

CHAPTER XII

REAL ESTATE

The Naval Facilities Engineering Command conducted a vigorous and meaningful Real Estate Program for the Department of the Navy. Since all government lands are held as a sacred, public trust, the Command regarded its real estate responsibilities as a scrupulous stewardship of a portion of that trust which was granted to assure full shore support to the United States fleet.

Prior to 20 July 1942, the responsibility for the administration of Navy Department real estate was a dual responsibility of the Bureau of Yards and Docks and the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy. However, on 7 July 1942 this cumbersome situation was eliminated by order of the president and, as a result, the Command became the primary real estate authority for the Department of the Navy.

The duties and functions exercised by the Office of the Judge Advocate General with respect to the acquisition and disposition of real estate including all interests therein and temporary uses thereof, and all property acquired under the provisions of Title II of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, approved March 27, 1942 (Public Law 507, 77th Congress), or any amendments thereof, are hereby transferred to the cognizance and jurisdiction of the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, together with such appropriated funds as are necessary to carry out the purpose and intent of this order.¹

¹Executive Order 9194, F.R. Doc. 42-6503, filed 8 Jul 1942, 12:06 p.m.

The intent of the presidential order was subsequently conveyed to the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks and all major Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard commands by the Secretary of the Navy.² The effective transfer date was designated as 20 July 1942. Thus, for over thirty years, the Command has conducted a Navy Department Real Estate Program of major proportions.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Although internally the program was structured along "cradle to grave" lines, each segment was, nevertheless, highly interrelated and interdependent.³ In systems terminology, each subsystem was a necessary and integral part of the Real Estate Program as a whole. Additionally, in the broader spectrum, the entire program was complementary to the mission of the Command as a whole. Only with this in mind can each subsystem be isolated and discussed as an entity in itself.

The subsystems or segments of the program previously referred to included the expeditious acquisition and disposal of Navy real property interests, the management of real property not currently needed for exclusive Navy use, the inventory of real property under

²Ltr from SECNAV to CHBUDOCKS of 21 Jul 42; Ltr from SECNAV to ALL of 13 Jul 42.

³FY 1975 Command Management Plan, NAVFAC P-441 (June 1974).

the control of the Navy,⁴ the maintenance of adequate records and maps of Navy real estate, the sponsorship of necessary real property legislation, and the management of natural resources on Navy lands. The overall mission of the Real Estate Program, accomplished through the concerted, coordinated action of these subsystems, was to provide for timely, effective support in meeting the Navy's real estate requirements and to manage the real property of the Navy in a manner that would derive maximum benefit to the government. The program's mission remained basically unchanged from 1965 to 1974.⁵

The Command's Real Estate Program was carried out at Command Headquarters, the various Engineering Field Divisions, and FACS0. In accordance with the management philosophy of the Command, broad real estate responsibilities were delegated to the Engineering Field Divisions. Since implementation of transactions, policy and procedure take place, or problems crop up, at this level, the existing decentralized management system was not only the most efficient, but the most effective method for Navy real estate management. Command Headquarters coordinated and provided direction for real estate actions performed in the field.

⁴The inventory function is no longer a Real Estate Program responsibility. In July of 1973 it was placed under the cognizance of the Shore Facilities Planning Program.

⁵Although the inventory function was transferred to Shore Facilities Planning, it remained an integral part of the combined Planning and Real Estate Programs. Furthermore, this functional transfer in no way changed the comprehensive mission of the Real Estate Program.

Resources for the program came from O&MN, SIOH, Z-Planning, Forestry (Reimbursable) and Federal Housing Fund appropriations as well as centrally managed funds. These resources were allocated on the basis of program priorities and projections of the level of funds necessary to accomplish priority goals. While the program provided a valuable service to the Navy, it also dealt with limited resources. Consequently, management sought to reduce backlogs of underfunded goals through the most scrupulous use of assigned funds, attention to improving work methods in the interest of economy and, finally, the intelligent use of any resources that became available from other real estate goals.

While the mission of the Real Estate Program remained relatively constant from 1965 to 1974, the organizational structure underwent many small changes and one large reorganization. Minor organizational changes emphasizing increased efficiency and coordination with the Command as a whole occurred between 1965 and 1973. In the latter year, however, a major reorganization took place which meshed the Real Estate Program and the Facilities Planning Program into one joint activity.⁶

⁶See Chapter 3 of this history for a more detailed discussion of this major reorganization; "NAVFAC Headquarters Reorganization - Real Estate & Planning Merged", CEC Biweekly Report (11 Jul 1973), p.2.

LEGISLATION

Part of the mission of the Real Estate Program was to keep abreast of and make recommendations to Congress on legislation which affected Navy real estate interests or responsibilities. During the period 1965 to 1974 several legislative enactments had a significant impact on the Command's real estate policies and procedures.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 had a tremendous effect on acquisition actions by the Command.⁷ In general, it provided for the preparation of an environmental impact assessment or impact statement prior to any federal action which might affect the environment. In essence, governmental agencies were to assume the lead in protecting the nation's environment.

Following the passage of this new law, it became Department of Defense policy to treat all military land acquisitions as an action which had environmental consequences. This policy decision logically stemmed from the conclusion that lands acquired by military departments were either for the purpose of supporting the construction of an additional facility or for putting an area to some new and different use. The result was that an environmental impact assessment was now required prior to any real estate acquisition. The assessment could be formal or informal depending upon the nature of the proposed future use of the land.

⁷ PL 190, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. Act of 1969. 83 Stat. 852.

If the initial environmental impact assessment anticipated a major environmental impact as a result of the Navy's action, then an environmental impact statement was also prepared. Within the statement was a list of all things that would be irretrievably lost or gained because of the Navy's use of the land. Such statements were sent to the Chief of Naval Operations and, if approved, further forwarded to the nation's Council on Environmental Quality. All other appropriate state and federal agencies were also given an opportunity to comment on the proposed acquisition and its environmental effects. The last steps in this process consisted of a final review by the Command and, then, once again, submittal of the statement to the Council on Environmental Quality.

Although these new procedures were indeed a laborious process and demanded even more extensive planning prior to any real estate acquisition, the ultimate benefit to the Navy and the public was great. The environmental quality of Navy-controlled lands had been protected as a heightened awareness of the need for such protection permeated the nation. Following the enactment of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Command diligently applied its provisions and included environmental impact statements as necessary in support of decisions to acquire real estate.

Another legislative measure, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, also significantly affected real estate policies and procedures.⁸ Signed into law on

⁸PL 646, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess. Act of 1970. 84 Stat. 1894.

2 January 1971, the act revised previous federal agency authority to acquire real estate under separate legislation that applied to each agency. The passage of this law was the culmination of strenuous efforts since 1961 to establish a uniform policy for the fair and equitable treatment of persons who were displaced by the acquisition of property for federal or federally assisted projects. The thrust of the measure was twofold; its impact covered both Navy relocation and acquisition policies.

Prior to this legislative enactment, the Navy could reimburse displaced persons only for expenses directly related to searching for and moving to another property. The new law provided for additional stipends beyond the fair market value paid for the property and the previously reimbursable expenses. Additionally, the Navy was now required to work actively to assist individuals in relocating to decent, safe, and sanitary housing. Recognizing the difficulty in finding suitable replacement housing, the new law even made provision for the use of construction project funds, if necessary, to furnish housing for displaced persons.

Previous procedure in the area of real estate acquisition entailed making an appraisal of a desired property and negotiating with the owner on the basis of this undisclosed appraisal amount. The new law, however, now required that the appraisal value be revealed to the owner prior to negotiations and that the initial offer be no lower than this amount. Condemnation, without first a serious attempt to resolve differences, was no longer tolerated.

In essence, the Uniform Relocation and Land Acquisition Policies Act, like the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, demanded that even more extensive and precise planning precede any real estate acquisition. The spirit of this legislation was conveyed in the Command's real estate policy statement.

"Real Estate requirements will be planned and accomplished
(1) with minimal interference and impact on the civilian economy,
(2) by respecting the rights of individual property owners, and
(3) by minimizing the damages to affected property owners.

All real estate transactions with private individuals will be conducted in a frank, fair, and helpful manner. Every effort will be made to acquire land by negotiation and direct purchase before resorting to condemnations. In those cases where acquisition by condemnation is necessary, the owners of the property to be acquired will be fully advised of the reasons of condemnation, of the procedures of condemnation, and of their rights under the condemnation statutes."⁹

An additional public law of 1970 that amended the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 further augmented the Command's real estate duties.¹⁰ This amendment provided the authority necessary to execute a new presidential policy known as the Legacy of Parks. The initial impetus for the program came in the president's Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union in which he stressed the need to retain the nation's slowly dwindling supply of parks and recreation areas.¹¹

⁹ FY 1972 Command Management Plan, NAVFAC P-441 (June 1971).

¹⁰ PL 485, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess. Act of 1965, amended. 84 Stat. 1084.

¹¹ "Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union," 22 Jan 1970, Public Papers of the Presidents (Washington, 1971), p.8.

The ultimate result was a policy which enabled governmental bodies such as municipalities, counties, and states to acquire excess public lands for conversion into park land. The Command's real estate disposals were often of prime recreational value and, when local government agencies indicated a desire to acquire Navy excess property for this purpose, it was noted on the disposal report to the General Services Administration. The local governmental agency also communicated their desire for the property to the Department of the Interior who, in turn, notified the General Services Administration.¹² Thus, the Command's Real Estate Program played a special role in implementing the Legacy of Parks policy. Not only did the Command, in this role, project an excellent image for the Navy, but the public reaped exceptional benefits by way of additional park and recreation areas.

ACQUISITION

Another integral and essential subsystem of the Real Estate Program was to provide for the timely acquisition of all real property interests required by the Department of the Navy and other Department of Defense agencies upon request.¹³ In essence, acquisition is the "first construction service," for acquisition personnel must move in the vanguard of any construction force.¹⁴ Proper planning, or the

¹²Telecon with Mr. A. M. Egeland, NAVFAC Real Estate, Code 20RS, 18 Mar 1975.

¹³BUDOCKS Operating Plan 1-66.

¹⁴Edward Gowen, "Real Estate - The First Construction Service," The Military Engineer, No. 433 (Sep - Oct 1974), pp. 316-317.

determination of a property requirement by a military command or as the result of a special program, was the initial step in this function. Once a need for real estate has been established, the Command would acquire property for permanent or temporary naval usage by one of a number of methods. These methods included, but were not limited to, transfer from other government agencies, lease (ingrant), direct purchase, condemnation (exercise of the right of eminent domain), and land exchange.

The right of the government to acquire land is given in the United States Constitution and Congress subsequently delegates this authority to federal agencies. Thus, it should be noted that title to all federal real estate vests in the United States and the Command acquires property that will be used and essentially controlled by the Navy rather than "owned."

As was mentioned previously, many aspects of the acquisition of Navy real estate were not a Bureau responsibility until July of 1942.¹⁵ These additional duties were transferred to the Bureau partially because of the urgent necessity for a massive, coordinated acquisition program during a time of national strife. In terms of recent Command history, it is most informative to comment on the development of this enlarged acquisition function since its inception over thirty years ago.

¹⁵ Executive Order 9194.

Whenever the need for additional real estate arose, either for a construction site or some other purpose, the first requirement was to determine whether or not the need might be satisfied through the utilization of other naval holdings. Should Navy real estate not be available, consideration was then given to the use of real estate controlled by other government agencies. During the early years of World War II, the Navy Department was able to make use of a considerable amount of War Department real estate under legislation which permitted "the interchange without compensation therefor (sic) of military stores, supplies, and equipment of every character, including real estate" between the Army and Navy.¹⁶ Later wartime and immediate post-war transfers were accomplished under the authority of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and, in more modern times, such transfers were made pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1949, as amended.¹⁷

In the event government real estate was not available, it became necessary to acquire the use of privately owned lands. It was the policy of the Navy Department at this time not to acquire land in fee simple if a leasehold or other lesser interest was adequate for the purpose contemplated and the property could be acquired on satisfactory terms and conditions. However, limitations on rental,

¹⁶Title 10, United State Code, Section 1274.

¹⁷Title 50, United State Code, Sections 1622, 1632A, and 1641 as amended.

alteration, improvement and repair expenses for leased premises spelled out in the Economy Act of 1932 seriously hampered vital defense construction.¹⁸ While these restrictions provided for a much needed peacetime safeguard, Congress soon recognized the immense problems posed by these provisions in a wartime situation. As a result, the Act was modified on 28 April 1942 to provide for special conditions during war or national emergency.¹⁹

Leasehold restrictions were not the only problem facing the Bureau's fledgling real estate acquisition efforts. Another provision of law prevented any expenditure of public funds for construction on newly acquired lands until the Attorney General had approved the title to the real estate. This limiting situation was met by the Second War Powers Act which permitted the President to authorize any of his governmental department heads to take immediate possession and to use and improve real estate prior to the Attorney General's approval.²⁰

The special requirements of a wartime situation extended beyond the need for special legislative and executive acquisition authority to the immediate need for huge amounts of real estate to support the war effort. During this period, acquisitions involved 1,080,000 acres of land in 27,000 tracts. The total cost of this program exceeded the

¹⁸Economy Act of 1932. 47 Stat. 382

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Executive Order 9262, F. R. Doc. 42-11595, filed 6 Nov 1942, 2:40 P.M.

staggering figure of \$200,000,000. In addition, the Real Estate Division entered into more than 4,300 leases with an annual rental expense of more than \$16,500,000.

