

FORT RICHARDSON, ALASKA

\$2,140,000

Fort Richardson is located 7 miles northeast of Anchorage, Alaska. The mission of this installation is to support all U.S. Army operations in Alaska including special requirements for supply and maintenance facilities for both Reserve Components and continental active Army units receiving tactical training in Alaska. The installation also provides ground and surface-to-air defense for Elmendorf Air Base. The program provides for barracks modernization.

## Status of Funds

(\$000)

Funded Program Not in Inventory	8,375
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	651
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	356

## Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
252	Barracks Modernization	103	20

## ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, FORT RICHARDSON, ALASKA

	<u>MEN*</u>
Total Requirement	2,841
Existing Substandard	1,043**
Existing Adequate	134
Funded, Not in Inventory	1,552
Adequate Assets	1,686
Deficiency	1,155
FY 1974 Program	270
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Sep 72	2,911

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

\*\* Includes 1,043 spaces that can be made adequate

Mr. TALCOTT. Are there any questions?

[No response.]

FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

Mr. TALCOTT. We go to Fort Wainwright, Alaska.

Insert page 238.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 9 July 1973		2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION Fort Wainwright											
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU U. S. Army, Alaska			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER Alaska 871		6. STATE/COUNTRY Alaska										
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1936		9. COUNTY (U.S.)		10. NEAREST CITY Fairbanks									
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Provide Ground Defense of Northern Alaska. Major and Tenant Units are: HHC, USAG, Fort Wainwright  4th Bn 9th Inf (172d Arctic Inf Bde) E Troop (Air) (1st Cav) HHC 222d Avn Bn (Cbt) (-) 12th Avn Co (GS) 242 Avn Co (As Lt Spt Hel) 568th Trans Co (Acft Maint) (DS/GS) 343d Avn Det (Hvy Hel) USASTRATCOM USASA Bassett Army Hospital * Transients				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 28 Feb 1973		330	2,434	641							3,405
				b. PLANNED (End FY )		345	2,378	495		10*	20*				3,248
				13. INVENTORY											
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)							
a. OWNED		656,327		0		230,782		230,782							
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS								0							
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Excludes land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19		72						230,782							
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY										2,587					
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM										2,715					
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS										5,077					
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)										241,161					
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
PROJECT DESIGNATION					TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM						
CATEGORY CODE NO.	PROJECT TITLE			Page No	c	d	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h					
a	b			PRIORITY			e								
724	139 - BOQ Modernization			1	239			750		750					
741	138 - Relocation of Activities to South Post			1	239A			1,965		1,965					
	Totals							2,715		2,715					

FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

\$2,715,000

Fort Wainwright is located at Fairbanks, Alaska. The mission of this installation is to provide ground defense for the Wainwright-Fairbanks-Eielson Air Force Base Complex. Also supports a US Army Hospital, a reinforced infantry battalion and other non-divisional type units. The program provides for relocation of activities to South Post and modernization of bachelor officer quarters.

## Status of Funds

(\$000)

Funded Program Not in Inventory  
 Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)  
 Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)

## Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
138	Relocate Activities to South Post	102	0
139	Modernization of Bachelor Officer Quarters	21	0

## BACHELOR OFFICER QUARTERS SUMMARY, FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

	<u>MEN</u>
Total Requirement	80
Existing Substandard	112*
Existing Adequate	0
Funded, Not in Inventory	0
Adequate Assets	0
Deficiency	80
FY 1974 Program	48
Occupying BOQs, 15 Mar 73	125

\* Includes 112 spaces that can be made adequate

Mr. TALCOTT. Will the project to relocate activities to the South Post complete the requirements for this move?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. This year?

General COOPER. This is part of the announcement that we made on April 17. This completes the requirements to close out the North Post and consolidate on the South Post so we can take advantage of the annual savings involved, which we estimate to be something like \$3.4 million.

#### U.S. ARMY, HAWAII

Mr. TALCOTT. We will turn to U.S. Army, Hawaii.

Insert page 240 in the record.

[The page follows:]

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
U.S. Army, Hawaii:			
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.....		9,592	9,592
Fort Shafter, Hawaii.....		1,233	1,233
Total.....	0	10,825	10,825

#### SCHOFIELD BARRACKS MILITARY RESERVATION, HAWAII

Mr. TALCOTT. First is Schofield Barracks Military Reservation, Hawaii. Insert page 241 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 9 July 1973		2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION Schofield Barracks Military Reservation												
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU United States Army, Pacific			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER Hawaii 815		6. STATE/COUNTRY Hawaii											
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1899		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Honolulu	10. NEAREST CITY Honolulu											
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Headquarters and home post of the 25th Infantry Division and supporting elements.				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	1,162	9,322	2,201								12,685	
				b. PLANNED (End FY 75)	1,505	14,049	1,773	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17,327	
				13. INVENTORY												
				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)			TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
				a. OWNED		14,034		58		91,174			91,232			
				b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		78							0			
				c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72									91,232			
				d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Exclusive of family housing - \$16,321)									18,611			
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM									9,592							
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS									49,631							
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)									169,066							
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS																
PROJECT DESIGNATION																
CATEGORY CODE NO.	PROJECT TITLE				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM							
		Page	Priority	No.			SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000)	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000)						
721	78 - Barracks Modernization	1	1	242		MN	1,809	8,124	1,809	8,124						
722	77 - Consolidated Dining Facility	1	1	243				1,468		1,468						
				Total				9,592		9,592						

804

SCHOFIELD BARRACKS, HAWAII

\$9,592,000

Schofield Barracks Military Reservation is located 7 miles northwest of Honolulu, Hawaii. The mission of this installation is to command, train and provide logistical support for a division. It is the headquarters for U.S. Army Hawaii and operates the USARHAW Supply and Maintenance Center and the USARHAW Personnel Center. The program provides barracks modernization and a consolidated dining facility.

## Status of Funds

(\$000)

Funded Program Not in Inventory	18,611
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	9,997
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	0

## Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
78	Barracks Modernization	420	20
77	Consolidated Dining Fac	75	10

## ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, SCHOFIELD BARRACKS, HAWAII

	<u>Men*</u>
Total Requirement	7,284
Existing Substandard	3,519**
Existing Adequate	88***
Funded, Not in Inventory	3,798
Adequate Assets	3,886
Deficiency	3,398
FY 1974 Program	1,809
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Mar 73	6,928

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

\*\* Includes 3,305 spaces that can be made adequate

\*\*\* Private housing

## REDUCTION IN SIZE OF 25TH DIVISION

Mr. TALCOTT. An announcement by the Army dated February 9, 1973, indicated that the 25th Division at Schofield Barracks would be rounded out by the Hawaii Army National Guard's 29th Infantry Brigade and an Army Reserve battalion rather than having three active brigades. How will this affect the station loading shown here and the requirement for the barracks modernization project in this year's program?

General COOPER. It will not affect it at all, sir. The long-range plan assumes that we will have only two-thirds of a division active duty on Schofield Barracks.

Specifically, the total requirement that we have for barracks is related to having only those two active duty brigades.

Mr. NICHOLAS. That is the total barracks requirement of 7,284?

General COOPER. The 7,284 requirement is related just to the active duty soldiers.

Mr. NICHOLAS. That ties in also to the end population of 18,900, the two brigades?

General COOPER. The two brigades. We are still building up the two brigades to 100-percent strength, plus the supporting units.

Mr. TALCOTT. Do you have 1,400 acres valued at \$91 million?

General COOPER. No. The improvements are \$91 million. The land cost only \$58,000 initially. That was a long time ago.

Mr. TALCOTT. The Army made some good deals out there.

General COOPER. There is a very definite attempt to be sure we do not give up any of the property we may need out there.

Mr. McEWEN. That was about \$4 an acre. What is that land worth now? This is near Honolulu, is it not?

General COOPER. No, sir. Schofield Barracks is about 20 miles or so from Honolulu. This is fairly far away from Honolulu. It is up in the pineapple country. We got this land, I think, about 1900.

Mr. TALCOTT. It is still considered an ideal spot.

General COOPER. Yes, sir, but the value it is not like the land around Waikiki.

## CONSOLIDATED DINING FACILITIES

Mr. TALCOTT. What part of your post will the consolidated dining facility serve? A \$1 million facility will not serve all of Schofield Barracks. What part will it serve?

General COOPER. No, sir. It will serve the people who are in Quads I, J, and K. I can give you more specific detail. There are presently seven active and two standby dining facilities.

Mr. TALCOTT. Is this in lieu of a central food processing facility?

General COOPER. This will be a complete facility in itself as opposed to a central food and satellites. Having done this, we would not expect to come back in the near future and replace it with a central food processing facility.

Mr. TALCOTT. Is this the direction you are going—toward consolidated dining facilities, rather than central food processing facilities?

General COOPER. The central food processing concept is still being tried out. We have not yet completed the experiment at Fort Lee, and

we have not built any full-scale facilities. If there are savings and the troops are fed better with the central food processing facility, I think we will go more to that concept.

Mr. TALCOTT. Are you making comparisons? Are you trying to decide which is better?

General COOPER. We have made comparisons in theory. We have experience with the consolidated messing. We do not have corresponding comparisons yet with operating a large-scale central food processing facility. The only actual experience we have is the test we ran out at Fort Lewis.

FORT SHAFTER MILITARY RESERVATION, HAWAII

Mr. TALCOTT. We go to Fort Shafter Military Reservation, Hawaii. Insert page 244 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 9 July 1973		2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION Fort Shafter Military Reservation											
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU United States Army, Pacific			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER Hawaii 835		6. STATE/COUNTRY Hawaii										
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1907		9. COUNTY (U.S.) Honolulu	10. NEAREST CITY Honolulu										
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Provide headquarters facilities for U.S. Army, Pacific family quarters for headquarters personnel; troop housing; post headquarters for Ft. Shafter and sub-installations; quartermaster service; and communications center.  *Includes all sub-installations except Fort Ruger and Tripler AMC				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH*		PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL		
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)			
				a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972			775	1,387	3,851						6,013
				b. PLANNED (End FY 78 )			650	1,669	3,404	0	0	0	0	0	5,723
				13. INVENTORY											
				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
				a. OWNED		1,339		55		36,845		36,900			
				b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS		1						0			
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72								36,900							
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY (Exclusive of family housing - \$23,919)								1,610							
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								1,233							
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								7,458							
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								47,201							
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
PROJECT DESIGNATION															
CATEGORY CODE NO.	PROJECT TITLE			TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM							
a	b			c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h						
550	50 - Medical/Dental Clinic			30	245	SP	14,140	1,233	14,140	1,233					

## FORT SHAFTER, HAWAII—\$1,233,000

Fort Shafter is located 3 miles northwest of Honolulu, Hawaii. The mission of the installation is to support Headquarters, U.S. Army Pacific. Support facilities and family housing are located there. The program provides a medical/dental clinic.

*Status of Funds**(Thousands of dollars)*

Funded program not in inventory.....	1,610
Unobligated projects, March 31, 1973 (actual).....	1,500
Unobligated projects, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	0

*Design Information*

Project no. 50—Medical/dental clinic:

Design cost (thousands).....	80
Percent complete Apr. 30, 1973.....	5

Mr. TALCOTT. You show a substantial reduction in the number of civilians projected at Fort Shafter. From what does this result? It represents about half the civilian employees.

General COOPER. We do not have that information available. We will have to provide it for the record.

[The information follows:]

The projected civilian strength shown is in error. The correct figures should be 650 officers, 1,669 enlisted men and 3,404 civilians, for a total strength of 5,723.

## STUDY OF ACTIVITIES LOCATED AT FORT SHAFTER

Mr. TALCOTT. Have you thoroughly studied all of the activities located at Fort Shafter to see which ones can be reduced or relocated to Schofield Barracks?

General COOPER. I do not think we have done a study specifically in that regard. Fort Shafter as a headquarters has to deal with many other service headquarters and joint headquarters in that particular area, the Pearl Harbor and Fort Shafter area.

The direct answer to the question is that we have not contemplated moving Fort Shafter up to Schofield. We did on a tri-Service basis have a review that was called Project FRESH, to look at all the facilities in the Hawaii area to see what could be consolidated and what could be eliminated.

I think it would take a fair amount of construction to move everything at Shafter up to Schofield Barracks.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Did Project FRESH look into the requirement for the missions that are located in Hawaii as well as the requirement for the facilities that support the missions which are planned there? I believe this question is directed to the requirements for retaining all of these missions at Fort Shafter?

