RR NO.
19168

DATE DUE

1680

19168
Report of the National
Academy for Fire Prevention
and Control site selection
board

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED

19168
Report of the National
Academy for Fire Prevention
and Control site selection
board

National Academy for Fire
Prevention and Control
Library
Washington, D. C.

NETC LRC
022193

1680

16

Report of the National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control SITE SELECTION BOARD

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Fire Prevention and Control Administration
1976

STAN # 13405 RR#19.168

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Fire Prevention and Control Administration
Washington, D.C. 20230

July 2, 1976

Honorable Elliot L. Richardson
Secretary of Commerce
Washington, D. C. 20230

THROUGH: Honorable Howard D. Tipton H.D.T.
Administrator
National Fire Prevention and
Control Administration
U. S. Department of Commerce
Washington, D. C. 20230

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control Site Selection Board is pleased to transmit with this letter its report and recommendations for a site for the Academy.

The Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, enacted October 29, 1974, directs the Secretary of Commerce to make a site selection for the Academy no later than October 29, 1976, based upon a recommendation report from the Site Selection Board. The Site Selection Board was appointed in January 1976 and charged with delivering its recommendation report to you by June 30, 1976 (as set forth in the training and facility guidelines from the Administrator, NFPCA, published in the Federal Register, March 17, 1976).

The three-member Site Selection Board is comprised of John L. Swindle, Chief of the Birmingham, Alabama Fire Department, Henry D. Smith, Chief of Fire Service Training at Texas A&M University and me as Chairman and Superintendent of the Academy. Collectively, the Board members are representative of the academic and fire service communities and represent over 90 years of experience in education relative to fire prevention and control.

This experience provided a firm foundation for the Board in developing the site evaluation procedures and applying them to the wide range of high quality sites which were submitted and/or identified. Although

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL 1776-1976

some of the techniques utilized involved empirical measures, these served not as a substitute for the experience-based judgmental approach but rather as an efficient method of communication of the results.

The Board believes that its determination accurately reflects the thoughts of those involved in the multiple disciplines of the fire protection delivery system in the United States. There are approximately 3,000,000 people in this system, and the Board is confident that all are interested in the early establishment of a National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control.

The Board was instructed (Federal Register, March 17, 1976) to recommend at least one site for each of the feasible Academy options at the low and high range of Academy operations. The Board also had the latitude to recommend suitable sites in the range between these options. At the low level of activity, there would be minimal direct education and training at the Academy facility, with no special purpose facilities required. The high level of activity would include direct education and training and require a site with related support as outlined in the Federal Register notice and detailed in the report of the Academy for Education and Development.

The issues of Academy program levels and site selection are so interwoven that they cannot be effectively separated. The Board recognized that the specific training and facility needs for the Academy are dependent upon program goals and plans which have not yet been developed in final form and which can be expected to evolve and change over the years as the importance of the NFPCA to the fire community increases.

For purposes of site evaluation the Board considered four options for Academy operations within the range prescribed by the Secretary. Each is based on a set of assumptions for Federal commitment to education and training for the Nation's fire service and others engaged in the country's fire protection delivery system.

Option I holds the Academy at present budget and staffing levels with limited direct training.

Option II permits expanded budget and staffing levels with limited direct training.

Option III permits an expansion of the range of instructional and operational functions from Options I and II and includes on-site instructional facilities.

Option IV permits all of the functions of Option III, and adds student residence capability.

Options I and II are similar in that administrative concerns predominate and there is little or no student presence. The Board is firm and unanimous in its belief that such program levels are inappropriate to the mission of the Academy, contrary to Congressional intent, and would be counterproductive to the goals of the NFPCA. We strongly urge the Secretary not to restrict the level of Academy program operation to either of these levels.

Unlike Options I and II the program levels envisioned by Options III and IV contemplate the full range of Academy programs necessary to accomplish its mission: the principal distinction between the two being that Option IV contemplates a fully developed and matured Academy program with resident student capability while Option III contemplates a full range of Academy instructional programs but with somewhat reduced size and facility requirements and no resident student capability.

The program levels envisioned in Option IV, in the judgment of the Board, accurately reflect what the Academy was expected to be by the authors and supporters of the legislation and what it should and will become in its maturing years. The Board therefore fully supports an Academy program operation at the Option IV level and strongly recommends against any decision which would impede or deny development to that level.

The Board believes that the instructional program level under Option III would be appropriate for the early years of the Academy's development and maturing process, but that such process would itself be expedited and enhanced by providing for a resident student capability. This approach which we recommend is actually a combination of Options III and IV that allows for a full, but reduced scale, academic environment during the program development and testing phase of the Academy's formative years, thus providing a full setting for a critical evaluation of the Academy's performance and progress.

The Board therefore supports an Academy site selection at either the Option III or Option IV program level. Consistent with this support and findings of the Board's Report, the Board strongly recommends to the Administrator and the Secretary selection of the Marjorie Webster College site. Marjorie Webster offers a location and facility which could be utilized immediately at the Option III instructional program level with, as we have recommended, a student resident capability. It also allows for on-site co-location of the other NFPCA programs.