From 1946 to 1964, acquisition activities fluctuated tremendously. In terms of total acreage, acquisition by fee and lesser interests was understandably at an all time low during 1947. Acquisition of public lands, which included government owned lands acquired from other government agencies, inter-defense transfers, and public domain, exhibited its lowest point during 1962. The immediate post-war years, however, also went unnoted for tremendous expansion in this realm. The overall low, including both public lands and fee and lesser interests, was a total acreage of 1,804.31 obtained in 1962. The 1947 figure was slightly above this at 2,219.89 acres.

The high point in acquisition of fee and lesser interests was in 1959 with a total acreage of 133,280.95. The corresponding peak in public lands fell a year earlier, in 1958, with the acquisition of 539,420.57 acres. During the entire seventeen year period, 1959 was the overall pinnacle in the acquisition of real property. Barely topping the 1958 figure of 569,071.33 acres, a total of 576,678.11 acres, including public land, fee, and lesser interests were acquired.

The general trend in the amount of acreage acquired exhibited several peaks and valleys. From a low in 1947 acquisition activities climbed to a peak in 1957 and subsequently dropped to another low in 1955. It would be safe to speculate that an increased demand for real

estate to support naval forces during the Korean conflict generated this post-World War II rise in real estate requirements. From 1955 to 1959 the amount of acreage acquired climbed to its all-time seventeen year high. The Bureau had successfully striven to meet the real estate demands of the "Space Age" which had confronted them in the latter years of this decade. Total acreage dropped again in 1960, climbed slightly in 1961, and subsequently fell to another low in 1963. In 1964, just a year prior to the period under consideration, came another tremendous leap in real estate acquisition. The 483,736 acres acquired were primarily by withdrawal from public domain. Additional land and facilities were also obtained by lease construction contract. This method of acquisition enabled the Navy to obtain suitable facilities constructed to its specifications by a lessor who, upon completion of the facilities, leased the premises to the Navy for a specified period of time.²¹

Acquisition costs do not closely parallel the number of acres acquired for two primary reasons. First, there are no expenses generated by some public land acquisitions and, second, the market value of certain properties will vary tremendously depending upon such factors as location and existing improvements. Nevertheless, it is also interesting to note original acquisition cost trends from 1947

²¹BUDOCKS Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1964).

to 1964. The least amount spent on real property was in 1950 when 18,312.42 acres were obtained at a cost of \$358,993. On the other hand, the largest amount spent was in 1948 when only 10,517.85 acres were acquired for \$42,541.927. A major portion of this figure was spent for public lands which are often acquired for nominal fees or at no cost to the government.

Acquisition activities from 1965 to 1974 encompassed a continuation of past efforts combined with new programs and policies designed to keep abreast of rapidly changing real estate requirements. Policy and procedure during the period was greatly affected by two legislative measures. These were, of course, the National Environmental Protection Act of 1969 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Acts of 1970 discussed previously.²²

Under additional public law, all transactions involving the acquisition of or interest in real property which had an estimated fair market value in excess of \$50,000 had to be reported to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress. Furthermore, a summary report of transactions exceeding \$5,000 but less than \$50,000 were also to be submitted to Congress but on a quarterly basis.²³

²²PL 190, 91st Cong.; PL 646, 91st Cong.

²³Title 10, United States Code, Section 2662, as amended.

CHART 12-1

NAVY ACQUISITION SUMMARY OF THE
CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES,
1 JULY 1946 to 30 JUNE 1964

Fiscal Year		Acres	Acquisition Costs*
1947	*a.	169.46	1,731.841
	*b.	2,050.43	-
1948	a.	1,157.87	276,730
	b.	9,359.98	42,265,197
1949	a.	8,931.48	12,691.810
	b.	1,189.27	2,532,645
1950	a.	3,646.38	328,743
	b.	14,666.04	30,250
1951	a.	7,382.73	2,084,315
	b.	181,200.19	6,859,978
1952	a.	29,045.42	6,264,330
	b.	3,039.99	-
1953	a.	21,769.68	11,312,353
	b.	58,120.77	543,779
1954	a.	8,303.68	2,331,655
	b.	1,031.51	501,180
1955	a.	6,587.21	1,160,641
	b.	1,540.35	596,563
1956	a.	8,837.17	4,127,963
	b.	6,527.52	-
1957	a.	20,042.42	7,458,184
	b.	1,315.00	-
1958	a.	29,650.76	6,112,958
	b.	539,420.57	15,000

Fiscal Year		Acres	Acquisition Costs
1959	a.	133,180.95	6,003,119
	b.	443,397.16	-
1960	a.	6,965.05	4,055,184
	b.	85,662.26	152,157
1961	a.	5,418.13	1,462,383
	b.	96,697.22	-
1962	a.	786.51	948,216
	b.	1,017.80	-
1963	a.	2,538.47	712,934
	b.	4,130.00	-
1964	a.	8,282.96	510,791
	b.	314,249.835	718

* a. Fee and lesser interests

* b. Public Lands (includes government owned lands acquired from other government agencies, inter-defense transfers and public domain).

* Includes improvements

In 1969, the Department of Defense reissued and refined their requirements for the prior approval of real property actions. Acquisitions in the \$50,000 and over category and public domain in excess of 500 acres that was to be held for a period longer than one year were to be submitted to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) for prior approval. Extensive supporting justification was to accompany this submittal.²⁴ The Command implemented the Department of Defense Instruction and rapidly incorporated the appropriate changes in the Real Estate Administration Manual which was then under revision.²⁵

To better plan, coordinate, control, and review the many actions of Command Headquarters and the Engineering Field Divisions, it was decided in November of 1967 that the Engineering Field Divisions would collate their own monthly reports on the "Schedule and Progress of Land Acquisition" and forward them to Headquarters for compilation into one complete report for the Command as a whole.²⁶ Previously the Engineering Field Divisions had prepared flexowriter tapes which were forwarded to Headquarters for summarization of Engineering Field Division status.

²⁴DOD Instruction 4165.12 of 6 Feb 1967.

²⁵SECNAV Instruction 11011.42 of 9 Jun 1967; NAVFAC Instruction 11011.55 of 20 Jul 1967; Real Estate Administration Manual, NAVDOCKS P-73.

²⁶NAVFAC Instruction 11011.42A of 27 Nov 1967.

An oftentimes little mentioned function of real estate acquisition was to provide support for the Command's Family Housing Program. In many areas family housing units were leased by the Navy for military personnel who were unable to locate adequate housing at a reasonable cost. Working closely with the Family Housing Program, acquisition personnel negotiated for and acquired the use of leased housing as required.

Leasing of family housing was authorized both in the United States and in foreign countries, although the primary thrust of the program was domestic. On a yearly basis, the number of domestic leases negotiated from 1965 to 1974 remained fairly constant. In 1967, 3,510 units were leased while in 1971, 1972, and 1973 leased family housing units numbered 2,300, 3,103, and 3,450 respectively. Approximately 10,000 units per year were authorized in the 1970s for the entire Department of Defense and the Navy's allotment of this total remained around 4,000 units per year. On the other hand, during the same period foreign housing leases steadily increased. This expansion was a reflection of the Command's continuing efforts to provide adequate housing for the growing number of Navy personnel and their families transferred to foreign homeports. From a minimal 136 units of foreign housing leased in 1971, this number had more than quadrupled by 1974.²⁷

²⁷Telecon with Mr. L.V. Mason, NAVFAC Family Housing, Code 082B, 11 Mar 1975.

From 1965 to 1968 the Command was engaged in a special program involving the review of existing coastal facilities in order to determine if the acquisition of contiguous submerged lands was necessary to protect these facilities. Known as Submerged Land Studies, this program became a dual responsibility of Command Headquarters and the Engineering Field Divisions. In 1966, Headquarters completed studies of four installations while the Engineering Field Divisions were tasked with seven coastal installation studies.²⁸ However, in 1967, only the Engineering Field Divisions were required to perform further Submerged Land Studies and, as a result, four additional installations were taken under consideration. At the same time, a new Headquarters responsibility was to review all completed studies and determine if, in fact, submerged lands should be acquired.²⁹ The findings of these studies and their subsequent review brought numerous small acquisitions in 1968 to protect Navy interests in coastal facilities. Other than for future updates, the program was essentially completed during this year.³⁰

Prior to a discussion of actual acquisitions from 1965 to 1974, it would be relevant to discuss yet another essential function of the acquisition group. Preceding all real estate actions in support

²⁸BUDOCKS Operating Plan 1-66.

²⁹NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-67.

³⁰NAVFAC Operating Plan, 1-68.

of military construction were Land Planning Studies and Reports. These instruments which determine real estate requirements were of particular import in light of the continuing emphasis placed on acquisitions of this nature. The need for real estate was naturally generated outside the Command structure but eventually passed to the cognizant Engineering Field Division for action.

A 1966 target was the completion of six land planning projects by Eastcentral, Atlantic, Southeast, Gulf and Midwest Divisions. At the same time, acquisitions were made in support of fourteen military construction projects. The responsibility for these acquisitions was divided fairly evenly among the Engineering Field Divisions. As a result, each Division was tasked with one project except Northeast, Southeast, and Pacific Divisions which made three, three and two acquisitions respectively.³¹ In succeeding years workload fluctuated considerably. In 1967, three land planning projects were completed by Northeast, Southeast, and Pacific Divisions. Acquisitions by the Engineering Field Divisions in support of military construction dropped to seven projects.³² Although the numerical goals of this function were not noted in the Command's fiscal year 1968 Operating Plan, their importance as a part of acquisition was delineated.³³

³¹BUDOCKS Operating Plan 1-66.

³²NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-67.

³³NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-68.

The following year land planning studies jumped to twenty projects. Four studies each were performed by Atlantic and Southeast Divisions while Northeast, Southwest, and Western Divisions were each tasked with two.³⁴ The remaining Engineering Field Divisions concentrated their efforts on one project apiece. There were forty-two planned military construction acquisitions during 1969 which varied from a high of eight projects accomplished by Southeast Division to a low of one project completed by Chesapeake Division.³⁵

The first Command Management Plan and each of its successors emphasized that one of the major and continuing areas of emphasis in the Real Estate Program was the acquisition of property in support of the Military Construction Program. In fact, detailed goals for fiscal year 1972 included forty-seven Land Planning Studies with nineteen in support of military construction and twenty-eight in support of operations and maintenance acquisition projects. In addition, title and occupancy to 405 parcels of land would be obtained. Of this total, 353 parcels would be acquired to support military construction and 52 parcels would be acquired to support operations and maintenance.³⁶

The stress on Military Construction Program acquisitions continued

³⁴Atlantic Division's increased workload was due to the transfer of real estate responsibilities from the Caribbean Division.

³⁵NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69.

³⁶FY 1972 Command Management Plan.

in fiscal year 1973 with a requirement for fourteen land planning reports and 207 parcels of land. Land Planning Reports for the Operations and Maintenance Program numbered twenty-five, but fee interest was required in only 86 parcels of land. Total parcels acquired, however, amounted to 284 or 9 parcels below the requirement. This backlog was the result of limited resources for military construction acquisitions.³⁷

Increased resources in fiscal year 1974 helped actualize the continuing emphasis on acquisitions in support of military construction. A total of forty-five Land Planning Studies were required; eighteen were in support of military construction acquisitions, twenty-seven were in support of operations and maintenance acquisitions, and four projects were backlogged because of underfunding. Title and occupancy was to be obtained in 277 parcels of land while 2 parcels in the Military Construction Program and 10 parcels in the Operations and Maintenance Program were backlogged.³⁸

For fiscal year 1975, forty-two land planning studies were projected. The need for title and occupancy of 206 parcels of land was also identified.³⁹

Beyond acquiring fee title to lands, the Command conducted an extensive program aimed at acquiring the use of land by lease or other use agreements whenever this action would satisfy a real estate

³⁷FY 1973 Command Management Plan, NAVFAC P-441 (Jun 1972).

³⁸FY 1974 Command Management Plan, NAVFAC P-441 (Jun 1973).

³⁹FY 1975 Command Management Plan, NAVFAC P-441 (Jun 1974).

requirement. The scope of the Command's ingrant program for the years 1965 through 1974 was quite extensive.

CHART 12-2	ANNUAL RENT PAID FOR LEASED PROPERTY ⁴⁰ (in thousands of dollars)			
	Worldwide	U.S.	Possessions	Foreign Countries
1965	3,829	980	6	2,843
1966	4,730	2,787	5	1,933
1967	6,698	3,249	6	3,443
1968	7,141	3,800	8	3,333
1969	7,620	3,740	14	3,866
1970	7,295	3,435	13	3,847
1971	7,431	3,433	1,619	2,379
1972	7,191	3,819	18	3,354
1973	8,874	4,941	18	3,915
1974	9,965	4,653	18	5,294

Rental costs rose steadily with only minor downward fluctuations. From a worldwide standpoint, annual costs increased from a low in 1965 to a high in 1974 by \$6,136,000. Leased property rental expense

⁴⁰ Report DD-Comp (A), 741 of 30 Jun each fiscal year from 1965 through 1974.

in the United States as compared to foreign areas remained relatively close on a yearly basis. Thus, the total worldwide increase in expenses came from increases in both of these locations. Ingrants in United States possessions were relatively insignificant by comparison.

