will keep only his uniforms, other clothing and personal belongings in his quarters. In other words, we are separating out his gear.

Mr. SIKES. In the old days you wanted his equipment close to him, including his weapon. You think we have outgrown that stage, it is not necessary, in this modern world to have his weapon where he can get to it in a hurry?

Mr. BRAZIER. Well, sir, we have other influences on some of our decisions; but yes, sir, we think this is a more effective way to run the Army.

General COOPER. It will be immediately adjacent, not where he can reach over and pick it up. He will go by the supply room on his way to the truck to pick it up.

Mr. SIKES. Will you have ammunition there, too?

General COOPER. That is stored separately. You are well aware of the desire to keep good control over weapons. That is part of it. Also, it is easier to keep it there.

Mr. SIKES. There have been situations where men were sent out without ammunition to face dangerous situations in our own country. I wonder if the weapon and the ammunition were in reasonable proximity under the new system.

General COOPER. They are in reasonable proximity, but sometimes in the case of riots they deliberately do not give the men ammunition because of the fear or the danger they would cause. If that is the case, you might as well not give them the weapon.

Mr. SIKES. Why give them the weapon if you are not going to give them the ammunition to go with it?

I think it is a mistake in policy, but that is one man's opinion.

FUNDING REDUCTIONS

Mr. DAVIS. You have indicated $42 million has been applied to obligational authority requested in 1974 to reduce the new budget authority required from the Congress.

First of all, you mentioned $20 million with respect to NATO recoupments. Is that still your best estimate with respect to that?

General COOPER. The estimate of $20 million in recoupments for fiscal 1974 was made in the fall of 1972. At that time we anticipated a total of $44 million would be recouped; $24 million in fiscal year 1973, and $20 million in fiscal year 1974.

Most of these recoupments do come from programs which we have funded in anticipation, or we felt we needed and later on it was authorized by NATO to be covered under infrastructures.

When you do that and it later comes into the category, you get the money back. Our estimate now is that for fiscal year 1973 and 1974 we estimated originally we would get $44 million, and now our current estimate is that we will get for those 2 fiscal years $50 million.

Mr. DAVIS. Does that indicate, then, that we will have an offset here of about $6 million that will not be needed in terms of new obligational authority?

General COOPER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. You mentioned there was a $22 million item in savings in prior year programs. Is that still a good estimate?

If so, what are the sources of that $22 million?

General COOPER. The source of that $22 million was a surplus as of June 30 of about $5 million and we recouped about $17 million from Southeast Asia. As you go through the pluses and minuses since we made that estimate, we now figure there will be about $2.8 million short. In other words, we will not be able to meet the $22 million; it will be closer to $19.2 million. But there will be some other changes as we go along.

I can provide the details as to how we arrived at that number for the record.

[Information follows:]

Status of MCA funds

	Millions
Surplus June 30, 1972	$5,089
Recouped from SEA	17,100
Cancelled:	
Loc 263—Operations building	111
Loc 266—Operations building	95
AUTOVON switch (Germany)	519
Anniston waste treatment	915
Meade sedimentation lagoon	257
Awards since June 30:	
Fiscal year 1973 program savings	6,500
Fiscal year 1972 and prior overrun	−2,299
Reprograming for medical planning	−4,200
Reprograming for Korea ALOC	−1,204
Reprograming for three unfunded projects in Germany fiscal year 1973 program	−3,674
Applied to fiscal year 1974	−22,000
Present indicated deficit based on awards to date	−2,791

Mr. DAVIS. For the record, in order that we can have a little better comparative breakdown, as you have gone along in the current fiscal year, from time to time there have been reprogramings that have occurred, which would tend to throw off actual figures for 1973 as against projections for 1974, unless those reprogramings are taken into account.

Would you provide us with a tabulation of the reprogramings that have occurred in this fiscal year?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Reprogramings approved during fiscal year 1973:

(*a*) Planning and design of improvements to hospital and medical facilities—$4,200,000.

(*b*) Construction of Air Line of Communications (ALOC) Airfields in Korea—$1,204,000.

(*c*) Reconstruction and repair of facilities in the I. G. Farben Building, Germany which were damaged by a bomb explosion—$872,000.

The Appropriations Committees have also been requested to approve reprograming of $20,650,000 required to offset the dollar devaluation impact on NATO Infrastructure commitments.

SINGLE MISSION POSTS

Mr. DAVIS. Let me get into the general question with respect to construction at small single mission bases, Carlisle Barracks, Fort Monroe, Fort McPherson, Fort Greely, and so on. These estimates are, I assume, based on the assumption that these rather isolated installations will continue to be utilized for the foreseeable future; is that about correct?

General COOPER. We are restudying all of our bases, not just the small ones.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask a question?

I am puzzled by the fact that you say you are restudying utilization of bases. We have just gone through a base closure, a rather significant base closure action, which I would have assumed had already included all of the studies that would be necessitated for a number of years. Apparently that is not true for the Army, you still are not decided on the future use of some of these installations.

General COOPER. The major thrust of the study that was done this past calendar year was really in the reorganization of the Army, in which we ended up with eliminating CONARC, reducing the size of the continental armies and establishing the Training and Doctrine Command and the Forces Command. That was the major part of that study and the major effort. We did not exert a comparable effort in examining in detail each of these individual bases. We did have some base closures and realinements such as Fort Wolters and Hunter Army Air Field that came out fairly naturally. But we have not looked, on the long-term basis, at whether Fort Monroe is the best place to locate TRADOC. When we reorganized, we did not want to disrupt that reorganization by moving the people to some new base at the same time.

Mr. SIKES. When do you contemplate that the Army will have firm recommendations on the utilization of bases such as those that have been mentioned?

General COOPER. By the end of this calendar year.

Mr. SIKES. You think the Army will be in a position to recommend by the end of this calendar year, a more firm base structure than you have now?

General COOPER. I think we are, primarily, going to look at the whole thing again. We studied the installations in detail several years ago in the Boatwright study. I would differentiate among some of the small bases Mr. Davis mentioned.

There were some, even prior to doing the study, we are quite convinced are going to stay there. But some of them like Monroe, looking to the long term, we will decide on by the end of this year.

As we do the study, we will pick off information prior to the end of the year to be sure that the 1975 budget submission does not include any items that we think will fall out because of the base closure.

Mr. TALCOTT. Has the Army reorganization plan been approved by the appropriate authorities or is that going to be changed?

General COOPER. No, the reorganization was approved by the appropriate authorities and the announcement was made January 11, 1973.

Mr. TALCOTT. Is that secure?

There is no review of that?

General COOPER. There is no review of that that I know of.

Mr. TALCOTT. So the base closures and consolidation and changes are being adapted to the major reorganization of the Army?

General COOPER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. Could we have a summary of the reorganization plan put in our record? It appears that is going to relate to the base closures and all.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. I think we all are concerned, General, with respect to some of the bases, the future of which appears to be uncertain, that we are not proceeding with long-term construction projects only to discover that a decision is made that we will not go ahead with those projects, or that we will go ahead with some of them and then find that the base is going to be closed or changed in its application in such a way that it looks as if we really did not know what we were doing by going ahead and funding these things.

That is the thing we would like to have you address yourself to, with respect to some of these smaller single mission bases, in particular, and I am sure the chairman will want to get into the overall program of base utilization or base closures of which we have been informed.

General COOPER. We are equally concerned we do not spend money at bases about to be closed. It not only makes the committee who might have authorized or appropriated the funds look bad, it makes us look even worse, because we are the ones who make the presentation. So we would agree with you in principle.

When we worked up the 1974 budget we tried to eliminate construction projects where we thought the base itself might be in doubt, for the long range. Since the time the budget was originally prepared, there are a few others, not very many, which we think fall in that same category.

You can be assured that we would not proceed with the construction of any of those, assuming you appropriated the funds for them, until that study is complete on any of those particular bases.

I would like to emphasize that is a small number, not a major portion of our request.

Mr. DAVIS. I think a practical way to handle this, Mr. Chairman, might be if we did have the Secretary and the general provide our clerk here, Mr. Nicholas, with a list of those installations where there still is considerable doubt as to their future beyond, let's say, fiscal 1974. Then we should be in a position to check back with them as to the latest available information that you get from higher sources, decisionmaking sources, prior to the time that we do attempt to mark up this bill.

Mr. SIKES. Are you in position to do this?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. All right.

General COOPER. We do not want to prejudge our study. We are certainly in a position to do that and will do it.

Mr. SIKES. Very well.

Now would it not be more realistic for the committee to defer action on funding requests for the small bases until you have actually decided on their future?

General COOPER. We would prefer that you not defer action since to do so, would prejudge the outcome of the study.

Again I would differentiate among the bases. I think on an individual case-by-case basis as we go through the program, we could indicate to you those where, again referring to the small bases, we think there is a 100-percent chance that they will be in the long-term basis, those where we think there will be a 50-percent chance or those where we think there will be a 25-percent chance.

Mr. SIKES. The committee wants to work with the Army on this matter, but we do not want to fund projects at bases that are not going to be used, and I am sure you do not want us to do that.

So let's maintain close contact. You keep us advised as well as you can as to the progress of your studies; give us the best advice that you can on the bases that are most likely to remain in the program.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, may I just express another concern that I have?

Mr. SIKES. Of course.

IMPORTANCE OF MISSION EFFECTIVENESS

Mr. TALCOTT. I am fearful in this, as in other base closings and consolidations, sometimes we are going to force an important facility into an unused but inadequate base.

I can remember the time when they put the Defense Language Institute teaching facility in El Paso simply because we had an empty hangar or warehouse down there. It was not the appropriate place to put a defense language teaching facility in my judgment as well as many expert and distinguished language teachers.

With all these base closures, I have the feeling that you are going to see an empty barracks here or there and you are going to force an activity into that barracks, regardless of the long range detriment to the mission. I think we ought to be caring first and foremost about the mission that is going to be performed.

An infantry training base up in Minnesota I would think would be—I will change that, New York or Washington or some place—all I am trying to say is, without offending too many people, that we have to make sure we have the training facility in the kind of installation appropriate to it.

This worries me, that we have so much juggling to do that some of the juggling is just going to be putting a facility in an empty barracks or an empty hangar and in the long range it is going to be inadequate, inconvenient, and inefficient. It is going to cost more money in the future, we are not going to adequately support our mission and we are going to make it a less pleasant place for the military service people to work and live.

I think this attitude is prevalent right now.

General COOPER. We specifically consider, among the criteria, mission as being the first and foremost criterion. But you also have to consider, if there are large permanent facilities available someplace, how much is it worth in terms of degradation of your mission accomplishment to use those existing facilities.

That is what you have to do in considering all of this. We agree with you.

Mr. TALCOTT. I would like to know a little bit more about how you do it; how much degradation is there? What is the cost-effectiveness in each situation?

We have to be involved in that decisionmaking process, too.

General COOPER. We can certainly go over with you the criteria used in the decisionmaking. You recognize some of this is not easy to quantify. It is easy to quantify the cost of existing facilities, but not,

for example, how much poorer the teaching facility is at El Paso than at Monterery.

Mr. TALCOTT. Monterey or Washington, D.C.

Sometimes we, including you in the Army, have to be more sensitive to the individual personal needs of the soldier than we have been in the past.

A few years ago this committee suggested that you consult with wives when you were talking about family housing. You were not doing it then. You finally did it. Your family housing is much better now.

I agree with the chairman, your housing for enlisted people is a lot better. But you still refer to it as barracks and you still refer to it as family housing and family housing is pretty close to warehousing and barracks.

I just looked up in the dictionary what it says about barracks: A plain and large building such as a row of houses joined together or a barnlike structure.

You still continue to do these kinds of things in the service. In my judgment, you simply ought to be changing and be more sensitive to the individual needs.

In your testimony today, you said, 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. We ought to include where he works. That ought to be very important, also.

Then where his family lives, where his family plays, and where his family is treated when they are sick, not just him.

In other words, I think you need to try to develop a broader sensitivity to what you are trying to do. It is not simply barracks any more, it is not warehousing, it is not the soldier himself; it is the total concept.

I believe all the way through the system that you lack a sensitivity. I am not trying to be mean or ornery with you. I am suggesting when we develop these programs that we remember that all of these things are important.

Degradation is hard to quantify, but it is more important to the soldier, to the family, and the kind of a military force we are going to have than just looking down at a topographical map and saying, there is an empty hangar and we are going to force some activity into it. That is the way I feel about it. And that is the way the servicemen and their families in the service feel about it.

We on this side of the table have to reflect this sensitivity. You have to win the wars. But we have to make sure that the individual and the service family are considered.

General COOPER. I think we have to reflect that sensitivity or we will not get the mission accomplishment out of the soldier ourselves.

I think we have done that in terms of the barracks, in spite of your not liking the term. The new barracks——

Mr. TALCOTT. If you like that term, you can have it.

General COOPER. Well, we have to be careful we are not accused of using euphemisms. I agree with you it does not fit the dictionary definition. These new barracks are very nice, they have carpeting on the floor.

I will agree with you, there are some oldtimers who say you are pampering the young troops. But the Army is firmly committed to giving these troops privacy, giving them a private bathroom for every three men of the lowest grade level. That is a conscious decision, that is where most of our funds are going.

We have not yet solved the family housing problem. I do not want to mislead you that we have solved the family housing problem.

We have turned around in terms of trying to build to quality versus quantity; we design it so we have the quality features. But we are not yet in a position today where we are building what we consider today quality family housing.

Mr. SIKES. You certainly have progressed a long way from open barracks to rooms with private baths for two men. That is a very fine improvement.

I agree with what both of you have said about the subject.

Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. SIKES. Mr. McEwen, do you have any questions at this point?

COST OF CONSTRUCTION OVERSEAS

Mr. MCEWEN. Just one, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

General, you or the Secretary spoke on square-foot costs for barracks and bachelor officer quarters. How much does that differ overseas from the United States, for instance in Europe?

General COOPER. The cost?

Mr. MCEWEN. The cost per square foot.

General COOPER. We are not building anything overseas now, so we do not have any directly comparable costs.

Mr. MCEWEN. I thought you spoke about schools that you wanted, for instance.

General COOPER. Yes.

The cost factor in Germany, I do not know what it is now with the devaluation.

Mr. MCEWEN. Has that been taken into consideration, the devaluation, in your figures?

General COOPER. No, sir, not in the 1974 program.

The most recent one was not. The prior one was.

Mr. MCEWEN. Would that not be fairly substantial?

General COOPER. Well, it is going to be about an 11.1 percent increase.

Mr. MCEWEN. That is not in these figures?

General COOPER. That is not in the $12 million that we asked for in Germany.

Mr. MCEWEN. Are construction costs higher in Germany or lower than in this country?

General COOPER. That is the cost index, which I do not have right now. I would say that with the latest devaluation, the costs are probably higher in Germany than they are in Washington.

We use Washington as a geographical cost index of 1.0. The area adjustment factor for Germany is 1.20. This factor has not been revised since the dollar devaluation.

Mr. SIKES. But you not only have the devaluation, but inflation is higher in most countries than it is in the United States?

General COOPER. Inflation, is greater, that is correct.

Mr. TALCOTT. But the requirements are different in every country, too? You have to go to a different kind of school in Germany than you do in Hawaii or Japan or Guam?

General COOPER. That is right, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Last year we had quite a discussion on the number of chairs in a room. We found you were planning to put one chair in a room for four men, at that time. How many chairs are you providing now?

General COOPER. In these new barracks they will each have a chair. There also will be a sitting room cluster around these four, three-man rooms. They will each have their own chair, sir.

Mr. SIKES. That is encouraging.

General COOPER. General Kjellstrom last year went off the record to say something about this.

Mr. SIKES. General Kjellstrom, do you have an observation?

IMPACT OF CURRENCY REVALUATION

General KJELLSTROM. I wanted to come back to the increase due to currency revaluation and its impact on the Army's budget. Within the MCA appropriation, up through the 27th of April, there was a $9.6 million increase in the overseas construction requirements, and that is basically in the European area.

Within the Army overall, there is $103 million impact of the currency revaluation since the President's budget came down. Of particular concern to us is in family housing.

As you know, in the normal appropriations we have the authority to reprogram or transfer between appropriations to meet unforeseen requirements. In the family housing area, we have been forced to make adjustments within the family housing account.

For 1973 we have been forced to adjust our family housing O. & M. account by $6 million. This is primarily in Germany. Within a tight family housing account, it makes for real problems. We are anticipating we will have an $11 million impact at the present time in family housing.

I would respectfully submit that we might consider some type of flexibility in the family housing account, particularly for those unforeseen adjustments.

Mr. SIKES. The committee would like to have your recommendations spelled out on that.

General KJELLSTROM. Be very happy to, for the record, sir.

[The information follows:]

The desired flexibility in the Family Housing Account could be achieved by amending Section 735 of the DOD Appropriation Act by adding the words underlined below:

"Sec. 735. During the current fiscal year upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $750 million of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense for military functions or family housing (except mililtary construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this

authority; *Provided further*, That not less than $25 million of the authority granted in this section shall be available only for a program to substitute civilian personnel for military personnel."

ARMY REORGANIZATION PLAN

Mr. SIKES. I would like to ask that we have the basic outline of the Army reorganization spelled out for the record.

Mr. BRAZIER. Yes, sir, we will provide it.

[The information follows:]

ARMY REORGANIZATION PLAN

The Army reorganization plan consists of a series of major actions designed to modernize, reorient, and streamline the Army's organization within the continental United States. The plan is designed to improve readiness, training, the materiel and equipment acquisition process, the quality and responsiveness of management, and better support for the soldier in an era of constrained personnel and budget resources. It is estimated that the bulk of the plan will be fully implemented by December 31, 1973. The reorganization plan was considered during the formation of the fiscal year 1974 budget request. Savings associated with reorganization are not specifically identified but most are included in the operation and maintenance, Army appropriation submission under the heading of "Reduction in Civilian Employment—Army Realinement and Reorganization."

Highlights of the plan include:

Elimination of the Continental Army Command (CONARC), the Combat Developments Command (CDC) and the 3d U.S. Army;

Creation of the Forces Command (FORSCOM), a single field headquarters to supervise the unit training and combat readiness of all Army units to include the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard;

Creation of the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), a single field headquarters to direct all Army individual training, education, and the development of organizations, materiel requirements, and doctrine;

Consolidation of the Munitions Command and the Weapons Command into an Armaments Command;

Consolidation of the major headquarters elements of the Electronics Command;

Consolidation and realinement of the Army depot system;

Elimination of major administrative levels between all major Army posts and the Department of the Army;

Increased responsibility, authority, and flexibility for installation commanders;

Establishing a major active Army organizational framework organized solely to improve reserve component readiness;

Improving the quality and administration of the ROTC program;

Creation of a new command to provide improved delivery of Army health care in the United States;

Improving responsiveness to individual needs and goals in handling personnel matters with the Army;

Improving the weapons development and procurement processes by updating managerial practices and organizations in recognition of technological advances;

Elimination of 813 personnel spaces from the Army staff in the Pentagon;

Transfer of an additional 1,986 individuals from the Department of the Army headquarters staff to other commands or field operating agencies;

A reduction in requirements of approximately 16,500 military and civilian personnel spaces.

TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Tradoc commander will be headquartered at Fort Monroe, Va., previously the home of Conarc. He will concentrate on training and educating the individual soldier and officer and developing new organizational and doctrinal concepts to meet the demands of modern warfare. The reorganization will provide for more intensive management of individual training. Further, it will permit the command and its schools to play a major role in providing assistance for the training of FORSCOM's deployable units and the training of Reserve

component units—disseminating workable training ideas throughout the total Army force so as to maintain and upgrade skills of soldiers within units.

In addition to assuming command of individual training and Army schools at 22 major installations, Tradoc will absorb the combat development functions formerly belonging to CDC and Conarc. Some of the 19 previously separate branch-oriented CDC agencies, which are presently colocated with the associated branch schools, will be merged with the schools. Both combat developments and training will benefit from harnessing the wealth of experience found in the schools' faculties and student bodies and the organization charged with distilling the experience into new doctrine, organizational, and materiel requirements.

To further join combat developments to training, other existing CDC agencies and activities will be consolidated into three functional combat development centers colocated with key Army educational institutions. They are the combined arms center at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; administration center at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., and logistics center at Fort Lee, Va.

Tradoc also will manage the ROTC programs, source of 65 percent of the Army's new officers through a dedicated structure of four newly established ROTC regional activities at Fort Bragg, N.C.; Fort Riley, Kans.; Fort Knox, Ky., and Fort Lewis, Wash.

The reorganization of ROTC management enhances the capability to supervise and assist the professors of military science on the Nation's campuses by reducing the various spans of control, improving reponsiveness, and providing continuity between on-campus and off-campus (ROTC summer camp) training activities.

When fully constituted, the TRADOC organization will include about 159,000 military and 40,000 civilian personnel.

FORCES COMMAND

FORSCOM will move into 3 Army facilities at Fort McPherson, Ga. The FORSCOM commander will be responsible for combat readiness of all Active Army, Army National Guard and Army Reserve forces, such as brigades, divisions and corps in the United States and Puerto Rico. A major contribution of the reorganization to improved force readiness is [illegible] ability of the senior commander to concentrate his attention on one mission—combat readiness.

The new structure eliminates one management layer between the Department of the Army headquarters and the major tactical units by removing the Continental Armies from the chain of command in the Active Army forces and from installation management. This, in turn, permits the Continental Army headquarters to concentrate their attention on the readiness and training of the Reserve forces.

With the reduction in the scope of their missions, the Continental Army commanders will also employ considerably smaller staffs.

First Army Headquarters, covering generally the geographic areas presently assigned to 1st and 3rd Armies, will remain at Fort Meade, Md. Fifth Army Headquarters will continue to be located at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., and the headquarters of 6th Army will remain at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.

Continental Army commanders will have the support of nine Army readiness regions. Each region will be managed by a small control element which will serve as a coordination point for Army Reserve and Army National Guard readiness, trai[illegible]and support. Within the readiness region, readiness groups—consisting of branch, maintenance, and administrative teams and other specialists—will assist reserve units. Most battalion level advisors will be withdrawn from current single-unit dedicated status and placed into the readiness groups to capitalize on branch and functional expertise. Geographically isolated units will retain single-unit advisors.

FORSCOM will number some 219,000 Active Army personnel and 660,000 personnel in Reserve component units.

ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

The key action involving the Army support structure is the organizational realinement of the Army Materiel Command (AMC). These actions will improve the organizations on which the Army depends for the design, development, procurement, distribution, and support of its combat and support materiel.

Actions within this over-all reorganization include the consolidation of the Munitions Command and the Weapons Command into a single command, the

Armaments Command at Rock Island, Ill. This action will effectively merge the currently splintered "guns and bullets" responsibilities within AMC and increase the use of available resources.

Another project within the over-all AMC reorganization is the consolidation of elements of the Electronics Command headquarters located in Philadelphia, Pa., with the bulk of the headquarters located at Fort Monmouth, N.J. This consolidation will eliminate the present geographical dispersion of major Electronics Command organizations, improving necessary day-to-day coordination and management efficiency, and providing substantial manpower savings.

The Mobility Equipment Command in St. Louis, Mo., will be converted into the Troop Support Command and dedicated primarily to improving the personal equipment and environment of the individual soldier. Initially, Natick Laboratories and other personnel equipment related activities will be assigned to this command. Later, responsibilities for material handling equipment, construction equipment, and industrial engineering will be transferred to the Tank/Automotive Command in Detroit, Mich.

A realinment of the Army depot system, reflecting managerial improvements and reduction in workload will be accomplished. These actions will result in a change in mission and a force reduction of the Atlanta Army Depot, Atlanta, Ga., and a reduction in the level of activity at Umatilla Army Depot, Ore.

OTHER MAJOR ACTIONS

In the area of health care, a U.S. Army Health Services Command will be established at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., to provide a single manager for Army medical activities in the United States. The new command will perform medical supervisory functions consolidated from a wide variety of sources, which include the Office of The Surgeon General (Army) in Washington and headquarters of CONARC, 1st, 3d, 5th, and 6th Armies.

Concurrently, all medical service schools and the medical training center will merge into an Academy of Health Sciences, under the Health Services Command.

The ABM Treaty and 1972 congressional actions limiting the SAFEGUARD program to one site require a consolidation of some activities and reduction in overall personnel strengths to support the site now under construction in North Dakota and on-going research and development production and testing.

The merger in place, with concurrent reduction in strengths, of the U.S. Army SAFEGUARD Systems Command and the SAFEGUARD Logistics Command at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala.

The disestablishment of the SAFEGUARD Central Training Facility at Fort Bliss, Tex.

A reduction-in-force of the U.S. Army Engineer Division, Huntsvile, Ala., and Malmstrom, Mont.; U.S. Army SAFEGUARD Communication Agency, Fort Huachuca, Ariz.; and U.S. Army SAFEGUARD Evaluation Agency, White Sands Missile Range. N. Mex.

Another action within the reorganization is the accomplishment of the long-sought Army objective establishing a one-stop personnel center for its officer and enlisted personnel. Establishment of the Military Personnel Center in Alexandria, Va., combines personnel assignment career planning, counseling, automated accounting and other personnel-related functions currently fragmented throughout the National Capital region.

Other changes include:

Relocation of Recruiting Command Headquarters from Hampton M/Roads Va., to the more geographically favorable mission-suited location at Fort Sheridan, Ill.

Assumption of the responsibility for installation communications-electronic support throughout the continental United States by the Strategic Communicaions Command.

Continuance of the reorganization of the Army Intelligence Command with a further manpower reduction and moving the Intelligence Command Headquarters from Fort Holabird, Md., to Fort Meade, Md.

Reduction in size of the U.S. Army Chemical Corps and eventual merger with the U.S. Army Ordnance Corps and disestablishment of the U.S. Army Chemical School at Fort McClellan, Ala.

Expansion of the Strategic Tactical Analysis Group in Bethesda, Md., into a Concepts Analysis Agency so as to provide the Department of the Army with a capability to analyze and study requirements and alternatives for new materiel systems and new force designs and operational concepts. This agency will com-

plement the recently activated Operational Test and Evaluation Agency established at Fort Belvoir, Va., which is designed to provide independent analysis on operational tests so as to improve procurement and force management.

Relocation of the U.S. Military Academy Prep School from Fort Belvoir, Va., to Fort Meade, Md.

ASSISTANCE TO AFFECTED EMPLOYEES

Civilian employees affected by the reorganization will be afforded entitled benefits under the Department of Defense stability of employment program, Civil Service Commission displaced employee program and re-employment priority list. They will be given priority consideration for vacancies occurring where they are now employed.

Travel and transportation expenses will be allowed for career employees who must be relocated to other geographical areas. The local offices of the Civil Service Commission, State Employment Service offices and business firms will be solicited for assistance in locating employment for those needing such assistance.

A Personnel Coordination Center, consisting of representatives of the Office of Personnel Operations, Director of Civilian Personnel, and the U.S. Army Personnel Information Systems Command, has been established to monitor all military and civilian personnel actions associated with the reorganization. Goals of the center are to: Provide personal consideration to affected personnel and their families, achieve minimum movement of personnel within and between commands; and serve as a DA headquarters coordination activity to ensure a smooth transition to the new continental U.S. Army structure.

Mr. SIKES. Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

CAMP DRUM FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I hope that when we have the new family housing completed at Camp Drum it may be as attractive and as well-constructed as these photographs we have been looking at of the new enlisted men's barracks.

Mr. SIKES. Are you in position to discuss the Camp Drum situation now?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

After our meeting last week we arranged a meeting with Mr. Fliakas in the Office of Secretary of Defense to discuss the fact that in order to award Camp Drum, we would not be able to award Grand Forks.

We made a proposition to him which would provide almost the same quality in the housing at Camp Drum you were talking about of the new barracks. So we have tentative approval from Mr. Fliakas to proceed and we are proceeding on that basis.

This will require, if we are going to provide housing at Grand Forks, that we get a change to the authorization just for Grand Forks, because otherwise we will go over the $24,000 authorization limit.

We will ask that Congress provide that. We have done that once before.

Mr. SIKES. That is for Grand Forks?

General COOPER. That is right.

Mr. SIKES. You will be able to go ahead at Camp Drum?

General COOPER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SIKES. When can you do that?

General COOPER. Well, we have open bids by the contractors, and I am not sure exactly but it will be within 1 or 2 weeks. We have to move out quickly because the construction season is on us.

Mr. McEwen. Mr. Chairman, may I say that we have had a break in the weather this year. After a rather mild winter and an excellent spring; it is a time when it is inviting to get construction started.

General Cooper. We have the open bids and we are in the process of negotiating with the contractor now.

Mr. Sikes. The committee is very concerned about this because we know how bad the housing situation has been at Camp Drum. Will you pursue this vigorously and will you advise the committee step-by-step of what happens?

General Cooper. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sikes. Gentlemen, we will reconvene at 2 o'clock.

Thank you very much.

After Recess

BASE UTILIZATION AND BASE CLOSURES

Mr. Patten. Last year in its report on the fiscal year 1973 military construction bill, this committee included the following language:

The committee directs that the office of the Secretary of Defense and the military services develop firm criteria for base realinement actions and furnish these to the committee during the hearings on the fiscal year 1974 request. Furthermore, in connection with future base realinement actions, the committee will expect Department of Defense witnesses to be able to justify their base closure decisions on the basis of these criteria.

In addition, I would like to include in the record at this point the language in the committee's report explaining why such criteria are necessary.

[The language follows:]

The committee has attempted, in past years' hearings as well as during the hearings on the fiscal year 1973 military construction request, to establish what criteria are used in evaluating proposed base realinements. Also, numerous questions have been directed at future utilization of certain installations or classes of installations. In the fiscal year 1973 hearings more than 75 such questions were asked. Department of Defense witnesses were not able to be very frank and informative in their answers. This makes it more difficult for the committee to examine and evaluate the assumptions and criteria upon which base closure actions will proceed. The committee feels that the difficuly in providing facilities at numerous military installations while base closure actions are in the offing is not that projects will be built at bases which are being considered for closure, but that unless firm decisions are reached, announced, and implemented, guidelines may shift in a way which will cause the closure of bases which had been considered to be firm. The reluctance of Department of Defense witnesses to provide current guidelines greatly hinders the ability of the committee to act in a foresighted manner in this regard.

Mr. Patten. Are you ready to provide these criteria to the committee and to discuss them in relation to your recently announced base closure package?

General Cooper. Yes, sir.

[Information follows:]

The Army's Criteria for Base Realinement Actions is provided.

CRITERIA FOR BASE REALIGNMENT ACTIONS

1. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to present the criteria and major considerations used within the Army to determine which bases and activities should be consolidated, reduced, realined or closed.

2. Background

(*a*) Army missions involve the accomplishment of a wide variety of functions requiring both general and specialized accommodations. The base structure varies from administrative office space to production/rebuild plants; from troops bases with tens of thousands of acres to small complexes in urban areas. As missions and the size of the Army vary, so do the requirements for bases and facilities.

(*b*) The Army continually reviews its missions, strength and structure and, concomitantly the base structure requirement to insure that it is in proper balance. Some requirements are relatively fixed because they support more stable missions such as military schools, research and development activities, materiel testing and specialized depot activities. These bases may experience variations in workload, however, the need for the bases, and their physical plants, is a continuing requirement. On the other hand, some Army missions are subject to large variations and may either generate additional requirements or reduce requirements for bases. Examples are training centers for basic and advanced individual training, aviation training facilities, production facilities, administrative space to support specialized activities and troop unit bases.

(*c*) The Army also reviews its missions to determine where and in what manner it can consolidate, realine and reduce resource requirements and still operate efficiently. This review may or may not result in a change in the base structure.

(*d*) Inherent in these analyses are consideration of the following criteria (not rank ordered):

Mission requirements
Budget/manpower constraints
Cost savings
Personnel turbulence
Civilian labor market
Facilities/housing availability
Capital investment (sunk cost)
Geographical location
Land area
Impacts on other services/agencies
Community impact
Environmental impact
Reserve components support
Mobilization and contingency requirements
Encroachment
Long range plans

(*e*) The Army does not wish to convey that the analyses will produce clear-cut advantages for proposed realignments vis-a-vis related alternatives. This is not always the case. Decisions are often charged with great emotionalism for the decisionmakers, the public and Congress. There are formidable realities that must be confronted. Some examples follow:

(1) *Investment in facilities.*—The decisionmaking criteria often work at cross purposes to one another. On the one hand, the Army is short of permanent facilities in every construction category; and, if a base is to be closed, it usually means walking away from some permanent facilities. On the other hand, if the missions performed at that post can be performed satisfactorily by consolidating them with missions at other posts, then substantial overhead savings could generally be realized.

(2) *One-time realinement cost.*—A factor complicating the execution of realinement actions, regardless of the long range savings associated with the actions, is their one-time costs. These costs must be amortized within a reasonable period of time.

(3) *Emergency expansion.*—The Army often finds itself in a "crossfire" with respect to base management and pressing facilities requirements. In some cases, the urgency of the moment forces the Army to adopt courses of action which run counter to the long range (peacetime) objectives. For example, during the Vietnam war the Army expended funds on aviation facilities at a number of bases, all of which will not be required by a peacetime Army.

3. Mission requirements

The base structure of the Army exists to support Army missions. These missions are influenced by many factors, for example, strategy, budget, force level, Department of Defense guidance, weapons systems, new technology, et cetera. As

mission changes occur, an analysis of the resources, including bases, allocated to accomplish that mission is made by the Department of the Army staff agency having proponency for the mission. Existing resources are weighed against the new requirements and adjusted accordingly. It is here that those bases no longer required for accomplishment of the changed mission are most frequently identified. It is there that the economies of consolidation, realinement or reduction in scope of operations are identified. The ability of each base to meet the unique operational and training requirements of the assigned force or function is of paramount importance.

4. Budget/manpower constraints

These constraints permit retention of only the minimum number of bases; demand the avoidance of costs for unnecessary personnel relocations; and militate against construction at those bases with limited land area and outmoded, old, functionally inefficient facilities requiring large investments for replacement facilities. Significant annual savings may result from the closure of such bases. Consolidation of missions on a single multimission base which subsequently results in a base closure generally produces significant annual savings. However, these savings are offset in some instances by additional investment at the gaining base. Additionally, one-time relocation costs become a factor. In evaluating the budget implication of base realinements it is necessary to weigh initial and annual savings against the one-time construction and movement costs of the various options. In general, large outlays in construction or equipment funds are not feasible and options which depend on such outlays are avoided unless no other viable alternative exists.

5. Cost savings

The objective of the Army is to accomplish the assigned mission at the least cost. Where alternatives exist it is essential that the least cost, both in terms of dollars and manpower, be selected. The decisionmaker must not be lulled into thinking that the proposed action will save an amount approximately equaling the base's operating budget and military pay if he closes the base. In cases where the mission requirement for the base is eliminated, a savings equaling the operations cost prior to phasedown and closure cannot be achieved. As the activity phases down, fewer plumbers, carpenters, supply clerks, et cetera are needed and utility costs also decrease. Those savings would be realized with or without closure. In cases where the mission is not eliminated the savings at the base to be closed must be offset by the increased costs at the base, or bases, assuming the mission to determine net savings. In this connection, a base function easily overlooked is that of area support. Many bases provide support to the Reserves, ROTC, recruiting activities, air defense and a host of other Army and other service activities in the geographical area. Although it is feasible to provide many of these services from another location, or through contract, these alternatives carry offsetting costs.

6. Personnel turbulence

The adverse impact of military and civilian personnel turbulence must be given significant consideration because of both the high cost and the adverse effect on morale.

7. Civilian labor market

Many Army missions involve utilization of a highly specialized and unique civilian work force. Many of these people establish deep roots in the local community and are reluctant to dislocate with the transfer of the functions they perform. The lack of appropriate labor market thus becomes a factor in evaluating proposed realinement actions.

8. Facilities/housing availability

Maximum utilization of existing Government facilities with minimum expenditures for new facilities is the primary goal in realinement actions. This includes both mission related facilities and support facilities. The facility types that are of prime concern in base realinement actions vary dependent on the mission under consideration. For combat and combat-support units, the firing ranges, vehicle maintenance space, parking area and maneuver area are of major concern in evaluating realinement proposals. Conversely, for administrative and headquarters activities, adequate administrative space is essential. For training activities, classroom and student housing are key factors. For all actions, availability of housing (bachelor and family) is a significant element. However,

facility availability varies in importance and influence on base realinement actions. In some cases, mandatory requirements exist. For example, adequate firing ranges and maneuver area are an absolute requirement for combat and combat-support units. Certain unique facility requirements are generated by intelligence, communications, logistical, and research and development activities. Relocation of these functions which do not have facilities available to accommodate them may not be feasible due to the cost of new facilities. Also, due to mission requirements, the required facilities must often be available prior to transfer of the function. This can often be expensive in terms of delay in savings to be realized as well as redundancy in equipment and facilities. Additionally, in considering bases for closure, the overall condition of the real property facilities at the base is an important element in the selection process. Relocation of an activity housed on a base with considerable substandard facilities—both prime mission as well as support—may be most effective even if certain facility criteria cannot be initially met. Over a period of time provision of a few additional facilities could prove economically beneficial as opposed to a large expenditure for expensive replacement facilities at the former base. An additional facility consideration is the extent of area support to other bases. For example, if a base provides hospital, housing, and other support facilities for surrounding bases, then it may not be possible to completely close the base. As a result, savings from the realinement are significantly less than at a base where all activities can be shut down and facilities declared excess.

9. Capital investment (sunk cost)

Realinement actions are designed to achieve the best utilization of permanent facilities at large, multimission bases. If relocation of a function or mission requires new construction of duplicate facilities, then the cost reduction sought must be carefully weighed against movement and construction costs that result from the propsed realinement. This consideration is especially important in view of the shortage of construction funds and the large construction backlog. Where mission changes dictate relocation of a particular function utilizing permanent facilities at a large, multimission base, attempts are made to backfill the vacated facilities with other compatible activities from small, single-mission, high cost bases or from leased facilities.

10. Geographical location

The geographical location influences the ability of assigned forces to execute their mission. Weather, terrain, vegetation, proximity to strategic airfields, transportation networks, et cetera, all contribute to retention of bases which enhance operational effectiveness. In some cases certain mandatory elements may present themselves. For example, basic combat training and aviation training require good weather in order to maintain course schedules. Combat and combat-support training activities require appropriate firing ranges and maneuver area. Each type unit has its unique requirements. A geographical location which is adequate for the training of the infantryman would not necessarily be adequate for the training of tank crews.

11. Land area

The need for adequate and suitable land area to support major combat units and their supporting forces is a major consideration. Bases must be capable of supporting the readiness and deployment of the assigned forces as envisioned in the U.S. strategy. This requirement often determines which bases will be retained in the active inventory. Where mission compatibility can be achieved, the consolidation of activities at large, multi-mission bases, takes precedence over utilization of small, single-mission bases.

12. Impact on other services/agencies

The Army provides support to many units and activities of the Department of Defense, the other services, and other Federal agencies. Inherent in any base realinement action is consideration of the impact on these agencies. The personnel turbulence and costs associated with relocating or supporting these type activities are an integral part of any analysis conducted.

13. Community impact

Civilian support resources (e.g., community housing, medical, schools, and recreational facilities) are a consideration in developing base realinement actions. Of particular importance is family housing. Areas which have residual capability to adequately house families negate the cost of providing Government

housing and facilitate rapid completion of the proposed action. Adequate support should exist on or off a gaining installation to avoid a realinement action being counterproductive in terms of morale. Since personnel support capability on our installations is limited, the contribution of the civilian community in this area is important. Conversely, realinement actions, which reduce the Army presence in an area, seriously impact on communities, particularly those in which the major source of the economic base is the military installation. When possible, realinement actions are designed to minimize the impact on local communities. Where appropriate, assistance is provided to local community leaders in their negotiations with the Office of Economic Adjustment, Department of Defense, whose function is to assist communities in reestablishment of an economic base where reduction in Defense expenditures has been severe.

14. Environmental impact

All actions must be assessed to determine their impact on the environment. Base realinement options must have an initial assessment during the preliminary planning. If significant environmental impact is indicated, or the action is determined to be controversial, at either a gaining or losing base, then an environmental impact statement must be prepared.

15. Reserve components support

The increased emphasis on utilization of Reserve component forces to meet future contingency requirements must be considered. Reserve units are generally constituted in areas where there are population resources. Their readiness depends upon availability of adequate ranges and training areas. This requires that the range facilities and training areas not only be of the proper size and configuration, but also that they be within reasonable commuting distance. Readiness is adversely affected by increased commuting time and corresponding decreased training time availability. Concomitantly, personnel job satisfaction is lowered and personnel recruiting and retention rates decreased. Many of our bases, both active and inactive, are used extensively for support of these units, both for weekend training and annual summer training. The impact on these type units is an integral part of any analysis conducted.

16. Mobilization and contingency requirements

The type and number of bases required are determined by the need to be capable of supporting the strategy directed by national policy, the operational and training requirements of the Army, and the retention of sufficient flexibility to support unprogramed increases in troop strengths. Coupled with this is the uncertainty as to when a base might be needed again. The costs of inactivating and reactivating a base can offset savings derived from its closure. Although we hope that we are entering upon a prolonged period of peace—a hope and expectation which is not unlike that after World War II and the Korean war—any decision to inactivate a base, whether it is retained in standby status for mobilization and contingency requirements, or is disposed of, is made without positive assurance that the decision—in the long term—will prove to be a good one.

17. Encroachment

Urban and airspace encroachment into vital areas surrounding installations is of continuing concern. Some installations which were originally remote have attracted major population growth and, as a result, continued operations have been threatened through urban expansion. Civilian aviation activity has served to restrict the airspace available for military operations. Encroachment, therefore, is an element in determining the future viability of an installation. Currently, programs to protect installations from encroachment are being instituted. These are comprised of efforts to obtain properties adjacent to bases so that only activities compatible with military operations will be developed in these areas. It is also possible that major weapons changes may bring about encroachment "from within." For example, ranges now adequate for artillery firing, may become too small for artillery weapons which may be introduced in the future. However, where encroachment has become a problem, its impact is considered during development of base realinement actions.

18. Long-range plans

Since the future forces cannot be predicted with certainty and are subject to unprogramed changes, flexibility to accommodate these changes within the base structure should be preserved when possible and economical. This entails de-

veloping reasonable assumptions on what unprogramed force changes might occur and determining how the various options could support the assumed force changes. However, flexibility is difficult to quantify and, as a result, tends to be a subjective consideration. There are some instances though which do lend themselves to objective analysis. For example, basic combat training production capability at each training center can be determined. Based on the required levels of production, the degree of flexibility (unused production capacity) within the structure can be determined and the degree that the structure can meet increases can be calculated. Similarly, workload versus capacity can be determined in a quantifiable manner for production and depot activities. Conversely, the degree of flexibility of the installation structure to meet other program changes not the result of clear-cut workloads is difficult to determine. For example, the flexibility of the base structure to accommodate major combat units currently deployed overseas, depends on many variables. These variables include type of unit, equipment density, mission requirements of the unit, if they are to be retained as active duty forces, or as reserve forces. Realinement alternatives are weighed in terms of their potential to meet unprogramed force changes.

Mr. PATTEN. Are there any questions on my left?

Mr. DAVIS. The succeeding questions deal with this matter.

CLOSURE OF FORT WOLTERS, TEX.

Mr. PATTEN. The Army is proposing to close Fort Wolters, Tex., and consolidate its helicopter training activities at Fort Rucker, Ala. What is the optimum training workload of a helicopter training base? What criteria apply to this type of activity? Where does Fort Rucker rank—higher or lower—according to each of these criteria in comparison with Fort Wolters?

General COOPER. Both Fort Rucker and Fort Wolters can adequately support primary helicopter training requirements. However, the training loads have been reduced to the point where it is no longer necessary to maintain both installations. Only Rucker has the facilities and land area to support a one aviation training base concept. Rucker has the capacity to support all anticipated training, including primary, advanced, and graduate level; whereas Wolters has been limited just to primary.

The basic criteria that would be considered in selecting one base over the other would be such things as weather, available airspace, land area, and support facilities. Rucker is superior to Wolters in terms of land area and facilities available to support the training base concept. They are probably about equal in weather. Available airspace is also somewhat a tradeoff.

I can provide additional information as to what the facilities are at Wolters and Rucker. I can also, if you like, go down the consideration of the criteria that we had on a point-by-point basis. It depends upon how much time you want to spend on this particular subject.

Mr. PATTEN. Perhaps you can expand your answer for the record. I would like you to put the criteria in the record at this point.

[The information follows:]

Mission requirements.—Decrease in training load from 6,887 pilots in fiscal year 1969 to a projected 1,502 in fiscal year 1974 permits contraction of training base from three to one installation. Fort Rucker is the only installation of the three concerned which is capable of accommodating the entire training load.

Budget/manpower constraints.—Consolidation will eliminate 946 civilian and 1,111 military jobs.

Cost savings.—Annual recurring savings are projected as $25.2 million with a one-time cost of $9.9 million.

Facilities/housing available.—Due to the minimum increase in civilian employees (+23) at Fort Rucker and the decrease in military (−68), the MCA required as a direct result of the consolidation is $534,000 for the expansion of aviation training and safety facilities.

Community impact.—The inactivation of Hunter AAF will have little impact on the local community, while the action at Fort Wolters will have a major impact on Mineral Wells, Tex.; and nearby towns. The inactivation of Fort Wolters will result in the loss of a civilian and military payroll of approximately $35 million.

Impact on other services/agencies.—The inactivation of Hunter AAF will impact on an Air Force radar unit, a Coast Guard rescue unit and a FAA radar approach control element which are tenants. Negotiations for revised support agreements are being conducted.

Mobilization and contingency requirements.—Both Hunter AAF and Fort Wolters will be retained as inactive installations in the event a rapid expansion of the aviation training base is required.

Mr. PATTEN. In this regard, is Fort Hunter of comparable status?

General COOPER. Hunter Army Airfield?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes. Is it in comparative status as compared to Fort Rucker and Fort Wolters?

