, and not. He is afraid that with the bigger what we call the patient-visitor facility, it will put him just below the margin.

We do not believe that is the case, but only time will tell.

We do need a patient-visitor facility which is larger than his motel can provide. We think the better course of action would be to lease the whole facility from him that would accommodate mostly people that are attending courses at Walter Reed on temporary duty, who now usually stay in motels in Silver Spring.

Senator SYMINGTON. Again this year, the bulk of your construction program relates to housing and personnel facilities. Is it possible the Army is overemphasizing this at the expense of operational and training facilities?

General COOPER. No, sir, not at this stage of the game. We have been very far behind in providing adequate bachelor housing for our troops, and this will be a big leg up. We will still have another year or so at approximately the same level.

Senator SYMINGTON. All right, General, you may proceed with your line-items description.

General COOPER. Yes, Senator.

FORT BELVOIR, VA.

Fort Belvoir is located 11 miles southwest of Alexandria, Va. The installation mission is to command, train, and provide logistical sup-

port to engineer troop units and the engineer school; to operate and maintain the U.S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Center; and, to support the Topographic Research and Development Laboratory and Davison Army Airfield. The program is for a helicopter landing facility and parking apron, an enlisted men's barracks without mess for medical personnel and an enlisted men's barracks complex. The request is for \$14,403,000.

The helicopter landing facility and parking apron project is to provide Davison Army Airfield with a taxiway, helipad, hoverlane, an approach lighting system, and an additional parking apron for UH-1 and OH-type helicopters. Completion of this project will permit the separation of rotary and fixed wing operations, reduce airfield congestion with the accompanying hazardous conditions and improve the efficiency of mission accomplishment of Davison Army Airfield. Davison Army Airfield is the only Army airfield in the Washington area with helicopter capability for supporting contingency operations under national emergency conditions plus it provides helicopter support to the White House and U.S. Government officials in the Nation's Capital.

Senator SYMINGTON. This is a rather expensive helicopter landing facility you are requesting for Fort Belvoir. I notice that you need space to park some 42 helicopters, and you indicate some support to the White House and other Government officials. Can you give us a little more detail as to what these helicopters are actually used for, and why you need space for parking this many?

General COOPER. There are a total of 92 aircraft, 31 fixed wing and 61 helicopters, stationed at Davison U.S. Army Airfield, as follows:

Organization	Fixed wing				Rotary wing					Total
	T-41	T-42	U-8	U-21	OH-58	UH-1	VH-3	AH-1	CH-47	
MDW.....	10	8	9	2	7	33				69
Exec flt det.....						2	2		2	6
164th med det.....						2				2
30th engr bn.....						2				2
Night vision lab.....			1			5		1		7
District of Columbia National Guard.....			1		1	4				6
Total.....	10	8	11	2	8	48	2	1	2	92

The 40 helicopters assigned to MDW have the primary mission to support the evacuation of Washington during a national emergency and to support contingency plans in times of civil disturbance. The 11 U-8 and U-21 fixed wing aircraft provide priority air transportation to Army installations. The primary mission of the 18 T-41 and T-42 aircraft and a secondary mission of all other MDW aircraft is to support the training of assigned operational Army aviators and those attached aviators whose combat readiness flying skills must be maintained. Another secondary mission for assigned helicopters is to provide transportation to DOD officials on a space required basis.

The executive flight detachment with six assigned helicopters, provides dedicated helicopter support for the President, Vice President, and their staffs.

The 164th Medical Detachment and the 30th Engineer Battalion are table of organization and equipment—TOE—units which are stationed at Fort Belvoir. Each unit has assigned helicopters organic to the unit which are required to support their combat mission.

Seven aircraft are assigned to the Aviation Detachment, Night Vision Support Branch, to support the testing of airborne night vision devices.

Six aircraft are assigned to the Headquarters, District of Columbia National Guard to provide support to the adjutant general and his staff.

At present there is suitable parking apron, that is, paved and having proper aircraft tiedowns, for 14 light helicopters. The remainder must be parked in less satisfactory expedient areas. Some deficiencies of these expedient areas are no paving, which generates dust and flying debris—both a detriment to good maintenance practices and a safety hazard; expedient tiedowns; and, less than adequate lighting or lane marking.

The enlisted men's barracks for medical personnel will provide 122 bachelor housing spaces for the DeWitt Army Hospital Medical Detachment and Dental Company. These personnel are now residing in temporary barracks constructed in 1940 that are in poor condition, have never been improved, and have long ago exceeded normal life expectancy. In addition, the present barracks are a considerable distance from the worksite.

The barracks complex will furnish adequate living and support accommodations for 1,054 of the permanent party and student enlisted men stationed at Fort Belvoir. These personnel are now living in substandard World War II mobilization-type buildings. Besides the barracks, the project includes the necessary supporting facilities to provide a completely functional bachelor enlisted housing complex. These include unit administration, equipment storage, battalion headquarters, classrooms, and dining areas. Present support facilities are of the same vintage as the old temporary barracks, are in poor condition and lack adequate plumbing, heating, and lighting.

Senator SYMINGTON. You have numerous barracks projects in this year's bill, and I notice you are requesting an increase in unit cost this year from \$27 per square foot to \$28.50 per square foot. Last year was the first year we permitted you to estimate barracks space on a square foot basis. Barracks have not formerly been priced out by cost per man. This new form of pricing gives you more leeway, and actually considerably increases the cost per man. I am wondering why you found it necessary to ask for an increase in the unit price this year.

Here at Fort Belvoir last year we approved a 1,200-man barracks at a total unit cost of \$7,399,000. Yet, this year, you are asking for \$8,385,000 for a 1,054-man barracks, which is about a 20-percent increase. I notice this applies in several other instances. What is your explanation for this?

General COOPER. The fiscal year 1972 project costs were estimated using a gross \$3,200 per man. In fiscal year 1973 the estimating basis was changed to a unit cost factor based on gross area of barracks space. The fiscal year 1973 project costs were estimated using a statutory limit of \$27 per square foot of gross area. The fiscal year 1974 barracks costs were estimated using a proposed statutory limit of \$28.50 per square foot of gross area, the increase being to offset inflation. In fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 the living area per individual was based on grade: 90 square feet for grades E2-E4; 135 square feet for grades E5-E6; and 270 square feet for grades E7-E9.

Barracks for trainees, grade E1, are designed at 72 square feet per man on an open-bay concept.

A comparison of the fiscal year 1974 barracks costs, on a per-man basis, with prior year projects reveals apparent significant cost increases. Several factors have contributed to these increases.

Since mid-1970 improved barracks standards have provided increases in the gross and net barracks area per man and improved living conditions. The gross area has expanded by 32 percent and the net living area by 25 percent. Improved living conditions include private or semiprivate rooms with adjoining bathrooms, air conditioning where authorized, carpeting and more modern furniture, and better security for personal possessions. As mentioned earlier, statutory limits for new barracks construction have been increased in response to improved standards and construction cost escalation. Since mid-1970 this cost escalation has been 42 percent. Prior to the fiscal year 1974 MCA program the barracks personnel loading on project documentation has been shown at the maximum capacity as though occupied by soldiers all in grades E2-E4. In actual practice the barracks are occupied somewhat differently, housing a mix of grades based on the space criteria discussed in paragraph 3 above, resulting in fewer soldiers per barracks building. The fiscal year 1974 barracks projects recognize this fact and the project scopes reflect the intended loading as planned by field commanders for those types of units programed to occupy the respective barracks.

The fiscal year 1975 barracks projects also reflect a greater appreciation of the need for ancillary facilities, in particular, small unit administrative and storage areas. The projects include these facilities, where required, planned around the types of units programed to occupy the particular projects.

Prior year barracks projects essentially ignored these associated requirements to the detriment of efficient use of the barracks.

The remaining deficiency in enlisted quarters at Fort Belvoir upon completion of the above barracks projects is 24 percent of the installation requirement.

CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA.

Carlisle Barracks is located at Carlisle, Pa. The mission of this installation is to provide administrative and logistical support for the operation of the Army War College, Army Institute of Advanced Studies, Army Institute of Land Combat, Dunham Army Hospital, and other units and activities. The program provides for a physical conditioning facility for which \$2,465,000 is requested.

This project is to assure adequate physical conditioning facilities for the students, staff and faculty, permanent party personnel, and military families at the U.S. Army War College. Physical conditioning activities are now carried out in two widely separated structures. The existing post gymnasium, Thorpe Hall, was constructed in 1889 as part of the Carlisle Indian School and is no longer adequate for present needs. In addition, if plans are approved by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Thorpe Hall will be demolished to provide space for construction of the Gen. Omar Bradley Museum. The second building now in use is a converted World War II-type temporary barracks building which is seriously inadequate and will be de-

molished. Adequate physical conditioning facilities for assigned personnel are necessary since the school environment imposes a need for regular winter indoor exercising to maintain sound physical condition and alertness.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you are asking \$2,465,000 for a physical conditioning facility, which I suppose is a new name for a gymnasium. This seems to me to be unduly expensive. Will you explain to us just what this facility consists of, and what it contains.

General COOPER. The Carlisle Barracks gymnasium will serve the U.S. Army War College and will be the focal point for a very comprehensive athletic program for the War College staff and faculty, students, and dependents. Included in the facility will be a basketball floor with running track, a swimming pool, three squash courts and three handball courts, weight rooms and exercise areas, a steamroom, a first aid and rubdown room, an indoor rifle range, and locker rooms for both male and female personnel.

FORT DEVENS, MASS.

Fort Devens is located 2 miles northeast of Ayer, Mass. The mission of the installation is to provide command, training, administrative, and logistical support to Active Army units, annual and weekend active duty training for Reserve units and individuals of the six New England States; and to provide logistical support to the U.S. Army Security Agency Training Center and School, off-post U.S. Army Air Defense Command units, Reserve Centers, Reserve Officers Training Corps units and family housing in the New England States. The requested program is for barracks without dining facilities, for an estimated \$2,749,000 to house 350 enlisted women.

This project is to provide adequate permanent quarters for the Women's Army Corps detachment assigned to this installation and to support a new mission requirement for training female personnel for the Army Security Agency. The total of 350 spaces will include 125 spaces for students plus 225 spaces required for personnel assigned to the Fort Devens garrison and hospital unit. Upon completion of the new facility, three temporary buildings will be demolished.

Upon approval of this request the remaining deficiency at Fort Devens in permanent bachelor housing will be 34 percent of the total installation requirement.

FORT DIX, N.J.

Fort Dix is located 18 miles south of Trenton, N.J. The mission of this installation is the operation of a personnel center and to support onpost training of U.S. Army Reserve, National Guard, and Reserve Officer Training Corps. Fort Dix also provides offpost support to Aradcom missile sites, USAR centers, ROTC units and recruiting stations and provides medical care for Fort Dix, McGuire AFB, Lakehurst NAS, and for evacuees. The program provides a project to convert buildings to administrative facilities for which we are requesting \$339,000.

The conversion work includes partitions, suspended ceilings, modification to electrical service, lighting and heating system to provide adequate space for an Army Readiness Region Headquarters and an Army Readiness Group Activity to be located at Fort Dix. These are new missions at Fort Dix as a result of the Army reorganization.

CAMP DRUM, N.Y.

Camp Drum is located near Watertown, N.Y. The mission of this installation is to command and to provide administrative, logistical, and training support for all units and activities assigned to Camp Drum for such support. During the annual training periods approximately 105,000 troops per year use these facilities and support. The requested program is for an enlisted men's barracks with dining facilities for an estimated cost of \$1,099,000.

This project is to provide adequate housing, dining, and company administrative facilities for troops permanently assigned to Camp Drum. Existing facilities are far below current Army standards. Present billets are 30-year-old temporary-type wooden structures. Plumbing and electrical utilities have long ago exceeded their 5-year design life and are now unreliable and difficult and costly to repair. A complete replacement of heating plants will be required within the next 5 years. Upon completion of the requested project enlisted personnel permanently assigned to Camp Drum will be adequately housed. Four temporary buildings will be demolished to make room for the requested consolidated barracks.

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not question the need for a new barracks for Camp Drum, but your reasoning that men assigned there must walk 100 yards to the mess hall is not very convincing. This does not seem to be a great distance to walk even in inclement weather.

How many men are assigned to this camp during the wintertime, and what are their duties?

General COOPER. There are approximately 650 Regular Army and civilian personnel permanently stationed at Camp Drum. These people constitute the garrison complement responsible for operating, securing, and maintaining the installation. They also support Reserve component training activities that take place throughout the year. The station complement is small and is augmented by additional personnel during the peak months of Reserve training activity.

FORT EUSTIS, VA.

Fort Eustis, Va. is located about 20 miles northwest of Newport News, Va. The installation mission is to organize and train Transportation Corps units and individuals. Tenants include the Transportation School, Transportation Engineering Agency, Aviation Materiel Laboratories, Transportation Agency, and the Computer Systems Command Support Group, Fort Story, Va., a subinstallation, is also supported. The requested program consists of projects for barracks modernization, supply and administrative facilities, a main post office, and alterations to the electrical distribution system for a total estimated cost of \$4,782,000.

The barracks modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to provide adequate housing for bachelor enlisted personnel. At the present time, many bachelor enlisted men are still housed in open bay squad rooms which have little privacy and few conveniences. This project will rehabilitate existing squad rooms to provide semiprivate rooms housing 1,040 soldiers. Following completion this project, 50 percent of the existing barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Eustis will meet current housing standards.

The supply and administrative facilities will provide adequate administrative, supply and storage for two transportation companies that will move to this installation from Fort Story as a result of the Army reorganization.

The Main Post Office project will provide a permanent structure to replace the existing temporary type building constructed in 1941. The Post Office workload averages 10,000 pieces daily. The present wooden structure affords insufficient security and fire protection and the parking area is limited to three patron spaces. The usable postal operations area is cramped and normal locker and rest areas for postal personnel are completely lacking.

The requested electrical distribution system alteration project is required to meet the increase in electrical power requirements that has developed over the last 10 years. The local utility company has constructed a new substation of increased capacity to serve the power demands of Fort Eustis and this project will add the Government electrical power facilities needed for its full utilization. Circuit rearrangements to facilitate maintenance, without disruption to dependent agencies, are also to be provided to improve electrical service continuity, reliability, and capacity.

CAMP A. P. HILL, VA.

Camp A. P. Hill is located near Fredericksburg, Va. The mission of this installation is to serve as a maneuver and training area for Reserve, Active Army, other military services and governmental agencies and to provide logistical and administrative support for these activities. The mission also include the provision of repair and utility services to off-post facilities, including U.S. Army Reserve Centers and Recruiting Stations in assigned areas of the State of Virginia. The requested program is for an enlisted men's barracks with dining facilities for a cost of \$535,000.

This project is to provide a permanent enlisted men's barracks with dining facilities for the permanent station complement. These troops are now housed in small sheet metal hutments which do not meet recognized criteria for adequate housing. These hutments were erected as expedients and were never intended for permanent housing. Latrine and shower facilities are some distance from the billets. The remaining deficit in adequate bachelor housing upon completion of the requested project is 54 percent of the total requirement at Camp A. P. Hill.

Senator SYMINGTON. Similar to Camp Drum, you are asking for an enlisted men's barracks with a mess. How many of these projects are you asking for Reserve training areas, and what are the duties of the people assigned there?

General COOPER. We are asking for enlisted men's barracks projects, either new construction or modernization, at four installations considered Reserve training areas. These are Camp Drum, Camp A. P. Hill, Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, and Camp Pickett. The barracks requested will be for the Regular Army permanent party. These personnel are the garrison complement who, along with supporting training activities, are responsible for operating, securing, and maintaining the installation.

INDIANTOWN GAP MILITARY RESERVATION, PA.

Indiantown Gap Military Reservation is located near Lebanon, Pa. The mission of this installation is to serve as a training and maneuver area for Active Army and Reserve component units and to provide logistical and administrative support for these activities. The requested program is for an enlisted men's barracks with dining facilities for a cost of \$1,657,000.

This project will provide housing and dining facilities for 151 permanently assigned enlisted personnel. These personnel now live in substandard frame barracks buildings which cannot be economically upgraded to meet minimum acceptable standards. Upon completion of this project enlisted personnel permanently assigned to the Indiantown Gap Military Reservation will be adequately housed.

FORT KNOX, KY.

Fort Knox is located 30 miles south of Louisville, Ky. The mission of this installation is to provide facilities for the U.S. Army Armor School, U.S. Army Maintenance Board, U.S. Army Armor Board, an ROTC Regional Headquarters, and certain medical research activities. The installation commands, trains, and supports nondivisional armor units and a recruit training center and supports reserve component summer training. The requested program provides for modernization of enlisted men's barracks and administrative facilities for the newly assigned ROTC Regional Headquarters at a total estimated cost of \$7,305,000.

The barracks project will upgrade 2,026 barracks spaces to current standards and provide associated improvements to troop administrative, storage and the dining space incorporated in the barracks. At present, many bachelor enlisted men are still housed in open bay squad rooms without privacy and with few conveniences. Replacement of existing squad areas with two to four man rooms providing more privacy, better security for personal property, improved lighting and air conditioning will upgrade the barracks to an acceptable level of troop housing. Upon completion of this project 48 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Knox will meet minimum housing standards. The remaining deficit in adequate bachelor housing is approximately 59 percent of the total requirement at Fort Knox.

The second project will provide administrative facilities for the Headquarters, ROTC region II, by converting a portion of an existing building. Fort Knox, as with many Army installations, is short suitable administrative space. The ROTC Headquarters is a new mission assigned to Fort Knox under the 1973 Army reorganization.

FORT LEE, VA.

Fort Lee is located 2 miles east of Petersburg, Va. The mission of this installation is to command, train, and support units and activities assigned to the Quartermaster Center, the Quartermaster School, the Army Logistics Management School and other onpost and satellited units and activities. The program provides for additions to Kenner

Army Hospital, barracks for enlisted male and female personnel, a central food preparation facility, bachelor officer quarters, and a confinement facility for a total estimated cost of \$22,769,000.

The hospital project is required to improve inadequate outpatient facilities at Kenner Army Hospital. Subsequent to the completion of Kenner Army Hospital in 1961, changes in the technique of delivering health care have led to significant increases in the outpatient workload. The clinical workload has increased from 361 visits per day in fiscal year 1961 to 786 daily visits in fiscal year 1972, an increase of 118 percent. The proposed addition to the clinical operational areas will provide facilities that are either not now available or that are located in substandard World War II mobilization-type buildings. Existing clinical operational areas are over crowded and separated from the hospital by nearly 1 mile which seriously inconveniences patients and staff alike. The temporary hospital buildings now in use have long exceeded their useful life as satisfactory medical treatment facilities. Heating and electrical systems are inadequate and the buildings are in a deteriorated condition. Expansion of the hospital to provide needed capabilities will require alteration of the existing permanent building to accommodate supporting services and clinics not included in the proposed new addition. Ten temporary buildings will be demolished.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are asking for an addition to the Kenner Army Hospital at Fort Lee. When was this hospital originally constructed? I notice that in this instance, and in other similar projects, you indicate that the outpatient workload has increased considerably, resulting in a requirement to expand outpatient facilities. What is this attributable to?

General COOPER. Kenner Army Hospital, Building P-8130, was completed in 1961. The hospital is rated at a 100 bed capacity. The area known as the Kenner Annex consists of typical World War II temporary type wooden structures constructed during early World War II. This annex houses most of the clinics associated with Kenner Hospital and is located nearly 1 mile from the main hospital.

The construction we are requesting in the fiscal year 1974 military construction Army budget request will provide permanent adequate clinic facilities contiguous to the main hospital to replace the inadequate annex facilities. The techniques of delivering health care services have changed significantly in recent years. Advances in medical equipment, medicines, and treatment techniques have shifted much of the health care delivery load from an inpatient to an outpatient basis. Concurrently, as is the case at Fort Lee, the facilities housing many of our clinics at numerous hospitals have simply outlived their economic life and are now extremely expensive and difficult to maintain, are functionally inappropriate under today's standards, and cannot be economically modernized.

The proposal for an additional enlisted men's barracks without mess facilities will provide adequate housing for 422 permanently assigned enlisted personnel, PCS and TDY students who are now occupying temporary substandard buildings.

The project for additional enlisted women's barracks is to increase the adequate housing spaces for Women's Army Corps (WAC) personnel at Fort Lee. WAC personnel are now living in the temporary

substandard facilities. Recent increases in strength authorization will result in a total of 211 WAC personnel living in the inadequate billeting spaces. Four temporary buildings will be demolished in conjunction with this project.

Upon completion of the requested housing projects approximately 62 percent of the bachelor personnel at Fort Lee will be provided adequate quarters.

The project for a central food preparation facility (CFPF) is required to provide a central kitchen, ingredient centers, food storage and distribution facilities plus the modernization of 10 existing permanent messhalls which will be used as dining facilities satellited on the central food preparation facility. This proposed system for preparing food in a central kitchen and serving the food in satellite dining facilities located in the troop housing areas is a major element in the Army's program to improve food service. This CFPF at Fort Lee will be an operational facility plus it will be the training and doctrinal development center for CFPF management. If this project is not approved the goal to improve food service operations in support of the Army cannot be totally realized, and the use of the less effective facilities and methods with their recognized shortcomings must continue. No buildings will be demolished as a result of this project.

The bachelor officer quarters (BOQ) requested are needed to provide adequate housing for military and civilian students attending the U.S. Army Quartermaster School and the U.S. Army Logistics Management Center, and for some permanently assigned bachelor officers. At present, Fort Lee, has only 64 percent of its BOQ requirements in adequate facilities. The remaining BOQ's available are substandard World War II mobilization type wooden frame buildings. As a consequence, many personnel elect to live off post in hard-to-find, expensive private housing. An onpost adequate BOQ, located near the respective schools, will reduce transportation and traffic problems for the students, provide more efficient group study possibilities, and help alleviate the inequitable bachelor housing situation. If this project is not approved, these personnel will be forced to continue living in substandard bachelor officer quarters or costly off post housing.

The confinement project is required to provide adequate facilities for the custody, control, and correctional treatment of military prisoners in accordance with the Army's new correctional system. It will replace the stockade at Fort Belvoir, Va. The Fort Belvoir facility consists of seven temporary, substandard World War II barracks and one permanent building constructed in 1934. These buildings are wholly inadequate in terms of ability to allow proper control, supervision, and the required segregation of prisoners. The buildings are fire risks, and their age necessitates constant and costly maintenance. The present facilities will accommodate 276 prisoners at 55 SF per man in open-bay billeting. This arrangement is not flexible and presents a severe discipline problem. The proposed Fort Lee project will provide facilities for confinement of military prisoners apprehended in 12 counties of West Virginia, the entire State of Virginia, and from Fort Eustis, Fort Story, Fort Monroe, Camp Pickett, A. P. Hill, and Langley Air Force Base. The confinement facilities at Fort Belvoir will be demolished except for maximum security cells (2,005 SF) which are located in a permanent building. These will be retained as a small installation holding point.

FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MD.

Fort George G. Meade is located 18 miles south of Baltimore, Md. The mission of this installation is to train and support strategic Army forces and post troop units; to support Headquarters, 1st U.S. Army, National Security Agency, the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School, Reserve components, and Reserve Officer Training Corps summer training. The program provides barracks modernization for which we are requesting \$5,924,000 and a facility for the USMA Preparatory School costing \$1,521,000.

The barracks project will provide modernization of 1,918 housing spaces to continue the work of upgrading existing permanent barracks to current standards to provide modern housing for bachelor enlisted personnel. At the present time, many bachelor enlisted men are housed in open-bay squad rooms with little privacy or conveniences. Modernizing the barracks to provide semiprivate rooms, air-conditioning, security of personal possessions, and improved lighting and other convenience will greatly contribute to the health, welfare, and morale of the individual soldier. Upon completion of this project, 56 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Meade will have been upgraded. Fort Meade will still have a deficit in adequate bachelor enlisted housing of 39 percent of the long-range requirement.

The USMA Preparatory School is to be relocated from Fort Belvoir to Fort Meade. The project includes alteration of existing permanent buildings at Fort Meade to provide classrooms, administrative facilities, and athletic team locker rooms. The project also provides for construction of drill and athletic fields.

FORT MONROE, VA

Fort Monroe is located near Hampton, Va. The primary mission of this installation is to serve as a Headquarters, U.S. Continental Army Command Training and Doctrine Command (Tradoc). In addition, this installation provides administrative and logistical support for U.S. Forces Atlantic; U.S. Conarc Support Element; USA Garrison; USA Medical Department Activity; USA Security Agency Detachment; USA Separation Transfer Point; 50th Army Bank; 559th Military Police Company; USA Audiovisual Support Center, and other Army activities located at Fort Monroe. U.S. Conarc has been the administrative and operational headquarters for the Conus Armies and becomes Headquarters, Tradoc, under the 1973 Army reorganization. The program provides barracks modernization for which we are requesting \$867,000.

As at many Army installations, this project is required to continue the work of upgrading existing permanent barracks to current standards to provide modern housing for bachelor enlisted personnel. At the present time, many bachelor enlisted men are housed in open-bay squad rooms with no privacy and with few conveniences. Replacing existing squad rooms with two- to four-man rooms and providing new lighting and convenience outlets will convert the barracks into more adequate troop housing and contribute to the health, welfare, and morale of the individual soldier. This project will complete Fort Monroe's requirements for modern housing for bachelor enlisted personnel.

Senator SYMINGTON. Isn't consideration being given to closing this base? If so, shouldn't this project be deferred?

General COOPER. Fort Monroe, along with several Army installations, is being reviewed in our stationing study now underway. We would not want to predetermine the results of this study at this time, but hopefully we will have some firm decisions prior to the committee's final actions on the construction bill.

CAMP PICKETT, VA.

Camp Pickett is located near Petersburg, Va. The mission of this installation is to serve as a maneuver and training area for Reserve components, Active Army units and other military services, and to provide logistical and administrative support for these activities. The mission is also to provide repair and utility services to off post facilities, including U.S. Army Reserve Centers and Recruiting Stations located in assigned areas within Virginia and West Virginia. The program consists of an enlisted men's barracks with dining facilities for which we are requesting \$476,000.

This project consists of an enlisted men's barracks and dining facilities for the permanent station complement. The dining area will serve up to 200 permanent party plus temporary duty officers and enlisted men attached for duty. Housing is currently provided in temporary World War II-type buildings constructed in the early 1940's. In the past, dining requirements have been met by utilizing an existing 100-man temporary-type facility during the winter months and opening additional mess buildings during the summer training period. Even with additional mess buildings, these facilities are overcrowded and not adequate to accommodate personnel authorized subsistence support. If this project is not approved, permanent party personnel must continue to utilize inadequate dining facilities and to occupy substandard barracks. The existing buildings will be utilized to house Reserve and National Guard units assigned for short periods for annual training. Upon completion of the requested project, enlisted personnel permanently assigned to Camp Pickett will be adequately housed.

FORT BENNING, GA.

Fort Benning is located at Columbus, Ga. Its mission is to command, train, and provide logistical support for a division, support the infantry school and infantry board, qualify officers and enlisted men in airborne and ranger techniques and to support summer reserve component training. The program consists of a barracks modernization project, a Ranger training complex (located at Eglin Air Force Base), a central food preparation facility, and modifications to the electrical distribution system. The total request is for \$15,354,000.

The barracks modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Lack of privacy has long been a source of irritation and dissatisfaction among enlisted personnel and at present many bachelor enlisted men are housed in open bay squad rooms with little privacy and few conveniences. Replacement of existing squad areas with two-to-four-man semiprivate rooms having modern conveniences will significantly improve livability of the barracks. Upon completion of

this project 60 percent of the existing barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Benning will meet minimum housing standards.

The project for a Ranger training complex will provide permanent enlisted barracks and bachelor officer quarters for personnel engaged in conducting or undergoing the Ranger course of the infantry school at Eglin Air Force Base. Existing facilities were constructed during World War II as temporary, woodframe buildings and lack adequate heating, lighting, and cooling equipment.

Modification of the electrical distribution system is required to provide two new substations and modernize the system. The additional electrical capacity will furnish adequate power to the growing Fort Benning area which has recorded a 30 percent electrical system load increase in 5 years. This project will complete the third and last increment of a three-part plan for modernizing the 30-year-old electrical distribution system. It will also provide a two-way power supply at 44 kilovolt to the two new substations which in turn will improve reliability for continuous service to all areas of the main post proper and to Lawson Army Airfield. This project will also install mercury vapor type street lighting in some heavily built-up areas of the post now without street lighting. Deferral of this project will result in continued use of circuits without the reliability of alternate service for emergencies, in insufficient power for planned new construction, and large areas will remain without adequate street lighting.

The next project is for a central food preparation facility (CFPF). Similar to the CFPF requested at Fort Lee, this facility will consist of a central kitchen, ingredient centers, food storage and distribution facilities, a pastry kitchen, warewashing facilities, and the modernization of 25 existing permanent type messhalls for use as satellite dining facilities. Troops have long voiced dissatisfaction, either real or imagined, with the quality of food service. The CFPF system, being introduced with this project at Fort Benning and the companion project at Fort Lee, will vastly improve the Army's capability to provide appealing, wholesome meals.

Senator SYMINGTON. \$5.3 million seems quite high for a central food preparation facility. Will you describe to us just what such a facility consists of? I don't recall having seen such a project heretofore.

General COOPER. The central food preparation facility (CFPF) is the heart of the Army's new concept designed to improve the overall quality of food service provided to our soldiers. The CFPF requested for Fort Benning is one of two proposed in our fiscal year 1974 budget request. The second facility is planned for Fort Lee. These are the first facilities of this type we have requested and they are the beginning of a program tentatively planned to develop 24 such facilities. Basically the CFPF is where wholesome meals will be prepared on a large-volume basis using the latest in modern food processing equipment. The CFPF will support several satellite dining facilities which will have some supplemental modern equipment and offer the food for dining in attractive, familiar surroundings. Examples of the equipment utilized in the CFPF are mechanized vegetable cleaners, continuous belt deep-fat fryers, quick chill and flash-freeze vaults, continuous cookers for pasta and rice, automatic warewashing and sorting equipment, high-speed ovens, laboratory, and insulated equipment for transporting food to the satellite facilities.