A sampling of the number of leases involved is fairly representative of the program trends. For example, 2,640 new inleases were to be acquired in 1969.⁴¹ Requirements set forth in fiscal year 1971 entailed the issuance of 2,000 new or renegotiated leases and the administration of 4,400 leases already in existence.⁴² By 1973, the requirement for new or renegotiated ingrants had dropped to 1,083, while, because of limited resources, action could only be taken on 938 such instruments. On the other hand, the Command's lease administration duties had drastically increased to satisfy the needs of 8,176 existing inleases.⁴³ In 1974, the downward trend continued as requirements fell to 965 new or renegotiated leases of which only 867 were funded. In addition, the total number of existing leases under the Command's administration was reduced to 6,135.⁴⁴

Thus, as can be seen from the preceding, a discussion of acquisition activities cannot be limited to a listing of fee interest acreage

⁴¹NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69.

⁴²FY 1972 Command Management Plan.

⁴³FY 1973 Command Management Plan.

⁴⁴FY 1974 Command Management Plan.

acquired and its corresponding cost to the government. New legislation, internal procedure and policy changes, special projects, and ongoing studies all played a role in the acquisition function. Additionally, the Command's ingrant program was of such tremendous scope that it too could not be ignored. Nevertheless, as a comprehensive indicator of accomplishment, yearly trends in acreage acquisition and the corresponding costs are particularly informative.

During fiscal year 1965, a leveling trend continued in acquisition costs while the total amount of acreage acquired dropped substantially from the 1964 figures. At a total cost of \$483,177, 12,739.89 acres were acquired. Approximately 650 acres accounted for the entire acquisition costs of the year while the remaining acreage was received at no cost by transfer from other government agencies.

Major acquisitions which highlight the year were all obtained by such no cost transfers. Among these transactions were 5,104 acres for the Arctic Research Laboratory, Point Barrow, Alaska; 3,755 acres for the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Ransburg Wash, China Lake, California; 1,078.8 acres for the Naval Electronics Laboratory, Microwave Space Relay Station, San Diego County, California; and 1,885.19 acres consisting of the former Bonham Air Force Base, Barking Sands, Kauai, Hawaii. These four acquisitions accounted for all but 916.91 of the 12,739.89 acres obtained during the year.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ BUDOCKS Real Property Acquisition Summary (1 Jul 1964 - 30 Jun 1965).

Acreage acquisition for fiscal year 1966 remained relatively comparable to the previous year while acquisition costs took a tremendous leap. The total number of projects during 1966 was thirty-seven, out of which thirty-six involved properties in the continental United States, Alaska, and Hawaii and one involved an overseas possession. United States acquisitions totaled 13,678 acres at a cost of \$2,150,476 while the overseas acquisition project obtained for the government only 22 acres at no cost.

Lands were acquired by condemnation, purchase, transfer and land exchange. Seventeen projects or 46 percent were acquired by purchase, eighteen projects or 24.3 percent each were acquired through condemnation and transfer, and two projects or 5.4 percent involved a land exchange.⁴⁶

The bulk of all acquisitions, 11,674 acres, was once again acquired by transfer from other government agencies. As a matter of fact, the highlight of the year was the acquisition of the Naval Weapons Industrial Plant, McGregor, Texas by transfer from the Air Force. Previously Air Force Plant #66, it was an 11,445 acre facility with a plant account value of \$28,647,000. In addition, 1,940 acres in 130 parcels were acquired by purchase and condemnation and the remaining 64 acres were obtained through land exchanges. Forty-one

⁴⁶BUDOCKS Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1966.

installations were affected by these acquisition projects. Many of the smaller acquisitions were submerged land areas of nominal value which were required to protect the Navy's interests in improvements constructed on such areas.⁴⁷

Fiscal year 1967 brought a decrease in both the total acreage acquired and its corresponding costs. In total, 4,287 acres were obtained through thirty-eight projects for \$287,964. Of these amounts, 3,645 acres were acquired in the continental United States, Alaska, and Hawaii through thirty-four projects and 642 acres were acquired in United States possessions through four projects. Methods of acquisition included six projects or 15.8 percent by condemnation, eighteen projects or 47.4 percent by purchase, thirteen projects or 34.2 percent by transfer, and one project or 2.6 percent land exchange.⁴⁸

In an effort to precisely tailor acreage to fit the Navy's current needs, the Command acquired permanent interests in 627 acres of privately owned land. These tracts, plus those acquired by other means, helped expand activities at twenty-nine vital installations. In turn, this enabled the Navy to meet the pressing demand for shore support during the Vietnam conflict.

⁴⁷ BUDOCKS Real Property Acquisition Summary (1 Jul 1965 - 30 Jun 1966).

⁴⁸ NAVFAC Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1967.

One of the largest acreage acquisitions of the year was 128 acres for the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, one of the Command's own installations. Another of the year's larger acquisitions was 125 acres for the Naval Fuel Supply Depot, Craney Island, Virginia. By far the largest acquisition in terms of cost was the \$44,775 spent for an additional 46.87 acres, plus \$8,925 for an 18.01 acre easement, at the Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas.⁴⁹

Total acquisitions for fiscal year 1968 consisted of 11,791.52 acres at a cost to the government of \$969,520. An unusual reversal occurred during this period in that the largest portion of the total acreage acquired was by direct purchase rather than transfer from other government agencies. Of this total figure 9,861.11 acres were obtained by purchase, 1,878.76 acres were obtained by transfer, and 31.65 acres were obtained by land exchange. Acquisitions were made in support of forty-one installations.

Major acquisitions for the year included 7,627 acres at a cost of \$181,885 for the Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California; 1,094.75 acres at a cost of \$219,034 for the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi; and 1,262.46 acres by no cost transfer for the Naval Research Laboratory, Hybla Valley, Virginia.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ NAVFAC Real Property Acquisition Summary (FY 1967).

⁵⁰ NAVFAC Real Property Acquisition Summary (FY 1968).

Acquisitions reached their peak for the period 1965 to 1974 in 1969. During this year 109,010 acres were acquired at a cost of \$15,390,000. Subsequently a steady decline began which continued through 1972. In 1970, 12,403 acres were acquired at a cost of \$9,089,000. Fiscal years 1971 and 1972 brought similar totals, 3,963 acres and 3,498 acres respectively. At the same time, acquisition costs had dropped substantially from \$4,789,000 in 1971 to \$31,000 in 1972. In 1973 the number of acres acquired leapt to their second highest figure for the ten year period while, at the same time, costs continued to decline. Specifically, 23,681 acres were obtained at a cost of \$21,000. The following year, in 1974, the Command experienced a reversal of the 1973 situation. That is, costs climbed significantly to \$268,000 while acquisitions fell to an all-time low of 990 acres.⁵¹

⁵¹According to research contacts, detailed acquisition summaries from 1969 through 1974 are unavailable.

CHART 12-3

REAL ESTATE ACQUISITION SUMMARY⁵²
FISCAL YEARS 1965 to 1974

Fiscal Year	Acres	Cost
1965	12,740	483,177
1966	13,678	2,150,476
1967	4,287	287,964
1968	11,792	969,520
1969	109,010	15,390,000
1970	12,403	9,089,000
1971	3,963	4,789,000
1972	3,498	31,000
1973	23,681	21,000
1974	990	268,000

DISPOSAL

At the opposite end of the continuum from the real estate acquisition function was the prompt disposal of property that had been determined excess to the Navy's needs both currently and in the foreseeable

⁵²Telecon with Mr. J. M. Suflita, NAVFAC Shore Facilities Planning, Code 2011B, 12 Mar 1975.

future. The same Executive Order which transferred the legal aspects of the acquisition of real property from the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy to the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks also transferred the legal aspects of the disposition of real property.⁵³

While most of the real estate effort during World War II was directed toward acquiring property to support the war effort, shortly after the cessation of hostilities the Bureau found itself in the midst of a massive disposal program. Many of the naval activities located on leased property were disestablished by December 1945. At the same time, however, the Bureau's Real Estate Division was actively engaged in declaring surplus those properties that had been acquired in fee simple. Roll-up schedules for hospitals, training camps, ordnance stations, personnel separation centers, and other naval activities were prepared and each of the surplus activities was scheduled for transfer to the War Assets Administration pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944. The program had gained great momentum when by May of 1946 the roll-up schedules for all airfields were completed.

Of the more than 25,000 tracts of land acquired during the war (over one million acres at a cost of more than \$200,000,000), final

⁵³Executive Order 9194.

determination of the value of several thousand of these tracts was still pending in court in June of 1946. To further complicate the Bureau's extensive disposal program, many of these tracts were now considered surplus to the Navy's needs.

From 1947 to 1964 disposal trends were naturally quite varied. From increased disposals in the late 1940s and early 1950s, a low, leveling trend developed which continued from 1952 through 1956. Subsequent emphasis was once again on an expanded disposal program that spanned the first half of the 1960s.

CHART 12-4

NAVY DISPOSAL SUMMARY OF THE
CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES,
1 JULY 1946 to 30 JUNE 1964

Fiscal Year		Acres	Acquisition Costs*
1947	a.*	33,760.40	\$149,850,724
	b.*	4,469.56	-
1948	a.	20,153.49	51,812,187
	b.	533.92	188,278
1949	a.	2,545.18	15,872,883
	b.	1,840.42	13,700,377
1950	a.	22,571.83	30,291,337
	b.	52.49	47,676
1951	a.	993.41	17,454,945
	b.	160,343.33	39,723,441
1952	a.	3,131.24	4,360,086
	b.	-	-
1953	a.	1,993.12	2,927,443
	b.	3,925.34	18,963,492
1954	a.	1,548.38	1,347,464
	b.	2,828.50	13,398,450
1955	a.	3,361.03	9,146,156
	b.	8.06	18,220
1956	a.	5,421.96	23,097,704
	b.	2,569.99	60,005
1957	a.	9,773.71	24,673,062
	b.	1,783.56	2,199,005
1958	a.	20,870.17	125,413,184
	b.	688.69	36,539,848

CHART 12-4 (continued)

Fiscal Year		Acres	Acquisition Costs*
1959	a.	18,687.20	176,139,755
	b.	1,644.06	-
1960	a.	81,609.2	411,007,974
	b.	4,440.22	25,871,584
1961	a.	23,391.92	216,862,875
	b.	8,095.39	4,164,602
1962	a.	26,694.66	289,694,116
	b.	4,147.18	53,319,328
1963	a.	9,104.05	219,263,667
	b.	281,621.20	1,234,067
1964	a.	4,797.61	67,265,779
	b.	48,402.537	185,723

*a. Fee and Lesser Interests

*b. Public Lands (Includes government owned lands acquired from other government agencies, inter-defense transfers, and public domain)

* Includes Improvements.

Huge disposals in 1951 of 161,336.74 acres and in 1963 of 281,621.20 acres were comprised of returns to public domain, inter-defense transfers, and government agency transfers. The peak year for the disposal of fee interest property was 1960 when a record 81,609.2 acres were reported as excess to the General Services

Administration (GSA). As a matter of fact, more than 50 percent of all property disposed of during that year by GSA was originally Navy property.

The most significant year for disposals in terms of original acquisition costs including improvements was also 1960. Throughout the year excess property valued at \$436,879,559 was relinquished. Overall, the original acquisition costs of surplus property corresponded to the emphasis placed on the disposal program during this seventeen year period. In general, high costs matched increased disposals in the post-World War II years. Substantially lower costs were found during the low, leveling trend of the early 1950s. Finally, tremendous costs were associated with the strong emphasis placed on increased disposals from the late 1950s through the first half of the next decade.

Key policy and procedural changes from 1965 to 1974 had an important effect on the direction of the Command's disposal program. One instrument which precipitated a tremendous impact was Executive Order 11508 of 10 February 1970.⁵⁴ In essence, it provided for identification of all unneeded federal real estate. Each federal agency was charged with completing a survey of land under its control for the purpose of identifying those properties that were either under-utilized, not utilized at all, or not being put to optimum use. Any land

⁵⁴Executive Order 11508, F.R. Doc. 35-2855, filed 12 Feb 1970.

described by the survey as non-utilized was to be disposed of promptly.

In contrast, identification of excess property through the Navy's existing excess facilities plan was historically a lengthy process. To facilitate disposals, the president established a Property Review Board and tasked the General Services Administration (GSA) with conducting the surveys. GSA began their surveys with the Department of Defense, primarily because of its position as the most extensive government landholder. A response was to be provided by the Department of Defense within thirty days after the receipt of any GSA determination of land use. Thus, the net effect of this procedure was to compress a once lengthy excess property identification process into one month.

Once it had become apparent that GSA was unable to complete with the necessary rapidity all those surveys which the Property Review Board desired, the Department of Defense was asked to render assistance. Each military department was charged with completing additional surveys and, as the program accelerated, the time frame for the identification process was shortened even further.