General COOPER. I think Project FRESH assumed certain of the missions. We have reviewed the missions as a separate issue to eliminate such headquarters as U.S. Army, Hawaii, and things like that, but I do not know just when that study was completed. We will be looking at this again as a part of our overall study.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Is this one of the smaller bases that you are looking at particularly?

General COOPER. We are looking at it, but it is not in the same category as Fort Monroe.

Mr. SIKES. Did your comments indicate a reduction in personnel strengths in the area?

General COOPER. No, sir. By the "area," you mean Hawaii?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, Hawaii.

General COOPER. We expect it to stay the same as we have it programmed. We are building up in strength, the full strength of 2 brigades at Schofield Barracks.

Mr. TALCOTT. There was a considerable reduction in strength at Fort Shafter. He is going to supply the reasons for that.

General COOPER. In civilians, yes, sir.

#### MEDICAL DENTAL CLINIC

Mr. TALCOTT. I note that the medical/dental clinic is a low priority project, also. Could you give us the priority figure for this project?

General COOPER. The priority is No. 30.

Mr. TALCOTT. What is the requirement for this project?

General COOPER. The requirement for this project is the fact that the existing clinic is in an old guardhouse. This is located close to Tripler General Hospital. Tripler is already fully occupied. To that extent, we want this clinic at Fort Shafter as a replacement for the existing one we have in the guardhouse.

General Pixley can add to that.

Mr. TALCOTT. Tripler is not fully occupied, is it? It is a hospital used for Vietnam casualties, for one thing.

General COOPER. It is fully occupied insofar as the dental facilities and outpatient facilities. We could put more inpatients in it, that is correct.

Mr. TALCOTT. Will this be affected by the reduction in the size of the division at Schofield Barracks? Would that reduce the medical workload at Tripler Hospital?

General COOPER. No, sir. I do not believe the premise in your question is correct.

Mr. TALCOTT. There will be a reduction in the size of the division at Schofield Barracks.

General COOPER. At one stage of the game, someone did contemplate perhaps a full division, but the planning basis we are using now is on the basis of those 2 brigades being brought up to full strength and using the reserve component as the roundout brigade. You may be going back a little further in time. The answer to your question is, no, it won't be affected.

Mr. TALCOTT. Does that make a division?

General COOPER. The roundout brigade makes a division; yes, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. So, there will be no reduction in the size of the division at Schofield Barracks?

General COOPER. That is correct.

#### POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Mr. TALCOTT. We will turn to pollution abatement.

## POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROJECTS AT WEAK INSTALLATIONS

Have you carefully screened the fiscal year 1974 pollution abatement items to remove those at installations which may be closed? There are a lot of these facilities planned everywhere. Now we are closing some bases and there are prospects of further closures. We think this may reduce your requirements for pollution abatement facilities. Is that correct?

General COOPER. That is correct. There is only one in that list that I would consider as having a significant possibility of being closed as a result of our current studies, and that is Pueblo.

Mr. TALCOTT. Is there some way you can keep the committee apprised of changes in this?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. I promised earlier to keep the committee advised.

## AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

Mr. TALCOTT. Air pollution abatement facilities.  
Insert pages 247 through 250 in the record.  
[The pages follow:]

1. DATE 2 Apr 73		2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION Various		3. INSTALLATION Various															
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU				5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER		6. STATE/COUNTRY United States															
7. STATUS				8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY		9. COUNTY (U.S.)															
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL									
				OFFICER (1)		ENLISTED (2)		CIVILIAN (3)		OFFICER (4)		ENLISTED (5)		OFFICER (6)		ENLISTED (7)		CIVILIAN (8)		TOTAL (9)	
				a. AS OF _____																	
				b. PLANNED (End FY )																	
				13. INVENTORY																	
				LAND				ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)				IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)				TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
				a. OWNED																	
				b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS																	
				c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 _____																	
				d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY																	
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM													7,295								
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS																					
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)																					
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS																					
PROJECT DESIGNATION																					
CATEGORY CODE NO.		PROJECT TITLE				TENANT COMMAND		UNIT OF MEASURE		AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM			FUNDING PROGRAM								
a		b				c		d		SCOPE e			ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f		SCOPE g			ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h			
		Priority No.				Page No.															
800		Air Pollution Abatement Facilities											7,295					7,295			



1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
2 Apr 1973	1974		ARMY	Various - United States,
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
B971-Various		Air Pollution Abatement Facilities		
<u>DETAILED BREAKOUT</u>				
	<u>Station</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>(\$000) Cost</u>	<u>REQUIREMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF WORK</u>
<u>Alaska</u>	Fort Wainwright	Stack Emission Controls	3,227	Existing south post coal-fired plant emits particulates in excess of Federal and state air pollution control regulations. This project will provide particulate removal systems to control emissions, and smoke detection and recording devices.
<u>Colorado</u>	Pueblo Army Depot	Stack Emission Controls	395	Existing coal-fired plant emits particulates in excess of that permitted by Federal and state air pollution control regulations. This project will replace existing stacks and provide wet scrubbers and/or electrostatic precipitators for the removal of particulates to meet the controlling criteria.
<u>Louisiana</u>	Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant	Explosives Incinerator	350	Explosive wastes are currently disposed of by open burning in violation of pollution control regulations. This project will provide an incinerator with the required air pollution control devices to comply with the applicable Federal and state regulations.
<u>Tennessee</u>	Holston Army Ammunition Plant	Incinerators - Explosive Wastes	730	Project will provide two incinerators, one for explosive wastes and one for explosive contaminated wastes, with the necessary air and water pollution control devices to satisfy Federal and state criteria. Present method of disposal is by open burning in violation of air pollution control regulations.
<u>Texas</u>	Loughorn Army Ammunition Plant	Incinerator - Contaminated Waste	800	Proposed incinerator with air and water pollution control devices is required to comply with Federal and state air pollution control regulations. Present method of disposal is by open burning which is prohibited.

814

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	3. DEPARTMENT		4. INSTALLATION												
1 Feb 1973	1974	ARMY		Various - United States												
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE														
B971-Various		Air Pollution Abatement Facilities														
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Station</u></th> <th><u>Description</u></th> <th><u>(\$000) Cost</u></th> <th><u>REQUIREMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF WORK</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Virginia</u> Radford Army Ammunition Plant</td> <td>Incinerator - Contaminated Waste</td> <td>730</td> <td>Project will provide an incinerator with pollution control devices to replace present method of disposal by open burning which is in violation of Federal and state air pollution control regulations.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>United States</u> Various Locations</td> <td>Air Pollution Monitoring Stations</td> <td>1,063</td> <td>This project is required to provide air pollution monitoring stations at various installations to ensure that emissions from ammunition production facilities and other installations are maintained within the limits prescribed by Federal and state air pollution control regulations. Pollutants to be monitored include: particulate matter, sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides, hydrocarbons, oxidants and carbon monoxide. Monitoring systems will vary in scope depending upon the constituents of the emissions at each installation.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					<u>Station</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>(\$000) Cost</u>	<u>REQUIREMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF WORK</u>	<u>Virginia</u> Radford Army Ammunition Plant	Incinerator - Contaminated Waste	730	Project will provide an incinerator with pollution control devices to replace present method of disposal by open burning which is in violation of Federal and state air pollution control regulations.	<u>United States</u> Various Locations	Air Pollution Monitoring Stations	1,063	This project is required to provide air pollution monitoring stations at various installations to ensure that emissions from ammunition production facilities and other installations are maintained within the limits prescribed by Federal and state air pollution control regulations. Pollutants to be monitored include: particulate matter, sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides, hydrocarbons, oxidants and carbon monoxide. Monitoring systems will vary in scope depending upon the constituents of the emissions at each installation.
<u>Station</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>(\$000) Cost</u>	<u>REQUIREMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF WORK</u>													
<u>Virginia</u> Radford Army Ammunition Plant	Incinerator - Contaminated Waste	730	Project will provide an incinerator with pollution control devices to replace present method of disposal by open burning which is in violation of Federal and state air pollution control regulations.													
<u>United States</u> Various Locations	Air Pollution Monitoring Stations	1,063	This project is required to provide air pollution monitoring stations at various installations to ensure that emissions from ammunition production facilities and other installations are maintained within the limits prescribed by Federal and state air pollution control regulations. Pollutants to be monitored include: particulate matter, sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides, hydrocarbons, oxidants and carbon monoxide. Monitoring systems will vary in scope depending upon the constituents of the emissions at each installation.													

## AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES, VARIOUS U.S.—\$7,295,000

The program provides for air pollution control and abatement measures at various installations in the United States to effect compliance with pollution control regulations.

*Status of funds*

	<i>Thousands of dollars</i>
Funded program not in inventory.....	
Unobligated projects, March 31, 1973 (actual).....	36, 106
Unobligated projects, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	35, 012

*Design information*

Project No.....	74
Project.....	Air pollution abatement facilities
Design cost (thousands).....	438
Percent complete, April 30, 1973.....	0

## STATUS OF PRIOR PROGRAMS

Mr. TALCOTT. Are there projects in prior-year programs which are still pending because of the changes in criteria, lack of agreement with communities, reduction or closure of installations, or new rules of EPA or NOAA or any other city or Federal regulations? We have to keep up with a lot of facets of this, or you have to do it for us.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

The criteria do change, particularly the State criteria.

Mr. TALCOTT. Will it reduce or increase your budget request?

General COOPER. No, sir. We do not know of any specific reductions which would have eliminated them. There probably will be changes that come along later which may add requirements. The trend clearly has been to have increasingly higher requirements.

What the energy crisis does to that trend for higher requirements is entirely another subject.

Mr. TALCOTT. In case you find one where the project will not be necessary because of a base closure, will you let us know?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

## FUEL

Mr. TALCOTT. What effect will the reduction in availability of fuels such as natural gas or oil have on your program?

General COOPER. That would tend to do two things: One, in some places where you might want to continue to use coal, as at Fort Wainwright now, for example, where we are spending \$3 million for stack emission controls because we are continuing to use coal. If you had sufficient oil available, not that Alaska does not have sufficient oil potential in the area, you might want to convert to oil rather than continue to use coal.

Mr. SIKES. The trend may be in the other direction. We do have great resources of coal in this country which are not being utilized. Oil apparently will become a scarcer and scarcer item. We have been converting from coal to oil. Now we may be forced to move in the other direction.

Has the Army given any thought to this? Have you any tentative plans in this direction? Or are you waiting for the situation to worsen before you do anything?

General COOPER. We have thought about it. I think the Department of the Interior is charged with the overall question of energy and how

best to use the energy. You are right, we have something like 300 years' supply of coal. We are considering that specifically at Fort Wainwright.

Mr. SIKES. Are there any conversions in this budget from coal to oil?

General COOPER. Not that I know of.

Mr. SIKES. Not in this budget?

General COOPER. No, sir. There are some places where there is a small amount of oil, it might be preferable to convert to oil.

But even the large powerplants, for example, Consolidated Edison has converted all its powerplants from coal to oil for environmental reasons and we may have to convert back. Those are very large users. If you have an isolated site, you really probably are better off in terms of the people who operate it to convert to oil.

Mr. SIKES. What will the situation be on air pollution if you change from oil back to coal?

General COOPER. In many cases, we will have to add scrubbers to take out pollutants. We may have to add more expensive air pollution control devices. In some cases we have designed emission controls assuming the use of No. 6 fuel oil.

I think the only short-term prospect is that air quality standards are going to be inevitably violated.

Mr. TALCOTT. One of the problems will be the rationing of fuel. I do not know what priority the Defense Department have over the farmer, but I know the farmer is at the bottom of every totem pole there is, and he will be rationed. What effect will rationing have on the military?

General COOPER. I think for nonmission essential or personal use the military may well have his gas or fuel rationed. The Defense Supply Agency, the military procurement agent for fuel, is having a difficult time getting contracts for the military. We do not yet have any specific rationing scheme.

For the nonoperational aspect, I would expect the military in terms of the heating of barracks, homes, and administrative spaces, we would end up in the same category or at the same level as the rest of the United States.

Mr. SIKES. Before you leave that, on power and fuel in Germany, what is the status of the changeover from coal to oil?

General COOPER. It is suspended, sir, in accordance with the discussions with Mr. Flood and you as of last year.

For the record, if I might say, sir, we still think the conversion is desirable.

#### WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

Mr. TALCOTT. We will insert pages 252 to 258 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

1. DATE 2 Apr 1973		2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM Various											
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER		6. STATE/COUNTRY United States										
7. STATUS		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY		9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY										
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL			
				OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)	(9)		
				a. AS OF _____											
				b. PLANNED (End FY ) _____											
				13. INVENTORY											
				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
				a. OWNED											
				b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS											
				c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 _____											
				d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY											
				e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM											
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS															
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)															
6,799															
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
PROJECT DESIGNATION															
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b				Page No. c	TENANT COMMAND e	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM					
					PRIORITY			SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE h	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) i				
841	74.1 - Water Pollution Abatement Facilities  <u>PRIOR AUTHORIZATION</u> PL 90-110 (FY 1968)				1	253			6,799		6,799				
831	232.1 - Sewage Treatment Facility, Fort Richardson, Alaska (DEF)				1				_____		300				
	Totals								6,799		7,099				



1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)		3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
1 Feb 1973	1974			ARMY	Various - United States
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE			
B972-Various		Water Pollution Abatement Facilities			
<u>DETAILED BREAKOUT</u>					
<u>Station</u>		<u>Description</u>	<u>(\$000) Cost</u>	<u>REQUIREMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF WORK</u>	
<u>Alabama</u>					
Anniston Army Depot		Industrial Waste Treatment Facility	2,229	This project is required to provide for adequate treatment of liquid industrial wastes and sanitary sewage generated at this depot. These wastes are presently discharged, without proper treatment, into streams and creeks that ultimately flow into the Coosa River. This practice is in violation of Federal and state water pollution control regulations and remedial action must be provided.	
<u>Georgia</u>					
Military Ocean Terminal, Kings Bay		Sewage Disposal Facility	175	This project will provide adequate sewage treatment facilities for the wharf area of this terminal. Untreated domestic sewage from the wharf area is now being discharged into Kings Bay in violation of Federal and state water pollution control regulations.	
<u>Kansas</u>					
Fort Leavenworth		Water Plant Waste Treatment	178	This project is required to provide treatment facilities for water treatment plant backwash water and sludges that are now discharged untreated into a tributary of the Missouri River.	
<u>Louisiana</u>					
Fort Polk		Wash Racks w/Grease and Sedimentation Traps	262	The effluent from existing wash racks, containing oil, grease and the sediment caused by dirt washed from vehicles, is now discharged into streams and creeks on this installation in violation of water pollution control regulations. This project will provide new wash racks complete with oil and sediment traps to prevent this pollution and comply with the Federal and state regulations. The original wash racks were constructed during World War II and have deteriorated to the extent that the installation of traps in them is not economically feasible.	

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	3. DEPARTMENT		4. INSTALLATION
1 Feb 1973	1974	ARMY		Various - United States
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
B972-Various		Water Pollution Abatement Facilities		
<u>Station</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>(\$000) Cost</u>	<u>REQUIREMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF WORK</u>	
<u>Louisiana</u> Fort Polk	Latrines for Ranges	455	Existing range latrines are of the unlined open trench type and seepage from the waste deposited in them pollutes the ground waters in violation of Federal and state regulations. This project will provide concrete pit type latrines from which wastes will be pumped periodically and transported to the post sewage treatment plant for proper disposal.	
<u>United States</u> Various Locations	Water Quality Surveillance Equipment	3,500	This project is required to provide water quality monitoring equipment at various installations to ensure that the quality of effluents from waste treatment facilities is maintained within the limits prescribed by Federal and state water pollution control regulations. Effluent properties to be monitored will vary, but may include determination of dissolved oxygen content, residual chlorine content, temperature, conductivity, nitrate and/or sulfate concentrations, acidity (or alkalinity), and may include provisions for automatic samplings for use in tests to determine Biochemical Oxygen Demand, Chemical Oxygen Demand, suspended solids content, and bacteriological analyses.	

1 DATE 1 Feb 1973		2 FISCAL YEAR Deficiency 1974		3 DEPARTMENT ARMY			4 INSTALLATION Fort Richardson								
5 DEFICIENCY AUTHORIZATION \$ 300,000			6 PRIOR AUTHORIZATION \$1,800,000 P.L. 90-110		7 CATEGORY CODE NUMBER 831		8 PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 23396A		9 STATE/COUNTRY Alaska						
10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION \$ 300,000				11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER 6100		12. PROJECT NUMBER B902-232.010		13. PROJECT TITLE Sewage Treatment Facility							
SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT					SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES										
14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION		18. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY				20. PRIMARY FACILITY		U/M QUANTITY UNIT COST COST (\$000)							
a. PERMANENT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		a. NO. OF BLDGS		b. NO. OF STORIES		c. LENGTH		d. WIDTH		NA	Sewage Treatment Facility				\$ 2,100
b. SEMI-PERMANENT		e. DESIGN CAPACITY		f. GROSS AREA		g. COST / SF									
c. TEMPORARY		g. COOLING		CAP		COST / SF									
15. TYPE OF WORK		19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE				21. SUPPORTING FACILITIES									
a. NEW FACILITY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Modify existing sewage collection facilities and construct sewer main to connect to area sewage disposal system. Participate in, on a pro-rata basis, the construction of an area-wide sewage treatment and disposal system with the Greater Anchorage Area Borough (GAAB). Off-post construction to be executed by GAAB.				a.						\$			
b. ADDITION						b.									
c. ALTERATION						c.									
d. CONVERSION						d.									
e. OTHER (Specify)						e.									
16. REPLACEMENT								f.							
17. TYPE OF DESIGN								g.							
a. STANDARD DESIGN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								h.							
b. SPECIAL DESIGN								i.							
c. DRAWING NO								j.							
								22. TOTAL PROJECT COST						\$ 2,100	
SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT					25. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT										
23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U-M _____) NA					This project was approved in the FY 1968 MGA Program at an estimated cost of \$1,800,000 for construction of a sewage treatment facility and outfall for the proper disposal of sewage generated at Fort Richardson. Subsequently, an agreement was consummated between the Army and the Greater Anchorage Area Borough (GAAB) for joint participation in the construction of a sewage treatment and disposal system to serve the Anchorage Area and Fort Richardson. Under said agreement the Army was obligated to pay GAAB a fixed amount of \$1,020,927 that was estimated to be the Army's pro-rata share of the cost of the off-post portion of the project. Additionally, the Army had to construct on-post facilities, now completed at a cost of \$627,000, in order to connect to the area system. Delays experienced by the GAAB in the award of construction contracts, coupled with spiraling construction costs, have resulted in a substantial increase in the cost of the area system. Because of the cost increase, the GAAB has requested that the Army provide additional funds, on a pro-rata share basis, to cover the cost overruns. As indicated above, the agreement between the Army and GAAB was based on a fixed amount for the construction. The Army feels that the additional payment requested is fair and equitable in view of the unanticipated cost increases, but cannot legally assist the GAAB without additional implementing legislation. This project requests additional authorization and funding in the amount of \$300,000 to permit the Army to modify the existing agreement and pay its pro-rata share of the increased cost of the area system.										
a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT															
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD															
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE															
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY															
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (c + d)															
					AUTHORIZED		FUNDED								
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION															
g. INCLUDED IN FY _____ PROGRAM															
h. DEFICIENCY (e - g - f - g)															
24 RELATED PROJECTS None															

## WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES, VARIOUS U.S.—\$7,099,000

The program provides for water pollution control and abatement measures at various installations in the United States to effect compliance with pollution control regulations. It also includes deficiency funding for sewage treatment at Fort Richardson, Alaska, authorized by Public Law 90-110.

*Status of funds*

	<i>Thousands of dollars</i>
Funded program not in inventory.....	
Unobligated projects, Mar. 31, 1973 (actual).....	61, 546
Unobligated projects, June 30, 1973 (estimated).....	60, 336

## DESIGN INFORMATION

Project No.	Project	Design cost (thousands)	Percent complete Apr. 30, 1973
232.....	Richardson sewage treatment (DEF) Public Law 90-110.....		100
74.....	Water pollution abatement facilities.....	408	28

Mr. TALCOTT. Provide for the record the details and reasons for the cost increases in the project at Fort Richardson.

[The information follows:]

By a utility service contract in September of 1969, the Department of the Army agreed to contribute \$1,020,927 to the Greater Anchorage Area Borough (GAAB) as the Army's fair share costs for construction of facilities to transport and treat sewage from Fort Richardson. Additionally, the Army had to construct onpost facilities, now completed, at a cost of \$627,000 in order to tie into the GAAB system.

Construction cost escalations resulted in substantial cost overruns on the borough's projects for sewers and treatment plant. Because of this, the GAAB has requested all participants in this areawide pollution cleanup system to contribute additional funds on a pro rata share basis to cover the construction cost overruns.

The additional amount requested is considered fair and equitable in view of the unanticipated cost increases, but the Army cannot legally assist the GAAB without additional authorization and funding that will permit the Army to modify the existing agreement and pay its share of the increased cost of the area system.

Costs involved are as shown in the following tabulation :

	<i>Thousands of dollars</i>
Government's pro rata share (GAAB contract).....	1, 021
Government negotiating expenses.....	13
Cost of Government onpost project required.....	627
Government's pro rata share of GAAB costs.....	439
Overrun and related Government costs subtotal.....	2, 100
Prior authorization ; fiscal year 1968 MCA.....	1, 800
Deficiency request.....	300

## U.S. ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Mr. TALCOTT. We go to the U.S. Army Forces, Southern Command. Insert page 259 in the record.

[The page follows:]

U.S. Army Forces, Southern Command Canal Zone, various locations :

Prior authorization.....	
Proposed authorization.....	\$8, 095, 000
Proposed funding.....	8, 095, 000

Mr. TALCOTT. Why is it necessary to have a separate command for this area?

General COOPER. That is really within the province of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The main reason is that this is the only command that we have close to all of South America. We are often accused of ignoring our South American neighbors. One of the main purposes of this command is to monitor the various missions and groups of military people in Latin America and South America.

Mr. SIKES. How many troops does the commander command?

General COOPER. Very few, sir. I do not have the specific numbers, but I would guess it is less than 10,000.

Mr. TALCOTT. Will you supply that for the record?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

The command has a strength of approximately 8,000 military personnel.

Mr. TALCOTT. Maybe you would want to state generally what the function of those troops is.

General COOPER. The troops under the command of the United States Forces, Southern Command, are primarily for the defense of Panama. There are not any significant number of American troops in Latin and South America, other than people with the missions.

#### PANAMA AREA, CANAL ZONE

Mr. TALCOTT. Let us go to Panama area, Canal Zone.

Insert page 260 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 2 Apr 1973	2. DEPARTMENT ARMY	3. INSTALLATION Panama Area								
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU US Army Forces Southern Command		5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY Canal Zone							
7. STATUS Active	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Training assigned military units, ground and anti-aircraft defense of the Panama Canal, training individuals for deployment in other overseas areas.		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 _____								
		b. PLANNED (End FY ) _____								
		13. INVENTORY								
		LAND		ACRES (1)	LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)	
		a. OWNED								
		b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS								
		c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 _____								
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY							25,430			
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM							8,095			
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS							4,806			
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)										
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS										
PROJECT DESIGNATION				TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM		
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b			c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h	
		<b>PRIORITY</b>	Page No. No.							
721	Panama Area 16 - Barracks Modernization		1 261		MN	1,439	7,820	1,439	7,820	
111	Fort Sherman Army Reservation 7 - Upgrade Airfield		1 262				275		275	
			Total				8,095		8,095	

PANAMA AREA, CANAL ZONE

\$8,095,000

The Army installations in the Canal Zone are located at the Pacific and Atlantic entrances to the Panama Canal. The mission of these installations is to train military units and provide ground and air defense of the Panama Canal. The program consists of modernization of barracks and improvements to the Fort Sherman Army Airfield.

## Status of Funds

	(\$000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	25,430
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	8,129
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	0

## Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
16	Barracks Modernization	350	20
7	Upgrade Sherman AAF	20	0

## ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, PANAMA AREA, CANAL ZONE

	<u>MEN*</u>
Total Requirement	3,296
Existing Substandard	6,351**
Existing Adequate	0
Funded, Not in Inventory	1,299
Adequate Assets	1,299
Deficiency	1,997
FY 1974 Program	1,439
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Mar 73	3,404

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

\*\* Includes 6,259 spaces that can be made adequate

Mr. TALCOTT. Provide for the record the missions and the details on the barracks requirements for each of the installations for which you are requesting barracks modernization.