FORT BRAGG, N.C.

Fort Bragg is located 10 miles northwest of Fayetteville, N.C. The mission of this installation is to command, train, and support an airborne division and other airborne units, to test airborne equipment and techniques, to support a ROTC regional headquarters and an Army readiness region group, and to support the U.S. Army John F. Kennedy Center for military assistance. The program being presented provides for additional tactical equipment shops and facilities, administrative facilities, enlisted women's barracks with mess facilities, an enlisted men's barracks complex, a service club for enlisted personnel and for modernization of existing enlisted men's barracks. For this program we are requesting \$33,471,000.

Tactical equipment shops are required to provide additional organizational level maintenance facilities for the 3,072 wheeled vehicles and 862 portable generators, compressors, and pumps assigned to the XVIII Airborne Corps Artillery, 313th Army Security Agency Battalion, 600th and 612th Quartermaster Companies, and the 35th Signal Group. These organizations occupy a permanent barracks complex completed in February 1971. Their vehicle repair is accomplished in seven temporary shops located at distances varying from 1.9 to 4.7 miles from the new barracks. These existing shops will be supplemented by the two 500-vehicle shops proposed in this project to provide a design support capacity 1,875 vehicles. This increase in capacity will provide but 59 percent of the total Fort Bragg requirement and continued use of the temporary shops will be required to carry out the maintenance support mission. Wide separation of troops from their vehicles and shops will continue to contribute to administrative and transportation problems until the total deficit is overcome.

The project for administrative facilities is required to provide adequate permanent type space for Headquarters, ROTC Region I and for an Army readiness group. These organizations are new missions assigned to Fort Bragg in the 1973 Army reorganization.

The enlisted women's barracks with mess facilities are required to provide adequate quarters for the enlisted women at Fort Bragg. The current strength for enlisted women stationed at Fort Bragg is being increased to 400. Existing barracks are not of a size, appropriately located, or suitable for alteration to provide the necessary enlisted women's billets, administration and mess in one location. The Women's Army Corps company is presently housed in temporary World War II mobilization barracks and must continue to occupy such housing until adequate quarters can be provided. Upon completion of this project, 23 temporary buildings with an aggregate area of 74,329 square feet will be demolished.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you are requesting a barracks with a mess for enlisted women. I notice that you carry as a separate item administration storage space. Why is this not considered a part of the unit cost of the barracks as is done by the other two services?

General COOPER. During the late 1950's, Congress agreed to accept that the statutory limit—unit cost—for barracks would apply only to troop housing, as differentiated from messing, supply, and administration. Troop housing spaces relate to those only in direct support of the living space. These items do include some personal storage and

minor administration space. However, the administration and storage building programed as a separate item supports the entire enlisted women's company composed of its officer and troop unit personnel housed within this project and those offsite, family housing, officer housing, and offsite personnel. Therefore, this building is not considered or programed as part of the statutory limitation—unit cost—of the barracks. This is also the case with the other services. Troop unit administration and storage buildings in all services are programed as separate items.

The modernization of enlisted men's barracks will continue the Army plan to bring existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Lack of privacy has long been a source of irritation and dissatisfaction among bachelor enlisted personnel and many are presently housed in open bay squad rooms without privacy and with few conveniences. Replacement of existing squad areas with two- to four-man rooms providing new lighting and convenience outlets, air conditioning, carpeting, and security for possessions will upgrade the barracks to a more acceptable level of troop housing. Upon completion of this project 48 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Bragg will meet the current housing standards.

The enlisted men's barracks complex is required to provide adequate housing and supporting facilities for bachelor enlisted men of the 1st Corps Support Command. These men are now housed in World War II mobilization-type barracks constructed in 1941. Living conditions afforded by these facilities are far below current standards with a detrimental effect on morale and efficiency. Deferment of this request will necessitate the continued use of substandard facilities.

Upon completion of the housing projects discussed above the remaining deficit in bachelor enlisted housing at Fort Bragg will be 10 percent of the total installation requirement.

The final project is to provide service club facilities for 5,000 men in the permanent barracks area. The only service club now in this area is a 7,750 square foot converted bowling alley which can handle approximately 1,200 men or about 8 percent of the 15,000 troops living nearby. The nearest other clubs are located 1.6 and 2.6 miles away, are located in old World War II temporary-type structures, and are fully utilized by troops living in their immediate area. Counting the temporary assets, Fort Bragg has only 49 percent of its required service club facilities. Consequently, many soldiers are denied opportunity for participation in the social and entertainment activities normally available in a home or civilian community.

FORT CAMPBELL, KY.

Fort Campbell is located 8 miles northwest of Clarksville, Tenn. The mission of this installation is to provide for the support and training of an airmobile division and other nondivisional combat units. This request provides for the third phase of an airfield complex at Campbell Army Airfield. It also includes barracks modernization, an enlisted men's barracks complex, and a commissary. New funding authorization for an estimated cost of \$51,881,000 is requested.

The airfield project is the final phase of a three-phase program required to provide adequate aircraft operations and maintenance facil-

ities for the 439 aircraft authorized at Fort Campbell in support of the aviation elements of an airmobile division and other supporting units. Present facilities include those authorized under phase I—MCA fiscal year 1972—for support of 118 aircraft, and those authorized under phase II—MCA fiscal year 1973—for support of an additional 178 helicopters. This project provides parking and maintenance facilities for 143 attack utility helicopters assigned to two divisional assault helicopter battalions and the support company of the aviation group, a control tower, storage facilities for JP-4 fuel and a fire and rescue station needed for the expanded mission and flight operations. Until this project is approved and constructed, available facilities will not adequately support the total complement of 439 helicopters authorized.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here you are asking \$8.4 million for phase 3 of your tactical airfield complex. Are the first two phases previously authorized completed? It seems to me that you are attempting to place an unusual amount of construction under contract in this area at one time. Do you think that you can get this project under contract during this fiscal year?

General COOPER. The fiscal year 1972 MCA program provided \$9,996,000 for construction of airfield facilities—phase 1—at Fort Campbell. The phase 1 items, with one minor exception, were placed under contract in March 1972, and are now 85 percent complete. Completion of the work is scheduled for November 1973.

The fiscal year 1973 MCA program provided \$6,948,000 for construction of additional airfield facilities—phase 2—at Fort Campbell. A construction contract for this work was awarded in June 1973. Currently, the contractor is mobilizing equipment and supplies for an August 1973, start. Completion of this project is scheduled for January 1975.

Concerning the possibility of awarding the fiscal year 1974 MCA project—phase 3/\$8,420,000—during the current fiscal year, it is anticipated that this project will be ready for bidding by January 1974. It is realized that the large construction program at Fort Campbell will place heavy demands on all available construction crafts within commuting distance of the base; however, it is believed that the contractor effort in this area is sufficient to support the program and that the bidding competition will be adequate.

The barracks modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks similar to modernization projects proposed for several other posts. Upon completion of this project 71 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Campbell will meet current housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

Fort Campbell has a long range requirement to support a combat division and supporting units, with a net barracks requirement of 11,764 spaces. Existing permanent barracks, once modernized plus approved projects will satisfy approximately 69 percent of this requirement. The balance of the troops must occupy World War II mobilization barracks which require excessive maintenance and no longer meet even minimum requirements for standard troop housing. This request for a new 3,300-man barracks complex will greatly reduce the permanent barracks deficit for Fort Campbell, one of the Army's

key division installations. Upon completion of this construction, 155 temporary buildings with a total area of 822,450 square feet will be demolished.

The last item at Fort Campbell is a request for permanent commissary facilities. The existing commissary presently serves over 13,500 military families in the area and operations are carried out under very congested conditions. Dollar volume of sales for the first half of fiscal year 1973 averaged over \$975,000 per month. Sales have increased each year since 1966 with fiscal year 1972 showing a 15.3 percent jump over fiscal year 1971. Projections for fiscal year 1974 based on the above factors indicate that sales at the main commissary store will increase to \$1,350,000 per month with service to 17,000 families, including retired service personnel. Backup storage space is limited which contributes to double-handling of merchandise and a requirement for additional operating manpower and vehicles. It is not feasible to expand the temporary building now in use as a commissary store due to its location, the age of the building, and its poor physical condition. The main store currently maintains a 54 hour-per-week operating schedule while three annexes are open a total of 98 hours per week. Despite this schedule many authorized military customers are not able to patronize the commissary outlets because of excessive shopping times required, thus sacrificing a privilege which is considered in the establishment of military pay levels. Recent annual cost comparison surveys indicate that personnel shopping at commercial food stores must pay in excess of 30 percent above commissary price levels.

FORT GORDON, GA.

Fort Gordon is located 12 miles southwest of Augusta, Ga. The installation mission is to support the U.S. Army Signal School, a U.S. Army general hospital and assigned strategic Army force units. The program will provide an enlisted men's barracks complex, barracks modernization for enlisted women, a commissary, and an automotive self-help garage. The request is for \$23,780,000.

The first project will provide permanent barrack spaces and ancillary support facilities for enlisted personnel assigned to advanced individual training. Personnel now live in temporary mobilization buildings built in 1941 and semipermanent facilities constructed in 1967. These temporary structures require continual maintenance, are expensive to heat and are not air conditioned. Such substandard quarters are not conducive to retention of personnel. The existing deficit at Fort Gordon for permanent bachelor enlisted housing upon completion of this project will be 28.5 percent of the total installation requirement.

The barracks modernization project will continue the work of upgrading existing permanent barracks to current standards for female enlisted personnel. The WAC population at Fort Gordon is being increased due to the expansion of the Women's Corps and the opening up of many additional job categories to women. Upon completion of this project 10 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Gordon will meet minimum housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

The third project is to provide permanent operating facilities for the commissary sales store which has a daily average customer workload during peak periods of over 2,700 people. Average monthly sales of \$890,470 for fiscal year 1972 showed a continuing increase in volume, advancing 14 percent over the monthly volume in 1971. Projected monthly sales in fiscal year 1974 will average \$1,150,000. The present commissary store is a converted mobilization type warehouse building constructed in 1941. Floor space for sales area is limited and areas for installation of adequate display shelving are not available. Volume quantities of replenishment stock must be transported from remote locations and rehandled. The physical structure of the building has so deteriorated as to preclude the maintenance of food sanitary standards. There were no existing facilities which can satisfy this requirement. Annual projected savings on completion of the project are estimated at \$66,000.

The final project is to provide a permanent automotive self-help garage. The existing temporary buildings now in use were constructed in 1942 and are not designed to meet the requirements of an automotive garage. Space and equipment are inadequate and insufficient security exists for vehicles left overnight. Due to the high cost of automobile repairs and maintenance, the auto self-help garage is a very popular, well-used facility and is a valuable asset. This project will provide a modern, well-equipped facility to support the mission of the Army crafts program.

Senator SYMINGTON. \$626,000 seems to be an excessive amount for what might be termed a hobby shop. It is noted that this is to be a permanent structure. Cannot prefabricated buildings be used for this purpose in order to have a little money?

General COOPER. The unit is most in line with the approved criteria for this type of structure. Contributing to this unit cost are the many large doors opening to the working stalls and other installed equipment; for example, a compressed air system, exhaust expulsion apparatus, and auto hoists.

The automotive self-help garage is designed for conventional construction; that is, masonry and steel frame, and the design is 100 percent complete. Pre-engineered structures were considered as an alternative design for the facility. A life cycle cost analysis of the alternatives indicated the conventional masonry construction would realize approximately a 15-percent savings over a 15-year life span.

Other considerations influencing the choice of masonry construction were:

(a) The automotive self-help garage would be compatible with nearby existing or planned structures of masonry construction.

(b) The majority of structures used for similar purposes in the communities near Fort Gordon are of masonry construction. This indicates a viable market source for required materials plus the local construction contractors are experienced in this type of construction thereby creating a competitive atmosphere for procuring this type of structure.

(c) A design using the concept of entering all working bays directly from the exterior of the building provides the maximum number of bays within gross space allowances. A key feature of this design is that the side walls consist primarily of large doors

and the more rigid masonry construction is particularly well suited for this design. An alternative concept would be to have a common center aisle for access to the working bays. This design is often used in large commercial garages where an auto being repaired would be moved to several different bays, each equipped only for specialized work. In the auto self-help garage the work is usually less sophisticated and all accomplished in the same bay so the center aisle would consume space better used as working area to accommodate more customers.

FORT JACKSON, S.C.

Fort Jackson is located at Columbia, S.C. The mission of the installation is to command, train, and support an Army training center. It also supports a U.S. Army reception station and reserve components summer training. This project is for construction of an enlisted women's barracks with mess facilities. We are requesting \$2,902,000.

This project is to provide a permanent barracks for enlisted women stationed at Fort Jackson. Permanent enlisted women housing facilities are not available at present. To provide a temporary solution, one existing permanent building is being modified to house approximately 244 WAC. This has required displacement of male trainees to World War II-type temporary barracks until the permanent WAC barracks are constructed. Also, until this is completed other enlisted women must continue to occupy temporary buildings which were constructed in 1941 and have had no major renovations or modifications. Accomplishment of this essential housing project will satisfy the housing requirement for enlisted women assigned to Fort Jackson, however an overall Post deficit of more than 10,000 spaces will still exist.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here again you propose an enlisted women's barracks with a mess, at a cost of almost \$3 million. It is noted that the barracks and administrative and storage space combined amounts to over \$6,100 per man. Isn't this excessive when only 2 years ago there was a limitation of \$3,200 per man?

General COOPER. This is explained by the application of the statutory limitation. The troop housing and only those spaces in direct support of the living space are applicable to statutory limitation. This was agreed upon by Congress in the late 1950's. Therefore, this limitation only applies to the barracks. In turn, the barracks have been programed as a separate item differentiated from the administration and supply and the mess facilities. In fiscal year 1974 the proposed statutory limitation is \$28.50 per square foot. At 165 gross square feet per man this equates to \$4,700 per man. As compared with fiscal year 1972, the statutory limitation was \$3,200, at 150 square feet per E-2 to E-4. The increase in statutory limitation is reflected in the programing of adequate space for upper grade enlisted men, the growth of construction costs, and the increased gross area per man to provide the privacy required by our enlisted men. It should be noted that additional barracks area listed on the DD form 1391 is for mechanical utility requirements.

FORT M'CLELLAN, ALA.

Fort McClellan is located 7 miles northeast of Anniston, Ala. The mission of the installation is to support the Women's Army Corps Center and School. The WAC Center and WAC School conduct basic training and officer candidate courses. The installation also supports the 3d Army NCO Academy, the U.S. Army Police School, and Noble Army Hospital.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here at Fort McClelland you are proposing a \$19.5 million construction program. Isn't some consideration being given to closing this base? If so, shouldn't this proposed program be deferred?

General COOPER. Fort McClellan is one of the installations being reviewed in the Army's stationing study now in progress. However no decisions have been made at this time. We hope to have made our determinations prior to the committee's final action on the construction bill.

The program is for alterations to training facilities, additions to academic buildings, a gymnasium, alterations and additions to WAC Headquarters, barracks modernization, additional barracks for enlisted women, housing and training facilities for the Women's Army Corps Band, a WAC reception and processing building, WAC bachelor officers quarters and an expansion of utilities capabilities. The request is for \$19,505,000.

The first project is required to provide adequate classroom facilities for the Military Police School moving to Fort McClellan under the 1973 Army realignment. Training facilities previously structured to meet the specialized needs of the Army Chemical School will be altered to more standard classrooms.

The second project is to provide academic facilities for three WAC basic training battalions. Present buildings were designed and built in 1954 to accommodate a training strength of approximately 500 women but planned WAC expansion will increase the training strength to 2,430. Thirty-two additional classrooms and two performance training rooms are required to support this additional workload.

The next project will provide a gymnasium for personnel assigned or attached to the WAC Center/School. The existing facility was designed in 1954 to support a total population of 1,060 WAC personnel. Today the average daily population is 2,680 and the indoor physical training program has had to be curtailed contrary to Army policy. Under the WAC expansion program, the average daily basic trainee population will increase significantly and the present gymnasium will no longer support basic training or permanent party requirements. If this building is not constructed, an adequate training program cannot be supported. The existing facility will revert to a badly needed classroom.

Senator SYMINGTON. Here at Fort McClellan you are requesting a gymnasium to serve approximately 3,300 personnel, at a cost of \$1,261,000—whereas the one we previously discussed at Carlisle Barracks costs twice as much and serves a far less number of people. What is your explanation for this?

General COOPER. The estimated unit costs for the Carlisle Barracks and Fort McClellan gynasiums are \$44.6 per square foot and \$35.6 per square foot, respectively. The geographical construction cost index is 19 percent higher in the Carlisle area than at Fort McClellan accounting for approximately 75 percent of the apparent cost difference. The remainder is attributed to differences in the design as dictated by the planned utilization.

The Fort McClellan gymnasium will be designed primarily for female personnel as a training facility used for WAC basic training. As a result, it will be somewhat less sophisticated in features and accommodations than the gymnasium planned for Carlisle Barracks. The Fort McClellan facility will provide a basketball floor, a handball and a squash court, a sauna and a swimming pool. This will provide an indoor exercise area for the WAC training program plus individual and some unit sports competition. There will be only limited accommodations; for example, restrooms, for spectators or male personnel.

As mentioned earlier, the gymnasium planned for Carlisle Barracks will offer a much more comprehensive program to both male and female personnel and it contains several facilities not incorporated in the Fort McClellan gymnasium.

The fourth project is needed to provide adequate administrative space to support the WAC expansion program. The present WAC Headquarters was designed to support an 8-company operation but the planned expansion will require administrative support and auditorium space for 16 companies. The present headquarters building does not provide either the space or the configuration necessary to support operations at this level of activity. The existing auditorium does not have sufficient seating capability for present requirements and with increased trainee loads the auditorium will be even more inadequate. If this project is not approved, prevailing operating constrictions must continue.

The barracks modernization project is required to continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current standards for enlisted female personnel. Upon completion of this project, 80 percent of the existing barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort McClellan will meet current housing standards.

The barracks construction project is required to accommodate an increased number of basic trainees as a result of the WAC expansion. The 10 WAC trainee barracks now available provide a total of 2,150 spaces. Of these, 150 are cadre spaces leaving 2,000 spaces to house trainees. The accelerated WAC expansion program will require the housing of 16 companies with 3,120 billet spaces (2,940 trainees plus 180 cadre), or a deficit of 970 spaces. This project will provide 645 of those spaces. If this project is not approved, new WAC trainees will be required to live in inadequate, semipermanent barracks designed strictly for male personnel and remote to the WAC training area.

The next project is required to provide permanent housing and training facilities for the only all-women's band in the Armed Forces. This band presently works and lives in a building designed for enlisted housing. Band members spend their entire military career at Fort McClellan and are required to live and train in quarters designed to house lower ranking enlisted personnel regardless of their promotions to higher enlisted status. The present building does not provide sep-

arated training rooms. The only areas available for individual or small group training are stairwells, latrines, kitchens, and open cubicles in the living areas which are not acoustically treated. Individual and group training are hampered by the lack of acoustically engineered training areas since intonation, articulation, rhythm, tone and accuracy cannot be detected properly as a result of the intermix of resonance and sound when band members are rehearsing or undergoing proficiency tests.

If this project is not approved, bachelor officers at this station must continue to live in inadequate facilities.

The final project is required to provide for utilities expansion necessitated by planned new construction to support the Women's Army Corps expansion program. This project provides for conversion of 4-kVA lines to 12 kVA to provide adequate electric power to support the proposed construction. Two existing boilerplants, one at 1,200 and one at 600 boiler horsepower (BHP), will be expanded to 1,500 and 1,000 BHP respectively, to provide additional heating capacity and capacity for steam absorption type chillers. Chilled water distribution piping is required to transport chilled water from plants to buildings to support air-condition requirements. Existing systems cannot support the construction planned under the expansion program.

The next project will provide critically needed recruit housing and facilities for processing incoming officer and enlisted personnel for the Women's Army Corps. During the 5-year WAC expansion plan, programed input of enlistees will increase from a current annual level of 6,000 to a total of 12,000. The space presently being used for administrative processing includes the second floor of a building originally designed to provide classrooms and two barracks buildings intended for housing. The location and arrangement of these facilities do not meet minimum requirements for the conduct of tests and initial classification processing. The programed increase will require the release of all classrooms and barracks for use as originally designed and the reception area will be lost. If the requested reception facilities are not constructed, the present facilities will, of necessity, continue to be used; thus, hampering the proper use of existing assets and causing severe inefficiencies in processing incoming WAC personnel.

The next project will provide adequate bachelor officer quarters at this station for both commissioned officer students and permanent party. There are 160 permanent BOQ spaces now available compared to the present bachelor officer population requirement for 410 spaces. Excluding the 160 spaces onpost and 25 adequate spaces off post, the result is a net deficit of 225 spaces required for onpost bachelor officer housing. Present housing needs are met by assigning two officers to each one-man room which requires four officers to use a common bathroom facility. This project will provide 100 bachelor officer quarters against the total requirements.

FORT M'PHERSON, GA.

Fort McPherson is located near Atlanta, Ga. The mission of this installation is to provide support for activities of Headquarters, U.S. Army Forces Command. The requested program consists of a barracks modernization project for an estimated cost of \$1,804,000.

This project is to continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Upon completion of this project 100 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort McPherson will meet current housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

Senator SYMINGTON. Aren't you considering closing Fort McPherson, and shouldn't this project be deferred?

General COOKE. Fort McPherson is another of the installations under review in the Army's stationing study now being conducted. We are looking very carefully at single mission, high cost posts. However, to defer the project at this time would be to prejudice the study results. Hopefully, we will have made some firm decisions prior to the final committee action on the construction bill.

FORT RUCKER, ALA.

Fort Rucker is located at Daleville, Ala. The installation mission is support of the Army Aviation Center which trains individual pilots for fixed and rotary wing Army aircraft. The program consists of construction of an enlisted women's barracks, modernization of enlisted men's barracks, and the upgrade of airfield facilities. A total of \$3,987,000 is requested for these projects.

The first project will provide WAC billets to house station permanent party WAC's and some WAC students. The WAC's are presently housed in barracks originally designed for male personnel and these buildings do not have required features, such as kitchens and reception rooms. On completion of the new WAC billets, the billets now occupied by WAC's will be returned to the use by male soldiers.

The second project is required to continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. The existing barracks are typical of the old open-bay concept, offering the soldier little privacy or modern conveniences. Upon completion of the project 68 percent of the existing barracks capable of being modernized at Fort Rucker will meet current housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

The third project will provide adequate airfield training facilities to handle the increased flight training mission assigned to Fort Rucker under the 1973 Army realignment. All Army helicopter training will be consolidated at Fort Rucker from Fort Wolters, Tex., and Hunter AAF, Ga.

FORT STEWART, GA.

Fort Stewart is located at Hinesville, Ga. Its mission is to support annual field training for National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve units and to provide armor and artillery ranges for training Active Army and Reserve components. The requested program is for a gas generating plant at an estimated cost of \$264,000.

This project is to provide a propane-air gas generating plant to supplement the restricted natural gas supply procured under contract with the Atlanta Gas Light Co., a regulated sole-source supplier. Because of the developing critical nationwide shortage of natural gas available to suppliers, all customers are restricted to current firm con-

tract demands during periods of curtailment. The contract firm gas demand is 300,000 cubic feet per day (CFD). Current conversions of coal-fired facilities to natural gas fuel to comply with air pollution control regulations has increased the total gas requirement to 760,000 cubic feet per day. Negotiations with the gas supplier has resulted in an agreement to make an additional 488,000 cubic feet per day available until October 1974, at which time the contract demand will revert to the current contract firm gas demand of 300,000 cubic feet per day. The proposed propane-air gas generating plant is the most economical means of providing energy for adequate heating during periods of natural gas curtailment. If this project is not approved, it will be necessary to close buildings and operations on a selective basis during periods of natural gas curtailment subsequent to October 1974.

FORT BLISS, TEX.

Fort Bliss is located in El Paso, Tex. The installation mission is to provide facilities and support for the U.S. Army Air Defense Center, U.S. Army Air Defense School, and U.S. Army Air Defense Board. Fort Bliss supports and supervises units in their annual missile firing training and provides logistical support for William Beaumont General Hospital. It also operates an Army air defense training center. The program provides for modernization of both enlisted women's and enlisted men's barracks for a total requested authorization of \$6,087,000.

The first project will provide adequate quarters for the enlisted women stationed at Fort Bliss. With the expansion of the Women's Army Corps (WAC) and the opening of many additional job specialties to women in the Army, the WAC population assigned to Fort Bliss and Beaumont Army Hospital is being increased nearly twofold. There are no quarters at Fort Bliss which meet current barracks standards, hence this request for authority to modernize existing buildings.

The second project is also required to continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Fort Bliss has a large number of barracks structures which can be economically and effectively modernized to provide the features desired in barracks for today's Army.

Upon completion of these two projects, 20 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Bliss will meet modern housing standards, providing approximately 25 percent of the Fort Bliss long-range bachelor enlisted housing requirement.

FORT BENJAMIN HARRISON, IND.

Fort Benjamin Harrison is located 14 miles northeast of Indianapolis, Ind. The installation supports the Army Finance Center and School, the Adjutant General School, and the Defense Information School. The program is for an enlisted men's barracks without mess facilities for medical personnel, an enlisted women's barracks without mess facilities, and a project for barracks modernization for a total program request of \$3,893,000.

The first project will provide adequate housing for enlisted men assigned to the hospital medical detachment. The new quarters will be

adjacent to the hospital so that medical personnel will be immediately available and the facilities may be used for hospital wards in event of an epidemic or disaster. The medical detachment personnel now live in three temporary-type woodframe structures constructed in 1941 as an integral part of the old World War II mobilization-type hospital that is now obsolete and scheduled for demolition.

The second project is to provide adequate quarters for the enlisted women stationed at Fort Benjamin Harrison. This need is currently being met by use of permanent barracks diverted from use by enlisted men. This housing is not appropriately located, with the WAC's being housed in separated facilities interspersed with adjoining male billets creating administrative and command problems. Upon completion of the requested WAC barracks, their present quarters will be modernized and revert to billets for male personnel.

The final project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel.

Upon completion of these three projects, approximately 76 percent of Fort Benjamin Harrison's long-range bachelor enlisted housing requirement will be satisfied.

FORT HOOD, TEX.

Fort Hood is located at Killeen, Tex. The installation mission is the command, training, and logistical support of one armored and one TRICAP division, a corps headquarters, numerous miscellaneous support units, and support of Reserve forces summer training.

The program includes improvements for Gray Army Airfield by installing approach controls, an instrument landing system and strengthening the taxiways and aprons, and modernization of enlisted barracks and bachelor officers quarters for a total program of \$15,094,000.

The first project is to upgrade Robert Gray Army Airfield so that missions involving the use of heavy Air Force transport aircraft can be accomplished. The proposed taxiway and apron upgrading is required to support the weight of the heavier C-133, C-141, and C-5 aircraft. The existing fuel dispensing and storage system is inadequate for these large transports, resulting in lengthy ground times which preclude servicing more than one or two aircraft per day. There are a number of Strategic Army Force units at Fort Hood with worldwide deployment missions which require the use of the heavy transport aircraft. Accomplishment of this project will increase the quick reaction flexibility for accomplishment of assigned missions.

The next project, also involving Gray Army Airfield, will provide a radar approach control facility, instrument landing system (ILS), and airfield lighting. The Federal Aviation Agency has delegated responsibility for the Killeen, Tex., control zone—which includes Gray Army Airfield, Hood Army Airfield, and Killeen Municipal Airport—to Fort Hood. There were 170,000 flight operations at these three airfields in 1969, 270,000 in 1970, 300,000 in 1971, 585,000 in 1972, and an estimated 635,000 in 1973. These rapidly increasing traffic volumes cannot be safely handled without the radar facilities covered in this project.

The barracks modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Fort Hood is one of the Army's key installations, being the station for two important combat divisions. The division troops undergo considerable strenuous field training and deserve the modern living conditions approved for today's Army.

The final project will provide air-conditioning for four 30-man permanent bachelor officer quarters constructed in 1956. This improvement will aid in equating accommodations provided by these existing BOQ's and those provided by the 300-man, air-conditioned, high-rise BOQ recently completed at this station. The existing roof-mounted mechanical ventilation system in these buildings has proven unsatisfactory since outside air is drawn into buildings from sun-heated roofs. The influx of hot air, dust, and insects funneled through the buildings creates a very uncomfortable housing situation. On an average of 111 days each year, the temperature exceeds 90° F. and the residual heat absorbed by these buildings throughout the day makes the living conditions extremely uncomfortable. Occupants are denied reasonable conditions for study, work preparation, and adequate rest, thereby adversely affecting their efficiency during duty period.

FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEX.

Fort Sam Houston is located at San Antonio, Tex. This installation provides administrative and logistical support, training areas, and supply and maintenance for Headquarters, 5th U.S. Army, Brooke Army Medical Center, their subordinate activities and units, and other Army activities or units generally located within the 5th U.S. Army area of responsibility.

The program includes enlisted women's barracks modernization, construction of barracks for enlisted personnel, and air-conditioning for bachelor officer quarters, for a total program of \$11,738,000.

The first project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for female enlisted personnel. The existing buildings are of the old open-bay configuration, are not air-conditioned, and offer little privacy or conveniences to the occupants. Modernization of the buildings will provide semiprivate rooms and bathrooms, security for personal possessions, air-conditioning, and in general offer a much better living standard.

The next project is to provide adequate permanent facilities for permanent party and student enlisted men and women assigned to Brooke Army Medical Center and the Medical Field Service School (MFSS). These men and women now live in World War II temporary wooden barracks built in 1941, which are all open-bay type, without air-conditioning or even mechanical ventilation. Brooke Army Medical Center WAC personnel totaling 282 will be housed in the enlisted women's barracks, 500 spaces will be assigned to permanent enlisted male personnel from the Medical Company and the Medical Holding Company, Brooke General Hospital; Headquarters Company, Brooke Army Medical Center; and the Medical Field Service School Cadre; and 318 spaces will be assigned to MFSS students.