The Command's disposal program was necessarily expanded during the 1970s to implement the demands of Executive Order 11508. The Command Advisory Board found it advisable to assign this function real estate resource priority.⁵⁵ The arduous task of identifying unneeded Navy

⁵⁵FY 1974 Command Management Plan.

real estate and at the same time protecting the Navy's vital interests in some properties of currently marginal but foreseeably essential use was not easy. In light of this, the Command's performance was commendable.

A later executive order superseded Executive Order 11508, but the program remained basically unchanged. The new order made only superficial changes in the program's content.⁵⁶

In 1967, the Department of Defense provided overall guidance for its military departments on the necessary procedures prior to disposal of excess real estate.⁵⁷ It clarified and combined all those recent regulations pertaining to this area of Command concern. All excess property disposals were accomplished under the provisions of the Federal Property Act of 1949.⁵⁸ However, intervening policy changes required several additional procedures on the road to a completed disposal project.

All property with an estimated fair market or annual rental value of \$50,000 had to receive the prior approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) and, under existing legislation, the action was also to be reported to the Congressional Armed Services Committees.⁵⁹

⁵⁶Executive Order 11724; Telecon with Mr. A.M. Egeland, NAVFAC Real Estate, Code 20RS, 11 Mar 1975.

⁵⁷DOD Instruction 4165.12 of 6 Feb 1967.

⁵⁸Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

⁵⁹Title 10, United States Code, Section 2662.

When property was determined excess to the needs of the Navy, it underwent a screening process. A memorandum was circulated to all military departments, each defense agency, and the Coast Guard in order to alert them to the availability of the property. However, in order to acquire the property by transfer, a tentative commitment was required within thirty days and a firm commitment within an additional thirty days. If time factors were not strictly met, the disposal action would proceed notwithstanding a governmental requirement for the property.

The process of accelerated screening was usually implemented in the event of a base closure. In this instance, only ten days were allowed for a response from a military department or defense agency indicating a requirement for the property. Additionally, under public law, installations that were scheduled for disestablishment and had a personnel complement in excess of 250 had to be reported to the Armed Services Committees of Congress at least thirty days prior to the action.⁶⁰ Full justification was provided to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) for the purpose of presenting this Congressional report.

Disposal policy and procedure from 1965 to 1974 naturally underlies all Command actions in this realm. Variations in program emphasis

⁶⁰PL 568 (Section 613), 89th Cong.

and functional activity levels, however, are best described by yearly accomplishments. In the latter years of the 1960s the number of major and minor disposal projects fluctuated between 500 and 600.⁶¹ Often it was necessary to backlog minor improvement disposals in order to meet the higher priority major disposals with the resources available. In the early 1970s the number of disposal projects had begun to increase. By fiscal year 1972, the Command was engulfed in a major disposal program aimed at reducing Navy operations and maintenance responsibilities for surplus property and meeting the provisions of Executive Order 11508. Instead of a leveling trend, 1973 and 1974 brought further disposal demands as the Command provided support to the Navy's new Shore Establishment Realignment Program.

In fiscal year 1965, the Command's real estate disposal function handled the release of 560,908.83 acres with an original land acquisition cost of \$4,501,727. In addition to this amount, betterments and related property located on these relinquished areas amounted to \$85,751,069 and \$17,401,012, respectively.⁶²

In terms of total acreage, the largest disposal action of the year was the transfer of the 519,106 acre Sahara Gunnery Range, Fallon, Nevada to the Department of the Interior. Other major acreage dispositions were the 19,702.18 acre Naval Missile Facility, Point Arguello, Lompoc, California with a massive total cost of \$31,795,157;

⁶¹NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-67.

⁶²BUDOCKS Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1965).

4,357.05 acres and 45 buildings from Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana with a total cost of \$21,934,456; and 14,952 acres from Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington with a total cost of \$64,100. Additionally, the disposal of the former Naval Ammunition Depot, Hastings, Nebraska was begun during this year when 10,236.22 acres with improvements were transferred to the Department of the Interior and another 4,230.62 acres with a total cost of \$3,581,525 were turned over to the General Services Administration.⁶³

Other 1965 disposals of relatively insignificant amounts of acreage were extremely important because of their original acquisition value. For instance, a miniscule .487 acres with a total cost of \$1,561,015 from the "J" Street Annex of the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard was released. Other such transactions included 27.64 acres from the Public Works Center, Independence Housing, San Diego, California with a total cost of \$1,176,491; 50.25 acres from the Net Depot, Tiburon, California with a total cost of \$1,826,946; 47.65 acres and 168 buildings from the Cumberland Road Housing, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida with a total cost of \$1,217,227; 343.25 acres and 121 buildings from the Naval Ordnance Plant, Macon, Georgia with a total cost of \$13,491,958; 111.25 acres

⁶³BUDOCKS Disposal Summary (FY 1965).

from Headquarters Support Activity, New Orleans, Louisiana with a total cost of \$4,972,709; 8.3 acres and 32 buildings from the Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, New Orleans, Louisiana with a total cost of \$4,741,714; 156.58 acres from the Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant, Saginaw, Texas with a total cost of \$9,424,753; and 15.02 acres from the Shearwater Housing, Naval Air Station, Seattle, Washington with a total cost of \$1,589,854.⁶⁴

Fiscal year 1966 brought sixty-two disposal projects in the United States and its possessions. These disposal projects consisted of 32,306 acres with original land acquisition costs of \$4,744,571. Improvements and related personal property on this real estate was valued at \$109,273,259 and 38,486.172. Structures on this year's excess property numbered 1,954.⁶⁵

The highlight of the year was the further disposal of Naval Ammunition Depot, Hastings, Nebraska. From August through November the Command disposed of 24,768.93 acres and 1,503 buildings (including utilities) with a total original acquisition cost of \$51,639,008. The seven actions involved accounted for almost 80 percent of the total acreage relinquished during the year and over 30 percent of the total acquisition costs of all disposals.⁶⁶

⁶⁴BUDOCKS Disposal Summary (FY 1965).

⁶⁵BUDOCKS Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1966.

⁶⁶BUDOCKS Disposal Summary (FY 1966).

In fiscal year 1967, total acreage disposition continued its decline to 13,311 acres while land acquisition costs of yearly excess property climbed to \$7,723,608. Original costs for improvements were \$192,841,866 and costs for related personal property were \$20,333,867. Disposal actions affected twenty-seven naval installations.⁶⁷

The most important disposal of the year was the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York. A prime piece of Navy real estate, it consisted of 226.23 acres of land, 75 buildings, 6 piers, 1 bridge, 6 drydocks, and 2 shipways. The property's total acquisition costs, including \$6,000,984 for land and \$144,182,024 for improvements, was \$150,183,008.⁶⁸

Although substantially overshadowed by the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard, there were several other multi-million dollar disposals during the year. Among them were 791.71 acres and 90 buildings with a total cost of \$9,700,400, from the Naval Air Facility, Litchfield, Arizona; 1,813.64 acres and 174 buildings with a total cost of \$17,053,706 from the Naval Air Station, Sanford, Florida; 158.31 acres and 38 buildings with a total cost of from \$9,268,123 from the Long Island Fuel Annex, Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine; and 69.06 acres and 25 buildings with a total cost of

⁶⁷ NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1967).

⁶⁸ NAVFAC Disposal Summary (FY 1967).

\$5,621,984 from the Naval Industrial Reserve Gear Plant, Lynn, Massachusetts.⁶⁹

The previous years activity slacked off considerably in fiscal year 1968. Excess acreage dropped to 11,344.51 and original land acquisition costs fell to \$449,088. Disposal actions affected only eighteen naval installations. The largest disposals, as measured by acreage, were 3,610 acres comprising Unalaska Island and Hog Island, Alaska; 3,040 acres of the Naval Station, Rodman, Canal Zone; and 2,627 acres of the Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico. The latter transaction was also the most costly; the original acquisition cost of the now surplus property was \$148,500. Another valuable disposal was 50.25 acres of the Naval Net Depot, Tiburon, California with original acquisition costs of \$118,500.⁷⁰

In 1969, excess acreage and acquisition costs climbed substantially. Over 54,500 acres with original land costs of \$5,821,000 were relinquished from Navy control. This trend continued into 1970 when 102,851 acres, almost double the previous years total, with costs of \$15,317,000, almost triple the previous years total, were released.

In 1971, however, only 5,645 acres with an original value of \$1,648,000 were removed from the ranks of Navy real estate. In

⁶⁹NAVFAC Disposal Summary (FY 1967).

⁷⁰NAVFAC Disposal Summary (FY 1968).

terms of acreage, dispositions were relatively small as compared with earlier years. For instance, one of the larger disposals was 507 acres comprising a portion of the Marine Corps Helicopter Outlying Landing Field in Orange County, California.⁷¹ Significant for their total costs which included original land, improvement, and equipment expenses, were four excess naval installations. These valuable disposals consisted of a Naval Research Laboratory Transmitter Site and a separate Receiver Site in Texas with combined total costs of \$4,865,299;⁷² the former Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas with total costs of \$20,849, 900;⁷³ and the Naval Support Activity, Seattle, Washington with total costs of \$3,388,318.⁷⁴

In fiscal year 1972 the Command's excess acreage increased to 15,696 while original land costs declined to \$1,206,000. During the year, four million and multi-million dollar disposals transpired. A 17 acre section of the Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard, known as Islais Creek, in San Francisco, California was reported as excess. With land acquisition costs of \$374,063 and improvements valued as \$219,425, the total cost of the facility amounted to \$1,193,488.⁷⁵ In addition, a 30 acre portion of the Naval Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg,

⁷¹NAVFAC Disposal Report #323 (30 Apr 1971).

⁷²NAVFAC Disposal Report #325 (30 Apr 1971).

⁷³NAVFAC Disposal Report #318 (29 Jan 1971).

⁷⁴NAVFAC Disposal Report #316 (29 Jan 1971).

⁷⁵NAVFAC Disposal Report #329 (30 Jul 1971).

Pennsylvania with a reported total cost of \$1,843,305 was also relinquished.⁷⁶ In the multi-million dollar cost category were the Virginia-Cheatham Annex of the Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia valued at \$5,573,495 and the former Naval Operating Base, Dutch Harbor, Alaska valued at \$12,480,831.⁷⁷ In terms of acreage, each disposal project was relatively small but, correspondingly, the total number of projects was substantially increased. One of the larger acreage disposals was unimproved fee-owned land at the Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California.

During fiscal year 1973, the number of acres reported as excess more than doubled over the previous year while the corresponding acquisition costs of these properties had declined. During this period, 34,644 acres were released with original land costs of \$518,000. This latter figure is, of course, tremendously enlarged when improvement costs are also considered. For instance, the Naval Station (including the Naval Communications Station), Kodiak, Alaska was comprised of 30,100 acres of land costing \$41,447 but improvement costs were \$77,145,608. Thus, total acquisition costs for the property were \$77,187,055.⁷⁸ Although the Naval Station at Kodiak

⁷⁶ NAVFAC Disposal Report #354 (26 May 1972).

⁷⁷ NAVFAC Disposal Report #344 (25 Feb 1972); NAVFAC Disposal Report #365 (30 Jun 1972).

⁷⁸ NAVFAC Disposal Report #367 (25 Aug 1972).

was the disposal with the largest total cost figure, six other multi-million dollar actions transpired. Among them were the Boston Naval Hospital valued at \$6,626,865, the Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Maryland valued at \$48,035,163, and a portion of the Naval Ammunition Depot in Hawthorne, Nevada valued at \$75,494,300.⁷⁹ A large amount of fee owned acreage at the Marine Corps Base, Twenty-nine Palms, California was also relinquished.⁸⁰

Excess property disposals took a tremendous surge in fiscal year 1974 in response to the Navy's Shore Establishment Realignment. Over 39,000,000 acres were declared surplus in a Navy effort to realign the shore establishment commensurate with programmed reductions of operating units of the fleet. Some of the multi-million dollar activities disestablished as a result of this study were Naval Air Station, Albany, Georgia; Naval Air Station, Glyncro, Georgia; Marine Corp Supply Activity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Naval Station, Key West, Florida; Naval Undersea Center, Pasadena Laboratory, Pasadena, California; Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts; Naval Station and Supply Center, Newport, Rhode Island; Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island; Naval Support Activity, Boston, Massachusetts;

⁷⁹ NAVFAC Disposal Report #419 (29 Jun 1973); NAVFAC Disposal Report #394 (31 Jan 1974); NAVFAC Disposal Report #376 (29 Sep 1972).

⁸⁰ NAVFAC Disposal Report #384 (27 Oct 1973).

and one of the Command's own activities, the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, Rhode Island.⁸¹ The scope of the program was obviously tremendous and its impact on the disposal function was equally significant.

⁸¹NAVFAC Disposal Reports #423 (16 Jun 1973); #424 (16 Jul 1973); #425 (16 Jul 1973); #426 (16 Jul 1973); #428 (31 Aug 1973); #432 (31 Aug 1973); #431-A (26 Oct 1973); #434-A (31 Oct 1973); #455 (26 Oct 1973); #463 (30 Apr 1974); #462 (30 Apr 1974); #466 (28 Sep 1973); #449 (30 Nov 1973); #448 (30 Nov 1973); #478 (31 Sep 1974).

