

Dec 5 1976.

Confidential Memorandum

- Ed Harte, chairman
- Hayden Head, Sr., vice chairman
- Cecil Burney
- Charles Butt
- Dr. Hector Garcia
- H. C. Heldenfels, Sr.
- Ivan Wilson

Information copies to:

Ron Maples
Loyd Neal
Dick Stone
Joe Watson
Jim Woodard

Chamber President-Elect Ron Maples arranged meetings with Col. Frank Toner, CCAD commander, and Capt. Jack Wynn, CNATRA chief of staff, for Friday, December 3, 1976. We had several questions prepared for each meeting, and, in addition, asked that each officer give us his assessment of the situation. Attending each of the meetings were Ed Harte, Ron Maples, Loyd Neal and Dennis Parrish.

We met with Col. Toner at 10:00 a.m. Harte asked if the Navy had coordinated its move with him. Toner said that the Army had not been involved at all, to his knowledge. He said he personally had not been contacted.

Toner said that CCAD's workload looked solid for the next five years. One reason offered was that the Army is not purchasing new engines, only rebuilding, which is CCAD's mission. He said he expects no maintenance schedule changes for aircraft that affect CCAD.

Toner said that the Air Force has not been contacted to see how it would respond to any Navy change in airdrome operation. One of the alternatives the Navy is studying calls for reduction of airdrome operations to week-days and VFR conditions only. The Air Force transports much of the CCAD workload.

The committee inquired as to the status of moving the CH47 (Chinook helicopter) program from New Cumberland. Toner said it is currently at a "standoff" because the Army has selected the option to do nothing at this time. The alternatives have changed and are uncertain until status of CENAS is determined. Toner said it is logical, however, for the CH47 program to move here.

We asked what affect additional "housekeeping expenses" would have on CCAD should Navy be reduced here. One estimate is that CCAD would have \$3.5 to \$5 million increased expenses to incur. Toner first responded that this doesn't present a problem because CCAD already purchases these services from the Navy, but later agreed that there is a difference between "paying your share" and "paying the whole bill". Some expensive items the Army would have to pick up are increased costs of utilities and security. As part of the same question we asked if the Army might bring in additional activities to offset these costs. Toner replied that he knew of none and that the Army would not be "enthusiastic" about this

because they are also faced with prospective base closures.

Toner said CCAD was the largest employer of Mexican-Americans in the Army. The percentage breakdown of the civilian workforce is:

46.8% Spanish surname
49.4% majority group
3.6% black
.2% other

When asked if he predicted any workforce losses in FY77 or FY78, Toner said he saw no reduction in force for the future.

Toner agreed to assist us in assessing the impact on CCAD of the various alternatives being considered by Navy. He declined to visit Governor Briscoe with us or to let us use the services of his comptroller to review Navy data.

DS NBH

At 11:00 a.m. we met with Capt. Wynn. If I may subject you to editorial comment, my opinion is that Wynn was somewhat evasive and probably knew the answers to several questions that he said he couldn't answer. I believe this partly because of some information I received subsequent to the meeting and partly because it is unlikely the CNATRA staff could be so uninvolved in a realignment of its command as we were led to believe. I doubt that CNET could make such decisions without CNATRA's input.

Wynn confirmed that the study had been delivered by the contractor to CNET (Pensacola). He believed it would be sent to CNO-OPO4 during the week of December 6. He said no decision would be made until then. (The study will not become a public document until CNO releases it to CEQ.) Later that day, Wynn told Jim Woodard that no decision would be made at the time the study is sent to CEQ, but rather Navy would submit the document and ask CEQ's blessings on all the alternatives. He expected CNO to submit the study to CEQ in January.

Wynn said he did not know specifically what alternatives were being studied. We asked the status of moving helicopter undergraduate training from Whiting NAS to Fort Rucker, Ala. Wynn said that the consolidation of training had been delayed by Congress (largely through the efforts of Rep. Sykes) and would not be moved this year. Congress would now have to approve such a move through conference of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

Wynn said he did not know whether VT27 was scheduled to be disestablished. (We have several documents that show a time table for its disestablishment.)

We asked Wynn what is the ethnic mix among Navy civilian personnel at CCNAS and Pensacola. He estimated CCNAS civilian workforce at 40-45% Mexican-American. He did not know about Pensacola.

Wynn said, when asked, that he would give us the annual payroll figures for CCNAS military permanent party, military students and civilian permanent party. We asked him for the average payroll figure used in calculating projected savings in the realignment. He said he would inquire if he could give that to us.

Wynn confirmed that the new T44 aircraft would be assigned to VT28 and VT31 before the squadrons are relocated. He said civilian contractors would also be assigned here, but was not sure whether the study included relocation costs of moving the civilian contractors to the Pensacola area.

We asked Wynn for the Navy's pilot training requirements for FYs 77 through 81. He said FY77 was available and FY78 was fairly well established, but the others were undetermined.

At this point we suggested that we give Wynn a copy of the questions we had and he respond to those we had already asked as well as the following questions:

During the last year how many noise complaint phone calls per month have you received? Which fields were mentioned and what percentage of calls regarded each field? What is your estimate of total noise complaints that are "repeat business"?

If CCNAS is reduced to NAF status, what will be the effect on the Coast Guard? Have you coordinated the realignment with the Coast Guard? What has been the Coast Guard's reaction?

What degree of maintenance will there be on vacated facilities?

Are any other Navy units or functions being considered for location here to offset the impact of the NATRACOM Realignment?

Wynn agreed to answer those that he could. We may need to urge him to pursue answers to any questions he might leave unanswered once we get his response.