General COOPER. That is right. Hunter Army Airfield was used just for Cobra training and a portion of rotary-wing pilot qualification training. That training will be done at Fort Rucker. So, a comparison between Hunter and Rucker versus Rucker and Wolters was made. As a result, we are placing Hunter in a caretaker status.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the amount of construction which has been put in place at Fort Wolters in the past 5 years?

General COOPER. In the past 5 years, we have MCA projects totaling approximately $2.5 million. In the fiscal year 1973 program, there was a water pollution control project which was approved in the amount of about a quarter of a million dollars. We have placed that project in deferred status and may not award it because of the impact of the realinement plan.

Mr. PATTEN. How do the replacement values of facilities at Fort Wolters and Fort Rucker compare?

General COOPER. Roughly two-to-one. Rucker is twice as much as Fort Wolters. In total, the cost of the real property, including land, as of June 30, 1972, was about $94 million for Rucker and about $48 million for Wolters.

Mr. PATTEN. How much construction will be required at Fort Rucker because of this consolidation, both in the next 5 years and long-range?

General COOPER. Because of this reduction right now, it will be about half a million dollars to provide the supporting facilities for the basic flight training. We do not have any specific long-range requirement resulting solely from this increased mission. That does not mean there will not be additional construction at Fort Rucker, but it will not be as a direct result of closing down Fort Wolters.

Mr. PATTEN. How much will it cost to close Fort Wolters, and how much will you save?

General COOPER. The one-time cost associated with closing Wolters is about $6.5 million. The annual recurring savings are estimated to be about $14.6 million.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the present value of savings from this action?

General COOPER. I am not sure exactly what that question means, sir. Do you want to discount the future savings?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, as compared to the $14 million.

General COOPER. That is what we anticipate will be the annual recurring savings.

Mr. PATTEN. So, in comparison, we are saying what is the present value, not the recurring, not the $14 million.

General COOPER. It depends on how much you want to discount the future savings. If you discount the future savings at 5 percent or 10 percent, we can compute that and insert it for the record, sir.

[The information follows:]

The present value of savings associated with closing Fort Wolters computed on a 5-year criteria based on a 5 percent discount value is $64.8 million, and on a 10 percent discount value is $58.1 million.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you very much, Mr. Patten.

CLOSURE OF VALLEY FORGE GENERAL HOSPITAL

The Army is proposing to close Valley Forge General Hospital in Pennsylvania. What criteria apply in this decision, and how did you decide that this particular hospital is the one to be closed?

General COOPER. If I may, sir, I would like to go down through the criteria that we inserted earlier for the record for Valley Forge.

The first thing is mission requirements. The patient population was 1,804 patients during the Vietnam conflict. The workload at Valley Forge has declined to about 469 patients as of last October. With the availability of better facilities elsewhere, such as Fort Gordon, which is not quite yet onstream, and Walter Reed, the Valley Forge workload can be transferred to these newer facilities.

Three hundred and twenty patients are projected to be the patient load at Valley Forge as of the end of fiscal year 1973.

The next criterion we considered was budget and manpower constraints. The closure will reduce the civilian employment by 490 and release 221 military personnel for assignment to other duties.

Getting to cost savings, which is also a criterion, the annual recurring savings are projected at $6.9 million, with an estimated one-time cost of $6.8 million. As a single mission installation, the cost of providing health care at Valley Forge are approximately 50 percent higher than like services at similar hospitals, such as Fort Gordon.

Mr. SIKES. That is a very significant cut. Why are costs higher there?

General COOPER. Because you have the overhead of running just that installation. You still have to have the MP's, for example. You still have to have all the supporting services, commissaries, and so forth.

Whereas when you have the hospital at Fort Gordon, the hospital is on a base that already has troops there and the supporting services.

Mr. SIKES. When was the Valley Forge hospital built?

General COOPER. It was initially completed in 1942.

Mr. SIKES. Is it a cantonment type facility?

Colonel RAISIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Then it is probably inefficient as far as maintenance and operation are concerned.

General COOPER. That is correct, sir. If we were to keep it at that location, we really would want to put, we estimated, over a million dollars into it right now, just in maintenance.

Mr. SIKES. You would have to rebuild it, would you not?

General COOPER. That is right. You still would not have a new hospital.

Mr. SIKES. You do not require the capacity?

General COOPER. That is correct.

EXCESSING OF CLOSED INSTALLATIONS

Mr. TALCOTT. What happens to Fort Wolters and what happens to Valley Forge Hospital? Are they excess and given back——

General COOPER. They go through the normal procedures for excessing.

Mr. TALCOTT. Valley Forge as well as Camp Wolters?

General COOPER. Valley Forge as well as Camp Wolters. It contrasts with Hunter Army Airfield.

Mr. TALCOTT. What happens to Hunter Army Airfield?

General COOPER. I may be wrong about Fort Wolters, but Hunter Army Airfield will be put in caretaker status on the basis that we may need it, for example, if a division is pulled back from Europe. We may want to use the Hunter-Stewart complex to house a new division. We want to keep all those aviation facilities.

Mr. TALCOTT. There are no encroachment problems?

General COOPER. That is right. It is really almost too good in terms of aviation, but it is there and is an excellent facility. We would plan to keep that.

At Valley Forge, we plan to excess that completely. We would go through the normal procedures of asking within the Department of Defense, and the Coast Guard, and so on.

Mr. SIKES. How much land is involved at Valley Forge?

General COOPER. I do not know exactly, sir.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. 182 acres.

Mr. SIKES. At Fort Wolters, you state that you are not certain what will happen there?

General COOPER. We are putting it in caretaker status.

WORKLOAD VALLEY FORGE GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have for the record the workload at Valley Forge for the last 5 years, and the projected workload if it were not closed.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

VALLEY FORGE GENERAL HOSPITAL, AVERAGE DAILY BEDS OCCUPIED

	Actual, fiscal year—					Projected,[1] fiscal year—				
	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Active duty military	880	845	700	446	231	232	232	232	232	233
Dependents of active duty	27	22	24	13	9	9	9	9	9	9
Retirees	28	27	29	27	25	25	26	26	26	26
Dependents of retired and deceased	22	21	21	17	16	16	16	17	17	17
All other	10	5	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	8
Total	967	920	782	510	288	289	290	291	292	293

[1] Assumes Valley Forge General Hospital not to be closed and no change in policy controlling medical regualtion of patients.

AVERAGE DAILY CLINIC VISITS

	Actual, fiscal year—				Projected[1] fiscal year—			
	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77
Active duty military	758	758	458	282	282	282	282	282
Dependents of active duty	89	96	81	65	65	65	65	65
Retirees	37	46	55	62	67	74	81	88
Dependents of retired and deceased	56	67	74	82	91	100	109	118
All other	17	24	27	40	40	40	40	40
Total	957	991	695	531	545	561	577	593

[1] Assumes Valley Forge General Hospital not to be closed and no change in policy controlling medical regualtion o f patients.

BASIC TRAINING INSTALLATIONS

Mr. SIKES. The Army had a sharp reduction in its training workload. This is true of its basic training. What is the status of plans to reduce installations for basic training, if there are such plans?

General COOPER. We are currently conducting a reevaluation study for the six basic training centers which we have now. We are doing that as part of the Fort Dix reexamination which the Secretary of Defense announced on April 17.

Mr. SIKES. What primary factors make a post good or bad for basic training?

General COOPER. Some of the things are mobilization and contingency requirements. Normally, the ATC structure must serve as the nucleus for expansion. It is essential that each ATC continue in operation during mobilization. That is one factor.

Another is environmental considerations. In essence, how many available training days do you have during the year? If the weather is bad, it is difficult to train.

Another factor is encroachment. If you are in an area where there is a lot of pressure to move you out for industrial or other reasons, that is another factor.

Of particular interest, of course, is the mission requirements. You want to be able to train the troops as well as possible wtih the available facilities.

Mr. SIKES. Will all of these apply in your decisions which are anticipated as a result of the current study?

General COOPER. Yes, sir; those, and also another one is the available permanent facilities. That is another criterion.

Those are the basic things that I talked about in terms of the training center.

You also have to consider the budget and manpower constraints, cost savings, and the community impact.

Mr. TALCOTT. How about the area location?

General COOPER. The area location very definitely affects mobilization, and also the number of training days you can expect to get per year.

There are two factors. We want to have geographical dispersion so as to reduce costs; and also, as you mentioned this morning, the sensitivity of the troops. If you have a training base located where the

families can come and visit the men or they can go occasionally on the week end, that is also a significant factor.

Mr. SIKES. You have six basic training areas now in the Army. Can you rank these according to the applicable criteria?

General COOPER. Yes, sir, we can. I do not know if you want me to go over each one.

Mr. SIKES. Do it for the record.

(The information follows:)

[The table below summarizes the criteria when applied to the 6 Army Training Centers

Criteria	Fort Knox	Fort Leonard Wood	Fort Jackson	Fort Ord	Fort Dix	Fort Polk
Mission requirements	Good	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent.
Mob contingency requirements	Good	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Fair	Excellent.
Environmental	Good	Good	Good	Good	Poor	Excellent.
Reserve component support	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent.
Encroachment	Good	Excellent	Excellent	Poor	Poor	Excellent.
Geographical location	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Poor	Excellent.
Facilities	Good	Good	Fair	Good	Excellent	Poor.
Housing and community support	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Good	Excellent	Poor.
Personnel turbulence	Approximately equal effect.					
Budget and manpower constraints	Approximately equal effect.					

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Patten.

UTILIZATION OF FORT DIX

Mr. PATTEN. What amount of construction has been put in place at Fort Dix in the past 10 years?

General COOPER. About $80 million.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the amount of permanent construction at Fort Dix?

General COOPER. The amount is about $172 million, excluding land.

Mr. PATTEN. What is the cost of replacement?

General COOPER. If we had to replace that $170 million, it would cost us now about $670 million.

Mr. SIKES. How much real estate do we have?

General COOPER. I am not sure.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I am W. M. Lockwood, from General Cooper's office.

We have about 32,000 acres at Fort Dix.

Mr. PATTEN. What number of units of adequate and inadequate family housing, barracks spaces, and officer quarters are there at Fort Dix?

General COOPER. We have about 2,200 family quarters onpost. Of those, we declared 400 very recently as inadequate. Once you declare it inadequate, you cannot upgrade it for 5 years. There are some others that are better than those that are inadequate but still require additional upgrading, which we plan to do in the future.

In barracks space, we have about 18,000 permanent barracks spaces, based on 72 square feet per trainee. As to how many could be modernized to adequate standards, we can modernize in essence all of those barracks to modern standards.

[The information follows:]

Status of the family housing units at Fort Dix:	
Fully adequate	1,205
Funded for improvements that will bring to fully adequate standards	300
Programed for improvements that will bring to fully adequate standards	295
Inadequate	400
Total	2,200

STATUS OF BACHELOR HOUSING SPACES AT FORT DIX

	Barracks	Bachelor officer quarters
Permanent adequate	0	120
Permanent substandard that can be made adequate	18,257	180
Total	18,257	300

SAVINGS AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING IMPACT OF ARMY REORGANIZATION AND BASE CLOSURES

Mr. SIKES. I would like, for the record, the military construction and family housing impact of the Army reorganization and base closure plans, by base. I would like to have the costs and the savings associated with those actions.

[The information follows:]

Military construction and family housing costs required and avoided as a result of the Army reorganization and realinement actions are provided.

For additional information, see appendix to this volume, page 859.

SUMMARY

CONSTRUCTION REQUIRED

(AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS - UNITS IN PAREN)

COSTS REQUIRED

	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
Military Construction	8,500	11,182	22,025	13,166	4,088	1,795	60,756	61,999
Family Housing	0	0	8,469(290)	15,438(498)	6,419(196)	35,151(1013)	65,477(1997)	

CONSTRUCTION AVOIDED

	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
Military Construction	0	9,834	19,666	16,285	10,972	5,683	62,440	71,602
Family Housing	2,650(100)	0	24,357(832)	8,650(279)	6,451(197)	38,275(1103)	80,383(2511)	

The family housing costs are derived from an average family housing requirement based on total military strength considering the changes involved in Phase I and II. Family housing surveys to be conducted in CY 73 (incl consideration of new MAHC) may result in some changes but should not substantially affect data presented.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COSTS
REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION-LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
ALABAMA								
Fort McClellan	404	558	17,000				17,962	
Rehab Training Fac.	354	558						
Utilities & Grounds Improvement	50							
Barracks Complex			12,800					
Bachelor Officer Quarters			2,600					
Boiler Plan Expansion			400					
Gymnasium			1,200					
Redstone Arsenal	299						299	
Training Fac (Chem)	299							
Fort Rucker		534					534	
Airfield Paving		219						
Stage Field Lighting		90						
Control Towers (5)		45						
Operations Bldg & Fire Station		149						
Fencing		31						

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COSTS
REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION-LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
ALASKA								
S. Fort Wainwright		2,714	928	550	383	125	4,701	
BOQ Modernization		750						
Cold Storage Fac.			928					
Relocate Activities from N. Post		1,965						
Airfield Control Tower				200				
Telephone Expansion				350				
Auto Self Help Garage					383			
Bank Fac.						125		
GEORGIA								
Atlanta Army Depot		119					119	
Security Fencing		119						
Fort Gordon	3,632			7,816		270	11,718	19,800
Academic Fac Modification	2,132							
Academic Facility				7,816				
Printing Plant MOD	201							
Communication & Electronic Fac.	1,299							
Senior Enlisted Bachelor Quarters						270		
Various Supporting Fac.								19,800

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COSTS
REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION-LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
GEORGIA (Cont'd)								
Fort McPherson	459						459	19,166
Construct Parking Lot	132							
Rehab Bldg for Adm Headquarters Bldg (FORSCOM)	327							19,166
ILLINOIS								
Rock Island	525		2,584				3,109	
Admin Fac Mod	525							
Air-Cond Admin Fac			2,584					
Fort Sheridan	408						408	
Alteration and A/C Admin Fac	408							
KENTUCKY								
Fort Knox	325	250					575	
Admin Fac Mod (ROTC)		250						
Admin Fac Mod 1/	325							
Lexington-Blue Grass	293						293	
Admin Fac Mod	293							

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COSTS
REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION-LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
MARYLAND								
Aberdeen Proving Ground								7,200
Academic Fac								7,200
Fort Detrick	310						310	
Admin Fac	310							
Fort Meade	700	1,521					2,221	
School Fac for Prep Sch		1,521						
Admin Fac for Intel Cmd	700							
MASSACHUSETTS								
Fort Devens								1,242
Admin Fac Mod 1/								1,242
NEW JERSEY								
Fort Dix		339						905
Admin Fac Mod 1/		339						905

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COSTS
REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION-LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
NEW JERSEY (Cont'd)								
Fort Monmouth		3,302					3,302	
Academic/Admin Fac Mod		2,097						
Convert Tng Fac to Admin		552						
Convert Barracks to Admin		653						
NEW YORK								
Fort Hamilton/Fort Wadsworth	86		783		1,700		2,579	644
Admin Fac Mod			418					
Air-Cond Bldg			300					
Sprinkler System			75					
Barracks Mod					700			
BOQ					1,700			
Admin Fac Mod 1/	86							
Seneca Army Depot								364
Admin Fac Mod 1/								364
NORTH CAROLINA								
Fort Bragg		708					708	
Admin Fac Mod (ROTC)		475						
Admin Fac Mod 1/		233						

1/ Army Readiness Regions & Readiness Groups

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COSTS
REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION-LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
PENNSYLVANIA								
Indiantown Gap Mil Reservation	475						475	
Admin Mod 1/	475							
TENNESSEE								
Memphis Defense Depot	187	456					643	
Medical Equip Maint Fac		456						
Medical Storage Fac (DSA)	187							
TEXAS								
Fort Sam Houston								1,975
Admin Fac Mod (HSC)								1,975
UTAH								
Dugway PG	123						123	
Admin Fac Mod	123							

1/ Army Readiness Regions & Readiness Groups

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COSTS
REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION-LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
VIRGINIA								
Fort Eustis		680	720	4,800	2,005	1,400	9,605	
General Purpose Warehouse		300						
Co. Adm & Supply (2 ea)		240						
Utilities Dist.		140						
Utilities Expansion			720					
Enlisted Men's Barracks				4,000				
Enlisted Men's Barracks				800				
Maintenance Repair Shop					1,655			
Motor Pool					350			
Gen. Service Maintenance Shop						1,400		
Fort Lee								337
Admin Fac								337
Fort Monroe	274						274	9,976
Mod Admin Fac	274							
Headquarters Conversion (TRADOC)								9,976
WASHINGTON								
Fort Lewis								390
Admin Fac for ROTC								390
TOTAL	8500	11,182	22,025	13,166	4,088	1,795	60,756	61,999

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM PROPOSED
AT BASES WHICH WILL NOT BE REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION - LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
ALABAMA								
Fort McClellan				1,100	800		1,900	
BOQ				1,100				
Academic Fac					800			
ALASKA								
N. Fort Wainwright				1,138	665		1,803	
Air Pollution Control				1,138				
Sewage Treatment					665			
CALIFORNIA								
Presidio of San Francisco								2,373
Admin Fac Headquarters Bldg								1,146
Opn Center								879
Map Depot								348
GEORGIA								
Atlanta Army Depot			838	481			1,319	
Incinerator			381					
BOQ			162					
Propane Peak Shaving Plant				481				
Medical Maint Fac			295					

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM PROPOSED
AT BASES WHICH WILL NOT BE REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION - LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
GEORGIA (Cont'd)								
Fort Gordon				9,659	2,052	980	12,691	
Barracks Complex					2,052			
MP Academic Fac.				9,659				
Bachelor Officer Quarters						980		
Hunter AAF								5,140
Bachelor Housing								2,800
Gymnasium								1,550
Maint. Fac.								790
Fort McPherson								17,936
Headquarters Building (3d Army)								17,936
ILLINOIS								
Joliet			350				350	
Air-Condition Admin Fac			350					
Rock Island					755		755	2,437
Electric Distribution					755			
Air-Condition Admin Fac								2,437

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM PROPOSED
AT BASES WHICH WILL NOT BE REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION - LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
MARYLAND								
Fort Holabird			2,247	806	234	896	4,183	1,562
Admin Fac Mod			206					
Guest House				227				
Library Addition					83			
Gymnasium				579				
NCO-Mess						896		
Improve Elec Distribution Sys			692					
Service Club					151			
Post Headquarters								1,229
PM Admin Bldg								132
Relig Education Fac								201
Commo Imp			1,349					
Fort Meade		2,070					2,070	
WAC Barracks		2,070						
NEW JERSEY								
Fort Monmouth		7,331		2,223	1,680		11,234	
Barracks Modernization		990						
Consolidated Mess		2,404						
Gen Purpose Warehouse				2,223				
Consolidated Maint. Fac.					1,680			
EW Barracks		2,399						
EM Barracks		1,538						
Picatinny Arsenal		433					433	
BOQ		433						

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM PROPOSED
AT BASES WHICH WILL NOT BE REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION - LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
NEW YORK								
Fort Hamilton			1,199	250	2,583		4,032	
Admin Facility			520					
BOQ			679					
Guest House				250				
EM Barracks					2,000			
Academic Facility					583			
OREGON								
Umatilla Army Depot					235	332	567	4,292
Maint Bldg					235			
Ammo Storage Bldg						332		
Ammo Maint Bldg								2,387
Ammo LCL Bldg								613
Water Distribution System								330
Ammo Sup								284
Electric Firing System								50
Miss Opns Bldg								628

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM PROPOSED
AT BASES WHICH WILL NOT BE REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(Exclusive of Family Housing)
($ Thousands)

LOCATION-LINE ITEM	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	TOTAL	LONG RANGE
TEXAS								
Fort Wolters			3,000		1,099	2,310	6,409	22,700
Bachelor Officer Quarters			3,000					
Commissary					1,099			
Hospital Adm.						2,310		
Misc. Projects								22,700
VIRGINIA								
Fort Belvoir			5,682				5,682	
Classrooms & USMA Prep Fac			5,682					
Fort Monroe								9,976
HQ Conversion (CONARC)								9,976
Fort Story			6,350	628	869	1,165	9,012	5,186
Barracks			6,350					
Gymnasium					869			
Battalion Mess						1,165		
Bachelor Officer Quarters				628				
Amphibious Tng Fac.								2,055
Disp/Dental Clinic								770
Support Fac.								2,361
TOTAL		9,834	19,666	16,285	10,972	5,683	62,440	71,602

COSTS REQUIRED
FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAM COSTS REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF
CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS - UNITS IN PAREN)

LOCATION	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78
ALABAMA						
Ft. McClellan			4,380(150)		5,633(172)	
GEORGIA						
Ft. Benning						4,442(128)
Ft. Stewart						6,766(195)
ILLINOIS						
Rock Island Arsenal				1,984(64)		
Ft. Sheridan						2,047(59)
INDIANA						
Ft. Ben Harrison					360(11)	
KANSAS						
Ft. Leavenworth				1,457(47)		
Ft. Riley						1,631(47)
KENTUCKY						
Ft. Campbell						7,183(207)
Lexington-Blue Grass			282(10)			

COSTS REQUIRED
FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAM COSTS REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF
CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS - UNITS IN PAREN)

LOCATION	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78
MARYLAND						
Ft. Detrick			467(16)			
NEW JERSEY						
Ft. Dix						1,839(53)
Ft. Monmouth						729(21)
NORTH CAROLINA						
Ft. Bragg			3,330(114)	2,697(87)		
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Ft. Jackson					426(13)	625(18)
VIRGINIA						
Ft. Eustis				9,300(300)		9,889(285)
TOTALS	-	-	8,469(290)	15,438(498)	6,419(196)	35,151(1,013)

COSTS AVOIDED
FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAM COSTS AVOIDED AS A RESULT OF
CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS - UNITS IN PAREN)

LOCATION	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78
ALABAMA						
Ft. McClellan						3,366(97)
Ft. Rucker						972(28)
ARIZONA						
Ft. Huachuca						590(17)
COLORADO						
Ft. Carson (Incl ARADCOM)						2,533(73)
GEORGIA						
Ft. Gordon			5,256(180)			
MARYLAND						
Ft. Meade					5,010(153)	
NEW JERSEY						
Ft. Monmouth	2,650(100)					
Picatinny Arsenal			4,701(161)			
PENNSYLVANIA						
Valley Forge					1,441(44)	694(20)

COSTS AVOIDED
FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAM COSTS AVOIDED AS A RESULT OF
CONUS REORGANIZATION AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS
(AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS - UNITS IN PAREN)

LOCATION	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78
TEXAS						
Ft. Wolters						27,066(280)
VIRGINIA						
Ft. Belvoir (Incl Wash Metro areas)			14,400(491)			
Ft. Monroe						3,054(88)
Ft. Story				8,650(279)		
TOTALS	2,650(100)	-	24,357(832)	8,650(279)	6,451(197)	38,275(1,103)

BASE UTILIZATION MANAGEMENT BY THE ARMY

Mr. SIKES. In the Defense subcommittee's hearings with the Secretary of the Army, I questioned the Army's capability in the area of base utilization. Will you briefly describe how base realinement actions are managed in the Army, and then tell us in greater detail in the record how the Army's reorganization plan and the recent base closure announcements were handled?

General COOPER. Realinement proposals within the Army are usually initiated to effect personnel or dollar savings or to improve efficiency in carrying out Army missions. The proposals may be initiated by any major command, such as Conarc, the U.S. Continental Army Command; Army Materiel Command; or any others, or by any element of the Army Staff.

Proposals may also be initiated by the Office of the Secretary of Defense or the Office of the Secretary of the Army or the Chief of Staff of the Army.

Normally, specific proposals will be developed by the major command or Army staff agency which has primary staff responsibility for the major functional activity involved in the realinement.

For example, in Army training centers, individual training comes under our Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. Within the Army staff, the development of these actions comes together within the Office of the Chief of Staff of the Army for overall coordination, and this office is therefore advised whenever a realinement possibility is idenified for further study and analysis which may lead to an official proposal.

I can provide more detail.

Mr. SIKES. For the record.

[The information follows:]

On January 11, 1973, the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff announced a series of major management actions designed to modernize, reorient, and streamline the Army's organization within the continental United States. On April 17, 1973, the Secretary of Defense announced a number of facilities realinement actions to scale down the Department of Defense base structure commensurate with reduced force levels and training requirements.

The reorganization of the Army is designed to improve readiness, training, the materiel and equipment acquisition process, the quality and responsiveness of management, and better support for the soldier in an era of constrained personnel and budget resources. Although improved efficiency is the main purpose of the Army reorganization, these management actions will also result in reduced operating costs and manpower savings. The reorganization will be essentially completed by December 31, 1973.

The detailed planning process which resulted in the reorganization was coordinated closely with the Army's concurrent planning for base realinements announced by the Secretary of Defense on April 17. The Army's base realinement plan includes consolidation of service school activities, closure of one general hospital, reduction of depot activities, and closure of bases for which a need no longer exists.

These two actions are being carried out within the budget constraints of fiscal year 1973–74 and when fully realized, total annual savings from these two actions will be approximately $248 million, with over 21,000 manpower spaces eliminated.

Mr. SIKES. Now tell us who actually has the responsibility for the actions such as those recently taken in the base closure announcement. Did you or Mr. Brazier have a part in them, or was it at another level?

General COOPER. We definitely had a part in them.

Mr. SIKES. Were you the people who decided what would be done?

General COOPER. I did not make the final decision. We provided information and recommendations. We provided data.

In my particular case, as director of installations, we would tell them what the facilities were and what the facility costs would be if they made these changes.

General COOPER. Insofar as the installations are concerned, we would provide an analysis just on that part.

Mr. SIKES. Did you also make recommendations? I am not trying to point a finger at anyone. This committee is interested in knowing who does make the decisions on what bases can best be closed or left open.

General COOPER. Within the Army, the final decisions are really made by the Chief of Staff and then by the Secretary of the Army. These are very important decisions which are made——

Mr. SIKES. Of course, they are important decisions, and we realize they go to their level for final determination, but who are the action people? Who made the recommendations?

General COOPER. The recommendations are normally handled in the Office of the Chief of Staff of the Army.

Mr. SIKES. Then what is it that you and Mr. Brazier do?

General COOPER. We provide information. We provide specific recommendations with regard to specific bases. Then we participate in the discussion when the final recommendations go forward.

In the final analysis, it is usually somebody from the Office of the Chief of Staff of the Army who sits with the Chief of Staff and the Secretary, and they go over this in some detail.

Mr. SIKES. From your offices, do the recommendations go directly to the Chief of Staff and to the Secretary?

General COOPER. No. They usually go to an element within the Office of the Chief of Staff. There is an Assistant Vice Chief of Staff of the Army who coordinates the staff effort. Within the Secretariat, ASA (I. & L.) has the responsibility for coordinating the review.

Mr. SIKES. From your level, then, they would go to the Office of the Assistant Vice Chief?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Before they reach your level, whose hands do the recommendations go through?

General COOPER. At my particular level, they would go through Mr. Lockwood, who is the division chief of the Installations Management Division; but they also would go through the Army headquarters down below the DA staff level, because we have to be sure we get their input, also.

MISSIONS LOCATED AT SMALL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. SIKES. We find and we are somewhat puzzled by the fact that the Army proposes to put additional missions at some installations which are relatively small, and have rather poor and limited facilities, and are relatively costly to operate and maintain. That includes places like Fort Monroe, Fort MacArthur, Fort McPherson, Fort Sheridan, and Fort McClellan. Why would you place additional missions at this type of installation, rather than at the more modern, better developed installations?

General COOPER. In the case of Fort Monroe, for example, we placed TRADOC there to avoid having the disruption of moving a lot of people at the same time we were reorganizing the Army. We felt it was better, in terms of our mission, to disrupt as few people as we could, with the idea that we could go back and examine if Fort Monroe was in fact the best place.

Mr. SIKES. Are you inviting additional costs by doing this in that you probably will have to improve and modernize the facilities?

General COOPER. Right now at Fort Monroe, for example, we are providing only a minimum amount of changes to those facilities to take care of the short-term requirements. If we stayed at Fort Monroe for 10 years, we would have to provide quite a bit more facilities.

That is one of the factors we will consider when we review that particular aspect this calendar year.

BACKFILL OF FORT DIX

Mr. PATTEN. What is the total amount of permanent administrative space at Fort Dix?

General COOPER. About 150,000 square feet.

Mr. PATTEN. In the event the Army decides to phase out basic training at Fort Dix and backfill with other activities, what do your criteria tell you about the types of activities which could be accommodated here?

General COOPER. The nature of the facilities at Fort Dix which would be vacated if we disestablished the Army Training Center is such that they are considered ideal for troop intensive activities, with certain limitations. Those limitations apply primarily to the training facilities available for combat and combat support units.

For example, infantry, armor, or artillery battalion size or larger units would not have sufficient maneuver area or adequate ranges for the training they require.

The ATC facilities would be excellent for school-type training where a large number of lower ranking enlisted men or women are trained, because you would not have the family housing requirement.

We can very easily put activities back in to Fort Dix, but you would soon run out of the 2,200 family housing.

You can, however, convert the barracks spaces to administrative space. It would be expensive, but not nearly as expensive as building brand-new administrative space.

We are considering all of these factors, including the availability of civilian workforce, the effects of potential encroachment, and cost savings.

The thing you would want to backfill with would be the same thing that you took out.

Mr. PATTEN. How much of a factor is the work of the Air National Guard, which I know uses the facility there, and the Reserves? I know persons who visit Fort Dix every Sunday. I think there are three outfits. Maybe it is the National Guard rather than the Air Guard.

Whenever I went to Dix, it was always in connection with one of these other activities, and nothing is being said that I have heard about whether these other functions are important.

General COOPER. With regard to the National Guard and the reserves at Fort Dix, most of their training up until now has been on the week-

end. We are trying to look for something that would be there all during the week, as opposed to just during the weekend.

As a matter of fact, we are examining how we train the National Guard and Reserves to see if there is some way that we could train them for a few weeks straight instead of just on the weekends. In that case, we would use the facilities much more extensively by the National Guard and Reserves than we have in the past.

REDUCTIONS AT FORT DIX AND FORT MEADE

Mr. PATTEN. Can you explain now why the Army proposes to reduce headquarters and training functions at major installations such as Fort Meade and Fort Dix?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

The Army reduced its strength from the Vietnam high of 1.6 million to 804,000 at the end of fiscal year 1974 that we talked about. The need for a training base to train newly recruited soldiers also decreased.

As for the reductions at Fort Meade specifically, the Army reorganization plan removes the Continental Army from the chain of command. We are trying to reduce the number of levels installations have to go through. So, the Continental Army themselves, including the Continental Army at Fort Meade, are being reduced to where they are primarily taking care of the Reserves and National Guard, as opposed to the specific training of what we call the STRAF units, Strategic Army Force units.

These Continental Armies will assist the commander of FORSCOM in particular, who will have the overall Reserve training, to supervise and train just the Reserve components, not the Active Duty components.

Since we have tightened the mission, we have reduced the size of their staff.

Mr. PATTEN. This intrigues me, because I think in my short time in Congress, in the past 10 years, we have thought of our area command for the Army as being first at Governors Island. Then I believe we had to contact Fort Wadsworth over at Staten Island. Then I have a recollection somehow that we were tied in with Fort Hamilton, at least on some things.

I was astonished when we found we were going down to Fort Meade; and now to be told there is a further relocation makes me wonder.

General COOPER. We are reducing the number of headquarters elements.

USE OF SMALL RATHER THAN LARGE BASES

Mr. PATTEN. Will you explain now, with reference to the criteria which the Army has recently developed, why the Army proposes to put additional missions at installations like Fort Monroe, Fort MacArthur, Fort McPherson, Fort Sheridan, and Fort McClellan, all of which certainly are relatively deficient in facilities and size as compared to Dix or Meade and all of which have rather poor and limited facilities, and are expensive to operate and maintain?

General COOPER. Some of those new missions are basically small. In some cases, for example, you had to station the Reserve region units in areas where the Reserves are.

At Fort MacArthur, for example, we established one of the RR's. It is a small post, but it is the only one we have in southern California. That is the reason for some of those minor missions.

At Fort Sheridan, for another example, we established a Reserve readiness region. Here again, we have lots of Reserve units and National Guard units in the Chicago area.

I will address the question of TRADOC being established at Fort Monroe. That had to do with the fact that most of the people who will be in the Training and Doctrines Command, not all of them, were already located at Fort Monroe. We are trying to get the new reorganization of the Army off to a good start, and we did not want to move all those people to some other post at the same time we reorganized them in a new mission.

Mr. PATTEN. Was that justification for moving what you have at Hampton, Va., over to Fort Sheridan; 6,000 people?

General COOPER. You mean the U.S. Army Recruiting Command?

Mr. PATTEN. We moved the factory out of Springfield, Mass., to Fort Sheridan. I do not have to tell you they never convinced me on that and I listened and listened.

General COOPER. The Recruiting Command was in relatively poor facilities in the Norfolk area. There were reasonably good facilities at Sheridan. Also, Sheridan is in the geographical center of the United States, where we wanted the Recruiting Command stationed. Those were the two main reasons for moving the Recruiting Command.

COMPLETION OF FORT DIX STUDY

Mr. PATTEN. When do you expect the Army to complete its study on Fort Dix? Maybe it has already been completed.

General COOPER. On Fort Dix, it is not completed. We are required to have it to the Secretary of Defense by July 1.

Mr. PATTEN. I do not have to tell you that we phased out two installations in my county. I urged them to leave. I was the only one in public life who did.

Of course, Kilmer was easy.

Now there is the most beautiful complex you ever saw, just one-third of it—a medical school, a dental school, a pharmacy school, a medical library, 20,000 students. More people are working on 500 acres which were turned over to industry than Kilmer ever had under the Army.

When everybody was crying and opposing the close-down of Raritan Arsenal about 1962, I said, "Let's get rid of it," but on other grounds.

They were down to about 1,100 workers. There are now an estimated 20,000 people working at Raritan Arsenal. On a Friday afternoon, I went over there and addressed the Middlesex County Community College. They have 7,000 students at the old Raritan Arsenal.

That is not the whole story. That is just part of it. In retrospect, the transformation at Raritan Arsenal was beneficial in the long run, although many persons lost their jobs.

What we can do with 32,000 acres at Dix, believe me, would mean so much to our State, but you do have other factors. They tell me there are 55,000 retirees in that Dix section, all as a result of Camp Dix over

the years. They bought their homes there, figuring they would get the hospital service and things of that type.

Congressman Forsythe said there are 55,000 retirees in that area, civilian and military. I am told that with light industries, if you reduced the basic training, even, at Dix, it would create unemployment of 6,000 in the camp, but in the community another 9,000.

We met with the Secretary on this. At lot of statistics were given.

Frankly, as a piece of real estate, the way our State is growing so rapidly, we can do a great deal more economically with Camp Dix and that 32,000 acres than the Army is doing.

But as an American, I just cannot understand how, for the whole Northeast part of the United States, you ever hope again to get anything the size of Dix if you needed it.

COMPLETION OF SMALLER BASES STUDY

When do you expect the Army will complete its study of the long-range utilization of its smaller installations?

General COOPER. We expect to have the study completed by the end of this calendar year, not just the small ones, but we are reviewing all the installations, including the depots and activities like that, in the Army Materiel Command.

We do expect to have inputs from that study in time to influence our fiscal year 1975 budget submission.

Mr. PATTEN. You never said a word, that I recall, in your criteria about weapons or artillery at Dix., in basic training.

In your talk about Dix in particular, have you ever said anything about a change in our artillery, or the armament, or the training itself, that required a larger buffer area or greater care so we do not have something like happened in California, a couple of weeks ago? We had that at my area. We have the Navy loading station. When the explosion occurred, every window in my house was knocked out; my front door was flattened.

Is there anything in the Camp Dix criteria which brings in the question of the explosives of weapons? While Dix may have been appropriate in 1917 for the World War I Army, today it is a different ball game.

You did not mention, nor did I hear anyone else mention, the type of armament, artillery practice, of which we had plenty at Dix in our time. No one mentioned those factors.

General COOPER. I did mention, in talking about what type of units we might backfill into Dix, if we closed down the training center, that we could not use artillery units and infantry units because you do not have enough maneuver area and you do not have artillery ranges.

Mr. PATTEN. But we did in 1917.

General COOPER. That is right. You did not have as long range artillery. I am not sure what kind of buffer zones they had in 1917. Clearly, we could not get additional buffer zones now.

Mr. PATTEN. You are not using the same artillery, are you?

General COOPER. That is right.

Mr. PATTEN. I know the answer insofar as what you could do in 1942. You probably need a little more room today, at Fort Dix or any other place.

General COOPER. We certainly do.
Mr. SIKES. Are there further questions at this point?
[No response.]

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

Mr. SIKES. Tell me what steps the Army has taken to improve its execution of the construction program.

General COOPER. First of all, we are taking steps to assure that firm functional requirements for projects are obtained, and design initiated earlier. This insures that a better estimate based on firm criteria will be included in the budget, and that construction can start as soon as funds become available.

For example, we are now moving forward on the design of much of our fiscal year 1975 medical program. We are also increasing our use of special network analysis to analyze scheduling problems and bring them to the attention of top management.

We are continuing to use life cycle cost studies, value engineering, and improved contractor quality control.

For our major new barracks program we erected a full-size mock-up of our design, which you saw pictures of this morning, to enable the architect-engineer to refine the design and eliminate the bugs.

In addition, the model was used to obtain user reaction and allow designers to develop furnishings and color schemes. We plan on continuing to utilize this new design.

However, to insure we do not overlook any opportunities for cost reduction, we are continuing a full-value engineering study of the project and we will use this experience in the construction of the first major projects. We have also initiated this year special construction management inspection teams to review all large medical and barracks modernization projects.

These teams are reviewing all ongoing projects as well as recently completed projects, to be sure that full advantage is obtained from the experience on all the projects and that the problem areas are avoided wherever possible.

The medical teams include representatives of the Surgeon General as well as experts in medical facilities, construction, maintenance operation.

We are also continuing to evaluate all promising modes of procurement which offer the possibility of reducing costs.

One of these had been industrialized methods of construction, but we recently were told that the industrialized method used in fiscal year 1972 was not acceptable for 1973. That was told to me this morning.

CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING RESEARCH LABORATORY

Construction Engineering Research Laboratory has inventoried and established the data bank of manufacturer designers and users, so we do not redesign the same thing. We have completed a study of computer-aided design evaluation and actually are using this output in developing two projects in our fiscal 1974 program.

Mr. SIKES. Last year we discussed the Corps of Engineers laboratory at Champaign-Urbana, Ill. How important has that been in your work?

General COOPER. I would like to give you a few recent examples where it has helped us quite a bit. It actually works in all areas. One is in the fibrous concrete; CERL has extended and made practical for construction use a material known as fibrous concrete. We had the initial development of this under National Science Foundation grant.

CERL successfully applied it as a practical paving material; because of its strengths in all directions, fibrous pavements are often half as thick as conventional concrete, with greater crack resistance, longer life, and less maintenance cost.

We have also used them in the pollution abatement cost savings. Major study was done by CERL for the Mobile district of the corps to find the most effective process for treating liquid wastes and air pollutants from the Holston Army plant. This study resulted in solutions to the problems which cost $3.5 million less in construction costs and designs proposed before CERL got involved. The new design will meet the current anticipated environmental requirements.

I am not sure whether it will meet the new ones which will call for zero pollutant discharge by 1985 as part of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1972.

They are also involved in the habitability research. CERL studies of dining halls at Fort Lewis, Wash., not too surprisingly, linked a soldier's satisfaction with his food service to the influence of the functional arrangement and decor. Restaurants have known this for a long time.

I am not sure we had to have a specific study, but it helps. We have had as a result the decor catalog for dining facilities which we distribute Army-wide under the auspices of the Troop Support Agency to help the commanders decorate dining halls. CERL is also doing studies on occupant desires for the family quarters and barracks. CERL has developed an Automated Construction Progress Reporting System for corpswide use that reduces the variety of report forms by 60 percent and man-hours required for reporting by 50 percent.

Mr. SIKES. I am glad you seem to be getting some significant results.

RATE CHARGED FOR SUPERVISION, INSPECTION, AND OVERHEAD

What rate is the Crops of Engineers charging for supervision, construction, and overhead at the present time?

Do you expect this to go up or down?

General COOPER. Last year the rate for supervision and inspection was reduced for the ninth time since 1963. As of July 1, 1972, the rate was set at 5 percent. At this time we do not anticipate any change in the rate, however, it will be reviewed again at the close of this fiscal year.

PRIOR-YEAR CONTRACT AWARDS

Mr. SIKES. What success have you had in awarding prior-year programs for military construction and family housing?

General COOPER. At this time all of the fiscal year 1972 and prior MCA programs have been awarded with the exception of approximately $82 million. Over $60 million of this amount is for pollution abatement projects which have encountered numerous delays due to changing satndards, awaiting connection to regional systems and tech-

nical investigations. Many of these problems are now well on the way to solution so that we anticipate improved progress in this area. Approximately one-third of the fiscal year 1973 MCA program is now under contract and we anticipate that at least 60 percent of the fiscal year 1973 funds will be obligated by the end of the fiscal year. While the rapid cost growth is creating problems, we hope to successfully accomplish the authorized program.

The Army has awarded all of its family housing projects through the fiscal year 1971 program, all projects in the fiscal year 1972 program have been awarded except three projects; Camp Drum 88 units, Carlisle Baracks 60 units and the Grand Forks Safeguard site project of 90 units. We are in the final stage of awarding the Camp Drum project. We will not be able to award the Carlisle Barracks and the Grand Forks projects and still maintain the $24,000 statutory limitation. Construction costs in both these areas are extremely high and bids received on these projects were not responsive and precluded award within the statutory limitation. Advertising of four low-cost projects to start the fiscal year 1973 program is scheduled the latter part of this month of May 1973.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record a breakdown of the unobligated balances in military construction, Army.

[The information follows:]

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual as of March 31, 1973	Estimated as of June 30, 1973
Major construction	531.3	310.4
Planning	17.0	5.3
Minor construction	8.3	4.2
NATO infrastructure	18.2	[1] 2.9
Supporting activities	1.4	0.9
Safeguard	132.0	[1] 84.2
Construction	103.1	[1] 68.1
Planning	14.8	[1] 6.0
Access roads	5.2	4.0
Community impact assistance	8.9	6.1
Applied to fiscal year 1974 program	22.0	22.0
Total	730.2	429.9

[1] Includes reprograming of Safeguard funds for NATO increased costs resulting from currency revaluations ($20.6 million) not approved as of Mar. 31, 1973.

TURNKEY

Mr. SIKES. Now, the Army has made substantially less use of turnkey for the construction of family housing than have the other services. Is there any particular reason for that?

General COOPER. We have made some. How much less is a question—maybe we are more conservative. But let me tell you where we are now with regard to turnkey.

Specifically, we had two projects in the 1971 family housing, six projects in 1972. In the 1973 program, almost all of our projects will be turnkey with the exception we have two in Nome, Alaska, two in Bethel, Alaska.

Mr. SIKES. You are planning to make greater use of it?
General COOPER. Yes, sir, and all in 1974 are expected to be turnkey.

STATUTORY COST LIMIT—FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. SIKES. All right. Tell us something about the problems you have had with statutory cost limits for family housing?
General COOPER. In the past years we designed and constructed family housing to the dollar limitation contained in the authorization law. But with the sharp increases in labor and materials cost, the quality of the family housing declined and the statutory average unit cost has not been sufficient to permit construction of fully adequate family housing.
Mr. SIKES. Are you proposing an increase?
General COOPER. Yes, sir. We have asked this year to go to $27,500 for CONUS.
Mr. SIKES. From $24,500?
General COOPER. From $24,000 even, I believe it was in 1973, and it was the same in 1972.
Mr. SIKES. Considering inflation, will that give you housing as good as that which you have been getting for $24,000?
General COOPER. Yes, sir.
Mr. SIKES. Will it be better housing?
General COOPER. Well, slightly better, but the cost of inflation is almost 10 percent. Ten percent of $24,000 gets you up to $26,400 already. It was actually a little more than 10 percent. So it is just marginally better than what we got for $24,000, particularly when you remember we had no increase from 1972 to 1973.

SECTION 236 HOUSING

Mr. SIKES. What is the status of the Army's portion of the military setaside section 236 housing program?
General COOPER. On the 236 we accepted or the Department of Housing and Urban Development accepted a total of 2,250 units in 1971 and 1972 for development of housing near Army installations. At the present time we have 900 units at three of these installations, 300 at Fort Meade, 400 at Carson, and 200 in Hawaii, occupied or almost completed and ready for occupancy.
Two hundred additional units at two installations, 100 units at Fort Ord and 100 units at Fort Richardson, are under construction. A 100-unit project at Fort Belvoir has been approved for construction; nine other projects which comprise about half the program, 1,050 units, were in various stages of development by FHA.
Mr. SIKES. Let me interrupt for just a moment.
I have found quite a number of post commanders, and my experience has not been limited to the Army, who know nothing about the section 236 set-aside. I would have thought that all of them would have been alerted to its possibilities so that they could take advantage of it for their lower grade enlisted personnel who have families.
General COOPER. The Army, based on submissions by the——
Mr. SIKES. Off the record.
[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. SIKES. If they have not been notified, please do so.

We also want to discuss the changes necessary in order to continue the benefits from this program.

Mr. PATTEN. If the administration continues the program.

Mr. SIKES. That is a good point.

General COOPER. May I finish the answer to the previous question? Nine other projects were in various stages of development by the FHA. These projects have been deferred by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, who placed a moratorium on federally-subsidized housing projects on January 8, 1973. That amounted to 1,050 units.

SUGGESTED LEGISLATION FOR HUD SUPPORTED HOUSING

Mr. PATTEN. What would you propose in the way of corrective legislation?

General COOPER. I have considered this particular problem, because at Fort Carson there was a real issue, where we had some houses being built but, because of the pay raises, the people for whom they were being built no longer qualified. We got an exception to the policy from the Housing and Urban Development people. But we are considering—this has to be subject to the Office of Secretary of Defense approving it—trying to place the housing eligibility on the basis of the grade of the soldier.