CHART 12-5

REAL ESTATE DISPOSITION SUMMARY
FISCAL YEARS 1965 to 1974⁸²

Fiscal Year	Acres	Cost**
1965	560,909	4,501,727
1966	32,306	4,615,709
1967	13,311	7,823,608
1968	11,345	449,088
1969	54,681	5,821,000
1970	102,851	15,317,000
1971	5,645	1,648,000
1972	15,696	1,206,000
1973	34,644	518,000
1974	39,512,470	401,000

**Original acquisition costs of Class I property only.

⁸²Suflita telecon.

MANAGEMENT - UTILIZATION

Another important function of the Command's Real Estate Program was the management of property which was not required for current military use but was retained to meet future requirements or to provide buffer zones. The very nature of the requirement for some Navy real estate interests precludes its development for the highest and best use. Such interests may be in safety areas around ammunition depots, flight clearance areas at airfields,⁸³ land beneath aerial gunnery ranges, reserve training centers or military retention areas reserved for possible future mobilizations.

The outgrant program attempted to put this property to beneficial secondary use by granting leases, licenses, permits and other real estate instruments to corporations, civic associations, state and municipal governments, and private individuals. Through these actions, the Command hoped to improve the Navy's image as a "good neighbor," reduce maintenance expenditures, provide income to the United States Treasury, enhance the value of the property, protect the government's interests in Navy lands, and implement legislation and executive orders relating to the quality of the environment.⁸⁴

⁸³The utilization of Navy real estate near airfields was begun in 1964 with a view toward minimizing the possibility of future damage suits.

⁸⁴FY 1972 Command Management Plan.

During the period 1965 to 1974, the program can be termed a tremendous success. Even in years of limited program resources, priorities were established based upon the greatest number of benefits derived from a possible outgrant and agreements were consummated accordingly. An historical examination of the many positive benefits that had accrued from the program brought an increased emphasis on this real estate function during the 1970s.

Efficient, economical use and administration of property not presently needed by the Navy encompassed many subtasks which were directed from Command Headquarters and implemented by the Engineering Field Divisions.

The outlease was the most dynamic of all outgrant agreements and, as such, it bore the major thrust of the utilization program. Four key criteria had to be met before the outlease of Navy land was considered feasible. These necessary criteria were (1) a lease could not render the property unsuitable for its planned future military use, (2) a lease could not interfere with current or planned use of the adjacent property, (3) an outlease could not permit a useage that would represent a hazard to the premises being outleased, and (4) a substantial benefit, such as reduced maintenance costs, cash rental for unused property, or improved property management, had to result from the action. If the proposed use of the property conformed to the above criteria, and if the property was not excess to the Navy's needs or required by any other federal agency, as determined by

appropriate screening, it was made available for outleasing.⁸⁵

Among the many steps in the leasing process, the first was an examination of all naval installations in an effort to determine if property with outlease potential was available. By 1966, 20 percent of all activities had been so analyzed.⁸⁶ The following year an additional 50 percent were examined bringing the cumulative total considered through the identification function to 70 percent of the entire naval shore establishment. By 1969, all activities had undergone an initial appraisal.⁸⁷ This weighty accomplishment, however, did not bring the identification process to a conclusion. On a three year cycle each activity's real estate holdings were reexamined for possible changes in status while, at the same time, the continuing influx of new acquisitions also required that analysis be an ongoing process.⁸⁸

In the event property was identified for possible leasing, outlease plans were developed. Leasing criteria were established and, in the case of an agricultural outlease, conservation measures to be performed at the lessee's expense were developed.

⁸⁵ SECNAV Instruction 11011.18C of 14 Oct 1959. (Superseded by SECNAV Instruction 11011.45 of 28 May 1975).

⁸⁶ BUDOCKS Operating Plan 1-66.

⁸⁷ NAVFAC Operating Plans 1-67 and 2-67.

⁸⁸ NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69.

Outlease plans were prepared within the same fiscal year for at least 75 percent of the activities for which a potential was determined.⁸⁹ By 1970, following the completion of the initial installation identification analysis, outlease plans had been drawn up for all potential property. It is important to note that this too was an ongoing process as activities were periodically reevaluated and new property was continually acquired.

The number of agricultural outleases were naturally commensurate with the number of completed conservation plans. Contractual conservation improvements for 1966 were valued at \$500,000 and were performed on 200,000 acres of outleased agricultural land.⁹⁰ By 1974, the Command was administering 150 agricultural leases covering over 170,000 acres of Navy land with contractual conservation obligations which saved the government an estimated \$770,000. Conservation plans developed in 1973 numbered twenty-five.⁹¹ This subtask had increased to thirty-one by 1974.⁹²

One special consideration prior to outleasing agricultural lands was the lessee's proposed crop. Outlease of lands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply was not permitted. A list

⁸⁹ NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69.

⁹⁰ NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1966).

⁹¹ FY 1973 Command Management Plan.

⁹² FY 1974 Command Management Plan.

of these crops was periodically revised, compiled, and distributed by the Command.⁹³

Excellent examples of outleases requiring beneficial conservation practices abound. However, one long-term lease with a sugar company in Hawaii is fairly representative. The terms of the agreement called for the use of 1,200 acres of bare wasteland. In return, the company installed irrigation and drainage systems and created rich soil by dumping tons of sugar cane trash on the unproductive areas. After growing a succession of crops, the company would return the converted wasteland to the Navy in the form of rich agricultural lands.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 also had a significant impact on the outlease of Navy lands. Any new outleases of 50 acres or more, with the exception of agricultural or grazing land, were determined to have an environmental impact.⁹⁴ As such, the preparation of the requisite environmental impact assessments and statements discussed previously were necessary.

In the wake of identifying potential outlease land and developing outlease and conservation plans, the Command had to perform all the procedures that led to a finalized agreement. This process included

⁹³NAVFAC Instruction 1011.54 and all changes thereto.

⁹⁴OPNAV Instruction 6240.2D of 1 Apr 1974. Any outlease considered environmentally controversial was subject to the provisions of the act regardless of the qualifications noted.

advertisements for bids, negotiations as necessary, processing the outlease proposals to finalized leases, and the administration of consummated leases. Property was leased to the highest bidder unless it was determined that there was only one available lessee or that a selected lessee was in the best interests of the government.⁹⁵ With only particular exceptions, leases were granted for a period of not more than five years.⁹⁶

Besides the lease instrument, the real estate management and utilization function negotiated, prepared, secured the necessary approval, amended, executed, and administered easements, licenses, permits, and use agreements.

Easements were granted pursuant to four governing criteria. First, the real property involved was the only property which reasonably could be used for this purpose. Secondly, an easement was the most appropriate instrument to grant under the circumstances. Thirdly, the use of the easement would not materially interfere with the Navy's present or foreseeable use of the property or with any other government activities in the area and, finally, a cash consideration was paid equal to the fair value of the easement except when it was granted for the benefit of the government in which case the consideration

⁹⁵SECNAV Instruction 11011.18C of 14 Oct 1969.

⁹⁶Ibid.

was waived or reduced. Additionally, no consideration was necessary when the easement was granted for a federal-aid highway or a defense access road.⁹⁷

Licenses were issued only when the activity with cognizance over the real estate had reviewed the proposed use and was assured that it would not interfere with military requirements. Additional criteria were that the proposed use was of such a nature that it could be readily revoked and that the use would be to the benefit of the Navy or in the public interest.⁹⁸

Federal agencies with use requirements not readily revocable were permitted to use Navy real estate through use agreements. Before the granting of such instruments, the Command carefully reviewed the property to determine if transfer might be the more advisable approach. If a continuing Navy need existed and if the proposed use did not interfere and was compatible with operations on adjoining Navy property, then a use agreement was executed.⁹⁹

As a part of their real estate management duties, the Command conducted periodic inspections of outgranted property to insure that users were adhering to the terms of their agreements. The Command also processed the reassignment of property within the Department of

⁹⁷SECNAV Instruction 11011.21C of 19 Jul 1968.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹Ibid.

the Navy to ensure that all lands were utilized to the fullest extent possible. Replies to inquiries from outside sources or higher authority concerning the administration of real property was a natural offshoot of the administrative function.

Furthermore, the Command conducted the administration, management or coordination of real property actions relating to annexation by municipal entities, legislative jurisdiction, claims, and reversionary and retained interests in conveyances. In all annexation proposals requiring the approval of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics) prior to the entry by the District Commandant of a consent or protest, the Command provided comments and recommendations.¹⁰⁰

The scope and importance of the real estate management and utilization function can best be illustrated by highlighting some of its accomplishments from 1965 to 1974. Selected cases of note are equally informative.

In 1965, an unprecedented emphasis was placed on the management of real property required for military purposes but which permitted a secondary use. During this year the Command allowed others to use 180,000 acres of Navy land and over 24,000,000 square feet of improved

100

SECNAV Instruction 11011.29A of 1 Nov 1967.

properties. The most significant benefits derived from this year's program were identified as the reduction or elimination of massive government expenditures necessary to maintain the property, increased land value by requiring lessees to perform good soil and water conservation practices, and the creation of an income to the government of \$3,926,000.¹⁰¹

Although annual rental revenue declined in 1966 to \$2,704,911, the number of outgranted acres surpassed the previous year's figure by climbing to 209,360. Square feet of building space under secondary usage was recorded at 20,853,716. At this time, over 1,300 outgrant agreements were in existence and were comprised of 480 leases, 778 licenses and permits, and 71 miscellaneous real estate instruments.¹⁰² The largest amount of outgranted acreage, as in most years, was put to use by lessees as agricultural and grazing lands. On the other hand, over half of the annual rental generated and most of the improvements used were from expensive industrial and commercial facilities under outlease agreements.¹⁰³

Program emphasis during 1966 was given to lessees whose proposed use of Navy property was for educational purposes. As a result, this

¹⁰¹BUDOCKS Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1965); Report DD-Comp (a) 443 of 30 Jun 1965.

¹⁰²BUDOCKS Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1965; Report DD-Comp (a) 443 of 30 Jun 1966.

¹⁰³NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1966).

year's compendium of outgrants spanned the gamut from universities to nursery schools. Several specialized schools for handicapped children and Project Headstart made use of Navy real estate. Recreational and civic organization usage of property was also expanded. Municipal golf courses, beach areas, piers for pleasure boats, and Little League baseball fields were common outgrant agreements during this year. Boy Scout troops, thrift shops, rifle clubs, powerboat squadrons and chess clubs were among the many organizations which began operating on Navy property.¹⁰⁴ Through these extensive real estate actions the Command, among other things, had made positive inroads for Navy community relations.

Annual rental from the outgrant program decreased again in 1967 to \$2,313,259.¹⁰⁵ The number of acres under secondary use also plunged to 135,706 while square feet of building space outgranted remained relatively constant at 20,290,566. A corresponding decrease in the number of outgrant agreements in effect was the direct cause of this decline. Leases had dropped to 437 and, additionally, licenses and permits were below the previous year's total at 684. Only the miscellaneous category of other types of agreements had grown to 98 bringing the total number of outgrant agreements for 1967 to 1,219.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1966).

¹⁰⁵ Report DD-Comp (A) 741 of 30 Jun 1967.

¹⁰⁶ NAVFAC Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1967.

In the two succeeding years resources for the execution of the management and utilization program waned. The Command's policy under these limited circumstances was to provide priority treatment for those outgrants that would yield the greatest benefit to the Navy in terms of the program's objectives. Those outgrants of lesser import were delayed until a later date. It also became necessary to request additional assistance from station personnel in order to complete the many necessary compliance inspections.¹⁰⁷

Despite this unsettling situation, the Command's performance was commendable. In 1968, revenue generated by outgrants agreements was a substantial \$2,896,000, an amount in excess of the 1967 rental receipts.¹⁰⁸ The following year the Command executed and administered over 5,000 agreements. At the same time, action was taken on over 6,000 inquiries and requests concerning annexations, legislative jurisdiction, and reassignments.¹⁰⁹ Total annual rental receipts for 1969 fell very slightly to \$2,850,000.¹¹⁰

In 1970 and 1971 outgrant revenues were \$2,992,000 and \$2,650,000 respectively.¹¹¹ A relatively stable trend in this function was noted as revenues continued to exceed \$2.5 million.

¹⁰⁷NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69.

¹⁰⁸Report DD-Comp (A) 741 of 30 Jun 1968.

¹⁰⁹NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69.

¹¹⁰Report DD-Comp (A) 741 of 30 Jun 1969.

¹¹¹Report DD-Comp (A) 741 of 30 Jun 1970 and 30 Jun 1971.