The site allows for modest maturing Academy growth while yet permitting NFPCA co-location. As the Academy programs develop to the Option IV level, the Academy could expand to occupy the entire facility with the other activities of the NFPCA withdrawing to off-site office facilities and yet retaining nearly all the advantages of co-location.

As a second, but acceptable choice, the Board recommends selection of the St. Joseph's College facility at Emmitsburg, Maryland. This facility, like Marjorie Webster, would allow for Academy operations at Option III level but with resident capability as recommended by the Board and full operation at the Option IV program level. Co-location of other NFPCA activities at St. Joseph's, while possible, would be less feasible.

In consideration of all the factors as detailed in the body of the Report, the Site Selection Board urges the selection of Marjorie Webster College as the site for the National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control.

Respectfully,

David M. McCormack
Chairman
Site Selection Board

REPORT OF THE

NATIONAL ACADEMY FOR FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

SITE SELECTION BOARD

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

1976

C O N T E N T S

Section	Title	Page No.
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	1
	Option I: Minimal Direct Federal Training	3
	Option II: Direct Federal Training	4
II	SITE SELECTION REVIEW AND EVALUATION PROCEDURE	7
	Information Compliance	8
	Matrix 1 Analysis	8
	Matrix 2 Analysis	9
	Site Visitation	10
	Alternative Program Options	10
	Program Development and Refinement	14
III	IMPORTANT PROGRAM IMPLICATIONS FOR SITE EVALUATION	16
	Headquarters Instructional Facility	17
	Issues in Perspective	18
	Provision of On-Site Lodging Facilities	19
	The Issues in Perspective	20
	Co-location	21
	The Issues in Perspective	23
	Implications for Site Evaluation	24
IV	REVIEW OF SITE PROPOSALS FOR INFORMATION COMPLIANCE	26
	Inventory	26
	Compliance Procedure	26
	Proposal Audit	26
	Matrix 1 Analysis	39
	Matrix 2 Analysis	41
V	EVALUATION OF EACH SITE VISITED	44
	Marjorie Webster College - Washington D. C.	44
	Michoud Assembly Facility - New Orleans, La.	47
	Fire Training Center, Ward's Island - New York City, New York	50
	Hamilton Air Force Base - Marin County, Calif.	52
	St. Joseph's College - Emmitsburg, Maryland	54
	Vint Hill Farms Station - Fauquier County, Va.	56
	Naval Net Base - Tiburon, California	58
	Union Terminal - Cincinnati, Ohio	60
	Blue Grass Army Depot - Lexington, Kentucky	61

Section	Title	Page No.
VI.	SUMMARY	63
	Option I. Administer the National Academy System Existing Budget Level	63
	Option II. Administer the National Academy System Slightly Higher Budget Level	64
	Option III. On-Site Instructional Capability	64
	Option IV. On-Site Training and Residence Accommodations	65
VII.	RECOMMENDATIONS	67

E X H I B I T S

Exhibit	Subject	Page No.
A	Federal Register Notices, February 13 and March 17, 1976	70
B	Compliance Form	74
C	Matrix 1	75
D	Matrix 2	77
E	Field Visit Data Requirements	78
F	Site Visit Information Record Sheet	79

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

The Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 [P.L. 93-498, 15 U.S.C. 2201 *et seq.*, 15 U.S.C. 278(f), (g), 42 U.S.C. 290(a), (the "Act")] established the National Fire Prevention and Control Administration (NFPCA) within the Department of Commerce and directed the Secretary of Commerce to establish, at the earliest practicable date, a National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control (Academy).

In passing the Act, Congress emphasized that a headquarters training facility for the Nation's firefighters was essential if the fire loss reduction effort was to succeed. It was the intent of Congress that the Academy be a small but excellent campus with a first-class staff and facilities to serve as the focal point for the professional training of firefighters and others concerned with fire prevention and control.

The Act further provides that the Academy shall be located on such site as the Secretary selects after consideration of the recommendations of a three-member Site Selection Board. In January 1976, the Secretary appointed the Board members. On March 22, 1976, the Board undertook its duties in accordance with the provisions of Section 7(g) of the Act, the Charter of the National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control Site Selection Board, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and the Instructions by the Administrator, NFPCA, as published in the *Federal Register* of February 13 and March 17, 1976.

The Board, in making its recommendations, was required to give consideration to the training and facility needs of the Academy, the environmental effects, the possibility of using a surplus government

facility and such other factors as it deemed important and relevant. Additionally, the Board was instructed to function solely as an advisory body; conduct its duties and meetings in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act; and recommend at least one suitable site for each of the feasible Academy alternatives indicated in the Instructions to it.

In recommending suitable sites, the Board was not limited to those proposals that were submitted, but was authorized to consider sites identified on its own initiative. It was instructed to "give primary and preferential consideration to the identification and recommendation of sites which could be acquired from the public or private sector at no cost, or at nominal cost, and which contain existing structures generally meeting the facility requirements." The Board also was instructed to consider, in making its recommendations, that the Act authorizes no more than $9 million for the construction (or modification/rehabilitation) of facilities on whatever site the Secretary selects, and to transmit its recommendations in the form of a written report to the Secretary, through the Administrator, NFPCA.