The final project is to improve existing BOQ buildings, primarily by installing air-conditioning. These permanent buildings have been

well maintained, are structurally sound, and are centrally located. The projected Medical Field Service School Student load, based on present and fiscal year 1973 programed numbers, will require the continued use of these buildings as BOQ spaces. None of these buildings have any type of permanent central air-conditioning or mechanical ventilation. MFSS students that are assigned these non-air-conditioned BOQ's in the summer find it extremely difficult to study in the rooms because of the high temperature and humidity.

FORT POLK, LA.

Fort Polk is located 7 miles south of Leesville, La. The installation mission is to operate an infantry training center of five training brigades and supporting units, a reception station, and to provide administrative and logistical support for all units assigned to the installation. The program requests a barracks complex for enlisted men and women, an enlisted men's service club, and a commissary for a total estimate of \$29,276,000.

The barracks complex project will provide housing, mess, supply, administration, and support facilities for permanent party enlisted personnel. Existing buildings are of World War II mobilization design and were constructed in 1941. All barracks spaces at Fort Polk are unsatisfactory by current standards. In conjunction with this barracks construction, 158 temporary buildings are scheduled to be demolished. Completion of the requested barracks complex will satisfy the requirements for permanent party bachelor enlisted housing within current programing constraints. There remains an outstanding deficit of nearly 20,000 spaces for trainee housing.

The second project is to provide adequate recreational facilities for enlisted personnel stationed at the South Fort Cantonment area. These troops are predominately basic and advanced trainees who must use post recreational facilities, since most lack private transportation. Present facilities, consisting of one service club and two recreation buildings, are old World War II-type temporary structures constructed in 1942 and renovated to provide service club activities.

The final project is to provide adequate commissary facilities for military personnel and dependents. The present commissary is housed in temporary buildings constructed in 1941 with 19,881 square feet of usable space. An additional 29,000 square feet of floor space is required to provide adequate commissary customer service for the present patron population. Fort Polk is located in an isolated area with limited off post support. Monthly sales have increased from \$215,000 in fiscal year 1966 to more than \$440,000 in fiscal year 1973. With additional space and consequent better service, sales are estimated to increase to \$500,000 to \$600,000 per month. The existing commissary will revert to a warehouse upon construction of the new facility.

FORT RILEY, KANS.

Fort Riley is located 4 miles northeast of Junction City, Kans. The mission of this installation is to provide support and services for the First Infantry Division and to support ROTC, Reserve component summer training, and the U.S. Army Correctional Training Facility.

The program will provide barracks modernization, an enlisted men's

barracks complex, support facilities for a barracks complex, and outdoor athletic facilities at Custer Hill for a total request of \$34,918,000.

The first project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Fort Riley is one of the Army's key combat division posts. The personnel engage in vigorous combat training and other exercises and should be housed in modern attractive quarters in keeping with the goals of today's Army.

The barracks complex is to provide badly needed permanent barracks and supporting facilities to house elements of the First Infantry Division and nondivisional support troops. These troops now occupy World War II-type temporary wooden structures which lack adequate lighting, heating, cooling, or privacy for the individual.

The next project will provide standard direct-support facilities at Custer Hill for administration, classroom instruction, and supply/storage areas, at brigade and battalion level, for units of the First Infantry Division. Present support facilities do not accommodate the needs of all assigned units and support is provided by diversion of 729 barracks spaces, overcrowding in other facilities, and storage of materiel out of doors. Upon completion of the project the diverted barracks areas will revert to use for troop housing.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are asking \$2.6 million for support facilities for enlisted men's barracks complexes. It has been my impression that the support facilities are usually constructed when the barracks are built. What is the problem in this instance?

General COOPER. When we build barracks complexes now we do try to include ancillary support space, gymnasiums, chapels, dispensaries, and branch exchanges. The facilities, primarily unit administrative and storage space, being requested in this project will be in support of barracks areas built during much earlier periods (1880's, 1950's, 1960's) which do not have these associated facilities. The units occupying these barracks areas are now making do by diverting badly needed barracks spaces to administrative use.

The fourth project at Fort Riley is to provide a variety of adequate outdoor athletic facilities for use by men stationed in the Custer Hill area. Primary users of these facilities will be the lower grade enlisted men. The facilities will be a great asset in building and maintaining morale and esprit de corps as well as providing for safe and healthy use of the soldiers' off-duty time. The Custer Hill area has recently more than doubled its capability to house enlisted personnel without a corresponding increase in the number of outdoor athletic facilities. Existing outdoor playing courts and fields consist of one lighted double tennis court and one undersized lighted softball field. Until outdoor athletic facilities are available many soldiers will not be able to participate in organized sports.

FORT SHERIDAN, ILL.

Fort Sheridan is located at Highland Park, Ill. The installation mission is to support U.S. Army Air Defense Command activities; U.S. Army Reserve centers; U.S. Army support detachment, Selfridge Air Force Base, and the U.S. Army Veterinary School. This program requests facilities for the U.S. Army Veterinary School at Fort Sheridan for \$762,000.

This project will provide academic facilities for the U.S. Army Veterinary School at Fort Sheridan, Ill. This is the only school which provides instruction for Army Veterinary Corps officers and enlisted men in food inspection. Graduates are responsible for insuring the quality of all food for all U.S. Armed Forces worldwide. The school provides 12 separate programs of instruction with an average student load of 125. The annual student output for the school is 500. In 1972 the school graduated 618 students. Classes are currently conducted in three buildings formerly used as horse barns. All of the buildings are without benefit of interior finishing; two or more classes are, of necessity, conducted in a single large area without partitions or acoustical barriers. Essential, acceptable levels of instruction cannot be attained thus precluding the school's ability to successfully perform its assigned mission. Without this proposed project the school must continue to operate in grossly inadequate facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. I believe this project was denied last year, perhaps because it was not properly described. Just what type of training is given at this school, and does it provide training for the three services, or only for the Army?

General COOPER. The U.S. Army Veterinary School trains only Army personnel.

The Navy and Marine Corps have no veterinary service; however, they both have extensive requirements for veterinary services which are fulfilled by the veterinary services of the Army and the Air Force. The Army accomplishes approximately four-fifths of the Navy requirements for veterinary services and the Air Force accomplishes the remainder.

The mission of the veterinary service is to protect the health of the troops and to safeguard the financial interest of the Government. The veterinary service accomplishes this mission through the following functional areas:

- a. Food hygiene and quality assurance;
- b. Control of animal diseases transmissible to man;
- c. Preventive medicine and public health,
- d. Medical care of Government-owned animals;
- e. Medical and subsistence research and development.

While the stated mission of the veterinary service has remained virtually unchanged since it was established in 1916, the functional emphasis has been increasing at a rapid rate in the area of medical research and development.

Also, while complete care of all Government-owned animals has been provided since the service was established, the primary species of animals owned by the Government have shifted from equines to laboratory animals and military dogs.

The veterinary service consists of 512 officers, all of whom have degrees as doctors of veterinary medicine. The 243 enlisted animal specialists and 1,022 enlisted food inspection specialists also form an integral part of the veterinary service.

In addition to the functions described above, the veterinary service also supports the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the event an animal disease such as equine encephalomyelitis (VEE) should break out in our domestic animal population. During the past 2 years extensive support was provided the USDA; in 1972, 40 veterinary officers

assisted Federal and State veterinarians in successfully combating Newcastle's disease which threatened to decimate the poultry industry in America.

Both officers and enlisted men of the veterinary service attend courses at the U.S. Army Medical Department Veterinary School as a part of their overall military education.

A degree as a doctor of veterinary medicine is a prerequisite for commissioning in the Veterinary Corps. These officers are already professionally qualified as are physicians, engineers or lawyers who enter the Army. The Army Veterinary School does not teach them to be veterinarians. It does contribute to their education as Army officers and provides them working knowledge in the detailed functions of the Veterinary Corps.

The following are officer courses taught at the Veterinary School:

(a) Army Medical Department officer orientation course (Veterinary Corps). Length: 8 weeks.

Scope: To provide commissioned officers a working knowledge in preventive medicine, food hygiene and food technology as they relate to procurements, storage, shipment and issue of food for the Armed Forces both in the United States and overseas.

(b) Army Medical Department field grade officer refresher course (Veterinary Corps). Length: 2 weeks.

Scope: Same as orientation course; however, this course provides refresher and updating information.

(c) Veterinary officer statistics (Veterinary Corps). Length: 3 weeks.

Scope: Emphasizes statistical procedures employed in research and development activities, particularly those utilizing animals and those statistical principles involved in health and quality subsistence inspection and veterinary public health. Data distribution, significance tests for comparison of population groups, correlative methods, statistical sampling techniques, comparability procedures, quality control, and experimental design receive particular emphasis. Classroom presentations are supplemented by practical exercises.

The following are enlisted courses taught at the Veterinary School:

(a) Food inspection procedures, basic. Length: 8 weeks.

Scope: To provide a working knowledge of the fundamentals of food inspection, contract administration, field inspection and surveillance inspection.

(b) Food inspection procedures, advanced. Length: 10 weeks.

Scope: Unit and contract administration; fruit and vegetable inspection; surveillance inspection; food inspection of military installations; combat service support; veterinary aspects of CBR operations; dairy and poultry inspections; basic food sciences; veterinary anatomy and physiology; meat technology.

(c) Enlisted refresher courses (five in number). Length: 2 weeks.

Scope: Each of the five refresher courses offered provides refresher training in one or two of the subjects listed in the scope of the advance course in subparagraph (a) above.

Additionally, special courses are offered as required and programed to veterinary units, officers and enlisted men of the Reserve component.

Veterinary service personnel perform their functions on military installations and also on an area basis, in peacetime and in wartime,

in the United States and in scattered countries of the world wherever Armed Forces personnel are assigned. Congress assigned the basic missions to the Veterinary Corps. Other functions are delegated by the Surgeon General in order to fulfill the mission of the Army Medical Department. The missions and functions of the Veterinary service are properly assigned and cannot be performed by other individuals.

FORT SILL, OKLA.

Fort Sill is located 4 miles north of Lawton, Okla. The installation mission is to command, train, and support artillery and surface-to-surface missile units; to activate and train Straf artillery units; to support the Army Artillery and Missile School, Artillery Advanced Individual Training Center, and Reserve components summer training. The program consists of maintenance evaluation facilities and barracks modernization for a total program cost of \$9,447,000.

The first project is to improve and expand the electronic maintenance and test facility to support the newly assigned mission of testing and evaluating direct and general support maintenance on items of electronic equipment. Existing facilities permit only limited test measurements and some equipment has been sent to the field with undetected deficiencies. The improvements will provide adequate electric power, temperature, dust, and humidity controls, a radio frequency interference-free room, and adequate work storage areas. Existing facilities will be retained for use as an operational maintenance and equipment storage building.

The barracks modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. The buildings to be modernized were built in 1954, are not air-conditioned, and provide only large open-bay areas as living space. The proposed modernization will provide quarters for 2,814 enlisted men and will offer security for the soldiers' possessions, private or semiprivate rooms with adjoining bathroom, air-conditioning, and more spacious accommodations.

FORT LEONARD WOOD, MO.

Fort Leonard Wood is located 29 miles southwest of Rolla, Mo. The installation mission is to command and support an Army training center, Engineer, and Army reception station. The installation also trains and supports nondivisional units and supports Reserve components summer training. The proposed program includes a military police barracks with support facilities, an enlisted men's barracks complex, an enlisted women's barracks addition, barracks modernization, and a confinement facility for 250 men for a total request of \$44,482,000.

The first project will provide barracks and essential supporting facilities for a military police company with 35 vehicles and a strength of 260 enlisted men. A motor park adjacent to the barracks will assure that vehicle parking and organizational servicing is available at all hours. The buildings presently occupied by this unit are World War II temporary mobilization type structures constructed in 1941.

Construction of an additional 122 housing spaces for enlisted women and expansion of the dining, supply-administration, and classrooms

will provide adequate space for the planned 250 enlisted women strength. The existing permanent barracks will house 103 women. Personnel in excess of that capacity must be housed in remotely located, substandard mobilization-type barracks. This project will permit the balance of the permanent party enlisted women to be adequately housed adjacent to the other WAC personnel assigned to Fort Leonard Wood.

The purpose of the barracks complex for enlisted men is to provide permanent barracks and troop support facilities to house 2,522 personnel.

This project is part of the overall program to provide adequate troop housing facilities to support the long-range strength. Upon completion of the MP barracks, the EW barracks and this barracks complex, Fort Leonard Wood will have 60 percent of the total permanent barracks spaces required. The personnel who will occupy the new facilities are currently housed in substandard World War II-type temporary buildings.

The project for barracks modernization will continue the upgrading existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. The buildings being modernized house trainees and meet most current standards for trainee barracks. Outstanding deficiencies, primarily the lack of air-conditioning, will be corrected by this project. Upon completion of this project, 28 percent of the permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Leonard Wood will be completed. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

The final project will provide adequate facilities for the custody, control, and treatment of military prisoners in accordance with the Army's correction program. Buildings presently occupied are 23 World War II structures which are seriously inadequate in terms of proper control, supervision, and required segregation of the prisoners. This project will provide facilities for confinement of prisoners originating from Fort Leonard Wood, Fort Benjamin Harrison, other adjacent defense installations, and absentees on a geographical area basis.

FORT CARSON, COLO.

Fort Carson is located 7 miles south of Colorado Springs, Colo. The installation mission is to provide facilities and support for the 4th Infantry Division (mechanized) and nondivisional support units. The program includes a 28-chair dental clinic and a barracks modernization project for a total cost of \$5,651,000.

The dental clinic project will provide one of four permanent dental clinics required to furnish dental care to personnel of the 4th Infantry Division (mechanized) and other nondivisional units assigned to Fort Carson. Present facilities are housed in two temporary, mobilization-type buildings. These buildings were built in 1942 of frame construction; are not fire-resistive; are drafty, hard to heat; resist establishment of the sanitary conditions required for a medical facility; and require continuous maintenance and repair. Further use of these facilities will result in continued expensive repairs and alterations in an attempt to maintain operation of dental services. Other existing temporary dental clinics will remain in use until additional new facilities can be constructed.

The modernization project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current standards to provide modern housing for bachelor enlisted personnel. The modernization work will eliminate large open-bay areas and gang latrines and will provide more private one- to four-man rooms, new lighting and outlets, air-conditioning, and security for personal possessions. Complete accommodations will house 2,152 enlisted men. Upon completion of this project, 84 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Carson will meet modern housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

HUNTER-LIGGETT MILITARY RESERVATION, CALIF.

The mission of Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, a subinstallation of Fort Ord, is to provide the logistical, and administrative support for training conducted by the U.S. Army Training Center, Fort Ord, Calif. An additional mission is to furnish training areas and other support for the combat development experimentation command, and Reserve and National Guard units during unit field training. This includes the maintenance of ranges and other training facilities as required, policing of the reservation and adequate precautionary measures against the outbreak of forest fires and control thereof. The program proposes an enlisted men's barracks complex at a cost of \$7,776,000.

This project will provide troop housing and facilities at Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation (HLMR) to support the overall Fort Ord training and other missions. The proposed facilities will be used by troops of the combat developments experimentation command (CDEC), a tenant agency. Existing facilities are substantially below standards established for troops in the continental United States and have been described as the poorest living quarters provided troops any place in the world, exclusive of an active combat theater. Troop housing consists of light-frame hutments in five separate bivouac areas. Showers, latrines, and washrooms are community-type facilities and some are as far as 1,500 feet from the hutments. These bivouac-type structures are in every respect unsuitable to accommodate personnel during the extended period of occupancy dictated by their assignment.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice you propose semipermanent type barracks here at this reservation. Just what type of work is performed here, and why are the barracks to be semipermanent?

General COOPER. Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation (HLRMR) is a subpost of Fort Ord. It serves as a maneuver and training area for Regular Army, Reserve, and National Guard units. It is also the primary site for operations and test activities of the combat developments experimentation command (CDEC) which is a major testing agency for our force development advances.

Except for the post complement, most personnel engaged in activities at HLMR are in a transient status. They have permanent facilities elsewhere. The prime users of the proposed facilities would be troops supporting CDEC activities, but the barracks would be available for others when not required by CDEC. The purpose for the semipermanent facilities requested is to greatly improve the living

conditions at HLMR in the most economical manner, commensurate with the mission. The existing facilities at HLMR are extremely poor, considered by most who have viewed them as "the worst living conditions the Army has in CONUS."

FORT LEWIS, WASH.

Fort Lewis is located 15 miles east of Olympia, Wash. The installation mission is to support an infantry division, provide training and logistical support for nondivisional units, and to support National Guard and Army Reserve component summer training. The program includes a 28-chair dental clinic, and barracks modernization for a total cost of \$8,327,000.

The dental clinic will provide adequate dental facilities for a portion of the troops at Fort Lewis. Serious deficiencies still remain and will be addressed in future programs. Present facilities consist of 36 chairs in permanent buildings and 64 chairs in three temporary buildings. The proposed project will replace a temporary 25-chair clinic which is very inferior by present standards and which is in a building which must be demolished to make way for a new community center now under construction.

The barracks modernization project, as at many of our installations, will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards. The completed project will provide modern housing for 3,014 enlisted men of the 9th Infantry Division. Upon completion of this project, 75 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Lewis will meet minimum housing standards.

FORT MAC ARTHUR, CALIF.

Fort MacArthur is located near San Pedro, Calif. The installation's mission includes providing administrative and logistical support to on-post units, elements of the Army Air Defense Command, and Army Reserve and ROTC activities. The program requested consists of one project for \$428,000.

The project requested is for the modernization of barracks for WAC personnel stationed at Fort MacArthur. The building to be modernized was constructed in 1918. Only minimum privacy is offered under present conditions and the other features; for example, heating, lighting, air conditioning, fall far short of current standards.

Senator SYMINGTON. Aren't you considering closing Fort MacArthur? Shouldn't this project be deferred?

General COOPER. Fort MacArthur is a relatively small installation and is one of the Army's posts being reviewed in our ongoing stationing study. However, no firm decisions have been made on the future of Fort MacArthur at this time. Hopefully, we will make these determinations prior to final committee action on the construction bill.

FORT ORD, CALIF.

Fort Ord is located on the northern edge of Seaside, Calif. The installation mission is to command, train, and support an Army training center and nondivisional units and to support the Combat Develop-

ments Experimentation Command at Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, a common specialist school, a reception center and Reserve components summer training. The program consists of an enlisted men's barracks complex and modernization of enlisted women's barracks for a total cost of \$9,812,000.

The barracks complex project will provide another increment of the permanent enlisted men's barracks spaces and other troop support facilities required at this installation. Barracks and ancillary facilities presently occupied are World War II temporary mobilization-type buildings constructed in 1941. The advanced deterioration of these mobilization type buildings has reached a state where normal maintenance is no longer practical and an immediate replacement is indicated. Upon completion of this project, the remaining deficit in permanent bachelor enlisted housing on Fort Ord will be 36 percent of the total installation requirement.

The barracks modernization project will provide modern living accommodations for the enlisted WAC personnel stationed at Ford Ord. The buildings to be modernized were constructed in 1952 and do not offer quarters acceptable by modern standards. WAC personnel now live in World War II temporary-type structures which have long ago outlived their useful life. Upon completion of this project, 20 percent of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at Fort Ord will meet current housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The Presidio of San Francisco is located at San Francisco, Calif. The mission of this installation is to support Headquarters, 6th, U.S. Army, Letterman General Hospital, Western Medical Institute of Research and 6th Region U.S. Army Air Defense Command. The program consists of an enlisted women's barracks without mess facilities and modernization of enlisted men's barracks for a total cost of \$5,751,000.

The enlisted women's barracks project will provide adequate housing for 320 of 645 enlisted women scheduled for this installation. Billeting space is currently met by using eight deteriorated temporary World War II type buildings and by issuance of certificates of nonavailability at an annual cost of over \$286,000. Completion of this project will eliminate the requirement for enlisted women to live in the inadequate temporary buildings and in civilian housing costing well in excess of the authorized basic allowance for quarters.

The barracks modernization project will upgrade 15 buildings to provide modern quarters for 969 enlisted men stationed at the Presidio. Modernization will provide more private accommodations with better lighting and other utilities, security for personal possessions, and improved dining facilities. Upon completion of this project, all of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized will meet current housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that in your justification you indicate that 645 enlisted women are scheduled for assignment at this installation. I was under the impression that with the reorganization of the

Army the numbered Army headquarters were to be reduced in size, rather than increased. What is the situation at the 6th Army Headquarters?

General COOPER. What is reflected here is not an increase in the strength at the Presidio of San Francisco, but more specifically, a planned increase in the strength of WAC personnel on duty there within the overall post strength. This is a result of the expansion of the corps and opening up many more job opportunities for our female personnel. There will be WAC's in many of the jobs rather than men.

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD.

Aberdeen Proving Ground is located near Baltimore, Md. Its mission is to serve as Headquarters, U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command, to perform research on propellants and propulsive force systems; terminal effects of warheads; vulnerability of weapons to blast fragments and radiation; human factors engineering; and, dynamic and environmental testing of vehicles and ordnance equipment. The U.S. Army Ordnance School, Land Warfare Laboratory, Research and Development Center and Joint Military Packaging Training Center are located here. The Environmental Hygiene Agency is located at Edgewood Arsenal, a nearby subinstallation. The program consists of human factors engineering laboratory, an enlisted men's barracks, barracks modernization, and a chapel center. The request is for \$11,934,000.

The laboratory project will provide the Human Factors Engineering Research Laboratory with specialized laboratory facilities to accomplish its mission as the lead laboratory for human factors engineering in the Army. The project will furnish the temperature and humidity controlled areas for simulation, environmental control, data reduction, and electronics. This laboratory will be performing basic and applied research as they affect the design of Army materiel to include small arms, tactical vehicles, combat vehicles, artillery, communications, and aviation equipment. Existing facilities are not adequate to accommodate experimental mockups for materiel prototype development, complex electronic instrumentation, and the additional operating personnel required.

Senator SYMINGTON. This is a rather expensive facility. Will you describe for us just what type of work will be done in this facility and what you are currently doing for space?

General COOPER. The basic mission of the Human Factors Engineering Laboratory is to conduct research and development on the main component of military systems, and to provide direct design support to all materiel development programs sponsored by the U.S. Army Materiel Command. This design support introduces human performance requirements into the design of Army materiel items to be operated and maintained by human operators, thus obtaining maximum man/machine output. Current projects in which human factors engineering is being applied are the SAM-D missile, the advanced attack helicopter (AAH), the heavy lift helicopter (HLM), the XM-1 tank, new body armor, infantry helmets, long-term continuous soldier performance, and various new small arms concepts.

The facilities, occupied since 1962 by the U.S. Army Human Engineering Laboratory (HEL), Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md., are

composed of a variety of World War II structures including an old frame firehouse, a tire shop, a metal Nike repair shop, a warehouse, five mobile trailers procured approximately 5 years ago, and three additional trailers rented during fiscal year 1973. Although these facilities were converted to usable laboratory and administrative space approximately 12 years ago, they are now no longer economical to keep repaired. Several of the buildings have major deficiencies such as leaking roofs which will need major repair within the next 2 years. In addition to possessing poor quality facilities, the laboratory has increased in strength—because of increased workload—so that the present facilities are completely inadequate for housing 138 personnel presently on the staff. The three additional trailers were rented in fiscal year 1973 to accommodate this increased staff. The present make-shift World War II converted facilities are not conducive to good research and development, which is the only mission of the laboratory. The professional personnel are presently crowded together in small cubicles and available laboratory space is completely inadequate in both quality and quantity.

The new facilities will provide (1) space for the consolidation of personnel and laboratories into one building which will increase work efficiency, (2) additional specialized laboratory space for basic human factors research and simulation studies, (3) space for a library to house approximately 510,000 technical documents, which must be available since the laboratory serves as a DOD-wide data bank and provides analysis services on human factors engineering, (4) space for Army Materiel Command man/machine mockup studies while such materiel is still in the early phases of development, (5) space for training Army Materiel Command design engineers on human factors engineering—a responsibility of the laboratory, (6) appropriate administrative space for approximately 25 more professional engineers and scientists being added to the staff. Present obsolete facilities will be excessed and repair costs appropriately reduced.

The second project is for a permanent barracks for enlisted personnel presently quartered in substandard facilities including unimproved mobilization barracks built in 1941.

A project is proposed to modernize nine existing barracks buildings to provide modern accommodations for 1,940 enlisted men. The present buildings do not offer adequate quarters under current standards and should be upgraded, both to improve living conditions for the enlisted troops and to make maximum use of existing assets.

This chapel center project will provide a portion of the requirements for chapels and the total requirement for religious educational facilities to serve approximately 16,000 active military personnel and their dependents. There are no permanent chapel facilities at Aberdeen. The six World War II buildings now in use are austere, deteriorated, and the appointments leave much to be desired.

AERONAUTICAL MAINTENANCE CENTER, TEX.

The Aeronautical Maintenance Center is located 10 miles south of Corpus Christi, Tex. The mission of this installation is to perform aircraft depot maintenance and support functions, provide aeronautical depot on-the-job training (military), maintain mobilization readiness and prepositioned depot stocks, provide engineering services for

AVSCOM, and support U.S. Army Materiel Group No. 1. The program provides for upgrading turbine engine test cells and a supply, operations, and storage building. The request is for \$6,284,000.

A turbine engine test cell facility will be upgraded to feature a test cell management-maintenance and ADP center, standardized instrumentation, an engine quick-disconnect mounting system, and computerized open-loop data acquisition and logging system. This facility will improve service reliability of engines, reduce cost of testing, increase test capability from 2,750 to 6,000 horsepower, and provide performance data for engineering analyses and maintenance data to improve engine overhaul procedures. The overhaul and testing of turbine engines (including Navy and Air Force) at 1,600,000 man-hours per year comprises the major workload at this center, and this timely modernization will result in quality improvement and reduced operation costs. An estimated saving of \$376,000 per year will result from the construction.

The second project will provide an efficient, modern aircraft parts supply operation and storage facility. Receiving, shipping, packaging, crating, and preservation of mission and national inventory control point materiel will be consolidated for efficiency and economy and an environmentally controlled storage will be provided for high-cost aeronautical components. The value of planned storage in the building is \$150 million. Existing facilities are seven widely scattered World War II structures that lack environmental control, surface water runoff protection, loading docks, and mechanical material handling and storage systems. Two of the seven buildings are remotely located facilities leased at a cost of \$92,000 per year and lack adequate lighting, storm and fire protection. Two buildings totaling 107,346 square feet will be demolished, the two leased facilities will be returned to the owner, and the remaining three structures will be retained for slow-moving item storage. This project will result in estimated operational savings of \$848,057 per year.

Senator SYMINGTON. \$5.2 million seems to be an unusually large amount to provide for a supply operation and storage building. Why is such a facility needed at this time? Is this the principal center for maintenance of helicopters?

General COOPER. The U.S. Army Aeronautical Depot Maintenance Center (Aradmac) is the Army's principal center for aeronautical maintenance. The Aradmac mission is to completely rebuild, test, store, and place back into the supply system damaged and "worn out" aeronautical equipment for Army (and some Air Force and Navy) aircraft including aircraft frames, engines, transmissions, avionics, electrical and hydraulic components, and structural components.

The facilities now utilized for supply and storage operations at Aradmac are seriously inadequate. Portions of the operation are widely separated (14 miles), existing buildings are functionally inadequate since they have no suitable loading docks and building configurations preclude use of efficient materials handling equipment, there is no environmental control which is required for many of the expensive components in storage, and the structures are old, difficult, and expensive to maintain and cannot be economically renovated. The requested facility will consolidate the shipping, receiving, packaging and crating, and preservation activities in one location to effect efficiency, economy, and adequate support for the depot overhaul maintenance operation.

It will also provide environmentally controlled storage space for the national inventory control point (NICP) stocks and for depot property and material inducted for overhaul/storage/distribution by Aradmac.

ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT, ALA.

Anniston Army Depot is located 10 miles west of Anniston, Ala. The mission of this installation is to receive, store, and ship general supplies and ammunition, strategic and critical materials, and civil defense shelter supplies; to perform depot maintenance of general supplies, ammunition and assigned missile systems; to operate an area support secondary reference calibration facility (except nucleonics); to provide area support secondary reference transfer calibration teams for six Southeastern States and to perform production fueling of the Lance missile. The program is for a repair and processing vehicle facility for \$3,745,000.

This project will provide improved facilities for repair and processing of heavy combat vehicles and artillery. Work is now done in scattered, substandard facilities which are overcrowded and inhibit engineered shop flow to obtain optimum utilization of personnel or equipment. Recent operations in these congested facilities are hazardous and inflexible because of insufficient operational and holding areas and workload accomplishment is adversely affected by weather. The project will result in demolition of loading docks and 14,485 square feet of semipermanent buildings. In addition, 47,225 square feet of shop area will revert to other uses. The completed project will produce estimated personnel savings of \$4,616,525 during its economic life.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you outline for us what type of work is done at the Anniston Army Depot, and why this expensive facility is needed at this time?

General COOPER. Anniston Army Depot is our lead depot for the repair and overhaul of heavy combat vehicles—tanks, armored personnel carriers, artillery. The mission spans the entire cycle through receipt, overhaul, storage, and reissue. This work is now being done in overcrowded, scattered, substandard facilities that do not permit efficient operations or optimum utilization of personnel or equipment.

ARMY MATERIAL AND MECHANICS RESEARCH CENTER, MASS.

The Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center is located at Watertown, Mass. Its mission is to execute the AMC research and development program in structural materials and mechanics, conduct technological programs in structural materials and in mechanics as used in Army materiel, coordinate the AMC armor materials program; manage the testing technology portion of the AMC quality assurance and the DOD standardization programs and to provide technical surveillance over the AMC testing training program. The proposed project is for a dynamic deformation of materials laboratory for \$325,000.