The Command's responsibilities in this real estate subsystem during 1972 included the issuance of 1,200 new or renegotiated outgrant agreements and the administration of a record 3,500 existing instruments.¹¹² At the same time, annual rental received for the use of Navy property had increased to \$2,824,000.¹¹³

A sampling of the division of workload among the Engineering Field Divisions during 1972 was representative and worthy of comment. Western Division bore the brunt of both tasks with the execution of approximately 400 new or renegotiated outgrants and administration of 1,400 existing agreements. Issuance of new or renegotiated outgrants by the remaining Engineering Field Divisions included about 260 by Northern Division, 140 by Atlantic Division, 200 by Southern Division, 60 by Chesapeake Division, and 140 by Pacific Division. Administration of existing outgrants was comprised of approximately 350 by Northern Division, 750 by Atlantic Division, 600 by Southern Division, 250 by Chesapeake Division, and 150 by Pacific Division.¹¹⁴

In 1973 the stabilized trend in rental income from outgranted properties was broken as this figure decreased to \$2,147,000.¹¹⁵ By 1974, however, rent receipts had increased by over \$600,000 when an annual total of \$2,808,000 was recorded.¹¹⁶ During the year almost

¹¹²FY 1972 Command Management Plan.

¹¹³Report DD-Comp (A) 741 of 30 Jun 1972.

¹¹⁴FY 1972 Command Management Plan.

¹¹⁵Report DD-Comp (A) 741 of 30 Jun 1973.

¹¹⁶Report DD-Comp (A) 741 of 30 Jun 1973.

1,500 new or renegotiated outgrants were consummated while the ever increasing number of existing agreements that required administration by the Command was in excess of 5,500.¹¹⁷ Savings in maintenance expenses now performed by the user was estimated at \$1,000,000.

Examples of beneficial land use as the result of the Command's outgrant program from 1965 to 1974 are abundant. Farmers grew pine-apples, sugar cane, beans, tomatoes, squash, cabbage, cucumbers, and cranberries on Navy land. Agricultural land was also used for grazing purposes. Furthermore, airlines and oil companies were also on the lengthy list of Navy real estate users.

Natural tree and bush growth encroaching onto the aircraft approach zone areas at the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine created an aviation safety hazard. Rather than expending government funds on the application of herbicides and bush cutting, the property was leased to a blueberry producer. Not only was the safety hazard eliminated at no expense to the Government, it brought income in the form of a flat rental fee and a portion of the producer's profit, provided an excellent ground cover for erosion control, and boosted the civilian economy.

In Alaska, the departure of the salmon and halibut boats in early fall meant a slump in some local fishing communities. King crab fishing became a thriving year-round proposition in certain areas after a

¹¹⁷FY 1974 Command Management Plan.

lease and several licenses were executed with local fishermen.

A significant example of compatible land use between local government and the military was the outlease to Orange County, California of 485 acres surrounding the operating area of a Marine Corps Helicopter Outlying Field. Under the county's Master Plan of Regional Parks, the acreage was developed for public picnic, camping, botanical and arboretum areas, plus archery and play fields, a cultural center and other recreational facilities. The multiple benefits of this action were a large annual cash consideration, substantial savings in maintenance costs, and the establishment of excellent community relations.

With a world steel boom in the 1970s came an increased demand for United States ferrous scrap. This demand increased prices such that most grades of ferrous scrap reached their highest level in sixteen years. Through its outgrant program the Command was instrumental in relieving this serious situation. Appropriate naval installations were made available for leasing to the shipbreaking industry which was critically short of the necessary facilities to step up ferrous scrap production.

Poinsettia and lemon farms at the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California; orange groves at the Naval Air Station, Sanford, Florida; a horse ranch at the Naval Electronics Laboratory, San Diego, California; walnut groves at the Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California; and grazing land around the fuel tank farm at the Naval

Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina were a few further examples of agreements through which the Command's utilization function accomplished its beneficial program objectives.

CHART 12-6 ANNUAL RENTAL RECEIVED FOR LEASED
PROPERTY, FISCAL YEARS 1965 - 1974

Fiscal Year	Worldwide	United States	Possessions	Foreign Countries
1965	3,926,000	3,761,000	165,000	0
1966	2,979,000	2,827,000	151,000	0
1967	2,536,000	2,400,000	132,000	0
1968	2,896,000	2,798,000	94,000	4,000
1969	2,850,000	2,765,000	81,000	4,000
1970	2,992,000	2,901,000	85,000	6,000
1971	2,650,000	2,538,000	67,000	45,000
1972	2,824,000	2,706,000	69,000	49,000
1973	2,147,000	1,701,000	388,000	58,000
1974	2,808,000	2,309,000	441,000	58,000

NATURAL RESOURCES

For many years the Navy and Marine Corps, through the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, conducted a progressive, multiple use program for the renewable, natural resources of forests and woodland, fish and wildlife, soil, water, and grasslands compatible with the military mission of their installations.¹¹⁸ As the term "multiple use" suggests, none of the elements of this program were mutually exclusive. Although the Command divided this real estate responsibility into the three separate working components of forestry, fish and wildlife, and soil and water conservation management, in actuality, all were overlapping and highly interrelated.

The Command's natural resources management program made great strides from 1965 to 1974. From only 1,000,000 acres in 1965, natural resources management control had been extended to over 2,700,000 acres by the end of 1974.¹¹⁹ Only through an examination of the forestry, fish and wildlife, and soil and water activities of this period can the tremendous accomplishments of this program be justly described.

Forestry

Prior to 1960, few Department of the Navy activities recognized the potential value of their forest resources nor implemented any type

¹¹⁸ SECNAV Instruction 5430.50 of 27 May 1960; MCO 11015.2 of 13 Nov 1962.

¹¹⁹ BUDOCKS Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1965); "Land Management," The Blueprint (Sep 1974).

of active forestry management program. A lack of technical assistance in planning, directing, and supervising such programs and a lack of the necessary defense appropriations for the conduct of a viable forestry program were the principal reasons underlying this situation.

The active conservation and development of forestry resources on Navy lands began in earnest when Congress attached a new provision to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 1961. It provided for the use of funds derived from the sale of scrap, salvage, surplus personal property and timber products to reimburse expenses incurred in military forestry programs. From this date on, money was made available under these same terms as a part of the annual Department of Defense Appropriations Acts.

During the same year, permission was requested and authorization granted for the Command to prepare, award, and administer forestry management and harvest contracts.¹²⁰ The Command was also requested to implement for the Navy the provisions of an agreement between the Department of Defense and the Small Business Administration requiring that a fair share of the total timber sales be made to small business concerns.¹²¹

¹²⁰Ltr from CHBUDOCKS to CNM of 24 Aug 1961; Ltr from CNM to CHBUDOCKS of 19 Dec 1961.

¹²¹"Agreement Between the Department of Defense and The Small Business Administration for the Development of a Program of Assistance for Small Business Concerns in the Sale of Timber and Related Forest Products from Forests on Federal Lands Under the Jurisdiction of Department of Defense" (20 May 1961).

Still in the infant stages during the first half of the 1960s, the program was in a constant state of flux. Professional staff and activity foresters were initially recruited between 1962 and 1963. Also during 1962, the Command formulated forestry program policy and procedures to comply with its expanded responsibilities.¹²² The need for cooperation and mutual assistance with other federal agencies whose forestry management and conservation expertise made them valuable allies was recognized in 1963. As a result, a formal understanding between the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture was consummated.¹²³

In 1965, the Review of Management of the Department of the Navy resulted in the assignment of single executive duties for forest resources management to the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.¹²⁴ This was, of course, nullified by the Navy-wide reorganization of 1967.

As the Command entered 1965, the fledgling forestry program was just beginning to settle into refined objectives and procedures. The long-range forest resources management plan had previously been

¹²²BUDOCKS Instruction 11015.9 of 9 Apr 1962.

¹²³"Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture for the Conservation of Forests, Vegetative Cover, Soil, and Water on Lands Administered by the Department of Defense" (27 Mar 1963).

¹²⁴Recommendation 76, Review of Management of the Department of the Navy (1 Jul 1964); SECNAV Instruction 11015.4A of 12 Mar 1965.

established as the instrument which placed the Navy's forest resources under management control.¹²⁵ Separate from an installations natural resources master plan, these instruments were now developed when appropriate with the aid and assistance of federal or state forestry agencies. Within the plan, many facets of forestry management were considered. Timber area access roads, the management of soil, water, fish, wildlife, and watersheds as related to forestry, the enhancement of natural beauty and recreational value, natural and artificial regeneration of forest tree species, protection against wild fires, injurious insects and diseases, and the prompt salvage or disposal of dead or dying timber were some of these facets. Additionally, the forest resources management plan provided for the scheduled harvest, in accordance with appropriate technical standards and guides, of the Navy's timber stands. Scheduled cuts were planned to achieve optimum utilization of current and future markets and a desirable composition of the residual stands. Silviculture techniques were applied as necessary to improve the composition and growth of Navy forests.¹²⁶ Based upon the long-range plan, annual increments were prepared describing the details of all proposed work and harvesting operations.

During 1965, the Command increased the number of Navy acres

¹²⁵BUDOCKS Instruction 11015.9 of 9 Apr 1962.

¹²⁶DOD Instruction 4170.7 of 21 Jun 1965; SECNAV Instruction 11015.11 CH-1, of 18 Jun 1965.

under forestry management control to 276,000. Of this total 3,081 acres were reforested and 23,271 acres were improved by elimination of unwanted vegetation. Timber sales brought an income of \$320,388. Program expenses of \$608,950 exceeded sales revenue in the early years of the program but the difference continued to narrow in future years as growth on reforested and improved areas reached merchantable size.¹²⁷

In 1966, the forestry program exceeded its planned target by bringing 280,000 acres of forestland under management control. Planting and seeding of desirable timber-producing trees in order to bring the highest price and best meet defense needs in the future took place on 5,243 acres. At the same time, timber stands were improved on 10,268 acres. The ratio of income to expense had also surpassed the planned level of approximately 50 percent; income for the year was \$466,977 as compared to expenses of \$629,089.¹²⁸ The number of long-range forestry management plans in effect had grown to over seventy. It was estimated that by 1975 the program would become self-supporting as many young, barren areas were brought into production.

A special project of note was initiated during the year when Navy foresters, in conjunction with the United States Forest Service,

¹²⁷ BUDOCKS Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1965).

¹²⁸ NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1966); Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1966; BUDOCKS Operating Plan 1-66.

began experimentally growing thirty-three types of eucalyptus trees and sixteen varieties of Mexican pine at the Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California. The ultimate objective of the experimentation was to determine what species of timber producing trees would grow best in semi-arid areas.¹²⁹

The number of Navy acres under management control had grown to 303,168 by the end of 1967. An additional 4,238 acres were reforested and the quality of timber stands were improved on 16,947 acres through selective cutting, removal of low quality trees, and prescribed burning. At the same time, 128 miles of timber access roads and 217 miles of firebreaks were maintained. Income from the sale of timber was less than \$100,000 shy of covering expenses as income increased to a record high of \$500,918 while expenses decreased to \$600,005.¹³⁰ The Command had exceeded its planned yearly goal with the preparation of fifty-seven forestry plans.

The cooperative research project at the Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California had begun to reap important results. Other research progress included improved techniques in direct seeding and the application of silvicides for timber stand improvement, and more effective use of equipment for such operations as prescribed burning

¹²⁹NAVFAC Progress Report (FY 1966).

¹³⁰NAVFAC Progress Report (FY 1967); NAVFAC Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1967; NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-67.

and site preparation.¹³¹

In 1968, the amount of Navy acreage under forestry management plans had increased once more to 309,000 acres. Acres reforested were 3,307 and acres improved were 11,983. On the other hand, income from timber sales had fallen to \$358,889 while forestry expenses remained relatively constant at \$559,548.¹³² Also during the year, the number of staff foresters at the Engineering Field Divisions had reached five. They provided technical guidance to activity foresters and performed forestry work for many smaller naval activities without a forestry staff. Eleven activities had a large enough forestry program to warrant their own station foresters and the three largest installations even employed assistant foresters.¹³³ One particularly significant program begun during the year was the reclamation of fire-damaged forestland at the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey.

The following year, in 1969, the Command awarded approximately 100 forestry operation contracts.¹³⁴ As the number of acres under forestry management continued to grow at an average of about 10,000 acres per year, the number of forestry plans and annual increments

¹³¹NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy(FY 1967).

¹³²Forestry Progress, Fiscal Year 1968.

¹³³R. H. Ledford, "Natural Resources Management Program," The Navy Civil Engineer (Apr 1968), p. 18.

¹³⁴NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69.

required increased correspondingly. By 1971, approximately 313,000 acres were included in the program. Through this year, forestry income was averaging around \$569,000 or about 88 percent of expenses.¹³⁵

In 1972 the Command experienced a record year in timber sales with an income of \$633,139. This exceeded their anticipated income by over \$100,000. At the same time, twelve long-range forestry plans were developed and fifty-six annual increments were prepared.

While 1973's income and workload decreased slightly, 1974 was a year of tremendous accomplishment. Eight long-range management plans and fifty annual increments were prepared. Most importantly, however, forestry management expenses were \$747,677 while income had topped the incredible figure of \$1,907,682.¹³⁶ The Command's self-sustaining forestry program had come to fruition earlier than anticipated. Two installations were primarily responsible for this forestry milestone. The Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina sold \$495,374 worth of timber and the Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina recorded gross proceeds of \$732,750. It was recognized that good market conditions were partially responsible for these high returns but, without a professional management program, income would have

¹³⁵ NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69; FY 1971 Command Management Plan.