General COOPER. Yes, sir, for Fort Clayton, Fort Kobbe, and Fort Gulick.

[The information follows:]

Fort Clayton provides administrative and logistical support for the Pacific Area Installation Command, USSOCOM; U.S. Army Tropic Test Center; USA Medical Department activity; special mission TOE units; and various other military and nonmilitary activities and agencies.

There is a requirement for 1,600 barracks spaces. While there are no existing adequate spaces at Fort Clayton, there are 2,223 permanent spaces that can be made adequate by modernization. Eight hundred five of these spaces were included in the fiscal year 1973 program and 488 are planned in the fiscal year 1974 program, leaving a future requirement for modernization of 307 spaces.

Fort Kobbe trains and supports special mission forces engaged in defense of the Panama Canal.

There is a requirement for 724 barracks spaces. There are no existing adequate spaces at Fort Kobbe; however, there are 1,017 permanent spaces that can be made adequate by modernization. Seven hundred twenty-four spaces are included in the fiscal year 1974 program.

Fort Gulick provides administrative and logistical support for U.S. School of the Americas; USA Medical Department activity; Audio-Visual Support Center; special mission forces, ROTC units, and other activities.

There is a requirement for 565 barracks spaces. There are no existing adequate spaces at Fort Gulick; however, there are 1,107 permanent spaces that can be made adequate by modernization. Two hundred twenty-seven spaces are included in the fiscal year 1974 program, leaving a future requirement for modernization of 338 spaces.

Mr. TALCOTT. Will this complete the barracks requirements in the Canal Zone?

General COOPER. No, sir, it will not. We will still have a deficit of 500.

Mr. TALCOTT. What percentage is that?

General COOPER. We will have about 68 percent, or two-thirds of the requirement.

Mr. TALCOTT. These will all not only be completed, but will meet the standards and requirements for air-conditioning?

General COOPER. That is right. That 68 percent is for fully adequate barracks space.

#### U.S. ARMY, PACIFIC

Mr. TALCOTT. Turn to U.S. Army, Pacific.

Please insert in the record page 263.

[The page follows:]

#### *Installation summary--U.S. Army, Pacific*

Korea, various locations:

Prior authorization	-----	
Proposed authorization	-----	\$1, 568, 000
Proposed funding	-----	1, 568, 000

#### KOREA

Mr. TALCOTT. On Korea, insert page 264 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 1 Feb 1973		2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		3. INSTALLATION Korea - Various						
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU United States Army, Pacific			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER		6. STATE/COUNTRY Korea							
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY		9. COUNTY (U.S.)		10. NEAREST CITY						
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS To carry out the responsibility of the United Nations Command; U.S. Forces, Korea and the Eighth U.S. Army				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 _____												
b. PLANNED (End FY _____)												
13. INVENTORY												
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)				
a. OWNED												
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS												
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 _____										32,886		
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY										1,568		
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM										31,273		
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS										31,273		
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)												
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			SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h			
111	534 - ALOC Airfield (Vicinity of Andong)	1	265		SY	49,221	675	49,221	675			
126	549 - POL Mooring System, Pohang	1	266				893		893			
			Total				1,568		1,568			

828

KOREA VARIOUS

\$1,568,000

The Eighth U.S. Army is located in Korea. Its mission is to support the United Nations Command, to command and support the U.S. Forces, Korea, and units of the Eighth U.S. Army. The program will provide a contingency logistics airfield and a POL mooring system at Pohang.

## Status of Funds

	(\$000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	32,886
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	2,148
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	0

## Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
534	ALOC Airfield	32	5
549	POL Mooring System Pohang	53	5

## SCHOOL SITUATION IN KOREA

Mr. TALCOTT. What is the school situation in Korea, particularly with regard to the unauthorized dependents?

General COOPER. The last I heard specifically was that we were not authorized by the Office of the Secretary of Defense to pay for the schooling of the unauthorized dependents.

The answer to your question is that I would consider the situation is bad, based on what I knew about a month ago. We are not authorized to pay for schooling for unauthorized or noncommand-sponsored dependents in Korea.

Mr. TALCOTT. But they have a way of working together and providing independent classrooms so the children are not going uneducated, right?

General COOPER. It is very difficult. It is a very serious problem as far as we are concerned.

Mr. TALCOTT. What is the Army's responsibility for making sure that unauthorized children who accompany servicemen are educated?

General COOPER. We think it is very serious, and we are trying to get the policy changed, but for reasons—

Mr. TALCOTT. There needs to be a change in rules and regulations, rather than building or constructing more classrooms or anything of this sort?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. I do not really know the details of the classrooms. We are not allowed to use even existing facilities to provide schooling, unless the soldiers pay the bill.

Mr. TALCOTT. Do you provide adequate educational facilities for authorized personnel and dependents?

General COOPER. Yes, if they cannot be provided in the community.

Mr. TALCOTT. We have information that some Army dependents are going uneducated, and that is a sad situation.

General COOPER. We agree.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask a question?

What has the Army attempted to do to cope with this? Have you asked for legislation to insure the education of those children, or have you done anything?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. We have appealed to the Office of the Secretary of Defense to change their position. As far as I know, it is not specifically a question of legislation. There is nothing in the legislation or in the law that says we cannot do this. It is a matter of policy.

Mr. SIKES. How many children are affected?

General COOPER. I do not have the exact number, sir. I will provide that for the record.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to know how many, and in what grades.

Mr. TALCOTT. It probably will be hard to get the information, because these are unauthorized and they do not report in.

[The information follows:]

(a) In April 1973, the number of non-command-sponsored DOD dependents in the DOD schools in Korea was as follows: Total 172.

K—25	4—18	8—9	12—0
1—27	5—11	9—2	
2—32	6—9	10—7	
3—21	7—11	11—0	

(b) In April 1973, 78 non-command-sponsored DOD dependents were attending private schools. Additionally, the advent of rental guarantee housing (370 family units) and the increasing number of personnel on the key-position list may increase the number of non-command-sponsored dependents in Korea to approximately 500 for the 1973-74 school year. Based on the above grade strengths, it is estimated that 415 students (85 percent) will be grades K through 6, and 85 students (17 percent) in grades 7 through 12.

General COOPER. We have a pretty good idea.

The basic philosophy of the Office of the Secretary of Defense is to try to discourage unauthorized dependents from accompanying their husbands.

Mr. SIKES. It does not work.

Mr. TALCOTT. It will work less and less.

Mr. SIKES. It certainly will work less and less. Do you have any information as to how many unauthorized dependents there are, whether or not they are of school age?

Mr. KEENAN. These children number approximately 25 percent of the total school enrollment, and cannot be accommodated in the dependents' school unless additional teachers can be employed.

Mr. SIKES. Does that mean they are not in school, or some of them are in and some are not?

Mr. KEENAN. The decision has been made that they may be admitted on a tuition basis. For grades 1 through 12 the tuition is \$1,038 per year. Kindergarten tuition is \$519 per year.

General COOPER. Initially, we did educate these at no cost, just as we did for any authorized dependent, but the decision was made a few years ago—and I do not have all the details—to change this.

Mr. SIKES. Who are the unauthorized dependents?

General COOPER. They are children of a soldier sent there on a hardship tour, for example, where dependents are not authorized for lack of adequate facilities or for other reasons, but his wife decided she did not want to be separated from him for 13 months since she had already spent 2 years separated from him during Vietnam. He can pay to have his wife and children go to Korea, but then they are there as a nonsponsored family and, as such, schooling is not authorized.

#### SUPPORT SERVICES FOR DEPENDENTS OVERSEAS

Mr. SIKES. Does she and the children have all other benefits that normally would accrue to them, like medical care, commissary, and PX? Do they get those, but do not get schooling? Is that the difference?

General COOPER. It varies from location to location. I do not remember the details for Korea. Normally, they would certainly be provided emergency medical care, but the command often would not provide them with PX and commissary privileges as if they were sponsored.

Mr. SIKES. I think we would like to have specific information on what is allowed at the various posts where this type of thing occurs. We need to get more information on it than we have. I do not believe in treating them like second-class citizens just because they want to be with their husbands and fathers. You have discussed Korea. What is the situation in the Canal Zone? I would like a breakdown, world-wide, but let us talk about the Canal Zone. What is the situation in the Canal Zone?

[The information follows:]

## SUPPORT SERVICES FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS OVERSEAS

CLEARED  
FOR OPEN PUBLICATION

## DEPENDENT SCHOOLS

JUL 12 1973

DIRECTORATE FOR SECURITY REVIEW  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

## 1. Korea:

a. Authorized Dependents: Entitled to space-required, tuition-free education, grades kindergarten through twelve.

b. Unauthorized Dependents: Entitled to space-available, tuition-free education in DOD-operated schools, grades kindergarten through twelve. Because of the large number of unauthorized dependents and the limited facilities, space is not available in Korea to accommodate all space-available students. Therefore, Air Force with OSD concurrence authorized attendance on a space-available, tuition-paying basis, with top priority for enrollment within this category.

## 2. Germany, Italy, Belgium and Turkey:

a. Authorized Dependents Entitled to space-required, tuition-free education, grades kindergarten through twelve.

b. Unauthorized Dependents - Entitled to space-available, tuition-free education in DOD schools, grades kindergarten through twelve. Because of wide dispersion of unauthorized dependents in these countries and the large number of schools, space is available for the unauthorized dependents.

## 3. Thailand:

a. Authorized Dependents - Entitled to free tuition at a tuition-fee school under contract, grades kindergarten through twelve. No DOD schools are currently operated in Thailand.

b. Unauthorized Dependents Not entitled to free tuition as PCS to Thailand must be at Government expense per DOD Instruction 1342.10 in order to be entitled to schooling at Government expense.

## 4. Japan:

a. Authorized Dependents Entitled to space-required, tuition-free education, grades kindergarten through twelve.

b. Unauthorized Dependents Entitled to space-available, tuition-free education in DOD schools, grades kindergarten through twelve. Because of the small number of unauthorized dependents, space is available for them.

## 5. Canal Zone

a. Authorized Dependents Entitled to space-required, tuition-free education, grades kindergarten through junior college. The schools are operated by the Canal Zone Government.

b. Unauthorized Dependents - Entitled to space-required, tuition-free education in the Canal Zone schools, grades kindergarten through junior college.

## POST EXCHANGE PRIVILEGES

## 1. Korea, Thailand and Japan:

a. Authorized Dependents - Exchange patronage privileges are extended to the dependents of all uniformed military personnel consistent with inter-national agreements between the US and the host country.

b. Unauthorized Dependents Granted exchange patronage privileges equal to authorized dependents. Dependents not accompanied by their sponsors for periods exceeding thirty (30) days, generally are not eligible to patronize exchange

facilities.

2. Germany, Italy, Belgium and Turkey:

a. Authorized Dependents - Exchange patronage privileges are extended to the dependents of all uniformed military personnel consistent with international agreements between the US and the host countries.

b. Unauthorized Dependents - Granted exchange patronage privileges equal to authorized dependents. Dependents generally lose their patronage privileges after the following time periods subsequent to departure of the sponsor from assignment in the host country:

(1) Germany - 90 days

(2) Italy - 90 days

(3) Belgium - 60 days

(4) Turkey - a reasonable period, however, no agreement exists with the Turkish authorities to allow dependents to have exchange privileges after departure of the sponsor.

3. Canal Zone:

a. Authorized Dependents - Exchange patronage privileges are extended to the dependents of all uniformed military personnel consistent with international agreements between the US and the host country.

b. Unauthorized Dependents - Granted exchange patronage privileges equal to authorized dependents. Dependents not accompanied by their sponsors for periods exceeding thirty (30) days, generally are not eligible to patronize post exchange facilities.

COMMISSARY PRIVILEGES

1. Japan, Korea and Thailand:

a. Authorized Dependents - Commissary store agent privileges are extended dependents of uniformed military personnel consistent with international agreements between the US and the host country.

b. Unauthorized Dependents - Granted commissary patronage privileges equal to authorized dependents. Dependents not accompanied by their sponsors for periods exceeding thirty (30) days, generally are not eligible to purchase in commissary stores as agents for the sponsor.