Right now we cannot practically program housing for E–4's nor can build any for E–1's, E–2's and E–3's. If we could get the legislation written based on the grade of the lower grade enlisted men, we would then be able to start a program, without worrying about changes in the pay.

We still have the problem of the fact that the 236 housing units are all under a moratorium, you understand.

Mr. PATTEN. This would be welcomed by a great many, if we could get the legislation?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

We have a very real problem of the many young people coming into the Army now, particularly at Fort Carson, where a greater percentage are married than had been in the past. These people do not qualify for family housing. It gets to be very difficult. They cannot really afford it in the community.

Mr. PATTEN. General, fresh out of the office, Saturday morning, an old man came in—I can give you his name and address—they raised his rent $50 to $176. He only has $136 a month coming in on social security. He was in tears.

Another woman, who is over 70, came in with the same situation. Housing and rent increases in my little town are by far the biggest crisis. There is nothing you can do about it. So I know.

One of the best arguments around our way for the benefits of being in the U.S. Army is the housing. It is very definitely of interest to these young married couples what you do in the way of housing. That will be one of the main pillars of your Voluntary Army concept, or at least one of your main selling points.

CONSTRUCTION COST INCREASES

What has been the Army's experience with construction cost increases in the past year?

General COOPER. In the past calendar year 1972, it was 9 percent.

Mr. PATTEN. What cost escalation factor have you included in your fiscal year 1974 estimates and to what point in time are you projecting these costs?

General COOPER. The cost escalation rates used 6½ percent for calendar year 1973, 6 percent for calendar year 1974, and 6 percent per year for projections beyond 1974.

What we do is, we analyze each project at the engineer district to determine the construction time and the escalation rates are then applied to the midpoint of the estimated construction period. In other words, we do it the same as we would expect a bidder to do it.

These costs and time projections are reviewed for accuracy and reasonableness at the Department of Army level.

Mr. PATTEN. In view of your success in awarding contracts, are you being overgenerous?

General COOPER. No; we are not really putting enough in, because the current projected estimate of inflation for building in calendar year 1973 by the Engineering-News Record is 10.6 percent. We have allowed in these estimates only 6½ percent.

Mr. PATTEN. Especially if lumber is a factor.

General COOPER. The cost of lumber has had one beneficial effect in that for a lot of the temporary buildings that we could not get anybody to bid on to tear down, people are now bidding and paying us because the lumber has gone up sufficiently in value. So everything is not bad in this world.

Mr. PATTEN. I do not know about World War II lumber. I do not know if you would get much for that today.

General COOPER. Some of the lumber in World War II was very good and some of it was very poor. It was whatever they had available.

Mr. PATTEN. The weather has eaten right through the old Camp Kilmer barracks. I know those were put up in haste with green lumber, very thin, on a 5-year use basis.

Mr. BRAZIER. It is no longer green now.

Mr. PATTEN. There are a series of tables, charts, and so forth, which should be inserted in the record at this point. They are: The current and projected Army training workloads, including pilots and basic training, broken down by training center; a listing of all construction contracts awarded in the past year on other than a competitive bid basis; a listing of all guest house construction planned in the next year. Also show the nonappropriated fund projects accomplished in the past year, the major ones; a list of all minor construction projects awarded in the past year or currently pending approval by the Army; a listing of all facilities constructed with research and development, working fund, or procurement money, other than at Government-owned contractor-operated plants; a listing of any construction in Vietnam performed in the past year or pending approval.

General COOPER. We will.

[The information follows:]

ARMY TRAINING WORKLOADS

The Army's current and projected workload for initial entry helicopter pilot training is depicted below:

	Production	
	Estimated fiscal year 1973	Estimated fiscal year 1974
U.S. Army	856	915
USAF	225	75
USAR/NG	113	200
FMT [1]	98	47
Total	1,292	1,237

[1] Foreign military training.

In addition, it is estimated that 2,870 pilots in fiscal year 1973, and 2,162 pilots in fiscal year 1974, will receive advanced skill (graduate) flight training. The term, production, as used in the table above indicates the number of individuals who are estimated to complete the course during the fiscal year. Another measure of training facility workload is the number of students which must be accommodated at any one time.

	Student workload	
	Estimated fiscal year 1973	Estimated fiscal year 1974
Initial entry [1]	1,014	1,072
Graduate [2]	351	324
Total	1,365	1,396

[1] All helicopters.
[2] Includes some fixed-wing training.

CURRENT AND PROJECTED ARMY TRAINING CENTER WORKLOADS

Installation	Average load [1]	
	Fiscal year 1973	Fiscal year 1974
Fort Dix	10,500	9,400
Fort Knox	[2] 11,140	[2] 10,040
Fort Jackson	12,650	11,400
Fort Gordon	2,300	2,100
Fort McClellan	2,110	2,360
Fort Sill	2,100	2,000
Fort Bliss	1,200	1,100
Fort Sam Houston	2,700	2,300
Fort Polk	14,100	12,700
Fort Leonard Wood	12,200	11,000
Fort Ord	12,600	11,300
Total	83,600	75,700

[1] Includes both basic training and advanced individual training loads.
[2] Includes ROTC basic summer camp.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED BY ARMY ON OTHER THAN COMPETITIVE BID BASIS

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
REPORT REQUIRED BY SECTION 704 OF PUBLIC LAW 92-145 COVERING MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS
AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING DURING THE SIX-MONTH PERIOD FROM 1 JULY 1971 TO 31 DECEMBER 1971

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided by Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertisement
Process Plants Corp. College Point, N. Y.	Ft. George G. Meade, Maryland	Classified Waste Destructor Fac. including utilities & connections	91-142	$ 1,157,500	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(10). Construction for which it was impracticable to secure competition by formal advertising as adequate plans and specifications were not available. Competitive price proposals solicited.
Peter Kiewit Sons' Co. & Associates Omaha, Nebraska	Vicinity of Conrad, Montana	Letter Contract for mobilization and preparatory work - Phase II Malmstrom MSR & PAR SAFEGUARD Facilities	91-441	$ 50,000,000	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(15). Bids received under formal advertising were unreasonable. A letter contract was awarded in December 1971 in order to allow work to start pending completion of negotiations. Competitive price proposals solicited.
Leavesley Industries, Jacksonville, Texas	Lackland AFB, San Antonio, Tex	Two Incinerators	91-511	$ 24,399	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(10). Impracticable to obtain competition because only one proposal was received under Step I of the two-step formal advertising procedure.
P.G.&E. Co., San Francisco, California	Tracy Defense Depot, California	Relocation of Sub-Station and 60 KV Line	91-511	$ 51,100	Contract Negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(10) because the contractor is the sole source of supply.
Gehlen-Bau GmbH Frankfurt, Germany	Frankfurt, Germany	Renovation of Junior High School	91-142	$ 242,866	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions. Competitive price proposals solicited.
Gerhard Huebsch Bischofsheim, Germany	Ekstein, Germany	Facility Improvement Comm Site Eckstein	90-408	$ 106,874	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions. Competitive price proposals solicited.

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided by Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertisement
PREUSSAG Darmstadt, Germany	Schweinfurt, Germany	Expand Water Supply	91-511	$ 112,669	Same as above.
Brown, Boveri & Cie AG Trier, Germany	Baumholder, Germany	Enlargement of Existing Transformer Station	92-145	$ 10,515	Same as above.
Gerhard Huebsch Bischofsheim, Germany	Heidelberg, Germany	Boiler Replacement & fuel oil storage for heating plant-USAREUR Comd Center	91-142	$ 42,852	Same as above.
M.F. Wachter KG Stuttgart, Germany	Gablingen, Germany	AUTODIN Switch Installation ASA Location 300 Area "K"	91-511	$ 355,163	Same as above.
Held & Francke Vilshofen/Ndb, Germany	Eckstein, Germany	Facility Improvement Comm Site Eckstein Phase II & Section B of Phase I	90-408	$ 28,614	Same as above.
Leonhard Baumann Kaiserslautern, Germany	Mainz, Germany	Extension of Elementary School	91-511	$ 488,621	Same as above.
MAX JORDAN Mannheim, Germany	Mannheim, Germany	Alter Bldg 49 Coleman Bks.	90-408	$ 107,890	Same as above.
Josef Fischer Regensburg, Germany	Schwabach, Germany	Constr of Hardstands and Washrack	91-511	$ 63,554	Same as above.
Josef Fischer Regensburg, Germany	Fuerth, Germany	Constr of Hardstands and Washrack	91-511	$ 60,241	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions. Competitive price proposals solicited.
Federal Republic of Germany	Bitburg, Germany	LOX Plant	89-568	$ 198,107	Same as above.
Same as above.	Hahn, Germany	LOX Plant	89-568	$ 265,287	Same as above.
Wolf & Sofsky Zweibruckern, Germany	Zweibruckern, Germany	Constr of Bachelor Officers' Qtrs.	91-511	$ 410,571	Same as above.
Leonhard Baumann Kaiserslautern, Germany	Hahn, Germany	Hazard Cargo Pad	91-511	$ 308,225	Same as above.

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided by Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertisement
Hummel & Baumann Kaiserslautern, Germany	Zweibruecken, Germany	TAB VEE Aircraft Shelters Cable System	91-142	$ 11,298	Same as above.
Same as above.	Ramstein, Germany	TAB VEE Aircraft Shelters Cable System	91-142	$ 13,980	Same as above.
Josef Fandel Bitburg, Germany	Hahn, Germany	TAB VEE Aircraft Shelters Cable System	91-142	$ 10,164	Same as above.
Same as above	Bitburg, Germany	TAB VEE Aircraft Shelters Cable System	91-142	$ 15,896	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Ramstein, Germany	Water Retain Basin	90-408	$ 314,338	Same as above.
Ed. Arnbruster Mannheim, Germany	Feldberg/Taunus, Germany	Constr of Emergency Power Plant	89-188	$ 243,373	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions. Competitive price proposals solicited.
Leonhard Baumann Kaiserslautern, Germany	Ramstein Air Base Germany	Constr of Helicopter Hangar	91-142	$ 395,566	Same as above.
Josef Fandel u. Soehne Bitburg/Eifel, Germany	Schoenfeld, Germany	Constr of Emergency Power Station	89-188	$ 206,717	
Westphal GmbH Neu-Isenburg, Germany	Bamberg, Germany	Central Heating Bldg 7095 Warner Bks	91-511	$ 45,180	Same as above.
Heinrich Koppers Essen, Germany	Germershem, Germany	Constr of Water Supply System for Germershem - Water towr - Potable "	91-110	$ 182,303	Same as above.
Adolf Lupp KG Hessen, Germany	Buedingen, Germany	Flood Control US Army Airfield	89-188	$ 161,797	Same as above.
Dipl. Ing. Leonhard Baumann - Frankfurt, Germany	Friedberg/Hess. Germany	Constr of Tank Repair Shop-RAy Bks	91-511	$ 314,286	Same as above.
Firma Karl Doll Stuttgart, Germany	Grafenwoehr, Germany	Heating and Latrines	91-142	$ 263,518	Same as above.

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided by Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertisement
Klee KG Ilvesheim b., Mannheim, Germany	Frankfurt, Germany	Rehab of 97th Gen Hospital	91-142	$ 1,497,008	Same as above.
Dilp. Ing Leonhard Baumann - Frankfurt, Germany	Frankfurt, Germany	Alter of Bldg. 272 USAREUR Crime Lab	90-408	$ 78,550	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions. Competitive price proposals solicited.
Gabriele Pollera Asmara, Ethiopia	Asmara, Ethiopia	Extension of Water Supply Line	88-174	$ 74,673	Same as above.
Pierfrancesco Murino Rome, Italy	Montevergine Avellino, Italy	Addition to Tech Control Facility & Autodin D.S.T.E.	91-142 90-408	$ 104,180	Same as above.
I. STIVIS-D. SFIRIS TH Theofilides Athens, Greece	Athens, Greece	Construction of Cold Storage, Auto Maintenance Shop, Dormitory and Dining Hall	90-408	$ 520,000	Same as above.
Marwais International Luxembourg G.D.	Aviano Air Base Italy	Installation of front closures, (TAB VEE) Aircraft Shelters	91-142	$ 239,100	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions.
Fratelli Stimamiglio	Aviano A.B. Italy	Construction of Photo Lab. Base	90-408	$ 13,291	Modification to a previous contract which was awarded with price proposals solicited.
Medioli Di E&G Medioli Parma, Italy	Aviano A.B. Italy	TAB VEE Phase IIIa Aircraft Shelters	91-142	$ 32,154	Same as above.
Ari Insaat A.S. Instanbul, Turkey	Incirlik A.B. Turkey	MCAF FY 65, 66, 68 & 69 Facilities	89-568	$ 13,179	Same as above.
G.E.T.E.M. Athens, Greece	Athenai A.B. Athens, Greece	Const. Power Improve & Power Plant Addition	89-568	$ 12,800	Modification to a previous contract which was awarded with price proposals solicited.
Federal Republic of Germany	Ramstein Air Base, Germany	Aerial Port Facility	90-408	$ 517,967	Same as above.
Same as above	Miesau, Germany	Controlled Humidity Storage Warehouse	90-408	$ 13,604	Same as above.

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided by Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertisement
Same as above	Germany & Holland Germany	Aircraft Shelters	90-408	$ 10,000	Same as above.
Same as above	Bitburg, Germany	Approach Lighting	91-142	$ 14,583	Same as above.
Same as above	Kaiserslautern, Germany	Command Stock Storage Warehouse	90-408	$ 211,500	Same as above.
Same as above	Haustadt, Germany	12 Ammo Storage Igloos	89-367	$ 51,693	Same as above.
Same as above	Mannheim, Germany	Controlled Humidity Storage	90-408	$ 14,968	Same as above.
M.F. Wachter KG Stuttgart, Germany	Gablingen Germany	Army Security Agency Facility	90-408	$ 23,217	Same as above.
Josef Fischer Regensburg, Germany	Hohenfels, Germany	Storage Facilities	90-408	$ 20,627	Same as above.
Montagegesellshaft Frankfurt/Main, Germany	Schweinfurt, Germany	Heating Plants Extension Bldg.	91-511	$ 59,706	Same as above.
M.F. WACHTER Stuttgart, Germany	Gablingen - Augsburg, Germany	Constr of 1,000 man mess-hall-Gablingen Kaserne	91-142	$ 15,484	Modification to a previous contract which was awarded with price proposals solicited.
Marwais Steel Co. California, USA	Spangdahlem, Ramstein, Hahn & Bitburg, Germany	Delivery and Installation of 10 Aircraft Shelter Closures, w/Integrated Support systems	90-408	$ 96,284	Same as above.
Max Jordan Bau KG Mannheim, Germany	Germersheim, Germany	Constr of Equipment Washing Facility	90-110	$ 3,056	Same as above.
Helde & Francke Mainz/Rhein, Germany	Mainz, Germany	Alteration and Rehab of 5 Spray booths & Constr of New Paint Bldg.	91-142	$ 13,771	Same as above.
Eduart Armbruster Kaiserslautern, Germany	Misesau, Germany	Constr of Ammo Renovation Shop & Heating Plant	89-367	$ 3,586	Same as above.
Wolf & Sofsky Zweibruecken, Germany	Zweibruecken, Germany	Constr of Bachelor Officer's Qtrs	91-511	$ 24,548	Same as above.

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided by Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertisement
Heinrich Lenhard Kaiserslautern, Germany	Pirmasens, Germany	Upgrading of Power Comm Facilities	90-408	$ 27,365	Same as above.
Gehlen Bau Frankfurt, Germany	Frankfurt, Germany	Renovation of Frankfurt High School (Junior)	91-142	$ 543,666	Same as above.
Pacific Architects & Engineers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.	Vietnam	Construction of Additions to Power Plants	89-202	$ 31,833	Same as above.
Stolte, Inc., Sante Fe Engineers, Inc., Korea Development Corporation (A Joint Venture) Seoul, Korea	Pohang to Seoul, Korea	POL Pipeline, Essential Construction & Changes	90-392	$ 444,393	Modification to a previous contract which was awarded with price proposals solicited.
Fischer Engineering & Maintenance Co., Inc., Tong Yange Construction & Engineering Co., Ltd. (A Joint Venture) Seoul, Korea	Osan and Suwon Air Bases, Korea	Construction of POL Interface facilities	91-142	$ 94,000	Same as above.
Morrison-Knudsen International Co., Inc., Dae Lim Industrial Co., Ltd., Han Yang Development Co., Ltd., (A Joint Venture) Seoul, Korea	Various Sites, Korea	Contractor procured Materials Furnished to Using Agency	90-392	$ 82,343	Same as above.
Martin-Zachry Constructors, Honolulu, Hawaii	Marshall Islands	NIKE-X & Related Facilities, Essential Construction & Changes	89-568 91-142 91-511 90-408 90-110	$ 2,144,236	Modification to a previous contract which was awarded without price competition.
Pacific Architects & Engineers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.	Vietnam	Construction of Generator Addition	89-202	$ 10,000	Same as above.

Summary Data for Six-Month Period Covered by this Report

Total Awards	$191,550,798
Total Awards Not Formally Advertised	63,270,829
Total Awards Without Price Competition	2,468,835
Percent Awards Not Formally Advertised/Total Awards	33.0
Percent Awards Without Price Competition/Total Awards	1.3

NOTE: The large increase in the precent of the dollar amount of negotiated contracts (33.0%) for this period over the previous period (8.6%) resulted from the negotiation of one SAFEGUARD contract in the amount of $50,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
REPORT REQUIRED BY SECTION 704 OF PUBLIC LAW 92-145 COVERING MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS
AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING DURING THE SIX-MONTH PERIOD FROM 1 JAN 1972 TO 30 JUNE 1972

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided by Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertising
Jack Austin & Assoc. Oklahoma City, Okla.	Fort Polk, Louisiana	Family Housing	91-142	$5,746,830	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(15). Bids received under formal advertising were unreasonable; the negotiated price is lower than the lowest rejected bid; and the negotiated price is the lowest offered by any responsible contractor. Competitive price proposals solicited.
REVCON Corporation Lubbock, Texas	Roswell Airpark Roswell, N. Mex.	Rehabilitation of Buildings, Satellite Basing/Alert Area	91-511	$ 267,711	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(10) due to urgent need for the facility. Competitive price proposals solicited.
F.A. Villalba & Co El Paso, Texas	Roswell Airpark Roswell, N. Mex.	Rehabilitation of Mechanical & POL Facilities Satellite Basing/Alert Area	91-511	$ 118,345	Same as above.
Jowett Incorporated Clinton, Maryland	Ft. Belvoir, Va.	Air Conditioning and Improvements 11 Blg.	89-367	$ 213,500	Same as above.
M.M. SUNDT Construction Co. Tucson, Arizona	Ft. Huachuca Arizona	Repairs to Garden Canyon Water Collection System	90-408	$ 22,500	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(2). Impracticable to secure competition because work must be started immediately, prior to completion of plans and specifications, to protect the health and well being of the area residents.
Peter Kiewit Sons' Co. & Associates Omaha, Nebraska	Vicinity of Conrad, Montana	SAFEGUARD Ballistic Missile Defense System Facilities - Phase II Malmstrom	91-441	$110,927,932	Modification to a previous contract which was awarded with price proposals solicited. Basic contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(15). Bids received under formal advertising were unreasonable. A letter contract was awarded in December 1971 in order to allow work to start pending completion of negotiations. Negotiations were completed in February 1972 and the contract was definitized by this modification.

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided By Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertising
Peter Kiewit Sons' Co. & Associates Omaha, Nebraska	Vicinity of Conrad, Montana	Modification establishing new item in the Unit Price Schedule for interim adjustments under contract provisions. Phase II - Malmstrom	91-441	$ 900,000	Modification to a previous contract which was awarded with price proposals solicited.
Ballenger Corp. & Central International Corp. (Joint Venture) Greenville, South Carolina	Republic of Panama	Rehabilitation of Boyd Roosevelt Trans-Isthmian Highway	92-145	$ 6,745,240	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions Competitive price proposals solicited.
Federal Republic of Germany	Ramstein Air Base Germany	Aerial Port Facility	90-408	$ 94,355	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions. Competitive price proposals solicited.
Federal Republic of Germany	Ramstein Air Base Germany	Aerial Port Facility	90-408	$ 15,557	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Ramstein Air Base Germany	Aerial Port Facility	90-408	$ 60,682	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Ramstein Air Base Germany	Aerial Port Facility	90-408	$ 31,697	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Ramstein Air Base Germany	Aerial Port Facility	90-408	$ 38,064	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Germany, Holland, Italy, Turkey	TAB VEE Air Craft Shelters Frontal Closures	90-408	$ 638,273	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Hahn Air Base, Germany	POL TANK	89-568	$ 12,902	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Miesau, Germany	Controlled Humidity Storage	90-5	$ 15,546	Same as above.

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided By Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertising
Federal Republic of Germany	Kaiserslautern, Germany	Command Stock Storage	90-408	$ 732,982	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) (6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions. Competitive price proposals solicited.
E. Armbruster, Kaiserslautern, Germany	Finthen, Germany	Water Supply	90-110	$ 260,933	Same as above.
Karl Doll Stuttgart, Germany	Grafenwoehr, Germany	Heating for Messhalls and Latrines	91-142	$ 29,974	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Kaiserslautern, Germany	Command Stock Storage Warehouse	90-408	$ 52,311	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Ramstein & Fischbach, Germany	Tree Cutting	91-142	$ 17,659	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Erding, Germany	Erection 18 Aircraft Shelters	90-408	$ 27,171	Same as above.
Max Jordan Mannheim, Germany	Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany	Apron Operational	91-142	$ 39,807	Same as above.
Marwais Steel Co. Richmond, Calif.	Various locations in Germany	Delivery & Installation of 10 Aircraft Shelter Closures	90-408	$ 64,499	Same as above.
Leonhard Baumann Frankfurt/Main, Germany	Frankfurt/ Main, Germany	Bldg 272, Crime Lab	90-408	$ 13,671	Same as above.
Heinrich Lenhard Kaiserslautern, Germany	Pirmasens, Germany	Upgrading of Power Comm Facilities	90-5	$ 11,421	Same as above.
Gehlen Bau Frankfurt/Main, Germany	Frankfurt/Main, Germany	Renovation of Jr. High School	91-142	$ 23,292	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) (6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions. Competitive price proposals solicited.
AVCO Field Engineering Munich, Germany	Ludwigsburg, Germany	Conversion of Coal Firing Heating to Oil Firing	91-511	$ 88,590	Same as above.

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided By Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertising
Ed. Armbruster Mannheim, Germany	Fischbach, Germany	AMMO Depot	91-142	$ 500,465	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Hahn, Germany	Aircraft Shelter Erection	90-110	$ 40,498	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Erding, Germany	18 Aircraft Shelters	90-408	$ 41,782	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Ramstein Air Base, Germany	TAB VEE Aircraft Shelters	90-110	$ 84,833	Same as above.
Josef Fischer Regensburg, Germany	Hohenfels, Germany	Storage Facilities	91-121	$ 32,080	Same as above.
Gerhard Huebsch Bischofsheim/Hanau, Germany	Wobeck, Germany	Support Facility	90-408	$ 10,622	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Morbach, Germany	Tree Cutting	90-408	$ 20,432	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) (6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions. Competitive price proposals solicited.
	Bitburg, Germany	Liquid Oxygen Plant	89-568	$ 10,827	Same as above.
N. Sinewe Kaiserslautern, Germany	Germersheim, Germany	Snack Bar	89-568	$ 132,698	Same as above.
N. Sinewe Kaiserslautern, Germany	Germersheim, Germany	Dispensary	89-568	$ 194,286	Same as above.
N. Sinewe Kaiserslautern, Germany	Morbach, Germany	Ammot Stor Facility	90-408	$ 181,329	Same as above.
M. F. Wachter Stuttgart, Germany	Gablingen, Germany	Army Security Agency Location 300	90-408	$ 135,437	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Bitburg, Germany	Upgrading, TAB VEE Aircraft Shelters	90-110	$ 46,463	Same as above.
Federal Republic of Germany	Hahn, Germany	Erec of Maintenance Shelters	90-110	$ 20,441	Same as above.

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided by Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertising
Max Jordan Mannheim, Germany	Rhein Main, Germany	Aviation FUEL System	92-145	$ 34,082	Same as above.
Heilmann & Littmann Kassel, Germany	Mount Meissner, Germany	Army Security Agency Location 287	90-110	$ 156,078	Same as above.
M. F. Wachter Stuttgart, Germany	Esslingen, Germany	Barracks Improvements Nellingen Kaserne	92-145	$ 725,397	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions. Competitive price proposals solicited.
Federal Republic of Germany	Hahn, Germany	TAB VEE Aircraft Shelters	90-110	$ 12,926	Same as above.
Wolf & Sofsky Zweibruecken, Germany	Ramstein Air Base Germany	Fueling Support Facility	92-145	$ 79,206	Same as above.
A. Von Kaick Neu Isenburg, Germany	Ramstein Air Base Germany	Test Stand with Sound Suppressor	91-511	$ 19,916	Same as above.
Aero System Milano, Italy	Coltano, Italy	Modify Air Condition System at Autodin Facility	88-174	$ 24,279	Same as above.
De Lieto Const Co. Rome, Italy	Signonella, Italy	Construction of Facilities at Naval Air Station	92-145	$ 4,475,091	Same as above
Aero System Milano, Italy	Aviano Air Base Italy	Modify Air Condition System	90-110	$ 11,178	Contract negotiated in accordance with provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6) for property or services to be procured outside the United States and possessions.
Stolte, Inc., Santa Fe Engineers, Inc., Korea Development Corporation (A Joint Venture) Seoul, Korea	Pohang to Seoul, Korea	POL Pipeline, Essential Construction & Changes	90-392	$ 524,268	Modification to a previous contract which was awarded with price proposals solicited.

Name of Company With Which Contract Was Placed	Location of Work	Description of Military Construction Provided by Contract	Public Law Which Authorized This Military Construction	Dollar Amount of Contract (Or Contract Modification)	Reason Why Contract Was Awarded Without Formal Advertising
Martin-Zachry Constructors Honolulu, Hawaii	Marshall Islands	NIKE-X and Related Facilities, Essential Construction & Changes	89-568 91-121 91-142 91-441 92-145	$ 4,598,504	Modification to a previous contract which was awarded without price competition.

Summary Data for Six-Month Period Covered by this Report

Total Awards	$461,847,213
Total Awards Not Formally Advertised	139,324,562
Total Awards Without Price Competition	4,632,182
Percent Awards Not Formally Advertised/Total Awards	30.2
Percent Awards Without Price Competition/Total Awards	1.0

NOTE: A major portion of the dollar amount of negotiated contracts ($139,324,562) for this period resulted from the negotiation of one SAFEGUARD contract modification in the amount of $110,927,932.

GUEST HOUSE CONSTRUCTION

Guest house construction: A guest house is planned for Fort Polk, La., in 1974, pending the outcome of a justification study. This project will be accomplished with nonappropriated funds.

A 100-unit patient visitor facility for Walter Reed Army Medical Center is proposed in the fiscal year 1974 military construction program which, if approved, will be constructed with appropriated funds.

NONAPPROPRIATED FUNDED CONSTRUCTION
PROJECTS OVER $300,000 STARTED OR PLACED UNDER CONTRACT
FOR THE PERIOD 1 JAN TO 31 DEC 1972

Installation	Project Title	($000) Cost
Fort Belvoir, VA	Indoor Swimming Pool	500.0
	Multiple Craft Shop	687.7
Fort Dix, NJ	Aquatic Facility	543.0
	Post Library	500.0
Fort Eustis, VA	Construct Auto Craft Shop	349.2
Fort Knox, KY	Theater (500 Seat)	448.1
	Construct Main Post Exchange Store, Cafeteria, Warehouse and Facility for Services Outlets	2,705.8
Fort George G. Meade, MD	Construct Main Post Exchange Store, Cafeteria, Warehouse and Facility for Services Outlets	2,129.1
	Construct Citizen's National Branch Bank	373.0
Fort Benning, GA	Construct Community Post Exch Shop Ctr	5,396.7
Fort Gordon, GA	Theater 500 Seat. Project started 26 Jul 71 and completed 9 Nov 72.	353.2
	EM Service Club. Project started 23 Nov 71 and completed 15 Jan 73.	636.0
Fort Jackson, SC	Theater (500 Seat). Construct permanent Bldg to include stage, air conditioning, parking area.	438.2
	Bowling Center, 24 Lane. Project started 2 Nov 72, to be completed March 1973.	625.0
Fort McClellan, AL	Construct NCO Open Mess	504.5
Fort Hood, TX	Construct 88 Unit Guest House	785.6
Fort Sam Houston, TX	Expand Officer's Open Mess	670.5
Fort Leonard Wood, MO	Construct Officer's Open Mess	1,094.0
	Construct 40 Lane Bowling Alley	1,226.0
	Construct Multi-Craft Shop	400.0
	Construct Main Post Exchange Store, Snack Bar, Warehouse and Facility for Services (Concession) Outlets. (Main Post Exchange Store and Services at 1,851,600 reported Dec 70; snack bar and warehouse at 393,000 reported Dec 71. *An additional $43.9 for this period totaling $2,288.5.	43.9*
Presidio of San Francisco, CA	Addition to Officer's Open Mess Bldg 50	980.0
Fort Shafter, HI	Gymnasium	840.0
Machinato Service Area, Okinawa	Gymnasium	510.0

CONSTRUCTION FOR OTHER APPROPRIATIONS

O. & M FACILITIES PROGRAM CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS APPROPRIATION R.D.T. & E. FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972
($1,001 TO $50,000)

Installation	July 1–Dec. 31, 1971		Jan. 1–June 30, 1972		Total fiscal year 1972	
	Number of projects	(thousands)	Number of projects	(thousands)	Number of projects	(thousands)
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md	7	$58.7	10	$120.1	17	$178.8
Deseret Test Center, Utah			4	15.4	4	15.4
Fort Detrick, Md	3	30.0			3	30.0
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah	1	25.0			1	25.0
Harry Diamond Laboratory, Washington, D.C	3	5.5	7	42.8	10	48.3
Fort Monmouth, N.J			2	3.0	2	3.0
Picatinny Arsenal, N.J	1	25.0			1	25.0
Redstone Arsenal, Ala			5	61.9	5	61.9
Rock Island, Ill	6	43.9	4	9.3	10	53.2
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex	13	82.1	22	212.3	35	294.4
Yuma Proving Grounds, Ariz	5	64.4	23	150.9	28	215.3
Safeguard System Command, Ala	39	170.7	42	234.9	81	405.6
Engineers (CRREL)	1	2.2	11	145.1	12	147.3
TSG—Detrick Medical R. & D. Command			6	120.9	6	120.9
Fitzsimons GH, Colo	1	1.5	2	12.3	3	13.8
Walter Reed AMC, Washington, D.C	5	7.8	9	22.7	14	30.5
SCC—Fort Huachuca, Ariz	2	12.7	2	12.9	4	25.6
Conarc:						
1st Army—Fort Belvoir, Va	1	14.5			1	14.5
5th Army—Fort Bliss, Tex	1	1.9	3	9.1	4	11.0
Southern Area Command:						
Fort Clayton, Corozal	7	55.4	1	14.8	8	70.2
Fort Gulick, Corozal	1	5.0	1	29.9	2	34.9
Grand total	97	606.3	154	1,218.3	251	1,824.6

There were no construction programs performed in the past year nor are there any pending approval which will be financed by Army procurement funds at other than Government-owned contractor-operated plants.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS
APPROVED AND FUNDED FOR EXECUTION IN FY 1973
(AS OF 7 MAY 1973)

Location	Project Description	Estimated Funded Cost
Fort Carson, Colorado	Road Extension and Widening	$ 299,000
Fort Lee, Virginia	Air Condition of Classroom Facility	159,300
Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D.C.	Modernize Animal rooms in Building 40	268,200
Fort Huachuca, Arizona	Training device fabrication building	260,600
Mannheim, Germany	Addition to dependents high school	297,600
Fort Ord, California	Security Lighting in various areas	127,800
Fort Sill, Oklahoma	Pollution prevention bypass system, Sewage Treatment Plant	85,277
Camp Humphreys, Korea	Helicopter parking pads and taxiways	299,000
Fort Benning, Georgia	Drug Treatment Facilities	26,400
Fort Huachuca, Arizona	Ground surveillance academic laboratory classrooms	295,300
Fort Hood, Texas	Street and parking area lighting	215,800
Fort Ord, California	Modifications to night firing range	99,500
Fort Shafter, Hawaii	Alterations to Pictorial and Audio/visual facility	81,800
Augsburg, Germany	Perimeter security fence at an Army Security Agency Activity	62,400
Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado	Metal Processing Shop	256,200
Woodbridge, Virginia	Modification to Research Facility Building	293,600
Fort Bliss, Texas	Alteration to Building 769 for School TV Facility	120,200
Fort Rucker, Alabama	Treatment facilities	94,240
Frankfurt, Germany	Army Post Office Terminal	73,200
Deseret Test Center, Utah	Hospital air conditioning and warehouse addition	182,630
Sacramento Army Depot, California	Automatic data processing/communications facility	96,000
Fort Sill, Oklahoma	Academic facilities for NCO Academy and Drill Sergeant School	99,883
Fort Campbell, Kentucky	Electrical substation and distribution system	230,600
Fort Lewis, Washington	Personnel Central Processing Facility	293,440
Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado	USAR Administrative facility	53,400
Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado	Medical equipment maintenance school facilities	297,400
Fort Bliss, Texas	Modification of 3 tactical equipment shops and facilities	239,895
New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania	Alter bldg 83 for rotor blade overhaul facility	267,100
U.S. Army Natick Laboratories, Massachusetts	Relocation of automatic data processing activity	104,300
Hunter Liggett Military Reservation, California	Security lighting in various areas	62,000
Fort Ord, California	Parking ramp and taxiway lighting at Fritzsche Army Airfield	80,000
Fort McClellan, Alabama	Expansion of WAC dispensary	274,500

Location	Project Description	Estimated Funded Cost
Fort McClellan, Alabama	Expansion of WAC clothing store	$ 298,300
Fort McClellan, Alabama	Construct 2 Battalion Headquarters buildings	198,855
Fort McClellan, Alabama	Modifications to WAC Band Building	297,700
Fort McClellan, Alabama	Construct gas plant	280,900
Fort Ord, California	Graphic Aid Facility	67,600
Fort Ord, California	Emergency power generator for confinement facility	60,300
Fort Bliss, Texas	Facilities for Army Sergeants-Major Academy	291,000
Munich, Germany	Vocational Automotive Shops and Business Education Laboratory Perlacher Forst	264,680
Nuernberg, Germany	Vocational Automotive Shops, Business Education Laboratory and Cosmetology Laboratory	300,000
Bad Kreuznach, Germany	Vocational Education Facilities	184,900
Karlsruhe, Germany	Vocational Business Education and Office Machine Laboratory	148,500
Stuttgart, Germany	Vocational Automotive Shop, Electronics/ Electricity Laboratory and Cosmetology Laboratory	298,440
Camp Ederle, Vicenza, Italy	Vocational Education Facilities	206,000
Baumholder, Germany	Vocational Education Facilities	299,900
Wuerzburg, Germany	Vocational Automotive Shop, Business Education Laboratory and Cosmetology Laboratory	300,000
Augsburg, Germany	Vocational Automotive Shop, Business Education Laboratory and Cosmetology Laboratory	300,000
Kaiserslautern, Germany	Vocational Education Facilities	299,900
Fort Bliss, Texas	Tank Gunnery Range	299,255
Crailsheim, Germany	Site for receiver and TV Transmitter	90,500
Einkorn, Germany	Site for receiver and TV Transmitter	72,200
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania	Property disposal operations building	179,500
New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania	Alter facilities for recruiting main stations	91,719
New Orleans Army Base, Louisiana	Sanitary Sewer System	94,000
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey	Pilot Line, High Explosives	299,927
Tooele Army Depot, Utah	Modify compressed airlines in bldg 619, Maintenance Facility	201,300
Fort Gordon, Georgia	Improvements to Drug Treatment Facility	150,200
Fort Hood, Texas	Tank Crew Proficiency Course	182,300
Fort Carson, Colorado	Mezzanines in twelve motor pool buildings	298,600
Giessen, Germany	Addition to Elementary/Junior High School	299,500
Landstuhl, Germany	Additions to Bldg 3767 for Cardio-Vascular Facility	261,000
Grafenwoehr, Germany	Tank Gunnery Range	297,800

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS
APPROVED AND UNDER DESIGN FOR CONSTRUCTION FUNDING FY 73 - FY 74
(AS OF 7 MAY 1973)

Location	Project Description	Funded Cost
Edwards AFB, Calif.	Alter Bldg 1820 for Administrative space for US Army Flight Test Agency	$ 152,800
Fort Shafter, Hawaii	Addition to Intelligence Data Handling System Facility	296,000
Fort Wadsworth, New York	Alterations to Bldg 210 for the US Army Chaplains School	280,000
Twin Cities Ammunition Plant, Minnesota	Standby power for sewage pumping station	87,000
Fort Belvoir, Virginia	Communications facility at Davison US Army Airfield	58,600
Fort Belvoir, Virginia	Aviation Maintenance Facilities at Davison US Army Airfield	299,900
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey	Boiler Feeder Treatment	180,000
Fort Detrick, Maryland	Direct communications link (DCL) Satellite site preparation	205,800
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama	Missile Intelligence Agency Computer Facility	99,000
Fort Polk, Louisiana	Upgrade Post Stockade Electrical Distribution System	208,100
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts	Electrical distribution improvement for administration building	210,000
Corpus Christi, Texas	Upgrade turbine engine test cells at the US Army Aeronautical Depot Maintenance Center	222,820
Camp Casey, Korea	Transient Confinement Facilities	79,400
Camp Humphreys, Korea	Confinement facilities	268,000
Fort Sherman, Panama Canal Zone	Upgrade US Army Runway	294,900
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas	Protective tier screening within US Disciplinary Barracks Cell Blocks	99,900
Vint Hill Farms, Virginia	Sewage Treatment Plant	275,000
Wake Island	Missile Launch Complex	216,000
Red River Army Depot, Texas	Theater Readiness Monitoring Facility Addition	78,900
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri	Street and Area Lighting	299,700
Fort Lee, Virginia	Alterations to Bldg P12400 for Army Troop Support Agency	267,000
Fort Knox, Kentucky	Stabilized Tank Crew Proficiency Course	290,700

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN PROCESS FOR SECRETARIAT APPROVAL (AS OF MAY 7, 1973)

Location and project description	*Estimated funded cost*
Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, N.J., upgrade interior lighting in warehouse 43	$91,000
Fort Lee, Va., alter facilities for central food processing system	242,100
Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colo., alterations for intensive care facility	298,500
Fort Benning, Ga., electric service to Kunzig Range complex	92,400
Fort Sam Houston, Tex., incinerator facility	206,000
Fort Benning, Ga., modify temporary barracks for 197th infantry Brigade and School Spt Bn	299,600
Fort Benning, Ga., motor pool facilities for 197th Infantry Brigade	110,435
Fort Benning, Ga., range facilities for infantry school	195,900
Schoefield Barracks, Hawaii, construct 10 temporary motor pools for troop units	298,300
Fort Dix, N.J., modify primary electrical substation	199,400
Tooele Army Depot, modify magazines for storage of Minuteman boosters	184,400

CONSTRUCTION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Construction performed in the Republic of South Vietnam during the past year, funded with prior year Southeast Asia military construction, Army appropriations, consisted essentially of the continuation of construction of the line of communications and the military assistance construction programs. The total work placement for these programs for the period March 31, 1972, to March 31, 1973, was $15.9 million. Of this amount $8.6 million was applied on the line of communications program and $7.3 million to military assistance construction projects.

Major military assistance, Service-funded construction projects pursued during the year included:

	Funds (thousands)
Infantry school	$4,500
Communications centers	129
Supply and maintenance centers	445

There are no new construction projects for South Vietnam pending approval at the present time.

Mr. SIKES. Have there been changes in the procedures for nonappropriated funds construction?

General COOPER. None that I know of, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You are to provide a listing, are you, on construction provided with nonappropriated funds?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Davis.

FAMILY HOUSING AVERAGE UNIT COST LIMITATION

Mr. DAVIS. The limitation on unit cost, is that a matter of permanent legislation or has this been included in the appropriation request?

General COOPER. That is a matter of permanent legislation. It is in each particular bill that authorizes the family housing; it authorizes an average cost. That is countrywide.

So you build some houses that cost less than that in places where the construction costs are less; later on you build the above-average-cost house in higher cost areas.

Mr. DAVIS. Is there anything in the bill to discourage building these units in the areas of cheap construction and then simply deferring those in the areas of higher construction?

General COOPER. Well, you would lose the authorization if you do not start building it or at least part of it in the area. Once you start building, even the road up to the area, that locks you into that particular fiscal year. So you either are going to lose the authorization or in some isolated cases where you obviously have tried hard to award the complete program within the average costs and failed, we have asked for exceptions to that, by specific location, such as for Leavenworth a few years ago. We will need to do this separately in the 1972 program for the housing at Grand Forks.

We expect just to loose the authorization for housing at Carlisle Barracks because the construction costs there were so out of sight and the bids were so unresponsive. The contractors had plenty of work to do, more than they could do, as a result of Tropical Storm Agnes.

Mr. DAVIS. Do you have a special exception that applies generally with respect to designated areas of high construction cost or do you get that—do you go to the Armed Services Committee and get an exception in each individual case?

General COOPER. If we deviate from that, we get an exception in each case, but we do not deviate very often. It is very rare that we deviate. The other flexibility that we have in keeping within the average cost limitation is to use what we call deducts.

In other words, you can build a house initially without a carport or garage. You can build the basic house, come back later to add the carport or garage.

We have had to use that extensively in the past, that is, take some of these things out of the program, sidewalks and the like. We do not want to, but that is the only way we could get the complete program.

VALLEY FORGE HOSPITAL

Mr. MCEWEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Cooper, with regard to Valley Forge Hospital, that was used extensively during the Vietnam conflict, was it not?

General COOPER. Yes, sir; and also during World War II and the Korean war, as far as I know.

Mr. MCEWEN. At all of those times it was needed? We did not have other facilities that could have carried that caseload, am I correct?

General COOPER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MCEWEN. Should we have a similar demand in the future, what facility would take the place of Valley Forge?

General COOPER. Well, if we had a similar demand which greatly peaked, it is conceivable we might have to build another temporary hospital, which would be preferable—although we have a certain expansion capability within our own program. We have a major new hospital program of $750 million which Mr. Brazier mentioned earlier.

I do not know precisely what our expansion capability is. We have General Pixley here from the Office of the Surgeon General, if you like some more detail.

Mr. MCEWEN. First, if you will clarify this for me, General Cooper. You said you might possibly have to build another hospital. Was Valley Forge a temporary facility?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

General PIXLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCEWEN. There is a good deal of obsolescence?

Mr. BRAZIER. Very much.

Mr. MCEWEN. Not a facility, then, that you might put in caretaker status?

General COOPER. No.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11508 SURVEY OF PROPERTY

Mr. MCEWEN. One other matter. Have you, General Cooper, or any of the gentlemen here, been involved in this matter of the disposal of surplus lands?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. I have been involved in it, Mr. Lockwood has been involved in it at great length.

Mr. MCEWEN. Let me more specific.

The surplus program I am speaking of is the one initiated by our President's——

General COOPER. Executive Order 11508.

Mr. MCEWEN. Precisely, I am concerned about this. I do not know what has happened on other posts, but in the case of Camp Drum there were proposals to take quite a number of parcels out of that post, including the site for the housing project we have been discussing. That, I am told, has been straightened out. But I am concerned, General, because I do not know, first off, of anyone up there who wants the land. There is no clamor for it. That day may come. But right now there is not any pressure for that land.

With Camp Drum being, as far as I know, the only large military reservation in the Northeast that can take division-sized operations, I think we would be well-advised to retain that land.

I would like to have your comments on this.

General COOPER. First of all, under the provisions of 11508, we are not authorized to consider what the possible use is going to be. We have to consider whether we are using it in an optimum fashion right now.

Now we have added to that that if we have a planned use for it, or if we have a mobilization requirement that requires it, we then indicate that we have a requirement for the land.

Mr. MCEWEN. Let me interrupt you right there.

A mobilization requirement is one of the criteria?

General COOPER. That is right. We apply it in determining within the Army whether we recommend it be excessed or not.

Mr. MCEWEN. In other words, even though at the particular moment all of the land is not being utilized, if it would be utilized under a mobilization plan, then you can retain it; is that correct?

General COOPER. Well, that is our criteria when we go forward to the Office of Secretary of Defense.

Now the Property Review Board under the President does not necessarily have to follow that; they can then consider other factors. But the Office of Secretary of Defense has supported us in that being a legitimate requirement.

After it is declared excess, we then have to, in the process, go to the Armed Services Committee of the House and they then pass on all of these.

So there are checks and balances in that regard. The Property Review Board is not governed by that mobilization requirement.

Mr. SIKES. Well, I realize that there is pressure from many directions for the Government to excess land. I think frequently it is a mistake for Defense land to be excessed. I have seen too many instances, in my time here, when we had to go and buy it back a few years later at several times the price the Government got for it.

I always like to see the Government proceed on the side of caution in excessing land. You never know what the future requirements are going to be.

I think Mr. McEwen is exactly right in his comments.

Now, is a part of the land at Camp Drum in the process of being excessed?

General COOPER. I am not sure.

Mr. Lockwood has the details on Camp Drum.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Sir, the survey that was made by the Office of Secretary of Defense under Executive Order 11508 recommended that we dispose of about 11,900 acres.

Mr. SIKES. Out of what total acreage?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Out of some 107,000 acres that comprise Camp Drum.

Mr. SIKES. I do not know the details, but I would certainly recommend taking a second look. Go ahead.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. The Army agreed to excess 75 acres which were off in one corner bisected by a road.

Mr. SIKES. That sounds like a good compromise.