¹³⁶ FY 1974 Command Management Plan; "Navy Timber Sales Set New Record," The Southerner (Jan 1975).

been nonexistent or, at the very most, inconsequential.

In conclusion, it is important to reiterate that planned forestry operations had many other beneficial effects not measurable in monetary terms. Savings in ground maintenance costs, providing good habitat for wildlife, protecting watersheds, creating buffer zones, and favorably affecting the environment by reducing noise, trapping pollutants, and improving the aesthetic quality of the landscape were just a few of the valuable outgrowths of this program.

Fish and Wildlife

The Command's fish and wildlife management program received its initial impetus from presidential policy and subsequent legislation which conferred upon the Secretary of Defense certain responsibilities for the management, conservation, and harvesting of fish and wildlife resources on military lands and prescribed Department of Defense policy for the establishment of a meaningful program.¹³⁷

The instrument for the administration of the program became the tripartite cooperative agreement between the Navy, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, and the appropriate state Fish and Game Department. These agreements provided for mutual cooperation in the form of technical advice and professional assistance

¹³⁷PL 797, 86th Cong., 2nd Sess. Act of 1960. 74 Stat. 1052; PL 337, 85th Cong.; "Message of the President to the Congress" of 23 Feb 1961 (H. R. Doc. 94, 87th Cong., 1st Sess.).

toward the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources on Navy lands.¹³⁸

Shortly after the military fish and wildlife program had become national policy, the Department of Defense and the Department of Interior developed a model cooperative agreement which established future policy and separated areas of concern.¹³⁹

From 1962 to 1965 the parameters of the program were first delineated and then refined.¹⁴⁰ By 1965, however, fish and wildlife management had become an active progressive part of the Command's natural resources management program. One of its two primary objectives was to manage land areas in such a manner that they would produce the maximum amount of fish and wildlife needed to meet growing public demand and pressure for additional hunting, fishing and other recreational areas. Navy lands were opened to military and federally employed personnel as well as to manageable quotas of the public compatible with station security and safety. The fish and wildlife program also sought to restore, enhance, and preserve, through wise use and proper management, the fish and wildlife and related resources on all Department of the Navy installations.¹⁴¹

¹³⁸PL 797, 86th Cong.

¹³⁹"Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Interior and the Department of Defense for the Conservation of Fish and Wildlife on Military Installations" (11 Jul 1960).

¹⁴⁰DOD Directive 5500.5 of 16 Feb 1962; SECNAV Instruction 11015.7 of 15 Jun 1962; BUDOCKS Instruction 11015.10 of 8 Nov 1962; DOD Instruction 4170.6 of 21 Jun 1965; SECNAV Instruction 11015.7B of 15 Oct 1965.

¹⁴¹NAVFAC Instruction 11015.10A of 25 Mar 1968.

As previously noted, the program was to be implemented through cooperative agreements which assigned conservation contributions of different governmental agencies to the overall program.¹⁴² These agreements were to be executed for all naval installations identified as having suitable land and water areas. In addition, the Command required that five-year fish and wildlife management plans be prepared and further maintained by annual increments.¹⁴³ Methods of operation included such actions as surveys of installations to determine the species of fish and wildlife native to the area, a census of present numbers, a determination of the carrying capacity and many additional procedures directed at improving the habitat of fish and wildlife. Other activities consisted of fish and wildlife trapping, transplanting, stocking and restocking, protection, predator control, securing the proper harvest to maintain optimum numbers, operating game farms and fish rearing ponds, constructing water impoundments and improving streams.

In 1965 and 1966, thirty-six cooperative agreements were consummated bringing the total number of existing agreements to sixty-six.¹⁴⁴ By 1968 cooperative agreements numbered seventy-three. At

¹⁴²"Memorandum of Understanding" (11 Jul 1960); PL 797, 86th Cong.

¹⁴³NAVFAC Instruction 11015.10A.

¹⁴⁴NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1966).

the same time, long-range fish and wildlife management plans and annual increments were completed for each of the installations covered by cooperative agreements. Plans continued to be prepared and/or up-dated at a rate of approximately ten per year through the early 1970s.¹⁴⁵ This number had increased to twenty by 1972 and further increased to twenty-six per year in 1974.¹⁴⁶

Since its inception the program was hampered by a lack of appropriated funds to pursue its objectives.¹⁴⁷ While it was permitted to collect fees from sportsman, in addition to their purchase of a state license, this was rarely done. Instead the Command relied heavily on membership fees charged by activity Rod and Gun Clubs to purchase needed materials. Volunteer labor from these Rod and Gun Clubs, as well as youth and other organizations, were used to accomplish the many tasks called for in the activity management plans. Staff conservationists at the Engineering Field Divisions served as a focal point of contact and coordinated conservation efforts. To assure program continuity, Conservation Committees were appointed at participating installations.¹⁴⁸ Further, the Command solicited and received public support from conservation organizations such as the Wildlife Management

¹⁴⁵BUDOCKS Operating Plan 2-67.

¹⁴⁶FY 1972 Command Management Plan; FY 1974 Command Management Plan.

¹⁴⁷NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1967).

¹⁴⁸NAVFAC Instruction 11015.10A; NAVFAC Instruction 11015.14 of 5 Oct 1973.

Institute and the Izaak Walton League.

Despite limited resources the program progressed admirably. Public Law 86-797 (the Sikes Act) was passed in 1967 which authorized funds for the Department of Defense to be used for the enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat and public recreation during 1969, 1970, and 1971.¹⁴⁹ These funds were never appropriated by the Department of Defense.

From 1965 to 1974, the use of Navy lands for recreational purposes continued to expand. In compliance with public law, the Command conducted a survey in 1966 for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of installations having a potential for hunting, fishing and other outdoor recreation. The results indicated that public access was permitted on over 2,000,000 acres of Navy-controlled land.¹⁵⁰

In 1968, twenty installations permitted public access for hunting, twenty-seven for fishing, and twenty-six for other types of recreation. While it was not, in some instances, compatible with the mission of the activity to permit usage by the general public, twenty-one installations provided hunting, thirty provided fishing, and thirty-two provided other types of recreation for installation personnel and guests. A total of 1,021,382 people were accommodated

¹⁴⁹PL 465, 90th Cong., 2nd Sess. Act of 1960, amended 1968. 82 Stat. 661.

¹⁵⁰PL 29, 88th Cong.; NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1966).

for outdoor recreational activities on Navy installations. This represented a substantial increase over the previous year when only 748,811 people visited Navy installations for recreational purposes.¹⁵¹

In contrast, by 1973, 246 Navy and Marine Corps installations had opened their gates to outdoor enthusiasts. Over 2,000,000 people including 61,410 hunters, 138,961 fishermen, and 1,826,486 other individuals who participated in such activities as camping, picnicing, hiking and cycling were allowed to utilize Navy facilities.¹⁵²

Accomplishments in the various areas of the fish and wildlife program were numerous. Nevertheless, representative examples are informative. In 1966, cooperative research on dangerous bird and aircraft collisions were conducted at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland and on Midway Island. This research succeeded in reducing aircraft hazards created by local species of birds.¹⁵³ The following year, inventories of fish and wildlife resources on 2,100,000 acres of land were begun. Navy waters were stocked with 690,953 fish weighing 21,255 pounds. Further efforts were directed at restoring bighorn sheep to the Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵¹ Memo from R. Leonard (NAVFAC Real Estate) to C. N. Powell (OASD) of 2 Oct 1968.

¹⁵² "Outdoor Buffs Use Navy Lands for Recreation," The Southerner (Aug 1974).

¹⁵³ NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1966).

¹⁵⁴ Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1967); NAVFAC Progress Report (FY 1967).

The Endangered Species Act of 1969 had a tremendous effect on the direction of Navy fish and wildlife efforts.¹⁵⁵ Great emphasis was subsequently placed on conserving, protecting, and propagating species of fish and wildlife that were faced with extinction. Since hunting was relatively well regulated by state law, the Command turned its efforts toward combating the other major causes of fish and wildlife extinction, habitat destruction. As a result, the Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii was declared an inviolate sanctuary for the Hawaiian stilt and the Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California was declared a National Wildlife Refuge by Congress. The Navy even eliminated overflights along coastal national forest land in California to help preserve the rapidly disappearing condor and brown pelican who nested in these regions.¹⁵⁶

The Command was quick to develop new techniques and experiment with new innovations. Installed on Navy lands in the Southwest were "gallinaceous guzzlers."¹⁵⁷ Actually a water catchment device, the "guzzlers" accumulated drinking water for birds while barring unwanted and predatory animals with iron grillwork. Although native fish and game received preferential treatment, some experiments were performed to introduce adaptable and beneficial foreign species.¹⁵⁸ For instance, Himalayan snow partridges were placed at their homeland altitudes on

¹⁵⁵ PL 135, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. Act of 1969. 83 Stat. 275.

¹⁵⁶ NAVFAC News Release #2-75 of 19 Jan 1975.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

the mountainous terrain of the Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada. Chukar partridges from India and fallow deer from Spain were successfully introduced at several naval installations.

While these are but a few examples of the accomplishments of the Command's fish and wildlife management program, it is easily concluded that tremendous progress was made from 1965 to 1974 in achieving attendant natural resources objectives.

Soil and Water Conservation

The third segment of the Command's natural resources management program was soil and water conservation. The objectives of this program were to conserve, develop, manage and maintain the soil and water resources on all Navy Department lands through proven scientific methods and techniques. Such action facilitated military operations, protected real estate investments from depreciation, protected, restored and enhanced natural resources, contributed to pollution abatement and proper waste disposal, enhanced the appearance of installations through appropriate landscaping, and protected and improved the beauty of the natural landscape.¹⁵⁹

Soil and water conservation, along with the other elements of the natural resources program was given a special significance in the early 1960s to keep abreast of new national policy. The same agreement

¹⁵⁹ NAVFAC Instruction 11015.6B of 6 Feb 1973.

which provided for mutual cooperation between the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture in the conduct of the forestry program also provided for mutual cooperation in the conduct of the soil and water program.¹⁶⁰

Major planning devices and guidelines for the implementation of appropriate soil and water conservation measures were activity soil and water (land management) conservation plans. These plans were periodically updated to keep abreast of changing conditions. The Command also prepared functional landscape plans which were simple and informal in design and compatible with the overall natural beauty of each installation.¹⁶¹ Other important functions included fire prevention measures and the preparation of conservation plans for out-leased lands.¹⁶²

Another major task of the soil and water conservation program was to incorporate sound measures in project planning, site evaluations, ground maintenance contracts, new construction and other instruments or special projects which involved soil, vegetation, water and land use problems. Additionally, the Command took the

¹⁶⁰"Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture for the Conservation of Forests, Vegetative Cover, Soil and Water on Lands Administered by the Department of Defense "(27 Mar 1963).

¹⁶¹SECNAV Instruction 11015.2B of 15 Oct 1965; BUDOCKS Instruction 11015.6A of 7 Jun 1963; NAVFAC Instruction 11015.6B of 6 Feb 1973.

¹⁶²This function was previously described as a part of the real estate management and utilization function.

initiative in stimulating education, understanding, and beneficial action for the conservation of natural resources on military lands and in providing on-site technical assistance when soil and water problems arose.¹⁶³

In 1965, soil and water conservation measures in construction and rehabilitation projects accounted for expenditures of \$2,500,000. With technical assistance from the Department of Agriculture, the Command published a manual on herbicides which was accepted for use by several state and federal agencies as well as other military departments.¹⁶⁴

During 1966, fifty-nine soil and water conservation plans covering 263,830 acres of Navy land were completed.¹⁶⁵ Conservation measures incorporated in 200 construction projects amounted to expenses of more than \$3,000,000.¹⁶⁶ At the same time, general costs for the conduct of the program were approximately \$100,000.¹⁶⁷ Over 50 percent of the 383 activities requiring plans had now been provided with updated and current ones. Conservation plans were also provided for numerous agricultural outleases.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶³ SECNAVINST 11015.2B.

¹⁶⁴ BUDOCKS Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1965); BUDOCKS Progress Report (FY 1965).

¹⁶⁵ BUDOCKS Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1966.

¹⁶⁶ NAVFAC Progress Report (FY 1966).

¹⁶⁷ BUDOCKS Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1966.

¹⁶⁸ NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1966).

In 1967, forty-five plans covering over 278,640 acres were prepared.¹⁶⁹ This brought the cumulative total of all soil and water conservation plans in effect to 311 or 80 percent of all installations with sizable land areas. Also during the year, 153 conservation plans were prepared or updated prior to the issuance of agricultural outleases. Another \$2,000,000 was spent on conservation measures for new construction projects. A program to survey all Navy and Marine Corps installations to determine the needed soil and water conservation projects was then over 82 percent completed.¹⁷⁰ Program expenses for the year increased to \$140,000.¹⁷¹

From 1969 through 1972 soil and water projects and plans fluctuated slightly above and below 180 per year.¹⁷² This was a relatively stable period as the soil and water program settled into established procedures and requirements. Soil and water conservation measures for new construction projects and agricultural outleases were met in a timely fashion. On the other hand, the increasing number of activity soil and water conservation plans and, as a result, the increasing number of plans requiring update, brought an expanded workload in this area of responsibility.

¹⁶⁹ NAVFAC Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1967.