2. Germany, Italy, Belgium and Turkey:

a. Authorized Dependents - Commissary store agent privileges are extended to the dependents of all uniformed military personnel consistent with international agreements between the US and the host countries.

b. Unauthorized Dependents - Granted commissary patronage privileges equal to authorized dependents. Dependents generally lose their patronage privileges after the following time periods subsequent to departure of the sponsor from assignment in the host country:

(1) Germany - 90 days

(2) Italy - 90 days

(3) Belgium - 60 days

(4) Turkey - a reasonable time; however, no agreement exists with the Turkish authorities to allow dependents to have commissary store agent privileges after departure of the sponsor.

### 3. Canal Zone:

a. Authorized Dependents - Commissary store patronage privileges are extended to all uniformed military personnel who in turn may designate two of their legal dependents as agents to purchase in his/her behalf, provided such dependents are at least 15 years of age.

b. Unauthorized Dependents Granted commissary patronage privileges equal to authorized dependents. Dependents not accompanied by their sponsors for periods exceeding thirty (30) days, generally are not eligible to patronize the commissary store.

### MEDICAL SUPPORT

1. Para 7a(2), AR 55-40 provides that commanders outside CONUS cannot deny medical service as provided by law to military dependents solely on the basis of an "individual sponsored" status where these facilities are available to "command sponsored" dependents.

2. Title 10 United States Code, Section 102, defines dependents who are eligible for medical care. Title 10 United States Code, Section 1076, authorizes care to dependents in uniformed services facilities, subject to the availability of space and facilities and the capabilities of the medical and dental staff.

3. The determination as to availability of services for dependents is made by the commander of the medical treatment facility, and is based upon existing circumstances at the time the patient reports for treatment. When care is not available locally to dependents (regardless of command sponsorship) such patients are evacuated to the closest facility capable of providing the required treatment.

General COOPER. I do not know of any particular problem with schooling of dependents in the Canal Zone.

Mr. TALCOTT. That is not unauthorized duty, is it?

General COOPER. There are very few people in the Canal Zone. They are all authorized to bring their dependents.

We do have a separate problem; namely, that a lot of the quarters in the Canal Zone are now occupied by civil servants. During the period of Vietnam, the military population went down and the command permitted civil servants to move into the family quarters. They were authorized to bring their dependents.

Mr. SIKES. Now you cannot get them out? They are homesteading?

General COOPER. They are homesteading, sir, and we are taking steps to try to get the workers out after they have been in a certain length of time so we can get the military people back in.

Mr. SIKES. There is not a school problem in the Canal Zone?

General COOPER. Not that I know of, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Is Korea the worst of the school problems?

General COOPER. Korea is the worst. We have separate school problems in Germany, which involve facilities, but Korea is the one place where we think we have people who should be educated but we cannot because we cannot pay for the teachers.

#### REQUIREMENTS FOR UNAUTHORIZED DEPENDENTS EDUCATION OVERSEAS

Mr. SIKES. I would like to know what you require in order to educate these children—in the way of facilities, teachers, et cetera. Will you provide that for the record, specifically for Korea, but also for other areas?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I am talking primarily about the unauthorized types. [The information follows:]

Requirements to support the education of unauthorized dependents overseas:

(a) Korea. The Department of the Air Force will be able to finance the operational costs such as teacher salaries and school supplies associated with educating the estimated 500 non-command-sponsored children anticipated for school year 1973-74 (fiscal year 1974). If there is no appreciable increase in the estimated number of children, present school facilities in Korea can accommodate all non-command-sponsored dependents during fiscal year 1974. In view of reduced air fares and improved living conditions for dependents living on the economy, the number of non-command-sponsored dependents in Korea, could increase substantially by fiscal year 1975. If this should occur, additional school facilities would be required, or it might be necessary to place some grades on a double-session basis. Requirements for additional school facilities will be addressed when data relative to the specific number of additional dependent children is available.

(b) Other areas. Because of the relatively small number of non-command-sponsored dependents in overseas areas other than Korea, they are absorbed into the existing school systems on a space-available, tuition-free basis. Programmed resources are sufficient to support non-command-sponsored dependents throughout the European area and elsewhere. Many of the school facilities at congested locations are overcrowded while others are deficient. Requirements exist beyond the fiscal year 1974 Military construction, Army program for approximately \$25 million in major construction projects for dependents schools at 19 Army installations throughout the European area.

General COOPER. I do not know to what extent in Korea these might also be children where the wife was originally a Korean national.

Mr. TALCOTT. As I understand it, we have the problem wherever

dependents are unauthorized. In Vietnam, very few dependents went there, but in almost every place else in the world, dependents go—Korea, Thailand, Taiwan. Dependents go there, one way or another.

General COOPER. But in Korea, for many years we have had a very large group of hardship tours where the people except those mostly in the higher headquarters assigned there for 2 years, were not authorized to take their dependents.

Mr. TALCOTT. The policy was to discourage dependents from coming.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. If you provided all of the facilities for dependents who came unauthorized, you would just invite them to come.

General COOPER. That is part of the philosophy of not educating these nonsponsored children.

Mr. TALCOTT. I found, not in Korea, but maybe in Thailand, that in one part of Thailand they would be authorized, and maybe in another part of Thailand just a few miles away they would be unauthorized. There would be a boundary line. So, people were moving from one side of that boundary line to another to try to accommodate their personal situation. Maybe the officer would be trying to serve at one base so his children could come when actually he had been assigned to another base.

General COOPER. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. TALCOTT. I think we have a general problem which may not deal too much with military construction, but in getting the regulations more attuned to the times.

General COOPER. It is a problem which is more in the personal area.

Mr. SIKES. It is not specifically our problem, but we have an interest because of the necessity for providing facilities.

General COOPER. Yes, sir. The facilities are definitely a problem in Europe.

#### PUERTO RICO

Mr. TALCOTT. Insert page 267 in the record.

[The page follows:]

#### *Installation summary—Puerto Rico*

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico :

Prior authorization.....	
Proposed authorization.....	\$517, 000
Proposed funding.....	517, 000

#### FORT BUCHANAN, P.R.

Mr. TALCOTT. We go next to Fort Buchanan, P.R.

Insert page 268 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 9 July 1973	2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION Fort Buchanan							
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Third United States Army		5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER PR 327		6. STATE/COUNTRY Puerto Rico						
7. STATUS Inactive		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1928		9. COUNTY (U.S.) San Juan						
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS Provides administrative and logistical support for all active Army and reserve elements and to other services located in Puerto Rico, including community and welfare type services to retired military personnel.	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 1973	77	352	432	13		121	457	268	1720
	b. PLANNED (End FY 78 )	54	186	331	0	0	7	51		629
13. INVENTORY										
LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)		
a. OWNED		883		165		9,228		9,393		
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS								0		
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 1972				72				9,393		
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								0		
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								517		
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS								0		
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)								9,910		
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS										
PROJECT DESIGNATION										
CATEGORY CODE NO.	PROJECT TITLE			TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM		
			Page No.			SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000)	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000)	
721	74 - Barracks Modernization		PRIORITY 1		MN	60	517	60	517	

FORT BUCHANAN, PUERTO RICO

\$517,000

Fort Buchanan is located at San Juan, Puerto Rico. The mission of this installation is to provide administrative and logistical support for all active Army and reserve elements and to other services located in Puerto Rico, including community and welfare type services to retired military personnel. The program provides modernization of barracks.

## 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
74	Barracks Modernization	30	15

## ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, FORT BUCHANAN, PUERTO RICO

	<u>Men*</u>
Total Requirement	68
Existing Substandard	275**
Existing Adequate	8
Funded, Not in Inventory	0
Adequate Assets	8
Deficiency	60
FY 1974 Program	60
Barracks spaces occupied, 9 May 1973	91

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

\*\* Includes 275 spaces that can be made adequate

Mr. TALCOTT. Is this similar to other projects to support regular personnel at Reserve training installations?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

NATIONAL MISSILE RANGE, MARSHALL ISLANDS

Mr. TALCOTT. We go to the National Missile Range, Marshall Islands.

Insert page 271 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE 1 Feb 1973		2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION National Missile Range, Kwajalein								
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU Office, Chief of Research & Development			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER K7408		6. STATE/COUNTRY Marshall Islands							
7. STATUS Active		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY 1947		9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY							
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS National Missile Range coordinates all planning, direction and control of the work and associated resources in all phases of research, development, and logistic support involved in developing an effective system for SAFEGUARD, ABMDA and other Range Users.				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								
				b. PLANNED (End FY )								
				13. INVENTORY								
				LAND		ACRES (1)	LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)	
				a. OWNED (Foreign Rights)		3,564	0		201,180		201,180	
				b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS							0	
				c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19		72					201,180	
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY							83,692					
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM							2,353					
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS							15,274					
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)							302,499					
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS												
PROJECT DESIGNATION												
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b			TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM SCOPE e		FUNDING PROGRAM SCOPE f				
	Page No. g					ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) i				
310	196 - Additional Instrumentation and Technical Support Facilities				SF	2,696	849	2,696	849			
811	198 - Ennylabegan Power Addition				KW	200	475	200	475			
812	199 - Electrical System Feeder Upgrading						1,029		1,029			
	Total						2,353		2,353			

NATIONAL MISSILE RANGE, KWAJALEIN

\$2,353,000

The National Missile Range, Kwajalein is located at Kwajalein Atoll 2100 miles west of Hawaii. The mission of this installation is to support the research, development, and test programs for missile systems for all Services. The installation also supports the programs conducted by NASA. The program consists of additional instrumentation and support facilities, an addition for Ennylabegan power and upgrading the electrical feeder system.

## Status of Funds

(\$000)

Funded Program Not in Inventory	83,692
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	31,961
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	26,600

## Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
196	Add Instrument & Sup Fac	60	22
198	Ennylabegan Power Addn	28	82
199	Electrical Sys Feeder Upgr	55	5

Mr. TALCOTT. I note that these projects have priority numbers ranging from 35 to 49, actually in the bottom 20 percent of this year's request. How urgent are they? May they be deferred a year or so?

General COOPER. We do not think they can be deferred a year or so without affecting the Safeguard testing program.

Mr. TALCOTT. If we proceed with Safeguard testing, we will need these?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. What programs will these projects support? Only Safeguard?

General COOPER. Safeguard. There is also a related research program called ABMDA, Army Ballistic Missile Defense Agency. They also will support to some extent the firings from places like Vandenberg into Kwajalein, where the facilities are used to help out in the design of reentry vehicles and decoys.

Mr. TALCOTT. How often are they really used—once a month or once every 6 months?

General COOPER. I do not know at the moment how often they are used. Based on my experience about 10 years ago there were several missiles a month. I do not know the present numbers.

Mr. TALCOTT. Is it still going on at that rate?

Colonel SELL. I have no data on the number of firings, but they are daily in operation. It is the national missile range to support the Air Force and the Navy, Poseidon missile firings.

General COOPER. What you asked for, we do not have right here—the rate of missile firings.

Mr. TALCOTT. I want you to justify as best you can the budget request. That is what I am trying to do. Provide it for the record.

General COOPER. Yes, sir. I understand that.

[The information follows:]

The primary mission of Kwajalein missile range (KMR) is to collect data in support of strategic offensive missile, ballistic missile and space defense testing. During fiscal year 1973 approximately 50 major missile tests will be conducted; that number will increase to about 60 during fiscal year 1974. These major tests require a total commitment of range resources. Additionally, KMR annually conducts over 500 miscellaneous radar data collection and minor launch operations which exercise various portions of the range facilities. Specifically, the electrical system feeder will be in constant use; the requested instrumentation and support facilities will be in use in about one out of every two major missile tests and the full capability of the Ennylabegan powerplant will be required for every major missile test referred to above.

#### ARMY SECURITY AGENCY [OVERSEAS]

Mr. TALCOTT. Let us go to the Army Security Agency [Overseas]. Insert pages 275 and 276 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

#### *Installation summary—U.S. Army Security Agency (O/S)*

Location 276:	<i>Thousands</i>
Prior authorization.....	
Proposed authorization.....	\$1,434
Proposed funding.....	1,434

1. DATE 1 Feb 1973		2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION Various Locations											
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU United States Army Security Agency			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER		6. STATE/COUNTRY Overseas										
7. STATUS Active			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY		9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY									
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS The US Army Security Agency is a Department of the Army Field Agency engaged in intelligence activities.  * Only includes Loc 276.				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 _____											
				b. PLANNED (End FY _____)											
				13. INVENTORY											
				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
a. OWNED															
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS															
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except Land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 _____															
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY								882*							
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM								1,434							
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS															
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)															
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
PROJECT DESIGNATION															
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b				TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM SCOPE e		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f		FUNDING PROGRAM SCOPE g		ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h		
721	Location 276 127 - EM Barracks w/o Mess				PRIORITY 1	Page No. 277	MN	300		1,434		300	1,434		

U.S. ARMY SECURITY AGENCY, OVERSEAS, LOCATION 276

\$1,434,000

This request is for various overseas locations operated by the U.S. Army Security Agency. The mission of the sites is to engage in communications and intelligence activities. The program provides barracks without dining facilities for enlisted men at one location.