Mr. MCEWEN. That is all right, Mr. Chairman, that is fine. Where does it stand right now, the decision on this?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Sir, as with many of the surveys where there has been a disagreement, we have forwarded our position. We have not heard any final decision yet. It is pending further review by the Property Review Board, GSA, Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. SIKES. Well, there is a court of last appeal. If it comes up to the Hill, it still goes to the Legislative Committee which deals with the subject.

Are there further questions?

Mr. MCEWEN. No further questions.

Mr. SIKES. Gentlemen, thank you very much. You have been very helpful to the committee.

Mr. Brazier, I guess we can release you since we are ready to go into the line item breakdown.

Mr. BRAZIER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We appreciate the courtesies of the committee.

SUMMARY OF ARMY PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Reporter, will you please insert in the record pages xi through xv of the justifications book.

[The pages follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
INSTALLATION SUMMARY			
Title I:			
Inside the United States	15,261	548,558	563,819
Outside the United States		[1] 108,581	88,581
Classified		3,000	3,000
General authorization			51,500
Total	15,261	660,139	706,900
COMMAND SUMMARY			
Inside the United States			
Command:			
Continental Army Command	528	413,281	413,809
U.S. Army Materiel Command	0	58,649	58,649
U.S. Army Security Agency	0	287	287
U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command	0	8,226	8,226
U.S. Military Academy	0	30,145	30,145
Army Medical Department	10,830	1,997	12,827
Corps of Engineers	0	597	597
Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service	3,603	2,113	5,716
U.S. Army, Alaska	0	8,344	8,344
U.S. Army, Hawaii	0	10,825	10,825
Pollution abatement, air	0	7,295	7,295
Pollution abatement, water	300	6,799	7,099
Total	15,261	548,558	563,819
Outside the United States			
Command:			
U.S. Army Forces, Southern Command		8,095	8,095
U.S. Army, Pacific		1,568	1,568
Puerto Rico		517	517
Kwajalein Missile Range		2,353	2,353
U.S. Army Security Agency		1,434	1,434
U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command		2,097	2,097
U.S. Army, Europe		[1] 92,517	72,517
Total		108,581	88,581
SUMMARY			
Classified			
Classified project		3,000	3,000
General authorization			
Planning			39,000
Minor Construction			12,500
Total			51,500

[1] Includes $20,000,000 for NATO infrastructure not proposed for funding.

First Army

Mr. Sikes. We will turn to the 1st Army.
Place page 3 in the record.

INSTALLATION SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

1st Army	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Fort Belvoir, Va		14,403	14,403
Carlisle Barracks, Pa		2,465	2,465
Fort Devens, Mass		2,749	2,749
Fort Dix, N.J		339	339
Camp Drum, N.Y		1,099	1,099
Fort Eustis, Va		4,782	4,782
Camp A. P. Hill, Va		535	535
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pa		1,657	1,657
Fort Knox, Ky		7,305	7,305
Fort Lee, Va		22,769	22,769
Fort George G. Meade, Md		7,445	7,445
Fort Monroe, Va		867	867
Camp Pickett, Va		476	476
Totals	0	66,891	66,891

Mr. SIKES. The request for 1st Army is $66,891,000.

General Cooper, I see that the justifications do not contain the priority numbers with which this committee has worked in prior years. Will you see that the justification pages are corrected to show the priority numbers?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I recognize there have been some recent changes in the program, your personnel may not have had a chance to include these figures at this time.

General COOPER. We have the priority list with us, sir. We will indicate the priority on each of these as we go along, but we will also adjust the books.

Mr. SIKES. Very well.

PERSONNEL STRENGTHS

Do the personnel strengths which we see on the justification pages reflect changes due to base realignment?

General COOPER. In most cases they do. In some cases there were not any changes. In any case, where we had to change a particular page it does reflect it. So I would have to answer you on almost a sheet-by-sheet basis.

Mr. SIKES. Let's go back to the case of Fort Dix, the pending study on the future utilization is not complete. That could make quite a change in the strengths at other posts, is that not right?

General COOPER. It could have, yes, sir; it could have a difference in the strengths at other posts.

Mr. SIKES. Then, at the time that the hearing goes to press, please provide the most recent figures that you have. In other words, update your figures. And show upon what assumptions the figures are based.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[Editor's Note: The Army provided updated sheets reflecting base utilization decisions as of June 1973, but prior to the completion of studies on training bases and small bases.]

Mr. SIKES. Has the fiscal year 1974 program been adjusted to reflect base realinements in general?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

We made some specific changes in the base realignments in the 1974 program. There are some other modifications to the realignments where we are going to ask in the very near future for some reprograming within fiscal year 1973.

FORT BELVOIR, VA.

Mr. SIKES. Take up Fort Belvoir, please place page 4 in the record.

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Fort Belvoir

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	Virginia 105	Virginia

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Active	1918	Fairfax	Alexandria, 11 miles Northeast

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Command, train and provide logistical support to Engineer Troop Units, Engineer Officers and specialists at the Engineer School; provides facilities and support for USA Mobility Equipment Research and Development Center; provide facilities for Topographic Research and Development Laboratory, and other tenant activities. Support Davison Army Airfield.

* $25,700 one-time cost for easement.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972	707	3,453	2,072	621	3,144	1,054	1,917	3,251	16,219
b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	889	3,211	4,995	679	1,514	117	595	175	12,175

13 INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	9,016	1,192	133,263	134,455
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	221	(26*)	0	26
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				134,481
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY			(Exclusive of family housing - $4,084)	31,259
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM			(Exclusive of family housing - $20,010)	14,403
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS			(Exclusive of family housing - $43,000)	42,242
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				222,385

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
113	259 - Hélicopter Landing Facility & Parking Apron (Davison AAF)	40	5	MDW	SY	46,400	1,628	46,400	1,628
721	168 - EM Barracks w/o Mess (Medical)	1	6		MN	122	897	122	897
721	410 - EM Barracks Complex	1	7		MN	1,054	11,878	1,054	11,878
		Total					14,403		14,403

FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA

$14,403,000

Fort Belvoir is located 11 miles southwest of Alexandria, Virginia. The mission of this installation is to command, train and provide logistical support of Engineer troop units and the Engineer School; to operate and maintain the U.S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Center and the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School; to provide facilities for Headquarters Combat Developments Command and for the Topographic Research and Development Laboratory; and to support Davison Army Airfield. The program consists of a helicopter landing facility and parking apron, barracks without dining facilities for medical personnel, and a barracks complex.

Status of Funds

	($000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	31,259
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	13,488
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	2,200

Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
259	Helicopter Landing Fac & Park Apron	21	10
168	EM Barracks w/o Mess Med	40	7
410	EM Barracks Complex	480	25

ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA

	Men*
Total Requirement	5,666
Existing Substandard	8,405**
Existing Adequate	0
Funded, Not in Inventory	1,200
Adequate Assets	1,200
Deficiency	4,466
FY 1974 Program	1,176
Barracks spaces occupied, 22 Dec 72	3,998

* 90 square feet per man - permanent party personnel;
72 square feet per man - trainees.

** Includes 1,903 spaces that can be made adequate

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $14,403,000, for a number of projects. I would like to have someone show us on the map where the projects will be located.

Mr. CARTON. Sir, this is the upper part of Fort Belvoir, U.S. 1 goes through the center of the post in this manner.

The barracks complex which has been requested lies in this area, which is north of U.S. 1. The medical barracks lie at this point which is adjacent to the existing hospital and the existing medical barracks. At Davison Army Airfield is this project which covers the helicopter landing facilities.

Mr. DAVIS. Does your overall map there show where Davison is located with relation to it?

Mr. CARTON. Davison lies about here [indicating].

BARRACKS

Mr. SIKES. Who will occupy the barracks you are going to build?

General COOPER. The barracks are going to be occupied—we have several barracks projects.

Mr. SIKES. The two you are speaking of here?

General COOPER. One is a medical barracks.

Mr. SIKES. It will be near the hospital?

General COOPER. That will be near the hospital.

Mr. SIKES. The other is quite some distance away?

General COOPER. Across the highway on the north part of the post. That is for 1,054 men. That is going to be occupied, about half of it, 507 spaces, by a permannt party, T.O. & E. and tenant units, including the Davison U.S. Army Airfield, U.S. Army Engineer Power Group, the Navy Nuclear Power Group, 112th Field Activities Group, U.S. Army Computer Systems Command, Operations Test and Evaluation Command, Defense Systems Management School; 547 will be occupied by PCS and TDY students from the U.S. Army Engineers School Brigade.

Mr. SIKES. Where are the barracks in relation to the cantonment areas?

Mr. CARTON. Sir, if you will recall, this is the old World War II hospital. There are some World War II barracks in this area now. The main cantonment area of the post is due south, just below this complex of buildings here. The permanent barracks will be just about here. [Indicating.]

Mr. PATTEN. You are indicating that this is 2,000 feet away, are you not, more than 2,000 feet?

General COOPER. It is more than 2,000 feet away from where the permanent barracks are now.

Mr. CARTON. Yes, sir, there is a permanent barracks complex approved in the 1973 program which will lie immediately adjacent to this.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record at this base and at all other installations where bachelor quarters are proposed an analysis of the bachelor housing situation. Is it fair to say that off-post housing for bachelor personnel is difficult to find in this area?

General COOPER. Bachelor enlisted men or lower rank?

Mr. SIKES. Both.

General COOPER. I would say it is difficult for bachelor enlisted men. It is not difficult for bachelor officers.

Mr. SIKES. Have you taken into account in your housing computations the two permanent barracks buildings which the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School will vacate?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

MILITARY ACADEMY PREPARATORY SCHOOL MOVE

Mr. SIKES. Where are you going to move the school?

General COOPER. The present plan is to move the school to Fort Meade, Md.

Mr. SIKES. Why do you not move it out of the Washington area? We have been concerned about the congestion of Government facilities in Washington. Why not move it out of the Washington area, if it is going to be moved?

General COOPER. It is kind of half out of the Washington area in Fort Meade. We wanted to try to keep the students at the West Point Preparatory School reasonably close to Washington so they could see their Congressmen and Senators concerning appointments to the military academy.

Mr. SIKES. That is not much of a reason for keeping the school here.

General COOPER. We had facilities at Fort Meade in terms of barracks that had been vacated by the move of the first squadron of the Sixth Armored Cavalry to Fort Bliss. So we had facilities there and it was close to Washington. Those are the reasons.

Mr. SIKES. I hope you can think of some better ones. Those do not impress me.

[The information follows:]

There are a number of reasons why our present plan is to move the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School from Fort Belvoir to Fort Meade.

First, as part of our study to reduce the Army's presence in the National Capital Region, we looked closely at all administrative type activities which could be considered susceptible to relocation outside the NCR. At that time, the USMA Prep. School was requesting for fiscal year 1974 MCA, a complete new facility, to be constructed at Fort Belvoir, costing approximately $4.8 million. The new, larger facility is required to accommodate the increased student enrollment for the prep. school authorized along with the expansion of the Military Academy.

We felt that one of the best times to relocate an activity was when new facilities were being requested. Such was the case with the prep. school.

We surveyed several installations to determine where we could master plan the new construction for the prep. school. This survey was conducted at installations along the general axis Washington-West Point. We limited ourselves to this general geographic area for several reasons; to permit the prep. school to move with minimum disruption to its mission; to reduce turbulence among civilian instructor personnel; to permit continuance of our guest speaker program whereby senior officers and civilians from the Washington area visit the prep. school and share their experiences and philosophy with the cadet candidates to facilitate the required close liaison between the commandant of the prep. school and the DA staff; to avoid disruption of established intercollegiate athletic programs with colleges and junior colleges in the Washington-Maryland-Virginia area; and to insure that a close relationship is maintained between the prep. school and the Military Academy so that the admissions and academic programs remain compatible.

Fort Meade was selected when it was determined that barracks and other facilities would be available there following the move of the first squadron, Sixth Armored Cavalry Regiment to Fort Bliss. This would permit us to put the prep. school in good, existing permanent facilities with only limited new construction and modification at a lower cost than totally new construction.

As a side note, the prep. school as it is now constituted was established in 1946 at Stewart AFB. N.Y. In 1956, it moved to Fort Belvoir into an old mobilization hospital. In 1966 they relocated into their present facilities. Our plan gives us a chance to settle the prep. school into a permanent location.

Mr. SIKES. What kind of buildings does the Combat Developments Command occupy at Fort Belvoir?

General COOPER. The Combat Development Command now occupies, among other things, one of the barracks buildings.

Mr. SIKES. What use will be made of those buildings?

General COOPER. The Computer Systems Command is going to move into the buildings that have been occupied by the Combat Development Agency. There are also some World War II temporary structures that they are moving into.

AIRFIELD FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. You are requesting an additional airfield facility at Davison. Tell us about the condition of facilities that you have, if these are replacements, or the lack of facilities, if these are additions.

General COOPER. These are primarily additions. We have Colonel Coats here from the Army staff who is an aviator and also an engineer, judging by his buttons. I will ask him to address this particular question.

Colonel COATS. Our primary problem out at Davison is the fact that both the fixed-wing and rotary wing aircraft use the main runway.

Mr. SIKES. I must say you handle a pointer with alacrity.

General COOPER. Part of your guidance to use backup witnesses more.

Colonel COATS. The congestion is due to both the fixed-wing and rotary wing traffic using the fixed-wing runway. There is a rotary wing runway complex that is located northeast of the main runway.

The problem with this, sir, is that the traffic landing to the northeast on the northeast-southwest runway would have to go directly across the fixed-wing runway. Traffic landing to the northwest on the perpendicular rotary-wing runway which is located only 640 feet from the landing threshold has to cross the alert hangar. This is an unsafe condition that we would correct by providing a new rotary-wing landing area.

The other aspect of the project is that on the existing rotary-wing parking apron we have space for only 14 of the 35 Huey type and the seven light observation helicopters.

The project will provide the required parking for the remaining helicopters by expanding the existing parking area and utilizing the existing rotary-wing runways.

We have quite heavy traffic at Davison, as you can imagine. Last year we had almost 59,000 rotary-wing activities and over 62,000 fixed-wing activities. We seek to split the helicopter traffic from the fixed-wing operations so that we do not have the congestion. This is particularly difficult during adverse weather conditions when we are operating under instrument flight conditions.

The operating minimums are different for fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft. This project will enable Davison to split its traffic and provide a much safer and efficient operation.

Mr. PATTEN. Did you say 5,800 or 58,000?

Colonel COATS. Sir, I said 59,000 activities. This is counting as an activity, each takeoff and landing.

We did provide some figures that talked in terms of mission sorties. That would be a mission that would take off, accomplish an assigned task and return, and could include maybe a number of different takeoffs and landings. Some of the operations that are conducted at Davison involves flights that might be single missions, but might have as many as 20 or 25 landings and a similar number of takeoffs. This would account for the high activity to sortie ratio of, say, 50 to 1.

Mr. PATTEN. That is greatly at odds with the figures that we had. Your other data indicated you had about 7,000 operations a year.

Colonel COATS. Those, sir, if I may again, were sorties.

A sortie is a mission that would start from initial takeoff, complete a specific task or mission, and would terminate with final landing. On some of the transition missions conducted at Davison, a man would take off, he might make as many as 20 landings and 20 takeoffs, so he would actually log somewhere in excess of 40 activities in the process of logging a single sortie, or training mission. Only those takeoffs or landings at Davison are included in the Davison traffic activity data.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have a comparison of the landings and operational activities at this airfield and comparison with that of other Army airfields.

Will you provide that?

Colonel COATS. Yes, sir. I have some figures now and I could provide more complete data for the record.

Mr. SIKES. Do it for the record, for the last 3 years.

Colonel COATS. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Available operational statistics for the past 3 years and a forecast for the next 3 years are as follows:

	Fiscal year 1971		Fiscal year 1972		Fiscal year 1973 [1]		3-year forecast per year	
	Fixed wing	Rotary wing	Fixed wing	Rotary wing	Fixed wing	Rotary wing	Fixed wing	Rotary wing
Mission sorties	850	2,090	919	1,440	761	737	800–1,000	1,000–1,300
Night operations [2]					405	159	700–800	300
Training flights	5,914	1,625	4,695	1,427	2,416	1,327	2,500	1,500

[1] Fiscal year 1973 covers period July 1, 1972 through Apr. 19, 1973.
[2] Night operations available only for the past 6 month period, October 1972–March 1973.

SELECTED ARMY AIRFIELD AIR TRAFFIC ACTIVITY[1]

Airfield	Aircraft assigned, Dec. 31, 1972			Calendar year 1970			Calendar year 1971			Calendar year 1972		
	Rotary wing	Fixed wing	Total	Rotary wing	Fixed wing	Total	Rotary wing	Fixed wing	Total	Rotary wing	Fixed wing	Total
Davison AAF, Fort Belvoir, Va	61	31	92	56,469 [2] (359)	66,462 (2,811)	122,931 (3,170)	61,977 (841)	65,097 (3,723)	127,074 (4,564)	58,601 (831)	62,579 (4,566)	121,180 (5,397)
Henry Post AAF, Fort Sill, Okla	77	12	89	118,801 (3,455)	194,113 (13,991)	312,914 (17,446)	132,047 (3,059)	193,670 (14,404)	325,717 (17,463)	95,516 (6,030)	164,676 (13,484)	260,192 (19,514)
Godman AAF, Fort Knox, Ky	124	5	129	124,566 (554)	107,929 (1,115)	232,495 (1,669)	153,983 (1,021)	108,630 (1,034)	262,613 (2,055)	103,880 (1,924)	51,017 (1,313)	154,897 (3,237)
Campbell AAF, Fort Campbell, Ky	306	6	312	5,000 (6)	39,685 (6,445)	44,685 (6,451)	11,273 (65)	41,925 (7,126)	53,198 (7,191)	90,041 (11,237)	43,000 (11,088)	133,041 (22,325)
Hood AAF, Fort Hood, Tex	425	7	432	117,308 (919)	66,383 (1,185)	183,691 (2,104)	151,753 (1,856)	21,568 (839)	173,321 (2,695)	244,684 (4,455)	10,406 (862)	255,090 (5,317)
Robert Gray AAF, Fort Hood, Tex	58	20	78	51,995 (819)	31,931 (2,686)	83,926 (3,505)	79,339 (1,084)	49,463 (2,350)	128,802 (3,434)	170,170 (2,595)	48,029 (3,020)	218,199 (5,615)
Libby AAF, Fort Huachuca, Ariz	12	32	44	9,213 (2)	72,898 (476)	82,111 (478)	6,606 (5)	62,883 (603)	69,489 (608)	14,950 (13)	81,769 (916)	96,719 (929)

[1] Numbers in last 9 columns represent numbers of takeoffs and landings to include those of itinerant military and civilian air traffic.

[2] Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) activities included in totals.

Mr. SIKES. We had assumed there has been a decline in the number of operations at Davison. Is that correct?

Colonel COATS. There has been a decline in the last year over the previous year. But generally, it has held within about 10,000 activities for the past 4 years, sir.

Mr. SIKES. The figures supplied to the committee staff on the number of sorties, night operations and training flights, would indicate about 10,500 in 1971, 18,500 in fiscal year 1972, 5,800 through April 19, 1973, and a projection of between 6,800 and 7,400 a year in the out-years. That would show a decline.

Do you have any figures that would contradict that?

Colonel COATS. My figures are activity figures as opposed to the figures which you have. They amplify the sortie figures by providing an actual count of takeoffs and landings at the airfield and include itinerant air traffic at the airfield.

In 1969 there were a total of 108,820 activities.

In 1970 there were 122,931.

In 1971, 127,074.

And in 1972, 121,180.

These were split just a little heavier on the fixed wing as opposed to the rotary wing activities.

I have those figures if you would like them and will include them in the insert on air traffic activities.

Mr. SIKES. All right.

I would like to have for the record the numbers of aircraft stationed at Davison, broken down by type and mission. Also, explain the various missions for the record.

[The information follows:]

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
Executive flight detachment						2	2		2	6
164th medical detachment						2				2
30th engineering battalion						2				2
Night vision laboratory			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 during 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 Ft. Belvoir. Each unit has assigned helicopters which are organically required to support the combat mission of these units.

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.

Mr. SIKES. How serious is the need for these airfield improvements?

Colonel COATS. The need for these improvements has been recognized, sir, during several different safety inspections.

Another fact that might be brought to bear here is the safety record at Davison.

During the past 5 years Davison AAF has experienced a number of incidents and accidents which we cannot directly trace to this. Those figures I can provide for the record, if you like, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Very well.

[The information follows:]

During the last 5 years, Davison AAF has experienced 138 precautionary landings, 2 forced landings, 12 incidents and 14 accidents.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions on Fort Belvoir?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. All right.

Mr. DAVIS. These helicopters stationed out there, what part of them, in round figures, is for actual Army use and what part for other than Army uses?

Do you have any figures on that?

Colonel COATS. Yes, sir.

We have a total of 61 rotary wing type aircraft at Davison. Six of these are in the Executive flight detachment, which provide support to the President, the Vice President and their staff.

There are 40 helicopters that provide support to the Military District of Washington. They provide for the evacuation in times of national emergency to some of the alternate headquarters. They are also used for contingency type missions here within the local area.

The other rotary wing aircraft are in support of the District of Columbia National Guard activities, Medical and Engineer Table of Organization and Equipment (TOE) Units and Night Vision Laboratories, which are located at Fort Belvoir.

BARRACKS SPACES

Mr. DAVIS. Let me see if I interpret these justification sheets correctly.

You indicate something over 8400 existing substandard enlisted men's quarters. You indicate a total requirement of 5,666.

Now, the 244 units that we are talking about here—these would be man-for-man replacement?

In other words, would you take 244 units which are substandard and phase them out of use as these 244 new spaces become available?

General COOPER. That basically is correct.

When you build a new barracks or modernize it, you might have to keep some people in the temporary barracks until you finish the construction. But the idea is, once you get the new construction, you tear down the World War II temporaries that they were housed in.

Mr. DAVIS. As I understand it, here at Belvoir, with 8,405 substandard units, you expect to renovate 1,903 of them; is that correct?

General COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS. Is that underway at the present time?

General COOPER. Part of that is underway at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS. How does that relate to the 1,200 funded?

General COOPER. That is the program that was in 1973 that Mr. Carton referred to, on the other half of the area. Those are not yet available but they have been funded, I am sure, in the 1973 program.

Mr. DAVIS. Apparently the entire program at Belvoir contemplates that you will end up with 5,666 either renovated or new housing units in replacement of 8,405; is that correct?

General COOPER. That is correct. The 8,405 is what exists there now. They are not all being occupied, you understand. Some of them may be used for other purposes.

Mr. DAVIS. We have 200 of them either funded or under construction? They are not in inventory, so none of those are completed; is that correct?

General COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS. Those are from 1971 and 1972 and 1973 appropriations?

General COOPER. The 1973 program is when those projects had been funded.

Mr. DAVIS. All 1,200 of them?

General COOPER. All 1,200 new barracks were programed in the 1973 program.

In addition, we programed, in 1973, the modernization of 536 spaces. We have just started the renovation of some of those.

Mr. DAVIS. In other words, you took some of the best of the existing ones for renovation?

General COOPER. We take generally just the permanent type facility that can be renovated and we do not try to renovate any of the World War II temporaries, because you could renovate them and still end up with an unsatisfactory solution.

What it amounts to is that for the 1,903 which can be made adequate we programed to modernize 536 in the 1973 program. We have none in the 1974 program.

Mr. DAVIS. Running side-by-side then are these two programs, one of renovation and one of new construction and you contemplate this would continue over a period of how many years?

General COOPER. We plan to have it all modernization-programed, by the end of fiscal year 1976, the total program to be completely funded by 1978, new and modernization.

Now that is the total program. That does not mean all the facilities are going to be available. We will have funded it all by that time.

Mr. DAVIS. I think that covers it.

Mr. PATTEN. Turn to Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA.

Mr. PATTEN. Please insert page 9 in the record.

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Carlisle Barracks

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY	
First United States Army	Pennsylvania 155	Pennsylvania	
7. STATUS	**8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**9. COUNTY (U.S.)**	**10. NEAREST CITY**
Active	1776	Cumberland	Carlisle, Pennsylvania

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provide administrative and logistical support for the operation of the U.S. Army Garrison, U.S. Army War College, U.S. Army Combat Developments Command Strategic Studies, USASTRATCOM CBks Telecommunications Center, Dunham Army Hospital, and other units and activities at Carlisle Barracks. Provides Services and facilities to other installations and activities as directed by higher headquarters.

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 72	196	330	650	228	0	0	0	0	1,404
b. PLANNED (End FY 78)	128	201	502	224	0	0	0	0	1,055

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	441	187	18,873	19,060
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	0	0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				19,060
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Exclusive of family housing - $1,920)				1,781
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,465
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				4,478
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				27,784

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
740	20 - Physical Conditioning Facility	14	10		SF	43,100	2,465	43,100	2,465

CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA., $2,465,000

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 Combat Developments Command Institute of Land Combat, Dunham Army Hospital, and other units and activities. Carlisle Barracks also provides services and facilities to other installations as directed. The program provides a physical conditioning facility.

Status of funds

	Thousands
Funded program not in inventory	$1,781
Unobligated projects, March 31, 1973 (actual)	1,078
Unobligated projects, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	0

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project number	Project	Design cost (thousands)	Percent complete Apr. 30, 1973
20	Physical conditioning factor	144	3

BASE STATISTICS

Mr. PATTEN. Provide for the record the Operations and Maintenance and Military Personnel costs associated with base operations, the real property maintenance costs, the backlog of essential maintenance and repair, and the replacement value for this installation.

[The information follows:]

REAL PROPERTY, PERSONNEL AND OTHER OPERATING COSTS, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA.

(In thousands of dollars)

Activity:	Cost
Backlog of essential maintenance and repair	80
Initial cost of improvements	18,873
Replacement cost (excluding land)	71,681

	Fiscal year—		
	1972	1973	1974[1]
Real property maintenance	1,855	1,933	2,163
Other operating costs	427	397	234
Personnel:			
Military expense	887	934	900
Civilian cost	2,691	2,811	3,042

[1] Estimated.

Mr. PATTEN. Approximately one-third of the military and civilian personnel here are overhead, that is they are just involved in keeping the installation going.

You have 441 acres here. The replacement cost of the facilities is about $72 million and they cost $2.4 million a year to maintain.

Is it the most economical plan to continue these functions at Carlisle Barracks rather than consolidating them elsewhere?

General COOPER. We think so, based on all we know now.

Carlisle Barracks is the home of the Army War College and, as such, it caters to a very high level of student. These are the top 20 percent of the colonels of the Army from whom most of the general officers will be selected. Even though it is a relatively high cost instal-

lation, to replace those facilities elsewhere would cost approximately $72 million.

As I indicated, some of the smaller bases are under consideration to be phased out; we will review Carlisle Barracks, but I would say at this stage of the game I doubt we will end up recommending that it be phased out.

GYM

Mr. PATTEN. Every day I learn something new.

I see you want a physical conditioning facility. Is this what we usually call a gym?

General COOPER. That is what I would call a gym.

The short answer is yes, sir.

These are high level people so we used a high level word.

Mr. PATTEN. What are you using for a gym here at the present time?

General COOPER. We have an existing gym that is called Thorpe Hall. We also have some other facilities, squash courts that are in a World War II temporary building.

Mr. PATTEN. You do not touch cricket?

General COOPER. No, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. How about paddle ball? That is Mr. Davis's long suit.

Mr. DAVIS. Let's not ridicule that, either.

Mr. PATTEN. Do you plan to dispose of the present facility?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. There are problems in disposing of Thorpe Hall because it is on the roster of historic buildings. So we have to get permission.

Mr. PATTEN. It will probably take 50 permits and an act of Congress.

General COOPER. General Kjellstrom and I used to play ball in Thorpe Hall. We know it well.

Mr. MCEWEN. When was Thorpe Hall built?

General COOPER. Constructed in 1889 and expanded in 1895.

General KJELLSTROM. It is a decrepit building. It is a sad state of affairs.

Mr. PATTEN. How about the fellows who use it?

General KJELLSTROM. They will become decrepit.

Mr. PATTEN. Any questions on this?

Mr. DAVIS. Let me ask this, General.

I thoroughly approve of providing a facility of this kind. I would like to have somebody's professional advice as to whether this is an appropriate unit cost—something approaching $45 a square foot for a facility of this type.

General COOPER. Yes, sir. These costs per square foot are based on preliminary designs, they are based on the area cost factor. These are reviewed both at the district engineer level and also reviewed in OCE.

In any gym we have a large ceiling. So your square foot cost is not as accurate a measure, or a comparison as you would have in a building with a 10-foot-high ceiling.

Because of the procedures that have been set up, we do it on a square-foot basis. To make a true comparison, you would also have to compare the cubic-foot basis and consider what goes into it.

I would ask one of the backup witnesses to expand on that if you like.

Mr. DAVIS. I think when it comes to the engineers, they price out the kind of a design that is given to them.

Who screened the design to see whether, perhaps, this was a little fancier than might be required?

General COOPER. Initially, with regard to any facilities that you have, you have to start off with the Department of Defense instruction concerning criteria. They will tell you roughly how many square feet you can have for a certain number of people, and what you can expect to have, whether you can have one swimming pool, two; one gym, how many chapels, what the size is.

In this particular case, it is a small facility for a relatively small number of people. But you have two separate groups who review the facility. You have people that review the design, to be sure the design is adequate, not plush; and then you have people——

Mr. DAVIS. Who are those people?

General COOPER. You have people within the District Engineers, people who are responsible, and the Office of the Chief of Engineers, from which Mr. Carton comes.

Then you have people who review the design and the people who, on the basis of that design, make the estimated cost.

The constraint, in addition to the Department of Defense criteria, that we have if we overdesign things, the cost will be so high we will not get them in the program.

So we are not eager to overbuild. On the other hand, for permanent facilities, we want to be sure what we build will be adequate and last a long time.

Mr. PATTEN. You will have a swimming pool, steam baths, a sauna and golf course. Is that a miniature golf course?

General COOPER. I do not believe we have any miniature golf course in the physical conditioning facility——

Mr. PATTEN. A little playroom for the children?

The facility we have on the golf course, in case it rains and the crowd comes out on Sunday, you would be amazed what they have in what they call their physical facility. They even take care of the wives and they have rooms to keep the children busy in physical activities.

Mr. DAVIS. At Fort McClellan, Ala., the unit cost is $9 per square foot less than this one.

General COOPER. I am sure the cost of construction is higher in Carlisle. I do not have the area cost factor for Carlisle.

Mr. GRAY. 1.02, and 0.9 at McClellan.

General COOPER. You would expect it to be 12 percent higher, just on the basis of the area cost factor. That does not get you all the way up.

We provided more facilities in this gym at Carlisle Barracks than will be provided in the one at McClellan.

The one at McClellan is for WAC trainees.

Mr. GRAY. That is 1.19 at Carlisle. So, it is 19 percent.

Mr. MCEWEN. Would you explain that cost factor?

General COOPER. There is a geographical cost index which is average for the Washington area. The construction in some areas—for example, in Missouri, the construction cost is 1.2 for various reasons. The price of labor is one of the major factors.

When we come up with the costs in here in the 1391's that you have, those will be different for the same project based on the geographical cost index.

Mr. McEwen. Where is 1.0? What area is that?

General Cooper. Washington, D.C.

Mr. McEwen. Missouri, you said, is 1.2?

General Cooper. Yes.

Mr. McEwen. That means it is——

General Cooper. 20 percent more.

Mr. Davis. Are these comparable facilities, the one at Fort McClellan and the one at Carlisle Barracks?

General Cooper. No, sir. The one at Carlisle Barracks has more things in it and more sophisticated things in it. It has squash courts and handball courts. Basketball courts would be the same. It has steam facilities. It has an indoor swimming pool. It has rubdown facilities. It has facilities for women. It also has an indoor rifle range.

In the gym at McClellan, we have a basketball court and the other normal things that go with the gym. That is for the trainees as part of their normal basic training. The gym at Carlisle is somewhat more sophisticated.

Mr. Davis. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

[The subcommittee adjourned at 4:10 p.m.]

Friday, May 11, 1973.

Fort Devens, Mass.

Mr. Obey. The hearing will come to order.

I was not here for your last meeting. I am told we begin with Fort Devens, Mass.

Mr. Reporter, will you insert page 11 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Fort Devens

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	Massachusetts 145	Massachusetts

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Active	1917	Middlesex	Ayer, 2 Miles Southwest

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS : To provide command, training, administration and logistical support to active Army units stationed at Fort Devens, to annual and week-end active duty training for reserve units and individuals of the six New England States; to provide logistical support to the U.S. Army Security Agency Training Center and School, and off-post ARADCOM units, Reserve Centers, ROTC Units and Family Housing in all New England States.

12

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 72	701	4,020	1,389	37	2,044	35	116	708	9,050
b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	708	4,134	1,461	57	2,100	0	0		8,460

13 INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	10,098	639	96,379	97,018
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	2	0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				97,018
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				2,697
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,749
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				43,609
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				146,073

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
721	123 - EW Barracks w/o Mess	1	12		EW	350	2,749	350	2,749

FORT DEVENS, MASSACHUSETTS

$2,749,000

Fort Devens is located two miles northwest of Ayer, Massachusetts. The mission of the installation is to provide command, training, administrative and logistical support to active Army units stationed at Fort Devens; to annual and weekend active duty training for reserve units and individuals of the six New England States; to provide logistical support to the U.S. Army Security Agency Training Center and School and 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 program provides barracks without dining facilities for enlisted women.

Status of Funds

	($000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	2,697
Unobligated Projects, 30 March 1973 (actual)	2,697
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	2,697

Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
123	EW Barracks w/o Mess	48	30

ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, FORT DEVENS, MASS.

	Men/Women*
Total Requirement	4,674
Existing Substandard	10,364**
Existing Adequate	252***
Funded, Not in Inventory	1,264
Adequate Assets	1,516
Deficiency	3,158
FY 1974 Program	350
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Mar 73	3,011

* 90 square feet per man - permanent party personnel;
72 square feet per man - trainees.

** Includes 2,684 that can be made adequate

*** All in private housing

Mr. OBEY. Fort Devens is one of the few Active Army posts in New England. General, would you describe its missions for us?

General COOPER. The main mission of Fort Devens is to provide command, training, and administrative and logistical support to the Active Army units stationed at Fort Devens, to annual and weekend active duty training for Reserve units and individuals of the six New England States. It also provides logistical support to the U.S. Army Security Agency Training Center and School, and the off-post ARADCOM units. The main purpose of the post is the ASA school.

RESERVE TRAINING IN NORTHEAST

Mr. OBEY. What problems does the Army have with regard to training areas for Reserves in the Northeast portion of the United States?

General COOPER. Because of the high density of the population in the Northeast, if you exclude New York for the moment, it is more difficult to find training areas.

Also, you run into the problem of the weather.

Those are the main difficulties we have.

Due to encroachment, getting training areas is much more difficult in the Northeast than it is at places in the South and the West.

Mr. OBEY. Are you having any problems with the 11508 actions?

General COOPER. In general, or here at Fort Devens?

Mr. OBEY. At Fort Devens, to begin with.

General COOPER. At Fort Devens we have a total of about 10,000 acres. In the recent GSA survey, they recommended that we excess 655 acres, and we agreed to excess 185 acres.

Mr. OBEY. How about generally in the whole Northeastern section?

General COOPER. No, sir. Generally, overall, we are not having major problems with Executive Order 11508. Often the initial recommendations are higher than we would like to see them. In all but a few cases, we are able to compromise so that it does not interfere with our mission.

There are still many actions pending, but as of the moment, in terms of the final decisions that have been made, we cannot say that we have been hurt significantly. There are some places that we may lose which will interfere with Army activities.

Mr. OBEY. Where?

General COOPER. Fort Meade, for example. That is currently in limbo. The basic thrust behind Executive Order 11508, the real push for us to give up property, normally is in connection with the national parks and recreation areas. Right now, because of funding limitations, at least as reported in the newspapers, there aren't a lot of funds available to the Interior Department to develop some of these parks. We see an easing of that particular pressure.

Mr. OBEY. Would you provide information for the record on what number of Reserves you train annually in the area, and what training areas you require?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

The total number of Army Reserve Component personnel attending annual training in the 1st Army area averages 210,000, using 32 active Army installations as well as State-controlled camps. With the large influx of equipment, units are now in a position to conduct more meaningful home station field training. The increased reliance placed upon the Reserve Components also requires that emphasis be placed on attaining unit proficiency. Field training areas for this purpose must be made available; however, as the majority of Reserve Component units are located near large population centers, suitable training areas near these centers are at a premium. In order to satisfy training requirements, increased use is being made of active and inactive Army installations and State-owned camps. In addition to the annual training requirements, units are required to conduct weekend training on a continuing basis. Again, the military installations and State-controlled camps are used to the maximum to satisfy this training requirement. Weekend training sites must be selected which are conveniently located to Reserve Component units and provide sufficient acreage to conduct unit training. Many constraints have, however, been realized by the Reserve Components in the acquisition of land. The population explosion in the United States, the expansion of industry, and a continuing healthy economy create competition in bargaining for land. Civilian encroachment on military bases is also an everincreasing problem. Training areas must be obtaned by the most economical means, while sufficient acreage is still available within the United States. The purchase of land is not contemplated to satisfy these requirements. Field commanders are, instead, soliciting community and State support in an effort to obtain suitable training areas.

BARRACKS

Mr. OBEY. You are providing the barracks situation at Fort Devens for the record. What are the possibilities of additional off-base support here?

General COOPER. For the people we plan to put in this particular barracks, who are enlisted women, the probability is very small. They are all enlisted women, and most of them are in the lower grades. We would much prefer in this case to have these people housed on the base and not in the community.

They are mostly people who work on the base or are attending schools. There is also a total of 13 women in the E–7 to E–9 higher enlisted grades that we expect to use this barracks. Those people are not authorized by the current OSD directive to live off base on an optional basis.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. McEwen, any questions?

FUTURE ROLE OF FORT DEVENS AND CAMP DRUM

Mr. MCEWEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

How far is Fort Devens out of Boston?

General COOPER. It is about a 40-minute ride.

Mr. MCEWEN. This is in the Boston metropolitan area?

General COOPER. In the loose sense, it is. It is a good long ride from central Boston.

Mr. MCEWEN. Is it an urbanized area?

General COOPER. No. It may eventually be. I would not call it an urbanized area right now. The last time I was there personally was in

1966. It is outside of Boston. It may be as much as 30 miles or 40 miles.

Mr. McEwen. Can you tell us what sort of training mission they perform there? For example, do they fire weapons at Devens?

General Cooper. They may fire small arms, but they do not fire large caliber weapons.

Mr. McEwen. How about 155 howitzers?

General Cooper. Not to my knowledge. If anybody differs, I am sure they will speak up. We did train a light infantry brigade there during the Vietnam war. That was primarily the infantrymen. They fired rifles and other small arms. We are not training any basic infantrymen there now.

Mr. McEwen. What size unit will Fort Devens accommodate?

General Cooper. It is what we call medium in terms of the mobilization stations. I would say for training we probably would put a unit of about 10,000 there. It would be not too much greater than that. It probably would have to be light infantry, because you have only about 10,000 acres. You could not do much maneuvering with tanks.

As a matter of fact, when they trained the light infantry brigade there, as I remember, they went up to Camp Drum for their final training when they got beyond the individual training stage.

Mr. McEwen. I wonder if we are looking down the road enough at some of these military installations. Here is what I have in mind. I wonder what the future of Devens is. I am concerned about it, because Camp Drum, as I understand it, is being given some new designation of subactive or satellite to Devens. I forget the exact terminology of it.

Here at Devens you are in a metropolitan area. Can you not reasonably foresee more pressure for this land to be used for other purposes?

Then I look at the other side of the coin. Every summer I write letters explaining to people who complain about 155 howitzers firing between 1 and 4 in the morning, that, yes, the Army must be prepared to fight in dark as well as daylight. I explain to people who, like myself, a week ago Saturday, when I got caught in an Army National Guard convoy and was 20 minutes late for a meeting, that this is the price we pay for the defense of America.

Yet we still seem to be ignoring, I think in many cases, areas like Drum. If the Army in the future is going to carry out training operations, it will be in an area like Drum. In the Northeast I do not see where you will ever go out and acquire another 100,000 acres such as you have at Camp Drum.

I think in many cases we are going on with installations like Dix and Devens and Meade where ultimately the pressures of the urban area, the demands for parks, housing, and other things, will make it increasingly difficult to keep these as military reservations.

Yet, we are putting more and more facilities and buildings into them. I just suggest that maybe we should be looking down the road a little way to where the Army's locations will be in the future. I would be interested in your comment on that.

General Cooper. Yes, sir.

Fort Devens is one of the smaller posts. We are looking at all of the posts as part of the study that we are doing this calendar year. The facilities we are adding to Fort Devens now are really in support of the U.S. Army Security Agency (ASA) school. At about 10,000 people, the installation size is admittedly on the borderline. My prediction would be that we will keep Fort Devens, but not primarily

for the mobilization requirement. We will have to go to places like Camp Drum if we mobilize a brigade that is anything other than a light infantry brigade where we are training for a conflict in a location like Southeast Asia and you would not have a lot of heavy equipment.

We may get pressures to give up some of the land that we now have reserved for mobilization of units like a light infantry brigade, but I think it is valuable from our point of view to try to keep an installation, if it can be justified, in the New England area.

You would have to trade off the economics. In this particular case, I think we are sufficiently large, and we have a sufficiently large investment in Fort Devens, already, of close to $100 million.

[Off the record.]

General COOPER. I was responding to Mr. McEwen's question about Fort Devens, and the relatively limited area there for mobilization training. I agreed with him that for the long term, the mobilization training requirement may drop out, but I personally think we would want to keep Fort Devens as the ASA school. It is sufficiently large. We have a sufficiently large capital investment.

Mr. SIKES. What is the capital investment?

General COOPER. Slightly less than $100 million.

Mr. SIKES. What is it being used for now?

General COOPER. It is primarily used for the U.S. Army Security Agency school.

Mr. SIKES. What is the size of the permanent party, and how many people are enrolled in the school?

General COOPER. There are about 9,000 total. That excludes civilians. The number of students right now is about 2,000 enlisted and 37 officers.

Mr. SIKES. Have you further questions?

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I was expressing my concern that Devens may be an example of an Army installation in a metropolitan area where there are pressures for parks, recreation, housing, industrial parks, all of the things that people can see as meeting their needs and benefiting their economy in the area.

On the other side of the coin, I look at an installation like Camp Drum, with over 100,000 acres, where we are under no demand to take any part of it for parks, for industrial parks, for housing, or for any other purpose. I was suggesting to General Cooper that possibly the Army should be looking ahead to the growing demand for land in metropolitan areas.

At some of these bases, where ultimately we may have to cut back and give up land, instead of expanding, we should be looking at areas like Camp Drum, where I would imagine for a good many years we will not face these pressures.

Mr. SIKES. Have you a response, General Kjellstrom?

ARMY BASE UTILIZATION STUDIES

General KJELLSTROM. I have been on the Army staff for 5 years now, sir. About 2 years ago there was a very extensive, long-range study of Army stations. We called it the Boatwright study. The Boatwright study and conclusions were used to a significant extent in the recent base closure actions announced by the Secretary of Defense.

Furthermore, the Chief of Staff—a new Chief of Staff—has just initiated and directed another study. This is a new administration

of the Department of the Army. So, we are taking a hard look, and we share your concern.

As far as Fort Devens is concerned, I know of two specific actions directed to the future of Fort Devens. In both cases the conclusions were reached that the Army Security Agency school was of sufficient importance and such a unique activity that it was absolutely essential to keep it separated from some of the other schools that the layman—I consider myself a layman in the Army Security Agency mission business—would consider could be readily consolidated.

I have been assured, as have the decisionmakers on the Army staff, that Fort Devens is an important installation. We have to take a very hard look, and we are, at the small, very expensive installations.

IMPORTANCE OF CAMP DRUM FOR RESERVE TRAINING AND UTILIZATION

Mr. McEwen. If I am wrong in my thinking on this, I would appreciate any of you gentlemen straightening me out. When the rumors were circulating as to base closures, I had very few express concern about Camp Drum. To the few that did, if I was too casual in dismissing their concern, please tell me.

I said:

I can't worry about the closing of Camp Drum. If the First Army intends to have any area for summer training of Guard and Reserve units up to division size, they have to have Camp Drum. There is no other place in the Northeast United States.

I do not know where you could go out today and acquire 100,000 acres. Am I correct?

General Kjellstrom. You are correct. I agree with you. I have not heard any discussion of Camp Drum as being a surplus installation.

To be sure, there may be some who would say Camp Drum is used only 2 or 3 months a year, and it is not fully utilized, but it is very essential to the Reserve components.

Since our primary concentration in the event of mobilization is now on the Reserve components, as opposed to the draft situation which we utilized in Vietnam, it is most important that we retain installations of that type.

Mr. McEwen. You are saying, General, as we are going to greater reliance on the Reserve components, Guard and Reserve, then the mission of Drum becomes more important?

General Kjellstrom. Yes, sir.

I would suggest, sir, that 3 to 5 years ago you would never have seen a request for a permanent barracks at an installation dedicated to support of the Reserve components. In this year's budget, Camp Drum has an enlisted men's barracks with mess.

Mr. McEwen. Which we are coming to.

Mr. Chairman, I have one or two other matters with regard to Drum, but this relates to Devens. The two are now connected in a command relationship, and that is why I brought it up. I have no other questions on Devens.

Fort Dix, N.J.

Mr. Sikes. We turn to Fort Dix, N.J.

Place in the record page 12A.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3 INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Fort Dix

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6 STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	New Jersey 245	New Jersey

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Active	1917	Burlington & Ocean	Trenton

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Train recruits and train Active Army units. Operate a personnel center; provide off-post support to ARADCOM Missile Sites, USAR centers, ROTC units, and recruiting stations. Support on-post training of USAR, NG, and ROTC. Provide medical care for Fort Dix, McGuire AFB, Lakehurst NAS, and for evacuees.

