

~~TOP SECRET~~

AFSAC: 59/29

12 March 1951

MEMORANDUM FOR THE MEMBERS OF AFSAC:

Subject: Selection of a Site for the Proposed Cryptologic Establishment Outside the Washington Area.

Reference: AFSAC: 77/15.

Enclosure: Note to the Holders of J.C.S. 2010/32, Copy No. 41.

1. The Enclosure is forwarded for information.
2. Attention is invited to the directive contained in the reference which sets forth the policy for the safeguarding of J.C.S. papers containing highly secret information.


J. W. PEARSON
H. D. JONES
Secretariat, AFSAC

AFSAC: 59/29

~~TOP SECRET~~

39

~~TOP SECRET~~

41

COPY NO. _____

(LIMITED DISTRIBUTION)

~~TOP SECRET~~

NOTE TO HOLDERS OF J.C.S. 2010/32

9 MARCH 1951

~~TOP SECRET~~
Note to Holders of JCS 2010/32

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

COPY NO. _____

9 March 1951

(LIMITED DISTRIBUTION)

NOTE BY THE SECRETARIES

to the

HOLDERS OF J.C.S. 2010/32

(Selection of a Site for the Proposed Cryptologic Establishment
Outside the Washington Area)

1. At the request of the originators, J.C.S. 2010/32 is withdrawn from consideration by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

2. Holders are authorized to retain their copies.

W. G. LALOR,

E. H. J. CARNS,

Joint Secretariat.

DISTRIBUTION

Gen. Bradley (C/JCS)	Gen. Lindsay (DDSP)
Gen. Collins (CSA)	Gen. Pierson (DDL P)
Adm. Sherman (CNO)	Gen. Megee (DDI)
Gen. Vandenberg (CSAF)	Secy, JCS
Gen. Bolte (DC/S, P)	Secy, JSSC
Gen. Taylor (Asst. C/S, G-3)	Secy, JSPC
Gen. Eddleman (JSPC)	Secy, JIC
Adm. Duncan (DCNO-Op)	Secy, JCEC
Adm. Ingersoll (ACNO-Op30&JSPC)	
Gen. Edwards (DC/S-Op, Air)	
Gen. White (Dir. Plans, Air)	
Gen. Smith (JSPC)	
Adm. Davis (D/JS)	

~~TOP SECRET~~

Note to Holders of JCS 2010/32

5624

REF ID:A71147

~~TOP SECRET~~

41

COPY NO _____

(LIMITED DISTRIBUTION)

~~TOP SECRET~~

J.C.S. 2010/32

3 March 1951

1295

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

COPY NO. _____

J.C.S. 2010/32

(LIMITED DISTRIBUTION)

3 March 1951Pages 205 - 217 incl.NOTE BY THE SECRETARIES

to the
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
on

SELECTION OF A SITE FOR THE PROPOSED CRYPTOLOGIC
ESTABLISHMENT OUTSIDE THE WASHINGTON AREA

References: a. J.C.S. 1800/109
b. J.C.S. 2010/16
c. J.C.S. 2010/18

1. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, at their meeting on 14 February 1951, agreed to return a previous report on the subject matter (J.C.S. 2010/29) to the Armed Forces Security Agency Council for reconsideration and possible revision in the light of:

a. The view expressed at the meeting that the possibility exists that if the Center were established at Fort Knox it would be difficult to obtain for it civilian personnel of proper qualification.

b. The desirability of providing the Joint Chiefs of Staff with perhaps two alternate locations (total of three), in order of priority from which a selection might be made.

2. The enclosed revised report by the Chairman, Armed Forces Security Agency Council, which supersedes the report in J.C.S. 2010/29, is submitted for consideration by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

W. G. LALOR,

E. H. J. CARNS,

Joint Secretariat

DISTRIBUTION:

Gen. Bradley (C/JCS)	Gen. Smith (JSPC)
Gen. Collins (CSA)	Adm. Davis (D/JS)
Adm. Sherman (CNO)	Gen. Lindsay (DDSP)
Gen. Vandenberg (CSAF)	Gen. Pierson (DDLFP)
Gen. Bolte (DC/S,P)	Gen. Megee (DDI)
Gen. Taylor (Asst. C/S, G-3)	Secy, JCS
Gen. Eddleman (JSPC)	Secy, JSSC
Adm. Duncan (DCNO-Op)	Secy, JSPC
Adm. Ingersoll (ACNO-Op30&JSPC)	Secy, JIC
Gen. Edwards (DC/S-Op,Air)	Secy, JCEC
Gen. Landon (Dir. Plans, Air)	