## Status of Funds

	(\$000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	882
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	882
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	882

## Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
127	EM Barracks w/o Mess	70	0

## ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, LOCATION 276, OVERSEAS

	<u>MEN*</u>
Total Requirement	719
Existing Substandard	0
Existing Adequate	403
Funded, Not in Inventory	0
Adequate Assets	403
Deficiency	316
FY 1974 Program	300
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Jun 72	427

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

## U.S. ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND [OVERSEAS]

Mr. TALCOTT. U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command  
[Overseas].

Insert pages 278 and 279 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

*Installation summary—U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command (O/S)*

Various locations:

*Thousands*

Prior authorization	-----	
Proposed authorization	-----	\$2, 097
Proposed funding	-----	2, 097

1. DATE 1 Feb 1973		2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION Various											
4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU United States Army Strategic Communications Command			5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER		6. STATE COUNTRY Various										
7. STATUS		8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY		9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY										
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS The mission of the U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command is to engineer, install, operate, and maintain the Army portion of the Defense Communications System (DCS) and assigned Army communications.				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 _____											
				b. PLANNED (End FY )											
				13. INVENTORY											
				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
				a. OWNED _____											
				b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS _____											
				c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 _____											
				d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY _____											
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM _____										2,097					
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS _____															
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f) _____															
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
PROJECT DESIGNATION															
CATEGORY CODE NO.	PROJECT TITLE			TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM							
a	b	PRIORITY	Page No.	c	d	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) f	SCOPE	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) h						
812	969.031 - Upgrade Power	1	280				2,097		2,097						

U.S. ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND, OVERSEAS

The U. S. Army Strategic Communications Command provides and operates communications facilities world-wide. The program will upgrade power at communications stations located in various overseas sites.

## Status of Funds

(\$000)

Funded Program Not in Inventory	
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	1,412
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	753

## Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
969.031	Upgrade Power	10	14

Mr. TALCOTT. Could you provide the status of the prior-year programs for the record?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

STATUS OF STRATCOM O/S POWER UPGRADE PROJECTS

All prior year STRATCOM O/S Power Upgrade projects have been completed except for the fiscal year 1973 MCA program. The status of those projects is as follows:

Project	Programed amount	Status
Upgrade Power-Breitsol, Germany.....	\$241,000	Scheduled for award July 1973.
Upgrade Power-Munich, Germany.....	117,000	Scheduled for award June 1973.
Upgrade Power-Zwiebrucken, Germany.....	185,000	Scheduled for award July 1973.
Upgrade Power-Teheran, Iran.....	348,000	Scheduled for award September 1973.
Upgrade Power-Savona, Italy.....	116,000	Scheduled for award July 1973.
Upgrade Power-Yongson, Korea.....	276,000	Construction awarded January 1973.
Upgrade Power-Osan, Korea.....	65,000	Construction awarded April 1973.
Upgrade Power-Juzon, Taiwan.....	64,000	Construction awarded January 1973.

Mr. TALCOTT. What is this for? It is a pretty good sized project for upgrading power.

General COOPER. This is to provide improvement to eight Army communications stations within the Defense Communications System, provide replacement of generators, provide additional generators, associated switch gear, and ancillary equipment.

Mr. TALCOTT. Has there been any increase in the program which requires more energy?

General COOPER. For the specific communications link?

Mr. TALCOTT. Are you adding any work which requires adding the generators?

General COOPER. Are we adding any increase in terms of the mission?

Mr. Carton says it is primarily for improved reliability. It is not providing any additional communications. There are some future year requirements in addition to this one, for 1975 and 1976.

Mr. TALCOTT. What is the priority for this project?

General COOPER. Priority No. 1, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. Maybe you would like to expand this a little bit more for the record, then.

General COOPER. Yes, sir, we can add the Army portion of the communications.

Mr. TALCOTT. Is this a multiservice operation? Does this provide power for Navy facilities?

General COOPER. It is all part of the Defense Communications System. This is the Army portion of that.

Mr. TALCOTT. Do the Army's long-range plans call for the retention of all the stations for which funds are requested?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. There are no planned base closures or consolidations here?

General COOPER. No, sir. We expect to need these communications in any case.

Mr. TALCOTT. I am speaking of long-range, not just next year but long range.

General COOPER. Long range. Some of these communications are specifically in Europe. Primarily, this is the main trunk of the communications system, and as such, closing a base here and there would not affect the main trunk.

### U.S. ARMY, EUROPE

Mr. TALCOTT. We go to U.S. Army, Europe.

Insert page 283 in the record. We have already discussed the NATO infrastructure program.

[The page follows:]

#### INSTALLATION SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
U.S. Army, Europe:			
Various, Germany.....		12,517	12,517
Europe various, NATO.....		80,000	60,000
Total.....	0	92,517	72,517

### GERMANY—VARIOUS

Mr. TALCOTT. We will go to Germany—various.

Insert page 284 in the record.

[The page follows:]



GERMANY, VARIOUS

\$12,517,000

This request is for locations operated by the U.S. Army, Europe. The mission of the installations is support of the U.S. Army, Europe. The program includes barracks for enlisted men at Pruem Post and additions to dependent schools at Nuernburg, Fulda, and Wuerzburg. Also included is an elementary school at Baumholder and a middle school at Mannheim.

## Status of Funds

	(\$000)
Funded Program Not in Inventory	13,857
Unobligated Projects, 31 March 1973 (actual)	3,942
Unobligated Projects, 30 June 1973 (estimated)	0

## Design Information

Project No	Project	Design Cost (Thousands)	Percent Complete 30 Apr 73
126	EM Barracks Pruem	24	10
147	Dependent School Addn	396	5
148	Dependent Schools	274	5

## ENLISTED BARRACKS SUMMARY, PRUEM, GERMANY

	<u>MEN*</u>
Total Requirement	355
Existing Substandard	150
Existing Adequate	69**
Funded, Not in Inventory	40
Adequate Assets	109
Deficiency	246
FY 1974 Program	80
Barracks spaces occupied, 15 Mar 73	121

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

\*\* Includes 63 in private housing

Mr. TALCOTT. You are requesting an enlisted men's barracks at Pruem, dependent school additions, and dependent schools.

#### KASERNE RENOVATION PROGRAM

What is the status of the kaserne renovation program?

General COOPER. Basically, in the kaserne program we started off with 165 kasernes.

Mr. TALCOTT. How many people are housed in one kaserne?

General COOPER. One kaserne, up to 1,000 people per kaserne. But they vary from a few hundred.

Mr. TALCOTT. Would you define a kaserne?

General COOPER. A kaserne is really a barracks complex where you have the barracks and the mess hall and the facilities to take care of the equipment and vehicles. It is a small post.

Mr. TALCOTT. We took these over from the Germans, and they call them kasernes.

General COOPER. Yes, sir. That is one of the reasons we had to have this extensive renovation program. They are all very old.

Mr. TALCOTT. Have many of them been renovated and turned back to the Germans?

General COOPER. None that I know of have been renovated and turned back to the Germans. We are going through on a priority list of the ones we are renovating, to renovate the ones that need it the most.

Mr. TALCOTT. Are there kasernes which are substandard, in which U.S. troops are now living, which are not proposed to be upgraded?

General COOPER. No, sir. We plan to renovate all of them which U.S. troops are occupying.

Mr. SIKES. What is the relative percentage of those that have been renovated and those which are now in process of renovation and on which no work has been done?

[Additional information follows:]

USAREUR determined in 1968 that 120 of the 165 kasernes required complete rehabilitation from stem to stern and that the remaining 45 required certain renovation but not the full stem-to-stern treatment. As of April 30, 1973, 20 of the 120 kasernes or 17 percent have been completed, 30 percent are in process of renovation with the remaining 53 percent still to be rehabilitated.

General COOPER. We started off with O. & M. projects using U.S. dollars to renovate 26 kasernes. Twenty are completed and six are well underway.

One of the worst things was the plumbing and heating. As part of the offset agreement we had a total of 61 additional kasernes, 30 of them in phase 1 with about 33,000 spaces, and the phase 2 has about 27,000 spaces. As a separate effort in fiscal year 1972 and 1973—

Mr. SIKES. Are phases 1 and 2 completed?

General COOPER. No, sir. I don't have the specific progress with me. They are not completed as of the moment.

Mr. SIKES. What is the completion date for them?

General COOPER. I will have to provide the details.

[The information follows:]

Thirty kasernes are now under contract by German construction authorities in phase I of the present offset program. USAREUR estimates that 14 of these will be completed during fiscal year 1974 and the remaining 16 during the first

half of fiscal year 1975. The kasernes in phase II that have been designed and are in the preaward stage are expected to be completed by early fiscal year 1976.

**Mr. SIKES.** I would like a better breakdown of what we have accomplished in the way of kaserne modification and modernization. How many have been completed? How many are in process of completion? What is the completion date? How many would be accommodated under this year's program?

How many will remain to be accomplished at the end of that time?  
[The information follows:]

Of the total 120 kasernes requiring complete renovation of barracks and dining facilities, 20 have been completed; 36 are under contract in the process of completion with estimated completion dates in the first half of fiscal year 1975. This year's program is being accomplished under the current U.S./FRG Offset Agreement. USAREUR estimates that available deutschmark funds will finance an additional 23 kasernes plus troop living facilities at certain border and remote sites. There will remain 41 kasernes in need of complete renovation.

**Mr. SIKES.** We still have a long way to go?

**General COOPER.** Yes, sir. We will have to fix up 132,000 spaces and the initial Offset Agreement takes care of roughly 60,000. The U.S.-funded stern-to-stern program took care of 35,000, so we need another offset agreement before we can complete all of phase 2 and complete the program.

**Mr. TALCOTT.** What is the offset agreement?

**General COOPER.** That was an agreement with the Germans whereby they agreed to provide 600 million deutsche marks to offset our adverse balance of payments. It considers the fact we are spending a lot of dollars in Germany with the troops.

**Mr. TALCOTT.** They were not paying for the whole renovation?

**General COOPER.** They are paying for the whole renovation when I refer to the offset. We spent about \$26 million in the first phases up until December 1971 when the offset agreement was signed.

**Mr. TALCOTT.** How much reimbursement did the Germans give us in dollars?

**General COOPER.** The agreement was in deutsche marks, which is fortunate for us because the amount is not affected by the recent devaluation. It was some 600 million deutsche marks, of which 576 went to the Army.

**Mr. TALCOTT.** What is the conversion rate?

**Mr. KEENAN.** At that time it was \$176 million to the Army and \$186 million total.

**Mr. TALCOTT.** How were the Kasernes selected; were they the ones in worst repair, the ones that were most needed in the locality, or the ones that caused the most trouble? We are having some demonstrations and riots and this sort of thing because of living conditions.

**General COOPER.** It was a combination of all of those. The priority is established by the commanding general, U.S. Army, Europe.

**Mr. TALCOTT.** What percentage of our troops in Germany live in kasernes?

**General COOPER.** Essentially, all of them live in kasernes. Many live in family housing, but most live in kasernes.

**Mr. TALCOTT.** Most on-base living is in formerly German facilities which we converted?

**General COOPER.** Except for large supply depots built since World War II.

Mr. TALCOTT. We have not built too much new barracks and housing in Germany?

General COOPER. That is correct. I don't know how many family housing units we have built.

Mr. TALCOTT. Not that, but barracks?

General COOPER. No, sir. For the most part, we try to use the kasernes.

#### SCHOOLS

Mr. TALCOTT. Are you requesting school facilities or additions at any of the locations not firm in this case? There are going to be some bases closed? Are you building any school facilities at these?

General COOPER. No, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. School facilities are only to be built where you believe the location is firm?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. That gets back to the mutual balance force reduction negotiations. It depends on what is finally agreed to. We are building these school facilities where we need them the most right now.