* Includes trainees, transients, and students

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 28 Feb 1973	1,152	20,271	2,460						23,883
b. PLANNED (End FY)	932	4,889	2,643	0	14,683*	0	0	0	23,147

13 INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a OWNED	31,993	2,490	0	200,144
b LEASES AND EASEMENTS	0	0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				200,144
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				23,929
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				339
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				35,956
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				260,368

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION			TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	Page No PRIORITY	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
610	200 - Convert Buildings to Administrative Facilities	1 12B				339		339

301

FORT DIX, N.J., $339,000

Fort Dix is located 18 miles south of Trenton, N.J. The training mission of this installation is to command and support an Army training center, train nondivisional combat units, and operate a personnel center. Fort Dix also supports reserve components training, ARADCOM missile sites, USAR centers and recruiting stations. The program consists of converting buildings to administrative facilities.

Status of funds

	Thousands
Funded program not in inventory	$23,929
Unobligated projects, Mar. 31, 1973 (actual)	9,635
Unobligated projects, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	9,444

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project number	Project	Design cost (thousands)	Percent complete Apr. 30, 1973
200	Convert buildings to administrative facilities	19	10

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $339,000 to convert buildings to administrative facilities.

STATUS OF PRIOR PROGRAMS

What is the status of prior year construction projects at Dix?

General COOPER. Mr. Carton has those details.

Mr. CARTON. The fiscal 1970 project for confinement facilities is 100 percent complete.

Of the three fiscal 1971 projects, the reception station is 98 percent complete; the laundry is 90 percent complete; and on the sewage treatment plant we have a small contract underway; however, the major portion of the work has not been awarded.

Of the 1972 projects, the boiler plant improvement is 100 percent complete; and the barracks improvement is 45 percent complete. We have not yet initiated any work on the 1973 program. They are a cold storage warehouse, barracks modernization, and a small sewage plant improvement project at Pedricktown, N.J.

Mr. SIKES. What is the status of the last ones you named?

Mr. CARTON. There are a cold storage warehouse and a barracks modernization project at Fort Dix itself which are under design but have not yet been advertised.

Mr. SIKES. There has been no contract awarded on those?

Mr. CARTON. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. Why has there been a delay?

Mr CARTON. May I refer that to General Cooper?

General COOPER. The reason for the delay is in connection with the restudy of the utilization of Fort Dix.

Mr. SIKES. What are the present plans?

General COOPER. The present plans are to hold up authorizing work on the cold storage facility and the barracks modernization until we finish our study, by the first of July of this year

Mr. SIKES. Then, at this time, you do not know what the exact status or future of Fort Dix is and what functions will definitely stay there; is that correct?

General COOPER. That is correct, sir.

ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES

Mr. NICHOLAS. Would your answer include the U.S. Army Reserve support function for which this building is being requested?

General COOPER. In any case, we expect Fort Dix to remain open. We have very limited administrative facilities there. This addition to the existing 150,000 square feet of administrative facilities is necessary.

Mr. SIKES. What buildings are you converting?

General COOPER. We are converting specifically EM barracks.

Mr. SIKES. They are barracks buildings?

General COOPER. One is a barracks building. One is classroom and administration, and one is currently used for administration. Primarily, it is one enlisted men's barracks.

Mr. SIKES. Is it permanent or semipermanent construction?

General COOPER. It is permanent construction, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Is it a good building that will make satisfactory administrative space?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Is your estimate of $5.62 per square foot a good estimate at this time?

General COOPER. Yes, sir, I have to put the caveat on all of these, you understand, that these were based on our estimates.

Mr. SIKES. In view of the fact that the study is not complete on the future of Fort Dix, are you certain there will not be a surplus of administrative space there?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

CAMP DRUM, N.Y.

Mr. SIKES. We turn to Camp Drum.

Put page 13 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Camp Drum

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	New York 205	New York

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Inactive	1910	Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lauren	Watertown

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Responsible for the command, training, and operation of all units and activities assigned to Camp Drum. Prepares, coordinates and implements, as directed, plans to include air raid, domestic emergency, mobilization and local defense. Provides administrative and logistic support to all First Army installations, units and activities located in Camp Drum Zone. Provides administrative and logistical support for active Army units conducting training at Camp Drum. Provides training facilities and administrative and logistical support for AT units, amounting to approximately 105,000 troops per year.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 72	55	70	611			8	79	1	824
b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	23	79	362	0	0	10	177	0	651

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	107,265	2,996	29,925	32,921
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	18	0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				32,921
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Exclusive of family housing - $2,196)				0
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,099
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS (Exclusive of family housing - $756)				2,336
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				36,356

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
721	15 - EM Barracks w/Mess	1	14		MN	99	1,099	99	1,099

CAMP DRUM, NEW YORK

$1,099,000

Camp Drum is located near Watertown, New York. The mission of this installation is to command and to provide administrative, logistic 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 program provides barracks with dining facilities.

Status of Funds

	($000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	0
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	0
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	0

Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
15	EM Barracks w/Mess	31	10

ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, CAMP DRUM, N. Y.

	Men*
Total Requirement	99
Existing Substandard	12,494
Existing Adequate	0
Funded, Not in Inventory	0
Adequate Assets	0
Deficiency	99
FY 1974 Program	99
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Mar 73	49

* 90 square feet per man - permanent party personnel;
72 square feet per man - trainees.

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $1,099,000, for an enlisted men's barracks with mess.

Mr. McEwen, will you take the questions on Drum.

Mr. MCEWEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATUS OF FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. SIKES. This is a question Mr. McEwen is very much interested in. As of this date, what is the exact status of the 88 units of family housing which were provided in the fiscal year 1972 program?

General COOPER. As of this morning, we have met with the contractors, and the contractors are coming back with their proposals on Monday.

We sent up to OSD last Tuesday the final, specific word. We had a discussion with OSD earlier, as I mentioned on Monday. So, we expect to get the bids from the contractors by Monday and, assuming there are no problems within OSD, and we do not really anticipate any, to be in a position to award the contract by the end of next week.

I will let you know even prior to that time if there is any hangup that we cannot foresee.

Mr. SIKES. Will you take it from there, Mr. McEwen?

Mr. MCEWEN. Would you explain the problem which the Army has had in awarding a contract for adequate housing here? You may provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

The fiscal year 1972 family housing new construction program includes eight projects in CONUS. Five of these projects were awarded during the second half of calendar year 1972. The average cost of units in these five projects which include 1,130 units, was $22,863. In addition, the fiscal year 1971 Natick Laboratories 28-unit project was carried over for award under the fiscal year 1972 unit cost authorization. This increased the unit cost of the six projects to $23,212 as compared to the $24,000 statutory limitation. Bids received on the remaining three projects exceed the amounts programed. The following tabulation indicates the high cost of construction in these areas:

	Amount programed by Army	Estimated total project cost
Grand Forks (90 units)	$2,520,000	$3,911,000
Camp Drum (88 units)	2,376,000	3,191,450
Carlisle Barracks (60 units)	1,920,000	2,430,000

Since all three projects could not be awarded within the statutory limitation of $24,000 Army decided to award only the contract for Camp Drum. Because of the difficult contractor situation and the saturation of the market due to repair work as aftermath to Hurricane Agnes, the Carlisle project will be allowed to lapse and Army will consider including it in the fiscal year 1975 program. Special authorization will be required to continue with the Grand Forks project.

Mr. MCEWEN. Does the Army intend to build additional housing at Drum?

General COOPER. Not at the present time. This housing is to take care of the permanent party there. We do not build permanent housing and family housing for the people stationed there only in the summer.

Mr. SIKES. Is it adequate for the purpose? Is there enough housing for the purpose?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Your estimated authorization for the next 4 years—I recognize that family housing figures change due to change in requirements—shows the figure of $756,000 for family housing construction. Is that modernization or is it something that you do not now need because of changes in community support?

General COOPER. I do not know the answer to that question, but I will be glad to furnish it for the record.

[The information follows:]

The $756,000 represents a program deficit of 21 family housing units as projected by the calendar year 1972 housing survey, after consideration for the 88 units of construction. We will not program that small residue until it is reconfirmed by a new survey.

BASE STATISTICS

Mr. MCEWEN. What are the facilities maintenance statistics for this installation?

General COOPER. We have a backlog of maintenance of $752,000.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Will you provide the figures on operating costs for the record?

[The information follows:]

Real property, personnel, and other operating costs, Camp Drum, N.Y.

Activity	*Cost (thousands)*
Backlog of essential maintenance and repair	$752
Initial cost of improvements	29,924
Replacement cost (excluding land)	117,711

	Fiscal year—		
	1972	1973	[1] 1974
Real property maintenance	2,534	4,151	3,629
Other operating costs	1,955	2,308	1,490
Personnel:			
Military expense	2,943	2,900	2,900
Civilian cost	3,916	4,548	5,007

[1] Estimated.

Mr. MCEWEN. General, will this barracks complete the requirement for the permanent personnel stationed here?

General COOPER. Yes.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH

Mr. MCEWEN. There is just one thing I would like to see if we can clarify from the justification sheet, page 13, where personnel strength is given as of December 31, 1972; and then planned, in line "b", for end of fiscal year 1975.

This shows the number of civilian employees as of last December at Drum is 611. I believe that figure is in error. This would indicate quite a drastic reduction in the number of civilian employees at Drum, and I do not believe that is correct.

Have you any information on that?

General COOPER. No.

Mr. CARTON. This figure was taken from information provided by Camp Drum. It may have included some contractor employees or non-Government employees at the installation at that time. We will be glad to provide additional information of it, if you like, sir.

Mr. MCEWEN. That will be fine.

When I saw that, I made inquiry. I do not know whether my figures are correct. On that line where it shows officers, enlisted men, and civilians, in that order, rather than 55, I was told it was 26; rather than 70, it was 51; and rather than 611, it was 370.

Mr. CARTON. We will be happy to clarify that.

[The information follows:]

The figures shown on line 12a of the 1390 are correct except for the number of civilians. Active Army civilian force should read 391. The 611 figure shown is in error in that it includes a large number of civilians that are on other than Army payrolls and included personnel employed by the National Guard of the States of New Jersey and New York who are engaged in vehicular maintenance activities. In addition, the figure included post exchange personnel who are supported by nonappropriated funds.

The current military strength figures for any installation can vary significantly from day to day and the civilian force can also vary considerably at posts like Camp Drum, which have differing training loads at various times. For example, the figures quoted by Mr. McEwen are very close to the "as of 31 March 1973" figures which are 32 officers, 56 enlisted men, and 379 civilians.

Mr. MCEWEN. The number of enlisted men is increasing from 70, according to the justification sheet, to 246. Can you tell me the reason for this? Where will these additional personnel come from? What is their mission?

General COOPER. I cannot answer right now.

Mr. MCEWEN. You may furnish that for the record.

Mr. SIKES. Tell us what additional activities, if any, are being programed there.

[The information follows:]

The 246 figure shown includes 177 Air Force enlisted personnel who are provided support by Camp Drum. The "Planned (end fiscal year 1975)" line on the justification sheet should show 20 officers, 69 enlisted, and 346 civilians under the "Permanent" column, and 10 officers and 177 enlisted under the "Supported" column. The "As of December 31, 1972" strengths shown represent the assigned strength at a specific point in time. The "Planned (end fiscal year 1975)" strengths shown represent the projected authorized strength of the installation. Actually, there are no additional personnel being added.

There are no additional activities programed for Camp Drum.

FORT EUSTIS, VA.

Mr. SIKES. We take up Fort Eustis, Va.

Place page 15 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Fort Eustis

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	Virginia 215	Virginia

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Active	1918	Nome	Newport News

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Headquarters, U.S. Army Transportation Center and location of the U.S. Army Transportation School. The Transportation Center Command is responsible to command control all assigned activities, to provide logistical support to the activities, to assist in the development, evaluation and coordination of new doctrines, techniques, operational concepts concerning transportation equipment and facilities.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 72	875	4,663	2,248	138	757	66	49	616	9,592
b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	1,884	6,558	2,812	440	1,436	2	15	0	12,327

13 INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	8,114	754	108,144	108,898
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	1	0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				108,898
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				12,965
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM		(Exclusive of family housing - $254)		4,782
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS		(Exclusive of family housing - $13,389)		21,603
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				148,248

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
442	286 - Supply & Administrative Facilities	1	15A				680		680
721	284 - Barracks Modernization	1	16		MN	1,040	2,577	1,040	2,577
740	280 - Main Post Office	20	17		SF	9,700	533	9,700	533
812	220 - Electrical Distribution System Alteration	1	18		LF		992		992
	Total						4,782		4,782

FORT EUSTIS, VIRGINIA

$4,782,000

Fort Eustis is located about 20 miles northwest of Newport News, Virginia. The mission of this installation is to organize and train all types of Transportation Corps units and individuals. It supports the Transportation School, Transportation Engineering Agency, Aviation Materiel Laboratories, Combat Developments Command, Transportation Agency, Computer Systems Command Support Group, and Fort Story, Virginia, a sub-installation. The program includes barracks modernization, a main post office, alteration of the electrical distribution system, and a supply and administrative facility.

Status of Funds

	($000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	12,965
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	5,475
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	0

Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
284	Barracks Modernization.	32	10
280	Main Post Office	26	5
220	Electrical Dist Sys Alt	36	35
286	Supply and Administrative Facility	34	5

ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, FORT EUSTIS, VA.

	Men*
Total Requirement	8,219
Existing Substandard	9,766**
Existing Adequate	0
Funded, Not in Inventory	1,468
Adequate Assets	1,468
Deficiency	6,751
FY 1974 Program	1,040
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 May 73	2,767

* 90 square feet per man - permanent party personnel;
72 square feet per man - trainees.

** Includes 3,630 spaces that can be made adequate

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $4,782,000 for barracks modernization, electrical distribution system alteration, supply and administrative facilities, and a main post office.

MISSION

You have an increase in the personnel level between December 31, 1972, and the end of fiscal year 1975. Is there a change in the mission or an addition to the mission?

General COOPER. There is no major change or addition to the mission. We believe the big difference between the numbers reported is the fact that these figures were taken the 31st of December. We try normally not to have any of the students there at that time.

Mr. SIKES. What are the missions at Fort Eustis?

General COOPER. The missions at Fort Eustis are primarily the U.S. Army Transportation Center and the location of the Army Transportation School. It is really responsible for command and control of these activities and to assist in the development, evaluation, and coordination of new doctrines.

It is basically a transportation school. We are moving one unit from Fort Story to Fort Eustis as part of the recent realinement.

Mr. SIKES. Are there any major changes in the programs there in the out years?

General COOPER. Not that I know of, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Is Fort Eustis one of the bases you are looking at?

General COOPER. We are going to look at all of the bases. Fort Eustis is one we are looking at. Based on average size and the projected size, we would clearly expect Fort Eustis to remain as an active base. It is big enough that the overhead is spread out over a sufficiently large number of people.

FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation on family housing?

General COOPER. I would have to look that up, sir. You mean the number of units that they presently have?

Mr. SIKES. How many units you have and how many you expect to program in the next 3 to 5 years.

You may provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

Based on the calendar year 1972 survey, Fort Eustis projects a family housing program requirement for 3,304 units. There are 1,339 military assets and 1,477 adequate units in the community. Excluding 300 units programed in the fiscal year 1974 program there will be a remaining deficit of 188 units to be scheduled in the next 3 to 5 years, depending on priorities and funds available.

Mr. SIKES. Is there no one here who knows generally what the family housing situation is?

General COOPER. We have none programed in 1972 or in 1973 at Fort Eustis. Looking to the longer term, I have some figures. The total long-range requirement at Fort Eustis that we are allowed to program is 3,304 housing units. Off-post-adequate assets as of a couple of months ago were 1,477 units. That is the community support. Military housing, we had 1,339 units. The total assets are 2,816 units. The long-range deficit that we can program for at 90 percent is 448 units.

We may program some additional units at Fort Eustis in fiscal year 1975, depending upon the availability of funds.

SUPPLY AND ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. Tell us the need for supply and administrative facilities.

General COOPER. That is to support the battalion I just mentioned that is being moved from Fort Story to Fort Eustis.

Mr. SIKES. When will they move?

General COOPER. They will move as soon as these facilities are available. They will move no later than that. We may move them earlier.

Mr. SIKES. Where would you base them if the units were not ready?

General COOPER. We would put them in temporary facilities.

Mr. SIKES. What kinds of temporary facilities are there?

General COOPER. I do not know, sir.

NATURE OF FACILITIES AT FORT EUSTIS

Mr. NICHOLAS. What is the nature of the capital investment at Fort Eustis? In other words, how much space there is permanent, how much is semipermanent, and how much is temporary construction?

General COOPER. About 72 percent is permanent, about 22 percent is semipermanent, and 6 percent is temporary.

OTHER PROJECTS

Mr. SIKES. What are you using for a post office now?

General COOPER. For a post office, we are using a temporary building.

Mr. SIKES. What is the condition of the building? Why do you need to provide a new one?

General COOPER. We need to provide a new one because we had a study that was done back in 1967, when they reviewed all the post offices within the Army and set up a long-range program, and at that time it was recommended about 24 post offices be changed. These were placed in order of priority. Of those 24 post offices, we included seven during the period of fiscal year 1970 to 1972.

We had Ford Ord in the 1972 program. We had Fort Riley in the 1973 program.

Mr. SIKES. Is the electrical distribution system being modernized or expanded?

General COOPER. Both, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What is the requirement for an additional electrical distribution system?

General COOPER. Mr. Carton can provide some additional information.

Mr. SIKES. What is the requirement for additional capacity?

Mr. CARTON. We are having a growth problem in our electric distribution. Due to additional air-conditioning and other electrical work, the load has grown over the years. The service to the installation is adequate. Most of the project we are asking for is improvement of the

distribution system so we can meet the load growth in the various areas.

We are eliminating some old 4.2 kV lines which were installed in World War II. We are replacing them with 13.8 kV circuits.

We are also improving our distribution to the airfield.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

Mr. MCEWEN. What is the situation on sewage treatment?

Mr. CARTON. We had a project funded for a sewage collection facility in fiscal year 1972. It is now under construction and is 74 percent complete. That would be at the airfield facility.

We have a potential project in the future to improve our outfall line. At the moment, that does not appear to be a requirement.

SEWAGE TREATMENT, CAMP DRUM

Mr. MCEWEN. What is the situation now at Drum on their sewage treatment? Do you have that?

Mr. CARTON. To the best of my knowledge, sir, we are or shortly will be in compliance with the existing regulations. I would have to check that for the record.

Mr. MCEWEN. Would you please?

Mr. CARTON. Yes, sir, I will.

[The information follows:]

A project for a secondary sewage treatment plant at Camp Drum has been approved and funded by the Congress previously. Work is now 87 percent complete. The facility should be fully operational by the fall of 1973, which will bring Camp Drum's sewage treatment facilities in compliance with existing regulations. While there have been no reports by other agencies on the need for any additional corrective actions at Camp Drum, the installation commander has recently prepared recommendations for improved latrine facilities in the range area, separating a storm and sanitary sewer line and providing new vehicle wash racks. These recommendations are being reviewed at intermediate command levels and will be considered by Department of the Army for a future program when received by the Office of the Chief of Engineers.

CAMP A. P. HILL, VA.

Mr. SIKES. Turning to Camp A. P. Hill, Va., please place page 19 in the record.

[The page follows:]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY *(WHEN DATA IS ENTERED)*

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3 INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Camp A. P. Hill

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	Virginia 290	Virginia -

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY *(U.S.)*	10. NEAREST CITY
Inactive	1941	Caroline & Essex	Fredericksburg, 23 miles Northwest

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Installation serves as maneuver and training area for reserve, active Army, other military service and Governmental agencies and provides logistical and administrative support for those activities. Mission also includes the provision of repair and utility services to off-post facilities, including US Army Reserve Centers and Recruiting Stations in assigned areas of the State of Virginia.

(*) Active Army and reserve component troops totalling approximately 15,125 men trained at this installation during CY 1972.

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972	14	57	145	0	0	0	63	37	316
b. PLANNED *(End FY 75)*	9	35	147	0	0	0	0	0	191

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST *($000)* (2)	IMPROVEMENT *($000)* (3)	TOTAL *($000)* (4)
a. OWNED	77,139	2,567	8,443	11,010
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	0	(0)	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL *(Except land rent)* AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				11,010
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				535
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS (Exclusive of family housing - $288)				353
g. GRAND TOTAL *(c + d + e + f)*				11,898

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
721	3 - EM Barrack w/Mess	1	20		MN	40	535	40	535

CAMP A. P. HILL, VIRGINIA

$535,000

Camp A. P. Hill is located near Fredricksburg, Virginia. 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 includes 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 program provides barracks with dining facilities.

Status of Funds

	($000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	0
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	0
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	0

Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
3	EM Barracks w/Mess	28	5

ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, CAMP A. P. HILL, VA.

	Men*
Total Requirement	87
Existing Substandard	507
Existing Adequate	0
Funded, Not in Inventory	0
Adequate Assets	0
Deficiency	87
FY 1974 Program	40
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Mar 73	106

* 90 square feet per man - permanent party personnel;
  72 square feet per man - trainees.

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $535,000 for an enlisted men's barracks with mess.

This is a Reserve training facility. What is the situation generally on Reserve training programs? What is happening at A. P. Hill? Is the program being expanded?

You are, of course, having a problem maintaining strength figures. What does this do to the program at Hill?

General COOPER. At the present time, we still consider Camp A. P. Hill a major mobilization station with Camp Pickett. Active Duty and Reserve Component troops totaling about 15,000 men trained at this installation in calendar year 1972. Overall without the draft it will be more difficult to get personnel in the Reserves and National Guard.

Mr. SIKES. Is this barracks a replacement or an addition?

General COOPER. This is a new barracks, so to that extent it is a replacement. They have temporary facilities there now, but they are all World War II type.

Mr. SIKES. What is the barracks picture there in toto?

General COOPER. They have about 507 existing substandard barracks there.

Mr. SIKES. How many rehabilitated or modern barracks?

General COOPER. We do not have any rehabilitated or modern.

Mr. SIKES. Is this the first?

General COOPER. This is a new barracks, sir. This is the first in the total program.

Mr. SIKES. I would say that you waited long enough, because I have seen some of those barracks, and if they are all like the ones I have seen, it is time to replace them.

REAL PROPERTY COST STATISTICS

Mr. SIKES. Provide the real property cost statistics for the record.

[The information follows:]

Real property costs statistics—Camp A. P. Hill, Va.

Activity:	*Cost (thousands)*
Real property maintenance	$1,276
Backlog of essential maintenance and repair	(1)
Initial cost of improvements	8,433
Replacement cost (excluding land)	32,085

[1] None.

INDIANTOWN GAP MILITARY RESERVATION, PA.

Mr. SIKES. We take up Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pa. Place page 21 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Indiantown Gap Military Reservation

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	Pennsylvania 305	Pennsylvania

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Inactive	1941	Lebanon & Dauphin	Lebanon, 13 miles Northwest

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Serves as training and maneuver area for active Army and reserve component units and provides logistical and administrative support for these activities.

(*) Active Army and reserve component troops totaling 99,238 men trained at this installation during CY 1971.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972	32	74	527						633
b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	57	133	892	0	0	0	0	489	1,571

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	64	6	24,735	24,741
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	18,493	0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				24,741
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,657
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				2,046
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				28,444

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO.	PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	Page No			SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST ($000)	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST ($000)
a	b			c	d	e	f	g	h
721	29 - EM Barracks w/Mess	1	22		MN	151	1,657	151	1,657

INDIANTOWN GAP MILITARY RESERVATION, PENNSYLVANIA

$1,657,000

Indiantown Gap Military Reservation is located near Lebanon, Pennsylvania. The mission of this installation is to serve as the training and maneuver area for active Army and reserve component units and provide logistical and administrative support for these activities. The program provides barracks with dining facilities.

Status of Funds

	($000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	0
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	0
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	0

Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
29	EM Barracks w/Mess	22	5

ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, INDIANTOWN GAP MIL RES., PA.

	Men*
Total Requirement	151
Existing Substandard	14,132
Existing Adequate	0
Funded, Not in Inventory	0
Adequate Assets	0
Deficiency	151
FY 1974 Program	151
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Mar 73	34

* 90 square feet per man - permanent party personnel;
  72 square feet per man - trainees.

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $1,657,000 for an enlisted men's barracks with mess.

REAL PROPERTY COST STATISTICS

Mr. SIKES. Provide the real property cost statistics for the record. [The information follows:]

Real property costs statistics, Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pa.

Activity:	Cost (thousands)
Real property maintenance	$2,583
Backlog of essential maintenance and repair	701
Initial cost of improvements	24,735
Replacement cost (excluding land)	93,990

BARRACKS

Mr. SIKES. What is the barracks picture here? How many modern or rehabilitated barracks do you have? How many substandard barracks do you have?

General COOPER. We have quite a few substandard barracks. We have a total of slightly over 14,000 spaces in substandard barracks.

Mr. SIKES. What is the principal operation at Indiantown Gap?

General COOPER. The principal operation is a training maneuver area for Active Army and Reserve Components.

Mr. SIKES. Is it in use all year?

REQUEST FOR PROJECTS TO SUPPORT ARMY REORGANIZATION

General COOPER. It is used certainly on weekends. During the summer it has its heaviest use. We are going to put one of the readiness groups at Indiantown Gap as part of this reorganization and realinement. We probably will ask for those funds in connection with reprograming in 1973.

We also have recently decided that we would make this a base operations post, and we are going to put in a computer there. That is to give you an indication of the expected long-term use of Indiantown Gap.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Are all the items which are required to support the reorganization included in the fiscal year 1974 budget, which is before the committee, or requested under the minor construction program, or are there further projects which you propose to insert in the 1974 program?

General COOPER. There are no further projects that we propose to insert in the fiscal year 1974 program. There are some projects for which we plan to ask for reprograming authority within 1973. I would not want to foreclose programing within fiscal year 1974, but presently we do not plan to.

LAND LEASED FROM STATE

Mr. MCEWEN. General Cooper, I notice on page 21 of the justifications the number of acres owned at Indiantown Gap is 64. Is that correct?

General COOPER. That is correct. Most of the land is on lease from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIKES. So, it is State land. Have you any apprehension about being deprived of the use of that land?

General COOPER. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Why not?

General COOPER. There were some proposals whereby we were told we ought to give it back to the States, but there is no pressure I know of directly from the State to give it back.

General KJELLSTROM. To the contrary, Mr. Chairman, the Pennsylvania delegation en masse was very concerned last year when a working paper of the Department of the Army was forwarded to the State adjutant general. This paper stated we wanted to turn the installation back to the State. I met with the delegation and assured them that at that point in time there was no action by the Department of the Army to turn Indiantown Gap back to the State and rescind our lease.

However, we are studying all installations of this nature to determine whether it is more cost-effective and whether we can reach agreements with interested governmental bodies on who should be the prime source of funds for maintenance and operation.

Mr. SIKES. What type of land is this at Indiantown Gap?

General KJELLSTROM. It is just the normal type installation, sir, quite a bit of training area.

Mr. SIKES. Is the land itself timberland or rough land?

General KJELLSTROM. Sir, I have been over part of the installation about 5 years ago. It is a pretty good training area, a lot of timber, hilly land, and, of course, ranges and all. It is quite a typical small installation.

Mr. SIKES. Who harvests the timber?

General KJELLSTROM. I would have to provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

No timber has been harvested at the Indian Gap Military Reservation.

Mr. SIKES. What is the length of your lease?

General COOPER. The lease terminates in 1989.

Mr. SIKES. If somebody ever discovers another use for that land, you may be looking for a new place to live. I wonder about the wisdom of continuing an operation indefinitely without a little more certainty, possibly you should have a term lease, or you should purchase enough land to be sure you can carry on your training operations. More and more people are looking for land. It seems to me that State land is always a target for some groups.

General KJELLSTROM. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCEWEN. I notice the cost of land there is $6,000. Apparently you acquired 64 acres for $6,000.

Mr. SIKES. That was probably some time ago.

General COOPER. That was back in 1941; $100 an acre then was, I think, quite reasonable.

Mr. SIKES. It would cost a little more now.

Mr. MCEWEN. Where are the buildings located? Are they all on the 64 acres that the Army owns, or on leased land?

General COOPER. I think they are on both.

Mr. SIKES. You seem to feel you are quite secure in your lease, and I will not quarrel with your assumption, but there is constant demand from many sources for acreage now. Since this ownership is not in the Federal Government, you may be affected by it in time.

General KJELLSTROM. I would suggest, sir, since this is a focal point for the National Guard and Reserve Components for the State of Pennsylvania, and with the State deeply involved through their support facilities for the National Guard, that we do not have too much cause for concern. The record will display the details of our lease.

Mr. SIKES. Please provide the terms of the lease for the record.

[The information follows:]

The major portion of the Indiantown Gap Military Reservation comprising 18,550 acres of land is leased from the Department of Property and Supplies, State of Pennsylvania. The current lease was effective on July 1, 1963, and terminates on June 30, 1989. The lease is at no cost to the Army. The lease can be canceled by either party on 30 days notice.

FORT KNOX, KY.

Mr. SIKES. We turn to Fort Knox, Ky.

Insert in the record page 23.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Fort Knox

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	Kentucky 405	Kentucky

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Active	1918	Hardin, Meade and Bullitt	Louisville, 30 miles North

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

USA Armor School, USA Armor and Engineer Board, 1st, 2nd, 4th & 5th Training Brigades, Headquarters Commandant, 194th Armored Brigade, Fort Knox MEDDAC, US Army Reception Station, USACDC Armor Agency, US Army Maintenance Board, US Army Medical Research Laboratory, US Army Armor Board, US Army Armor Human Research unit, Firts US Army NCO Academy, Committee Group, US Advisor Group, Logistical Assistance and Protection of Gold Depository, 16th Weather Squadron, Summer Training, Support of Civilian Components.

*Includes Trainees, transients, and students
**$104,500 one-time cost for easement.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 72	1,935	11,141	4,559	394	13,038	648	1,724	2,291	36,003
b. PLANNED (End FY)	1,896	*10,484	4,498	690	14,769*	3	16	0	32,356

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	110,193	6,629	217,414	224,043
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	158	104**	0	104
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				224,147
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				42,754
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				7,305
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				25,484
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				299,690

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
610	72 - Convert Building to Admin Facs (Hq 2nd ROTC Region)	1	23A				250		250
721	279 - Barracks Modernization	1	24		MN	2,026	7,055	2,026	7,055
	Total						7,305		7,305

FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY

$7,305,000

Fort Knox is located 30 miles south of Louisville, Kentucky. The mission of this installation is to operate the U.S. Army Armor School, U.S. Army Maintenance Board, U.S. Army Armor Board and certain medical research activities. The installation commands, trains and supports non-divisional armor units, a recruit training center and supports reserve component summer training. The program provides barracks modernization, and conversion of buildings to administrative facilities.

Status of Funds

	($000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	42,754
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	26,813
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	12,160

Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
279	Barracks Modernization	170	10
284	Convert Buildings to Administrative Facilities	12	5

ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY

	Men*
Total Requirement	22,435
Existing Substandard	22,570**
Existing Adequate	2,742***
Funded, Not in Inventory	4,381
Adequate Assets	7,123
Deficiency	15,312
FY 1974 Program	2,026
Barracks Spaces occupied, 15 Dec 72	25,510

* 90 square feet per man - permanent party personnel;
72 square feet per man - trainees.

** Includes 6,801 spaces that can be made adequate

*** Includes 60 in private housing

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $7,305,000, principally for barracks modernization.

This committee is glad to see the Army is stressing improved living facilities in this program. I think you are behind in this area. We are glad to see the emphasis that is being placed on this type of construction.

There is also a conversion of a building to administrative facilities for $250,000.

STATUS OF PRIOR PROGRAMS

I would like to have for the record the status of prior year construction.

[The information follows:]

Projects at Fort Knox for fiscal year 1970 and 1971 are virtually complete. All projects for fiscal year 1972 are under construction. Projects for fiscal year 1973 are listed below:

Range operations building—bid opening May 24, 1973.
EM barracks complex—advertising delayed pending evaluation by DA.
Bachelor officer quarters—awarded May 1973.
Commissary—awarded January 1973.
Branch library—awarded January 1973.
Barracks modernization—bid opening May 23, 1973.

Mr. SIKES. Are there other major projects besides the barracks complex here which are unapportioned?

General COOPER. Not unapportioned. We have the one new barracks complex unapportioned pending final decision on a look at all the training centers. That is a new barracks as opposed to a barracks modernization.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 REQUEST

Mr. SIKES. Does that mean that the barracks modernization requested this year also would be held in abeyance, if approved, until the studies are completed?

General COOPER. No, sir. We need to modernize this barracks in any case.

Mr. SIKES. What units or personnel will use it?

General COOPER. The new barracks will be used primarily by the Headquarters Command, the Ireland Army Hospital, the U.S. Armor School, the 194th Armored Brigade, and the Committee Training Group.

Mr. SIKES. What type of buildings are you modernizing? Are they temporary or semipermanent?

General COOPER. The buildings that we are modernizing are permanent buildings, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Are you satisfied that the life expectancy of the modernized buildings will justify the cost of modernization?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. If the basic training load should be reduced, would that in itself make additional administrative space available?

General COOPER. Probably not; most of the trainees are in trainee barracks. There is some limited administrative space in company headquarters and battalion headquarters, but it would not make any significant amount of administrative space available.

FORT LEE, VA.

Mr. SIKES. Fort Lee, Va. Insert page 25 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Fort Lee

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY	
First United States Army	Virginia 315	Virginia	
7. STATUS	**8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**9. COUNTY (U.S.)**	**10. NEAREST CITY**
Active	1918	Prince George	Petersburg

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Commands, trains, and logistically supports units and activities assigned to the Quartermaster Center, provides logistical support to others on post and satellited units and activities. Supports the Quartermaster and the Army Logistics Management School.

* Includes $7,300 one-time cost for easement.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972	703	3,398	2,059	631	3,188	311	534	561	11,385
b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	820	2,636	2,649	515	3,278	160	440	63	10,561

13 INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	5,751	697	96,066	96,763
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	215	7*	0	7
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				96,770
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				9,030
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				22,769
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				48,802
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				177,371

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
530	79 - Addition to Kenner Army Hospital	13	26	TSG	SF	43,900	5,310	43,900	5,310
721	16 - EM Barracks w/o Mess	1	27		MN	422	3,444	422	3,444
721	126 - EW Barracks	1	28		EW	211	1,558	211	1,558
722	125 - Central Food Preparation Facility	1	29		MN		6,876		6,876
724	124 - Bachelor Officer Quarters	1	30		MN	55	1,138	55	1,138
730	123 - Confinement Facility - 200 Men	28	31		SF	87,830	4,443	87,830	4,443
	Total						22,769		22,769

FORT LEE, VA., $22,769,000

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 and to support other on-post and satellited units and activities. The installation also supports the Quartermaster School and the Army Logistics Management Center. The program consists of an addition to Kenner Army Hospital, barracks without dining facilities for enlisted men, barracks for enlisted women, a central food preparation facility, bachelor officer quarters, and a confinement facility.

Status of funds

Funded program not in inventory	$9,030,000
Unobligated projects:	
Mar. 31, 1973 (actual)	2,378,000
June 30, 1973 (estimated)	2,378,000

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project number	Project	Design cost (thousands)	Percent complete Apr. 30, 1973
79	Addition Kenner Army Hospital	215	98
16	Enlisted mens' barracks without mess	185	5
126	Enlisted mens' barracks	84	5
125	Control food preparation facility	370	5
124	Bachelor officer quarters	56	5
123	Confinement facility 200 men	190	5

Enlisted barracks summary, Fort Lee, Va.

	Men/Women [1]
Total requirement	5,933
Existing substandard	[2] 10,880
Existing adequate	[3] 19
Funded, not in inventory	42
Adequate assets	61
Deficiency	5,872
Fiscal year 1974 program	633
Barracks spaces occupied, Mar. 15, 1973	3,256

[1] 90 square feet per man—permanent party personnel; 72 square feet per man—trainees.
[2] Includes 3,099 spaces that can be made adequate.
[3] Private housing.

Bachelor officer quarters summary, Fort Lee, Va.

	Men
Total requirement	962
Existing substanadard	731
Existing adequate	[1] 270
Funded, not in inventory	348
Adequate assets	618
Deficiency	344
Fiscal year 1974 program	55
Occupying BOQ's, Mar. 15, 1973	294

[1] Includes 45 in private housing.

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $$22,769,000.

CENTRAL FOOD PREPARATION FACILITY—INVESTIGATIVE STAFF REPORT

At this point, unless there is objection, we will insert in the record the report of the surveys and investigations staff on the central food preparation facility at Fort Lee.

[The report follows:]

A. Report to the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, on the Central Food Preparation Facilities, Department of the Army

U.S. House of Representatives,
Committee on Appropriations,
May 7, 1973.

Investigation: Military Construction.

In accordance with committee directive dated February 22, 1973, the committee's surveys and investigations staff has prepared a study relative to the central food preparation facilities requested by the Department of the Army in the fiscal year 1974 military construction program.

The study has been completed and the results are set forth in the attached report.

Sincerely,

Keith F. Mainland,
Clerk and Staff Director.

Attachment.

Distributions:

The Chairman, Mr. Sikes, Mr. Patton, Mr. Long, Mr. Obey, Mr. McKay, Mr. Davis, Mr. Talcott, Mr. McEwen, Mr. Cederberg, Bob Nicholas, Dales Shulaw, Ralph Preston, Keith Mainland, and Minority.

[Please note that no release of information contained in this report should be made unless authorized by the committee.]

House Appropriations Committee,
May 3, 1973.

Memorandum for the Chairman:

Re military construction program for fiscal year 1974.

Central Food Preparation Facilities Department of the Army

By directive dated February 22, 1973, the committee requested that an inquiry be made of the central food preparation facilities requested by the Department of the Army in the fiscal year 1974 military construction program.

In compliance with the committee's request this inquiry has been completed and the results are included in this report.

Respectfully submitted.

C. R. Anderson,
Chief of the surveys and investigations staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. DIRECTIVE

By directive dated February 22, 1973, the committee requested that an inquiry be made of the central food preparation facilities requested by the Department of the Army in the fiscal year 1974 military construction program.

The committee requested that the inquiry should include, but not be limited to, the Army's long-range plans for such facilities; the amortization rate of such facilities compared to various types of mess halls currently in operation; an analysis of other alternatives considered by the Army for providing this service; the requirement for these facilities; and the status of the design of these facilities.

II. INTRODUCTION

The military construction program of the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1974 includes a request for funds for the construction of central food preparation facilities (CFPF) at Fort Lee, Va., and Fort Benning, Ga., at an estimated cost of $6,876,000 and $5,346,000, respectively.

Central food preparation is a system that provides for the centralized receipt, preparation, cooking, processing, packaging, storing, and distribution of selected entree and menu items for delivery to satellite dining facilities for final preparation and service. Central warewashing of all tableware is also an integral part of this system.

The investigative staff was advised by Army officials that in addition to Fort Lee and Fort Benning, the following Army installations are being considered for central food preparation facilities during the period fiscal year 1975 through fiscal year 1979:

Fort Campbell, Ky.
Fort Sill, Okla.
Fort Carson, Colo.
Fort Dix, N.J.
Fort Jackson, S.C.
Fort Gordon, Ga.
Fort Lewis, Wash.
Fort Riley, Kans.
Fort Devens, Mass.
Fort Rucker, Ala.
U.S. Army, Europe
Fort Knox, Ky.
Fort Ord, Calif.
Fort Bragg, N.C.
Fort Hood, Tex.
Fort Bliss, Tex.
Fort Sam Houston, Tex.
Fort Polk, La.
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.
Fort Hauchuca, Ariz.
Fort Stewart, Ga.
U.S. Army, Pacific.

The 6-year program is expected to cost about $160 million in military construction funds and $90 million in operation and maintenance funds for equipment. Improvement of satellite dining facilities at the various installations will be included in the estimated $90 million operation and mainenance costs. The proposed fiscal year 1975 element of this cost is expected to be $35 million in military construction funds and $25 million in operation and maintenance funds.

The investigative staff did not visit Fort Benning during this inquiry but limited travel to Fort Lee. Army officials stated that all pertinent information regarding the CFPF concept for both installations could be obtained from the personnel at the Troop Support Agency, Fort Lee. Furthermore, no project officer had been appointed for Fort Benning and the only thing to be gained by visiting Fort Benning at this time would be to view the site location of the proposed CFPF.

A. Background

The Army's present garrison food service system is primarily based on company sized units which are completely staffed and equipped to cook A-ration type meals whether in garrison or in the field. According to the Army, with the advent of the volunteer military forces a need for new systems of food service has been created which will offer significantly improved service to the military customer and substantially reduce manpower requirements.

In 1969, the DOD Facilities and Equipment Planning Board accomplished an on-site survey of military garrison feeding facilities in the United States. As a result of this survey, this Board initated. wth OSD and Army approval. a study to define, and implement a new, modern food service system at Fort Lewis, Wash. The objectives were to improve performance and reduce costs. This system would then serve as a model for all military services.

In 1970, the DOD food research, development, test and engineering program was established at the U.S. Army Natick Laboratories, Natick, Mass. Included within this program were an increased emphasis on garrison food service systems and a requirement to apply a total systems concept in the design of new military food service systems. This requirement was initially addressed by the operations research and systems analysis (ORSA) office at the Natick Laboratories, and resulted in the merger of the research, development, test, and engineering systems study effort with the DOD Facilities and Equipment Planning Board program to study and then build a modern food service system at Fort Lewis.

During the period August 1971-June 1972, ORSA tested the concept of central food preparation at Fort Lewis, Wash. Fort Lewis was selected because it represented $23 million in annual food expenditures and constituted the largest military feeding operation in the continental United States. The study was conducted to develop the means to improve food service and measure troop acceptance of centrally prepared food and to validate the technical feasibility of preparing, chilling, packaging, and storing food in a CFPF, then transporting food for reheating and serving in existing dining facilities. Upon completion of the study, ORSA concluded that the CFPF concept provided many advantages at a cost savings in the operation of a modern food service system.

Concurrent with the Fort Lewis study, a similar small scale test was conducted by the U.S. Army Troop Support Agency and the U.S. Army Quartermaster School at Fort Lee, based upon concepts proven in civilian industry and in the hospital central preparation facility at the U.S. Army Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D.C. Army officials advised that the tests at Fort Lee demonstrated that a more palatable meal could be provided using the central food preparation concept and that the enlisted personnel were relieved of many of the oppressive tasks inherent in the present dining facilities.

In November 1970, the Chief of Staff of the Army established the Department of the Army Subsistence Operations Review Board (SORB), which was headed by a major general, to investigate on a one-time basis the adequacy of subsistence support and food service programs and to develop an Army food service system that would be effective, efficient, and economical. Accordingly, a worldwide review was made by the SORB of Army dining facilities and a report covering this review was subsequently issued. This report described dilapidated facilities, obsolete and inoperable equipment, untrained, demoralized, and inefficiently used food personnel, and sketchy and ill-defined supervision and control. It was the opinion of the SORB that these deficiencies were primarily caused by the continued use of small inefficient and independent food preparation facilities that were being operated, in many cases, by unqualified personnel under minimal supervision.

During its review, the SORB learned that the centralization of food service operations had been recommended to the Army in studies by the Logistics Management Institute, which were conducted from 1965 through 1969; in the Report of the 1969 White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health; and by the Logistic Systems Policy Council in 1970. Despite these recommendations the Army had not made any moves toward the centralization of food service operations and lagged far behind industry in this endeavor. Throughout the United States, many large commercial food service companies, hotel and motel chains, manufacturers, airlines, and educational institutions have adopted centralized food preparation systems to offset labor costs and to insure the production of uniformly high quality food.

The SORB study noted that a central food processing system offers advantages such as, fewer KP's and cooks needed, more civilianization of jobs, less wasted food, less equipment needed, simplified maintenance of unit dining facilities, expanded menu selection (pick and choose), and orderly career progression for civilian and military personnel assigned to food service operations. Consequently, the SORB recommended that the Army develop a concept for centralized food preparation at the installation level and that a prototype facility be established for development purposes.

B. Interim central food preparation facility at Fort Lee, Va.

Army officials advised the investigative staff that the Army's current food service program has been subjected to criticism from within and outside the Department of Defense. The present system has been described as ineffective, uneconomical, and inefficient. For example, the present system divides each function among the number of dining facilities being operated at each Army

installation, thereby increasing the waste of food products, utilities, and man-hours. The nonproductive planning, organizing, and management type functions are multiplied in almost direct proportion to the number of separate kitchens operated. This division spreads the qualified personnel so thin that food is being prepared by inexperienced personnel, with the resulting lower quality product being served and the end result being increased food waste. Also, the problem of maintaining the proper sanitary conditions in food preparation areas is multiplied many times in the individual kitchens.

In order to remedy the above conditions and to implement the recommendations of the SORB, as well as to further evaluate the experiment of the CFPF operation at Fort Lewis, Wash., the Army is in the process of installing an interim CFPF system at Fort Lee, Va. This facility was approved by the Congress as a minor construction project in the fiscal year 1973 military construction program at an estimated cost of $242,000. Included in this cost will be the alteration costs of three buildings for CFPF use. A fourth building will be used as a microbiological laboratory. The four buildings are situated at different locations on the Fort Lee installation but in the general proximity to each other.

Two of the structures slated for renovation are permanent type and the other is temporary. One of the permanent structures is a cold storage warehouse and the other is an unused 450-man dining facility. The temporary structure is now being used as a publication warehouse. After the construction of the permanent CFPF is completed, the cold storage warehouse will again be used for that purpose and the 450-man dining facility will be converted to barracks space or a dayroom. The publication warehouse will revert to its present use.

Army officials expect the interim facility to provide an ongoing operational CFPF from which data can be extracted and transported into the necessary doctrine and procedures required to operate permanent CFPF's. Also, Army officials advised that the establishment of the interim facility at Fort Lee will afford the Troop Support Agency and the Quartermaster Schools the opportunity to obtain some expertise in the operation of a CFPF, which will be essential to conduct the necessary training required to teach skills inherent in a food service of this caliber. Officials at the Troop Support Agency are confident that the operation of the interim CFPF will result in reduced cost for food service and a more economical system. They pointed out that manpower and equipment requirements in the dining facilities will be reduced, double and triple handling of food will be eliminated, controlled supervised production will reduce preparation waste and a reduction of food waste will be accomplished through a more responsible distribution system.