This project will provide laboratory facilities for the test and evaluation of materials subjected to varying dynamic loads and environmental conditions. This test and evaluation program is essential for the development of: lightweight materials for aircraft; improved armor materials for hardening the antiballistic missiles to survive

in nuclear environments, and to resist critical damage from dust erosion and blast loads. This laboratory is unique to both Government and industry in its techniques of evaluating new materials in the simulated systems environment without lengthy and expensive trial and error system testing. Using existing theoretical support, the proposed laboratory will also pursue and experimentally verify new concepts for materials system vulnerability.

ATLANTA ARMY DEPOT, GA.

Atlanta Army Depot is located in Atlanta, Ga. Upon termination of depot operations, part of the real property comprising Atlanta Army Depot will be retained as a subinstallation of Fort McPherson, Ga. The mission of this subinstallation will be to furnish administrative, logistical, and facilities support to staff elements and units of Headquarters, Forces Command; to other Army, DOD and Agency for International Development tenants; to the Reserve components; and to the Army and Air Force Exchange Service and other activities. The program provides for security fencing for an estimated cost of \$119,000.

The security fencing is required to provide an adequate security fence network around the portion of this installation that is to be retained for Army use following phaseout of depot activities and the excessing of surplus property. Major facilities located in the retained area include a sensitive worldwide military command and control system communication terminal and computer complex, Army and Air Force exchange service warehouses containing valuable merchandise and a troop training area with ammunition bunkers and a firing range that must be secured against unauthorized entry.

FRANKFORD ARSENAL, PA.

Frankford Arsenal is located at Philadelphia, Pa. The mission of this installation is the development, procurement, production, and supply of fire control systems, small arms ammunitions, cartridge activated and propellant actuated devices and to conduct research on optical material, metallurgy of nonferrous and reactive metals, degradation, corrosion, and mycological effects on materials, synthetic lubrication, small Army propellants, and laser countermeasures. The program consists of barracks modernization, for \$73,000.

The barracks modernization project will provide modern quarters for the small enlisted complements assigned to Frankford Arsenal. The project is similar to other barracks modernization projects in that it makes maximum use of existing structures to provide living accommodations upgraded to current standards. This project will satisfy Frankford Arsenal's requirement for bachelor enlisted housing.

MEMPHIS DEFENSE DEPOT, TENN.

The Memphis Defense Depot is one of seven principal distribution depots in the Defense Supply Agency integrated wholesale distribution system. It's mission is the receipt, storage, maintenance, inventory, and issue of clothing textiles, fuel, general supplies, construction supplies, industrial supplies, subsistence, and medical commodities. The

depot is responsible for providing these items to U.S. military activities—the south central region, comprising Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee, and the Caribbean area including South America. The program requests a medical equipment maintenance facility at an estimated cost of \$456,000.

This project is required to provide a medical equipment maintenance facility at Memphis Defense Depot to replace the existing maintenance facility at Atlanta Army Depot due to the phaseout of depot activities at the latter installation in accordance with the Army reorganization plan. The medical equipment maintenance operation provides direct, general and depot level maintenance, field maintenance and technical assistance for Army medical facilities in 31 States, supports the Defense Supply Agency (DSA), provides certain services to the Air Force and the Navy on a worldwide basis through interservice agreements, and provides maintenance, repair and calibration of medical equipment for the Army Reserve and National Guard. The Memphis Defense Depot site will result in a facility centrally located within the geographical area served by this maintenance activity. The proposed project will provide the minimum necessary facility to meet the mission requirements. Shop equipment and tools used in the existing operation will be moved and used in the Memphis facility.

FORT MONMOUTH, N.J.

Fort Monmouth is located at Red Bank, N.J. The mission of this installation is to support the U.S. Army Electronic Command which performs research, development, procurement and production of electronics materiel. The installation also supports the U.S. Army Satellite Communications Agency, U.S. Army Combat Developments Command Communications and Electronics Agency, Tri-Service Tactical Communications Agency, and the U.S. Army Communications System Agency. The program will provide a Research and Development electronic equipment installation facility, a 32-chair dental clinic, barracks modernization, alteration to classrooms to provide language laboratories, conversion of a classroom building to administrative space and the conversion of a barracks building to administrative space. The total program request is \$12,286,000.

The R. & D. facility will meet present and foreseen future requirements to install all types of communications and electronic equipments, radar sets, infrared and other surveillance and detection devices, electronic warfare equipments and special selected equipments in tactical vehicles such as tanks, personnel carriers, vans, trailers, military shelters, tactical trucks and self-propelled guns and other specialized military systems. Equipment installations to permit helicopters to fly under all weather conditions, to communicate, to detect enemy concentrations and equipment and to direct interdiction fire will also be accomplished by this facility. The system installations are accomplished on a quick reaction basis which may be for test and evaluation for later tactical use or to meet an immediate field requirement. This facility will allow continuous equipment installation work on large systems without the delays now encountered through inclement weather. Work must be accomplished near the U.S. Army Electronics Command (USAECOM) Laboratories to efficiently use the engineering, scientific and technical personnel who are familiar with the specialized systems and are available at the laboratories.

The dental clinic project is to provide dental facilities to replace those now located in a converted wooden mobilization-type barracks. Installation of essential new equipment in old buildings to meet the requirements of modern dental practice is difficult and costly, and results in little improvement in the physical plant and no improvement in clinic design. The new clinic will permit full realization of the advances in dental care methods and procedures developed in recent years.

The barracks modernization project will upgrade existing barracks to modern standards for both permanent party personnel and language students. Ten buildings will be modernized to provide adequate quarters for 1,889 personnel. The buildings are configured to now outdated standards. Modernization will greatly improve individual privacy, security, utilities, latrine facilities, administrative space, and the dining areas.

Under the 1973 Army reorganization the east coast branch of the Defense Language Institute is being relocated to Fort Monmouth. No facilities exist at Fort Monmouth which fully satisfy the unique requirements for language instruction. The proposed project will convert existing classrooms to language laboratories through the installation of soundproof study booths, audio equipment, effective heating and air-conditioning systems, expanded utilities—particularly electrical, and an intercom system and closed circuit TV outlets.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that these facilities are necessary due to the move of the language school from the Washington area to Fort Monmouth. How does this school tie in with the language school at the Presidio, Monterey, Calif.?

I believe at one time you had four or five language schools. Are they now consolidated into two locations, namely Fort Monmouth and Monterey? There has been some complaints in the past when the move of this school from the Washington area was considered to the effect that it might be better conducted here. Is there any merit to this argument?

General COOPER. The language school now in Anacostia, and planned for relocation to Fort Monmouth, is the east coast branch of the Defense Language Institute (DLI). The west coast branch of DLI is located in Monterey, Calif.

At the present, DLI headquarters and the east coast branch are located in Anacostia. These activities will relocate to Fort Monmouth. The DLI Systems Development Agency, located in Monterey, and the English language branch, located at Lackland Air Field in Texas, will both also relocate to Fort Monmouth. The west coast branch will remain in Monterey. DLI did have a Southwest branch at Fort Bliss during the peak of the Vietnam conflict but this branch was disestablished in June 1973.

The primary advantages for keeping a branch of DLI in Washington are the convenient access to foreign embassies and close working relationship with the Foreign Service Institute. However, the lack of adequate facilities for the academic and administrative functions, plus the lack of housing for the students are very serious drawbacks which outweigh the advantages just mentioned. The needed facilities will be available at Fort Monmouth.

Also as result of the Army realignment/reorganization, Headquarters Electronics Command (ECOM) will relocate to Fort Monmouth

from Philadelphia. As with many Army installations Fort Monmouth is short of adequate administrative space. Two projects are proposed for converting existing structures from their present use to administrative facilities. The resulting administrative space will accommodate the incoming headquarters elements plus permit the consolidation of other ECOM elements now at Fort Monmouth but occupying old World War II temporary-type structures or renting facilities off post.

NATICK LABORATORIES, MASS.

The Natick Laboratories are located at Natick, Mass. The mission of this installation is to create through research and development, prototypes in the commodity areas of textiles, clothing, footwear, organic materials, subsistence, containers, food service equipment, field support equipment, tentage and equipage and air delivery equipment, to provide technical support in the commodity areas above, and to carry out the standardization program so that new item procurements may be accomplished expeditiously and economically. The program for \$466,000 provides for an addition to an enlisted men's barracks, with dining facilities.

The proposed project is required to provide additional barracks spaces and modernized dining facilities for the enlisted complement stationed at Natick Laboratories. This project will complete the bachelor enlisted housing requirement at Natick Laboratories.

PICATINNY ARSENAL, N.J.

The Picatinny Arsenal is located 4 miles northeast of Dover, N.J. The mission of this facility is to serve as a field installation of the U.S. Army Munitions Command with national mission responsibilities including development and industrial engineering and support mission responsibilities for preproduction and maintenance engineering with respect to ammunition, pyrotechnics, and nuclear artillery and munitions including demolition types. The program provides for an addition to the explosives laboratory and barracks modernization for a total request of \$2,915,000.

The additional laboratory space is required to consolidate the Army's explosives program at Picatinny Arsenal and to provide the necessary laboratory space for basic and applied research on hazardous materials. The consolidation of the Army explosives program at Picatinny Arsenal has resulted in dangerous overcrowding in the present inadequate facilities. The construction will provide the facilities for the installation of special purpose equipment presently on hand. Existing buildings are required and will remain in use for explosive research.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you explain in a little more detail what type of work is performed at this explosive laboratory? I know that you do have a pyrotechnic hazard engineering program in operation at the NASA Mississippi Test Facility. Are you doing similar work here at Picatinny?

General COOPER. The proposed construction will provide the facilities necessary for a vital part of the Army explosive research program utilizing solid-state physics and applied physics to improve perform-

ance and reliability and safety of munitions. The planned work will include improvements in explosive train initiation methods; basic research on energy level structure and energy transfer mechanisms in explosives coupled with charged transport measurements to discover and develop methods for direct electronic initiation of explosives with greater reliability, safety and efficiency; experiments to understand and control sensitivity; development of improved models for initiation and detonation phenomenon by study of high pressure effects on optical and electronic properties of explosives and by shock tube combined with spectroscopy and high-speed photography; work on fuel air explosives which have improved effectiveness against certain targets; study of coupling of detonation to their surroundings to increase the utilized fraction of available energy.

No pyrotechnic hazard engineering is being performed at this laboratory.

The barracks modernization project will upgrade one building to provide modern living quarters for enlisted men stationed at Picatinny Arsenal. The existing building does not have adequate heating or lighting, suitable bathroom facilities or offer privacy to the occupants. Completion of this project will satisfy Picatinny Arsenal's requirement for bachelor enlisted housing.

PINE BLUFF ARSENAL, ARK.

The Pine Bluff Arsenal is located at Pine Bluff, Ark. and provides facility space for the Directorate of Chemical Operations; Directorate of Biological Operations and the Directorate of Engineering and Technology. The mission of the arsenal is to manufacture, store, renovate, demilitarize and distribute chemical agents and munitions, and to develop processes for manufacturing chemicals. This budget requests \$294,000 for an enlisted men's barracks, without mess facilities, at the arsenal.

The 36 EM barrack spaces and associated facilities to be supported will provide troop living quarters that meet current housing standards specified in DOD criteria. Existing accommodations are two-story, wood-frame (original construction 1942) open bay and dormitory room type barracks with central latrine facilities. These old buildings are difficult and expensive to maintain plus they fall far below the approved housing standards. Completion of the project will satisfy the installation's bachelor housing requirement.

REDSTONE ARSENAL, ALA.

Redstone Arsenal is located at Huntsville, Ala. and provides facilities for the headquarters of the U.S. Army Missile Command and the Munitions and Missile Training Center and School. The installation is the Army's principal commodity center for rockets, guided missiles, and related systems and equipment. This program requests \$4,971,000 for barracks modernization and a chapel center.

The first project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. This modernization project will upgrade 10 buildings to provide modern quarters for 990 enlisted men. The buildings concerned were built during the 1955-60 period and provide large open-bay living areas

and are not air-conditioned. Modernization will provide one- to three-man rooms, air-conditioning, improved latrine facilities, better security for personal possessions, and improved dining facilities. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

Additional chapel and religious education needs at Redstone Arsenal are required for the approximately 9,000 military personnel and their dependents. The existing 300-seat chapel is used to its maximum capacity with seven services conducted Sundays from 0730 to 2030 hours. Present attendance is heavy in services and requires that chairs be placed in aisles, and standing is permitted in an attempt to accommodate patrons. Occasionally, personnel are turned away. Religious educational needs are only partially met through use of wooden World War II buildings located at a two miles distance from the existing chapel. These old buildings have a dingy appearance and present serious space, safety, and fire problems. These factors discourage competent lay workers from offering their services, create hardships upon all who attend, and discourage many from attending. These deficiencies emphasize the inability of present chapel facilities to support the post mission and to meet existing personnel needs.

SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT, CALIF.

Sacramento Army Depot is located at Sacramento, Calif. The mission of this installation is to store, repair, and overhaul military hardware. Our requested program of \$412,000 is for barracks modernization.

This project will modernize an existing barracks building constructed in 1957. The completed project will provide modern quarters for 111 enlisted men stationed at Sacramento Army Depot and will complete the depot's requirement for bachelor enlisted housing. The existing accommodations are open-bay offering little privacy, have inadequate lighting and convenience outlets, have gang latrines, and improper heating and ventilating systems.

SAVANNA ARMY DEPOT, ILL.

Savanna Army Depot, Ill., is located on the Illinois River near Clinton, Iowa. The mission of this installation is the receipt, storage, renovation, and demilitarization of conventional and guided missile ammunition components and special weapons material and to train personnel in ammunition surveillance and maintenance. The program covers enlisted men's barracks with mess facilities, bachelor officers quarters and security lighting for a total request of \$2,746,000.

The barracks project is to provide suitable housing for assigned enlisted men. Existing temporary facilities are limited and each bay is occupied by up to 12 men without benefit of cubicles or partitions. Since these men perform shift work in the special weapons exclusion area personnel are sleeping at all hours of the day and normal daytime activities disrupt sleep with resultant effects on efficiency.

The second project, a BOQ, will provide a portion of needed housing for the military, civilian and foreign national personnel attending the AMC Ammunition School. The ammunition school conducts basic and refresher training to support storage, issue, receipt, mainte-

nance, test, inspection malfunction investigation and demilitarization of ammunition which includes conventional ammunition, nuclear weapons, large rockets, guided missiles, and chemical munitions. Other important training offered involves transportation of ammunition and other hazardous materiel, nuclear and chemical accident incident controls, and fire fighting techniques involving all types of ammunition. This project will enable the ammunition school to train additional students in these skills and assist in overcoming the present critical shortage of trained civilian ammunition technicians and managers. A savings of \$362,000 per year will be realized upon completion of the facility. The existing 96 substandard bachelor officer quarters will be retained and utilized until additional permanent housing can be programmed to provide the remaining required spaces.

The lighting project is to provide increased security within a special weapons exclusion area. Security requirements dictate that the entrance of all structures in which special weapons are located shall be lighted with an intensity of not less than 1 footcandle. Magazines without lighting above each door opening are presently being used under a temporary waiver to security regulations. These entrances become vulnerable points of penetration at night and undetected movements of personnel or equipment within the storage area could result in a serious break in our national security. Burial of the primary electrical line will aid in the prevention of its destruction by both natural and subversive means. This project will substantially improve protection of the special weapons area and eliminate the necessity for operation under waiver.

SIERRA ARMY DEPOT, CALIF.

Sierra Army Depot is located 36 miles southeast of Susanville, Calif., and 60 miles north of Reno, Nev. The mission of this installation is to receive, store, maintain, renovate, and distribute ammunition and components and general supplies; receive, store, and maintain special weapons material; and restoration of conventional guided missile and special weapons ammunition. The program requests a security lighting project for \$380,000.

This project is to provide increased security of classified material located within the directorate for special weapons (DSW) restricted areas. This project will provide protective lighting at entrance control points on igloos located in DSW exclusion area 1 and on the buildings located to exclusion area 2. Present structures are being used without this protective lighting under authority of temporary waiver and in the interim additional security forces have been assigned to insure adequate protection. Assignment of these additional forces has substantially increased the cost and complexities of providing a secure area for classified material stored at this depot.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE BASE, N. MEX.

White Sands Missile Range is located 28 miles northeast of Las Cruces, N. Mex. This installation is a national range with a mission to test and evaluate missile and rocket systems and related material. It supports all range users to include systems contractors. The program includes construction of a multitarget launch complex, a SAM-

D remote area test facility, barracks modernization, a post library, an addition to the gymnasium, water wells, and land acquisition. The request is for \$4,771,000.

The first project is to provide White Sands with the capability to prepare up to four target missiles for flight and launching simultaneously. It will provide a launch area which meets safety criteria. The new launch complex will provide use of a northerly flight azimuth oriented to take full advantage of the width and depth of the national range and restricted air space and will eliminate serious flight safety hazards connected with use of the present launch area. The project will provide minimum facilities required for target missile contractors to operate with maximum efficiency and minimum lost time. This project will support all missile development programs at White Sands Missile Range that require target missiles during their development and engineering phases. In addition it will provide a minimum multilaunch capability required for two specific research and development programs which are scheduled for this phase of development for the fiscal year 1976 and subsequent fiscal year time frames. A second phase of this project may be required by fiscal year 1976 or later depending upon project requirements. Nine small metal buildings now used at the present target missile launch area will be relocated and utilized for the support of instrumentation stations.

The second project is to provide the minimum essential uprange facilities for tactical testing of the surface-to-air missile development (SAM-D) weapons system. The system, which is an area air defense system with a secondary surface-to-surface role, is being designed to replace the current Nike Hercules and Hawk system in the field Army. Uprange launch sites are required to evaluate the mobility and performance of the weapon system against air and ground targets under various terrain conditions in a tactical configuration scheduled to start in fiscal year 1975. Completion of this project will assure timely collection of test and evaluation data on the SAM-D system under tactical conditions in accordance with the development schedule.

The next project will continue the upgrading of existing permanent barracks to current housing standards for bachelor enlisted personnel. Four existing structures will be modernized to provide quarters for 486 enlisted men. These buildings are of the open-bay concept and are far below current standards desired for individual privacy, heating, ventilating and lighting, and bathroom facilities. Upon completion of this project, all of the existing permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at White Sands Missile Range will meet minimum housing standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

The post library project will provide a permanent facility for a departmentalized library operation with space for shelving, administration, and audiovisual area, quiet rooms, music appreciation rooms, and storage and reading purposes. The post library has occupied 4,500 square feet of the existing education center building and expansion is not feasible without adversely affecting the education program. The project will provide a permanent facility for expansion of the library operation into the welfare, recreation, and morale Army-wide library program needed in this isolated area. Space now used by the library will revert to use by the post education center.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that part of your explanation for a new library is that if it is not provided it will have an effect on the education program. Can you explain that a little more clearly. Is this some kind of a technical training program, and is this a technical library, or simply a post library for the use of the military and their dependents?

General COOPER. The impact on the education program would be more physical than intellectual. At present the post library occupies a portion of the education center building. Both the education program and the library are in need of expansion, consequently, joint occupancy of the education center is no longer practical. If the requested new library is not approved to allow relocation from the education center, the education activities will not have any space available to accommodate their expansion. This ultimately will hinder the overall execution of the education program.

The education program is similar to that carried on at almost all Army installations. It is a formal program, providing both on duty and off duty opportunities for our soldiers to further their formal education.

The library is basically a typical post lending library for use by the military and their dependents. However, it is somewhat atypical in that it does house a more technical selection than might be found at other posts due to the interest generated in the post population by the testing and engineering activities conducted at White Sands.

The fifth item is to provide military personnel and their dependents at White Sands missile range with an indoor, year-around handball court and squash court, and a ladies' shower room at the existing post gymnasium. This project is needed to give WSMR a complete and well-rounded sports program to include handball and squash as well as to provide complete latrine and showers for enlisted women and female military dependents in the post gymnasium. On post facilities are important since WSMR is located some 30 miles from the nearest civilian community. Facilities that improve wholesome recreation possibilities for young military personnel will improve physical fitness and assist in maintenance of morale. There are no facilities to be disposed of as a result of this project.

A key project at WSMR is that of acquisition of fee title to 71,159 acres of privately owned real estate and title to 126 mining claims, all located within the boundaries of White Sands Missile Range (WSMR). This request is phase I of a two-phase plan to acquire all private estates and State-owned land and improvements thereon located within the boundaries of WSMR. Phase II of this plan, to be included in a future year program, will acquire the State-owned lands. The cost of these State lands is to be determined following negotiations between State and Federal representatives. An estimated \$10 million of Government construction improvements such as roads, buildings, instrumentation sites, communications systems, and power lines, are located on the State and privately owned lands. Accomplishment of phase I would eliminate rentals of almost \$80,000 per year and phase II about \$237,000, for a total of approximately \$317,000 per year. Additionally, future restoration costs estimated at \$700,000 would be eliminated. Funds for relocation costs, as provided for

under the provisions of Public Law 91-646 are not required for this project.

Senator SYMINGTON. You are proposing to spend \$2.7 million for land acquisition at this vast reservation, and to extinguish mining claims. What is this total program going to cost, and why is it necessary? I recall that some time ago a bill was proposed to buy up certain lands and pay for grazing rights on Federal lands at this base. Is such a procedure involved in this proposed purchase?

General COOPER. The land acquisition program at White Sands missile range is expected to cost a total of \$7,500,000 for which we plan to request the balance of \$4,800,000 in the fiscal year 1975 military construction program. Since the military requirement for these States and privately owned land areas is indefinite and long term, it is appropriate to acquire the fee and to extinguish all mining claims. Public Law 91-511, section 104, October 26, 1970, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to acquire State- and privately-owned lands, and estates in land, and improvements thereon, located within the boundaries of White Sands missile range. No funds were appropriated, however. To the extent that such State-owned lands can be traded for Government-owned land located outside the boundaries of White Sands missile range, such action will be taken.

The final project is to provide additional water wells to insure an adequate potable water supply for the WSMR by replacing existing capacity that will be lost due to water well deterioration. Although the peak usage is kept to a minimum by a water conservation program, the computed daily demand by fiscal year is 5.9 million gallons per day (MGD). There are nine production wells in use currently with a capacity of 5.5 mgd. This project is included in the fiscal year 1974 MCA program to assure continuation of an adequate potable water supply at this vital testing range. There would be no disposal action as a result of this project.

YUMA PROVING GROUND, ARIZ.

The last installation in the Army Materiel Command program, Yuma Proving Ground, is located 32 miles northeast of Yuma, Ariz. The installation mission is to perform engineering and service tests of research and development projects; to conduct surveillance and acceptance tests on production material; and to support other research and development activities. The program provides the first phase of construction of KOFA range improvements, for enlisted men's barracks without mess facilities, an NCO open mess and expansion of the electrical distribution systems. The total request is for \$6,472,000.

The KOFA range project will provide facilities for artillery weapons and associated ammunition testing over the next 15 years. The artillery firing range front extends over 9,000 meters. At present, the northern end of the firing front is dedicated to special test facilities such as mortar positions, armor plate range and acceptance related tests. These facilities severely limit the locations for artillery testing. At the southern end, 2,500 meters of firing front are not usable because of safety distance limitations to inhabited buildings. This project will realign the southern front to accommodate five long range artillery weapon positions. Projectile impacts must now be observed from towers at great distances from points of impact. This results in frequent test

interruption for impact point certification and, in the case of functioning and range table firing, results in questionable data. The impact shelters will permit much closer observation while insuring personnel safety and greatly improving the data acquisition capability. The soft impact area will facilitate recovery of projectile components to assess the effects of firing. If this project is not approved Yuma Proving Ground will be unable to improve and expand its capability to meet the existing and future artillery test and evaluation requirements. Approval of this project will result in the demolition of two temporary buildings totaling 874 square feet.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is meant by KOFA, and what will be the cost of this total program?

General COOPER. KOFA is an acronym that stands for "King of Arizona," being taken from a mine that existed in the early Western days in the area of Yuma Proving Grounds. Over the years, common usage of the acronym have caused the name of the range to be known as KOFA range.

The estimated total cost of planned KOFA range improvements is \$6.6 million. The overall project is planned for accomplishment in two phases.

Phase I, estimated at \$2.7 million, is included in the fiscal year 1974 military construction, Army (MCA) budget request. This phase includes construction of 5 gun positions, 21 artillery impact observation shelters (bombproof), and a soft impact area.

Phase II, estimated at \$3.9 million, is now being studied within the Army staff for possible inclusion in the fiscal year 1975 MCA request. This phase consists of paving and other improvements to 34.2 miles of range roads.

The next project is required to provide adequate bachelor housing and mess facilities for assigned troops not eligible for family quarters. The troops that cannot be accommodated in the permanent barracks are housed in temporary barracks, constructed in 1952 and 1953. If this item is not provided enlisted personnel will continue to be housed in inadequate temporary barracks. The temporary barracks will be retained for use by TDY personnel. Those not required for this purpose will be diverted to office space, thus reducing the deficit in that functional area.

The third project is required to provide adequate dining facilities and space for recreational activities for noncommissioned officers assigned to Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The present NCO open mess is housed in a temporary building, which because of interior arrangement can only provide marginal service and activities to accommodate the patrons. The new facility will provide pleasant surroundings and adequate facilities for use by noncommissioned officers and their authorized guests, thus enhancing military career attractiveness. Since YPG is 26 miles from the nearest town, adequate on post recreational facilities become even more important.

The final project is to furnish electrical power to artillery firing range areas, to provide additional electrical power to the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) and to improve reliability by adding a second source of electrical supply to this isolated installation. A scheduled increase in testing of long range tube and self-propelled artillery will substantially increase requirements for acquisition of more accurate ballistic data at down range sites by electro/optical instruments. Port-

able generators now in use are not desirable due to voltage and frequency fluctuations which disable and damage delicate instruments and introduce errors into the data. Generator failures in the past have resulted in loss of vital communications, have halted tests with resultant data loss, increased costs, and decreased productivity. A source of reliable power is urgently needed to permit synchronized operation of the testing instrumentation. The load on the main transformer station has reached rated capacity and planned power requirement increases will add at least 1,350 kva. within the next 3 years. Additional capacity is essential to meet this load. Operational reliability will be increased by the addition of a second source of power to the installation.

VINT HILL FARMS STATION, VA.

Vint Hill Farms Station is located 10 miles east of Warrenton, Va. This is a U.S. Army Security Agency installation engaged in communications intelligence activities.

The program is for storm drainage facilities for \$287,000.

This project is required to provide adequate storm drainage protection for this installation. Storm drains, curbs, and gutters exist on only a portion of the post and consequently roads, shoulders, grounds, and some buildings located in the unprotected area are subject to deterioration from storm water runoff. This results in excessive maintenance costs and unsafe conditions for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Existing facilities will continue in use in conjunction with proposed construction.

FORT HUACHUCA, ARIZ.

Fort Huachuca is located 41 miles east of Bisbee, Ariz., and is the headquarters of the U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command (USASTRATCOM). This command is the principal manager for the Army's portion of the Defense Communications System (DCS). The command also provides engineering, installation, and technical support services for non-DCS communications systems and logistics and administrative support to the Intelligence School. The program provides improvements at Libby Army Airfield, electronic test equipment facilities, enlisted (medical) barracks without mess facilities and barracks modernization for a total cost of \$6,832,000.

The first project is to provide for a safe 24-hour operation of Libby Army Airfield which supports the activities at Fort Huachuca and U.S. Forest Service firefighting equipment. The existing 21-year-old taxiway is underdesigned for the wheel loads of today's aircraft and requires continual maintenance due to repeated overloading. The parking area which handles approximately 70 percent of the assigned aircraft is temporary pavement of sealed gravel. The gravel is easily dislodged, is subject to erosion, and when blown around by operating aircraft causes a serious hazard to personnel, aircraft, electronic equipment and ground handling vehicles. Taxiways running west from the hangars and north from the security ramp are without lighting facilities and represent a serious deficiency in the night flying capabilities needed for full operations.

The second project is to provide additional integrated secure floor space for electronic testing equipment activities in the test and evaluation center. A continued expansion of center operations in the pro-

vision of detailed evaluation and report services has been met by the crowding of additional equipment into existing center space and the leasing of another 3,000 square feet of commercial modular-type structures at a cost of \$15,000 per year. Additional equipment operations to meet projected workloads cannot be accommodated in available facilities. Further crowding or adjustment within the existing facility is not feasible and will impair mission effectiveness.

The next project will provide housing adjacent to the hospital for enlisted men and women assigned to the medical detachment and hospital. These personnel now live in substandard barracks over one mile from the hospital and the dining facilities. This separation works a hardship on the people, who must work irregular hours and are subject to immediate call during emergencies, plus detracts from the efficiency of hospital operations. The billets now occupied by medical personnel will be utilized by troops assigned to other units.

The barracks modernization project will improve 6 buildings to provide modern quarters for 1,208 enlisted men and women. Improvements will include providing better lighting and electrical service outlets, effective heating and ventilating systems, more individual privacy and security for personal possessions.

FORT RITCHIE, MD.

Fort Ritchie is located 8 miles southeast of Waynesboro, Pa. The installation mission is to support the Alternate Joint Command Center. The program consists of barracks modernization for \$1,394,000.

This project will modernize four buildings to provide adequate, modern quarters for 483 enlisted men. The billets are now configured in open-bay squad rooms with community latrines, poor heating and ventilating systems, and inadequate lighting. Modernization of the buildings will improve personal privacy, install effective heating and ventilating systems, provide security for personal items, and improve latrine facilities.

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT, N.Y.

The U.S. Military Academy is located 10 miles south of Newburgh, N.Y. The mission of the Academy is to instruct and train the Corps of Cadets, the members of which will be the future officers of the Regular Army Establishment. The program consists of a new hospital, barracks modernization and utilities extension. The authorization requested for this program is \$30,145,000.