Mr. TALCOTT. What will the school facility deficit be after this program is completed?

General COOPER. It is about \$20 million.

Mr. TALCOTT. What facilities will that provide in terms of classrooms?

General COOPER. I don't have those details. It is about 17 separate projects, Colonel Williamson tells me.

#### ARMY DEPENDENTS IN GERMANY

Mr. TALCOTT. Supply for the record the overall statistics for the Army dependents in Germany and whether they are increasing or decreasing.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. They are increasing?

General COOPER. They have been increasing.

[The information follows:]

The number of dependents of active duty Army personnel and U.S. citizen employees located in Germany during calendar years 1970-72 are as follows: September 1970, 73,407; September 1971, 95,348; and, September 1972, 105,850.

Mr. TALCOTT. Do you know the reasons for that? Is there a more secure feeling among the people? They have more money, easier transportation, less restrictions?

General COOPER. I am sure part of the reason now is we have more stability over in Germany than we had during the time of Vietnam when people might stay only a year. The average age of the soldier is greater. In some cases during the Vietnam years, we had battalions in Europe with mostly second lieutenants and one lieutenant colonel. Now we have many more Regular Army people stationed in Europe. The increase in schoolchildren has not been that great. It has gone from 111,000 to 112,000 in 1971 to about, estimated, 120,000 in 1974.

Mr. TALCOTT. Is that increasing causing any pressure on PX's, schools, or on family housing?

General COOPER. It is causing pressures on the schools. The family housing situation is very, very severe in Germany. It is worse in Germany than any place else.

## BARRACKS, PRUEM

Mr. TALCOTT. What barracks are you currently using at Pruem? Where is that?

General COOPER. Pruem is fairly close to the border. I have not been there. The current—

Mr. TALCOTT. What kind of facility do we have there?

General COOPER. This is a picture of it.

Mr. TALCOTT. These are not kasernes?

General COOPER. No, Pruem is an outpost, a small post. Pruem is a special case. This is not a kaserne. That is correct.

Mr. TALCOTT. Pruem is a place where we have a facility?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. What kind of installation do we have there?

General COOPER. At Pruem, we have a Signal Corps group. It is a communications post. We have specifically part of the Company B Signal Support Group.

Mr. TALCOTT. You showed us some pictures which looked like wooden barracks.

General COOPER. They are old wooden frame-type barracks.

Mr. TALCOTT. That is what we are using at the present time?

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. What does this contemplate doing so far as they are concerned?

General COOPER. We plan building nine new barracks, a semipermanent barracks mostly for E-9's and E-2's to E-4's.

Mr. TALCOTT. How long have we been in Pruem?

General COOPER. These barracks were constructed initially in 1952.

Mr. TALCOTT. How many people are stationed there?

General COOPER. Total Pruem barrack spaces required is something like 355.

## GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

Mr. TALCOTT. We will go on to "General Authorizations."

Insert pages 297 and 298 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

## GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Planning.....			39,000
Minor construction.....			12,500
Total.....	0	0	51,500

1. DATE 1 Feb 1973		2. DEPARTMENT ARMY		3. INSTALLATION FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		4. STATE/COUNTRY General Authorization									
5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER			6. STATE/COUNTRY												
7. STATUS			8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY		9. COUNTY (U.S.)		10. NEAREST CITY								
11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS				12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL			
				OFFICER (1)		ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)		
				a. AS OF _____											
				b. PLANNED (End FY _____)											
				13. INVENTORY											
				LAND		ACRES (1)		LAND COST (\$000) (2)		IMPROVEMENT (\$000) (3)		TOTAL (\$000) (4)			
				a. OWNED											
				b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS											
				c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 _____											
				d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY											
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM															
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS															
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)															
SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS															
PROJECT DESIGNATION					TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM						
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b			PRIORITY c	Page No. d	e	SCOPE f	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) g	SCOPE h	ESTIMATED COST (\$000) i					
	74.1 - Planning			1	299					39,000					
	74.3 - Minor Construction			1	300					12,500					

## PLANNING

Mr. TALCOTT. The first item is planning.

What is the unobligated balance in planning funds as of the latest reporting date?

General COOPER. Mr. Carton.

Mr. TALCOTT. What is the date?

Mr. CARTON. As of March 31, there was approximately \$17 million unobligated.

Mr. TALCOTT. For 1973?

Mr. CARTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TALCOTT. Are you ahead or behind your projections?

Mr. CARTON. We are behind our projections. We have had slight delay in awarding the architect-engineer contracts for our medical facilities that we anticipate to be awarded by June 30.

We had requested and Congress approved reprogramming of \$4.2 million to award these contracts. We anticipate that we will be awarding them in the June-July time frame.

Mr. TALCOTT. How much carryover money do you anticipate having at the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. CARTON. About \$5.2 million.

Mr. TALCOTT. In addition to that, you are asking for \$39 million for planning for fiscal year 1974. Will that be sufficient to meet your expanded medical facilities program and other requirements?

Mr. CARTON. Yes, sir. That did take into consideration expanded medical facilities program. We anticipate that by the end of fiscal year 1974 our unobligated carryover will be \$2.4 million. We will spend what we have requested, plus about \$3 million of our current carryover.

Mr. TALCOTT. You intend to spend \$41 million in 1974?

Mr. CARTON. Yes, sir.

## MINOR CONSTRUCTION

Mr. TALCOTT. Go to minor construction.

What amount will be spent in fiscal year 1973 and 1974 in order to accommodate base realignments?

That is an unfair question now, but supply that for the record.

General COOPER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

We do not expect to spend any minor military construction funds in fiscal year 1973 to accommodate base realignments. It is planned to provide military construction facility support for base realignments through reprogramming of savings on previously approved military construction line items and through regular military construction programming procedures. Reprogramming actions approximating \$8.5 million have been initiated. Also, prior to submission to the Congress, the fiscal year 1974 military construction program was realigned to include the required construction projects to support base realignments on a timely basis. These projects are estimated at \$11.2 million. While it is not specifically planned to use minor military construction funds to support base realignments, there will undoubtedly be some unanticipated construction requirements which will necessitate the use of minor military construction funds in fiscal year 1974 to maintain continuity of base realignment operations.

Mr. TALCOTT. All of these base realignments are going to require some minor repairs, construction.

General COOPER. We have provided the details for the record. Minor construction?

Mr. TALCOTT. Yes. That is a problem to you people, isn't it? Some places where I have been there has been a need—I won't mention the Army, but some other service. Maybe a \$250,000 project, but they decide to divide it into five contracts.

General COOPER. They are not supposed to do that. That is forbidden.

Mr. TALCOTT. In wartime you might have to do it once in a while?

General COOPER. We do quite well with the minor construction projects. If the people put them in and they are urgent minor, there is a legitimate reason they didn't program it through the normal procedure, we can get the request processed quite rapidly. There are occasions when people try to look for ways out, but that usually leads to disaster because somebody finds out. If you take a project and split it in two to avoid the ceiling, it is not supposed to come under urgent money. Most of the projects relating to the realignments and reorganizations we have tried to fund as part of the reprogramming rather than using the urgent minor construction route.

Mr. TALCOTT. You are offended by my suggestion, I take it?

General COOPER. I am offended not with the idea that people never did it before but with the thought that people should consider breaking the law. In my particular position where I have to pass on these requests, I have a man that looks very carefully to be sure they don't.

Mr. TALCOTT. The rules and regulations may be severe in some circumstances, but you can live with them generally, and particularly now in peacetime?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. We probably ought to increase the dollar level slightly to take care of cost escalation, but we can live with it.

Mr. SIKES. How much unobligated money do you expect to have in this fund at the end of the current fiscal year?

Mr. CARTON. We expect to have a carryover of \$4.2 million.

Mr. TALCOTT. For minor construction?

General COOPER. Yes, sir. At the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. SIKES. How much will you spend during the next fiscal year?

Mr. CARTON. We expect to obligate \$13 million during the next fiscal year. That would leave us with an unobligated carryover at the end of that time of about \$3.7 million.

Mr. SIKES. Is that a healthy carryover or could you probably do with less?

Mr. CARTON. This is a carryover that is partially for projects which are underway, the contingency reserves for those projects, and for projects which we would expect to obligate during the July and August time frame. We would recommend this carryover be allowed to continue.

Mr. TALCOTT. We had a few diversions today but it is now 4 o'clock. Does the Army want to say anything more in defense or promotion of itself?

General COOPER. No, sir. I think we have had ample opportunity with the courtesy provided by the chairman and members of this committee to put our case on the record.

Mr. TALCOTT. Any other questions?

Mr. SIKES. If not, thank you very much, gentlemen.

This does conclude the Army hearings other than housing and possibly for special projects. You have been very helpful to the committee. Thank you.

## APPENDIX

### BASE CLOSURE SAVINGS:

#### *DOD Base realignment announcement—Apr. 17, 1973*

Fiscal year:	<i>Millions</i>
1973 -----	<sup>1</sup> \$15.1
1974 -----	<sup>1</sup> 33.8
1975 -----	224.7
1976 -----	361.4
1977 -----	375.0
1978 and future -----	375.0

<sup>1</sup> Indicates cost.

It is important to note that these estimates were based on data applicable to end fiscal year 1972. The Navy fiscal year 74 estimates contained herein vary from the original statement in that they are based on fiscal year 74 budget and experience to date. All of these estimates have had minor changes due to realignment and disposal corrections.

#### APRIL PACKAGE, NET ANNUAL SAVING

[In millions of dollars]

	Army	Navy	Air Force	DOD
Fiscal year:				
1973 -----	(5.8)		(9.3)	(15.1)
1974 -----	14.6	(76.6)	28.2	(33.8)
1975 -----	51.1	89.8	83.8	224.7
1976 -----	57.5	211.6	92.3	361.4
1977 -----	57.8	221.6	95.6	375.0
1978 -----	57.8	221.6	95.6	375.0
1979 -----	57.8	221.6	95.6	375.0
1980 -----	57.8	221.6	95.6	375.0
1981 -----	57.8	221.6	95.6	375.0
1982 -----	57.8	221.6	95.6	375.0
1983 -----	57.8	221.6	95.6	375.0
1984 -----	57.8	221.6	95.6	375.0
Subtotal -----				3,537.2
Fiscal year 1973 -----				-15.1
Total -----				3,552.3

Note: Decade fiscal year 1974 to fiscal year 1984 savings equals \$3,500,000,000.

#### DOD BASE REALIGNMENT ANNOUNCEMENT OF APR. 17, 1973

[Savings in millions of dollars]

Army actions	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977 plus
Transfer aviation activities from Fort Walters, Tex., to Fort Rucker, Ala.....	-\$1.7	\$10.3	\$14.5	\$14.4	\$14.7
Transfer aviation activities from Hunter AAF, Ga., to Fort Rucker, Ala.....	-3.1	10.2	10.6	10.6	10.6
Consolidate Defense Language Institute activities by transfer to Fort Mon- mouth, N.J. ....		-2.1	-1.8	.7	.7
Move Signal activities from Fort Mon- mouth, N.J., to Fort Gordon, Ga.....	1.1	9.5	17.7	17.7	17.7
Close Valley Forge General Hospital, Pa.....		-5.1	6.8	6.9	6.9
Close North Fort Wainwright, Ark.....	.9	-4.2	.6	3.4	3.4
Reduce Army activities at Fort Story, Va.....		-1.5	1.7	1.7	1.7
Move military police community from Fort Gordon, Ga., to Fort McClellan, Ala.....	-3.0	-1.4	.3	.3	.3
Inactivate Charleston Army Depot, S.C.....		-1.1	.7	1.8	1.8
Total -----	-5.8	14.6	51.1	57.5	57.8