The mission and mode of operations of the National Academy, the Board's Instructions indicated, were "to help reduce the Nation's fire losses by advancing the ability of fire service personnel and others concerned with fire safety problems to prevent and control fires." To accomplish this goal, "the Academy will serve as a delivery mechanism for other programs of the NFPCA and will encourage the development of new education and training programs, and the strengthening of existing programs offered by local fire services, state and local governments and private institutions. The focus of the Academy program will be on fire prevention and control. . . .

"Specific, long-term objectives and suitable plans for implementation of the Academy have not yet been fully developed and approved," the Instructions stated. "Accordingly, a firm list of training and facility requirements could not be provided to the Board." Instead, the Board was instructed to "identify and recommend sites which would be suitable for carrying out programs within the range of options listed below. Estimates of the instructional and facility requirements associated with the option at either end of the range of possible sites" were provided to the Board. These requirements are as follows:

Option I: Minimal Direct Federal Training

Under this alternative, Academy program emphasis would be directed toward carrying out the following programs authorized under Section 7(d) paragraphs (1) through (5) of the Act, at current authorized FY 77 levels:

> Train fire service personnel in such skills and knowledge as may be useful to advance their ability to prevent and control fires.
>
> Develop model curricula, training programs and other educational materials suitable for use at other educational institutions.
>
> Develop a program of correspondence courses.
>
> Encourage educational and professional practices which include fire prevention and detection technology.

Under this alternative, only minimal direct training would be conducted by the National Academy.

The training and facility requirements associated with this program alternative are, for the most part, those associated with a minimum training and education operation. A special audio-visual facility and four or five classrooms might also be needed.

Option II. Direct Federal Training

Under this alternative, direct Federal training would be added to the function listed in Option I above. The Academy would conduct actual courses in such fields as:

> Techniques of fire prevention, fire inspection, firefighting and fire and arson investigation.
>
> Tactics and command of firefighting.
>
> Administration and management of fire services.
>
> Tactical training in specialized fields, such as aircraft fires and fires aboard waterborne vessels.

In each of the above areas, emphasis would be given to the training of instructors, management and other professionals in these fields.

The training and facility needs associated with this alternative are flexible and will depend on the extent of direct training to be conducted. However, a maximum set of training and facility requirements was set forth for consideration by the Board. These requirements were:

1. Maximum operating conditions:

> Facility will be in operation 250 days per year.
> Maximum resident enrollment of 300; maximum attendance on any one day of 1,000.
> Approximately 210 employees, including resident and visiting faculty and support personnel.

2. Maximum facility requirements:

> Twenty classrooms, including seminar, demonstration and audio-visual rooms.
> Auditorium seating 500 persons.
> Library and reference center.
> Dormitory space for 300 resident students.
> Cafeteria.
> Instructional media center.
> Administration office space.
> Maintenance and support facilities for approximately 35 people.
> Sufficient land to insure an appropriate instructional setting and room for some potential future growth. Estimated maximum need of 50 to 100 acres, but may be less for initial use.

Neither of the above alternatives makes special provision for other potential Academy programs mentioned in the Act such as technical and financial assistance. No special site or facility requiremetns are associated with technical and financial assistance, and they were not required to be considered during the site selection process.

The Board was instructed that the following environmental, physical, and geographic factors were to be considered important in its evaluation of sites:

A. Favorable land use/zoning, air quality, water quality, sewage and noise level.

B. Ready access to a variety of transportation arrangements, including airports.

C. Ready access (30-50 miles) to a major urban center having metropolitan fire department facilities.

D. Readily served by vendors.

E. Community receptivity to the Academy with adequate health, education, religious and cultural opportunities and adequate housing for staff and faculty.

The Instructions to the Board emphasized certain other important factors governing site selection. Among those factors was that the Board consider that "the mission of the Academy is interrelated with the overall mission of the NFPCA and its other major elements. Academy programs are and will continue to be dependent upon continuing research by the National Fire Safety and Research Office and the Fire Research Center at the National Bureau of Standards. The National Fire Data Center is an indispensable store of data feeding directly to Academy programs and curricula. The Public Education Office will provide information and techniques used by the Academy and, in turn, the Academy will serve that Office with its

instructional resources. Generally these other programs will be major generators of new knowledge for inclusion in the Academy programs. Therefore, close interaction is essential."

Further, the Instructions said that "for purposes of efficiency and cost effectiveness in sharing resources such as the library and computer systems, consideration should be given to the selection of a site which can either house the Academy, together with the NFPCA, or be in such close proximity as to make conference facilities and resource sharing practical and administration more effective."

II. SITE SELECTION REVIEW AND EVALUATION PROCEDURE

As a result of solicitations, hearings and announcements, more than 220 sites were proposed from throughout the continental United States.