The first project is for the construction of a new hospital at USMA to replace the existing facility. The present hospital, developed piecemeal since 1923, cannot provide the required medical support to the expanded Corps of Cadets and other supported units and activities. Daily hospital clinic visits have increased 39 percent since 1962, much of the hospital equipment is inadequate by present-day standards, and the present structure is functionally inappropriate for current health care delivery. Additionally, the existing facility is located in the center of West Point, adjacent to the post headquarters, cadet barracks, a family housing apartment complex, and an academic building now under construction. Parking is virtually nonexistent, traffic is congested and the hospital emergency and service entrance can accommodate only

one vehicle at a time with no turnaround capability. Further, the existing structure should be freed to accommodate other activities now housed in temporary, inadequate facilities and planned in the USMA master plan to eventually occupy this building.

Senator SYMINGTON. I'd like a rather complete justification for this hospital. It seems to be entirely too expensive, and amounts to about \$250,000 a bed. I think this far exceeds the cost of the new hospital proposed for Walter Reed Medical Center.

I understand that the board of overseers for construction at West Point is not in agreement on where the new hospital should be located. Will you explain the background of this?

General COOPER. The requirement for a new hospital is derived from two considerations.

(a) First, the present hospital is outmoded and inadequate. It was built incrementally and modified over a period of years, it is inadequate for serving supported strengths, and is located in a highly congested and noisy area with extremely limited access other than on foot. This condition limits its usefulness to a significant portion of the population served.

(1) The last major expansion of the hospital was in 1943, and since that time a portion of the hospital has been razed to make room for the construction of the new south barracks in fiscal year 1958. The hospital is no longer functionally appropriate to deliver health care in accordance with modern standards.

(2) The new hospital facility was programed in the West Point expansion program to be ready along with barracks and other essential facilities at critical stages of the expansion of the Corps of Cadets. Based on anticipated early phasing of the hospital, much essential maintenance (particularly in the field of utilities) was deferred and modernization of clinical and other hospital features kept to a minimum. As a result, the Military Academy is providing medical service under difficult conditions in an inadequate facility.

(3) The hospital is located in the busiest part of West Point, across Thayer Road from post headquarters and a major academic building. To one side of the hospital are a cadet reception hall and part of the cadet store; on the other side is an apartment type family housing unit; to the rear is a cadet barracks. Two academic buildings, the remaining cadet barracks, and the cadet mess facility (Washington Hall) are in the immediate vicinity.

(4) Vehicular access to the hospital is limited to one road, and hospital parking for patients and other users is literally nonexistent; the nearest parking being, at times, as much as three-quarters of a mile distant.

(b) The second consideration is that the present hospital structure is urgently required to meet other USMA expansion requirements.

(1) The original plan for expansion (Gray Book) for the U.S. Military Academy included, as a fundamental requirement, the construction of a new hospital removed from the immediate cadet area. Early programing for the hospital was provided to free the existing building for other uses critical to the phased expansion of the Cadet Corps and the expanding staff and faculty.

(2) Construction planning and programing assumed eventual availability on a timely basis of the present hospital for other purposes.

Based on this consideration, modification of the post headquarters (fiscal year 1965) did not provide space increases for expanding activities located there since planning provided for use of the present hospital structure for relocation of certain headquarters activities. Likewise, Washington Hall barracks complex, fiscal year 1965, did not provide space for the cadet store as it is programed to relocate to the hospital structure.

(3) The delay in building a new hospital has caused several activities, scheduled to relocate to the old hospital building, to operate in temporary locations at greatly reduced efficiency.

(c) The relocation of the hospital was the second priority project in the overall expansion plan. The project was originally authorized by Congress in fiscal year 1966, however, due to several circumstances new congressional authorization is required. The planned relocation of the hospital has significantly affected other planning. Other construction to date, including roads, parking, utilities, academic building, has been based on the assumption that the hospital would be relocated.

Since a new hospital was planned the existing structure has received little more than breakdown maintenance since 1965, as noted above. Building systems requiring the expenditure of substantial funds, if the structure is continued in use as a hospital for any extended period, include the high pressure steam system, electrical service and branch wiring, both hot and cold water systems; the central dictation, nurses call, personnel paging and telephone systems require replacement; three building elevators require replacement; existing piecemeal air-conditioning requires major expansion and rehabilitation.

Overall, the actual building configuration is a limiting factor in accommodating the increasing staff, treating an increased number of patients, and providing the medical services that are required. Space deficiencies of the present structure are best illustrated by some specific examples:

(a) The cadet sick call area is so limited that the line of waiting cadets frequently extends out of the sick call area, past the pharmacy, radiology clinic, and administrative area to the main entrance to the hospital.

(b) The pharmacy occupies a space one-quarter the area needed to meet operation requirements.

(c) One of the three authorized optometrists must work in a partitioned portion of the waiting room and perform a part of the examination in a corridor.

(d) The medical-surgical clinic does not have sufficient space to assign an examining room to each physician. For efficient utilization, each physician should have two examining rooms.

(e) The emergency area is cramped. There is only one emergency treatment room available for multiple patients.

(f) The laboratory must leave valuable equipment, that is in constant use, in areas outside of the laboratory proper.

(g) The existing area for medical supplies is so limited that hospital linens are processed in an area that cannot be secured resulting in a lack of control and contributing to a high loss rate.

(h) The large wards are inefficient resulting in an uneconomical percentage of utilization of bed spaces.

(i) The intensive care and postoperative recovery room are improvised and the latter must be approached from the surgical suite by negotiating a steep ramp. There is no economical method of improving this condition without major rehabilitation.

(j) The area for inpatient pediatrics is so limited that the care of children must be combined with adults in an undesirable manner.

Hospital equipment replacement in the existing structure has been kept to a minimum since it was anticipated that a new hospital would be constructed. Failure to provide a new facility in the near future would require a major expenditure for new equipment for which procurement was deferred during the past 7 years. It is doubtful that the type and amount of equipment could be properly accommodated in the existing building.

The estimated cost of the hospital is \$25 million, a point that has raised considerable question. Improvements in the state of the art of medical care facilities in the past 2 years have resulted in increases in costs because of upgraded standards for electrical, mechanical, environmental, and fire protection systems which have been incorporated in the West Point design. For example, new standards adopted by the Veterans' Administration, HEW, and the American Society of Heating, Ventilation & Refrigeration Engineers have brought about better, but more expensive systems for temperature and humidity control, air-conditioning, and filtration. Also, new NFPA fire codes have required such things as higher fire ratings for walls and doorways along the major paths of egress from the building. In addition, recent developments in diagnostic and therapeutic equipment, as well as new codes and standards, have placed greater demands on the quantity and reliability of electrical service, its flexibility, and the number of service terminals required.

Historically, construction costs at West Point have been very expensive. Several prime and subcontractors who have recently bid on projects at West Point were contacted informally and questioned with regard to the magnitude of risk and contingency factors that they had applied to their bids. From the responses given, we have concluded that contractors add a factor of 50 percent to all labor costs at West Point as compared to similar projects in other areas. The following are reasons they gave for the higher contingency costs they add to West Point projects:

(a) Travel allowances for mechanical trades and other transportation charges.

(b) Adequate finishing trades are not indigenous to the area.

(c) Requirements to maintain utilities are more restrictive than at other bases.

(d) Soil conditions at West Point have a built-in element of risk.

(e) Lost time due to functional requirements of West Point as a national attraction for visiting dignitaries of high ranks and for large numbers of tourists.

(f) Unsubstantiated claims inferring noncompetitive bidding practices by some contractors and local unions.

We are taking positive steps to insure that the cost of the hospital, and other construction at West Point, is as reasonable as possible. Some of these actions are:

(a) Avoiding monumental construction.

(b) Developing designs which eliminate or minimize labor intensive-type construction.

(c) Extensive site and foundation examinations to eliminate unexpected problems.

(d) Careful siting of projects to minimize extensive and expensive rock excavation.

(e) Packaging construction contracts to generate maximum bid competition.

(f) Intensive design review and value engineering throughout the design period. In the case of the new hospital, a construction oriented architecture-engineering firm experienced in the New York area has been hired to assist in this detailed design review to help maximize cost reductions.

An alternative to a new hospital would be to renovate and modernize the existing facility. This alternative has been investigated and the results further support constructing a new facility. The estimated space requirements under modern criteria are just over 157,000 square feet. The present hospital can only provide just over 93,000 gross square feet of usable space. An ancillary clinic building would also be required to provide the remaining area. Engineering estimates for renovating the existing structure and providing an additional clinic building are approximately \$21 million. Also, facilities, estimated to cost approximately \$3.6 million, would be required to house those activities which are now programed to move into the old hospital building upon completion of a new hospital. Further significant considerations are the serious degradation of medical service during the renovation—apt to extend over several years—and the fact that the resulting facility would still be located in a very congested area with very limited access to the users.

Considerable discussion has ensued on the siting of the new hospital proposed for the USMA. A new hospital has been planned for West Point since the 1960's at a location known as the Washington Gate site. In late 1971 an architecture-engineering firm, The Architects Collaborative (TAC), was retained to study and make recommendations on the overall master plan for West Point. On January 1972, TAC made a presentation to the USMA Planning Advisory Board recommending that the hospital be located in the Stony Lonesome area rather than Washington Gate, although recognizing that the Washington Gate area was an acceptable alternative. By a vote of 6 to 1, with one abstention, the Board accepted the TAC recommendation. Subsequent staffing and study within the Army resulted in general disagreement with the Board's position. Reasons for disagreement were that: there were no overriding factors favoring Stony Lonesome over Washington Gate—to the contrary some factors not included in the TAC study favored Washington Gate, for example, construction difficulties and costs and other planned utilization of the Stony Lonesome area; a change in the location would delay construction for a year and incur additional engineering and design costs plus a year's inflation; the Stony Lonesome site is more remote from the center of population, particularly the cadets; and, it was challenged that a functionally acceptable structure could be erected in the Stony Lonesome area that would also satisfy environmental considerations of the West Point scene. In May 1972, the Chief of

Staff, Army, requested the Planning Advisory Board to reconsider its position. By a vote of 5 to 5 the Board failed to reverse its earlier recommendation. After considering all factors, the Secretary of the Army approved the Washington Gate site for the new hospital in June 1972.

The barracks modernization project will upgrade nine existing buildings to provide modern quarters for 575 enlisted men in Army units stationed at the USMA. Open-bay areas will be eliminated to provide semiprivate rooms, latrine facilities will be improved, utilities will be upgraded, and facilities for securing personal possessions will be improved. Upon completion of the project, 100 percent of the permanent barracks capable of being economically modernized at West Point will meet current standards. All existing facilities will continue in use and no demolition will result from this project.

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not question the need for barracks modernization here at the Academy, and I know that this is a high cost area. But, I notice your unit cost of \$22.40 per square foot proposed for Fort Richardson, Alaska, which is shown on page 237. Can you compare these two programs, since obviously Alaska is a high cost area?

General COOPER. The barracks modernization project for Fort Richardson includes one building of 93,454 square foot floor area built in 1949. The barracks modernization project for USMA includes seven buildings; two were built in 1908, one each built in 1935, 1939, and 1942, and two were built in 1943. The seven buildings range in size from 5,400 square foot floor area to 27,500 square foot floor area. The greater amount of labor and materials per square foot for modernizing these smaller and older buildings at USMA more than makes up the difference in the geographical area cost factors of 1.7 for Fort Richardson and 1.3 for USMA.

The final project is to provide adequate utilities to the proposed hospital site in the Washington gate area of the post. The academy expansion and modernization plan provides for consolidation of certain activities in the Washington gate area to relieve traffic congestion and minimize heavy vehicle operation in the main post area. This project will extend communications service to the area, upgrade primary electrical service to the Washington gate area to serve the new hospital project. Extension of the water, sewer, and steam distribution lines, and the heating plant expansion are also required to support the new hospital building.

WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND
MARYLAND

Walter Reed Army Medical Center is located in Washington, D.C. The mission of this center is to provide medical treatment for members of the armed services and their dependents, to engage in medical research and development, and to support all medical center activities. The program provides a patient visitor facility. The request is for \$1,997,000.

The patient visitor project is to provide a facility to house the next of kin of seriously ill patients and to house outpatients visiting Walter Reed for special treatment or diagnostic testing. Many of the

referred patients are in the seriously ill or very seriously ill category, and this project will provide short-term housing for immediate family members of these patients who come to Washington from all parts of the country to visit their loved ones. The present facility is always full, with 79 beds in 28 rooms and assignments must be made on a bed rather than a room basis, which is a most unacceptable practice. The proposed facility will support the new 1,280-bed Walter Reed General Hospital currently under construction. Cafeteria facilities are included in the new facility to accommodate the occupants. The facility will be available only to the next of kin of seriously ill patients and referred outpatients who will be at WRGH for a short period of time.

Senator SYMINGTON. What will this facility be used for? Is it in the nature of a guesthouse to accommodate visitors?

General COOPER. The patient visitor facility will provide accommodations for the next of kin of seriously ill patients and to house outpatients referred to Walter Reed General Hospital from other stations for special treatment or diagnostic testing. This facility will only be available for these people.

COLD REGIONS LABORATORY, N.H.

The Cold Regions Laboratory is located 8 miles from Lebanon, N.H. The mission of this installation is to conduct basic and applied research and scientific and engineering investigations pertaining to operations in cold environments, methods and techniques of using various energy forms and systems to obtain information about surface and subsurface features, and to perform environmental and such other research in support of mission activities. The program consists of a logistics and storage facility at an estimated cost of \$597,000.

This project is required to provide a storage facility for the logistics support of the laboratory. The majority of the items stored are special project and prototype equipment specially manufactured for use on particular projects. Loss of this equipment through fire or other causes would result in a slowdown or discontinuance of projects involved. Also stored is historical data, including project statistics, notes and charts which have been acquired over a period of several years and most are irreplaceable. Loss of this data would seriously impair the preparation of research reports and technical publications which are the main end products of the laboratory.

Storage is now provided in the basement of a leased, converted textile mill located in Lebanon, N.H., 8 miles from the laboratory. This building is a potential fire hazard and security risk.

If this project is not approved, the distant and unsafe storage space must continue in use as no other adequate space is available to satisfy this requirement within commuting area.

OAKLAND ARMY BASE, CALIF.

The Oakland Army Base is located in Oakland, Calif. The mission of this installation is to provide for traffic management, ocean terminal operations and related transportation services of cargo and personnel; train related military units, military personnel and civilians as assigned; and to provide administrative and logistical support to tenant and satellite agencies. The program consists of modernizing enlisted

women's barracks and security lighting. The request for this program is \$485,000.

The first item, a barracks modernization project, is to upgrade existing permanent barracks to provide modern quarters for female enlisted personnel. WAC personnel assigned to Oakland now are living in substandard World War II-type temporary structures or must live off post in expensive rental housing. The building to be modernized is configured for male occupancy to outdated standards, having open bay squad bays and community latrines. Modernization will provide improved privacy, greater security for personal possessions and improved bathroom facilities. Completion of this project will provide for the total enlisted WAC housing requirement at Oakland Army Base.

The security lighting project is to provide physical security measures and safeguards to adequately protect Government property, cargo awaiting processing, and personnel employed at this installation. Raising the perimeter and area lighting to 0.3 footcandle will provide sufficient illumination during the hours of darkness for visual and for low-light-level television camera surveillance. Three television cameras are presently installed externally and permit surveillance of the warehouses and perimeter fencing but are usable only during daylight hours since these TV cameras require 2 footcandle illumination for operation. The cost of providing 2 footcandle illumination over the entire installation is far greater than provision of 0.3 footcandle illumination and use of low-light-level television cameras. This project supports present policies for tightening security of transportation terminal facilities to prevent gross pilferage and loss of intransit cargos.

MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL, SUNNY POINT, N.C.

Military Ocean Terminal, Sunny Point, is located at Wilmington, N.C. The mission of this installation is to receive, handle, load and ship outbound and retrograde ammunition, explosives and other DOD cargo. The program is for a container transfer and marshaling facility for \$1,628,000.

This project will provide facilities for the containerized shipping mission at Sunny Point. This port will be the only Army containerized ammunition facility in the continental United States (CONUS). It now handles approximately 55 percent of all munitions shipped from CONUS. Existing conventional break-bulk methods of shipping munitions require costly amounts of dunnage lumber and stevedore labor which can be greatly reduced by using the containerized shipping methods planned for Sunny Point. These savings will be particularly significant during high volume shipping during war time.

FORT GREELY, ALASKA

Fort Greely is located at Fairbanks, Alaska. Its mission is to provide command, control, administration and logistical support to the U.S. Army Arctic Test Center, Northern Warfare Training Center, and such other units and activities as may be directed, and to maintain Allen Army Airfield and hangar. The program is for enlisted men's barracks, without mess facilities, and for an eight stall automotive self-help garage. The total request is for \$3,489,000.

The barracks project will provide housing for 182 enlisted men. The existing temporary wood frame barracks and quonset huts built in the late forties have deteriorated beyond economical repair and are inadequate especially during winter months when temperatures of -30° to -60° F., along with winds of 25-26 knots, are very common. These existing barracks are used for personnel attending courses of the Northern Warfare Training Center and observers and temporary duty troops assigned to Arctic Test Center activities. These activities—testing of equipment, clothing and materials, and training of personnel under arctic conditions—reach their peak during severe winter conditions. To assure continued progress in these activities, with sufficient numbers of personnel, it has on occasion been necessary to billet personnel in the already crowded existing permanent barracks. This overcrowding is not desirable and this project will assist in alleviating these conditions.

The automotive self-help garage will provide an eight stall automotive shop, which will replace temporary World War II type wood framed—4,758 square feet—structures. The need for a suitable facility is twofold at Fort Greely. First, the isolated location of Fort Greely and the absence of commercial facilities magnifies the requirement to the point where this facility is the only means of maintaining private vehicles in safe and dependable condition in this arctic environment. The only dependable commercial facilities are in Fairbanks—110 miles away—are limited, and costs are prohibitive. Secondly, this facility will greatly improve the tour of duty at this isolated installation by providing a place for the soldiers to pursue a gratifying hobby. Recreational facilities normally available in a community surrounding most installations are completely lacking at Fort Greely and the harsh environment makes outside activities unattractive and hazardous.

Senator SYMINGTON. \$81.50 a square foot for a permanent auto hobby shop seems to be quite exorbitant. Why cannot some type of prefabricated metal building be used in lieu of permanent construction?

General COOPER. The unit cost authorized for an auto hobby shop with a spray booth is approximately \$37 per square foot. Because of the extreme climate and remote location, the location adjustment factor for Fort Greely is 2.2 times the unit cost thus accounting for the \$81.50 per square foot construction cost. Unit costs and adjustment factors are given in AR 415-17, "Empirical Cost Estimates for Military Construction and Cost Adjustment Factors," which is based upon actual construction cost and is updated on a regular basis.

A prefabricated metal building was not chosen in lieu of permanent construction because concrete block is readily available whereas pre-engineered structures must be shipped to the site. A study of a similar project at Fort Richardson, Alaska, indicates that the initial construction cost is approximately equal for the two building types after including the shipping cost for the preengineered structure. In addition, the climate prohibits the use of a standard prefabricated metal structure without extensive modifications. The necessary modifications include structural and architectural changes to meet local wind and snow requirements, addition of acceptable insulation and vapor barriers, elimination of through-metal connections, and replacement of standard exterior components such as doors and windows. Furthermore, recent life cycle cost studies indicate that the average

preengineered building has higher maintenance cost and shorter life-span than conventionally constructed buildings.

FORT RICHARDSON, ALASKA

Fort Richardson is located 7 miles northeast of Anchorage, Alaska. The mission of this installation is to support all U.S. Army operations in Alaska including special requirements for supply and maintenance facilities for both Reserve components and CONUS-based Active Army units receiving tactical training in Alaska. The installation also provides ground and surface-to-air defenses for Elmendorf Air Base. The program provides for barracks modernization for \$2,140,000.

The barracks project will modernize two existing buildings constructed in 1951 to now outdated standards. The completed project will provide modern quarters for 270 enlisted men and will bring Fort Richardson to approximately 68 percent of their long range bachelor enlisted housing requirement. The situation at Fort Richardson is somewhat unique in that the long, harsh winters with weather that often precludes any outdoor activities makes it even more imperative that the Army provide comfortable, modern living accommodations for the soldiers.

FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

Fort Wainwright is located at Fairbanks, Alaska. The mission of this installation is to provide ground defense for the Wainwright-Fairbanks-Eielson Air Force Base complex. Also supports a U.S. Army hospital, a reinforced infantry battalion, and other nondivisional type units. Army activities at Fort Wainwright are being consolidated to the South Post. The program provides for bachelor officer quarters modernization and relocation of activities to South Post for a total estimated cost of \$2,715,000.

The bachelor officer quarters modernization project will provide adequate bachelor officer quarters on the South Post to replace existing quarters being used on the North Post area of Fort Wainwright and is part of a plan to move all activities to the South Post area.

The relocation of activities to South Post will provide adequate facilities for activities now located on the North Post. These activities include an officers open mess, a billeting office, a provost marshal facility and a post headquarters.

SCHOFIELD BARRACKS MILITARY RESERVATION, HAWAII

Schofield Barracks Military Reservation is located 17 miles northwest of Honolulu, Hawaii. The mission of this installation is to command, train, and provide logistical support for an infantry division. It is also the headquarters for U.S. Army Hawaii and operates the USARHAW supply and maintenance center and the USARHAW personnel center. The program includes barracks modernization and a consolidated mess hall. The total request is for \$9,592,000.

The barracks project will modernize 12 existing buildings to provide modern quarters for 1,809 enlisted men. The existing buildings are structurally sound but are configured to now outdated living standards. The large open bay squad rooms will be remodeled to provide semiprivate rooms, latrine facilities will be improved, air-conditioning will be installed, and the heating and lighting upgraded.

The second project is required to provide a modern consolidated dining facility for all personnel living in Quads, I, J, and K, Schofield Barracks. This project will replace the six active and three standby reserve dining facilities presently scheduled for renovation and reconstruction to unit administrative, gamerooms, or storage space under the barracks modernization programs in fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974. Construction of this project will insure adequate troop dining facilities, while providing excellent food, less food waste, and lower equipment replacement and food costs. The items of equipment presently in the nine existing dining facilities will be either used in the new facility or salvaged as their condition warrants.

FORT SHAFTER, HAWAII

Fort Shafter is located 3 miles northwest of Honolulu, Hawaii. The mission of the installation is to support Headquarters, U.S. Army Pacific. Support facilities and family housing are located there. The program will provide a medical/dental clinic for \$1,233,000.

This project is to provide a new medical/dental clinic to replace an inadequate facility which is a partially converted guardhouse. Although the present facility has been utilized as a dispensary for several years, the building has never been converted to a properly functioning medical clinic necessary to provide complete preventive dentistry care to eligible military personnel and dependents. The dental facility at Tripler Army Medical Center is overtaxed in providing normal patient care and cannot accommodate additional load. The requested dental facility will contain a 12-chair dental clinic. It is considered more economical to construct a new combined medical and dental facility than to convert the present facility to an adequate dispensary and then either add or construct a separate dental clinic. The medical clinic has an average of 52 visits per day. Physical examinations for the military staff at Fort Shafter and a drug screening program will also be accomplished here.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS—AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

This project will provide air pollution control and abatement measures at installations in compliance with Federal, State, and local air pollution control regulations and Executive Order 11507—February 4, 1970. The total request is \$7,295,000. The work includes various types of air pollution abatement measures such as fly ash separators, fume abatement systems, stack gas monitors, fuel conversion, air monitoring stations, and construction of incinerators. Type and scope of work varies because of the many different kinds and sizes of equipment and the specific pollution problem to be resolved, but corrective actions proposed are based on a determination of the most economical means of satisfying controlling criteria.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that several of these air pollution abatement projects are planned which are contractor operated. Why are military construction funds utilized for this purpose when most of the construction performed at these contractor operated plants come from PEMA funds?

General COOPER. These projects are included in the MCA budget rather than in the procurement of equipment and missiles, Army (PEMA) request based on an Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) memorandum, subject: Military Construction and Family Housing Construction—Program/Budget Estimates, dated July 5, 1968. This memorandum directs that pollution control projects for industrial-type activities will be proposed for financing under military construction appropriations. This position has been confirmed during the annual budget reviews.

In practice, those projects that are conceived to correct existing pollution problems, for example, smoke stack emissions, are funded by the MCA appropriation. Those projects actually related to the industrial production line or are incidental to plant modernization are funded by the PEMA appropriation. Since fiscal year 1968 approximately \$9 million have been authorized in PEMA budgets for pollution abatement projects.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS—WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

This program will provide water pollution control and abatement measures at various installations in compliance with Federal, State and local water pollution control regulations and with Executive Order 11507—February 4, 1970—for \$6,799,000. Work consists of the construction of new, and expansion and upgrading of existing sanitary and industrial waste systems, the construction of dikes around storage tanks and the installation of sand traps and oil separators in shops and vehicle wash racks. Type and scope of work varies depending upon the existing system, but the corrective actions proposed are based on the least costly means of meeting controlling criteria. When local conditions permit advantageous accomplishment of any portion of a project by connection to or use of a public system, the public system will be used.

PANAMA AREA, CANAL ZONE

Army installations in the Canal Zone are located near the Pacific and Atlantic entrances to the Panama Canal. Missions of these installations are to train military units and to provide ground and air defense of the Panama Canal. The program consists of barracks modernization in the Canal Zone and improvements to Fort Sherman Army Airfield for a total of \$8,095,000.

The barracks project will modernize existing buildings located at Fort Clayton, Fort Kobbee, and Fort Gulick in the Canal Zone. The completed project will provide modern quarters for 1,439 enlisted men. This project is required to provide modern living accommodations meeting current standards. Modernization will provide semiprivate rooms, improved latrine facilities, air-conditioning, and improved security for personal possessions.

The improvements to the Fort Sherman Army Airfield will establish a capability at this field to accept medium cargo/troop aircraft on a routine basis. Presently, landings of these aircraft—C-123, C-130—can be made only under emergency conditions.

EIGHTH U.S. ARMY, KOREA

The 8th U.S. Army is located in Korea. Its mission is to support the United Nations Command, to command and support the U.S. Forces, Korea, and units of the 8th U.S. Army. The program provides for the construction of an ALOC Airfield and for POL Terminal Facilities at Pohang, Korea, for a total of \$1,568,000.

The ALOC Airfield is an important link in the network of logistical airfields sited throughout Korea to supplement the ground lines of communication.

The POL terminal facilities will provide a deep water mooring system capable of accepting T-5 tankers (250,000 bbl.). This will make the Trans Korea pipeline system more responsive and economical.

FORT BUCHANAN, P.R.

Fort Buchanan is located at San Juan, P.R. The installation mission is to provide administrative and logistical support for all active and reserve Army elements, to other services located in Puerto Rico and to furnish community and welfare type services to retired military personnel. The program is for barracks modernization for \$517,000.

The barracks modernization project is required to upgrade existing substandard barracks to meet current standards for today's Army. The building to be modernized is still arranged in open bay squad rooms, is not air-conditioned and offers little security for personal possessions. To the extent possible semiprivate rooms will be constructed, the structure will be air-conditioned, utilities will be increased and improved, latrine facilities will be improved and secure areas for personal possessions provided.

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not question the need for barracks improvements here at Fort Buchanan in San Juan, but I wonder if any consideration has been given to moving the Army activities out of Fort Buchanan to the Ramey Air Force Base, which is being closed. There are many fine facilities at Ramey, including barracks, family housing, commissaries, et cetera. From your description of the mission at Fort Buchanan, it would seem that the type of work being performed there could be performed just as well at the Ramey Air Force Base.

General COOPER. The Army has reviewed its facilities requirements and holdings to include Fort Buchanan, to determine whether or not it would be appropriate to acquire some of the facilities which will be made available at Ramey AFB. Since most Army activities in Puerto Rico involve Reserve, National Guard, and ROTC officers they can best be performed by conducting them in the Metropolitan San Juan area. The travel and communications times to Ramey AFB are such that it would neither be economical nor conducive to mission effectiveness to transfer all or any Army activities from Fort Buchanan to Ramey AFB. The Army has, however, requested use of a small area (to include six buildings located thereon) at Ramey AFB to relocate the 770th Military Police Company of the Puerto Rico National Guard, now housed in an inadequate, privately-owned facility at Aguadilla, P.R.

It should also be noted that the Army is taking steps to obtain certain excess facilities at the San Juan Naval Station to permit the Puerto Rican National Guard to occupy better, consolidated facilities.

NATIONAL MISSILE RANGE, KWAJALEIN, MARSHALL ISLANDS

The National Missile Range, Kwajalein, is located at Kwajalein Atoll 2,100 miles west of Hawaii. The mission of this installation is to support research, development, and test programs for missile systems for all services. The installation also supports programs conducted by NASA. The program consists of additions to instrumentation and technical support facilities, Ennylabegan power addition, and electrical system feeder upgrading for a total of \$2,353,000.

The first project is to provide adequate facilities to house radars and other electronic equipment which support research and development programs for missile and radar systems. The Air Force Minuteman, the Navy Poseidon, the Army Sprint and Spartan, and the various Advanced Ballistic Missile Defense Agency programs all use these range facilities to obtain information vital to the success of their weapons systems. Minor additions to existing buildings at Eniwetok are for the hydroacoustics impact timing system (HITS). Ballistic camera electronic equipment will be installed on Legan, Omelek, and Gagan Islands and a new building will be constructed on Illeginni for a ballistic camera installation. In 1968 the telemetry building on Ennylabegan was expanded to 3,200 square feet to house four antenna systems, and two additional systems, a computer, and ancillary equipment were added later. An additional 1,200 square feet of space will permit analysis of data during missions, additional data processing equipment, and allow for calibration and repair.

The second project will furnish reliable electrical power to facilities on the island of Ennylabegan necessary for support of the missile research and development programs. The receiver equipment is located on this island and reception of all incoming radio communication signals depends upon efficient operation of this equipment. Recent installation of two radomes to support the new telemetry antenna systems and the planned addition to the telemetry building will severely overtax the existing power distribution system. This project will meet the increasing power demands, upgrade existing electrical distribution systems, and decrease equipment downtime and maintenance costs.