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

~~TOP SECRET~~E N C L O S U R EREPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN, ARMED FORCES SECURITY AGENCY COUNCIL

to the

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

on

THE SELECTION OF A SITE FOR THE PROPOSED CRYPTOLOGIC ESTABLISHMENT OUTSIDE THE WASHINGTON AREAReferences: a. J.C.S. 1800/109
b. J.C.S. 2010/11
c. J.C.S. 2010/16
d. J.C.S. 2010/18THE PROBLEM

1. In accordance with authorization from the Joint Chiefs of Staff contained in J.C.S. 2010/18, to determine a suitable location for the proposed cryptologic establishment outside the Washington area.

FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM AND DISCUSSION

2. See Appendix "B".

CONCLUSIONS

3. It is concluded that:

a. No available government-owned facility with existing or modified buildings meets the essential requirements for the proposed cryptologic establishment outside the Washington area.

b. New construction will, therefore, be necessary to meet these requirements.

c. The three most suitable sites for constructing a major cryptologic establishment for the Armed Forces Security Agency (AFSA) in order of preference are:

- (1) Fort Knox, near Louisville, Kentucky
- (2) Brooks Air Force Base, near San Antonio, Texas
- (3) Lockbourne Air Force Base, near Columbus, Ohio

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

- 206 -

Enclosure

~~TOP SECRET~~

d. Fort Knox is definitely preferable to the other two sites.

e. Regardless of location, the overall project should include the provision of adequate troop housing and such government-financed civilian housing as is determined to be necessary.

f. The construction of this facility for AFSA should be designated a Joint project in accordance with the Appendix to Enclosure "A" to J.C.S. 1800/109, with management responsibility assigned to the Department having jurisdiction over the selected site.

g. In view of the international situation and the urgent need for this project, its construction should be assigned a high priority.

RECOMMENDATIONS

4. It is recommended that:

a. The foregoing conclusions be approved.

b. Fort Knox, Kentucky, be designated as the location of the AFSA cryptologic establishment outside the Washington area.

c. The memorandum in Appendix "A" be forwarded to the Secretary of Defense.

d. Upon receipt of concurrence from the Secretary of Defense, necessary action be taken to implement the steps outlined in paragraph 5 of Appendix "A".

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

~~TOP SECRET~~APPENDIX "A"D R A F TMEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

1. Reference is made to memorandum by the Joint Chiefs of Staff dated 14 March 1950* and to memorandum by the Secretary of Defense dated 24 March 1950** concerning selection of a site outside the Washington area for the relocation of the main Communications Intelligence Center plus selected Communications Security and Research and Development activities of the Armed Forces Security Agency (AFSA)

2. A study of potential sites, including inspection of the thirty-five considered most promising, indicates a suitable location for this cryptologic establishment with utilizable buildings cannot be found at any government-owned facility. It will, therefore, be necessary to construct buildings on suitably located government-owned land.

3. Fort Knox, near Louisville, Kentucky, provides the best location for this construction. The Fort Knox reservation of more than one hundred thousand acres can provide land without interference with any other function of the post. It is estimated that needed construction will cost twenty million dollars. In addition, an expansion of present government financed civilian housing projects and some troop housing at Fort Knox will probably be required.

4. The reduction of the hazard inherent in the present concentration of AFSA activities by the construction of facilities outside the Washington area is a matter of urgency. Plans for the movement of these activities will be covered in a response to a memorandum by the Deputy Secretary of Defense dated 8 February 1951.

* Enclosure to J.C.S. 2010/16

** Enclosure to J.C.S. 2010/18

~~TOP SECRET~~

5. Subject to your concurrence, the Joint Chiefs of Staff will:

a. Designate as a joint project, as defined in the Enclosure to their memorandum of 6 October 1950,* the construction required by AFSA at Fort Knox, Kentucky, with management responsibility assigned to the Department of the Army.

b. Assign a high priority to this project.