All site proposals were reviewed and evaluated by the Site Selection Board, assisted by its staff and by consultants from the following firms:

Mills & Petticord/HOK/HOKA	Planners, Architects, Engineers
Hammer, Siler, George Associates	Economic Consultants
Architecture Planning Research Associates	Planners

Since the primary objective of the Board was to recommend the most suitable sites in accordance with the directives previously indicated, a four-step screening procedure was developed.

Although the Board recognized that its mandate could not properly be exercised solely by means of a numerical rating of the proposed sites, nevertheless it developed a quantified screening tool to limit the bounds within which the Board should exercise its discretion.

In approaching the site evaluation, the Board was faced with 223 distinct sites to evaluate but with limited time and resources to carry out the work. As a first step, the Board, working with staff and consultants, developed an evaluation methodology. This methodology was designed to achieve the following objectives:

1) First and foremost, to treat all sites in an equitable manner.

2) To reflect directly the site requirements of a successfully functioning Academy in the evaluation criteria and procedures used.

3) To limit the amount of resources spent in the evaluation of sites which clearly did not meet the Academy's needs and/or for which inadequate information made this determination impossible.

4) To provide a rational and systematic approach for comparing sites to each other and to Academy needs as well as for a scaling of relative quality within this approach.

The resulting methodology was applied to each site submitted and involved a four-step process which is in effect a multi-phasic screening.

1) Information Compliance

The Instructions to the Board published in the February 13 and March 17, 1976 Federal Register specified the information which all applicants would be required to submit in order to have their proposals considered (See Exhibit A).

Each application was carefully screened by a member of the Site Selection staff and reviewed by the Board. The results of the compliance screening for each site was summarized on a separate form (Exhibit B). When there was more than one application for a particular site, these submissions were combined. When additional data was received after the initial staff evaluation, but postmarked within the deadline, the application was reconsidered.

Application of this first-step screening process resulted in the advancement of 140 sites to the second step of the process.

2) Matrix 1 Analysis

The second step in the process was labeled Matrix 1 (Exhibit C). This Matrix was applied to all those site proposals which were found to demonstrate information compliance. Included in this step were sites identified on the Board's own initiative, as provided in its Instructions.

(This step in the methodology is explained in detail in Section IV.) The screening factors were:

- Acquisition Cost
- Present Facility Adequacy
- Availability
- Accessibility to Major Airport
- Location Appropriate for a National Academy

Those sites which met the minimum standards set by the Board for each of these five screening factors were passed on to Matrix 2. Thirteen sites met these requirements and advanced to Matrix 2. In addition, one site was added on the Board's initiative.

3) Matrix 2 Analysis

This third step in the evaluation was carried out for the 14 sites advancing from Matrix 1. This approach is described in detail in Section V of this report. Matrix 2 is a more refined process (Exhibit D). Seven factors were used designating relative degrees of performance, according to a numeric scoring method. The relative importance of the seven site selection factors was reflected in a numeric weighting. The factors considered were:

- Rehabilitation Extent
- Access to Airport
- Availability
- Environmental Impact
- Academy-administration Communication (Relations)
- Potential for Shared Cost
- Other Factors - Location Relative to Population Centroid; Availability of Support Services; Highway Quality; Expansion Capabilities

Based on Matrix 2 evaluation, 10 sites were selected for site visitation.

4) Site Visitation

In the fourth step, the Board and staff visited each of the sites and site vicinities to be briefed by the submitting agency or individuals and to collect whatever data was required. Several factors were considered, and acquisition and rehabilitation cost estimates were developed. The results of this site visitation analysis are summarized in Section VI.

The final recommendations of the Board were based on information and evaluation from each of the four steps in the process. The process was systematic and well documented.

The empirical scaling and ranking of the various sites were a valuable tool, aiding the Board's deliberations. Although built upon this empirical base, the methodology provided flexibility, allowing the Board members to draw upon their own broad experience, understanding, and to take action on their own initiative when this would improve the selection process.

Alternative Program Options

The Board was instructed to identify and recommend sites which would be suitable for carrying out Academy programs within a range of alternative program levels. In carrying out this responsibility, the Board used four program levels to identify a site which it considered to be suitable for carrying out the Academy activities at the program level. The program levels at the top and bottom of the range are those identified in the Instructions to the Board (Options I and II as listed in the Federal Register, March 17, 1976). The Board then identified two additional program levels that should be considered in its site recommendations. These program levels fall between the high and low options contained in the Board's Instructions. The four program levels and estimated associated costs representing each option are as follows:

OPTION I (Option I in Administrator's Instructions)

Staffing: 30 Positions
Estimated Budget: $2,082,000
Floor Space: 6,000-8,000 sq. ft.*

Department

Administration and Operations:
Administer the National Academy System.
Develop an evaluation and planning system for Academy programs.

Education and Training:
Develop and implement model curricula.
Contract for educational and curricula development expertise.

Assistance:
Administer the state financial and technical assistance programs.

OPTION II

Staffing: 65 Positions
Estimated Budget: $5,500,000
Floor Space: 14,000-17,000 sq. ft.*

Department:

Administration and Operations:
Administer the National Academy System.
Develop an evaluation and planning system for Academy programs.
Support instruction at the state and local levels.
Contract administration for innovative course development.