The final project is to furnish reliable power to the research and development and range support facilities necessary in support of the Safeguard, the Advanced Ballistics Missile Defense Agency (ABMDA), and other range users' programs. This project will provide increased capacity to meet the increasing power demand and provide for future growth, upgrade the existing electrical feeder system, and will decrease the time required to correct power failures that dead-line technical range equipment. The major portion of the present distribution system was installed in 1960 and 1961; however, a small portion is approximately 10 years older. Existing loads on several feeders are reaching the rated capacity of the lines and have affected the reliability of equipment during range missions as power outages increase. The upgrading will enable the system to furnish reliable electric service under routine maintenance conditions.

U.S. ARMY SECURITY AGENCY, OVERSEAS, VARIOUS LOCATIONS

This program is for various overseas locations operated by the U.S. Army Security Agency. Mission of the sites is to engage in communications and intelligence activities. The project consists of one enlisted men's barracks, without mess facilities, at location 276 for \$1,434,000.

This project is to provide adequate troop housing for the enlisted men at this isolated location. Present housing needs are being met by double bunking in overcrowded rooms. This project is essential to alleviate present overcrowded conditions, and will enhance the health, welfare, and morale of the men. Assignment to this station entails an unaccompanied tour with no off-post facilities available and the nature of the mission dictates that personnel strength be housed on the station. The nearest city accessible to the personnel of this station offers little recreation, and public relations are best maintained by permitting limited visits to the city as local nationals are generally unaccustomed to the Western way of life.

U.S. ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND, OVERSEAS

The U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command provides and operates communications facilities worldwide. The program will upgrade power at eight communications stations located in four countries for \$2,097,000.

This project is for power improvements at strategic Army communications stations within the defense communications system (DCS). It provides for new generators to include associated switchgear and ancillary equipment, construction of new and/or modification of existing power equipment buildings, and for upgrade of primary and secondary distribution systems. This project is a part of a systematic effort to accomplish the Army's portion of the Defense Communications Agency (DCA) Military Department worldwide electric power improvement program. Its objective is to achieve within the Army portion of the defense communications system (DCS) an absolute minimum of communication interruptions caused by electrical power failure. To achieve this objective, primary and auxiliary power facilities, as well as electrical distribution systems, are to be upgraded to insure adequate continuous electrical power at selected Army defense communications system (DCS) facilities.

Senator SYMINGTON. It seems like every year we have a substantial sum in the bill for the purpose of upgrading power at various locations. Just how important is this? Have you had many power outages under your present setup?

General COOPER. This project is quite important. The eight locations cited in the project are Army communications stations within the defense communications system (DCS). The DCS stations in Germany are all high priority stations within the European wideband communications system (EWCS). The stations at Juzon Mountain and Grass Mountain, Taiwan, and Fort Buckner, Okinawa, are all important tropospheric and microwave links in the integrated communications systems, Far East (ICS-FE). Failure to provide ade-

quate and reliable electrical power for these sites could cause serious degradation of communications vital to the national command authority and/or the DOD command and control communications network.

Electrical power failure continues to be a major cause of communications outages at many of these DCS facilities. A significant fact is that the primary power is furnished by a foreign country. This power is not as operationally reliable as in the United States nor is the ultimate control in U.S. hands. The project requested will provide emergency or standby power where it does not exist, will upgrade heavily taxed distribution systems and gear, and replace outdated equipment.

U.S. ARMY, EUROPE

GERMANY, VARIOUS

This request is for a group of six items at various locations in the Federal Republic of Germany. The missions of the installations are in support of the U.S. Army, Europe. The program consists of enlisted men's barracks and two projects for improvements to dependent schools for a total request of \$12,517,000.

The first project is to provide a new troop barracks at Pruem Post, Germany. Pruem Post is a small isolated installation near the Germany-Belgium-Luxembourg border. Because of the prevalent inclement weather and lack of recreational facilities, the need for adequate living accommodations becomes even more imperative. Currently, personnel are billeted in temporary theater of operations-type barracks that were constructed in 1952. The barracks have only large open bay living areas and seriously inadequate latrine facilities. They have undergone serious deterioration in the last 20 years. Investigations in 1971 revealed structural failure of the roof and wall supporting systems of several buildings. Due to the age of the buildings, an increased rate of deterioration can be expected within the immediate future. They are difficult to heat and remain drafty during the cold season each year. All of these factors contribute to the poor living conditions at Pruem Post and have generated a very serious morale problem among the troops stationed there. The Army barracks at this site will be replaced in two increments with this being the initial phase. Seven temporary theater of operations barracks with a total area of 19,330 SF will be demolished upon completion of this project. This project is not within the established NATO infrastructure category for common funding.

The second project requests \$4,937,000 to provide new dependent school facilities at two locations—an elementary school in Baumholder and a middle school in Mannheim. In both cases the existing schools are seriously overcrowded and lack proper educational facilities. Many classes are now held in makeshift classrooms including basements of private quarters. The proposed projects will alleviate the crowded condition and provide functionally adequate educational facilities.

The final project requested for our forces in Germany is also for facilities for dependent schools. This project will provide additions to existing schools at three locations—Nuremberg, Fulda, and Wurzburg. Similar to Baumholder and Mannheim, these three dependent school areas have experienced a significant enrollment increase which

must be absorbed in already inadequate facilities. The plight of our overseas dependent schools has been known for some time but suffered in the competition for limited construction dollars. The Army is now attempting to accomplish the badly needed corrections. The proposed projects will provide additional classrooms for the schools in the three locations which will alleviate crowded conditions and replace other functionally inadequate facilities now used.

Senator SYMINGTON. This seems to be quite a lot of money you are proposing to spend on upgrading dependent schools at various locations. Has consideration been given to using prefabricated structures for additional classrooms? I know the Air Force has done this in the Frankfurt area.

General COOPER. We have given thought to using prefabricated structures, that is, akin to the metal "Butler" type buildings. In fact in some areas we have utilized these buildings as an interim remedy to space problems. They have not been particularly satisfactory from a cost, maintenance, or functional standpoint. We are using preengineered structures of a different sort, for example, utilizing precast concrete sections. Our construction designs and contracts are being developed to provide for the maximum flexibility in construction. This allows the prospective contractors to bid on a variety of preengineered options, utilizing materials, and construction techniques commonly employed in Europe. This has proven very competitive and gives us better overall structures.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS (NATO INFRASTRUCTURE)

This is required to meet the estimated U.S. share of the multinational NATO common funded infrastructure program. The funds will be used to meet U.S. obligations during the fiscal year 1974 time frame as projects in established categories are approved for funding by the NATO Payments and Progress Committee. Such projects are from a backlog of construction requirements previously approved in SACEUR and SACLANC annual programs. The request for fiscal year 1974 takes into account unused authorization and funds as well as recoupments received from projects previously prefunded by the United States and now considered eligible for common funding.

Senator SYMINGTON. I notice that you are asking \$80 million in new authorization and only \$60 million in new funding for NATO infrastructure for fiscal year 1974. Why the difference between the funding and the authority you are requesting?

Last year you were given \$58 million in new authority. Why is the substantial increase to \$80 million necessary this year? Do these figures take into consideration the devaluation of the dollar? I have in mind that a few months ago you sent through a request to use emergency authority to make up a deficit created by the devaluation of the dollar.

General COOPER. Your question has three separate but related parts. I shall endeavor to answer them in the order in which they were asked:

1. The requirement for \$80 million in new authorization, as compared to \$60 million in new funding, stems from the fact that although the U.S. share of NATO infrastructure is a single line item in the military construction, Army appropriation, it differs from all other line items in that it is a continuing program—not a complete one-time

project. A carryover of unobligated authorization from one fiscal year to the next is therefore required to permit the United States to continue participation in NATO, pending enactment of authorization for the new fiscal year.

In recent years authorization has not been enacted until 3 to 5 months after the fiscal year has begun. Our unobligated authorization carryover at end fiscal year 1968 was \$29 million; fiscal year 1969, \$40 million; fiscal year 1970, \$62 million; and fiscal year 1971, \$47 million. As a result of congressional reductions of Department of Defense fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972 authorization requests, our carryover from fiscal year 1972 to fiscal year 1973 was reduced to \$18 million. The reduction in total authorization available to us in fiscal year 1973 reduced our ability to cope with unanticipated unbudgeted fiscal year 1973 costs of \$43 million stemming from devaluation in the U.S. dollar. Accordingly, we deferred \$12 million of high priority fiscal year 1973 requirements to early fiscal year 1974 and requested fiscal year 1973 reprogramming of \$20.65 million into NATO infrastructure. Late deferrals provided a \$1.7 million carryover of unobligated authorization into fiscal year 1974 to enable us to meet payroll and other nondeferrable costs pending resolution authority. The requirement for a carryover of unobligated authorization from one fiscal year to the next is developed more fully in a paper we are submitting for the record.

The requested carryover of \$20 million in unobligated authorization from fiscal year 1974 to fiscal year 1975 approximates 25-30 percent (3 months) of our estimated fiscal year 1975 requirement, based on the February 12, 1973, devalued dollar. It is a minimum requirement which contemplates that the Congress will enact fiscal year 1975 authorization within 3 months after the start of fiscal year 1975, that construction costs will remain stable, and the value of the dollar will recover to the February 12, 1973, official value level.

2. The fiscal year 1974 request for \$80 million new authorization, as compared to \$58 million for fiscal year 1973, is required to:

(a) Provide for a \$20 million carryover of unobligated authorization into fiscal year 1974 to permit continued participation in NATO pending enactment of new year authorization. As previously outlined, the fiscal year 1973 carryover to fiscal year 1974 is \$1.7 million, leaving a carryover shortage of \$18.3 million.

(b) Provide support of the NATO 1970-1974 level of program (Slice XXI-XXV) in keeping with previous U.S. sponsorship and commitments. This includes provision for the cost of recent dollar devaluations.

3. In response to your question regarding the cost of the devaluations of the dollar, I will insert two tables in the record—the first shows details of dollar devaluation costs in fiscal year 1973-1974; the second shows the impact on our fiscal year 1973-1974 authorization and fund requirements. Highlights of these tables include the following:

(a) The total cost of U.S. dollar devaluations in fiscal year 1973-1974 as related to the U.S. share of the NATO infrastructure program is \$63 million. Fiscal year 1973 costs are \$43 million, none of which was provided for in the Department of Defense fiscal year 1973 budget. Fiscal year 1974 costs are estimated at \$20 million, of which only \$5 million is included in our fiscal year 1974 budget.

(b) We have endeavored to provide for the unbudgeted fiscal year 1973 cost of \$43 million as follows:

	<i>Millions</i>
Cancellation and deobligation of projects.....	\$10.35
Reprogramming requested May 7, 1973. HAC has approved; SAC has not yet acted.....	20.65
Projects deferred to early fiscal year 1974.....	12.000
Total/Unbudgeted fiscal year 1973 costs.....	48.000

(c) Assuming SAC approves Secretary of Defense May 7, 1973, request to reprogram \$20.65 million additional funds into NATO infrastructure to partially provide for the \$43 million unbudgeted fiscal year 1973 cost of devaluation, revised fiscal year 1974 authorization and funding requirements are as listed below. The increased requirements are caused entirely by the devaluation of the dollar.

(1) \$19.3 million additional new obligation authority (NOA) is required over and above the \$40 million NOA requested in Department of Defense fiscal year 1974 budget. The revised fiscal year 1974 NOA requirement is therefore \$59.3 million.

(2) The revised fiscal year 1974 total obligation authority (TOA) requirement is \$85.3 million (\$60 million Department of Defense budget plus \$19.3 million additional NOA requirement, plus \$6 million additional estimated fiscal year 1974 recoupments).

(3) The revised fiscal year 1974 authorization is \$105.3 million (\$80 million Department of Defense budget plus \$19.3 million additional NOA requirement, plus \$6 million additional estimated fiscal year 1974 recoupments).

COST OF U.S. DOLLAR DEVALUATION, FISCAL YEAR 1973-74—U.S. SHARE OF NATO INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM
(MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY)

	Fiscal years—		
	1973-74 (total)	1973	1974
COST OF DEVALUATION			
May 8, 1972, revaluation of NATO IAU (reflecting Dec. 18, 1971, dollar devaluation).....	\$25.000	\$20.000	\$5.000
Feb. 12, 1973, devaluation dollar.....	31.000	23.000	8.000
Difference, Feb. 12, 1973 dollar versus current market dollar.....	7.000	0	7.000
Total, fiscal year 1973-74 cost devaluation.....	63.000	43.000	20.000
FUND REQUIREMENT			
Included in budget.....	-5.000	0	-5.000
Not included in budget.....	58.000	43.000	15.000
Carryover from fiscal year 1973 appropriation.....	-1.700	0	-1.700
Additional estimated recoupments.....	-6.000	0	-6.000
Total unbudgeted cost of devaluation.....	50.300	43.000	7.300
Projects canceled and deobligated.....	-10.350	-10.350	0
Projects deferred fiscal year 1973 to fiscal year 1974.....	0	-12.000	+12.000
Fiscal year 1973 reprogramming requested ¹	1 20.650	1 -20.650	0
Subtotal.....	(-31.000)	(-43.000)	(+12.000)
Total unbudgeted, if fiscal year 1973 reprogramming approved.....	19.300	0	19.300
Add fiscal year 1974 funds required, if fiscal year 1973 reprogramming not approved.....	+20.650	0	+20.650
Total unbudgeted, if fiscal year 1973 reprogramming not approved.....	39.950	0	39.950

¹ Request approved by chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives. Senate has not yet acted on request.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE PROCEDURES FOR OBLIGATING AND EXPENDING U.S. SHARE
OF COSTS

BACKGROUND

"Infrastructure" is the NATO term for facilities necessary for the deployment and operation of NATO military forces, including U.S. forces committed to NATO. It includes airfields, communications, POL, Naval bases, radar installations and other military operational facilities.

Common financing of Infrastructure is based on a cost sharing plan covering several (usually five) years, drawn up and agreed to by NATO countries. The most recent agreement was signed in February 1970, and covered annual increments (slices) XXI through XXV (1970-1974). This agreement established a program of \$753.1 million, of which the U.S. share (29.67%) was \$223.4 million. This cost will be increased as a result of the most recent dollar devaluation.

Annually, the NATO Military Commanders recommend construction or modernization of projects essential for the support of military forces committed to NATO. After review, selected projects together constitute the yearly program, or annual Slice, which is formally approved by the NATO Council/Defense Planning Committee (the highest political bodies of NATO). Each such slice must, when added to previous slice approvals, be within the multi-year cost ceiling.

In effect, the U.S. commitment to NATO Infrastructure occurs at the time of approval of the long-term program, and is reaffirmed in terms of specific projects at the time of approval of the annual slice program.

After approval of projects in an annual slice, full responsibility for project implementation is assumed by the applicable host country, which starts preparatory work; siting, preliminary estimates, plans and specifications. Individual projects are then submitted with supporting details to the NATO Payments and Progress (P&P) Committee. Based upon prior screening by the NATO Technical staff, the NATO P&P Committee must be satisfied that the project retains its military requirements, conforms to NATO criteria, is reasonable in cost, and is eligible for common funding under NATO Infrastructure rules. In addition, beginning with Slice XXI (1970), the NATO P&P Committee reviews the status of preparatory work to insure that the project can be contracted for within the next twelve months. This pre-requisite to P&P Committee approval has significantly reduced the lagtime between approval of an annual program (Slice) and contracting/obligating and has improved DoD capability for forecasting annual fund requirements. Once the project is approved by the NATO P&P Committee, the host nation may proceed with actual construction.

The NATO P&P Committee meets each week throughout the year to review and approve urgent and incremental Infrastructure project requests.

U.S. CONCURRENCE IN A NATO P&P COMMITTEE FUND AUTHORIZATION IS
SIMULTANEOUSLY A FUND OBLIGATION FOR THE U.S.

To prepare a budget request for the Congress, the U.S. representative must forecast the anticipated P&P Committee authorizations for the year in question, weighing various factors, including predicting when a host country will acquire the necessary real estate, provide local utilities, and prepare plans for submittal to P&P Committee. There are other variables which make it difficult to forecast the specific projects which will receive P&P Committee approval (and U.S. obligation) during a given fiscal year or to forecast with precision the resultant annual fund requirement. As a result, the Congress has requested and receives each quarter a listing of specific projects approved by the P&P Committee during the previous calendar quarter.

Upon approval of a given project by the P&P Committee an obligation reflecting the U.S. share of the cost of that project is recorded, based on the official

value of the dollar in relationship to the NATO IAU (International Accounting Unit) as of that point in time. Obligations are subsequently adjusted to reflect:

(1) Actual construction costs in the same manner as regular U.S. military construction projects.

(2) Changes in the official value of the dollar. Adjustment must be made to all unliquidated obligations to reflect the change in the relationship of the dollar to the IAU as of the date the U.S. Treasury officially notifies the IMF (International Monetary Fund) of the change in official dollar value. Subsequently, all new obligations must likewise reflect this change in value.

(3) The difference between the amount actually expended in the market place to liquidate a given obligation and the amount recorded for that obligation.

The history of the value of the dollar in relationship to the NATO IAU is as follows (expressed in terms of number of dollars required to equal one IAU):

Effective dates	Amount	Percent of dollar devaluation (since previous devaluation)	Cumulative percent devaluation (new value verses \$2.80)
Official value of the dollar in relationship to the NATO IAU (applies to all unliquidated obligations):			
Inception NATO—May 8, 1972-----	2.80		
May 8, 1972 to Feb. 12, 1973-----	3.04	8.57	8.57
Feb. 12, 1973 to current-----	3.38	11.1	20.7
Approximate current value of the dollar in the marketplace (applies to expenditures only): Current and assumed average for fiscal year 1974--	3.72	10.0	32.9

APPLICATION TO FISCAL YEAR 1973-74—IN KEEPING WITH THE ABOVE

(1) The DOD FY 1973 budget was based on the value of the official dollar, in relationship to the IAU, as of December 1971 (\$2.80 to the IAU). As of 8 May 1972 unliquidated obligations (in excess of \$150 million) were increased by 8.57% to reflect the new official rate of \$3.04 to the IAU and all subsequent obligations were recorded at the \$3.04 rate.

(2) The DOD FY 1974 budget, prepared in December 1972, is based on \$3.04 to the IAU. Unliquidated obligations (in excess of \$150 million) will be increased by an additional 11.1% to reflect the 12 February 1973 devaluation of the dollar immediately following passage of the applicable Public Law by the Congress (House-Senate conferees have agreed on a bill), approval by the President, and notification to IMF by the U.S. Treasury.

(3) Expenditures have been, and will be, made based on the value of the dollar in the market place as of the time the expenditure is made.

(4) Expenditures are currently made at the approximate rate of \$3.72 to the IAU, whereas obligations are currently recorded at the rate of \$3.04 to the IAU. As current expenditures are made, a concurrent increase in the applicable recorded obligation by the 22.3% is therefore required.

The DOD FY 1974 budget request submitted to Congress in January 1974 provides for \$80 million in authorizations, \$60 million in total obligations authority (TOA) and \$40 million in new obligation authority (NOA).

Only \$5 million of the \$63 million cost of dollar devaluations applicable to the U.S. share of the NATO Infrastructure Program were included in DOD FY 1973 and 1974 budget estimates. Assuming approval of DOD's request of 7 May 1973 to reprogram an additional \$20.650 million into NATO Infrastructure, revised FY 1974 requirements are \$105.3 million authorizations, \$85.3 TOA and \$59.3 NOA.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, FISCAL YEAR 1973-74

	1973	1974
AUTHORIZATION		
Carryover from PY.....	18.2	1 22.3
Authorization/President's budget.....	58.0	80.0
Subtotal.....	76.2	102.3
Fiscal year 1973 reprogram request.....	1 20.6
Total authorization available.....	96.8	102.3
Obligations/requirement:		
Estimated obligations fiscal year 1973.....	74.5
President's budget.....	60.0
Fiscal year 1973 cost Feb. 12, 1973, devaluation.....	1 20.6
Subtotal.....	80.6
Fiscal year 1974 cost Feb. 12, 1973, devaluation.....	8.0
Fiscal year 1973 projects deferred to fiscal year 1974.....	12.0
Fiscal year 1974 cost, difference Feb. 12, 1973, dollars versus current dollars.....	2 7.0
Subtotal, added requirement.....	27.0
Total obligations/requirement.....	74.5	2 107.6
Available for carryover/shortage.....	1 22.3	2 -5.3
Added authorization requirement (including \$20,000,000 carryover).....	0	2 25.3
FUNDING		
Carryover from PY.....	14.2	1.7
NOA/President's budget.....	38.0	40.0
Recoupments.....	24.0	26.0
Subtotal.....	76.2	67.7
Fiscal year 1973 reprogram request.....	(4)	1 20.6
Total funds available.....	4 76.2	88.3
Obligations/requirement (as above).....	74.5	2 107.6
Available for carryover/shortage.....	4 1.7	-19.3
Added fund requirement.....	19.3

¹ Approval of the Chairman, HAC and SAC was requested by letter May 7, 1973, to reprogram \$20,650,000 from Safeguard to NATO infrastructure to partially cover fiscal year 1973 cost (\$23,000,000) of Feb. 12, 1973, dollar devaluation. Concurrently, Chairman, HASC and SASC were advised that SecDef intended to utilize the provisions of sec. 703 to provide a like amount of additional authorization for Infrastructure. As of July 25, 1973 neither HASC or SASC has expressed disapproval; HAC has approved reprogramming of funds but SAC has not yet acted. Accordingly, this table reflects the requested \$20,650,000 additional authorization as available in fiscal year 1973 and assumes early fiscal year 1974 SAC approval to fund reprogramming. Failure to obtain approval of fiscal year 1973 funds reprogramming will increase fiscal year 1974 requirement for TOA and NOA by \$20,650,000 above requirements shown hereon.

² Assumes that the average market value of the fiscal year 1974 dollar will approximate the value of current dollars (i.e. approximately 10 percent below the Feb. 12, 1973, official rate). Fiscal year 1974 expenditures are estimated as \$70,000,000 at the Feb. 12, 1973 official rate. Table reflects additional fiscal year 1974 cost of \$7,000,000 (10 percent of \$70,000,000) to cover the difference between the official Feb. 12, 1973 dollar value versus the current market value.

³ A carryover of unobligated authorization to the ensuing fiscal year is required to permit the United States to continue participation in NATO, pending enactment of the ensuing fiscal year 1975 military construction authorization. This table provides for a carryover into fiscal year 1975 of \$20,000,000 unused authorization (approximately 25 to 30 percent of estimated total fiscal year 1975 authorization requirement, based on current market value of the dollar).

⁴ Excludes requested \$20,650,000 fiscal year 1973 reprogramming (see footnote 1). Although the \$20,650,000 has been apportioned to DOD by OMB (and will therefore be shown as available as of June 30, 1973, on DOD status of funds report), obligations can not be incurred until and unless reprogramming is approved by Chairman SAC.

STATEMENT BY MR. J. T. LOVELAND, U.S. MISSION NATO

FISCAL YEAR 1974 INFRASTRUCTURE HEARINGS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before your Committee to support the proposals of the Department of Defense for an authorization of \$80 million and an appropriation of \$40 million for Fiscal Year 1974 as the U.S. share of the common funded NATO Infrastructure Program. Since fiscal year 1968, the U.S. contribution to the NATO Infrastructure Program has been funded under Authorizations and Appropriations for Military Construction Army. This program provides the facilities necessary to support NATO military forces and which are intended for common use or have a high degree of common interest. The term covers such varied items as air fields, air defense facilities, communications, missile sites, war headquarters, nuclear storage sites, pipelines, and POL depots. It does not normally cover general purpose depots, troop billets, and other logistics support facilities closely related to national standards and practices, although a one-

time exception has been made to fund such facilities from this program as reimbursement for certain of the U.S. costs for relocation from France. I will discuss this in more detail later.

The NATO commonly funded Infrastructure Program was inaugurated by the North Atlantic Council in 1951 as a follow-on to a similar program begun in 1950 by the Western European Union countries. The NATO Infrastructure program has been a most successful common endeavor, and has been credited with fostering a large part of the cohesion among the Allies. Essential military facilities costing about \$3.4 billion have been completed, and facilities worth another \$1.0 billion are under construction or programmed. The program has given NATO a network of modern airfields, an efficient system of POL distribution and storage, common communications without which the NATO command structure could not function, essential air defense warning installations, and air and naval navigational aids. By jointly financing these and other types of facilities designed to enhance the effectiveness of NATO forces, NATO nations have demonstrated in a most realistic way their determination to provide for the common defense.

Now that the program has provided most of the basic facilities required in the common defense, its character is gradually changing. The requirement for major air and naval installations has given way to the new requirement for modernization and expansion of existing basic facilities. Airfields must be improved so that they can support today's more complex aircraft. The POL system should be modified to ensure its ability to function in an emergency independently of that part of the system located in France. Progress in communications technology has resulted in dramatic changes. The NATO Satellite Communications system (SATCOM) is based on the U.S. interim defense communication satellite system. Replacement satellites (SATCOM Phase III) are programmed and funded for launch in 1975. Another example is the semi-automation and integration of NATO's early warning system to provide a control and reporting system for the air defense of Allied Command Europe. Finally, in order to make the program fully responsive to the needs of the NATO "flexible response" strategy and associated force planning, we are providing facilities to support reinforcement on the flanks, improved air defense, and conventional capabilities for NATO air forces.

The new orientation of the program is providing a large proportion of the facilities needed by U.S. forces. In particular, it supports controlled humidity storage which maintains in good condition equipment of our dual-based forces. The program also includes aircraft survival measures which were implemented by the U.S. Air Force, with the approval of Congress, on a "pre-financed" basis in order to ensure early construction.

The 1973 NATO program includes a second phase of the air weapons training facility in the Mediterranean which replaces the facility lost in Libya. It also contains vital facilities for the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean.

We have previously announced that we had made great strides in maximizing U.S. benefits from the program. The major single benefit has come from our success in persuading our Allies to share up to about \$100 million of our costs in relocating our forces from France. In effect, the Defense Planning Committee (the North Atlantic Council less France) agreed in 1969 to cost-share, under certain conditions, up to that amount if our military services can provide and justify sufficient fund requests. As reported to you previously, NATO has agreed to continue the agreement thru end of calendar year 1973 by providing funds "a priori". This permits us to use NATO money to implement construction rather than spend U.S. funds which have to be recouped after projects are completed. NATO's final installment has now been made available in Slice XXIII and U.S. services are using this money as fast as possible.

In response to U.S. requirements, NATO has agreed to automatic deletion procedures to reduce or avoid future backlogs of Infrastructure projects. These procedures apply to Slice XXI, approved in 1971, and subsequent annual slice programs. We have told you that similar procedures are being developed for application to Slices XX and prior. In fact, we expect within two or three years, to have virtually closed out all slice programs prior to Slice XXI. In this connection we have made major strides this year. Some urgency in these efforts has resulted because inflation in Europe has rendered available infrastructure funds insufficient to pay for all of the projects programmed in early years. Our Allies have endorsed the U.S. position that new funds will not be added to old Infrastructure slice programs. Thus, projects must compete for available programmed funds within each slice, or drop out of the program when funds allocated for that slice are gone.

In 1970 the NATO Defense Planning Committee approved the financing of a five-year Infrastructure program for the years 1970-1974 (Slices XXI through XXV), and agreed that the ceiling be set at \$700 million (though the U.S. and some other countries believed it should be \$840 million). The agreement provided that NATO Military Commanders would program those urgent military requirements which could be accomplished within the ceiling and report back the financial condition after programming of Slice XXIV in 1973. The ceiling of \$700 million included relocation costs from France for U.S. and Canadian forces. The cost sharing formula (U.S. share 29.67 percent) remains unchanged, but the recent devaluations of the dollar will result in a higher U.S. dollar cost.

There are two factors which serve to reduce our share of this total amount of money used in the Infrastructure Program. First, in 1970, the Euro-Group (NATO less France, Portugal, U.S., Iceland, and Canada) offered an additional \$420 million (closer to \$450 million in devalued dollars) over a five year period to the Infrastructure Program as part of the European Defense Improvement Program (EDIP) to permit urgent implementation of the NATO aircraft shelter program. This permitted early recoupment of U.S. prefinancing funds spent on this program and relieved the pressure on programmed Infrastructure money to allow funding of additional NATO Integrated Communications System (NICS) projects. When the EDIP contribution is considered, the effective U.S. share reduces to approximately 18-20 percent.

The second factor is that host nations provide the land, access roads, and utility connections for each NATO Infrastructure project. These host nation contributions are estimated to average about 13 percent of costs paid by NATO common funding. If these costs were added to the total, the U.S. contribution would drop another 3 to 4 percent.

We have also taken steps to maximize U.S. industrial participation in the Infrastructure program. During our negotiations concerning the NATO Integrated Communications System (NICS), when our Allies insisted on a sharing of the production, we insisted on modifying the NATO rule which allowed host nations to include taxes and customs, in their comparison of bids (even though NATO did not have to pay these levels), thus favorizing local or regional firms. The final agreement gave us satisfaction on the taxes and customs issues and guaranteed that 38 percent of the production would be carried out by U.S. contractors, with a possibility of as much as 58 percent, depending on the competitive strength of U.S. industry. Recent dollar devaluations will help maximize U.S. industry's participation. Secretary Laird also told his DPC colleagues that he expected the new policy on bid comparison to be extended to the remainder of the Infrastructure program. Negotiations are now underway and we expect success shortly.

We continue to enjoy a greater benefit from this NATO program than could be expected from the size of our contribution. If we exclude facilities which are used in common by all nations—facilities which would in any case have required common funding—we have had significant success in convincing NATO that US projects are worthwhile. In 1968 we informed you that Slice XVIII included US projects in the amount of 40 percent of all projects for use by national forces. In Slice XIX this percentage rose to 47 percent for Slice XX to 55 percent; for Slice XXI, 68 percent; for Slice XXII, 58 percent; and 59 percent for Slice XXIII. In the six annual programs, therefore, well over 50 percent of all national user projects were programmed for benefit of US forces, but our formal contribution remains at 29.7 percent of the entire program. It is apparent, therefore, that we have a distinct financial interest in the continuing success of the NATO Infrastructure Program. As long as we can fit our national programs into the available common funds, the US will benefit directly from this NATO effort. In addition, Secretary Laird proposed last December a new category of Infrastructure projects in support of "stationed forces". We are exploring with the US military authorities the best way to take advantage of such a new category. We would hope to expand it to include many of the items such as warehouses and other logistic support facilities which are now ineligible for NATO funds.