* Appendix to Enclosure "A" to J.C.S. 1800/109

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

- 209 -

Appendix "A"

~~TOP SECRET~~APPENDIX "B"FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM AND DISCUSSION

1. In accordance with the authority in J.C.S. 2010/16 and J.C.S. 2010/18, the Chairman AFSAC, in his capacity as Director, Armed Forces Security Agency (AFSA), on 21 April 1950, appointed an Ad Hoc Site Board composed of representatives from AFSA, the Army Security Agency, the Naval Security Group, and the Air Force Security Service. This Board was directed to conduct a survey for the purpose of selecting the most suitable site outside the Washington area for the relocation of the main Communications Intelligence Center plus selected Communications Security and Research and Development activities of the Armed Forces Security Agency. Basic guidance was given the board concerning the physical characteristics and geographical locations which should be considered. The Board was directed to give primary consideration to government-owned facilities with existing suitability or adaptability to the needs of AFSA, without, however, excluding sites of high potential suitability requiring construction of necessary buildings. The Board was further directed to give full consideration of the desirability of ready access to the seat of government.

2. On the basis of information supplied by the three Services, the Public Buildings Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Veterans Administration, the Board determined that the thirty-five installations should be subjected to on-site inspections. The sites inspected are shown in Annex to Appendix "B".

3. All of the installations with existing buildings failed to meet one or more of the following essential criteria:

a. Location in an area of probable low strategic vulnerability and removed from other probable targets.

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

~~TOP SECRET~~

- b. Location in an area having adequate depth of defense.
- c. Location within a reasonable distance of a city capable of providing adequate labor and logistic support.
- d. Available without serious dislocation of other vital military activities.
- e. Buildings suitable or adaptable to the needs of AFSA.

It was therefore concluded that no site with existing buildings could be recommended and that a site requiring construction should be selected, utilizing government-owned land, if possible.

4. The Ad Hoc Site Board ranked Fort Knox, Kentucky, first among the sites requiring construction. Within the Fort Knox Reservation, which exceeds one hundred thousand acres, several possible sites are available which would not interfere with the primary functions of the command and which are not in any way committed in the Post Master Plan. The site favored by the Board (subject to detailed engineering surveys) comprises a tract of approximately four hundred acres situated west of the village of Muldraugh on the main highway connecting Fort Knox with Louisville, Kentucky. The site is approximately six miles from the main post and twenty miles from the city of Louisville, which has a population of 367,359.

5. The advantages of the Fort Knox location are as follows:
- a. Provides adequate defense in depth.
 - b. Is reasonably near to Washington, D. C. (473 air miles).
 - c. Is well removed from other probable targets.
 - d. Has adequate land available for construction without interference with any other activity now at Fort Knox.
 - e. Regular post facilities could furnish logistic support.

6. The principal disadvantage of the Fort Knox location is its distance (20 miles) from the supporting city of Louisville. While this is a distinct advantage from the standpoint of

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

~~TOP SECRET~~

vulnerability, it may make the problem of obtaining proper civilian personnel somewhat difficult. It is primarily within the lower grades that reliance must be placed on local resources to meet manpower needs. The experience of industry has indicated that in similar situations, needs equal to those of AFSA are met by total manpower pools smaller than those of the Louisville area. The present needs for high-level personnel for AFSA already require widespread recruiting efforts, and the Fort Knox location will not materially affect this situation. Expansion of the present program of construction of government financed civilian housing at Fort Knox would be of material assistance and should be undertaken.

7. Brooks Air Force Base situated three miles southwest of the City of San Antonio, Texas (population 406,811) placed second among the sites requiring construction of operational buildings. Adequate land could be made available at this 1332 acre reservation for construction of necessary operational buildings. Present temporary structures could provide initially for troop housing and support.

8. The advantages of the Brooks Air Force Base location are as follows:

- a. Provides adequate defense in depth, except from the south.
- b. Is reasonably well removed from other probable targets.
- c. Within convenient distance of a large city.
- d. Logistic support could be provided by regular installations in area.

9. The disadvantages of this location are as follows:

- a. Excessive distance from Washington, D. C. (1388 air miles)
- b. Presence of AFSA might interfere with operations as an air base.

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

~~TOP SECRET~~

10. Lockbourne Air Force Base which occupies a 1610 acre tract approximately seven miles south of the city of Columbus, Ohio (population 374,770), placed third. Adequate space for building operational buildings would involve encroachment on runway or approach areas. Present temporary buildings would be used initially for troop housing and support but would require extensive rehabilitation or replacement in the near future.

11. The advantages of Lockbourne Air Force Base are as follows:

- a. Is reasonably near to Washington, D. C. (320 air miles).
- b. Provides reasonable depth of defense.
- c. Within convenient distance of supporting city.

12. The disadvantages are as follows:

- a. Utilization by AFSA would preclude operation as an air base.
- b. Special provision would be required for logistic support.