Education and Training:
Develop, test, implement and deliver model curricula to be used both in limited classrooms at the headquarters Academy facility but predominantly in the field.

*In addition, Administration Floor Space required: 20,000-25,000 square feet.

Education and Training (Cont'd):

Establish an initial core cadre of full-time faculty.
Contract teaching in the field on a regional basis.
Administer correspondence courses.

Assistance:

Administer the state financial and technical assistance programs.

OPTION III

Staffing: 180 Positions
Estimated Budget: $12,119,000*
Floor Space: 95,700 sq. ft.**

Department:

Administration and Operations:

Administer the National Academy System including the headquarters National Academy campus facilities.
Conduct a regional evaluation and need assessment program.
Conduct accreditation programs with colleges and universities.
Administer the Resource Center with multi-media and reference back-up for all Academy courses.
Administer publication and information systems to specific student groups.

Education and Training:

Increase course delivery and model curricula to provide instruction both for students at the National Academy and those in the field.
Maintain a full-time faculty for instruction of on-site courses.
Administer correspondence courses and provide professional assistance to state and local instructors.
Develop and provide computer assisted instruction.

Assistance:

Administer all financial, technical and professional assistance programs for states.

*Estimated budget for Option III is higher than that for Option IV because food and lodging would not be available on-site.

**In addition, Administration Floor Space required: 20,000-25,000 square feet.

OPTION IV (Option II in Administrator's Instructions

Staffing: 210 Positions
Estimated Budget: $11,164,000*
Floor Space: 154,300 sq. ft.**

Department:

Administration and Operations:

Administer the National Academy System including the headquarters National Academy campus with dormitory facilities.
Develop an evaluation and planning system for Academy programs.
Support instruction at the state and local levels.
Administer contracts for innovative course development.
Conduct a regional evaluation and need assessment program.
Conduct accreditation programs with colleges and universities.
Administer the Resource Center with multi-media and reference back-up for all Academy courses.
Administer publication and information systems to specific clientele groups.

Education and Training:

Increase course development and model curricula and their development to provide instruction both for students at the National Academy and those in the field.
Maintain a full-time faculty for instruction of on-site courses.
Administer correspondence courses and provide professional assistance to state and local instructors.
Develop and provide computer assisted instruction.

Assistance:

Administer all financial, technical and professional assistance programs for states.

Under Options I and II, activities would be accommodated primarily in office-type space. Option III permits increased on-site instruction and instructional resources and technology. Option IV adds the requirement of space for on-site dining and sleeping accommodations.

*Estimated budget for Option IV is less than for Option III because of anticipated economic savings from on-site food and lodging.

**In addition, Administration Floor Space required: 20,000-25,000 square feet.

Space requirements for all four Academy program options and the Administration itself are summarized below:

Option I	6,000-8,000 square feet.
Option II	15,000-20,000 square feet.
Option III	95,700 square feet.
Option IV	154,300 square feet.
NFPCA	25,000 square feet.

Program Development and Refinement

The analysis presented in the preceeding paragraphs describes the activities and the floor space requirements of the Academy under each alternative operating level when in full operation.

Clearly there will be a substantial and very important period of program and organizational development and maturation from the present activity/facility level of the Academy to the full operation activity/facility level.

The Site Selection Board judged, based upon input from staff and consultants, that the required program and organizational development period would likely extend over a seven to ten year period. The Board, therefore, decided to consider this seven to ten year space need as the basis for the site evaluation.

The NFPCA including the Academy presently occupies something under 25,000 square feet. The staff estimates, and the Site Selection Board assumed for the purposes of its analysis, that the total space requirements of the Academy would not exceed 100,000 square feet of floor area over this seven to ten year development period assuming an Option IV level of operation. The remainder of the Administration would require from 20,000 to 25,000 square feet over this period resulting in a total Option IV space need of 120,000 to 125,000 square feet.

A similar program development period will be required for Option III. Here the staff estimates and the Board assumes that the seven to ten year space requirement will be 75,000 square feet including space for the Administration.

III. IMPORTANT PROGRAM IMPLICATIONS FOR SITE EVALUATION

The Board in approaching its site selection task felt it necessary to review the legislation, P.L. 93-498, establishing the NFPCA and especially Section 7, Section 16(c)(1), (2), (3) and (4) and the Report of the Committee of Conference in order to meet the intent of Congress regarding the National Fire Academy. Entering its considerations were several issues which were basic to the design of the Academy's instructional program and hence had a direct bearing on the site selection process.

Among those issues surrounding the design of the Academy's instructional program and selection of a suitable site are three factors that have a direct bearing on the site selection process, which the Site Selection Board has therefore examined as basic to site selection.

The desirability of a headquarters instructional facility
The desirability of associated on-site lodging facilities
The desirability of Academy co-location with the National Fire Prevention and Control Administration

The Board felt that the four basic instructional program options have varying implications for the desirability and appropriateness of each of the above factors. At the same time, decisions on these factors can only be made in the context of specific site alternatives and their suitability or limitations in accommodating any or all of the factors. In other words, the Board believes there is a high degree of interaction among the decisions on basic Academy program, site selection and the three factors addressed in this report.