A word about the prospects for the Infrastructure Program in the remainder of this decade is in order. As a result of inflation, an insufficient initial allocation of money, the need for more sophisticated equipments, and various delays in production and construction, none of the funds approved in February 1970 for the 1970-1974 period remain for Slice XXV (1974). To prevent a hiatus in the Infrastructure program, additional funds (estimated at \$180 million, of which the US share is 29.6 percent or \$53 million) are required for Slice XXV to meet the most urgent military requirements. On 17 November 1972, Secretary Laird

advised the Chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees that we would support an increase in the current five year program (Slices XXI-XXV) to Slice XXV. The NATO Defense Ministers agreed to the US position at their December 1972 meeting. In addition, the Ministers agreed in principle to a continuation of the program in the period 1975-79 and instructed the NATO Military Authorities and the Defense Planning Committee to work out the details. The DPC in Permanent Session is working out necessary financial arrangements and will report back to NATO Ministers in June 1973.

I should like now to describe briefly, first, the NATO system for processing Infrastructure projects, and second, how the US Mission to NATO (USNATO) arrived at its estimate for US obligations for Infrastructure.

Each year the Major NATO Commanders draw up a list of construction or modernization projects which they consider essential for the support of their forces. These projects are reviewed by all participating nations within the NATO Military Committee, the NATO Infrastructure Committee, and finally within the Defense Planning Committee (which is the North Atlantic Council without France). The projects finally selected make up the yearly Infrastructure Program or Slice. In the US, each proposed annual slice is reviewed thoroughly within the Executive Branch, starting with the interested US subordinate military commands and continuing through the US Commander in Chief, Europe, and the Commander in Chief, Atlantic, to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Military Departments, the Department of State, and all interested offices within the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The final NATO slice is really an approved list of military construction requirements and nothing more. After slice approval, the host country in which a project is to be built takes full responsibility for the work. It must obtain the necessary land (at its own expense), plan utilities connections and access roads (which it later builds at its own expense), prepare engineering plans and specifications, and develop cost estimates. When all is ready, the host country submits the project with all supporting data to the NATO Payments and Progress Committee for construction authorization and fund commitment. Before agreeing, the Payments and Progress (P&P) Committee satisfies itself that the project still represents a valid military requirement, conforms to NATO criteria, is reasonable in cost, and is in other respects eligible under NATO Infrastructure rules.

When the P&P Committee authorizes construction of an Infrastructure project, the US obligates funds from its annual appropriation for its share of that project. Let me explain briefly how we estimate our costs for FY 1974. The estimate is completed largely by the USNATO staff in Brussels because it has daily contact with our Allies on Infrastructure matters. The staff is the US agency closest to the plans and progress of the various "host" countries.

Last September, USNATO made a careful review of the NATO Infrastructure project backlog—that is, of all projects included in previously approved annual slices which had not yet been authorized by the P&P Committee for actual construction. The basic records—that is, the host country semiannual reports—were checked. Information was collated for all locations by project category and by cost sharing agreement, on the amount of money already authorized by the P&P Committee and on the amount of money remaining to be authorized. This initial step thus provided a firm base from which to start. To this project backlog USNATO then added its estimate of the contents of the subsequent slices which would require funding during fiscal year 1974. For example, Slice XXIII was approved by NATO in February 1973, and Slice XXIV is scheduled for approval this summer. From this total of project backlog plus planned projects for fiscal year 1974, USNATO then subtracted the amount of those projects which it estimated would be given funding authorization by the P&P Committee before the beginning of FY 1974, that is, before 1 July 1973. This may be shown in tabular form as follows:

(1) As of 30 June 1972, value of projects in Slices II through XXII yet to be authorized by the NATO P&P Committee totaled \$440 million.

(2) Add value of projects in Slice XXIII, approved in February 1973 \$187 million.

(3) Deduct estimated P&P Committee authorizations during fiscal year 1973 \$307 million.

(4) Total value of work to be funded as of 1 July 73 \$320 million.

(5) To this we must add Slice XXIV, scheduled for approval in the summer of 1973 \$184 million.

USNATO then applied country planning factors such as economic conditions, availability of contractor effort and pace at which Ministry of Defense construction personnel are expected to process fund requests. From this calculus, we estimate the fund requests to be approved within NATO in fiscal year 1974.

In defense of our entire request I should like to submit the following facts. In 1971, in recognition of a substantial carryover in both authorization and appropriation from fiscal year 1971, DoD requested for fiscal year 1972 only \$20 million of both authorization and new obligation authority to satisfy the estimated requirement for \$55 million of US obligations to the NATO Infrastructure program. Congress further cut these figures to \$15 million in authorization and \$14 million in appropriation. We have been able to live, precariously, within those figures only because some \$30 million of US obligations for NATO communications were slipped into fiscal year 1973. That slippage constituted a mortgage against our fiscal year 1973 funds, and we find ourselves in a position where without special additional authorization, we would have to call a halt to all future NATO fund authorizations until our fiscal year 1974 authorization has been passed by Congress. Since we have already two phases of commitment against the approved projects involved, such a delay caused by unilateral US considerations would have major political repercussions. In addition, as a result of the 12 February 1973 devaluation of the dollar, an additional \$23 million will be required in fiscal year 1973. When considered in terms of the two separate dollar devaluations in a period of 14 months (December 1971 and February 1973), the effect has been to increase US Infrastructure requirements by \$42 million. This problem has been compounded by the increasing cost of construction in Europe, approximating the 8-10 percent annual increase in construction costs in the US. Steps are being taken to utilize authorizations contained in earlier Military Construction authorizations acts, and to reprogram available Military Construction, Army funds to meet this increased NATO Infrastructure requirement in fiscal year 1973. We urge you, therefore, not to reduce either the authorization of \$80 million nor the appropriation of \$40 million for fiscal year 1974.

Even with the granting of our full request we expect to be some \$14 million short in new obligation authority in fiscal year 1974 because of dollar devaluation, European inflation, and certain projects which have had to slip from fiscal year 1973 because of lack of US funds.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, General. I appreciate your courtesies in coming this morning.

Admiral Marschall, will you be good enough to come around.

It is nice to see you again, sir.

TITLE II

GLYNCO, GA.

Admiral, first there are some questions with respect to the closing of the base at Glynco, Ga., that Senator Nunn asked me to submit to you, and I will submit these questions to you for the record.

Senator NUNN. In April the closing of the NAS Glynco, Ga., was announced. The training load, as I understand it, is to be distributed between the Naval Air Stations at Memphis, Tenn.; Dam Neck, Va., and Pensacola, Fla. Why were these particular installations selected?

Admiral MARSCHALL. In keeping with the aim of the Chief of Naval Training to improve training efficiency by reducing duplication of training resources, the training workload at NAS Glynco was distributed to locations where similar training is being conducted. The air traffic control training will be relocated to NAS Memphis where other air-related training is ongoing. The combat information center training will be relocated to the Fleet Combat Directions Systems Training Center, Dam Neck, where other command and control training is being conducted and the Navy flight officer training will be

moved and consolidated with the existing flight officer training at NAS Pensacola.

Senator NUNN. How much new construction requirements will be generated by this move? I know in this year's bill you are asking for \$10.436 million at Dam Neck and Memphis alone. Will there be more?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir, the two projects in the fiscal year 1974 program for Dam Neck and Memphis are all that is required to facilitate the relocation from NAS Glynco.

Senator NUNN. In your justification to this committee on the closing of Glynco, you give as part of your reasoning that from fiscal year 1973 through fiscal year 1978, construction costs of \$11,607,000 will be avoided. How can you consider this a savings when you are requesting almost this much for Dam Neck and Memphis this year?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The cost of \$11,609,000 was not intended to portray a position of positive net savings but only a total of the construction that was planned for Glynco that will now be avoided. With further study of the realignment actions, this number has been revised to \$9,109,000 of known construction avoided with an additional unknown savings to be obtained from contract closeout settlements. The total of construction required to facilitate the realignment actions, including fiscal year 1975, is \$10,437,000. This is for the two projects at Dam Neck and Memphis which as you mentioned are in the fiscal year 1974 program.

Senator NUNN. During the past 5 or 6 years you have requested construction authority in excess of \$10.5 million for Glynco, and about \$6.9 of this was in the past 2 years. Much of this is in various stages of completion. Was there not any coordination between those responsible for construction requirements and the base closure planners?

It seems to me if there had been, some of this waste might have been avoided.

Admiral MARSCHALL. The development of the base realignment plans and the execution of the ongoing construction programs were coordinated to the extent possible. When it became known that the Naval Air Station, Glynco, was being considered for closure, no new construction contracts were awarded. For instance, the fiscal year 1973 project for modernization of the bachelor enlisted quarters, \$1,213,000, was not awarded. The projects that had been awarded and were under construction could have been halted, however, this would have resulted in costly claims from the contractors for damages and delay of work. This was not considered practical since there was no assurance that NAS, Glynco, would be closed until the final approval was given. Consequently, no active contracts were altered pending approval of the Shore Establishment realignment proposals.

Senator NUNN. Just what is the status of the construction at Glynco?

Will the construction underway be completed, or simply abandoned? If the latter is true, will this not result in considerable contractor claims?

Admiral MARSCHALL. With the exception of the fiscal year 1972 military construction projects which were underway, one-family housing project, and one fiscal year 1973 project which was deferred, all other authorized military construction projects had been completed prior to the realignment decision.

The dispensary/dental clinic construction contract was almost complete with no savings to be gained by termination of the contract. The

contract will be completed but no medical equipment will be installed.

The projects to construct a bachelor officers' quarters and to modernize a bachelor enlisted quarters were approximately 60 percent complete. It has been decided to close out the contracts after the construction has reached a stage where the buildings are closed in sufficiently to protect against weather damage. This will protect the Navy's existing investment. The closeout of the contracts will most probably be done by a bilateral deductive change order which should negate any contractor claims. The savings to be realized by these deductive change orders is presently indeterminate.

The family housing construction contract was basically complete with no worthwhile opportunity for savings.

Senator NUNN. There are over 300 units of family housing at Glynco, with another 130 units under construction which were authorized as late as fiscal year 1972. Will these units be completed?

Won't this move generate a need for more family housing at Dam Neck, Memphis, and Pensacola?

Admiral MARSCHALL. As mentioned, the 130 units of family housing were basically complete at the time of the shore establishment realignment decision. The only construction that remained was some street paving and the installation of some minor kitchen appliances. It was decided to complete the construction and occupy the housing units until the time of base closure.

This relocation will not generate a need for more family housing at either NAS, Memphis, or NAS, Pensacola, where surplus housing presently exists. The relocation to FCDSTC, Dam Neck, will increase the existing deficit of family housing in the Norfolk area by approximately 3½ percent.

Senator NUNN. How did you arrive at an annual savings of \$9.260 million resulting from the closure of Glynco NAS?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The estimated annual savings is composed of the salaries of military and civilian positions that will be eliminated and other operating and maintenance costs that will be saved. For NAS Glynco it is estimated that 661 military and 308 civilian positions will be eliminated. This results in an estimated savings of \$5,571,000 of military pay and \$3,689,000 of civilian pay and other O. & M.N. costs. This data is based upon the number of personnel on board as of June 30, 1972.

Senator NUNN. I notice that you claim there will be a savings of 661 military personnel. Is it not true that these personnel will simply be transferred elsewhere, and are not an actual reduction in personnel or personnel costs?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The 661 military personnel represent positions that are actually being eliminated and not transferred elsewhere. A total of 1,828 other military positions are being transferred.

Senator NUNN. If NAS Glynco had to be closed, could not this training be moved to some bases where existing facilities could be used, thus avoiding expensive new construction?

Admiral MARSCHALL. As I mentioned earlier, in order to improve training effectiveness and avoid the needless duplication of training resources, every effort is being made to consolidate similar kinds of training at one location. In this case, the advantages of relocating training facilities to other activities where similar training is on going

outweighed the consideration of availability of existing facilities. As it turned out, however, the relocation of the naval flight officer training to NAS Pensacola will be accommodated by existing facilities at Pensacola and new facilities are required only at Dam Neck and Memphis.

Senator SYMINGTON. Have you a statement that you would like to make?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you be good enough, because of the time aspect, to supply it for the record?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I will supply it for the record.

[Statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE COMMANDER, NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND,
REAR ADM. A. R. MARSCHALL, CEC, USN

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: I am Rear Admiral A. R. Marschall, commander of the naval facilities engineering command. I consider it an honor and privilege to present the Navy's fiscal year 1974 military construction authorization program.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

The original new authorization request has 630.1 million dollars. This was revised by our letter of July 17, 1973 to 626.8 million dollars with the difference being made up by the addition of three amendments to prior authorization.

PRESENTATION OF REQUIREMENTS

I will depart from the procedure used in presenting the program for the last couple of years. The comparative analyses by categories of facilities and naval districts are included at the end of my statement for insertion into the record, if desired. I would like to comment on the important elements of this program and relate these elements to other Navy budgets examined by members of the committee.

I will discuss military construction projects associated with:

Strategic force (which is primarily Trident);

An all-volunteer force;

Major weapons systems;

Pollution abatement;

New technology; and

Training facilities.

STRATEGIC FORCES

Under Strategic Forces approximately 19 percent of this year's program or 118.3 million dollars has been allocated to initiate construction of a Trident refit complex and facilities for flight testing the Trident missile. The facilities requested this year are essential for meeting the initial operational capability date of late calendar year 1978 for this weapons system.

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

Projects that will assist the Navy in achieving an all-volunteer force are projects in the categories of bachelor housing, community support facilities (which are clubs, exchanges, commissary stores, and recreational facilities), medical facilities, and cold iron facilities. Cold iron facilities are shoreside utilities which enable a ship in port to shut down its boiler plant and electrical generation equipment. Projects associated with an all-volunteer force constitute 29 percent of the program.

BACHELOR HOUSING

Taking each of the programs related to an all-volunteer force in order, this year's bachelor housing program requests 80 million dollars for providing bachelor housing. The emphasis placed on bachelor housing the last couple of years still exists, with bachelor housing constituting 13 percent of this year's program.

This year's program will provide 5,378 new spaces for the Navy and 3,990 new spaces for the Marine Corps. For the Navy the program will also provide 103 new bachelor officer spaces and the modernization of 2,719 bachelor enlisted and 126 bachelor officer spaces.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT FACILITIES

Community support facilities—Navy exchanges, commissaries, and clubs—provide some benefits traditional with service life. Facilities for recreation and welfare are necessary to provide stimulating leisure activities for Navy personnel comparable to those of their civilian contemporaries. These facilities have received a minimum of authorization the last several years. The request for community support facilities is 12 million dollars, or 2 percent of this year's request.

MEDICAL PROGRAM

The medical program requested this year represents a significant increase over the program authorized last year. It has long been recognized that one of the major benefits of military service is complete medical care. There is a recognition within the Defense Department of a serious need to upgrade medical facilities so that the delivery of medical care will be improved. The quality of medical care has always remained high, but the delivery of medical care has left something to be desired for the last several years. Some of the inefficiencies in our present health care system stem from the inadequate facilities in which many of our physicians and dentists are required to practice their profession. Medical facilities that are undesirable from a professional standpoint have an adverse effect on medical officer retention. This year's program of 65.3 million dollars is 10.4 percent of the program.

COLD IRON PROGRAM

The cold iron program is directed toward reducing watch standing requirements when a ship is in port and thereby maximizing the amount of time a ship's personnel may spend with their families. The provision of utilities from the shore also provides benefits in shipboard equipment maintenance and fleet readiness. Last year 23 million dollars was authorized for fourteen projects. This year's program requests 26 million dollars for six pier and berthing wharf utilities projects, one berthing pier project, and one project for expansion of a steam distribution system.

MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Requested for major weapons systems this year is 8 million dollars, excluding Trident. The major weapons systems supported by projects in this year's program are the F-14 supersonic jet carrier based fighter aircraft, the A-7E attack aircraft, and the Mark 48 torpedo. This year's request for major weapons systems is slightly less than the 11 million dollars authorized last year. This element is significantly larger than last year when Trident facilities are included.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

This year's request for 92.3 million dollars continues an aggressive program initiated by the Navy in 1968 to abate air and water pollution at naval and Marine Corps installations. The Congress has given strong support to our requests and authorized, through FY 1973, 204 million dollars for pollution abatement facilities. The breakdown between air and water pollution abatement facilities is 53 and 151 million dollars, respectively. One unique facility this year is the provision of a facility to dispose of unserviceable ammunition that may no longer be disposed of by deep water dumping.

In looking ahead, we expect over the next few years to construct additional facilities to transfer ship wastes ashore. Based on technology now in the research and development stage, facilities will be required to control smoke and gases from jet engine test cells. Additional air, water, and for the first time noise pollution control facilities will be required to meet standards now being established under the "best practicable" and "best available" technology requirements of federal pollution control acts. In summary, we have made considerable progress with our pollution abatement programs, but we also expect a significant pollution abatement program for the next several years.

NEW TECHNOLOGY

For the element new technology, this year's program requests 23 million dollars for research, development, test, and evaluation facilities associated with underwater acoustic surveillance, communications, manned underwater systems, and coastal region warfare. This excludes 4 million dollars of RDT&E facilities associated with the Trident missile, since all Trident facilities are included under the strategic forces element. The request for new technology facilities is 4 percent of the total program request.

TRAINING FACILITIES

The Navy operates one of the largest school systems in the country. Since trained personnel are the Navy's greatest asset, the Navy is actively seeking ways to strengthen, modernize, and vitalize its training programs. Eight percent of this year's program is devoted to Naval and Marine Corps training facilities with the majority of the training program directed toward applied instruction facilities.

In the field of academic training, facilities are requested for conducting tactical command and direction systems training at two installations. At the Naval Academy the construction proposed will modernize, in consonance with the master plan, an existing building to provide classrooms, laboratories, and simulation training spaces for weapons and systems engineering courses.

SUMMARY

This year's program provides facilities for those elements with the greatest need. The projects are required this year to satisfy new and current missions and to provide facilities to modernize the shore establishment. We appreciate the past support of the committee and earnestly seek it for this year's program.

Next, with the committee's concurrence, I'll proceed with a brief description of the program modifications requested by our letter of July 17, 1973.

[A summary of the changes follows:]

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation/project	From	To	Change
NEW AUTHORIZATION, TITLE II (INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)			
1st Naval District:			
Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H.: Additional crane rail system.....	0	2, 817	2, 817
6th Naval District:			
Naval Hospital, Orlando, Fla.: Hospital replacement.....	22, 312	20, 981	1, 331
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Fla.: Systems development and test facility.....	2, 100	2, 300	200
Naval Aerospace Regional Medical Center, Pensacola, Fla.: Medical/dental support facilities.....	0	1, 084	1, 084
11th Naval District:			
Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.: Applied instruction building.....	1, 123	1, 542	419
12th Naval District:			
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, Calif.: Operational trainer building addition.....	0	430	430
Various locations (inside the United States), Trident facilities: Trident support complex and flight test facilities (phase I).....	125, 223	118, 320	(6, 903)
Net, title II new authorization changes.....	150, 758	147, 474	(3, 284)
	Authoriza- tion cost	Current working esti.nate	Change
AMENDMENTS TO PRIOR AUTHORIZATION			
Fiscal year 1971 authorization law:			
Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va.: Sewage treatment system.....	530	779	249
Fiscal year 1972 authorization law:			
Naval Air Station, Meridian, Miss.: Installation total ¹	3, 266	3, 895	593
Fiscal year 1973 authorization law:			
Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.: Bomb-loading plant modernization.....	5, 946	8, 388	2, 442
Total amendment changes.....	9, 742	13, 026	3, 284

¹ An amendment is needed primarily because of the escalation of the bachelor enlisted quarters (BEQ) project. Since there is a more urgent requirement for the bachelor enlisted quarters than the enlisted men's (EM) club, it was decided to proceed with the bachelor enlisted quarters construction and defer enlisted men's club construction until enactment of the fiscal year 1974 authorization and appropriation laws.

A book containing the program modifications has been provided for each member of the committee. By the change requested, two projects will be reduced. The projects are the hospital replacement project at the naval hospital, Orlando, Florida and the various locations, Trident facilities project.

A recent reevaluation of bed requirements at the naval hospital, Orlando, reveals that the number of beds may be reduced from 310 to 235. This reduction is feasible by the removal of the fifth floor of the hospital and will result in a cost reduction of \$1,331,000.

For the Trident facilities project, a reduction of \$6,903,000 is feasible because land acquisition requirements are smaller than were originally anticipated.

An equal dollar substitution was made for these reductions by increasing the scope and cost of two FY 1974 projects, the addition of three other projects and a request for appropriations for amendments to three prior year projects. I am prepared to provide a short description of each new or changed project or I can place in the record a short description of each new or changed project.

A new project for an additional crane rail system in the amount of 2 million 817 thousand dollars is requested at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. This project will provide a 20-foot gauge crane rail system to permit the use of portal cranes being transferred from the Boston Naval Shipyard.

A hospital replacement project at the naval hospital, Orlando, in the amount of 20 million 981 thousand dollars is requested. I discussed this previously under the reductions. The hospital replacement project of 235 beds is needed to replace an existing facility which is structurally and functionally inadequate, with open bay wards and unreliable utilities.

A 200 thousand dollar increase was requested for the systems development and test facility at the naval coastal systems laboratory, Panama City, Florida. This increase was requested to provide a parking and testing apron for conducting Navy trials on two air cushion amphibious landing craft. This is a new requirement levied on this activity and the total cost for the project is 2 million 300 thousand dollars.

Another new project in the amount of 1 million 84 thousand dollars is requested for medical and dental support facilities at the naval aerospace regional medical center, Pensacola, Florida. This project will construct a new dental clinic and modernize the existing dispensary at the naval communications training center (Corry Field), Pensacola. These facilities will be utilized for active duty dispensary and dental service and allow the vacated spaces in the naval hospital, Pensacola to be used for a newly developed family practice residency program.

For the applied instruction buildings project at the Naval Air Station, Miramar, an increase in the cost of \$419,000 was requested. This change alters the original project to provide additions to two buildings and alterations to three buildings instead of the construction of a new facility. This project is required to support the relocation of airborne early warning squadrons from the naval air station, North Island, under the shore establishment realignment program. The revised cost of the project is 1 million 542 thousand dollars.

A new project for 430 thousand dollars was requested for an operational trainer building addition at the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California. This facility addition will house two P-3C operational flight trainers. The trainers, which are on order, will be able to provide for the first time coupled-mode training by simulation instead of the more costly and hazardous in-flight training.

TRIDENT FACILITIES—UNITED STATES

For Trident facilities the original program requested 125 million 223 thousand dollars for establishment of the Trident weapons system support facilities.

Under the program change, the project was reduced by 6 million 903 thousand dollars. A more detailed land use study identified smaller land acquisition requirements than were originally anticipated. The estimated cost for the land is 5 million dollars.

Under the various locations, Trident facilities project we are, therefore, requesting at two sites 118 million 320 thousand dollars for Trident facilities construction.

SUPPORT COMPLEX FACILITIES—BANGOR, WASH.

Within the total are facilities at the Trident support site, Bangor, Washington, with an estimated cost of 83 million dollars. One requirement at Bangor is the acquisition of at most 150 acres of land to assure that the necessary explosive safety zone arcs are within government owned land. This year's project includes a covered explosive handling pier which is essential to the deployment of the weapons system and a refit pier to provide logical sequencing of construction. A weapon/navigation training building is included to permit early crew training by naval personnel at naval facilities. This will enable the navy to eliminate the more costly contractor factory crew training for all crews except those of the lead ship. The other facilities requested will initiate road and utilities construction required to assure timely utilization of Trident support facilities.

MISSILE FLIGHT TEST FACILITIES

At the Air Force Eastern Test Range, Cape Kennedy, Florida, we are requesting 35 million dollars for missile flight test facilities. The facilities to be provided are a wharf and dredging, alterations to a launch complex, missile checkout buildings, guidance and telemetry building and a lifting device proofing building. These facilities will support an initial flight test of the Trident I missile in late calendar year 1975.

AMENDMENTS

The remaining changes are for three amendments to prior year programs.

Under Public Law 91-511 (FY 1971) a 249 thousand dollar amendment is required for the sewage treatment system project at the Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Virginia. This amendment is required to correct a failure which was caused by unforeseen subsurface soil conditions in the dike of the finishing pond. Although the amendment is 47 percent of the original authorization, this type of change of this magnitude will occur occasionally even with the best design and engineering practices.

A 593 thousand dollar amendment is required for the installation total of the Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi under Public Law 92-145 (FY 1972). The amendment is required to permit award of the enlisted men's club project authorized at 714 thousand dollars. The FY 1972 bachelor enlisted quarters project generated the need for the amendment. Since the relative need is greatest for the bachelor enlisted quarters, a decision was made to proceed with the bachelor enlisted quarters, and to defer the enlisted men's club project and seek an amendment this year. The amendment which is 18 percent of the authorization total for the installation resulted from unanticipated labor and material cost increases.

For FY 1973, Public Law 92-545, an amendment of 2 million 442 thousand dollars is requested for the bomb loading plant modernization project at the Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Oklahoma. This amendment, which is 47 percent of the original authorization, is required to provide construction in accordance with new safety criteria promulgated by the Armed Services Explosive Safety Board for Structures Housing the Manufacture and/or Handling of Explosives.

PROJECT REQUIREMENT CHANGES

In addition to the above program changes, there are several projects with changes in the requirement or in the need for the project. I'll provide a brief explanation of the change for each of these projects.

PHILADELPHIA NAVAL SHIPYARD, PA.

At the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, the requirement for the electronics equipment facility project with a cost of \$735,000 was generated by the closure of the Boston Naval Shipyard and the need to perform the restoration and refit of selected electronics components for all East Coast Naval Shipyards at some other location. A recent check of the electromagnetic environment and the underwater noise level at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard disclosed that the background levels are not suitable for this facility and that it will be necessary to relocate the project to the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD, VALLEJO, CALIF.

The electronic shop alterations project at \$200,000 was requested at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard to provide facilities to accommodate the expanded workload created by the planned closure of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. A recent evaluation of the workload to be relocated disclosed that new facilities would not be required, therefore this project may be deleted from this year's program.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS INSIDE THE U.S. WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

Under the water pollution abatement facilities project, a reduction may be made in the scope and cost of the municipal sewer connection facility at the Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii. A recent examination of this project disclosed that a need exists this year to connect only the housing areas to the sewage system. The design and construction of the new city/county treatment plant has been delayed so that it will be practical to place the major portion of this project in the FY 1975 military construction program. This will permit a reduction in the family cost of \$5,868,000 and leave a balance of \$550,000 for connecting the housing areas.

AMENDMENTS, NAVAL ORDNANCE LABORATORY, WHITE OAK, MD.

A \$448,000 amendment was requested to the FY 1967 program, Public Law 89-568, for the hypervelocity wind tunnel project at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland. A recent evaluation of the project discloses that the amendment is no longer required.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement on program modifications. With your permission, we would like to have General Jannell present his statement, and then respond to questions of the committee.

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTS OF FISCAL YEAR 1974 AND FISCAL YEAR 1973 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS
(AUTHORIZATION)

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Fiscal year 1974 request	Percent	Fiscal year 1973 author- ization	Percent	Percent change
Strategic Forces:					
Trident ¹	\$118,320	18.9			
Other.....	177				
Subtotal, Strategic Forces.....	118,497	18.9			+18.9
All-Volunteer Force:					
Bachelor housing ²	79,880	12.7	\$112,233	21.8	
Community support facilities ³	12,307	2.0	13,973	2.7	
Medical facilities.....	65,028	10.4	42,440	8.2	
Cold-iron facilities.....	25,873	4.1	23,471	4.6	
Subtotal, All-Volunteer Force.....	183,088	29.2	192,117	37.3	-8.1
Major weapons systems:					
F-14 fighter aircraft.....	3,386	.5	726	.1	
A-7E attack aircraft.....	1,933	.3			
S-3A antisubmarine warfare aircraft.....			4,136	.8	
K 48 torpedo.....	1,327	.2	1,064	.2	
SSN 688 nuclear attack submarine.....			5,032	1.0	
Airborne mine countermeasures.....	1,321	.2			
Subtotal, major weapons systems.....	7,967	1.3	10,958	2.1	-8
Pollution abatement:					
Air.....	27,636	4.4	24,194	4.7	
Water.....	64,675	10.3	51,216	9.9	
Subtotal, pollution abatement.....	92,311	14.7	75,410	14.6	+1
New technology:⁴					
Research development.....					
Test and evaluation facilities.....					
Acoustic surveillance.....	4,340	.7			
Communication systems.....	4,198	.7	140		
Manned underwater systems.....	7,735	1.2	4,500	.9	
Coastal region warfare.....	2,300	.4	500	.1	
Aircraft.....			4,033	.8	
Other.....	4,655	.7	2,695	.5	
Subtotal, new technology.....	23,228	3.7	11,868	2.3	+1.4
Training facilities:					
Academic instruction.....					
Applied instruction:	6,024	1.0	17,792	3.4	
Aviation.....	16,271	2.6	16,008	3.1	
Ships.....	16,018	2.6	6,008	1.2	
Ordnance.....	2,470	.4			
Electronic warfare.....	3,982	.6	4,998	1.0	
Marine Corps.....	2,992	.5			
Operational trainer facilities, aviation.....	3,803	.6			
Other training facilities, Marine Corps.....	544	.1			
Subtotal, training facilities.....	52,104	8.3	44,816	8.7	-4
Subtotal, above elements.....	477,195	76.1	335,169	65.0	+11.1
Other operational and logistic support facilities.....	149,647	23.9	180,498	35.0	-11.1
Total, new authority.....	626,842	100.0	515,667	100.0	

¹ Excludes \$10,800,000 of planning and design funds.