The interim facility will have the capability of preparing food items to serve 7,500 meals per day, Monday through Friday, and 5,000 meals per day, Saturdays and Sundays, or 47,500 meals per week.

Army officials at Fort Lee, Va., contemplate the interim CFPF will be in operation by October 1973. However, it appears doubtful to the investigative staff that the renovation of the buildings and the installation of the equipment necessary for operation of the CFPF can be completed by that time. At the time of the investigative staff's visit to Fort Lee the Army had not solicited bids for the construction work but had obtained some of the equipment to be installed in the facility. Army officials admitted the possibility of some slippage in the initial operation date but did not believe it would go beyond 30 days.

When queried as to the possible continued use of the interim facility instead of constructing the permanent CFPF, Army officials and also officials of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics (OSD(I. & L.)), informed the investigative staff that the interim facility will be scattered in four separate buildings and, therefore, would not be economical to operate; whereas, the permanent facility proposed for fiscal year 1974 will have all the elements of the CFPF in one building. These officials stated that the interim facility should only be used as a means of getting the CFPF concept underway in order to establish the Army's doctrine for operation of such a facility and to formulate and institute training procedures for operation of other CFPF's.

Another official of OSD (I&L) believes the Army will make the interim facility prove that the concept of CFPF is economical and feasible and that there would be a minimal number required for the permanent facility. He also said the Army has no way of knowing whether the enlisted men will patronize the renovated dining facilities. However, since one of the principal complaints registered by the enlisted personnel throughout the Army, during a recent

survey, was the quality of food and dining facilities, the Army has high hopes that modernization of the dining facilities and improvements in the types and method of food preparation and serving will entice the enlisted men into the dining facilities.

III. PRESENT FACILITIES

Fort Lee

The enlisted personnel strength at Fort Lee, as of December 31, 1972, and planned for the end of fiscal year 1975, follows:

Personnel strength	Permanent	Students	Support	Total
As of December 31, 1972	3,398	3,188	534	7,120
Planned for end of fiscal year 1975	4,400	4,050	----------	8,490

At the present time there are 10 dining facilities in use to feed the above troops. These facilities vary in size from 4,602 square feet to 8,670 square feet and can accommodate from 225 men to 450 men per meal or a total of 316 men per meal. Each of these facilities is somewhat autonomous in that they each have separate dining stewards, chefs, and other employees required for operation. Under the central food preparation concept proposed for Fort Lee, the 10 dining facilities will remain in use but, except for "short order" type of cooking, all food will be prepared in the central facility.

Fort Benning

The enlisted personnel strength at Fort Benning as of December 31, 1972, and planned for the end of fiscal year 1975 follows:

Personnel strength	Permanent	Students	Support	Total
As of Dec. 31, 1972	10,382	3,462	350	14,194
Planned for end of fiscal year 1975	22,493	2,720	----------	25,213

Army officials advised the Investigative Staff that there are 55 dining facilities now in use at Fort Benning and available without charge to those enlisted personnel who are not receiving basic allowance for subsistence (BAS). They are operated in the same manner as those at Fort Lee. The Army plans to reduce the number of dining facilities to 38 under the central food preparation facility concept.

IV. PROPOSED FACILITIES

Fort Lee

Army officials advised the investigative staff that the proposed construction of a CFPF at Fort Lee, designed to serve 15,000 meals per day, will consist of a central kitchen, ingredient centers, food storage and distribution facilities, a pastry kitchen, and central warewashing facilities. The CFPF will require 94,500 square feet of space, 15,000 of which will be used for training of students from the Quartermaster School in CFPF operation and an additional 12,000 to 15,000 square feet will be needed for back-up storage space.

In addition to the construction of the central facility, the Army proposes to use fiscal year 1974 Military construction funds in the amount of $230,000 to modernize 10 existing dining facilities in which will be served the food prepared in the CFPF. The Army desires to make these facilities attractive for the troops and to encourage the troops to use them.

Fort Benning

The CFPF at Fort Benning will be similar in design to that at Fort Lee and will provide similar food preparation facilities in 80,000 square feet of space with a capacity for 25,000 meals per day. This facility will not be as large as the one proposed for Fort Lee as no classroom space will be required nor will it be necessary for back-up storage space. Army officials stated that the Fort Benning facility will be located in the industrial complex of the base and adequate storage facilities will be available.

Also, included in the Army's request for fiscal year 1974 military construction funds for Fort Benning is $750,000 to modernize 25 dining facilities. At the present time, according to an official in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for

Logistics, U.S. Army, food is being prepared and served in 52 to 55 separate dining facilities at Fort Benning. Under the CFPF program food will be prepared at one facility and the number of satellite dining facilities will be reduced to 38, of which 25 will be modernized.

The interior design for the satellite dining facilities at Forts Lee and Benning will be commensurate with first-class commercial cafeterias. Carpeting, draperies, effective lighting, paging and sound systems, and coordinated color schemes for all furnishings and equipment will be provided in the dining areas. Additionally, the dining areas will be provided with a combination of four-man/two-man tables and wall booths with tables and chairs.

The dining facilities will have cafeteria style eating and will provide the following: (a) A la carte and continental breakfast. (b) Regular meal service (multiple entree choice); (c) short-order menu; (d) salad/relish bar; (e) self-service bulk beverage dispensers; and (f) self-bussing or bussing by contract food service attendants.

Serious consideration is being given by the Army to serving specialty (ethnic) foods on a regular basis in some of the dining facilities.

A. Management of CFPF

Under the CFPF concept a postion of Director of Food Management will be established for the centralized management of all facets relating to the food service program. Army officials believe centralization will result in a long overdue improvement toward a more efficient food service operation. At the present time the dining facilities at each Army installation are under the command and direction of the various company commanders and there is no coordination or centralization of the food service operation among the dining facilities.

An automated management information system (MIS) is being planned for the CFPF's to measure dining facility attendance (headcount), meal consumption, food preferences, and eating patterns. The MIS will also control production, maintain an inventory of raw and prepared food items, record data on nutritional adequacy, and evaluate dining facility performance. The MIS will be centrally controlled to permit diners to eat at the facility of their choice. It will also permit the establishment of short order and specialty dining facilities open to the entire installation.

An official of the Troop Support Agency at Fort Lee furnished the estimated automatic data processing equipment (ADPE) costs to operate the CFPF management information system at Fort Lee. He stated the following new equipment and personnel would be required:

(a) Ten badge reading stations at a total monthly rental of $1,000.

(b) One central collecting station with data storage tape and data time generator at a monthly rental of $1,000.

(c) The Army Logistics Management Center (ALMC) computer to be used for data gathering and data processing will have an expected shared used cost of approximately $600 per month.

(d) A badge encoder system will have a one-time purchase cost of $3,500.

(e) A one -time cost for installation of equipment was not expected to exceed $5,000.

In addition to personnel authorized in the present manual system, two computer programers, one GS–12 at $16,682 annually, and one GS–11 at $13,996 annually will be required.

Several officials of Natick Laboratories advised there is no need for a continuous ADPE analysis of the food to be served in the CFPF at Fort Lee since the results of the analysis would not justify the costs. It is the opinion of the Natick ORSA Group that two-man spot checks on an interim basis would suffice but some people in the Troop Support Agency disagree.

B. Cost estimates

Officials of the Corps of Engineers informed the investigative staff that the preliminary cost estimates for each of the above facilities were based on construction of facilities (dining halls, etc.) in the past and modified as to what the CFPF will be. However, these officials stated that there are no facilities now in the Army which are similar to those proposed for Forts Lee and Benning.

Fort Lee

The latest cost estimate for the project at Fort Lee (as of February 14, 1973), prepared by the Corps of Engineers which are based on current costs plus cost growth to April 1975, shows the cost of the CFPF building as $4,630,000, new fixed equipment and installation $776,000, removal and reinstallation of fixed

equipment from an interim facility $74,000; and the modernization of 10 dining facilities at $230,000. Supporting facilities, such as utilities, roads and parking, communications, site improvements, and demolition of buildings would require an additional $1,167,000.

It will be noted that DD Form 1391, entitled "Military Construction Project Data" which the Army furnished to the investigative staff, contains a statement that no buildings will be demolished as a result of this project. During the visit of the investigative staff to Fort Lee and subsequent inspection of the site for the proposed building. Army officials advised that it would be necessary to demolish a number of unused barrack buildings to construct the CFPF. However, they pointed out that the particular buildings were scheduled for demolition and the proposed CFPF was not the cause of this demolition. Therefore, the DD 1391 indicated no buildings would be demolished. Nevertheless, the cost estimates by the Corps of Engineers includes the estimate of $58,000 for the demolition of 29 buildings.

The total investment cost for the permanent CFPF at Fort Lee is estimated as $10,575,000 to be funded as follows:

	Thousands
Fiscal year 1974 military construction funds	$6,876
Fiscal year 1974 operation and maintenance funds	1,364
Fiscal year 1973 operation and maintenance funds	1,500
Fiscal year 1972 operation and maintenance funds	835

Army officials advised that the fiscal year 1972 and fiscal year 1973 operation and maintenance costs above will be applied to the upgrading of dining facilities and equipment for the interim CFPF at Fort Lee which will be subsequently transferred to the permanent facility. The fiscal year 1974 operation and maintenance costs will be for noninstalled equipment throughout the CFPF and the satellite dining facilities.

Fort Benning

The most recent cost estimates for the CFPF at Fort Benning were prepared by the Corps of Engineers in December 1972. Officials of the Corps of Engineers advised that the estimates are preliminary and would be further finalized after the design work has been completed. The total investment cost for the Fort Benning facility is estimated as $9,230,000 to be funded as follows:

	Thousands
Fiscal year 1974 military construction funds	[1] $5,346
Fiscal year 1974 operation and maintenance funds	[2] 1,500
Fiscal year 1973 operation and maintenance funds	[3] 2,384

[1] Costs include all investment expenses, i.e., site preparation, $1,266,000 for installed equipment, utility hookup, satellite dining facility modernizations, communication, etc.
[2] Costs are for noninstalled equipment throughout the CFPF and satellite dining facilities
[3] Cost of upgrading existing facilities.

C. Status of design

No contracts have been awarded by the Army for the design work for either of these projects. However, the Corps of Engineers District Office at Baltimore, Md., has selected the architectural engineering firm of Lockwood Greene Engineers of New York, N.Y., to do the design of the Fort Lee CFPF. The Corps of Engineers estimate the architectural engineering fee will be $312,000.

The District Office of the Corps of Engineers at Savannah, Ga., has selected the architectural engineering firm of Wise, Simpson, & Atkins, Atlanta, Ga., for the design work at the Fort Benning facility, and estimated the design contract would cost $254,000.

Approximately 2 percent and 5 percent of the design work at Fort Lee and Fort Benning, respectively, has been completed by the Corps of Engineers but that represents only siting the work to be done on a plan. Corps of Engineers' officials stated that construction of both of these projects could begin about April 1974 and be completed about 1 year later, if the Congress authorizes and funds them in the fiscal year 1974 military construction program. However, Army officials at the Troop Support Agency, Fort Lee, Va., and at Army Headquarters, Washington, D.C., stated October 1975 would be the earliest date the CFPF could be available under the fiscal year 1974 military construction program.

D. Amortization cost

An Army official in the Troop Support Division, Directorate of Supply and Maintenance, DCSLOG, advised the prescribed Army methodology for conducting an economic analysis of proposed Army investments is contained in Army regulation 37–13, dated June 4, 1969. Neither this regulation, nor its predecessor, dated April 27, 1967, provides for the computation of an amortization rate. Since amortization was not computed in estimating the annual operating costs of existing Army dining facilities, there was no basis for comparison with the amortization rate for proposed CFPF's.

This official advised the methodology used to determine the amortization cost reflected in the economic analysis for Fort Lee and Fort Benning CFPF's was a carryover from the methodology used in Natick Laboratories technical report 72–67 ORSA "A Cost Analysis of Modern High Production Food Service Systems for Military Garrison Applications."

Applying this methodology, the following amortization costs computed as of September 1, 1972, were incorporated in the economic analysis for the proposed CFPF system at Fort Benning, Ga.

Item	Estimated life (years)	Initial cost	Capital recovery factor	Amortized cost
CFPF building	25	$4,053,000	0.11017	$447,000
CFPF equipment	12	3,298,000	.14676	484,000
Transportation and storage equipment	12	760,000	.14676	112,000
Management information system	8	144,000	.18744	27,000
New vehicles and modification	12	100,000	.14676	15,000
Satellite dining facility equipment	12	740,000	.14676	109,000
Satellite dining facilities—building modification	25	213,000	.11017	23,000
Total amortization costs/year				1,217,000

An official of ORSA advised an interest rate of 10 percent per year was applied per AR 37–13. This regulation also established building life as 25 years, food service equipment life as 12 years, and management information system equipment life at 8 years.

Applying the same principles the following amortization costs were computed as of September 1, 1972, for the proposed CFPF at Fort Lee, Va.:

Item	Estimated life (years)	Initial cost	Capital recovery factor	Amortized cost
CFPF building	25	$3,825,000	0.11017	$421,400
CFPF equipment	12	400,000	.14676	58,704
Management information system	8	55,000	.18744	10,309
New vehicles and modifications	12	30,000	.14676	4,403
Satellite D/F equipment and modifications	12	186,850	.14676	27,422
Total amortization costs/year				522,238

V. COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE FOOD SERVICE SYSTEMS

During 1971, a comprehensive study and evaluation was conducted of the garrison food service system at Fort Lewis, Wash. The study included an analysis of two conventional systems; one based primarily upon tables of organization and equipment (TOE) staffing levels with 130 dining halls; and a conventional system based upon 48 dining halls and tables of distribution and allowances (TDA) staffing levels. The system based on 48 dining halls was selected as the base line system for cost analysis comparison with modern food service systems, including the large consolidated dining hall facility, the CFPF and the vendor supplied convenience foods system.

A comparison of the annual operating costs of alternative food service systems is set forth in the following table:

[Dollars in thousands]

Factors	Conventional		Modern		
	TOE/TDA	Baseline system (48 dining halls)	Large, new consolidated	Central food preparation	Vendor supplied prepared foods
Food	$4,971	$4,971	$4,574	$4,225	$8,112
Labor	10,683	7,622	5,622	5,593	4,745
Other	865	730	585	870	785
Amortization of facilities			678	598	215
Total cost	16,519	13,323	11,459	11,286	13,857
Annual savings (as compared to baseline system)			1,864	2,037	[1] 534

[1] Cost increase.

An analysis of this data disclosed that the CFPF and the large consolidated dining hall would yield annual reductions of $2,037,000 and $1,864,000, respectively, when compared to the conventional 48-dining-hall system, whereas the vendor supplied pre-prepared foods system would result in an annual cost increase of $534,000.

A comparison of the effectiveness of alternative food service systems is set forth in the following table:

SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS

[Meals/man-hour]

Conventional TOE/TDA	3.1
Conventional 48 dining halls	4.4
Large, new consolidated	5.9
Central food preparation	6.4
Vendor supplied preprepared food	7.6

The system effectiveness was determined by dividing the total number of meals served by the number of personnel, multiplied by the number of hours worked. Using this formula the vendor-supplied preprepared food system proved most effective.

The manpower allocations for the alternative food service systems are set forth in the following table:

Manpower category	Conventional TOE/TDA	Conventional (baseline system)	Large, new consolidated	Central food preparation	Vendor supplied preprepared foods
Military:					
Management	18	15	11	22	16
Dining hall stewards	130	48	13	53	50
Cooks	591	418	323	209	168
Dining room attendants (KP)	None	None	None	None	None
Drivers	30	18	13	18	18
Other	4	4	7	13	7
Civilian:					
Management and technical	1	1	12	32	24
Cooks	None	None	None	58	48
Warewashing attendants	None	None	None	57	43
Dining room attendants	527	427	301	149	179
Clerks and typists	8	7	6	19	14
Mechanics	None	None	None	9	6
Other	16	13	12	6	6
Total personnel	1,325	951	698	645	549

The ORSA Group recommended, in addition to the nontechnical support and operating personnel, that the level of technical expertise for a 25,000 meal per day CFPF should include six food technologists, GS–11 through GS–14; two computer systems analysts, GS–11 and GS–13; two microbiologists, GS–9 and GS–12; one consumer analyst, GS–12; a dietician, GS–11; and other civilian positions of lesser grades. Also, the technical expertise should include a colonel

three majors, three captains, five warrant officers, a sergeant major and a master sergeant.

A comparison of the capital investment cost of the modern food service systems is set forth in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Large, new consolidated	Central food preparation	Vendor supplied preprepared foods
Central food production and warewashing facility	(1)	2,412	340
Equipment for central facility	(1)	2,327	350
Transport and storage equipment	(1)	760	300
Dining hall construction or modifications	9,203	384	384
Dining hall equipment	2,605	528	528
Management information system	120	144	144
New Vehicles and modifications to existing vehicles	None	100	100
Total cost	11,928	6,655	2,146
Value of released dining hall space	2,029		
Adjusted total cost	9,899	6,655	2,146

[1] Not applicable.

The value of the released dining hall space adjustment reflects the total value of 48 dining halls released at $20 per square foot, in accordance with AR 37–13.

It was noted that the total cost for the CFPF did not include dining hall refurbishment costs estimated at $1.1 million or utilities upgrading costs.

A. Advantages and shortcomings of the alternative modern food service systems

During the 1971 study, advantages of the large consolidated dining facilities were noted as decreased manpower requirements, high worker productivity, and reduced food cost due to better food management. Shortcomings noted were the distance customers must travel to get to the dining hall which would affect patronage and the high cost of new dining hall construction.

The advantages of the CFPF were decreased manpower requirements, high worker productivity, uniform quality of food products, reduced food cost due to increased yield from raw food, reduced skill level requirements of personnel at dining halls and maximum customer convenience. Shortcomings were the high cost of building a central preparation facility and the increased level of sophistication in the central processing facility, requiring a high level of professional expertise.

The advantages of the vendor supplied preprepared foods system were minimum manpower requirements, high worker productivity, reduced skill level requirements of operating personnel at the dining halls, and low initial capital investment. The shortcomings were higher total meal cost than consolidated or central preparation systems, a highly variable product, extreme difficulty in controlling quality and formulation, loss of proficiency by cooks, and the restricted variety of menu items.

1. Conclusions of the analysis

The cost effectiveness comparisons indicate that the CFPF and the large consolidated dining hall system are the most economical. These systems offer improved service to the customer in the form of specialty and short order meals over extended operating hours. However, the consolidated dining hall system significantly reduces convenient access to the dining halls for the customer.

The CFPF was, therefore, recommended for pilot system implementation, with the advantages of preserving a higher degree of troop convenience and unit integrity and lower operating and capital investment costs.

It was noted the entire system, including organization structure, management, central food preparation, transportation and distribution, satellite dining hall operation, and central warewashing will require detailed development and evolution under actual large scale operations. It was concluded that further systems development, systems testing and systems evaluation had to be conducted for the successful implementation of the recommended system.

Army officials stated that operation of the interim CFPF at Fort Lee, Va., will be the means of accomplishing the above conclusions.

An official of the Office of the Corps of Engineers advised the Investigative Staff there was some question in the minds of some Army officials as to whether Fort Lee is a good base to run the pilot program of the CFPF because it is a training base and an operational base would be more suitable.

Army officials in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics who were interviewed by the Investigative Staff advised the question of locating the pilot CFPF program on a training base versus an operational base was considered prior to submission of the fiscal year 1974 budget to the Congress. Fort Lewis, Wash., and Fort Riley, Kans., were given consideration during Army budget reviews and both were subsequently dropped from consideration, because the Army felt the troop strengths at both installations would not be static or stable in the future. Fort Lee was decided upon as it has a fairly constant troop population and also because all of the Army's food service doctrine training is developed and conducted there. This was the overriding factor in locating the pilot program at Fort Lee.

The National Research Council, in February 1972, reported the Fort Lewis study established the basic principles of a centralized feeding system, but noted much remains to be learned about other aspects of the concept such as practical engineering, equipment needs, personnel needs and education, sanitation, administration, and efficiency. It concluded that care should be taken in the extrapolation of guidelines from the Fort Lewis study and the principles should be tested at several scalings.

B. Comparison of CFPF at Keesler Air Force Base (AFB) and Fort Lewis

The Joint Technical Staff (JTS), DOD food research, development, test, and engineering program, made a staff visit to the CFPF at Keesler AFB in January 1972, to compare it with the Army's food facility at Fort Lewis.

One member of the JTS, in reporting the results of this visit, noted that the Air Force concept of central food preparation as seen at Keesler AFB is a logical and orderly approach to the establishment of a CFPF. The Air Force philosophy of central food preparation is not to convert from one total system to a completely new centralized system in one phase since this is considered to be too great a change and allows for too much chance for failure of the system. The Air Force at Keesler has adopted a six-phase system for establishing a CFPF. In this system the local food service management at the base level is given the flexibility to proceed at their own rate of speed in progressing from one phase to another.

Keesler has established and maintained the CFPF with only a minimum of outside assistance and funding and with no addition hiring of specialized personnel.

Keesler at the time of the visit was in phase 4 of the Air Force plan and it was noted the advantages and returns of progression beyond phase 4 into a total CFPF had to be carefully weighed, since it might not be worth the time, effort, funds, and planning necessary in the advanced phases of the operation.

It was also noted that central food preparation may not always be the best method of military feeding, depending upon the mission, existing food services facilities, local command elements and the capability of the local personnel who would have to establish the system and make it function effectively.

Another member of the JTS noted the central food preparation experiment at Keesler AFB, while less sophisticated at this stage than that of the Army at Fort Lewis, showed the advantages of phase-in implementation as compared with total system conversion. The important aspect of the experiment to other Air Force installations and other military services was that the concept of central food preparation could be successfully adopted on a local basis in part or in total, and not require outside professional guidance and monitoring. Implementation of the concept could be effected with maximum utilization of existing conventional equipment and spaces, allowing more installations to realize many of the advantages of the concept without the necessity for additional funding and outside professional assistance.

The Keesler experiment raised the question that perhaps there is a stage in implementation of the central food preparation concept beyond which efficiency and savings in capital and manpower do not increase proportionately with the additional investment required.

Two other members of the JTS, while commenting that the Keesler AFB system seemed to be functioning satisfactorily, noted that the last two stages of the system will require considerably more management involvement and technical know-how.

An official of OASD (I. & L.) advised the investigative staff that Keesler AFB is still in phase 4 of the central food preparation concept and does not intend to go further until more solid data is available. While Air Force officials believe it will be cost effective to progress to phases 5 and 6, they plan additional testing before proceeding further in order to be on sure ground. They plan to go to phase 6 only if the test data supports it.

This official further commented that the Air Force is waiting to see the results of the Army CFPF before completely accepting the concept.

C. Feasibility test of civilian contract food service in Army enlisted dining facilities

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (I. & L.) in October 1969, tasked the Army with the responsibility of conducting a test to determine the feasibility of operating military food service facilities by commercial contract in the Washington, D.C., area. A contract was awarded to the La-Tex Corp. for the operation of the Tri-Service Dining Facility, North Post, Fort Myer, Va., with a July 1, 1971, implementation date. The contract requires La-Tex to furnish all food, management, labor, supervision, and supplies.

Quarterly evaluation reports were submitted to the Army by the Military District of Washington utilizing the performance data of the military operation for 1970 as a basis for comparison. Based on these evaluations and on-site visits, the contract was renewed for fiscal year 1973 and contract renewal negotiations are being conducted for fiscal year 1974.

A test plan to compare the contract with a noncontract feeding operation was developed by the Army Troop Support Agency and the Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., consolidated dining facility was selected for comparison based on the comparable composition and number of persons being fed. The months of October and November 1972, and January 1973, were selected for the test period.

A draft of the final report noted the results of the feasibility test favor the contract operation at the Tri-Service Dining Facility and recommended the continuation of the contract, based on its apparent cost effectiveness and greater troop acceptability.

VI. OBSERVATIONS

Various individuals interviewed, who are familiar with the Army's CFPF concept, expressed concern that the Army is moving too rapidly into the CFPF construction program, with 24 new facilities planned during fiscal years 1974 through 1979, at a total estimated cost of one-quarter of a billion dollars.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Supply, Maintenance and Services, OSD (I. & L.), in November 1972, noted that the Army appears to base its plans for the CFPF projects on the Fort Lewis study and the use of similar facilities by the food service industry. However, the Army has not provided sufficient data to justify the size and staffing of these facilities or demonstrated that it can successfully manage them in a more efficient or cost effective manner than a consolidated system, or even the present existing system.

This official further noted that the Army has demonstrated a definite need for major improvements in its food service program and the CFPF concept appeared to be the most immediate answer. In view of this, he expressed approval of the Army's CFPF program, subject to certain conditions, including the justification of the size and staffing of the facilities and the drastic reduction of assistance furnished by Natick Laboratories, since the operation of a CFPF by the Army quartermaster school and Natick personnel at Fort Lee would not provide valid data as to the capability of the Army to manage a CFPF alone at Fort Benning or any other facility. Further, he noted no funds should be used to renovate company size dining facilities which should be phased out of the system and replaced by larger more cost effective facilities.

An official in OASD (I. & L.), in September 1972, reported that the Army was pushing for approval to construct central food preparation facilities in fiscal year 1974, although the Army had not proven the capability to manage a CFPF system nor that such a system is the most efficient or effective. He stated the CFPF concept may be sound theoretically, but the system has to be adapted to the practical problems of Army food service. However, the Army is programing to budget and construct new facilities while still working out the problems.

This official expressed the opinion that a CFPF system can be phased in at virtually all Army facilities without any large expenditures. Further, a pilot CFPF should be developed at Fort Lee to provide guidelines, procedures and poli-

cies before considering the phasing in of CFPF facilities at other Army installations.

He expressed concern that the rush to construct CFPF's may be similar to the development of the subsistence preparation by Electronic Energy Diffusion (SPEED) mobile field kitchen, which, while conceptually sound but highly sophisticated, was found to be too complicated for Army field use after an expenditure of $1,556,000.

In May 1972, the ORSA group of Natick Laboratories, which recommended the central food processing concept for pilot system implementation, cautioned that even though this system reduces the skill level needed at the dining hall, it requires a high degree of sophistication at the CFPF, which does not exist within the military services today. Because of this new level of complexity, the success of this system is predicated upon recognizing and filling the requirement for civilian and military professional expertise at the CFPF. ORSA concluded that if this requirement could not be met, the system would not be recommended for implementation.

Officials in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics assured the investigative staff that the Army would encounter no difficulty in obtaining the personnel needed to manage and operate the CFPF from the current ranks of military personnel and/or from private industry.

The investigative staff was informed during a briefing by the Troop Support Agency, Fort Lee, Va., that there has been long-standing pressure within the Army against consolidated dining halls dating back to World War II, although it was conceded the Army cannot continue to subsist in the use of small, inefficient, independent, and uneconomical dining facilities.

The Army has long experienced extremely unsatisfactory dining hall attendance. For example, during the period January 1, 1973, to March 31, 1973, only 51 percent of the total enlisted Army personnel at Fort Lee who were authorized to subsist without reimbursement, utilized the dining facilities. The remaining 49 percent ate their meals at the place of their choice.

While the dining facilities utilization rate has increased at Fort Lee over the past 12 months, 42.3 percent in March 1972 to 56.4 percent in March 1973, there is no assurance it will continue to improve. Army officials attributed the increase to improvements in the decor and the use of specialty items in some of the dining facilities. Ethnic foods have been offered on certain week nights and such menus have become quite popular and favorably received.

The investigative staff was advised the current trend in the military departments is toward authorizing Basic Allowance for Subsistence (BAS). More than 50 percent of the military personnel in DOD (75 percent in the Air Force) are currently receiving BAS. As of March 31, 1972, 32 percent of the enlisted Army personnel were receiving BAS, a 17-percent increase over the same period 2 years ago. This trend is attributed by Army officials to the higher rate of married enlisted personnel.

The acting director of the subsistence management policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, expressed the opinion to the investigative staff that in view of the trend toward the BAS concept he is contemplating requesting the military departments to conduct a survey in this area.

Although it is the belief and hope of the Army officials interviewed by the investigative staff that the implementation of the CFPF, together with the modernizing of the dining facilities will result in a sizable increase in the dining facilities utilization rate throughout the Army, there can be no assurance this will occur.

An OSD official stated that the Army will have more equipment and expertise in its food service program under the CFPF concept than most private food companies. He said that no real constraints were placed on the development of this system concept and "the sky was the limit." He believes the possibility of the Army experiencing some difficulty in the operation of the CFPF is not remote and that the Army might ultimately resort to a contract operation.

A food scientist from private industry, who is a member of the Research and Development Associates for Military Food and Packaging Systems, Inc., expressed concern that the Army is considering building large food preparation facilities, which he felt are in direct competition with private industry. In his opinion, private industry has the capability and technical expertise to operate such a CFPF more economically and more efficiently than the military departments.

The investigative staff believes the Army should operate the interim CFPF for a period of at least 12 to 18 months to test the CFPF concept, eliminate any "bugs" in the operation, and determine the acceptability by the troops before large expenditures are made on permanent facilities. Further, the current trend in the military departments toward wider authorizations for basic allowance for subsistence should be extensively surveyed, prior to requesting new CFPF construction, since this trend indicates that a total volunteer Army fewer troops will be eating all meals in military dining facilities.

DESIGN STATUS

Mr. SIKES. What is the design status of the central food preparation facility proposed for fiscal year 1974?

General COOPER. We have Colonel Burt here, who would like to give you a 5-minute presentation.

Mr. SIKES. Will you come up to the witness table and proceed. Tell us the design status, when you expect the design to be completed, the expected date for award of the contract, and then proceed in your own way.

Let me tell you, General Cooper, that the committee is glad to have this type of presentation on these major programs.

Mr. CARTON. You asked first for the status of the design of the project. Functional layout drawings have now been furnished by Natick Laboratories to the Troop Support Agency. The Troop Support Agency has now given the Office of the Chief of Engineers this information and all their data on the equipment layouts. We expect engineering instructions to be issued by the end of this month and an A/E contract to be awarded shortly thereafter. We anticipate that we would award this job in June of 1974.

BRIEFING ON CENTRAL FOOD PREPARATION FACILITY

Colonel BURT. Mr. Chairman, I will describe briefly the concept of central food preparation as we are developing it in the Army.

Our central food preparation is the result of some very vigorous action in the last few years on the part of improving the life of the soldier in terms of the food we feed him and the facilities he eats it in.

[Slide.]

The principal element of the central food preparation system is the central kitchen. Along with the central kitchen, we have other elements which are the warehouse, the central ware washing, which is part of our central food preparation concept, and the dining facilities.

Mr. SIKES. Will you state for the record what you mean by central food preparation?

Colonel BURT. Central food preparation is a central kitchen.

Mr. SIKES. For the whole post?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. For how many people?

Colonel BURT. In our design studies, we can build them to include a maximum of 75,000 meals per day. Our designs for Fort Lee and Fort Benning are in the 25,000-and-less range.

Mr. SIKES. Are you following generally the same plan that the major hotel restaurants follow?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir; we are—Ford Motor Co., several hospitals, and several schools.

[Slide.]

One additional factor that we consider important is what we call the time factor. In our current concept of preparing food, we prepare a meal which is served after it is prepared, and there is no particular consideration for the future.

With central food, we prepare groups of food in large lots over the scope of the menu system, which makes them more available, and they can be used for varying lengths of time, depending on the particular item concerned.

Mr. SIKES. I don't understand.

You mean you prepare food today and you may not serve it until the week after next?

Colonel BURT. This is true, sir. It may be stored in its basic condition. It may be a chill item or it could be a quick freeze item and we could prepare a package to be served on order from the dining facilities.

Mr. SIKES. Does that include all types of food?

Colonel BURT. Most foods, sir, except the grill items. This deals with preparing the items that can be frozen. All grill items or hot-serve items like steaks, french fries, sandwiches to order in our short order dining facilities, will be prepared onsite.

Mr. SIKES. How about fried chicken? I don't like warmed-over fried chicken.

Colonel BURT. We would prepare fried chicken as a deep fry item in the dining facilities. We don't want the prepackaged airline type meal.

Mr. SIKES. How about grits?

Colonel BURT. Sir, we have grits on the master menu now. I think we made a few soldiers happy.

Mr. SIKES. Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

INTERIM AND TEST CENTRAL FOOD FACILITIES

Colonel BURT. [Slide.] Sir, in our program leading to the formalization of the central food system we are in the process now of establishing an interim CFPF at Fort Lee. This will commence operations in October of this year.

This interim facility will provide us the basis for completion of our doctrine, policies, procedures, training requirements, staffing, and the management of the system throughout the Army and it will provide us an information system.

Mr. SIKES. Is this a pilot program?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir.

Sir, this program started at Fort Lewis with the U.S. Army Natick Laboratory test that was done in 1971. We have now moved it to the center of our training of this type. This information system really is partially an accounting system.

TOTAL PROGRAM

[Slide.] Following this, as we are discussing now, the first year, fiscal 1974, two permanent facilities for Fort Lee and Fort Benning.

Our program visualizes expansion to some 21 installations that qualify in size at the present time over the time frame fiscal 1979. Some of the examples which I mentioned a few minutes ago, Mr.

Chairman, that we have followed and who are helping us and advising are Ford Motor Co. which serves 15,000 meals a day at 13 facilities, Dutch Pantry, Marriott, the Los Angeles School System, Baltimore County, and some hospitals and we did prove this concept out at Fort Lewis in 1971 as I mentioned.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have just 1 year of operation there?

Colonel BURT. The actual operation of the central food was 3 months.

Mr. SIKES. Are you still using this system at Fort Lewis, or was this only a test program?

Colonel BURT. That was only a test program, sir, and with the drawdown of the strength in the division we discontinued that and continued the interim facility at Fort Lee.

[Slide.] This is a summary of our bases for opting for Central Food throughout selected installations in the Army.

General COOPER. We can stop this now if you think you have had enough.

Colonel BURT. [Slide.] I have a cost comparison, Mr. Chairman, which led to this conclusion.

Mr. SIKES. Go ahead.

Colonel BURT. And this also is a result of the Natick Laboratory study at Fort Lewis in which we show, using our baseline system, which was Fort Lewis, for 48 standard dining facilities, and these range from 1947 to 1955, in construction a total cost of $13 million.

The large new consolidated facility will range from 500 to 1,000 men per dining facility and then developing our modern food with central warewashing we see about a $2 million savings in this baseline size installation.

CENTRAL DINING VERSUS CONSOLIDATED PREPARATION

Mr. SIKES. Right at this point, in a large new consolidated facility apparently you don't make much saving, less than $200,000.

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. But you don't have many large new consolidated dining facilities, do you?

Colonel BURT. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have any?

Colonel BURT. We have one that feeds 2,000 men a day and we have three that are 1,000, 1,500, sir, in the United States at the present time.

Mr. SIKES. And how many years do you expect will elapse before all of them are large new consolidated facilities, if they are applicable for the installation?

Colonel BURT. Sir, we don't feel the large consolidated dining facility is applicable because it is not the most pleasing to the soldier. It feeds an entire base. It is difficult to get the soldier there. We lose all semblance of unit espirit and integrity.

We have opted more for the medium size consolidation.

Mr. SIKES. Are you telling us that modern central preparation, et cetera, is applicable for use at most of your installations? Is that what you are saying?

Colonel BURT. At the present time, sir, we have identified 21 installations that have a large enough population to make the central food preparation system advisable.

SAVINGS

Mr. SIKES. The present system costs $13 million versus $11 million for the central preparation facility system?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Is this the total picture?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. That is based on a comparison with the present type of feeding system that you operate?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir; totally decentralized system.

Mr. SIKES. You say the savings would be $2 million.

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir.

TOTAL COST

Mr. SIKES. What will it cost to put all of them into operation?

Colonel BURT. Our total program for 21, sir, is about $209 million according to our current estimate, over a period of 6 fiscal years.

Mr. SIKES. It will take you a hundred years to amortize it.

General KJELLSTROM. I think there is a misunderstanding, Mr. Chairman. If I understand this correctly, this is an illustrative installation and not the total for the 21 installations.

Colonel BURT. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. This is for one installation.

Colonel BURT. An illustrative type of installation.

Mr. SIKES. This is illustrative of what it will cost to put the system in at one installation?

Colonel BURT. This is our cost for one installation, at this installation. The CFPF will run about $10 million OMA and MCA combined, that is the CFPF and the improvement of satellite dining facilities and the equipment which we need to move centrally prepared food to the decentralized——

Mr. SIKES. You are proposing to put in a $6.8 million facility at Fort Lee. Will it be comparable to the $10 million facility that you just mentioned?

Colonel BURT. There will be one difference in the Fort Lee facility, sir. It will have classrooms because that is now and will be our training site for——

Mr. SIKES. You are getting the food facilities and the classrooms for $6.8 million. Why should it cost $10 million to put the system in elsewhere?

Colonel BURT. Sir, there is an OMA-related cost of about $4 million for equipment, decor, movement items, and so forth.

ANNUAL SAVINGS

Mr. SIKES. What is your annual saving at a base? Is this the figure you show here, $2 million, at one base?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir, at this particular base, which was Fort Lewis, of 48 dining halls.

Mr. SIKES. You estimate a saving of $2 million a year?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. With an $11 million investment, so you would amortize it in 5½ years.

Colonel BURT. These are operating costs.

General COOPER. But they are almost the same.

Mr. SIKES. Clear it up for me. Tell me the installation cost, the operating cost, and the savings. I want to know what the amortization would be.

Colonel BURT. Sir, I will have to supply that for the record. We did have it computed.

[The information follows:]

Utilizing the data provided in the U.S. Army Natick Laboratories Technical Report 72-67 on the Fort Lewis, Wash., test, the installation cost for a central food preparation system at Fort Lewis would be $7,759,000. This includes $6,655,000 for the central food preparation facility (CFPF) and $1,104,000 for dining facility refurbishment. The operating cost associated with a Fort Lewis-type facility would be $10,688,000. This is approximately $2,500,000 less in operating costs than the present system. Therefore, the amortization period at Fort Lewis would have been 3 to 4 years. This is a shorter payback period than would be expected at other installations because Fort Lewis decreased construction costs by utilizing existing excess cold storage in lieu of new construction.

General COOPER. It is about 5 years.

Mr. SIKES. About 5 to 5½ years for amortization?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. That is a moderately good amortization rate. What else do you gain? Efficiency?

[Slide.]

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir, we gain efficiency, better utilization of personnel. We see a decrease in manpower requirements and some reduction in food costs because we have the central management.

BETTER FOOD SERVICE

We have a somewhat reduced skill level requirement in the serving areas and we have maximum customer convenience in that the dining halls are still in the units areas.

General COOPER. The main thing we hope to get is to feed the troops better.

Mr. SIKES. You mean better preparation, better tasting food?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You hope to prepare and serve the meals in a more desirable form?

General COOPER. That is right. At some units now if you happen to have a very good conscientious mess sergeant, they eat extremely well. But on the average we hope to improve by this system because you have better central control. If you happen to have problems with cooks and bakers and mess sergeants, you should be able to feed the troops better by the centralized system.

If we don't feed the troops better the program shouldn't continue.

Mr. SIKES. What else do you have?

[Slide.]

Colonel BURT. Sir, we have a comparative cost of bringing the current decentralized feeding up to the new status as opposed to the cost of central food preparation and it does show a lesser investment cost to use this as our new system rather than to renew the old decentralized system.

Mr. SIKES. All right, that has been very interesting.

TWO CENTRAL FOOD FACILITIES REQUESTED IN FISCAL YEAR 1974

Why is the Army requesting two central food preparation facilities in the fiscal year 1974 program: One at Fort Lee, at a cost of $6,876,000, and the other at Fort Benning, Ga., at a cost of $5,346,000?

Colonel BURT. The central food preparation facilities in the fiscal year 1974 program are the first two of 21 planned to be constructed over a 6-year span. It is necessary to implement this program in order to achieve the economies in operating costs cited earlier in the testimony.

The installations selected for the current fiscal year will operate in different Army environments. Fort Lee will be a doctrine, procedures, and training facility with an associated operational mission. The Fort Benning facility will operate on a school-type post with few combat units and a widely dispersed cantonment areas.

COMPARISON OF SAVINGS FORT LEE AND FORT BENNING

Mr. SIKES. From information which the Army provided the committee staff, it appears that the cost of the central preparation versus actual data using conventional techniques would show a reduction from $5.998 to $4.038 cost per man at Fort Benning, and from $3.960 to $3.930 at Fort Lee. Fort Benning's facility is less expensive yet shows a greater cost reduction. Is this correct?

Colonel BURT. Yes, there are certain key differences between the two facilities which contribute to the higher cost of the Fort Lee facility over the Fort Benning CFPF, and also affect the estimated cost per man per day, at least initially. The facility at Fort Lee is primarily a training and doctrinal facility rather than an industrial type facility. Along with the regular food preparation capabilities, classrooms, space and equipment for practical exercises and circulation space for the students are required in the Fort Lee facility while the Fort Benning CFPF can be optimally designed strictly for industrialized food preparation. Additionally, the CFPF planned for Fort Lee will be located in the quartermaster school complex, rather than the post industrial area, to make it more accessible to the students undergoing training. Much of the backup warehouse space, available in the industrial area in which the Fort Benning CFPF will be sited, must be included in the Fort Lee facility to eliminate double handling of unprepared food items and be fully responsive to training needs. The savings realized by CFPF are very much a function of the number of meals served. The initial Fort Benning estimate is 23,000 meals per day—over 3 times the 7,500 meals per day planned for early operations at Fort Lee. Once the training and doctrinal mission becomes firmly established the daily meal output of the Fort Lee facility will be more than doubled. It is expected the savings over present conventional systems will then more strongly favor the CFPF system.

Mr. SIKES. What action will be taken by the Army to insure that all doctrine and procedures are developed during the operation of the interim CFPF for use in the operation of the permanent CFPF?

Colonel BURT. Sir, an evaluation is being prepared and will be run concurrently with the interim operation to include participation by the scientific people at U.S. Army Natick Laboratories.

AIR FORCE CENTRAL FOOD PREPARATION

Mr. SIKES. The Air Force apparently has had success in phasing in a central food process and facility at Keesler Air Force Bass, Miss. without a large expenditure of funds. Are you familiar with that?

Colonel BURT. No, sir, I am not.

Mr. SIKES. Well, I think, General Cooper, that the Army should take a look at the Air Force operation. On the basis of the Air Force's experience you might be able to phase in a pilot program at Fort Lee to develop the guidelines and procedures prior to constructing permanent facilities.

At any rate, I would like you to check that out and get acquainted with it and tell us if it is applicable to the Army and if not, why not.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

The central food processing at Keesler Air Force Base is on a limited scale when compared with the Army version of the central food preparation facility (CFPF). The Air Force operation is confined to the processing of food in the raw state (that is, peeling potatoes and carrots, cutting ingredients for salads, forming hamburger into patties, meat balls, and meat loaves, and preparing roasts for the oven). The CFPF does not cook the food for the dining facilities.

Keesler AFB was able to phase in their operation without a large expenditure of funds by utilizing 7,625 square feet of floor space from a converted central meat plant and continuing to operate their central pastry facility. They also limited their purchases of high productivity equipment to a vegetable peeler, cutter, chopper and two hamburger patty molding machines.

Central preparation as conducted by the Air Force at Keesler is only one phase of the Army CFPF. The Army also plans to cook in large batches to store for future serving periods. There is no need to conduct a pilot program similar to the Keesler program. The U.S. Army Natick Laboratories accomplished that at Fort Lewis, Wash. in 1971. The Army's next logical step is to operate their interim facility at Fort Lee until the facilities in the fiscal year 1974 program become operational.

COMMERCIAL FOOD CONTRACT—FORT MYER

Mr. SIKES. Why has the Army not awarded additional commercial food contracts in view of the apparent cost effectiveness and troop acceptability of the tri-service dining facility at Fort Myer. Are you acquainted with that one?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir, I am.

Mr. SIKES. Is it working well?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir, it is working quite well.

Mr. SIKES. Is it purely a commercial operation?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir, it is totally commercial.

Mr. SIKES. Is it applicable to other Army posts?

Colonel BURT. We feel it will be, sir. Fort Myer is a test we are running for the Department of Defense.

Mr. SIKES. How long has it been in progress?

Colonel BURT. At the present time, sir, a year and 9 months.

Mr. SIKES. What are your conclusions to date?

Colonel BURT. To date our conclusions are that it is a desirable economic manner to run a dining facility in a post of the type of Fort Myer where the clientele are not subject to deployment and can be available to the dining facility.

There are other installations in the Army we feel it is adaptable to. We have not made any final decision.

General COOPER. We are, I believe, using it down at Fort McClellan now, not just the KP's but also the cooks are contracted for.

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir. In the Fort McClellan instance, we are providing the food and contracting the cooks. At Fort Myer the contractor provides the food as part of the contract.

Mr. SIKES. Do you feel that this may be preferable to the CFPF concept?

Colonel BURT. No, sir, we believe we are going to have need for both types, for the large installation with many units, a requirement for our central food concept and on a smaller, centralized, predominantly administrative installation, a requirement for contract-type operation.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE

Mr. SIKES. The current trend appears to be toward authorization of a basic allowance for subsistence, more in the other services than in the Army at present. If there should be a continuation of this trend do you feel that the CFPF with its modernized dining facilities would still be justified?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir, we do.

Mr. SIKES. Why do you think so?

Colonel BURT. Sir, we believe that, even though a soldier would be on BAS, he will eat in our on-base facilities as a matter of quality, convenience, and price.

Mr. SIKES. That is better food. That is another reason for them to be there.

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. That will have a lot to do with it.

AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

Why does the Army feel that extensive utilization of an automated management information system to measure food preferences, eating patterns and meal consumption is essential to the operations of the CFPF? Here is why I ask the question: The findings of our investigative staff were that the officials of Natick Laboratories, who developed the management information system, stated that there is no need for a continuous automatic data processing equipment analysis of the food served in the CFPS since the results of the analysis would not justify the costs. They recommended a spot-check system.