In the paragraphs which follow, the Board identifies the major advantages and disadvantages of each program option for discussion purposes. At the same time, the issues are being placed in perspective and are related to the four major instructional options.

Headquarters Instructional Facility

Advantages

Presentation of instructional courses at a headquarters facility would have several advantages. These advantages can be grouped under two major headings: 1) those relating to the learning environment and instructional methods; and 2) those with an institutional dimension. Each is briefly highlighted below.

The Learning Environment and Instructional Methods. Particularly for instructionally sophisticated courses involving simulation and modeling techniques, the Board believes only a headquarters facility could provide the necessary computer and other instructional media equipment required. An Academy headquarters facility would also permit student access to the Academy's library and reference materials, and would provide opportunities for broader Academy staff participation in segments of a course or as resource personnel, specifically team teaching. There are other appreciable considerations: a headquarters facility would provide students with an immersion type learning environment, permit greater quality control and ensure instructor familiarity with ancillary equipment and the classroom environment.

Institutional Considerations. The Board believes that not only would an Academy instructional facility provide a strong functional environment for educational courses, it also would contribute to institutional aspects of the Academy. More importantly, the Board feels a headquarters instructional facility would contribute to the Academy's identity as an established and continuing entity. As a permanent home base for faculty members, a headquarters facility would be a positive feature in staff recruitment and

minimize staff "wear and tear" that inevitably accompany the continuous travel in itinerant course offerings. It would promote growth and professional development of staff to ensure instructional excellence. The headquarters facility would be recognized as the single location where the very best national expertise is focused for fire services education and training.

Disadvantages

The Board recognizes that the primary disadvantage of a headquarters facility is the cumulative travel cost of nationally dispersed students. High air travel costs for participants from distant locations would impact on both the local share of training costs and on the level of Academy subsidy. Despite apparent national interest in attendance, long-distance travel may discourage the most distant from participating in Academy-based programs. But the Board is aware that the Academy is authorized to pay the travel expenses for students attending the Academy and its current program planning anticipates such assistance.

Issues in Perspective

The Board notes Program Option I would include only minimal direct training. Most courses would be either portable or offered under contract. Under this option, a headquarters training facility would be unnecessary. If developed in keeping with Option I, the Academy program would not provide the opportunities for complex and sophisticated modeling and simulation techniques -- except as they were available in contractor facilities -- nor would Option I permit student access to reference materials. The established learning environment of a headquarters facility and its contribution to an Academy identity would be lost.

Program Option II would involve a limited headquarters instructional facility, but the Board doubts that the scale of operation would warrant complex and sophisticated training modes and the development of extensive reference materials. At the same time, the token number of courses conducted at the headquarters facility and the preponderance of off-site sessions would diminish the institutional identity aspects of the National Academy. The Board does recognize that some specialized course offerings might be more suitable for itinerant presentation or development on a contractual basis.

Provision of On-Site Lodging Facilities

Advantages

The Board believes that provision of on-site lodging and dining facilities in conjunction with a centralized instructional facility would offer a complete and almost self-sufficient environment for Academy programs. Noting the experience at other educational facilities, the Board is of the opinion that accommodations can be provided at far less cost than that required in off-site, commercial lodging. An Academy lodging facility would minimize the logistical aspects of room reservations and obviate the headaches when nearby commercial facilities were filled or when Academy demand exceeded the available number of rooms. On-site lodging would also minimize the local transportation costs and time required for daily travel between commercial facilities and the Academy.

At the same time, the total learning environment provided by on-site lodging would heighten the intensity of the experience, minimize distractions, heighten the opportunities for off-hours student interaction and be amenable to after-hours student "homework." The majority of students have full-time

jobs and must return as soon as possible. The immersion process provides the greatest amount of education in the shortest time.

The Board observes that, given the intensive instructional format envisioned for the Academy's programs, noontime meal service would almost be a necessity unless commercial dining facilities were immediately adjacent to the site. Were commercial facilities not immediately adjacent and noontime meal service required, food service operational efficiencies would be greatest when provided as full three-meal service in conjunction with the lodging facility.

Disadvantages

The Board recognizes that provision of lodging and dining facilities would, of course, require greater front-end capital outlays for construction or remodeling if the site did not already include suitable facilities. At the same time, management of the operation would require additional Academy staff personnel.

An on-site lodging facility requires predictability and constancy of demand. Were training course attendance to vary widely -- with pronounced peaks and valleys -- or involve extended periods of low utilization, the cost would be increased and operating efficiencies would be diminished.

The Issues in Perspective

Under Program Option I, on-site lodging is not a consideration, since few courses would be taught at the Academy. Under Option II, the scale of on-site training is not of sufficient magnitude to warrant operation of lodging and dining facilities. For both Options III and IV, the scale of on-site training is sufficient to support an ancillary residential facility and the benefits derived from it.