¹⁷⁰ NAVFAC Progress Report (FY 1967); NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1967).

¹⁷¹ NAVFAC Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1967.

¹⁷² NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69; FY 1972 Command Management Plan.

By 1973, the Command was preparing or updating twenty soil and water conservation plans per year. In addition, forty-one special project plans and specifications were developed and technical support was provided for 386 other actions with respect to their environmental effects. These actions included landscape and maintenance plans, construction and repair projects, surveys and investigations. Agricultural outlease conservation plans numbered eighteen.¹⁷³

In 1974, an additional twenty-three soil and water conservation plans were completed. Soil and water conservation expertise was provided for 35 special construction projects, 22 landscape and maintenance plans, 181 construction and repair projects, and 59 surveys and investigations. Conservation plans for agricultural outlease surpassed the previous year's figure at twenty-five.¹⁷⁴

A case of note which illustrates the importance to the Navy of the soil and water conservation program was also one of the largest erosion control projects of its type ever undertaken in Mississippi. The project at the Naval Air Station, Meridian involved the stabilization of all areas adjacent to the runways, taxiways, and forty acre aircraft parking apron and the elimination of steep eroding slopes and drainage problems in the administrative areas. A joint venture

¹⁷³FY 1973 Command Management Plan.

¹⁷⁴FY 1974 Command Management Plan.

between the Soil Conservation Service and the Command, the total cost of the project was approximately \$500,000. To protect this investment in grounds improvement and facilities, an updated soil and water conservation plan which furnished the necessary guidance for carrying out proper grounds maintenance operations was prepared.

The interrelationship between the soil and water conservation program and the other natural resources programs was demonstrated by the construction of numerous fish ponds on Navy lands. Not only did these ponds provide a source of water for minor irrigation needs and improve the scenic value of the land, but they were subsequently stocked with fish to accommodate outdoor recreation enthusiasts.

To provide added incentive for continued progress in applying natural resources conservation principles on Navy and Marine Corps installations, the Command sponsored a yearly contest for the Secretary of the Navy. The contest was directed at recognizing those activities that had made the greatest progress toward achieving natural resources goals.¹⁷⁵ Winners of the Secretary of Navy Award later competed with other military department winners for the Secretary of Defense Natural Resources Conservation Award.¹⁷⁶ From 1965 to 1974 conservation competition identified several exceptional natural resources programs

¹⁷⁵NAVFAC Instruction 11015.12 of 25 Jan 1968; NAVFAC Instruction 11015.14 of 5 Oct 1973.

¹⁷⁶DOD Instruction 5000.13 of 21 Jun 1965.

at various Navy installations.

Thus, in the areas of forestry, fish and wildlife, soil and water and related natural resources conservation, the Command's overall performance was exemplary. Their assigned obligation to the American people to act responsibly and effectively in restoring, improving, developing, and conserving Navy-controlled lands was fulfilled to the highest extent possible with the resources available.

INVENTORY AND CADASTRAL

In accordance with existing legislation and by directive from higher authority, the Naval Facilities Engineering Command has for many years maintained an official record of financial and physical data on all naval facilities.¹⁷⁷ In addition to financial and physical data, however, accurate information pertaining to the use, user, and condition of facilities was supplied for the conduct of the Shore Facilities Planning System. Overall, the Navy Real Property Inventory and the inventories of other military departments served as the source of current comparable information pertaining to military real estate used in developing and effectuating Department of Defense policy, plans, and programs.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁷ Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 2701; DOD Instructions 4165.14, 7500.1 and 4165.3; SECNAV Instruction 11011.40; OPNAV Instruction 11011.9.

¹⁷⁸ DOD Instruction 4165.14 of 21 Dec 1966.

Prior to July of 1973, the Real Property Inventory was an integral part of the Real Estate Program.¹⁷⁹ However, the dual program use of the inventory made it possible to transfer the inventory function to the auspices of the Shore Facilities Planning Program. Information derived from the inventory was of particular import to the Shore Facilities Planning System.¹⁸⁰ The ability to compare facility assets data with facilities requirement data was essential in isolating and identifying excesses and deficiencies at naval installations. In turn, the Shore Facilities Planning Program could more accurately determine the requirements of the Military Construction Program and use the available data as the basis for the allocation of facilities management resources.

Nevertheless, for the bulk of the period, the Real Property Inventory was maintained by the Command's Real Estate Program. Inventory objectives from 1965 to 1974 were aimed at improving the existing system.¹⁸¹ Accuracy of the collected data was a critical factor if the inventory was to be used for its stated purposes.¹⁸² For this reason, emphasis was placed on maintaining and policing the

¹⁷⁹ NAVFAC Key to Routing Slips of 1973.

¹⁸⁰ Real Property Inventory; Instructions for Reporting Class I (Land) and Class II (Buildings, Structures and Utilities), NAVFAC P-78 (Jan 1974).

¹⁸¹ NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-68.

¹⁸² NAVFAC P-78.

inventory reporting program to insure compliance with existing directives, improving the accuracy of information maintained and produced at the Headquarters level, improving the operation of the reporting program in order to meet established schedules and deadlines, developing minimum standards for accuracy of individual inventory records, providing real property information for both scheduled and special reports to Congress, the Department of Defense, and other departments and offices of the federal government as requested, and developing special methods and procedures to meet unusual requirements and reports.¹⁸³ The effort expended on this refinement and improvement program was extensive.

In 1965 action was initiated to transfer the detailed, centralized inventory records from the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California to Washington, D.C. At the same time, parallel testing of the two systems was conducted.¹⁸⁴

Also in the latter half of the 1960s, a manual with new and improved instructions for the preparation and distribution of Property Record Cards was prepared for publication and group study was conducted which led to the publication of a manual with new and revised category codes for real property classifications.¹⁸⁵ Yet another procedural

¹⁸³ NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-68.

¹⁸⁴ BUDOCKS Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1965).

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

manual was revised and implemented at a later date.¹⁸⁶ In addition, usable and timely records were compiled of general activity information and continued support was rendered to installation planning by development of the necessary input and output data.¹⁸⁷

A major effort begun during the late 1960s was the development of staffing criteria for the inventory function at the Engineering Field Division and activity level. A standardized assignment of responsibility at the activity level was also provided.¹⁸⁸

In the 1970s, Real Property Inventory records were transferred back to Port Hueneme and integrated with the Navy Facilities System administered by the Facilities Systems Office (FACSO).

Guidance and assistance was rendered by Headquarters to the Engineering Field Divisions, other naval commands, and various governmental agencies while the Engineering Field Divisions acted as the focal point of contact for the reporting activities.¹⁸⁹

A program was initiated to purify the use, user, and condition data on individual property records in the Real Property Inventory.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁶ NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-67.

¹⁸⁷ BUDOCKS Operating Plan 1-66; NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-67.

¹⁸⁸ NAVFAC Operating Plans 1-67 and 1-69.

¹⁸⁹ FY 1974 Command Management Plan.

¹⁹⁰ FY 1972 Command Management Plan.

Thousands of Class 1 and 2 property transactions executed by the Engineering Field Divisions were converted to the acceptable format and subsequently submitted to the Real Property Inventory reporting activities for transmittal to the Real Property Inventory data base at FACSO.

The Command continuously sought to maintain the Real Property Inventory in a current state based upon shore activity inputs, generate special and annual Real Property Inventory and statistical reports in a timely manner, and function as a working proponent in all matters relating to their inventory duties.¹⁹¹

In the 1960s the Command embarked upon a vital new real estate program which continued through 1974. The program entailed removing all of the Navy's real estate title papers from dusty, old files dating back to, in some instances, the late 1700s. Contained in these valuable files were the original title papers for Navy real estate and many descriptive accompanying letters written in longhand pertaining to this property. Prior to this the files had been periodically passed from one naval bureau to another as this real estate responsibility changed hands.

Initially the title papers were dispatched to the Engineering Field Division within whose jurisdiction the described lands were located.

¹⁹¹FY 1974 Command Management Plan.

In turn the Engineering Field Divisions prepared films of all the papers entrusted to them and forwarded these duplicates back to Headquarters for reference purposes and safekeeping.

As the program progressed it was decided that a cartographic portrayal in the form of a real estate summary map would be produced for all Navy-controlled Class I (real estate) property. These maps included such information as when the land was acquired, its acreage, a metes and bounds description, the type or types of jurisdiction held by the United States, the areas of public domain, transfers from other government agencies, the method of acquisition, and many other kinds of relevant information. The narrative descriptions rescued and derived from the old files and the summary maps played an important role in protecting the Navy's new, complex real estate interests.

By 1965, 70 percent of the graphic portion of the program was completed when summary maps were developed for an additional 140 individual activities.¹⁹² Engineering Field Divisions were instructed to administer and maintain, as a permanent part of their cadastral program, records of land which, even though disposed of by the Navy, might revert to it at some future date.¹⁹³

In 1966 the initial phase of the program was within control and attention was also turned toward the production of narrative summaries.

¹⁹² BUDOCKS Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1965).

¹⁹³ BUDOCKS Instruction 11011.50 of 19 Aug 1965.

Additionally, studies were conducted on the most current methods of legal documentation in order to improve the Command's record-keeping system and microfilming methods.¹⁹⁴ The cumulative total of summary maps had increased to 901 or 80 percent by the end of the year, while the number of narrative summaries had also begun to climb.¹⁹⁵

The need to describe Navy and Marine Reserve Centers was also recognized in the late 1960s and these types of naval installations were given special attention in the narrative and summary mapping program.¹⁹⁶

By 1967 the summary mapping program had reached the level of 90 percent complete.¹⁹⁷ At the same time, narrative summaries for 60 percent of all reserve training centers had been prepared as well as 35 percent of all other naval installations.¹⁹⁸

Resource constraints hampered progress during 1969 as summary maps were produced on a much smaller scale but with a continuing emphasis on quality. Efforts applied toward the preparation of narrative summaries were contingent upon resources leftover from the

¹⁹⁴BUDOCKS Operating Plan 1-66.

¹⁹⁵BUDOCKS Real Property Management Accomplishments, Fiscal Year 1966.

¹⁹⁶NAVFAC Instruction 11011.53A of 16 May 1967.

¹⁹⁷NAVFAC Annual Report to the Secretary of the Navy (FY 1967).

¹⁹⁸NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-67.

summary mapping program. Also during the year, a plan was devised for the most efficient method for preparation of narrative summaries for all major naval installations.¹⁹⁹

By 1970, half a million of the filmed real estate documents from the Engineering Field Divisions occupied seventy-five cubic feet of Headquarters filing space. The summary mapping program was now 95 percent completed.²⁰⁰

Even though the summary mapping program seemed virtually finished by the 1970s, this was deceptive. Although summary maps for the remaining 5 percent of all naval installations were soon completed, each map, to be reliable and accepted with confidence, had to be kept up to date and revised in response to further real estate actions. In addition, a workable system required that the maps and Real Property Inventory be in consonance. The timely and accurate accomplishment of both update and corroboration provided a serious, time-consuming challenge to all of the Command's cadastral staffs.

Narrative summary efforts during the 1970s focused on completing real estate descriptions of major naval shore activities.²⁰¹ In the future, when the high priority narratives were finished, the Command would turn its attention to facilities of lesser importance and, as

¹⁹⁹ NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69.

²⁰⁰ Calvin Fader, "NAVFAC Cadastral Branch," The Navy Civil Engineer (Jan 1970).

²⁰¹ FY 1972 Command Management Plan.

in the case of the summary mapping program, face the tremendous process of keeping these descriptions current.

With a presidential promulgation of 1971 came a new Command real estate responsibility.²⁰² The federal government was now required to provide leadership in preserving, restoring and maintaining the historic and cultural environment of the nation. All federal agencies were tasked with applying this new policy to property under their jurisdiction.²⁰³

The specific responsibilities assigned to the Real Estate Program were threefold. First, of course, Navy-controlled property of historic, architectural, or archaeological significance were to be identified and then nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. The Command first began its identification task by compiling a list of all installations fifty years old or older and furnishing the list to the National Park Service and the appropriate state officials. This initial effort provided the Command with an idea of the scope of the program. The process was later refined so that identification was provided at the activity level.

The second responsibility tendered by the new policy was the need to preserve, rehabilitate, and restore all registered sites to

²⁰² Executive Order 11593, F. R. Doc. 36-95, filed 15 May 1971.

²⁰³ Ibid.; OPNAV Instruction 11011.11 of 12 Jul 1971.

professional standards. Little was accomplished in this area as property of significant historic value had yet to be identified and funds had not been provided for this undertaking until 1974.

Lastly, the Command was required to plan new facilities and alterations to older facilities in such a way that they would result in the least adverse effect on registered historic sites. The Command continuously sought to carry this provision out. If an historic property was to be demolished or substantially altered, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation was given the opportunity to comment on the proposal. Furthermore, when such an action transpired, records showing the change were deposited with the Library of Congress.

From 1965 to 1974, the Command's Real Estate Program made important inroads in almost every area of endeavor. It responded admirably during a period when dynamic change and fluctuating resources required major adjustments to keep abreast of the current situation. By the conclusion of the first half of the 1970s the Command's real estate subsystem was already looking into the future in order to meet further complex demands for Navy real estate.