

13
25

CaptWhelan:dt 12/11/74

TALKING POINTS ON TINIAN LAND REQUIREMENT

All along we have tried to enter into as open, candid and detailed dialogue as possible; much more than usual

- It is clear that the Marianas are of key strategic importance
 - in the Marianas, Tinian has the greatest potential for base development because of topographical characteristics and limited development
 - considering the Asian-Pacific area, the current and projected military needs include training areas, storage areas, airport and seaport facilities
 - all in a politically secure environment.
 - these factors were developed and explained to you in great detail over the past year.

To recap the physical planning factors, there are major constraints which affect land utilization. These include:

Local Developments. There is considerable pressure for further development of Tinian. Upgrade of the existing harbor and airfield will assist in this area.

A Recap of our Planning Constraints also follows: There are several constraints which impact on efficient land utilization. These include:

- a. Airfield Runway Clearances and Aircraft Noise. Restrictions on the siting of certain facilities relative to safety distances from runways and to aircraft noise zones.
- b. Explosives Safety Zones. Prohibitions on the siting of personnel occupied facilities inside an Explosives Safety Quantity Distance (ESQD) arc.

03 - 036220

- c. Isley Field. The alignment and proximity of Saipan's Isley Field to Tinian impose an operational safety hazard when considering use of any existing or planned airfield on Tinian.
- d. Tinian Harbor and San Jose Village. The existence of only one harbor imposes shipping restrictions due to the incompatibility of concurrent general cargo and ammunition cargo and ammunition cargo operations. Further, the proximity of San Jose Village to the harbor required. Planned development of an alternative location for ammunition handling activities if required.
- e. Landing Beaches. As noted previously, the Tinian shoreline is formed predominantly by sea cliffs 20 to 100 feet high. This inhibits proper amphibious training because there are only a few narrow corridors along the shoreline through which amphibious vehicles can traverse.

Optimum siting of our requirements which we have made time and time again are:

1. The West Field site for a military runway. There are alignment problems with Isley Field on Saipan, which along with a possible reservation of the entire North Field area for the long-range ammunition storage requirements, eliminates North Field as a potential site. Realignment of West Field to parallel Isley Field reduces the real estate requirement and increases the safety aspect in terms of aircraft flight patterns.
2. The configuration of the northwest side of the island (Dump Coke) is ideally suited for ammunition storage because a substantial portion of the Explosives Safety Quantity Distance arc lies in the ocean. A remote ammunition pier mandatory when the number of ordnance transactions substantially increases.

3. Location of the operations and support area south of runway is preferred because it allows joint use of common use facilities leaving the north side for training and ammunition storage.

In the continuing spirit of our keeping each other fully and openly informed, we have kept you abreast of developments

- as the plans evolved in 1972, 1973 and 1974.
- as changes occurred, such as the discovery that a wet slip would be feasible at Dump Coke and San Jose would not have to be relocated.
- thus, I had to apprise you of this very recent - and still on-going - change.

However, sound military planning factors dictated the land requirement:

- The factors that led to the initial plan and the various missions or components of the base necessary to maximize its potential, have not changed.
- The necessity to put into execution the plan, at the pace previously indicated, has changed
 - worldwide developments have dictated this
 - the schedule of execution of the plan is being revised.
- Since we have fully apprised you of our plans, the impact of the base has been considered in your economic planning
 - now this change in plans is having an opposite effect. But it is better to know now than later.
- This does not alter fact that basic factors remain the same:
 - strategic need for certain capabilities in Western Pacific.
 - Tinian can provide them.

-- If we acquire the necessary land now a base with these types of missions will become a reality.

--- training now

--- other activities and facilities constructed sooner or later...and economic benefits will accrue.

-- If less land is acquired the Northern Marianas will benefit less.

--- Less initial payment for the land.

--- Less assurances that any or all of the other missions or facilities will be developed on Tinian.

-- However, as Joe Cruz indicated yesterday, confident that a base will be developed if land is provided. Timing has changed and could change again.

Because of our open and detailed exchange all along, you are aware of our requirements.

- To accept anything less would be a misleading and false indication of our requirements.
- In Article VIII, Section 802, of the Covenant we are committed to this open and frank policy in our defense land requirements. As you will recall, Section 802.b. says in effect that the U.S. affirms that it has no present plans to acquire any additional property...to carry out its defense responsibilities.
- If we agreed to acquire any less land we would be violating the letter and intent of that provision of the Covenant.

-- We have told you precisely how much land we need and why we need that much.

-- However, the timing of construction has changed.

-- Economic benefits have changed.

I do not have the details of the evolving DOD plans...as I reported yesterday, they still are being formulated.

- and will be for another month or two;

- I advised you of the change within a day or two after I was informed.

-- further speculation would be fruitless and could even be misleading.

POSSIBLE DISCUSSION POINTS

1. If alternative land proposals suggested:

- Ask for them in writing with promise to advise JCS of the proposal.

2. If application of restrictive Covenants is suggested:

- Remind MPSC of their previous proposal to reserve lands around Isely and Tanapag with restrictive covenants. But no covenants were advanced in response to my promise to consider such covenants.

- If you wish to propose this again, please provide them in writing in next week or so and I shall have them reviewed in Washington.

3. We have consistently stated that the usable land will not be placed in dead storage. The compatible economic uses will be fostered by our policies on leasing non excess land. I might add, at this point, our out-lease functions will conform to the non-alienation policies stated in the Covenant. That is, we will confine our offers to only those individuals and corporations who are authorized to conduct business in the area. It would appear now that you could further this aspect of land utilization by the organization of cooperatives or similar entities to be able to fully utilize the agricultural potential on Tinian. To me, it would not seem to be prudent to delay in this undertaking. At the time of the expiration of the MDC lease there should be an appropriate organized entity that could operate a similar enterprise on a smaller or larger scale.

Compatible use will be a general rule so as to make maximum acreage available to residents of Tinian. We must recognize, however, that there will be certain minimum constraints. However, I am confident that many out-grants can be so developed to satisfy both military and civilian needs*

*NOTE: Agricultural development connotes a degree of permanency. Exercising the right to establish farm plots, ranching/grazing activities, etc., requires a capitol investment by the recipient of the rights. Once established, these rights may be difficult and/or expensive to terminate should the military operations of the base so dictate. Additionally, the U.S. Government may be liable for any crop damage, etc., which may be caused by military units training. Therefore, any agreement should consider last out-grant on a case

by case basis, on a yearly or bi-yearly basis; defining the U.S. Government liability for damage/injury to civilian installation/personnel and providing for in restriction for use for operational/safety reasons during training exercises.

036226