Co-location

The Instructions submitted to the Board asked that it consider whether or not the Academy should be in the same location as the Administration. Since there are sound programmatic as well as legal bases supporting the retention of the Administration's headquarters at the "seat of government," co-location clearly favors the Academy being located in the metropolitan Washington, D.C. area. The advantages and disadvantages are examined below.

Advantages

The Board arrived at the opinion that the practical advantages to co-location were many. In essence, these can be grouped under two major headings: 1) functional interaction; and 2) administrative and support considerations.

Functional Interaction. The Academy is the central delivery mechanism for Administration programs to fire service personnel and other community sectors in the United States. Co-location would maximize the harmony between Academy programs and Administration policy and priorities. At the same time, the Board saw a wide variety of highly beneficial interactions that would be possible if both were located in close proximity. For example, and as was indicated in the Instructions it received, the compilation and analysis of data in the National Fire Data Center can provide a rich resource in identifying fire prevention and suppression problems as a basis for designing Academy training programs. Among the current programs of the Fire Safety and Research Office the Fire Protection Master Plan Project is currently being validated in 10 communities. When validated, the approaches developed in this program would provide a resource for Academy training programs. Similarly, interactions with both the NBS

Fire Research Center and the Office of Public Education provide input for fire prevention course development and instructional resources.

The Board noted that as hardware development and other technology transfer efforts extend the state-of-the-art in fire protection and suppression, the Academy could become a principal vehicle for dissemination among fire service personnel throughout the country. As these examples suggest, the Board saw many opportunities for program and policy development interaction between the Academy and its parent Administration. Close physical proximity would enhance and facilitate these opportunities.

At the same time, co-location would allow the Academy to tap Administration personnel for course participation in areas of special expertise from time to time and also allow for more frequent use of administrative staff as resource personnel in course development

Administrative and Support Services. In separate locations, both the Administration and the Academy would require additional budgetary, fiscal and logistical staff. In addition, support services such as photocopying, audio-visual aids and other equipment would be required for each. Particularly in the formative stages of both the Academy and the Administration, co-location would maximize the opportunities for efficiencies in these administrative and support aspects. At the same time, co-location can provide mutual enhancement of the stature and identity of both organizations.

Disadvantages

Because of the statutory support for the Administration's Washington location, co-location clearly favors a Washington base for the Academy. There is only one significant disadvantage: an off-center geographic

location which would require extensive long-distance travel from the Pacific Coast and other intermediate locations.

The Issues in Perspective

In the Board's opinion, the scale of on-site Academy operation associated with both Option I and II is not amenable to an Academy location distant from other NFPCA offices. The scale of operations under Option III and IV is amenable to an independent Academy location. However Option III and IV also present significant opportunities for both the Academy and other NFPCA program activities to enjoy the benefits of the increased efficiency allowed by co-location.

The Board recognizes that the co-location issue is closely tied to the availability of a suitable facility. While co-location is desirable, if there are no available facilities in Washington fully suitable to the functional requirements of the Academy, the advantages of co-location have to be weighed against the impacts of a mediocre or deficient facility. The Board sees two factors involved: If the facility does not provide the image of an instructional institution, such a deficiency will diminish its effecitveness and impair its functional operations. At the same time, an inadequate facility could adversely affect potential students' image of the Academy and their willingness to participate in its instructional programs.

It is the Board's understanding that the program of the Academy contemplates payment of transportation expenses of students attending the Academy. The Board also notes that the deferral of such expenses is authorized by P.L. 93-498. There is also ample precedent for such practices as evidenced by the FBI Academy programs. While the Academy course

subsidy minimizes the cost to participants, the Academy is nonetheless dependent upon voluntary attendance. The Board believes that not only must the Academy's program be of sufficient interest to stimulate participation, the quality of its physical plan must be compatible with its institutional image.

Implications for Site Evaluation

The Board concludes that the following considerations for resident on-site student instruction and co-location are extremely important to the ultimate success of the Academy and thus are of prime importance to the site selection process:

First, from the analysis presented here, it is clear that resident instruction and on-site student housing are essential to the mission of the Academy and thus, that the Congress was demonstrating clear perception of Academy needs by requiring a site which would be "a small but excellent campus with first class . . . facilities." Clearly the intensive nature of the instruction, the crucial role in the total instructional scheme played by formal and informal interaction, the very substantial additional cost of off-site housing of students and the great importance of a strong physical and functional image for the Academy in building up a large varied student body and support in the early years require this full range of resident facilities.

The Board has evaluated each of the program options against this essential need for resident instruction and on-site housing. Options I and II fail to provide these required facilities and in so doing would make virtually impossible the achievement of the aims of the Academy of:

1) developing an instructional program of excellence; and

2) demonstrating this excellence through widely ranging instructional activities which would attract the highest level of the fire and general population.

As a result, the Board finds that the program levels envisioned by Options I and II are not feasible alternatives and that the focus of the Board's effort in the site selection process should be Option III and Option IV.

Second, it is equally clear that co-location of the Academy with the NFPCA will allow the fuller use of the intellectual resources available resulting in a higher quality program. Duplication of administrative support, data processing, library and other facilities and services can be eliminated and the total cost of the program reduced with co-location.