² Excludes Naval Home, \$9,444,000.

³ Excludes employees parking structure, NAS, New Orleans, \$2,323,000.

⁴ Excludes R.D.T. & E. facilities for Trident and amendments, \$6,239,000.

AUTHORIZATION SUMMARY BY NAVAL DISTRICT

[In thousands of dollars]

Naval district	Fiscal year—	
	1974	1973
Inside the United States:		
1st Naval District.....	3,184	21,340
3d Naval District.....	12,695	8,375
4th Naval District.....	1,130	4,388
Naval District, Washington, D.C.....	25,043	15,000
5th Naval District.....	50,358	22,426
6th Naval District.....	85,643	77,791
8th Naval District.....	23,181	19,068
9th Naval District.....	19,908	5,255
11th Naval District.....	42,632	42,789
12th Naval District.....	23,001	40,225
13th Naval District.....	11,073	16,537
14th Naval District.....	15,694	19,484
Marine Corps.....	58,000	101,462
Various locations:		
Trident facilities.....	118,320	0
Pollution abatement:		
Air.....	27,636	25,194
Water.....	60,680	55,016
Total inside the United States.....	578,178	474,450
Outside the United States:		
10th Naval District.....	4,096	3,221
15th Naval District.....	0	5,699
Atlantic Ocean area.....	17,478	0
European area.....	8,192	15,188
Indian Ocean area.....	0	6,100
Pacific Ocean area.....	14,903	9,809
Various locations (pollution abatement):		
Air.....	0	0
Water.....	3,995	1,200
Total outside the United States.....	48,664	41,217
Classified programs.....	0	0
General support programs.....	626,842	515,667

FISCAL YEAR 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—AUTHORIZATION SUMMARY, BY FACILITIES CATEGORIES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Description	Fiscal year 1974 authorization request				Fiscal year 1973 authorization			
	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Percent	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Percent
Operational.....	\$71,938	\$333	\$72,271	11.5	\$49,319	\$2,983	\$52,302	10.2
Training.....	48,568	3,536	52,104	8.3	42,993	0	42,993	8.3
Maintenance production.....	120,460	3,317	123,777	19.8	49,921	10,210	60,131	11.7
R.D.T. & E.....	27,033	0	27,033	4.3	7,368	0	7,368	1.4
Supply.....	1,299	747	2,046	.3	7,578	1,778	9,356	1.8
Medical.....	61,203	3,825	65,028	10.4	41,180	1,260	42,440	8.2
Administrative.....	12,439	5,204	17,643	2.8	5,085	1,122	6,207	1.2
Housing and community.....	76,418	27,536	103,954	16.6	81,169	41,093	122,262	23.7
Housing.....	(63,893)	(25,431)	(89,324)	(14.3)	(72,045)	(40,188)	(122,233)	(21.7)
Comm. supp.....	(12,525)	(2,105)	(14,630)	(2.3)	(9,124)	(905)	(10,029)	(2.0)
Utilities.....	53,729	9,711	63,440	10.1	37,480	2,637	40,117	7.8
Pollution abatement.....	1 92,311	-----	92,311	14.7	2 81,410	-----	81,410	15.8
Air.....	(27,636)	-----	(27,636)	(4.4)	(25,194)	-----	(25,194)	(4.9)
Water.....	(64,675)	-----	(64,675)	(10.3)	(56,216)	-----	(56,216)	(10.9)
Real estate.....	3,444	3,791	7,235	1.2	10,702	40,379	51,081	9.1
Total.....	568,842	58,000	626,842	100.0	414,205	101,462	515,667	100.0

1 Includes \$7,080,000 pollution abatement for the Marine Corps.

2 Includes \$5,484,000 pollution abatement for the Marine Corps.

Note: Figures in parentheses do not add.

NARRATIVE CATEGORY ANALYSIS AUTHORIZATION

OPERATIONAL FACILITIES, \$72,271,000

This category represents 11.5 percent of the authorization request. It contains projects for essential aviation, communications, and waterfront operational facilities. Included are three Marine Corps projects that will provide airfield approach lighting, aircraft corrosion control facilities, and a telephone cable. Major Navy airfield projects include a runway and taxiway overlay at Naval Station, Adak, Alaska; a taxiway overlay at Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California; and an aircraft parking apron at Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece. Included in the communications area are: a satellite communications terminal at the Naval Communication Station, Wahiawa, Hawaii which will expand the existing capacity to allow for additional Communications Satellite equipment; and a communication facility with a classified mission at Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina. Other operational facilities include berthing piers at Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, and Naval Station, San Diego, California, and a wharf and dredging facilities for the TRIDENT project. Two projects will provide modernization of VLF antennas at Naval Communication Stations, Cheltenham, Maryland, and Wahiawa, Hawaii.

TRAINING FACILITIES, \$52,104,000

Training facilities included in this construction program cover a wide range of naval training activities for officer and enlisted personnel. The majority of the training program will provide applied instruction facilities; in the aviation field major projects include new flight simulators to be provided at the Naval Air Stations, Memphis, Tennessee, and Miramar, California. These new flight simulators with 6 degrees of freedom and visual motion integration will enable some of the flight hours of the jet pilot training syllabus to be transferred to the simulators with a resultant increase in safety. In addition, an applied instruction building will be provided at the Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, and an aircraft systems training buildings project will be provided at Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia.

For Shipboard personnel the training program will provide facilities for: (1) annual training of about 3,000 technicians and operating personnel who will be deployed aboard nuclear powered vessels; (2) facilities for expanding by 350 students annually the training facilities available for basic electricity and electronics training, which is a prerequisite course for training in 17 percent of the Navy rates; (3) machinist mate and boilerman training on the high pressure (1,200 PSI) propulsion plants going into the newer fleet ships. Specific major applied instruction facilities to be provided include an applied SONAR instruction building at Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia; a nuclear power training building and a basic electricity and electronics training building at Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida; and a machinist/boilerman instruction building at Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, and applied instruction buildings at Marine Corps Base, Twenty-Nine Palms, California.

In the ordnance area a training building at the Nuclear Weapons Training Group, Norfolk, Virginia, is requested to provide facilities for nuclear weapons orientation training annually of 3,800 officer and enlisted personnel of the Atlantic Fleet. In the electronic warfare area, an electronics warfare training building at Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, is requested for conducting annually advanced training for 700 electronic warfare technicians, 150 naval flight officers and electronic warfare officers, and 400 aviation electronic warfare equipment maintenance specialists. Electronic warfare is the reception of electronic signals to identify and locate enemy weapon systems; the transmission of electronic signals to decoy, deceive, or make ineffective enemy electronically controlled weapons; and the development of countermeasures, including tactics to defeat enemy measures to counter our electronically controlled weapon systems. There is a serious shortage of personnel with electronic warfare training, which makes this project very important to the Navy.

The second major area of training facilities is the academic instruction facilities. Included under this heading are the Maury Hall Rehabilitation project at Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, and the academic instruction building at Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, San Diego, California. The Marine Corps also has a project to provide combat training ranges at Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California. The training category represents 8.3 percent of the authorization request.

MAINTENANCE AND PRODUCTION, \$123,777,000

The maintenance and production category represents 19.8 percent of the authorization request. The projects will provide support to aircraft-oriented engine and avionics maintenance activities, mine assembly and torpedo overhaul shops, as well as shops to support maintenance of station facilities. The major portion of this category is for the refit facilities of the TRIDENT submarine weapons system. Two shipyard modernization projects will provide a service group building at Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, and a machine shop at Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, Naval Air Rework Facilities projects are the avionics building environmental control at Naval Air Station, Alameda, California; an aircraft final finish facility at Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida; and the maintenance hangar addition at Naval Air Station, North Island, California. Other projects include the integrated avionics shop at Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California; the mine assembly shop at Naval Magazine, Guam; the torpedo overhaul shop at Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia; the air/underwater weapons compound at Naval Air Station, Bermuda; a helicopter maintenance facility at Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida; and five Marine Corps projects which will provide a hangar addition, automotive shops, a parachute and survival equipment shop, an avionics shop, and a hangar modification.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, \$27,033,000

These projects represent an investment in our future security. This segment of our construction request, representing 4.3 percent of the total request, will provide the buildings, laboratories, and specialized test structures that are required in the conduct of a quality research and development program. The major laboratory projects are the electronics development and test laboratory at Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, California, and Phase II of the environmental health effects laboratory at Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland. The electronics development and test laboratory at San Diego is needed for effective development and "try-before-buy" performance testing of electronic command control, communications, and surveillance systems for the new guided missile frigates, destroyers, amphibious assault ships, and TRIDENT submarine. In the field of manned underwater systems, this year's program requests facilities to perform experimentation with animals to a 3,300 foot depth so that operational human diving depths may be lowered from 1,500 feet to 2,000 feet and beyond. The environmental health effects laboratory at the Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, will provide the facility for this experimentation. The laboratory will also provide facilities for personnel engaged in seeking a solution to medical problems associated with the inhalation of toxic vapors and the absorption of toxic compounds in weapon systems atmospheres. The toxic vapors or compounds are those associated with existing processes such as fueling missiles and torpedoes of the Polaris/Poseidon submarine fleet.

A facility for testing and evaluating airborne electronic equipment and systems is requested for the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland.

To advance basic research in underwater surveillance, an acoustic research facility has been requested for the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C. Undersea surveillance research has the objective of increasing the Navy's capability for acoustic surveillance of submarines. This research is directed toward techniques utilizing large, high power, low frequency acoustic energy sources and large receiver arrays. The basic research findings of the Naval Research Laboratory will be used by personnel of the New London Laboratory of the Naval Underwater Systems Center. The new engineering building requested at New London is needed for personnel engaged in the research and development of sonar systems and improved, underwater acoustic sensors for anti-submarine warfare ships. Sonar, which is an acronym for sound, navigation, and ranging, is the underwater equivalent of radar. The development of prototypes of acoustic energy transmitting and receiving (transducer) components will also be per-

formed in the engineering building. A transducer is a device for converting electric energy into sound (projector) or sound into electricity (receiver or hydrophone). Some sonars use the same transducer for generating and receiving sound. Other RDT&E to be performed in the engineering building is in the fields of the generation of spurious signals and electromagnetic silencing of jamming systems. The acoustic RDT&E to be performed in both facilities should find direct application in the TRIDENT weapon system.

At the Navy Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, an experimental diving facility is requested that will utilize the results of the basic research completed at the environmental health effects laboratory in testing and evaluating diving schedules, excursion diving, crew training, and underwater salvage operations. The experimental diving facility is a logical adjunct to the ocean simulation facility authorized in FY 1969 to provide a facility for development, test, and evaluation of the man/equipment interface in and on excursions from manned diving systems to depths of 2,200 feet.

In the coastal region warfare field, a systems development and test facility is requested for coastal technology and amphibious operations research: such as the development and testing of vehicles, sensors, and other equipment utilized in riverine operations and inshore underseas warfare; and research, development, and support of Marine Corps investigations of countermeasures for land mines, sensor equipment, and overland mobility equipment.

There is one project at the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, for an integrated electromagnetic test and analysis laboratory. This laboratory will provide facilities to conduct basic research required to develop and evaluate countermeasures against threat weapons systems such as the anti-ship cruise missile.

SUPPLY FACILITIES \$2,046,000

Supply and storage facilities include two projects for warehouses and one Marine Corps project for a cold storage and ready issue warehouse. These three projects represent 0.3 percent of the total request.

MEDICAL FACILITIES \$65,028,000

This year's program, representing 10.4 percent of the total authorization program, accelerates the replacement of World War II and other substandard medical facilities. This is a significant increase over prior year programs and will result in major improvements in the delivery of medical facilities. This is a significant increase over prior year programs and will result in major improvements in the delivery of medical care to Navy and Marine Corps personnel and their dependents. A new hospital is requested at Orlando, Florida, where the existing facilities are overcrowded, substandard, and incapable of providing the required medical services. Other projects in this category include modernizing hospitals at Great Lakes, Illinois, and Oakland, California, and Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida. Medical/dental clinics will be provided at Naval Air Stations, Chase Field and Kingsville, Texas; Meridian, Mississippi; Whiting Field, Florida; and at the Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia. At the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, two projects will provide a dispensary/dental processing facility and a dispensary/dental clinic. In this category there is one Marine Corps project for a dispensary at Marine Corps Recruiting Depot, San Diego, California. The improved delivery of medical care expected when these facilities are completed should make a significant contribution toward the goal of obtaining an all-volunteer force.

ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES \$17,643,000

The projects in this category represent 2.8 percent of the total program request. One project will provide facilities for the relocation of the Military Sealift Command to Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey, from the Brooklyn Army Terminal. An administrative complex requested at the Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, will provide administrative space for relocating the Armed Forces Entrance Examining Station from leased space in downtown New Orleans and for consolidation at one location the Naval Reserve Manpower Center, Personnel Management Information Center, and Enlisted Personnel Distribution Office. An administrative building is also requested for the Naval Technical Training Center, Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, and for the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia.

TROOP HOUSING \$89,324,000

Significant emphasis is again being placed this year on bachelor housing and messing facilities for improving the living environment for Navy and Marine Corps personnel. This year's program will provide 9,368 new spaces and will modernize 2,719 spaces for bachelor enlisted personnel. For bachelor officers, this year's program will provide 103 new spaces and the modernization of 128 spaces. The provision of modern facilities, which compare favorably with similar civilian community facilities, is considered to be a key factor in improving moral and retention of skilled personnel. This category represents 14.3 percent of the total authorization request. The Marine Corps lays great stress on the provision of modern functional quarters for their personnel with 47 percent of their portion of the authorization program devoted to bachelor housing and messing facilities.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES \$14,630,000

Community facilities are requested in order to provide for the welfare and morale of Naval personnel and their dependents, both in the United States and overseas. This category includes facilities for a dependent school addition, exchanges, commissaries, gymnasiums, theaters, and EM/CPO and officers clubs. Including two Marine Corps projects, this category constitutes 2.3 percent of the program.

UTILITIES AND GROUND IMPROVEMENTS \$63,440,000

This category makes up 10.1 percent of the total request and includes projects to install the necessary utility support for existing and programmed construction. Many systems are operating under full or overtaxed capacities and will be upgraded. A significant portion of the utility projects, approximately 43 percent, is devoted to the Navy's "Cold Iron" program which allows ships to shut down their shipboard equipment while in port, thus allowing more time for equipment maintenance and giving more opportunities for shore leave for ships' personnel. Approximately 17 percent or \$9.7 million of the Marine Corps program is assigned to utilities improvements.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT, AIR AND WATER \$92,311,000

The Navy is continuing its emphasis on Pollution Abatement by allocating 14.7 percent of the authorization request for these facilities.

For air pollution abatement the Navy has programmed 27.6 million dollars for eighteen facilities at Naval and Marine Corps installations. Eight facilities costing approximately 18 million dollars are for control of the particulate and chemical fume emissions produced in the industrial operation of coating metal surfaces. Three facilities will improve boiler plant emissions through fuel conversions. Rounding out the air pollution abatement facilities are four facilities to improve air emissions, two pipe insulation working facilities, and smoke abatement facilities for a fire fighting school.

For water pollution abatement, funding is requested in the amount of 64.7 million dollars for forty-five facilities at Naval and Marine Corps installations. A major portion of this request is for construction of pier sewers for collection of sanitary wastes from ships in port. In this, the second year of a five-year program for constructing disposal ashore facilities, there are thirteen facilities costing approximately 34 million dollars. The pier sewers are planned to coincide with scheduled ship alterations. There are eight facilities for handling of fuels and collection, treatment, and disposal of oils and oily waste products from ships and shore installations. There are three municipal sewer connections, eleven improvements to sewer systems and treatment plants, seven facilities for collection and treatment of industrial wastes, and two facilities for treatment of filter backwash water at Naval water treatment plants.

REAL ESTATE \$7,235,000

Authorization is being requested for four real estate acquisitions. These acquisitions will provide the land necessary to prevent urban encroachment.

AMENDMENTS \$5,718,000

This year's program originally requested two amendments totaling \$2,434,000. Under the program change three additional amendments were requested in the amount of \$3,284,000. The new amendment total is five amendments with a total

cost of \$5,718,000, which is less than one percent of this year's new authorization request.

Under the original program a \$448,000 amendment was requested to the FY 1967 Program, Public Law 89-568, for the Hypervelocity Wind Tunnel project at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland. A recent evaluation of the project discloses that the amendment is no longer required.

At the Navy Mine Defense Laboratory a \$1,986,000 amendment is requested to Public Law 90-408 (FY 1969) for the Deep Ocean Engineering Pressure Facility project. This amendment is required to complete the final contract, provide for the required material certification, and to pay approved contractor claims.

Under the program change amendments are required to the FY 1971, FY 1972, and FY 1973 Military Construction Acts.

Under Public Law 91-511 (FY 1971) a \$249,000 amendment is required for the Sewage Treatment System project at the Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Virginia. This amendment is required to correct a failure which was caused by unforeseen sub-surface soil conditions in the dike of the finishing pond.

For FY 1972, Public Law 92-145, a \$593,000 amendment is required for the installation total of the Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi. The amendment is required to permit award of the Enlisted Men's Club project authorized at \$714,000. The FY 1972 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters project generated the need for the amendment. Since the relative need is greatest for the bachelor enlisted quarters, a decision was made to proceed with the bachelor enlisted quarters and to defer the Enlisted Men's Club project and seek an amendment this year.

For FY 1973, Public Law 92-545, an amendment of \$2,442,000 is requested for the bomb loading plant modernization project of the Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Oklahoma. This amendment is required to provide construction in accordance with new safety criteria promulgated by the Armed Services Explosive Safety Board for structures housing the manufacture and/or handling of explosives.

STATEMENT OF THE ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER GENERAL, MARINE CORPS
(FACILITIES AND SERVICES) BRIG. GEN. M. T. JANNELL, USMC

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen. It is my pleasure to again have the opportunity to present the Marine Corps Military construction program. This year's authorization request reflects our continuing major effort to provide new and improved personnel support facilities. In addition, authorization to construct operational, utility and combat training oriented facilities is requested. The Marine Corps authorization request for FY 1974 military construction totals \$58,000,000. Exclusive of our aforementioned request is \$7,550,000 for pollution abatement projects at Marine Corps installations.

In addition to the appropriation dollars requested, the Marine Corps requests \$3,156,000 authorization only, for the acquisition of interests in lands contiguous to the Marine Corps air station, Yuma, Arizona, to be accomplished through exchange of excess Department of Defense Real Estate. The acquisition would provide encroachment protection of the air station which would assure unimpaired mission accomplishment, in addition to protecting the potential homeowner against overflight hazards and high noise levels.

The backbone of our \$58,000,000 request before this committee is concentrated in our concern to satisfy deficiencies in bachelor enlisted quarters and other personnel support facilities. The remainder will provide certain urgent operational facilities essential to our readiness posture. Our personnel support projects represent 54 percent of this \$58 million. \$25.4 million will provide room configured housing facilities and three modern messhalls for our bachelor enlisted marines. Additionally, \$5.9 million is requested for a gymnasium, commissary, and a dispensary, which will provide needed recreational and personnel welfare facilities.

The Marine Corps has dedicated a major portion of its construction efforts to bachelor housing facilities, for the past five fiscal years. We are convinced that the provision of modern and reasonably comfortable living accommodations for our bachelor marines is in the best interest of both the marine and the corps. In view of this conviction, we will continue to place personnel support projects to the foreground until we feel we have provided a reasonably sound functional physical plant for the needs of our men and women.

With the exclusion of the aforementioned \$3.2 million request for acquisition of interests in lands at Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, the remaining \$23.5 million authorization request provides \$2.7 million for utilities; \$.7 million

for cold storage warehouse; \$1.7 million for roads and vehicle maintenance facilities; \$6 million for real estate necessary for ordnance storage; \$3.5 million for a combat training complex and applied instruction facilities, and \$5.2 million for facilities in support of transfer of the inventory control point activity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia.

Gentlemen, that summarizes our program by facility category, which we believe to be a well balanced program. I shall attempt to answer any questions you may have.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

I have just a couple of queries here that I would like to ask.

TRIDENT

Admiral Marschall, the Navy is asking for \$118.320 million for the Trident support complex and flight test facilities for fiscal year 1974. Outline for us just what this will provide.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. I have an outline of Trident here.

There is a land acquisition item which is needed for explosive safety distances. And here is a training facility—

Senator SYMINGTON. How much is needed for that portion?

Admiral MARSCHALL. \$5 million, sir.

The facilities which we are requesting are the following, sir:

A covered explosive handling pier, for \$21.295 million;

A refit pier and slip, for \$14.793 million;

A first increment of utilities for \$16.827 million;

A land acquisition of 136 acres, which I mentioned, at \$5.1 million;

Site improvement, \$13.469 million;

A weapons navigation training building for \$11.392 million; and

A warehouse for \$294,000.

Senator SYMINGTON. Is this all at Bangor, Washington?

Admiral MARSCHALL. All at Bangor, Washington.

At the flight test facility at Cape Kennedy, we are asking for a wharf and dredging at \$31.345 million; missile checkout building—

Senator SYMINGTON. What is that for, the Trident?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you need to start that work this early?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, we do.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There are explosive safety distances involved down there with the new missile which we will test in the Poseidon boat. The channel is very narrow, and we are beginning to get encroachment from the outside.

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, if the Poseidon will take that missile, why do you not make this a part of your Poseidon cost, especially since there has been so much criticism of the Trident cost?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Because in reality, Mr. Chairman, it is for the Trident eventually. The total facilities here are geared to Trident.

Senator SYMINGTON. And that means you do not plan to retrofit any of the ULMS I missile in the Poseidon?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, we do; we do plan to retrofit some, but for testing only at this time.

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not follow you on that entirely, but we will skim it.

What is the total cost of the Trident base?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Trident base will be approximately \$550 million, sir; \$543.3 million is the figure.

Senator SYMINGTON. Last year it was going to cost considerably more than that. Why the heavy reduction?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We were able, during the last year, to cut down on certain ancillary features we feel the current program is really the hardcore. We eliminated depot level submarine maintenance at the support complex site and transferred that to the existing shipyards. We reduced facility support levels from 15 to 10 ships, which is now our plan. A reduction of land has had a major impact.

Senator SYMINGTON. And you are here today telling us that, to the best of the Navy's knowledge, the total cost of this base included in the Trident program is \$543 million, is that correct?

Admiral MARSCHALL. If the program were to go as we have outlined it, yes, sir, this is to the best of our knowledge.

If we were to have a postponement of some of the facilities, there would naturally be some cost escalation.

Senator SYMINGTON. Like what?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think, Mr. Chairman, that were we to cut the figure now, we would probably add substantially to the program.

Senator SYMINGTON. If you cut what figure now?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Excuse me.

The price would get up to about \$560 million, based on escalation, if we had substantial deferrals from the fiscal year 1974 MILCON program.

We did not include family housing in this \$543.3 million total because that is a separate item entirely. We have never considered the family housing as part of the Trident.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you need family housing?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We will need family housing.

Senator SYMINGTON. How much do you think you will need?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We probably will need something on the order of 1,400 units, phased in over several year periods.

Senator SYMINGTON. And how much money is that in total, 275 times 1,400?

Captain REED. It would be roughly about \$4.7 million.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, captain.

To the best of your knowledge, these are all the expenses involved in the construction for the Trident base?

Admiral MARSCHALL. To the best of our knowledge, yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And your estimate is—you see, last year the outlook was around a billion dollars, so you have now cut it in half. We do not quite understand that, especially since all the costs have been going up in practically everything.

Admiral MARSCHALL. When you are able to cut functions, you can cut costs. As I say, we did cut several functions out of what we wanted originally.

Senator SYMINGTON. But what you are really doing—I cannot believe the Navy would be that far off in 12 months on an estimate of a base for any thing. And so what you are really doing is transferring some of the functions to other bases, are you not?

Admiral MARSCHALL. What we are doing is just that, Mr. Chairman, we are transferring this depot level maintenance to the shipyard.

Senator SYMINGTON. But you will have the additional cost in that shipyard, will you not?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. This is in the existing shipyard at Puget Sound. And we will not need the facilities over at Bangor. It was the result of a good inward look by the Navy.

Senator SYMINGTON. You see, I am not criticizing at all, but on record you are going to have to stay on standby, and, as you know, the Trident has been the subject of tremendous discussion. The only committee that has ever studied it in any real detail in the Senate is the subcommittee which unanimously recommended against it last year and was overruled, and unanimously recommended against it this year, and it was overruled by the full committee.

So you are going to have a floor fight on this, you will have it this year, and every year for some years to come, in my opinion.

Therefore, I think it is very important that we get the cost of the base, an accurate figure, at this time; otherwise it will come back and haunt you. Last year it was \$1 billion, and this year it is \$500 million.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. I am fully aware of the way that developed. Naturally, when one group of people requests something that it feels is highly desirable, they become strong advocates. And it was a process of whipping the advocates, so to speak within the Navy.

The reduction was not imposed on us from outside at all, it was a very, very hard inside-the-Navy look, to ascertain just what it was we needed, a bare bones approach.

Senator SYMINGTON. Actually, that is close to \$2 billion, because at that time you figured you needed two bases, one in the Atlantic and one in the Pacific; am I correct?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, at the time I participated in this, there was the thought of only one at this time, and probably one at some future date, far down in the future.

Senator SYMINGTON. But now the testimony, as I understand it, is that you do not need a base in the Atlantic.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We do not need a base in the Atlantic at this time, no, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. We understand that the testimony of Admiral Lyon was that even if you went to 20 Tridents you would only need the one base.

Admiral MARSCHALL. If we went to 20 Tridents, we could accommodate the 20 Tridents at this particular base in Bangor.

Senator SYMINGTON. So there is no idea of a Trident base in the Atlantic?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Not at this time, yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. But you are not going to build more than 20 Tridents? You can only build 29 under the Moscow agreements.

Admiral MARSCHALL. All I am saying, sir, is that in the near future we have no intention of going anywhere but Bangor.

Senator SYMINGTON. And how long would you call the foreseeable future?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I certainly would anticipate within the next 20 years but that is an opinion.

Senator SYMINGTON. I am just thinking out loud.

If you get a development of 710 launchers, and 24 launches per Trident, if you had 20, which was a figure discussed in another hearing you, would have to scrap a lot of your present Polaris and Poseidon, because you could only have 14 American submarines.

Admiral MARSCHALL. At the time the Trident boat would come into the fleet until the present schedule, and should the SALT Agreements remain as they are, we would have to begin removing certain Polaris boats from the fleet. They would be reaching a 20-year life at that time.

Senator SYMINGTON. That is right. What worries me perhaps more than the cost is from the standpoint of my concept about submarines.

I do not think there has been a Member of the Congress more pro-submarines than I am, but the new Yankee class Soviet submarine has 12 launchers, and they are allowed 62 submarines maximum, or 950 launchers depending on how they want to do it.

It is hard for me to justify the rationale for the Trident, because what do you want, more submarines with less launchers, or more launchers and less submarines? To me it infringes on the whole concept of the submarine, which was dispersion, maximum dispersion. I would think the more submarines you had, the better off you would be from the standpoint of your deterrent capacity.

Admiral MARSCHALL. As you are aware sir, I am a civil engineer, not a submariner. But I am fully aware that the submariners have made a very detailed study of the optimum boat, and they came to the conclusion that the one they are going after is the one that they want from a deterrent standpoint and for cost effectiveness.

Senator SYMINGTON. I am aware of that, and I only mentioned it because it was only recently that I had heard that even if we only had 20 Tridents, according to the Navy, the testimony was that they would all be at Bangor. And my idea of defense had to do something with the idea of considering it important to defend the sealanes between here and Europe because of our troops in Europe after M plus a certain date needing reinforcement across the sealanes. Now to the next item.

WHITING FIELD, FLA.

Congressman Sikes has asked that there be included in the military construction bill \$1.4 million for Whiting Field, Fla., to provide outlying fields for helicopter training and \$831,000 for a petty officers' club at the Naval Communications Training Center, Fla.

Will you comment on these projects and tell us when they might ordinarily be included in the Navy construction program?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The item at Whiting Field, \$1.4 million, I think was programed in 1976.

This petty officers' mess at \$831,000 was in the out years, in the unprogramed years, but it is still a part of our overall plan.

Senator SYMINGTON. Please continue with your line items.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The program request at unclassified installations inside the United States totals \$578,178,000.

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL AIR STATION, BRUNSWICK, MAINE

We are requesting \$135,000 at the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine. This station supports land-based patrol squadrons equipped with P-3 aircraft engaged in all weather antisubmarine warfare operations. This project, which is the only project requested this year at the station, will provide a facility for training flight crews in the directional Jezebel sonobouy system.

This project is not a requirement of the shore establishment realignment since the realignment of Atlantic Fleet Patrol squadrons basing has been implemented, but these facilities are needed to relocate directional sonobouy trainer devices from the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, to Brunswick.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, WINTER HARBOR, MAINE

At the Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, we are requesting \$232,000 for a theater project. The activity is part of the high-frequency direction finder network and performs an antisubmarine warfare support mission vital to the security of the Nation. The theater project will provide a facility for movie, theatrical, and lecture presentations. There are no other indoor or outdoor theaters available within 50 miles of the base; and current use of the gymnasium for such purposes conflict with physical fitness programs and station athletic events.

PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD, PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

Under the program change a request of July 17, 1973, an additional crane rail system project in the amount of \$2,817,000 was requested. The facilities to be provided by this project will permit the transfer of a portal crane from the Boston Naval Shipyard and improve significantly productivity of this shipyard.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, NEW LONDON, CONN.

We are requesting \$6,158,000 for two projects at the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn. The base maintains and operates shore facilities to support two attack submarine squadrons, a submarine development group, and two deployed Polaris-Poseidon submarine squadrons.

For bachelor enlisted quarters modernization project that will rehabilitate five barracks and provide modern living quarters for 1,322 men, we are requesting \$3,372,000.

The electrical tie and distribution line project, at \$2,786,000, will provide facilities to meet increasing demand resulting from facilities expansion and a need to provide shore power to modern nuclear submarines.