13. Civilian housing is in short supply in all three of the above localities. For the duration of the present emergency, it would be futile to depend upon local effort to improve this situation adequately to provide for the needs of AFSA personnel. A nearby government financed housing project will be a necessary element of the over-all program whichever site is selected.

14. Upon the basis of the information assembled by the Ad Hoc Site Board during the course of its survey, the Armed Forces Security Agency Council agreed that:

- a. It being impossible to find a government-owned installation with existing buildings which was not open to such serious objections as to make it unacceptable as a location for an AFSA cryptologic establishment, a site for the construction of the necessary buildings should be selected.

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

~~TOP SECRET~~

b. Fort Knox, Kentucky, meets the essential criteria more fully than any other site considered, and should be selected for the construction of the AFSA cryptologic establishment.

15. It is estimated that construction of operational facilities at any one of these locations will cost twenty million dollars. Some expansion or conversion of troop housing may also be required regardless of which site is chosen.

16. The construction of the necessary facilities falls within the definition of a Joint Project as defined in Appendix to Enclosure "A" to J.C.S. 1800/109. In view of the present occupancy of Fort Knox by the Department of the Army and the logistic support required by AFSA in moving to the new site, the Army is the logical Service to undertake management responsibility for the project at that location. Should either of the other sites be selected, responsibility should be assigned to the Air Force. The Director, AFSA will furnish detailed information concerning AFSA's requirements in order to facilitate efficient planning of the installation, and to meet troops and housing requirements.

17. At the time of the formation of AFSA in 1949, the present concentration of cryptologic activities in the Washington area was accepted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff (J.C.S. 2010/11) as a calculated risk which should be "reduced as soon as practicable by the construction of a major cryptologic station at a suitable location remote from Washington." The deterioration of the international situation has further increased the risks involved in this concentration. Steps have been taken to provide some measure of protection by the dispersal of vital records to locations outside the

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

~~TOP SECRET~~

Washington area. No really effective measures for the protection of the vital Communication Intelligence and Communication Security activities of the United States are possible short of those outlined and approved in J.C.S. 2010/16. The contemplated division of AFSA activities between the Naval Security Station, Washington, and the new installation should provide a high degree of protection, but this division requires that at least a portion of the new installation be available for use. The initiation of construction at the new site is thus a matter of considerable urgency in order that the present hazardous situation may be terminated as soon as practicable.

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32

- 215 -

Appendix "B"

~~TOP SECRET~~ANNEX TO APPENDIX "B"LIST OF SITES INSPECTED BY THE AD HOC SITE BOARDSites with Buildings

U.S. Air Force Plant No. 36	Cincinnati, Ohio
Lackland Air Force Base	San Antonio, Texas
Kelly Air Force Base	San Antonio, Texas
U.S. Air Force Plant No. 3	Tulsa, Oklahoma
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	Dayton, Ohio
U.S. Air Force Plant No. 6	Marietta, Georgia
Lowery Air Force Base	Denver, Colorado
Chance Vought Plant	Dallas, Texas
Westinghouse Plant	Kansas City, Missouri
Naval Air Station	Olathe, Kansas
Naval Air Station	Denver, Colorado
Naval Air Station	Atlanta, Georgia
Naval Air Station	St Louis, Missouri
Kansas City Records Center	Kansas City, Missouri
St. Louis Administration Center	St Louis, Missouri
Lake City Arsenal	Independence, Missouri
Charlotte Quartermaster Depot	Charlotte, N. C.
Indiana Arsenal	Louisville, Kentucky
Medical Depot	Denver, Colorado
Lustron Plant	Columbus, Ohio
Denver Federal Center	Denver, Colorado
8900 S. Broadway	St Louis, Missouri

Sites without Buildings

Brooks Air Force Base	San Antonio, Texas
Lockbourne Air Force Base	Columbus, Ohio
Naval Air Station	Dallas, Texas
Fort Knox	Louisville, Kentucky

~~TOP SECRET~~

JCS 2010/32

~~TOP SECRET~~Sites without Buildings (Continued)

Ft. Benjamin Harrison	Indianapolis, Indiana
Rocky Mountain Arsenal	Denver, Colorado
Ft. George Meade	Maryland
Ft. Belvoir	Virginia
Andrews Air Force Base	Maryland
Ft. Holabird	Baltimore, Maryland
Ft. Sam Houston	San Antonio, Texas
Ft. Hays	Columbus, Ohio
Ft. Logan	Denver, Colorado

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2010/32