## NAVY REALIGNMENT ACTIONS, ESTIMATED SAVINGS/COSTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Complex	Estimated savings, fiscal year—			
	1974 <sup>1</sup>	1975 <sup>2</sup>	1976	1977
Alameda, Calif.....	(994)	5,845	8,076	8,076
Imperial Beach, Calif.....	(227)	(10,292)	4,290	4,290
Long Beach, Calif.....	(6,308)	11,426	11,426	11,426
Point Mugu, Calif.....	(750)	(14,200)	1,500	1,500
Naval Undersea Center, Pasadena, Calif.....	(2,454)	1,188	1,188	1,188
Naval Shipyard, Hunters Point, Calif.....	(20,532)	6,770	17,883	17,883
Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Point Hueneme, Calif.....	(465)	1,100	1,100	1,100
COMTWELVE.....	(250)	830	830	830
Project Laboratories, Mare Island, Calif.....	(830)	350	350	350
Key West, Fla.....	(3,631)	7,507	7,507	7,507
AUTEC West Palm Beach, Fla.....	(201)	227	227	227
Albany, Ga.....	(2,173)	3,772	3,986	3,986
Glynco, Ga.....	(4,386)	9,260	9,260	9,260
Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii.....	(5,261)	3,000	3,000	3,000
Electronic Supply Office, Great Lakes, Ill.....	(738)	(6,408)	3,219	3,219
Naval Examining Center, Great Lakes, Ill.....	(123)	166	166	166
NESTEF St. Inigoes, Md.....	(376)	360	360	360
Bainbridge, Md.....	(383)	5,493	7,158	7,158
Boston, Mass.....	(1,634)	23,980	23,980	23,980
Omaha, Nebr.....	(39)	1,086	1,086	1,086
Portsmouth, N.H.....	(1,549)	3,477	3,477	3,477
Lakehurst, N.J.....	(1,408)	200	800	800
NSSNF, Brooklyn, N.Y.....	(3,352)	1,100	1,210	1,210
New York complex.....	(86)	2,494	2,494	2,494
St. Albans, N.Y.....	(613)	2,100	2,827	2,827
Scotia, N.Y.....	(294)	170	170	170
NAEC, Philadelphia, Pa.....	(430)	(14,513)	15,945	15,945
COMFOUR.....	206	1,415	1,415	1,415
Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, Pa.....		(500)	(6,500)	2,610
Newport, R.I.....	(4,253)	18,385	18,385	18,385
Quonset Point, R.I.....	(12,801)	22,880	22,880	22,880
COMFIVE.....	(29)	917	917	917
Navy Training Pubs Division, Washington, D.C.....	(234)	215	215	215
Chief of Naval Training, miscellaneous training activities.....			40,773	41,663
Total.....	(76,598)	89,800	211,600	221,600

## NOTES:

<sup>1</sup> The FY-74 figures above represent the current unbudgeted estimates for net closure costs and do not include \$45.499M in the FY-74 MILCON bill currently before the Congress.

<sup>2</sup> Navy estimated savings depicted in FY-75 and out years have been invested in fleet modernization and readiness aimed at achieving our goal of an improved balance of a smaller, modernized more ready fleet with a more efficient supporting shore establishment.

## DOD BASE REALIGNMENT ANNOUNCEMENT OF APR. 17, 1973

Air Force actions	Fiscal year savings (dollars in millions)—				
	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977 (plus)
Forbes AFB, Kans.....	-\$3.0	\$1.4	\$9.2	\$9.2	\$9.2
Hamilton AFB, Calif.....	-1.5	5.2	11.8	13.7	14.0
Laredo AFB, Tex.....	-5	5.2	13.5	14.8	15.8
McCoy AFB, Fla.....	-9	5.5	13.3	14.3	15.1
Ramey AFB, Puerto Rico.....	-1.8	13.1	18.0	20.3	21.1
Westover AFB, Maine.....	-1.6	.8	11.6	13.2	13.5
Unprogramed effect of ancillary actions.....		3.0	6.4	6.8	6.9
Total.....	-9.3	28.2	83.8	92.3	95.6

## WITNESSES

---

	Page
Brazier, G. W., Jr.....	159
Bruch, G. D.....	1, 119
Burt, Col. D. L.....	159
Carton, A. M.....	159
Coats, Lt. Col. J. I.....	159
Cooper, Maj. Gen. K. B.....	159
Crap, A. B.....	119
Dillon, Rear Adm. J. G.....	1
Fitz, R. J.....	159
Fliakas, P. J.....	1, 119
Follmer, M.....	119
Gardiner, Col. W. P.....	159
Gerber, S. I.....	1, 119
Gray, T. L.....	160
Haas, Col. R. F.....	159
Harrington, E. R.....	1
Johnson, Brig. Gen. H. O., Jr.....	1, 119
Johnson, P. W.....	160
Kerr, A. S.....	1
Kirchner, H. G.....	160
Kjellstrom, Maj. Gen. J. A.....	159
Leber, Lt. Gen. W. P.....	159
Loddell, Brig. Gen. H., Jr.....	159
Lockwood, W. M.....	160
Loveland, J. T.....	160
Lombard, Col. H. W.....	159
McCreary, J. R.....	1
Nichols, G. F.....	1
Oliver, C. W.....	1
Oram, Lt. Col. C. J.....	159
Pixley, Brig. Gen. C. C.....	159
Raisig, Col. P. J.....	159
Richbourg, Col. J. A.....	159
Roche, F. B.....	1
Rollence, J. F.....	119
Sell, Lt. Col. C. E.....	159
Sheridan, E. J.....	1
Williamson, Lt. Col. R. L.....	159



# INDEX

---

	Page
Department of the Army.....	159
Army Materiel Command.....	647
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.....	709
Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Tex.....	655
Anniston Army Depot, Ala.....	668
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Mass.....	686
Atlanta Army Depot, Ga.....	689
Frankford Arsenal, Pa.....	691
Memphis Defense Depot, Tenn.....	694
Fort Monmouth, N.J.....	697
Natick Laboratories, Mass.....	718
Picatinny Arsenal, N.J.....	721
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Ark.....	724
Redstone Arsenal, Ala.....	727
Sacramento Army Depot, Calif.....	732
Savanna Army Depot, Ill.....	735
Sierra Army Depot, Calif.....	738
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.....	740
Yuma Proving Ground, Ariz.....	751
Army Medical Department.....	765
Walter Reed Army Medical Center.....	765
Army Security Agency (overseas).....	842
Corps of Engineers:	
U.S. Army Cold Regions and Engineering Laboratory, N.H.....	778
Fifth Army.....	438
Fort Bliss, Tex.....	439
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.....	441
Fort Hood, Tex.....	444
Fort Sam Houston, Tex.....	448
Fort Polk, La.....	560
Fort Riley, Kans.....	568
Fort Sheridan, Ill.....	572
Fort Sill, Okla.....	589
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.....	591
First Army.....	276
Fort Belvoir, Va.....	278
Carlisle Barracks, Pa.....	288
Fort Devens, Mass.....	293
Fort Dix, N.J.....	300
Camp Drum, N.Y.....	303
Fort Eustis, Va.....	308
Camp A. P. Hill, Va.....	313
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pa.....	316
Fort Knox, Ky.....	321
Fort Lee, Va.....	325
Fort George G. Meade, Md.....	360
Fort Monroe, Va.....	368
Camp Pickett, Va.....	376
General Authorization (Planning and minor construction).....	855

## IV

	Page
General statements.....	164, 168
Army barracks program.....	196
Bachelors living off-base.....	187
Backlog.....	176, 177
Base closures.....	180, 211
Fort Wolters, Tex.....	216
Savings.....	222, 859
Valley Forge General Hospital.....	218
Base utilization.....	211, 240
Camp Drum family housing.....	210
Construction at installations to be closed and at Fort Knox, 1964-73.....	181
Construction cost increases.....	251
Construction Engineering Research Laboratory.....	246
Construction for other appropriations.....	268
Deferred construction.....	176
Family housing average unit cost limitation.....	272
Fort Dix, future use of.....	183, 221, 241, 243
Fort Dix study.....	244
Fort Dix reductions.....	243
Fort Meade, reductions at.....	243
General authorization.....	178
Guest house construction.....	266
HUD supported housing.....	250
Minor construction projects, fiscal year 1973.....	269
Overseas construction costs.....	205
Prior-year contract awards.....	247
Reorganization plan (Army).....	207
Safeguard.....	191-196
Section 236 housing.....	249
Smaller bases study.....	245
Statutory cost limit—family housing.....	249
Summary of Army construction program.....	275
Survey of property (Executive Order 11508).....	274
Training workloads.....	252
Turnkey construction.....	248
Unobligated balance.....	180, 248
Valley Forge General Hospital.....	273
Military traffic management and terminal service.....	782
Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, N.J.....	782
Military Ocean Terminal, Summit Point, N.C.....	789
Oakland Army Base, Calif.....	786
National Missile Range, Marshall Islands.....	839
NATO Infrastructure.....	507
NATO reprogramming.....	552
Pollution abatement.....	810
Air.....	811
Water.....	817
Sixth Army.....	622
Fort Carson, Colo.....	627
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, Calif.....	629
Fort Lewis, Wash.....	632
Fort MacArthur, Calif.....	634
Fort Ord, Calif.....	637
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.....	643
Third Army.....	380
Fort Benning, Ga.....	380
Fort Bragg, N.C.....	391
Fort Campbell, Ky.....	398
Fort Gordon, Ga.....	415
Fort Jackson, S.C.....	418
Fort McClellan, Ala.....	421
Fort McPherson, Ga.....	428
Fort Rucker, Ala.....	431
Fort Stewart, Ga.....	435

	Page
<b>Third Army (Overseas) :</b>	
Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico.....	836
<b>U.S. Army, Alaska.....</b>	<b>791</b>
Fort Greely.....	793
Fort Richardson.....	797
Fort Wainwright.....	800
<b>U.S. Army, Europe (Germany).....</b>	<b>849</b>
<b>U.S. Army Forces, Southern Command.....</b>	<b>823</b>
Panama Area, Canal Zone.....	824
<b>U.S. Army, Hawaii.....</b>	<b>803</b>
Fort Shafter.....	807
Schofield Barracks.....	803
<b>U.S. Army, Pacific.....</b>	<b>827</b>
Korea.....	827
<b>U.S. Army Security Agency, Zone of Interior :</b>	
Vint Hill Farms Station, Va.....	755
<b>U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command.....</b>	<b>757</b>
Fort Huachuca, Ariz.....	757
Fort Ritchie, Md.....	762
<b>U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command (Overseas).....</b>	<b>845</b>
<b>U.S. Military Academy.....</b>	<b>451</b>
<b>Family Housing.....</b>	<b>119</b>
Aberdeen Proving Ground.....	150
Aliamanu Crater housing site.....	154
Average cost limitation.....	143
Backlog.....	127
Bainbridge Naval Station.....	147, 148
Fort Holabird.....	151
Fort Huachuca, Ariz.....	131, 152
General statement.....	120
Hawaii housing costs.....	153
Hawaii—Project Fresh.....	152
Housing excess as a result of base closures.....	145
Housing for pay grades E-1 through E-3.....	130
HUD-support programs—legislative proposals.....	140
Overseas housing.....	154
Section 236 housing.....	134
Space allowances.....	141
Substandard housing.....	132
Unit cost increase.....	145
Wherry housing.....	148
<b>Office of the Secretary of Defense.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Air installations compatible use zones.....	85
Army land exchanges, fiscal year 1971-72.....	87
Bachelor housing.....	27
Barracks standards.....	30
Base closures.....	38, 49, 54, 70, 71
Costs.....	71
Fort Holabird.....	40
Funds recaptured.....	41
Future.....	74
Savings.....	71
Base utilization criteria.....	54
Bid listing.....	98
Bolling/Anacostia.....	80, 83
Commissary facilities.....	102
Construction avoided and required as a result of Army reorganization.....	72
Construction backlog.....	36
Construction costs.....	78
Cross-service medical care.....	25
Defense depot maintenance policies.....	95
Dollar devaluation effects.....	84
Family housing.....	27
Closed bases.....	72

**Office of the Secretary of Defense—Continued****Family housing—Continued**

Standards	-----
Financing adjustments	-----
Force reductions, effect of	-----
Fort Holabird utilization	-----
General statement	-----
Health care facilities program	-----
Hospital programing limits for retired personnel	-----
Land exchange legislation	-----
Long-range medical program	-----
Maintenance	-----
Medical care facilities	-----
Navy overseas homeporting program	-----
New general hospital	-----
Nonappropriated fund construction	-----
Real property surveys	-----
Recoupments due to base closures	-----
Reductions in overseas bases	-----
Relocatable facilities guidelines	-----
Relocations out of Washington, D.C.	-----
Replacement and modernization	-----
Section 236 housing	-----
Southeast Asia funds	-----
Standards for fiscal year 1974 program	-----
Strategic Air Command force levels	-----
Temporary lodging facilities	-----
Training installations workload	-----
Turnkey construction guidelines	-----