What is your thinking on that?

Colonel BURT. Sir, we need the management information system because of our requirement to account for the rations served. Where we now authorize the soldier to eat in any dining facility, not just in one, we need a centralized ration consumption control for accounting purposes and the preference purpose is for menu planning.

We know what was served, where it was served, and as we prepare our future menus we have the data bank which is now done manually.

GETTING THE BUGS OUT OF THE FOOD PREPARATION SYSTEM

Mr. SIKES. There is some concern that the Army may be moving too rapidly into the CFPF construction program because there still are some bugs in the system, not literally bugs in the kitchen, General,

bugs in the system. Do you think that is true, or do you think that you have overcome any difficulties and are ready to go ahead?

Colonel BURT. Sir, we believe we are ready to proceed with our interim facility becoming operational and with the approval, if approved, of these two facilities it will be some 2 years before we have BOD, during which time we will generate additional data to iron the bugs out.

We will find the bugs in our interim facility.

Mr. SIKES. Then you don't plan to build any others for 2 years after this?

Colonel BURT. Sir, we are going to propose some in 1975. We think that the construction time is such that we will have a lot of experience before these two would be finished and available for us to move into and operate.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to know what similar installations are proposed for fiscal 1975 and the estimated costs.

[The information follows:]

The installations under consideration for inclusion in the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Army program and current estimated costs are: Fort Knox, Ky.—$8,565,000; Fort Campbell, Ky.—$6,916,000; Fort Sill, Okla.—$6,163,000; and Fort Ord, Calif.—$9,050,000. It is likely that only one or two will be selected for the fiscal year 1975 program.

FLY BEFORE YOU BUY

Mr. SIKES. When do you expect to incorporate design changes into the new facility?

Colonel BURT. Sir, the design of the facilities will be reviewed during all the normal stages of preparation. Now, there is a design difference between the Fort Lee facility and others. Fort Benning, which we are proposing for 1974, is a type design and from that and from our interim activity in seeing the organization that we need the design changes can be incorporated during the progress and during the test.

Mr. SIKES. We have heard quite a bit about fly before you buy. Is this a case of fry before you buy?

Colonel BURT. I really don't think so, Mr. Chairman.

General KJELLSTROM. Yes. It is because we will have this interim facility at Fort Lee in which we are implementing the concept in October of this year in existing temporary substandard facilities so that before the final construction starts and final designs are completed on the new facilities requested we will have experience with the system. I might suggest, sir, that in the review process within the Department of the Army, agencies other than the proponents are carefully observing this operation to insure that we are getting the proper facility to improve food service for the Army overall.

[Additional information provided follows:]

The interim facility at Fort Lee will have been operating from 6 to 9 months before the contract for construction is awarded. This will provide ample opportunity to identify any required major design changes. Changes identified later will be incorporated in the fiscal year 1974 facility at normal stages in the construction process. Changes that cannot be placed in the fiscal year 1974 facilities will be incorporated in future construction projects.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you, General.

Will the central food preparation facility at Fort Lee be utilized in the training of enlisted aides which is conducted at Fort Lee?

General KJELLSTROM. I will answer that question, sir.

At the completion of the present course, the enlisted aides' course will be terminated.

Mr. SIKES. Has the Army tested the operation of a Central Food Preparation Facility on this scale to date? When would the testing of the concept in the interim facility at Fort Lee be complete? I think we have touched on this. Provide what is needed for the record.

[The information follows:]

No; however, the Army tested the Central Food Preparation Facility (CFPF) concept on a limited scale at Fort Lewis, Wash., in late 1971. The Fort Lee, Va., interim CFPF will not test the concept. This was accomplished at Fort Lewis. Fort Lee will, however, develop doctrine, policy and procedures; train the personnel to operate the Fort Benning CFPF and provide food service to Fort Lee. The Fort Lee interim facility will continue to provide the Army with this service until the permanent CFPF at Fort Lee becomes operational in 1976. During fiscal year 1973, we will do some OMA funded dining facility upgrading at Fort Lee in preparation for the permanent CFPF.

TRAINING WORKLOAD AT FORT LEE

Mr. SIKES. What types of training are conducted at Fort Lee?

Colonel BURT. The present training, sir?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Colonel BURT. We conduct mess management training, the different levels of the NCO education training in the food field, the installation food adviser training for our warrant officers and young officers, and some cooks training, bakers training, and some menu planning training.

Mr. SIKES. I would like details for the record showing the total training workloads at Fort Lee during fiscal years 1969 through 1973 and as projected for fiscal year 1974.

[The information follows:]

TRAINING LOADS, FORT LEE, VA.

[Data from Presidential budgets]

	Fiscal year—					
	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973 [1]	1974 [1]
ALMC	318	301	462	342	341	341
QM school	5,260	4,909	4,066	3,523	3,440	2,667
Total	5,578	5,210	4,528	3,865	3,781	3,008

[1] Programed.

Mr. SIKES. The workload has been declining since 1969. Are the training facilities at Fort Lee underutilized? Now we are not talking only about food preparation. So, Colonel, were you speaking to all of Fort Lee, or just to the food preparation training?

Colonel BURT. Just to the food, sir.

Mr. SIKES. All right.

Are there any questions on the Food Preparation Facility?

Mr. MCEWEN. Just one, Mr. Chairman.

TRANSPORTATION OF FOOD FROM CENTRAL PREPARATION FACILITY

Somewhere I missed just how you get the food from the Central Food Preparation Facility to the satellite dining facilities?

Colonel BURT. The equipment list for these includes the heating, freezer-cooler type food movers on wheels that we see the airlines use, not the big trucks with the lifters but that which is being designed is commercial equipment, commercially available, and we can move hot food, cold food, or frozen food from the Central Preparation to the serving facility and the leftovers back by vehicle-mounted carriers of different types.

Mr. MCEWEN. Will this food be put into those movers in units for each person as the airlines do with meat, potatoes, vegetables, and so forth on a tray, or will it arrive in bulk at the place where it will be served?

Colonel BURT. Sir, they will be in small bulk lots, 25 servings. The pastry would be in smaller lots. The average hot entree serving is in a smaller container, about 25 servings.

Mr. SIKES. Let us see your first chart again.

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING FACILITIES AT FORT LEE

While he is getting set up, I asked if the training facilities are underutilized since your training load has been dropping steadily since 1969?

General COOPER. If you include all of the temporary training facilities the answer probably is correct, but we still have a lot of temporary training facilities, particularly for the cooks and bakers, that are in very poor shape.

Mr. SIKES. Are quartermaster functions the type which may be increasingly subject to civilianization?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I would like the detail for the record on what has been done and what is likely to be done in this area in the near future, the next 3 to 5 years.

[The information follows:]

Quartermaster occupational areas constitute 26 percent of the Army's fiscal year 1973–74, 10,000 position civilianization program. The occupational areas of supply and food service are highly suitable for civilian substitution and consequently of the 2,600 quartermaster-type spaces in the program the preponderance is in these two occupational areas. The Army believes that further civilianization should be deferred pending review of the fiscal year 1973–74 program. This course of action is considered necessary to permit an evaluation of the program in conjunction with civilian manpower reductions and headquarters and installation reorganization actions.

Mr. SIKES. In the event of increasing civilianization in the Quartermaster Corps, would the training workload at Fort Lee likely be reduced?

General COOPER. Yes. I don't know specifically in terms of numbers.

General KJELLSTROM. Sir, I would like to inject the thought here, because I have been through it with the Army Materiel Command just yesterday on a budgetary review. It is very important for the Army or any employer to train civilians as well as military. Within the Army Materiel Command, we have the Army Logistics Management Center

which is at Fort Lee whose mission is expanding to train our civilian employees as well as our military personnel. A sizable portion of the training load for the Quartermaster School at Fort Lee is also oriented toward support of civilian personnel—our supply management functions, our petroleum functions, and the like, so that even if an increasing number of Quartermaster-type positions were civilianized, I would have to differ to some extent with General Cooper and suggest that we would have a remaining training function for our civilian employees.

General COOPER. It will differ from things that you are talking about. If you are talking about cooks and bakers I would say the training load would tend to go down but with a lot of the other people in depots and so forth it would go up. I will defer to General Kjellstrom who was a Quartermaster Corps Officer before he became the Budget Officer.

Mr. SIKES. Would your facilities requirements also be reduced?

General COOPER. This is possible but it would depend somewhat on a case-by-case analysis of the type and amount of training to be supported. Portions of the Quartermaster School and the Army Logistics Management Center are inadequate, permanent structure. However, some courses are being taught in World War II temporary type structures and based on present plans a need for new, more modern facilities exists now. We would definitely seek to achieve maximum utilization of existing facilities and any new facilities would be planned to satisfy only the remaining valid requirements. An important consideration is the specialized character of some of the training conducted at Fort Lee; for example, certain aspects of airborne techniques and petroleum logistics operations. Many of these courses require unique training facilities that are not readily adaptable to other uses. Fort Lee is forecasting a need for six training facility projects for the Quartermaster School during the fiscal year 1975–79 time frame. These projects range from a commissary sales training facility to a petroleum laboratory addition to three airborne equipment facilities to an academic building. Possibly the eventual need for or the scope of these facilities would be changed from what is now planned and we would carefully review this before including these or other training projects in a given budget request.

CAPABILITIES OF FORTS EUSTIS AND LEE

Mr. SIKES. Which post has better overall training capabilities, facilities, and community support—Fort Eustis or Fort Lee? Which post would be the better to support a headquarters function such as TRADOC?

General COOPER. It would be difficult to directly compare the overall training capabilities of Fort Lee and Fort Eustis. The training facilities on both installations range from very good permanent structures to old World War II temporary-type buildings. Each installation has a unique and specialized training mission for the Army and much of the training support, for example, facilities, is tailored to the mission. For example, Fort Eustis is the Army Transportation School and they have a port facility with a full scale mock-up of an

ocean-going ship and cargo handling equipment. They also have life-size mock-ups of cargo aircraft. Fort Lee, the Army Quartermaster School, has specialized facilities for food service training, for example, cooks and bakers, commissary management, subsistence supply. They also have a petroleum training area containing a pipeline, pumping stations, storage facilities, and an oil tanker mock-up.

Fort Eustis has an edge in facilities with 72 percent of their structures being permanent, 22 semipermanent and 6 temporary. Fort Lee has 48-percent permanent buildings, 6-percent semipermanent, and 46-percent temporary. Fort Lee does offer more space for future expansion and construction of new facilities.

Both installations enjoy good community relations and support. Approximately 1,400 military families live in the civilian communities near the posts. Fort Eustis still has a housing deficit while Fort Lee can satisfy known requirements.

Since they are oriented heavily toward their training mission neither installation is particularly suited to house a headquarters such as TRADOC. This would not necessarily preclude establishing such a mission on these posts but we could expect construction requirements to provide administrative space, either through new construction or alteration of existing training facilities or barracks.

CONFINEMENT FACILITY

Mr. SIKES. With regard to confinement facilities, the committee has received a memorandum from the head of its surveys and investigations staff which will be included in part in the record at this point.

[The memorandum follows:]

MAY 3, 1973.

Memorandum for the Chairman.

Re: Military construction program for fiscal year 1974, Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.

During the course of the investigation of the above program, which includes a proposed confinement facility, the investigative staff developed information concerning the Army's new confinement facility design concept and the new Army Correctional System which I feel should be brought to the attention of the committee.

On October 2, 1972, the Army Chief of Staff approved a new Army Correctional System, which was implemented on March 1, 1973. The objectives were: To eliminate the correctional treatment mission at installation stockades, thereby doing away wtih large stockades at some installations; to accelerate the movement of post-trial prisoners to correctional treatment facilities; and to provide confinement services on an area basis at other facilities.

As part of this correctional system, the Army included the construction of confinement facilities using the new design concepts. This design concept has, as a characteristic feature, a central corridor with housing wings and other facilities extending from the central corridor much like the arms of a telephone pole and, in fact, it is referred to among correctional officials as "the telephone pole plan." Depending on the number of men the Army desires to house at a particular installation, this design concept can be modified to construct facilities housing from 50 to 400 confinees.

Since 1970, the Army has utilized more than $9 million in contingency funds to construct permanent confinement facilities, based upon the above design concept, at four installations. The identification of the installation, size of facility, date of completion, and total cost of the facilities are set forth below:

Installation	Size of facility (men)	Completion date	Costs
Fort Dix	400	August 1972	$4,131,000
Fort Bragg	250	August 1971	1,752,000
Fort Carson	150	February 1972	1,976,000
Fort Bliss	150	November 1972	1,232,000
Total	950		9,091,000

Based on information provided by the Army and interviews conducted with Army officials, it appears to the investigative staff that the above confinement facilities are modern, sophisticated, and elaborate facilities which the Army plans to utilize primarily to confine pretrial prisoners. About 90 percent of the prisoners have been charged with noncriminal-type offenses, mostly absent without leave (AWOL), and will, based on past experience, be confined for a period of less than 30 days.

Further, the investigative staff noted that, in the development of the new Army Correctional System, the Fort Bliss facility was not designed as an area confinement facility. Army officials interviewed on the use of this facility advised that the recently constructed 150-man facility at Fort Bliss was not, and will never be, fully utilized. Also, in view of the current uncertainty surrounding the future of Fort Dix and the recent base closure announcements for that area, the investigative staff feels that there is some question as to how the Army intends to utilize the newly constructed 400-man area confinement facility at that installation. Information furnished by a CONARC official to the investigative staff disclosed that the future of the training mission at Fort Dix is currently under study by the Army and a final decision is expected in July 1973. In the meantime, the Army training plans for Fort Dix extend only through fiscal year 1974.

The investigative staff recommends, if the Army has not previously apprised the committee of the information set forth herein, that the committee require the Army to fully explain (1) the justification for using Army contingency funds to construct permanent confinement facilities at the aforementioned installations, (2) the rationale for the confinement facilities' design concepts utilized in view of the fact that a vast majority of the confinees have been charged with noncriminal-type offenses, and (3) the proposed utilization of the new confinement facilities at Fort Bliss and Fort Dix.

Respectfully submitted,

C. R. ANDERSON,
Chief of the Surveys and Investigations Staff, House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SIKES. Is the confinement facility at Fort Lee to be the standard design which the Army has utilized in its other recent confinement facilities? Why will it cost $45 a square foot?

General COOPER. The confinement facility at Fort Lee will be the standard design utilized by the Army in its recent confinement facilities. The cost of $45 a square foot is based on historical cost modified for new design requirements adjusted for location, size, and escalation to the estimated mid-point of construction (March 1975).

Mr. SIKES. Will this facility be utilized primarily to confine pretrial prisoners? If it is to be largely used for that purpose, are you not overbuilding?

General COOPER. Yes; the Fort Lee facility will be utilized primarily to house pretrial prisoners; however, under the Army's present confinement program and as a designated area confinement facility, it may also house post-trial prisoners. Experience has shown that the majority of military offenders enter the confinement system in a pretrial status. The reason for this is that commanders have the prerogative to place offenders in pretrial status to assure their presence at their courts-

martial or, in cases of very serious crimes, to prevent further endangerment to life or property. Commanders do not have at their disposal the physical means with which to restrict the movement of their personnel, nor can they afford the loss of guard personnel required to guarantee that a man accused of a military offense will remain in the area until his court-martial can be convened, thus the need for pretrial confinement. Pretrial confinement is an important service rendered to the commander.

The telephone pole plan accepted by the Army on the recommendation of the Special Civilian Committee for the Study of the U.S. Army Confinement System ad hoc in 1969, is designed primarily to house medium custody prisoners in open bay-type wings. The number of cells designed to house personnel requiring close confinement is kept to the minimum required based on total capacity. Under the present Army confinement system, confinement facilities do not have correctional treatment programs, but have the mission of providing meaningful and gainful employment for prisoners, providing emergency counseling, and preparing prisoners for correctional treatment. The telephone pole plan has the built-in capability for year-round meaningful and productive prisoner employment. One of the most critical problems facing any confinement facility, military or civilian, is prisoner idleness and frustration caused by inadequate space within which prisoners can be utilized productively. Recent major disturbances at civilian correctional institutions, Oklahoma State Penitentiary, and the U.S. Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans., underscore the need for facilities with sufficient space and flexibility to properly manage and secure prisoners. In our designs there also is sufficient space provided for both individual and group counseling as required. Control procedures inherent in our design also assist in preparing prisoners with long-term sentences for confinement at the U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.,

The correctional process is a series of events that eventually lead to the individual prisoner being returned to duty or civilian life. Pretrial confinement is the initial step; it is here that the initial, and most lasting, impression of the correctional process is made. If during this portion of the process, the mission of gainful employment, emergency counseling, and preparation for further confiement is successful, then the transition into the correctional treatment phase is much smoother and the potential for successful completion of correctional treatment is increased. Pretrial confinement at the installation level and the impression made on the individual at that level can have a major impact on the individual's post-trial success in one of the Army correctional treatment facilities.

ARMY'S PRISONER POPULATION

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the Army's prisoner population for the past 5 years and that projected for the next 5 years. Also show the projections for Fort Lee and the past experience at the posts which it will replace. Also indicate if you anticipate an increase or decrease post-Vietnam and why.

[The information follows:]

The Army's prisoner workload for the past 5 years has averaged 7,940 prisoners, with a high of 9,794 in fiscal year 1969 and a low of 5,357 in fiscal year 1972. The projection for the next 5 years is as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1973	4,851
1974	5,282
1975	5,294
1976	5,326
1977	5,326

The projected population for the Fort Lee confinement facility is 175 prisoners. The Fort Belvoir confinement facility, which will be replaced by Fort Lee, has had an average prisoner population for the past 5 years of 203.

The prisoner population in the Army confinement facilities underwent a substantial decrease through fiscal year 1972 and the first half of fiscal year 1973; however, recent months have seen a noticeable rise. This increase has been influenced by the impact of AWOL/deserter apprehension effort and more stringent use of administrative separation policies.

KENNER ARMY HOSPITAL

Mr. SIKES. How many beds does Kenner Army Hospital have and what medical specialities does it offer, and can you compare this to the other military hospitals in the Norfolk area? Do you have that data here?

General COOPER. We have General Pixley and Colonel Haas here from the Surgeon General's Office. We certainly have some of the data but maybe not all of it.

Mr. SIKES. What specialties does Kenner Army Hospital offer?

General PIXLEY. It offers general practice, internal medicine, pediatrics, general nursing, orthopedics, eye, nose, throat, radiology, optometry, which is an allied specialty, and, of course, dental.

Mr. SIKES. How many beds does it have?

General PIXLEY. One hundred beds.

[Additional information follows:]

One hundred beds is the capacity constructed in 1961. However, by increasing the number of beds per room or ward, or by using some of the old World War II facilities, a hospital commander can increase the number of beds. Kenner Army Hospital is now operating 120 beds.

Mr. SIKES. Do you know how it compares to other hospitals in the Norfolk area with regard to the specialties that it offers?

General PIXLEY. Did you say the Norfolk area?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

General PIXLEY. There is a larger hospital, a general hospital in Petersburg, which is right next door.

Mr. SIKES. Is that a military facility?

General PIXLEY. No, you are talking about military?

Mr. SIKES. Would you normally refer your people for specialty training to a military facility or a civilian hospital?

General PIXLEY. The referrals from Kenner Army Hospital would be to either Walter Reed, or more likely now because of the construction program at Walter Reed, to the naval hospital in the Norfolk area.

Mr. SIKES. Could you provide some details for the record on what types of support they have been giving you or they will give you and

also could you provide for the record the information on the local civilian hospital?

General PIXLEY. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Patients are referred to other military hospitals. The two most frequently used are Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington, D.C., and the Portsmouth Naval Hospital. The extent of these transfers during the last 4 months is shown in the following table:

KENNER ARMY HOSPITAL

TRANSFER TO OTHER MEDICAL FACILITIES

	January	February	March	Apri
Transfers out to military facilities[1]	24	14	21	14
Transfers out to civilian facilities[2]	2	4	1	5
Total	26	18	22	19

[1] Currently about 50 percent to Walter Reed and 30 percent to Portsmouth Naval. 20 percent to other Army medical facilities either for patient convenience or because of lack of beds at Walter Reed or Portsmouth by specialty.
[2] Medical School Hospital, Richmond, Va.

Greater reliance on other hospitals in the area is not considered to be an acceptable alternative. These patients are authorized medical care and the Army is obligated to provide the facilities and services as appropriate. The facilities in the surrounding community are civilian and CHAMPUS costs are high. The military facilities are crowded already and could not take much increase in workload. In addition to the high cost of civilian medical care, it should be noted that these hospitals are already overcrowded. The occupancy rates for all hospitals in the Petersburg area, except the Federal Reformatory, exceed 82 percent. Nearby civilian hospital, Petersburg General Hospital, receives no referrals from Kenner.

The specialties provided at the above-mentioned facilities are shown below. X indicates availability.

Specialty	Kenner Army Hospital (100 beds)	Portsmouth Naval Hospital (1,412 beds)	Petersburg General Hospital (430 beds)	Walter Reed Army Medical Center (1,932 beds)
Anesthesiology		X	X	X
Dental	X	X		X
Oral surgery		X	X	X
Ear, nose, throat	X	X		X
Dermatology		X	X	X
Immunization	X	X		X
Internal medicine	X	X	X	X
Neuropsychiatry		X	X	X
Neurology		X		X
Neurosurgery		X		X
Obstetrics/gynecology	X	X	X	X
Orthopedic		X	X	X
Otolaryngology		X		X
Ophthalmology		X	X	X
Optometry	X	X		X
Pediatrics	X	X	X	X
General surgery	X	X	X	X
Physical examination	X	X		X
Urology		X	X	X
Physical therapy	X	X		X
Radiology	X	X	X	X
Pharmacy	X	X		X
Pathology	X	X	X	X
Emergency	X	X	X	X

The only other military medical facility within a reasonable distance is the Naval Hospital at Portsmouth, Va. This is a facility constructed in 1827 and now operating 1,100 beds.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the workload, both for inpatients and outpatients, at Kenner Army Hospital for the past 5 years and projected for the next 5 years. Break this down by active, retired, dependents, et cetera.

[The information follows:]

KENNER ARMY HOSPITAL, FORT LEE, VA., AVERAGE DAILY BEDS OCCUPIED

[Fiscal year]

	Actual					Projected				
	1969	1970	1971	1972	[1]1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Active duty military	49	45	50	57	35	35	35	35	35	35
Dependents of active military	23	23	25	20	20	21	21	21	21	21
Retired military	7	9	7	9	10	10	10	10	10	10
Dependents of retired military	11	13	11	13	14	14	14	14	14	14
Others	3	4	7	6	5	5	5	5	5	5
Total	93	94	100	105	84	85	85	85	85	85

[1] Based on 9-month actual.

KENNER ARMY HOSPITAL, FORT LEE, VA., CLINIC VISITS

	Actual: Fiscal year—					Projected: Fiscal year—				
	1969	1970	1971	1972	[1] 1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Active duty military:										
Total	117,165	123,005	123,370	132,858	109,865	109,865	109,865	110,166	109,865	109,865
Daily average	321	337	338	363	301	301	301	301	301	301
Dependents of active duty:										
Total	88,695	92,345	97,090	96,990	92,710	91,250	91,250	91,500	91,250	91,250
Daily average	243	253	266	265	254	250	250	250	250	250
Retired military:										
Total	9,490	11,315	17,155	19,764	22,995	25,550	28,105	30,744	33,215	35,770
Daily average	26	31	47	54	63	70	77	84	91	98
Dependents of retired and deceased:										
Total	17,885	19,710	25,550	27,816	34,675	36,500	38,325	40,260	41,975	43,800
Daily average	49	54	70	76	95	100	105	110	115	120
Others:										
Total	8,760	10,220	12,045	10,248	9,125	9,125	9,125	9,150	9,125	9,125
Daily average	24	28	33	28	25	25	25	25	25	25
Total visits all categories:										
Total	241,995	256,595	275,210	287,676	269,370	272,290	276,670	281,820	285,430	289,810
Daily average	663	703	754	786	738	746	758	770	782	794

[1] Based on 9-month actual.

Mr. SIKES. When was the present hospital constructed?

General PIXLEY. Kenner Army Hospital, Building P–8130, was constructed, or opened, in 1961, but the annex to Kenner was built during the World War II buildup—1942. Upon completion of this project, 11 temporary buildings which make up the annex would be turned over to the post for demolition. These buildings now house preventive medicine, physical examination section, laboratory, podiatry, ENT, physical therapy, radiology, pharmacy, pediatric clinic, outpatient clinic, immunization, and various administrative sections. Consolidation would permit a reduction in clinical staff and permit a higher standard of patient care.

Mr. SIKES. What would be the result of deferring this project until the Army has restudied its installations utilization plans for the Norfolk area?

General PIXLEY. The result of deferring this project would be additional patient inconvenience, and the continuation of an inefficient medical operation which wastes many valuable man-hours and provide less than the desired level of medical care.

This project is scoped to provide adequate facilities to service a population of roughly 9,000 military personnel plus their dependents and an additional 5 percent for retired personnel and their dependents. These figures are taken from the Army stationing and installation plan and recent adjustments in this plan have not materially changed these projections. The Army does not plan to alter the stationing strength at Fort Lee, so there is no apparent need to defer this project.

One additional point needs to be made at this time. The Army Medical Department has a backlog of $854 million of medical construction and modernization projects. Every project deferred means that the number of years required to eliminate this backlog is increased, and that one additional Army installation will continue to provide medical care in inadequate and undersized facilities. This delay will no doubt have an adverse effect upon the Army's ability to achieve an all volunteer force.

FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MD.

Mr. SIKES. We will take up Fort Meade. Place in the record page 32.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
July 1973	ARMY		Fort George G. Meade

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	Maryland 355	Maryland

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Active	1917	Anne Arundel	Baltimore, 18 miles North

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Trains and prepares Strategic Army Forces for combat readiness; logistically supports and trains Post Troop Units; supports Headquarters, First United States Army, National Security Agency, and Air Defense Units; maintains and operates U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School; provides First United States Army Field Maintenance, trains Reserve Components and provides ROTC Summer training.

$1,100 one-time cost for easement

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972	586	4,772	1,989			1,621	4,923	1,179	15,070
b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	1,169	5,455	3,148	0	285	580	3,208	34	13,879

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	13,484	1,143	134,913	136,056
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	20	1*	0	1
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				136,057
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Exclusive of family housing - $592)				19,869
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				7,445
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS (Exclusive of family housing - $5,508)				39,317
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				202,688

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
171	209 - USMA Prep School Facilities	1	32A				1,521		1,521
721	204 - Barracks Modernization	1	33		MN	1,918	5,924	1,918	5,924
	Totals						7,445		7,445

FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND

$7,445,000

Fort George G. Meade is located 18 miles south of Baltimore, Maryland. The mission of this installation is to train and support strategic Army forces and post troop units, to support Headquarters, First U.S. Army, National Security Agency, Reserve Components and ROTC summer training. The program provides barracks modernization and the US Military Academy Preparatory School.

Status of Funds

	($000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	19,869
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	10,765
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	8,747

Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
204	Barracks Modernization	266	10
209	USMA Preparatory School Facility	65	5

ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MD.

	MEN*
Total Requirement	4,859
Existing Substandard	14,769**
Existing Adequate	318
Funded, Not in Inventory	610
Adequate Assets	928
Deficiency	3,931
FY 1974 Program	1,918
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Dec 72	5,100

* 90 square feet per man permanent party personnel;
72 square feet per man - trainees.

** Includes 4,039 spaces that can be made adequate

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $7,445,000 for barracks modernization and for U.S. Military Academy Prep School facilities.

What activities at Fort Meade are to be reduced or relocated and what activities will move in or be increased?

ACTIVITIES RELOCATING TO OR FROM FORT MEADE

Tell us briefly the answer, but you can give us the actual details for the record.

General COOPER. Basically we are moving the 1st Squadron of the 6th Armored Cavalry, being moved out right now, which should be completed by the end of next month, to Fort Bliss, Tex. The plans that we have to move into Fort Meade now or the——

Mr. SIKES. What space is the 1st Cavalry taking at Fort Bliss?

General COOPER. I am not sure specifically. The specific buildings they are moving into?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

General COOPER. I don't have that with me, sir. but Fort Bliss has very good facilities relative to the rest of the Army posts.

General KJELLSTROM. Sir, the 1st Squadron of the 6th Cavalry is joining its regimental unit which was moved last year from Fort Lewis to Fort Bliss.

General COOPER. That doesn't answer the question about what specific facilities.

General KJELLSTROM. And it is occupying permanent facilities.

Mr. SIKES. What are those facilities being used for now? Do you know that?

General KJELLSTROM. I believe they are vacant, waiting for the squadron to arrive.

General COOPER. One of the main reasons for moving them there though was in connection with the ability to have enough area to train. But Fort Bliss did have excess facilities.

Mr. SIKES. Is there anything else?

General COOPER. No; that is the one that we are moving, the main one we are moving out. What we are moving in is the headquarters of the Intelligence Command from Fort Holabird. These people are moving into that.

We can provide the other specifics for the record.

[The information follows:]

SUMMARY OF REORGANIZATION ACTIONS, FORT MEADE, MD.: REDUCTIONS (INCREASES) AT FORT MEADE

Activity	Military	Civilian	Description
1. Headquarters, 1st Army Support Elements and U.S. Army Garrison.	324 (4)	558 (11)	Reorganize Headquarters, 1st Army and support elements.
2. Regional manpower survey office	3	8	To Fort Monroe.
3. TOE units	1,239		Relocate 1 squadron 6th Cavalry Regiment to Fort Bliss, 66th Military Intelligence Detachment, and 181st Ordnance Detachment to Fort Bliss; 13th Engineer Company to Fort Knox.
4. TOE units	192		Change to H-series TOE.
5. Health services command	59	(17)	Reorganize and establish.
6. USA Chaplain Board	7	3	Relocate to Fort Wadsworth, N.Y.
7. Army Readiness Region (ARR) and Readiness Group (RG).	(113)	(36)	Establish ARR and RG.
8. TOE units	(505)		Miscellaneous TOE changes.
9. USA Club Management Agency	(20)	(53)	Establish agency headquarters and regional headquarters.
10. U.S. Military Academy Prep School	(348)	(20)	Relocate from Fort Belvoir. Includes 48 military permanent party and 300 cadet candidates.
11. USA Intelligence Command	(234)	(398)	Relocate from Fort Holabird.
12. 35th AD Brigade	12 (1)		Internal reorganization.
13. Army claims service	(1)	(9)	Programed increase following increase to mission.
14. U.S. Army Criminal Investigative Command.	(17)	(1)	Programed increase fiscal year 1974.
Net	593	24	

Mr. SIKES. All right.

Is the location of the USMA Preparatory School still under study?

General COOPER. It is under study to the extent that it might be part of the Fort Dix backfill. To that extent it is under study, but in this particular case if we move the West Point Preparatory School to Fort Dix, instead of Fort Meade we would probably require modification of both the barracks at Fort Dix or any other place we might move in, as well as some additional classrooms.

Mr. SIKES. But not necessarily at Fort Meade?

General COOPER. That is correct, sir.

As far as we are concerned right now it will go to Fort Meade, but it is one of the candidates being considered along with lots of others as a backfill for Fort Dix in the event we decide to inactivate the training center at Fort Dix.

Mr. SIKES. The $1,521,000 that you are requesting is to rehab and alter barracks at Fort Meade in order to provide facilities for the prep school; is that correct?

General COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. And there is a high unit cost of $24 per square foot, something of that order.

General COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. Would the cost at Fort Dix be comparable or cheaper?

General COOPER. I would believe the cost would be comparable at Fort Dix.

ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE—FORT MEADE

Mr. SIKES. How many square feet of administrative space are there at Fort Meade, and how much of this is permanent?

General COOPER. There is a total of 780,565 square feet (gross) of administrative space at Fort Meade. Of that, 548,620 square feet

(gross) is permanent construction. This total includes 123,300 square feet (gross) of the new First Army headquarters building, now under construction and scheduled for completion in July 1973.

BARRACKS SPACE—FORT MEADE

Mr. SIKES. We have now 928 existing adequate barracks spaces and 4,039 spaces that can be converted to adequate, for a total of 4,967. What is the projected barracks requirement at Fort Meade?

General COOPER. The projected barracks requirement is 5,193 spaces.

Mr. SIKES. How much of this represents T.O. & E. units?

General COOPER. At Fort Meade only slightly more than one-third represent T.O. & E. units.

Mr. SIKES. Will the barracks when modernized be completely satisfactory?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record details on the T.O. & E. units barracks requirements will you?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

The barracks requirements for T.O. & E. units at Fort Meade is 1,855 spaces. This represents 38 percent of the total Fort Meade bachelor enlisted housing requirement.

Mr. SIKES. You will get a satisfactory life from the modernized barracks?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. For what period of time?

General COOPER. We would expect them to stay there for 25 years. Fort Meade, with the NSA Headquarters located there, is apt to stay in existence for a long time. It would be very expensive to move.

Fort Meade would be a possible candidate to move one of the units to from the smaller installations.

FORT MEADE'S POTENTIAL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE MISSIONS

Mr. SIKES. The committee notes that at some posts you are converting barracks space to administrative space at a comparatively low cost. Would this be feasible at Fort Meade if T.O. & E. units were moved elsewhere?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. It would be very expensive to first convert them to modernized barracks and then convert them to administrative space although it wouldn't all be lost by any manner or means because you are air conditioning the barracks and also putting in a lot of partitions. The partitions we build when we modernize are for the most part concrete block. They are not movable partitions.

Mr. SIKES. You have a total of 4,039 barrack spaces which can be made adequate and you are requesting the modernization of 1,918 this year; is that correct?

General COOPER. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. So that would still leave something over 2,000 which presumably could be modernized or rehabilitated for administrative space?

General COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. With an ample amount of administrative space and the potential for more at low cost, the nucleus for a major headquarters already existing in the First Army Headquarters, and ample community support, why are you not proposing to locate one of the major commands, such as the Training and Doctrine Command or the Forces Command, here?

General COOPER. The primary purpose of the Army reorganization—1973 was to improve management, with savings being a secondary consideration. As I have indicated earlier in these hearings, we are conducting a stationing study to determine, among other things, the optimum long-range location for HQ, TRADOC and HQ, FORSCOM. I cannot say that Forts Monroe and McPherson will remain the long-range locations of these headquarters. Fort Monroe was selected as the location for HQ, TRADOC since the majority of the required staff personnel with the appropriate skills were already stationed there in HQ, CONARC. By changing HQ, CONARC to accommodate the HQ, TRADOC mission, we were able to use these in-place personnel assets and thus significantly reduce mission disruption, personnel turbulence and one-time costs. The HQ, FORSCOM was established at Fort McPherson so as to make use of an existing CONUS Army Headquarters as a nucleus for staffing the new major command headquarters. Fort McPherson was considered more suitable for stationing HQ, FORSCOM than the other installations examined, including Fort Meade, for a number of reasons, such as: Its relative nearness to other major headquarters with which FORSCOM will work closely; Atlanta, as a major transportation center, provides easy access to CONUS wide locations. Fort Meade, being nearer the major concentration of Reserve components in the northeast, was considered better for stationing of a CONUS Army, with primary orientation toward support and training of the Reserve Components.

We recognize there are many fine facilities at Fort Meade. However, we felt that for what we wanted to accomplish in our reorganization at this time, the factors I have just mentioned were overriding. Our stationing study will again take fully into account the facilities impact as a key factor in the decision on further Army adjustments.

LAND EXCESSING

Mr. SIKES. What is the status of the GSA proposal to excess land at Fort Meade?

General COOPER. Based on a GSA recommendation resulting from an Executive Order 11508 real estate utilization survey, the Army was requested to excess approximately 6,850 acres of land. The area to be excessed consists of the training area (3,400 acres) and a portion of the range impact area (3,450 acres). A disposal report number 431, covering the 3,400 acre training area was submitted to the Congressional Armed Services Committees on March 30, 1973. Subsequently, at the request of the Property Review Board, the disposal report was withdrawn from the committees. Disposal action has been suspended pending a determination of the eventual disposition of the property.

Mr. SIKES. Will there be problems in decontaminating some of the areas in which there is unexploded ordnance? What will this cost?

General COOPER. Any decontamination of the area which would require movement of the soil would probably require the filing of an environmental impact statement. The cost to decontaminate the area ranges from $1.1 million to decontaminate the training area by the deliberate visual method to $32 million to decontaminate the entire 6,854 acres by scarifing to a depth of 12 inches.

RESERVE TRAINING MISSION

Mr. SIKES. What part does Fort Meade play in the Army's Reserve training program? Provide details for the record on the utilization of Fort Meade and other nearby Army posts for Reserve and Guard training.

[The information follows:]

Fort Meade is the sole installation within the Washington-Baltimore area where the majority of the required tactical field training can be conducted. Reserve component units draw their strengths from the population at large and thus are generally located in urban areas. The training requirements imposed upon those units by law are rather stringent and training time is at a premium. Therefore, in order to facilitate recruiting and enhance readiness, there is a requirement for convenient areas near our urban population centers where meaningful field and range training can be conducted.

During calendar year 1972, approximately 6,000 Army National Guard and Army Reserve personnel attended annual training at Fort Meade. In addition to annual training, 16,000 Army National Guard and Army Reserve personnel from 80 units accomplished weekend training at Fort Meade.

Shift of this weekend training to other installations within First Army, such as Camp AP Hill, Camp Pickett and Indiantown Gap Military Reservation would require excessive travel thereby seriously reducing valuable training time and cause serious scheduling problems at IGMR due to its current heavy weekend training load. IGMR is currently training approximately 131,000 man-days annually. If these units were forced to train at these other installations it would cost approximately $275,000 annually for commercial transportation. This of course does not address the intangible cost of noneffective training time spent in travel to and from the training site. The current critical fuel shortage further impacts on shifting weekend and annual training sites to other installations which are located at greater distances from the units home station. Camp AP Hill is 91 miles from Fort Meade, while IGMR is 113 miles and Camp Pickett is 183 miles. Therefore, within the Washington-Baltimore metropolitan area, Fort Meade is the only site available to the Reserve components to conduct weekend tactical training without an excessive loss in valuable training time, excessive transportation cost, plus use of critical fuel which must be conserved for required training.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Military Academy Preparatory School, does that school operate on a 12-month basis?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. The basic purpose of the preparatory school is to take people in the Army, who in some cases enlisted for that purpose, and prepare them for attendance at the Military Academy. People in different units encourage these soldiers to go in many cases to upgrade their high school education to the point where they can pass the entrance examination to be competitive with others for the appointments.

Mr. McEwen. And they enter, do they not, in the summer?

General Cooper. They all enter the Military Academy on July 1, or close thereto. Normally we try to get them in at the beginning of the year, but after finishing their examinations we keep them there to help them with the academics they expect to have while they are at the Military Academy.

Fort Monroe, Va.

Mr. Sikes. We will take up Fort Monroe.

Place page 34 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Fort Monroe

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	Virginia 360	Virginia

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Active	1838	Hampton City	Hampton

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Headquarters, US Army Training and Doctrine Command. Provides administrative and logistical support for US Forces Atlantic; USA Garrison; USA Medical Department Activity; USA Security Agency Detachment; USA Separation Transfer Point; 50th Army Band; 559th Military Police Company; USA Audio-Visual Support Center and othet Army activities located at Fort Monroe.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 72	151	868	673			586	374	1,033	3,685
b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	898	1,113	2,009	0	0	8	11	8	4,047

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	1,024	144	22,879	23,023
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	45	3	0	3
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				23,036
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				2,210
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (exclusive of family housing - $5,640)				867
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS (exclusive of family housing - $5,640)				4,841
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				30,944

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
721	48 - Barracks Modernization	58	35		MN	201	867	201	867

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

FORT MONROE, VIRGINIA

$867,000

Fort Monroe is located near Hampton, Virginia. The primary mission of this installation is to serve as the Headquarters, U.S. Continental Army Command. In addition, this installation provides administrative and logistical support for U.S. Forces Atlantic; U.S. CONARC Support Element; U.S. Army Garrison; U.S. Army Medical Department Activity; U.S. Army Security Agency Detachment; U.S. Army Separation Transfer Point; 50th Army Band; 559th Military Police Company; U.S. Army Audio Visual Support Center; and, other Army activities located at Fort Monroe. U.S. CONARC is the administrative and operational headquarters for the CONUS Armies. The program provides barracks modernization.

Status of Funds

	($000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	2,210
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	1,676
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	1,676

Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
48	Barracks Modernization	43	5

ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, FORT MONROE, VA.

	MEN/WOMEN*
Total Requirement	458
Existing Substandard	368**
Existing Adequate	0
Funded, Not in Inventory	253
Adequate Assets	253
Deficiency	205
FY 1974 Program	201
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Mar 73	459

* 90 square feet per man - permanent party personnel;
72 square feet per man trainees.

** Includes 368 spaces that can be made adequate

Mr. SIKES. The request is $867,000 for barracks modernization.

Give us the Army's reasons for selecting Fort Monroe as the location for the headquarters of the Training and Doctrine Command.

SELECTION OF FORT MONROE AS TRADOC HEADQUARTERS

General COOPER. We selected Fort Monroe as the headquarters for the Training and Doctrine Command for the primary purpose of avoiding disruption in connection with the reorganization which established the Training and Doctrine Command. The primary purpose of the reorganization was better management.

We consider this an interim solution, not a long-term solution.

Mr. SIKES. How many of the staff personnel at Fort Monroe are especially experienced in running the Army's training programs? Supply that for the record.

[The information follows:]

Military staff personel at Fort Monroe are considered to be highly qualified and experienced in running Army training programs. Those assigned to such duty have several years of troop and staff experience in addition to college level civilian and military schooling. In addition, most have previously been assigned to a service school or an Army training center. Civilian staff personnel are well qualified because of their years of experience in the training programs at Fort Monroe. Approximately 480 military and civilian personnel are assigned to the staff directorates most directly responsible for developing and managing the Conus training.

Mr. SIKES. Did the Army consider the base realinement package when studying the location of TRADOC?

General COOPER. Yes; this, as well as all other reorganization actions announced in January 1973, was considered.

Mr. SIKES. Will the Army retain Fort Monroe as the TRADOC Headquarters for the long range?

General COOPER. We do not yet know the answer to this question; we may decide to relocate Headquarters TRADOC to another installation. We are conducting a stationing study during this calendar year to determine, among other things, the optimum long-range location for Headquarters TRADOC.

FAMILY HOUSING LOCATION

Mr. SIKES. You are requesting 200 units of family housing at Fort Monroe. I would like to see on the map where that would be located.

Mr. CARTON. The area through here.

General COOPER. It is located at the northern end of the post.

Mr. CARTON. Existing family housing is at this point.

Mr. SIKES. Where is the land that GSA has proposed be excessed?

General COOPER. I don't know. I know how much was proposed to be excessed. It was 489 acres.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Excuse me. There was an Office of Secretary of Defense survey on this and they recommended that we excess 489 acres and the Army has agreed to excess 418 acres.

General COOPER. But that wasn't the question. He wanted to know where it was on the post.

Mr. SIKES. Where is that land on the map?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. It is generally on the northern end.

Mr. SIKES. Is that where the housing was to go?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. It is beyond that and I believe it overlaps in part.

Mr. SIKES. Who wants the land?

General COOPER. When we do a survey we don't address the question of who may want the land. This particular property was surveyed since it wasn't being used. It wasn't on Fort Monroe's master plan for family housing. It would be normal for the people making the survey to recommend it be declared excess.

Mr. SIKES. Can you provide a map for the record showing where the property is that would be excessed?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What is the status of this action?

General COOPER. Mr. Lockwood? I believe it still hasn't been finally determined. What is the status of this action?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Sir, most of the acreage that we agreed to give up at Monroe was in a separate location at a radio station and we did report that to GSA last year.

General COOPER. But the final determination hasn't been made, or has it?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Not on some of that which is in dispute, no, sir.

General COOPER. Then how much of it has been made?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I don't know that.

[Additional information follows:]

Of the 489 acres that the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) recommended that the Army report as excess, 418 acres (estimate) comprised the Continental Army Command's Radio Site located 6 miles southeast of Smithfield, Va. A report of excess for this site, consisting of 423.9 acres, was submitted to the General Services Administration on 23 May 1972. The remaining 71 acres recommended by OSD is the land area on which the Army proposes to build 200 housing units and recreational facilities.

(A map was submitted to the subcommittee on which a family housing site appears in the area to be excessed.)

Mr. NICHOLAS. When I visited this installation earlier this spring I was shown the various proposed sites for family housing but one of the major sites was exactly on the area which is proposed to be excessed, the beach area. I gather that if you are not able to build family housing there you will have to either build to a much higher density in some of the other areas or perhaps not be able to build it at all.

General COOPER. I think that is correct. There is an overlap, I am sure, but I just don't know the extent of the overlap of those 200 and what was declared excess. So your conclusion is correct.

The other alternative would be to go back and to appeal the excessing action on the ground we now plan to build family housing.

Mr. SIKES. That has not been done? I am surprised that you would plan to build housing when the status of the land is in doubt. Surely you are not going to excess this land and then buy it back.

General COOPER. That is correct, but as far as I know the final determination on the excessing has not yet taken place. Your question is had we gone up to them and recommended they withdraw that excess?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

General COOPER. And the answer to that question is, no, sir, and I agree with you we should. The reason we haven't in this particular case is because of the indefinite status of Fort Monroe. We certainly

would after the end of this study or if it becomes imminent that they are going to take that action.

Mr. SIKES. In your map for the committee please show precisely where the land is that is proposed for excess and show precisely where you would put the housing. We want to see where the overlap is there. I note rather frequently that the answer to questions has been, "I don't know."

When such is the answer, will you see that a proper answer is provided for the record?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

SEAWALL FOR FAMILY HOUSING AREA

Mr. SIKES. Will you have to fill and provide a seawall in order to provide family housing units where you now are proposing to build them?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Will this be a costly operation?

General COOPER. We don't have a current estimate of the cost of that.

Mr. SIKES. Shouldn't you have that before you decide whether the land can be used in that way?

General COOPER. We certainly have to have that before we can proceed with the final design.

Mr. SIKES. Will you need an environmental impact study?

General COOPER. Yes, sir, we certainly will need an environmental impact assessment to see whether it is a significant action affecting the quality of human environment.

[Additional information follows:]

Under current OSD guidance, contrary to the practice followed in the normal military construction program (MCA items), no family housing funds may be expended on design of a new construction project until a specific authorization is approved by Congress. Accordingly, no design has been authorized or initiated for this project at Fort Monroe, or any other family housing project in the Army fiscal year 1974, family housing program. Therefore the actual requirement for a seawall at this site is an unknown factor. Concurrently no cost estimate can be developed until design progresses to the point that the actual need for and extent of a seawall is determined. As an alternate location, land appears to be available at Fort Eustis and may be available at other Navy or Air Force installations in the area, but it would be highly desirable to locate the housing at Fort Monroe if at all feasible. Purchase of additional private land on which the housing could be sited would be prohibitive within the limitation on the project cost in the fiscal year 1974 program.

Mr. SIKES. I know that Fort Monroe requires some improvements, some modernization, and undoubtedly you need some family housing, but since you are restudying the long-term use of Fort Monroe is it reasonable to request new barracks spaces and new family housing at this time?

General COOPER. It is reasonable to request it but it is not reasonable to proceed with this until such time as the status is determined.

Mr. SIKES. Do you expect to have your answers before we are prepared to proceed with our consideration of the request?

General COOPER. Probably not in the case of Fort Monroe. I am not sure exactly when you have to know. By September 1, 1973, I think

we would probably know about Fort Monroe even though we don't have the total final answer. That may be too late for you.

Mr. SIKES. I hope so but I am afraid not. We historically are ready to mark up before then, but because of delays in authorization we have not been ready normally to go to the floor.

General COOPER. If we determine the status of Fort Monroe specifically and prior to the completion of the long-range study we will inform your committee.

Mr. SIKES. I will expect you to inform us on all of these matters as the determinations are made.

Are you proceeding with the fiscal 1973 barracks modernization program at Fort Monroe?

General COOPER. No, sir, we are holding that up.

COST TO MAINTAIN FACILITIES AT FORT MONROE

Mr. SIKES. Could you briefly describe the facilities at Fort Monroe in terms of the mission to which they are proposed to be put. What is their functional usefulness, age, state of maintenance, cost of maintenance, et cetera?

General COOPER. The existing facilities at Fort Monroe are considered to be suitable for support of an administrative headquarters such as TRADOC. They are not considered to be suitable or adaptable for use as a troop or logistical type installation.

There is approximately 256,000 square feet of existing administrative space in permanent type structures. Existing bachelor housing assets total 621 barrack spaces and 10 bachelor officer quarters. There are 198 family housing units on post and 376 available in the community.

Five percent of the existing structures on the post were constructed in the 1800's, 52 percent in the 1940's, and the remainder scattered throughout the intervening years. The most recent construction at Fort Monroe, a bowling center and a waiting shelter, were completed in 1969.

Condition of facilities overall is classified as "fair."

Total OMA expenses for real property maintenance activities (RPMA) were $3.1 million in fiscal year 1971; $3.3 million in fiscal year 1972, and are estimated to be $3.6 million in fiscal year 1973. These amounts include all reimbursements, including those from the family housing management account, and paid for utilities, maintenance of real property, minor construction and other engineering support. At these levels of expense, Fort Monroe's unfinanced workload in the RPMA area is reported as over $1 million.

Mr. SIKES. If the Army decides to retain Fort Monroe, how much will have to be spent for construction and renovation in order to put the facilities in first-class shape? Would they be efficient, functional facilities after this money has been spent? Provide those details for the record.

[The information follows:]

Estimated new construction costs to provide essential facilities are as follows:

	Thousands
MCA projects	$16.057
Nonappropriated funds	1.016
Family housing	8.476
Total	25.549

Estimated renovation costs to put existing facilities in first-class shape are as follows:

	Thousands
MCA projects	$6,828
Family housing	3.499
Operating and maintenance	2.668
Total	12.995
Grand total	38.544

The new construction and renovation would provide efficient, functional facilities for Fort Monroe.

Mr. SIKES. The question has been raised whether the number of civilian and military personnel at Fort Monroe for the maintenance and operation of the post itself is higher than normal. Is this true?

General COOPER. This would be true.

Mr. SIKES. Why?

General COOPER. Because it is a relatively small installation. You always are going to have a bigger overhead.

Mr. SIKES. List for the record the total costs of operation and maintenance and military personnel funds involved in running the installation as opposed to the headquarters and other missions assigned here.

[The information follows:]

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COST, FORT MONROE, VA.

	Cost (thousands)		
	Fiscal year 1972	Fiscal year 1973	Estimated fiscal year 1974
Civilian personnel cost	$4,237	$5,029	$4,692
Military personnel expense	5,096	5,013	4,481
Other cost	2,084	1,753	793

Mr. SIKES. List for the record the real property maintenance activities costs, the backlog of maintenance, and the replacement cost of the facilities (excluding old gun emplacements, et cetera, which are no longer functional) at Fort Monroe.

[The information follows:]

Real property costs statistics—Fort Monroe, Va.

Activity:	*Thousands*
Real property maintenance	$3,406
Backlog of essential maintenance and repair	1,037
Initial cost of improvements	22,879
Replacement cost (excluding land)	85,763

BARRACKS MODERNIZATION

Mr. SIKES. What barracks are you proposing to modernize in the fiscal year 1974 program?

General COOPER. At Fort Monroe, sir?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

General COOPER. The specific barracks that we plan to modernize are—we have them on the map—buildings 56, 9, and 162.

Mr. SIKES. And what will then be the status of modernized versus substandard barracks?

General COOPER. We now have 368 that are substandard, all of which may be made adequate. When we modernize these plus the additional ones in the 1973 program, that will complete the modernization.

Well, we have four barracks spaces but I don't think our numbers are really that accurate.

Mr. SIKES. There is a high unit cost for barracks modernization here. What is the reason for the high cost?

General COOPER. The high cost is because these are part of the national historic landmark, Fort Monroe-Old Point Comfort, as listed in the National Register and therefore must be preserved.

These were built in 1903, 1912, 1932, and 1939. It is really the fact that they are old and they are part of the national historical landmark.

Mr. SIKES. Well, Fort Monroe is a very historic place and it would seem a pity not to preserve it, and hopefully to use it. It is a very interesting place.

General COOPER. The real question is whether we can afford to continue to operate there because of the high cost and that is really what we are looking at. From a sentimental point of view people would like to stay there and great emotion can be aroused when you even suggest that you are considering closing it.

On the other hand, looking to the future we have to make those tough choices.

Mr. SIKES. Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

CAMP PICKETT, VA.

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Camp Pickett.

Place in the record page 36.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Camp Pickett

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
First United States Army	Virginia 535	Virginia

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Inactive	1942	Brunswick, Dinwiddie Lunenburg	Petersburg

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Installation serves as maneuver and training area for reserve components, active Army units, and other military services and provides logistical and administrative support for those activities. Provides repair and utility services to off-post facilities including US Army Reserve Centers and Recruiting Stations located in assigned areas within the states of Virginia and West Virginia.

(*) Reserve Component and Active Army troops totalling 84,482 men trained at this installation during CY 1972.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL (9)
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	
a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972	15	55	177						247
b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	7	20	200	0	0	0	0	0	227

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	44,926	1,161	39,403	40,564
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	272	0	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				40,564
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				476
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				2,390
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				43,430

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
721	25 - EM Barracks w/Mess	1	37		MN	40	476	40	476

CAMP PICKETT, VIRGINIA

$476,000

Camp Pickett is located near Petersburg, Virginia. 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 also is 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. The program consists of barracks with dining facilities.

Status of Funds

	($000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	0
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	0
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	0

Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
25	EM Barracks w/Mess	25	5

ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, CAMP PICKETT, VA.

	MEN*
Total Requirement	40
Existing Substandard	25,956
Existing Adequate	0
Funded, Not in Inventory	0
Adequate Assets	0
Deficiency	40
FY 1974 Program	40
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Mar 73	101

* 90 square feet per man - permanent party personnel;
72 square feet per man - trainees.

Mr. SIKES. The request is $476,000 for the enlisted men's barracks and mess.

What part does this installation play in the Army's Reserve training program, and where is it located?

General COOPER. Camp Pickett is located 30 miles southwest of Petersburg, Va., and 150 miles south of Washington, D.C. It is one of eight major inactive installations in the United States, retained in the Army real property inventory to support Reserve component training throughout the year and equally important to support the mobilization requirement. Camp Pickett, together with Camp AP Hill, Va.; Camp Drum, N.Y.; and Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pa.; form an important training complex in the area of the United States that has the highest concentration of Reserve component units. These four installations are mutually supporting. Their range and training facilities have been designed to be complementary in order to avoid duplication and capitalize on a particular installation's capabilities. Camp Pickett comprises 44,900 acres, with ranges capable of handling 8-inch howitzers, the Honest John, main tank guns, and limited light and heavy crew-served weapons.

Reserve component units comprising about 13,800 personnel conduct weekend training year round at Camp Pickett when the installation is not used for annual training. As concerns the annual training load at Camp Pickett, 32,876 personnel conducted training in 1971 and in 1972. In 1973, 34,807 personnel are scheduled for annual training at this installation.

Mr. SIKES. A high percentage of the cost of this barracks project is for administrative and storage space. Could this be reduced by a greater reliance upon existing facilities for this purpose?

General COOPER. The existing facilities are all temporary, primarily temporary, so only by using the temporary facilities could you do what you suggest.

Mr. SIKES. What type of administrative facilities are you proposing here?

General COOPER. These are administrative facilities to support the permanent population there.

Mr. SIKES. In the barracks itself?

General COOPER. Primarily within the barracks.

Mr. SIKES. Would it be efficient to utilize the temporary facilities for administrative space?

In other words, are they nearby and are they usable?

General COOPER. They are nearby but they would be in another building and it would be much more complicated. I think in the long run if we are going to stay there, and we do plan to stay there, it is more feasible to have them right in the same building.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

Very well, gentlemen. Thank you very much.

TUESDAY, MAY 15, 1973.

THIRD ARMY

Mr. SIKES. The committee will come to order.
We will begin the consideration of the Third Army.
Insert in the record page 38.
The request is for $153 million.
[The page follows:]

INSTALLATION SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
3d Army:			
Fort Benning, Ga	528	15,354	15,882
Fort Bragg, N.C		33,471	33,471
Fort Campbell, Ky		51,881	51,881
Fort Gordon, Ga		23,780	23,780
Fort Jackson, S.C		2,902	2,902
Fort McClellan, Ala		19,505	19,505
Fort McPherson, Ga		1,804	1,804
Fort Rucker, Ala		3,987	3,987
Fort Stewart, Ga		264	264
Total	528	152,948	153,476

FORT BENNING, GA.

Mr. SIKES. We take up first Fort Benning, Ga.
Insert page 39 in the record.
[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2 DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3 INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Fort Benning

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
Third United States Army	Georgia 025 Alabama 22	Georgia

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Active	1918	Chattahoochee, GA. and Russell, Ala.	Columbus

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Development of leadership in all ranks, instruction of Infantry officers and selected enlisted personnel in standardized techniques and tactics; training of officers in the duties and responsibilities of Commander and staff at regimental or battle group level and of tactical operations at brigade and division levels; instructing, testing, qualifying officers and enlisted men in Airborne and Ranger techniques and tactics. Furnish administrative and logistical support to an Infantry Division.

* $1,400 one-time cost for easement.

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972	2,109	10,382	4,342	2,205	3,462	181	350	179	23,210
b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	3,007	21,424	4,473	2,189	2,107	13	33	4	33,250

13 INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	182,055	4,945	196,464	201,409
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	190	1*	0	1
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				201,410
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Exclusive of family housing - $10,665)				25,740
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				15,354
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS (Exclusive of family housing - $144,072)				78,968
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				321,472

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO.	PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	Page No			SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST ($000)	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST ($000)
a	b			c	d	e	f	g	h
721	300 - Barracks Modernization	1	40		MN	1,540	5,748	1,540	5,748
721	301 - Ranger Training Complex (Eglin AFB)	1	41		MN	420	2,950	420	2,950
722	297 - Central Food Preparation Facility	10	42		MN		5,346		5,346
812	296 - Electrical Distribution Modification	1	43		LF		1,310		1,310
	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION PL 91-511								
851	294.1 - Extension of Lindsay Creek Parkway - DEF	1	44						528
	Total						15,354		15,882

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

FORT BENNING, GA.—$15,882,000

Fort Benning is located at Columbus, Ga. The mission of this installation is to command, train, and provide logistical support for a division. It operates and supports the infantry school and infantry board. It instructs, tests, and qualifies officers and enlisted men in airborne and ranger techniques and supports summer reserve component training. The program consists of barracks modernization, a ranger training complex at Eglin Air Force Base, a central food preparation facility, and modification of electrical distribution system. It also includes deficiency funding for the extension of Lindsay Creek Parkway authorized by Public Law 91–511.

Status of funds

	Dollars in thousands
Funded program not in inventory	$25,740
Unobligated projects, Mar. 31, 1973 (actual)	5,928
Unobligated projects, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	------

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project No.	Project	Design cost (thousands)	Percent complete, Apr. 30, 1973
300	Barracks modernization	266	20
301	Ranger training complex, Eglin	155	0
297	Central food preparation facility	280	0
296	Electrical distribution modification	45	75
294.10	Extension Lindsey Creek Parkway defense	0	100

Enlisted barracks summary, Fort Benning, Ga.

	Men[1]
Total requirement	12,637
Existing substandard	[2] 30,663
Existing adequate	293
Funded, not in inventory	4,329
Adequate assets	4,622
Deficiency	8,015
Fiscal year 1973 program	1,540
Barracks spaces occupied, Mar. 15, 1973	8,967

Enlisted barracks summary, Elgin Air Force Base, Fla.

	Men[1]
Total requirement	390
Existing substandard	331
Existing adequate	------
Funded, not in inventory	------
Adequate assets	------
Deficiency	390
Fiscal year 1974 program	390
Barracks spaces occupied, May 7, 1973	331

Bachelor officer quarters summary, Elgin Air Force Base, Fla.

	Men
Total requirement	30
Existing substandard	8
Existing adequate	------
Funded, not in inventory	------
Adequate assets	------
Deficiency	30
Fiscal year 1974 program	30
Occupying BQO's, May 7, 1973	6

[1] 90 ft.[2] per man, permanent party personnel; 72 ft.[2] per man, trainees.
[2] Includes 3,572 spaces that can be made adequate.

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $15,882,000 for barracks modernization, a Ranger training complex (Eglin Air Force Base)—this is a very good installation, a central food preparation facility, and an electrical distribution modification.

RANGER TRAINING COMPLEX (EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE)

We will take up the Ranger training complex first. The request is for $2,950,000. Describe the mission of the Ranger training complex.

General COOPER. The Ranger training complex mission is to train both officers and men to be Rangers. Basically, they have two types of courses.

One course is in the jungle areas, the swamp areas, which is where they are trained at Eglin. The other is to train in more mountainous areas, usually in Georgia.

Mr. SIKES. Don't forget those beautiful pine rolling hills and coral swamp lands at Eglin.

General COOPER. Yes, sir. I think the main purpose is to get them out where it is muggy and hot.

Mr. SIKES. Muggy?

General COOPER. I am sorry, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You have not studied your lesson at all.

General COOPER. I realize there are great beaches down there, such as Fort Walton Beach.

Mr. SIKES. They have to sweat enough to help to condition themselves, if that is what you mean.

General COOPER. Yes, sir. The basic purpose is to train the Rangers to be able to operate in difficult terrain and conditions.

That completes my answer, sir.

Mr. SIKES. The Ranger training function at Eglin is, of course, a long-time program. Very good work has been done there. The Eglin Air Force Base reservation has nearly half a million acres in it. There are all types of terrain, from flatland and swamp area around the rivers, to rolling hills. As a matter of fact, the highest point in Florida is a little north of this area. So there is a variety of terrain in the Eglin reservation.

The program has operated successfully there for a number of years. The facilities are inadequate. I am very pleased that new facilities are proposed.

Will the facilities that you are proposing complete all the requirements for the Ranger training complex?

General COOPER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

LOCATION OF RANGER FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. SIKES. What about the housing that is included in this program?

General COOPER. There are 25 units of family housing in this program which we, at least tentatively, plan to put at field No. 6. That will be the family housing.

Mr. SIKES. Why do you say tentatively? I thought it was understood that you wanted the permanent party to be housed at the location of the camp.

General COOPER. We do, but the Air Force initially thought it would be better someplace else.

Mr. SIKES. Is that not between you, the committee, and the Rangers?

General COOPER. Not entirely, sir. It is between us and our host, the Air Force.

Mr. SIKES. You are mistaken there.

General KJELLSTROM. You are correct, Mr. Chairman. The location will be jointly determined by the committee and the Army, with the cooperation of the Air Force.

Mr. SIKES. I am assured the Air Force will cooperate.

General, I am very pleased at what is being done here. We want to do it right. I assume the Army wants the housing where the facilities are.

General COOPER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I feel the Air Force won't interpose any objection.

Will 25 houses be enough?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What are you going to do with the houses that are there?

General COOPER. The houses that are there are inadequate.

Mr. SIKES. Are you going to use them or tear them down?

General COOPER. We are going to use them to the extent that they can be used. We have not decided yet whether we would declare them inadequate or substandard.

Mr. SIKES. What is the requirement for housing? How many families are there in the permanent party?

General COOPER. I have Mr. Bert Covey here.

Mr. COVEY. The program requirement is 50.

Mr. SIKES. You have 12 there, now, do you?

Mr. COVEY. As I understand it, the Air Force requirements will utilize what is there, and we are constructing to our requirements.

Mr. SIKES. I do not believe anybody here knows anything about that camp. If the requirement is 50, why are you building 25? First you have to decide whether to continue to use the 10 or 12 that are there now. They have deteriorated since they were built, and you have a termite problem. The question is, how many of them you want to continue to use.

The Air Force has housing elsewhere. I do not know whether the Air Force would be expected to use these. They were not constructed for the Air Force. They were constructed for the Federal prison there.

If you need 50, why are you building 25?

General COOPER. We are programing 25 as what would fit into the program. We have not finished the housing requirements for all the troops in every place. We believe with the 25, plus——

Mr. SIKES. Do you think the Rangers are a special group?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Do you not think you ought to build all the houses they need?

General COOPER. I think when they have a total of 37—

Mr. SIKES. You just told me you thought the Air Force was going to use the other 12.

General COOPER. I do not believe I said that. If I said that, I mis-spoke.

Mr. SIKES. Someone did.

General COOPER. Mr. Covey just handed me the family housing justification for Eglin Air Force Base. It says Air Force requirements will not permit indefinite use of these units by Army personnel, and Army-sponsored construction is required. That refers to the houses that are being used on Eglin Air Force Base.

Mr. SIKES. You are talking about housing at Eglin main or at other auxiliaries, not at field No. 6?

General COOPER. That is talking about 10 Air Force units at No. 6, and 19 units at Eglin Base. I do not foresee any difficulty in convincing the Air Force, with your support, to allow us to continue to use the 10 at field No. 6.

Mr. SIKES. General, I have been trying to teach you people that you do not get poor from asking. If you need 50, ask for 50. I would like to have an up-to-date summary of the housing picture there. How many of the permanent party do need family housing? Will you provide that for the record as of this date, and show what is anticipated at the end of fiscal year 1974 when the services will have settled down to their peacetime operating strength?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

At field No. 6 there is a projected end fiscal year 1974 family housing requirement for 88 family housing units. Based on up-to-date (May 21, 1973) information there are currently 82 Army military families housed as follows: Ten substandard units at field No. 6, 24 adequate units at Eglin main post, 10 substandard trailers, and 38 units of adequate community housing.

Construction of the 25-unit project in the fiscal year 1974 program could release most of the 24 units at Eglin main post for Air Force requirements if the Rangers continue to occupy the substandard units at field No. 6 and the substandard trailers. The projected long-range requirement for 88 units, considering the 25 units at field No. 6 in the fiscal year 1974 program and 38 offpost community support housing, would leave a remaining deficit of 25 units if the Air Force requires the Ranger school personnel to give up the units now occupied on Eglin main post.

OPEN BAY BARRACKS FOR RANGER TRAINING

Mr. SIKES. You are proposing to build open bay type barracks. We have made quite a point of getting away from open bay type barracks. What is the reason for building them here?

General COOPER. These are for the student trainees, who probably will be living in the barracks only a third of the time that they are there. We felt open bay barracks for people who would be assigned to them less than 6 weeks was adequate. We try not to overbuild.

Mr. SIKES. I understand the training program, and I know that they do work as a group, train as a group, a considerable part of the time. It is for a short period. You have a number of classes passing in and out of the complex during the year. Certainly, the open bay barracks will be much better than the quonset huts that they are using now. They are not at all satisfactory.

Have you thought this through? Are you sure that this will be satisfactory? We would not want to build open bay type barracks here, and nowhere else, unless there is a particular reason for it and you are certain that it will be satisfactory in the years ahead.

General COOPER. We are certain it will be satisfactory. It will be air-conditioned. These men will be able to get a good night's sleep for the few days that they are actually in the barracks.

Mr. SIKES. Until about 3 o'clock in the morning, when you get them up. That is no picnic down there.

General COOPER. That is correct.

DISPOSITION OF EXISTING RANGER TRAINING FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. What are the other existing facilities, and what will be done with them?

General COOPER. The accommodations that are now in use include some 20 or more World War II temporary-type barracks and support facilities. These are supplemented by the relocation of six temporary buildings that were formerly used at field No. 7 and which we moved to field No. 6 when the Ranger training was moved to that field.

When we get through with the program, those seven temporary buildings will be demolished, and all other facilities currently at field No. 7 will be retained and continued in use.

Mr. DAVIS. Are those seven simply the first of those that you have there, or are they in a class by themselves as far as their adequacy?

General COOPER. I think some of then are the worst that we have. Some of them also are located where we want to put the specific new facilities.

I could be more specific, if you would like, as to which buildings we are knocking down. I have a chart here which shows specifically the ones to be knocked down.

Mr. DAVIS. Are those identified by number, or something of that kind?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Why do we not put in the record the ones which will be demolished?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

BUILDING DEMOLITION, RANGER TRAINING COMPLEX, EGLIN AFB, FLA.

Seven World War II temporary type structures will be demolished in conjunction with construction of new facilities for the ranger training complex. These buildings are T-6004, T-6006, T-6008, T-6009, T-6010, T-6013, and T-6015 comprising a total of 37,430 square feet. These old substandard structures have outlived their usefulness and will be demolished to clear areas for the new construction.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH, FORT BENNING

Mr. DAVIS. You have some 23,210 personnel at Benning at the present time. When you use that figure, are you speaking entirely of Army personnel?

General COOPER. There may be in the support personnel some other than just Army. There may, from time to time, be some students from the Navy or Air Force or even from foreign countries. However, they are almost all U.S. Army personnel.

Mr. DAVIS. It is indicated that you plan to increase the personnel strength to almost 36,000 in the next 2 fiscal years.

General COOPER. That figure is based on the assumption that a major combat unit would be returned to the United States. That assumption is presently not correct. In this time frame the assumption is certainly not correct.

At the time these charts were prepared, the assumption was that the 2d Infantry Division would be redeployed from Korea by the end of fiscal year 1975. That is the reason for the large increase.

Mr. DAVIS. That would necessitate a considerable number of new housing units of various kinds, if that were to be done. Are we working against the requirement of 23,000, or are we working against an anticipated requirement of 36,000?

General COOPER. We are working eventually against the requirement of the 36,000, but we have not programed, for example, houses or barracks to take care of that large increase.

You will notice this year's program we limit to barracks modernization, but at some time when this does become firm—if we do in fact bring a major combat unit back and redeploy it to Fort Benning—we would require additional construction.

We have not programed that in fiscal year 1974. It would be programed in some later year. When there is some indefinite aspect about a large increase in personnel at an installation like this, we delay programing for it.

CENTRAL FOOD PREPARATION FACILITY

Mr. SIKES. We have already discussed in detail the concept of the central food preparation facility. Is the scope of this project based on the current or the proposed base population for Fort Benning?

General COOPER. The scope of this project was built on feeding 25,000 meals per day.

Colonel BURT. Our scope is about 25,000 meals per day at Fort Benning based on the projected strength for the next year and a half.

Mr. SIKES. You propose that the central food preparation facility will accommodate the entire post requirements?

Colonel BURT. That is true, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What are the anticipated savings for this facility?

Colonel BURT. Our economic analysis in planning the project anticipates annual savings of approximately $5 million, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What percentage is that of the total cost? In other words, what would be the amortization rate?

Colonel BURT. Sir, that is about 50 percent. This is approximately a $10 million project, including OMA investment. That represents about a 30-percent savings against the current conventional method of feeding at Fort Benning.

Mr. SIKES. Do you contemplate the additional population will materialize at Fort Benning? Will you actually have 25,000 there?

Colonel BURT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You are not apprehensive that you may be overbuilding?

PERMANENT FACILITIES AT FORT BENNING

Mr. SIKES. Are the facilities at Fort Benning underutilized at present?

General COOPER. Overall?

Mr. SIKES. Overall.

General COOPER. Not permanent facilities. There are temporary facilities that are underutilized.

Mr. SIKES. You have a lot of temporary facilities there. Can you tell us what percentage of the facilities is permanent compared with the percentage that is temporary?

General COOPER. We can tell you in terms of the numbers of barracks, sir, but I cannot tell you with regard to all the facilities.

Mr. SIKES. All right, give it to us for the barracks.

General COOPER. I can give it to you for barracks.

Mr. SIKES. I think Mr. Lockwood will have it. He is very good at this.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Our inventory shows we have permanent facilities of $157 million; and other, temporary and semipermanent, of $40 million.

Mr. SIKES. That is not a good comparison, is it? I want to know the floor space that is temporary and that which is permanent. Can you provide that?

General COOPER. I can give you the barracks, which will give you a feel for it, and we could provide additional details.

We have 27,712 temporary barrack spaces and about 7,500 spaces in permanent barracks and barracks that we can make adequate.

Mr. SIKES. A great part of it is still temporary.

General COOPER. Yes, sir. A lot of those temporaries are not required based on the present strength.

Mr. SIKES. Will they be kept for emergency use, or will you be tearing some of them down?

General COOPER. We plan to tear as many down as we can and keep just the minimum number for emergency use.

Mr. SIKES. Is that because of the difficulty of maintaining this type of facility?

General COOPER. That is correct. Also, these have outlived their useful life. If we do have another emergency, we ought to start over again.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The present allowance for barracks space of 90 square feet per man, in itself gives you considerable flexibility in the use of new permanent facilities you are building. Could you not, in effect, nearly double the load without jeopardizing health?

General COOPER. You are not supposed to go below 55 square feet per man in accordance with the criteria of the Surgeon General, and even that is supposed to be on an emergency basis.

Mr. SIKES. In an emergency, undoubtedly you will crowd facilities much more than you contemplate now. That is the nature of things.

General COOPER. In an emergency, that is correct, sir. We would rather tear down the old barracks and double soldiers up or almost double them up in the new barracks, rather than keep the old ones.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record the projects planned for the next 4 years, and show which would be required to support current stationing loads only.

[The information follows:]

Fort Benning, Ga., long-range program, fiscal year 1975–78 [1]

Facility class:	*Dollars in thousands*
Operational	
Training	730
Maintenance and production	6,752
R.D.T. & E.	
Supply	
Hospital and medical (dental clinics, 152 chairs)	[2] 5,563
Administrative	3,150
Troop housing (6,287 EM, 200 BOQ)	[3] 59,812
Community support	2,961
Utilities	
Real estate	
Total	78,968

[1] All projects required for present requirements, except as noted.
[2] Approximately 60 chairs would not be required at the present authorized strength.
[3] Approximately 1,600 barracks spaces would not be required at the present authorized strength.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record data on the electrical workload increase which makes necessary modification of the electrical distribution system.

[The information follows:]

FORT BENNING, GA., ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION MODIFICATION

The actual loading in the summer of 1972 exceeded 43,000 kilovolt-amperes at the Marne Road Substation which has a rated capacity of 40,000 kilovolt-amperes. The proposed facilities will alleviate this overloaded condition by providing additional distribution points. Recently completed facilities to be served by this project consist of the air-conditioning of the Post Office Building—42 tons—in the fiscal year 1971 program and barracks modernization—five buildings with 500 tons of air-conditioning—and 340 units of family housing in the fiscal year 1972 program. Facilities under contract include the air-conditioning of bui ding 241—44 tons—and barracks modernization—22 buildings with 2,250 tons of air-conditioning—in the fiscal year 1973 program. The proposed fiscal year 1974 program will include barracks modernization—10 buildings with 900 tons of air-conditioning—and the central food preparation facility. Additional facilities such as modernization of 16 barracks and construction of 474 units of family housing are programed for fiscal year 1975 and fiscal year 1976. The power demand on the proposed facilities at the time of completion is estimated to be 33,400 kilovolt-amperes. This demand consists of approximately 20,400 kilovolt-amperes of existing load and an estimated 13,000 kilovolt-amperes demand due to normal load growth and the facilities currently under contract and in the fiscal year 1974 program.

LINDSAY CREEK PARKWAY EXTENSION

Mr. SIKES. Tell us something about the Lindsay Creek Parkway. Show us on the map where it is and where the extension would be.

General COOPER. We had Mr. Carton go down and look into this matter, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I recall when we built the first part of it.

Mr. CARTON. This is the parkway. It enters the post at this point, sir. The portion that has been completed. The portion that is now under construction leads up to the main post hospital.

The parkway eventually will continue down and serve the main post.

Our problem at the moment, sir, is that this portion is under construction, and at this point, located just beyond the Upatoi Creek, we have had a land movement. We had a cut at the center line of the road

of about 30 feet. We encountered what is known as the Eutaw formation, which is a clay shale formation. We find that this formation will probably be stable with a surface slope of 1 vertical to 10 horizontal.

As our plans originally called for a 1-to-3 slope we are going to have to remove considerably more earth than we had originally planned.

Mr. SIKES. A very unusual formation for that part of the world. You do not have that movement, usually, in the East, but under those conditions you can.

How many miles are included in the present extension?

Mr. CARTON. About a mile and a half. It includes a bridge across Upatoi Creek, which is a major cost element in this portion.

Mr. SIKES. I also recall that we funded the first part without a budget request.

Mr. CARTON. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. It was authorized by the Armed Services Committee and approved by this committee.

Mr. CARTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What will be the cost of the completed project, and what is the schedule for completing the entire project?

Mr. CARTON. At the present time, the only portion of the program that is scheduled is to bring it up to this point where the major hospital is located and the new community center is being constructed. There is an existing connecting road that will feed both ways into these two areas.

In the long-range plan, there is a plan to extend the parkway to this point. I am sorry I do not have a current price.

Mr. SIKES. Is it in the next 5-year program? Where is it in the program?

General COOPER. We have in the 1978 program, parkway, ramps and bridges, for about $2,150,000.

Mr. SIKES. Does that conclude this project, the Lindsay Creek Parkway?

Mr. CARTON. That would complete to this point, sir, and I believe that will conclude it.

[Additional information follows:]

Following additional information provided by the Army: The Lindsay Creek Parkway is a four-lane interchange to the Martin Army Hospital. The plan for this road is to extend the parkway from Martin Army Hospital to Edwards Street, a distance of 3½ miles, with a three lane, middle lane reversible traffic flow pattern.

In the 5-year program there is a project in fiscal year 1978 for $2,150,000. This project would complete the Custer and Martin Army Hospital interchanges and extend the road with three lanes approximately ¾ mile beyond the Martin Army Hospital interchange.

The remaining extension of the Parkway to Edwards Street is in the long range program with a dollar cost of approximately $5 to $6 million.

CENTRAL FOOD PROCESSING FACILITY

Mr. DAVIS. You used the term "satellite dining facility." What is that?

General COOPER. Where you have the central food processing center, the satellite is where you ship the main courses to from the cen-

tral, but you also do things like fry hamburgers there, cook deep fry chicken, and things like that. It is, in essence, a short order plus the place where the troops eat.

Even though most of the food is prepared at the central, the people still eat with their own unit. That is what a satellite dining facility is.

Mr. DAVIS. I gather that this central facility basically is to replace 40 individual mess halls, is that correct, or are we talking about something less than that? I notice you refer to demolishing nine temporary buildings.

General COOPER. You also have mess halls in some of the barracks that were built. You used to have one mess hall per company. In most of the modernizations, we are eliminating the mess hall in every second barracks. As you will see in some of the other barracks modifications, we can eliminate mess halls as such and convert them to other uses. We will tear down the temporary mess halls. We convert the existing permanent mess halls to a satellite dining facility to the extent required, and the other we convert to administrative space or other barracks space.

Mr. DAVIS. I am trying to get at the relationship between the 40 mess halls and the nine temporary buildings that are to be demolished.

General KJELLSTROM. Colonel Burt, do you have the information on the nine temporary buildings?

Colonel BURT. Those are dining facilities in old structures that could not economically be refurbished.

Also, under the central preparation and the new barracks complex, we do not need as many facilities.

In the older part of the post, there are some of the old one-company dining facilities that we are getting away from.

Mr. SIKES. Colonel Burt, you are a good witness. You have studied your lesson.

Mr. DAVIS. This one facility is to take the place, for basic food preparation, of the 40 that are now there; and of those 40, 9 will be demolished, and the other 31 will be converted to a different type of use than the company mess hall, or whatever it is that they are now used for. Is that it?

Colonel BURT. Those will be dining areas and feeding areas, but they will not prepare the total meal and serve it.

As the General mentioned, they will prepare the grill items. We can do central preparation and they can put it together, the type of thing that adapts to central preparation in either temporary or midrange stores.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FORT BRAGG, N.C.

Mr. SIKES. We will turn to Fort Bragg, N.C.

Please place page 45 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3 INSTALLATION
9 July 1973	ARMY		Fort Bragg

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5 INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
Third United States Army	North Carolina 225	North Carolina

7. STATUS	8 YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9 COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
Active	1918	Cumberland & Hoke	Fayetteville, 10 miles Southeast

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Headquarters of the XVIII Airborne Corps and the 82nd Airborne Division; responsible for command, training and logistical support of an airborne division and air transport units; testing airborne equipment and techniques and support of the US Army John F. Kennedy Center for Military Assistance.

* $9,400 one-time cost of easement.

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL (9)
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	
a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972	4,576	33,081	4,098	43	42	28	55	4	41,927
b. PLANNED (End FY 78)	4,401	34,103	3,770	269	756	7	34	0	43,340

13 INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a OWNED	130,687	3,926	230,817	234,743
b LEASES AND EASEMENTS	9	9*	0	9
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				234,752
d AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (exclusive of family housing - $14,087)				29,833
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM (exclusive of family housing - $4,403)				33,471
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS (exclusive of family housing - $63,400)				36,045
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				334,101

SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	PRIORITY	Page No	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
214	279 - Tactical Equipment Shops & Facilities	1	46		SF	40,400	2,709	40,400	2,709
610	305 - Administrative Facilities	1	47A				708		708
721	295 - EW Barracks w/Mess	1	48		EW	360	2,399	360	2,399
721	296 - EM Barracks Complex	1	49		MN	1,649	18,203	1,649	18,203
721	302 - Barracks Modernization	1	51		MN	3,061	8,381	3,061	8,381
740	136 - EM Service Club	36	52		SF	27,800	1,071	27,800	1,071
	Totals						33,471		33,471

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

FORT BRAGG, N.C.—$33,471,000

Fort Bragg is located 10 miles northwest of Fayetteville, N.C. The mission of this installation, which houses the XVIII Airborne Corps, is to command, train, and support an airborne division and other airborne units, to test airborne equipment and techniques, and to support the U.S. Army John F. Kennedy Center for military assistance. The program provides for tactical equipment shops, barracks with dining facilities for enlisted women, a barracks complex, barracks modernization, a service club, and an administrative facility.

Status of funds

	Dollars in thousands
Funded program not in inventory	29,833
Unobligated projects, March 31, 1973 (actual)	964
Unobligated projects, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	964

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost (thousands)	Percent complete Apr. 30, 1973
Tactical equipment shops and factories	$102	25
EW barracks with mess	100	25
EM barracks complex	525	25
Barracks modernization	332	25
EM service club	69	60
Administrative facility	40	0

Enlisted Barracks Summary, Fort Bragg, N.C.

	Men/women [1]
Total requirement	18,166
Existing substandard	[2] 25,486
Existing adequate	------
Funded not in inventory	3,895
Adequate assets	3,895
Deficiency	14,271
Fiscal year 1974 program	5,070
Barracks spaces occupied, March 15, 1973	14,352

[1] 90 square feet per man, permanent party personnel; 72 square feet per man, trainees.
[2] Includes 10,066 spaces that can be made adequate.

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $33,471,000 for tactical equipment shops and facilities costing $2.7 million; administrative facilities; enlisted women's barracks; an enlisted men's barracks complex; barracks modernization; and an enlisted men's service club.

TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOPS AND FACILITIES

Show us on the map where the tactical equipment shops and facilities now are located, and where you plan to build the new ones.

Mr. CARTON. The existing tactical equipment shops are out in this area. The new ones will be located here, adjacent to the new permanent barracks complex.

Mr. SIKES. What will you do with the old buildings?

Mr. CARTON. Some of the old buildings at Fort Bragg are to be demolished, sir.

General COOPER. The total construction is approximately 636,000 square feet in the total Fort Bragg program. We propose to demolish approximately 652,000 square feet.

Mr. CARTON. There is a deficit of tactical equipment shops at Fort Bragg, as I recall.

Mr. SIKES. Some of them will continue in operation?

Mr. CARTON. They will be used until such time as they can be replaced.

Mr. SIKES. What is the relationship of the new shops to the parking facilities which already have been provided?

General COOPER. The parking facilities were provided by troop labor, in essence, to get the troops out of the mud. Basically, they did the earth work, and then did a slight surface treatment to the area. We put down some asphalt and rock which we engineers call a double bituminous surface treatment.

Mr. SIKES. It is adequate?

General COOPER. It is adequate only temporarily to keep them out of the mud. It is not permanent in the sense that we will have to overlay that with asphaltic concrete.

WORKLOAD AT JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Mr. SIKES. What was the projected workload for the John F. Kennedy Center for Military Assistance at the time it was built, and what is its current workload and projected workload?

General COOPER. We will have to provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

Individual training at the John F. Kennedy Center for Military Assistance is conducted by the U.S. Army Institute for Military Assistance (USAIMA). The USAIMA has four component schools: Psychological Operations School, Special Forces School, Military Adviser School, and Civil Affairs School. The student input, student load, and student output at the USAIMA during the period fiscal year 1970–1974 follow:

	Input	Load	Output
Fiscal year:			
1970 [1]	5,790	1,101	5,211
1971	9,281	1,024	7,666
1972	4,347	552	4,244
1973 [2]	3,987	703	3,892
1974 [2]	2,963	586	2,791

[1] Corresponds to anticipated long-range load at time center was programed.
[2] Programed.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The fiscal year 1970 hearings show a projected workload of 1,100 students. You do not have with you the current projections?

General COOPER. For the John F. Kennedy School? The projected total student load of 473 would not necessarily all be at John F. Kennedy. I cannot tell you specifically how much of that is at John F. Kennedy. I will provide that.

[The information follows:]

Of the projected fiscal year 1974 student input of 2,963 at the U.S. Army Institute for Military Assistance (USAIMA), approximately 106 students will undergo their training at a location other than Fort Bragg (special forces underwater operations course conducted at Key West, Fla.).

Mr. NICHOLAS. Do you think it reasonable to assume that the workload is going down from that projected when the fiscal year 1970 program was under review?

General COOPER. I would suspect it would be going down if for no other reason than that the total Army is going down, and our involvement in Southeast Asia is going down, but we would expect to keep it because we have responsibilities elsewhere in the world.

ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE

Mr. SIKES. You have 107,000 square feet in the academic building addition provided in fiscal year 1970, and 62,000 of that is administrative space. You are asking for another 22,690 square feet of new administrative space for an ROTC headquarters and a readiness group. Could not one or both of these activities be accommodated in the space you now have in the John F. Kennedy Center?

General COOPER. We looked at that very carefully. We do not have that space there. We are very short of administrative space throughout the Army. We did look specifically at the John F. Kennedy Center. As a matter of fact, we considered moving some of the people now in the John F. Kennedy Center out to temporary facilities so we could put the ROTC and Reserve people in there on an interim basis.

We think for the long term that is not the best solution. It is better to build the administrative space for these people. We do not have excess administrative space in Fort Bragg.

Mr. SIKES. I doubt there is excess administrative space anywhere. For a number of years, it has been the policy to frown on administrative space additions because of the pressure for other badly needed facilities.

Obviously, there does come a time when you must have adequate administrative space. I can understand the problem.

BARRACKS

Are both of these barracks projects for replacement of World War II facilities?

General COOPER. The accommodations now in use for the enlisted women's barracks are of World War II temporary vintage. I am quite sure they are World War II for the enlisted men, also, yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What will be done with the facilities that you are now using?

General COOPER. The facilities that we are now using for the most part will be torn down. They are Word War II facilities.

Mr. SIKES. What design will you use for the WAC barracks?

General COOPER. The design for the WAC barracks, 360, is large enough that we can probably use the new type design which is used at Columbia, S.C. If the size of the barracks is above 300, we figure we can use the new design. This one is 360. So, we intend to use that.

Mr. SIKES. I am sure the committee is supposed to be familiar with that, but why don't you refresh our memory on just what you propose to build.

General COOPER. We are proposing to build a barracks complex——

Mr. SIKES. Have you illustrations of that?

General COOPER. We have some illustrations here. As a matter of fact, since some of the new members of the committee were not here for the presentation on the new barracks design last year, we thought we would try to arranage a presentation on this of about 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. I think that would be very worthwhile.

Is this the same type you are building for the men?

General COOPER. Yes, sir, except for the women we will have bathtubs in the bathrooms.

Here are some brochures specifically for that. Basically, we have rooms for three, two, or one person. The standard room for three men or women in grades up to E–4 is 270 square feet of living space with a private bathroom.

For E–5 and E–6, we put 2 in the same size room, clustered around separate living rooms for each 4 or 8 individual rooms.

The main idea is to get privacy as well as good living accommodations.

ENLISTED MEN'S SERVICE CLUB

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation on service clubs? You are requesting one for enlisted men. Are the others adequate?

General COOPER. Not all of them, sir. We require four additional service clubs at Fort Bragg in order to meet the total requirement.

Mr. SIKES. Then you are building one of four?

General COOPER. We are building one of four, yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. When do you propose to build the others? These are important.

General COOPER. We plan to have those in the later programs. We try to stretch these out over the years.

Mr. SIKES. What does that mean? How much later?

General COOPER. Within the next 5 years, sir.

Mr. SIKES. If the need is serious, it should not wait 5 years.

General COOPER. Within the total level of funding, we thought it preferable to build the new barracks and modernize the barracks.

Mr. SIKES. Why are you building a regimental size gym as part of the barracks complex?

General COOPER. Each regimental size unit is authorized a gym. We are trying to build up to the point of having one gym of about 21,000 square feet for each regimental size unit, someplace between 1,500 and 3,000 men.

We do it as part of a complex, because in the past, sometimes we built the barracks without building the other facilities. We found that got us deep in the hole.

Mr. SIKES. Do I understand that you are building a larger gym than is required for the barracks complex, but it will be used by other individuals?

General COOPER. The gym itself is of the size required, consistent with the size as the barracks. It will be used by other people. They will use all the facilities that they can.

Mr. SIKES. How far removed are the other people? Are they near enough that they will in fact use this gym?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. The barracks complex is basically along one street.

Mr. CARTON. The new barracks complex is an extension of the existing housing area.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

BARRACKS SPACES

Mr. DAVIS. Referring to page 48, will you explain the figures down at the lower left? You show a personnel strength of pretty close to 42,000 people at Fort Bragg. Then again, looking at the enlisted men's requirements with respect to barracks, it shows you have something like 25,000 existing substandard. It indicates that 10,000 of those can be made adequate. That would bring us up to about 28,000 or 29,000, adding it to what you have listed as the total requirement.

Then it shows funded, not in inventory. I assume that these are under construction, but not yet available. That brings us up to, let us say, 33,000.

How do you explain the difference between the personnel strength and what appears to be the total inventory of barracks?

General COOPER. The total personnel strength you gave included officers, enlisted and civilian. It also included married as well as unmarried.

The enlisted men's barracks requirement, 23a, the first figure you saw in the lower left-hand corner, 18,166, is based on the total number of enlisted men, taking out the number we expect to be married.

Then the existing substandard includes both temporary barracks—we have about 16,000 temporary barracks spaces—and it also includes 10,000 barracks spaces that can be made adequate.

Mr. DAVIS. That is looking down the road some.

General COOPER. That is right. In general, these are permanent type buildings that under the current criteria are no longer adequate, usually because there is not enough privacy and there is not enough in the way of bathrooms. In many cases, they are not air-conditioned. But they are good barracks. Many of them were built in the late fifties.

In addition, 3,895 spaces are funded, but not in inventory. These are permanent barracks authorized in the fiscal year 1972 program and are being modernized right now. As a matter of fact, some of them should be finished as of today.

You have to take the 3,895 funded, but not in inventory, which are being modernized, and add the 10,000, and you get an idea of the total permanent spaces that we have available to meet that total requirement of 18,000.

If you add the temporary spaces we have a lot more spaces than we require.

This is not the easiest one to track, particularly when you have modernization, new and temporary.

Mr. DAVIS. Am I correct in adding the 10,000 that can be made adequate to the 18,000, or is that a part of it?

General COOPER. The 10,000 goes toward meeting that requirement of 18,000. If you add the 10,000 to the roughly 4,000 funded, not in inventory, you see we are about 4,000 permanent barracks spaces short.

The 18,000 is the requirement. We normally are not authorized to construct up to the full requirement.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you.

FORT CAMPBELL, KY.

Mr. LONG. Turn to Fort Campbell, Ky.

Insert in the record page 53.

[The page follows:]