As a result, the Board concludes that potential for co-location should be given substantial weight as an evaluation factor. Co-location potential is judged to be strongest where time/distance between the Academy and the NFPCA would be least and in no event could co-location be achieved were the Academy and the NFPCA more than 1 1/2 hours apart. Since the NFPCA must be located in Washington, co-location will be judged upon travel time between each potential Academy site and central Washington, D.C., for example, (2400 M Street, N.W., present NFPCA offices).

IV. REVIEW OF SITE PROPOSALS FOR INFORMATICN COMPLIANCE

As a first step in the selection procedure, a review of all proposals was carried out based upon the information request announced in the Federal Register (see Exhibit A). Activities in this review process included: (1) an inventory of the site proposals, (2) testing the proposals for compliance with the information request, and (3) conclusions in the form of identifying complying and non-complying proposals.

Inventory

An inventory of site proposals submitted to the Board was undertaken by identifying each by name and number. A total of 223 sites contained within 139 proposals from 37 states including the District of Columbia were so inventoried. In addition to the site proposals submitted to the Board, the General Services Administration provided a list of potential Academy sites which were also inventoried.

Compliance Procedure

Site proposals were initially reviewed for compliance and documented on information compliance forms. This form (see Exhibit B) consisting of 13 items was prepared for each site proposal. The symbol "S" in the table that follows indicates sufficient information was provided; "I" indicates insufficient information. In some cases, proposals were initially judged as having insufficient information but were subsequently judged to be sufficient by the Board due to new information postmarked before the established deadline.

Proposal Audit

The following table is a listing of the site proposals. Of the 223 site proposals inventoried, 141 were retained for further evaluation.

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
Alabama:		
Dothan	1	I
Tuscaloosa	2	S
Arizona:		
Prescott College	3	I
Marana	118	S
Arkansas:		
East Camden (former Shumaker Naval Amm. Depot)	4	S
Little Rock	5	I
California:		
Tiburon (Naval Net Depot)	6	S
San Francisco-Hamiliton Air Force Base	137	S
Colorado:		
Fort Collins	7	I
Grand Junction	7	I
Greeley	7	I
Pueblo	7	I
Colorado Springs	7 (see also 110)	I
State of	110 (see also 7)	I
& Denver	8	S
Connecticut:		
State of	9	I
Stratford	10A	I
Suffield	10B	I
East Haven	10C	I
South Windsor	11	I
D.C.-Washington:		
Marjorie Webster College	140	S
2400 M Street, NW	141	S

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
Georgia:		
Albany	12	I
Illinois:		
State of	13	I
Bartonville- Peoria State Hospital	14	I
Carbondale	15 (also 28)	S
Champaign	16 (also 126	S
Chicago	17	I
DuPage County	18	I
Granite City- U.S. Army St. Louis Area Support Center	19	S
Joliet Jr. College	20A	S
Ill. Army Amm. Plant	20B	I
Lawrenceville	21	I
Macomb	22	I
Naperville	23	I
Northbrook	24	I
Rantoul	25	I
Rockford	26	S
Skokie	27	I
Southern Ill. Univ.	28 (also 15)	S
Moultrie Co.	117	S
Univ. of Ill. - Champaign-Urbana	126 (also 16)	S
Indiana:		
State of	29	I
Camp Atterbury	30A	I
Ft. Benjamin Harrison	30B (also 31)	S
Indianapolis	31	S
Seymour	32	S
Kansas:		
Topeka	33	I

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
Kentucky:		
Paducah	34A	S
Ft. Knox	34B	S
Lexington	34C (also 35 (abc)	S
Bluegrass Depot-Lexington	35A	S
Ft. Knox	35B	S
Paducah	35C (see 34)	S
Louisiana:		
Houma Evans School	36 (also 37	I
Houma	37	I
New Orleans	38	S
Maryland:		
Maryland-Anne Arundel County	39A (also 49-28)	S
Police & Fire Headquarters-Cedar Knoll School	39B (also 49-28)	S
Baltimore-Washington International Site	39C (also 49-30	S
Fort George Meade	39D (also 49-31, 47A	I I
D.C. Children's Center	39E (also 49-32	I
Crownsville State Hospital	39F (also 49-33	I

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
Maryland Cont'd		
Maryland House of Correction	39G (also 49-34)	I
U.S. Naval Academy Dairy Farm	39H (also 49-35)	I
Whitney's Landing Farm	39I (also 49-36)	I
Amendale	40 (also 132)	I
Avondale De La Salle College	41	I
Bainbridge-Naval Training Center	42	S
Baltimore-Hanna More Academy	43	I
Columbia	44	I
Emmitsburg-St. Joseph Joseph's College	45 (also 49-1)	S
Fort Holabird	46	S
Beltsville	47A (also 49-14)	I
Fort Meade	47B (also 39D 49-31)	I
Charles County	48	I
St. Joseph's College-Emmitsburg	49-1 (also 45)	S
Ft. Detrick	49-2	S
Middletown Valley	49-3	S
Gaithersburg	49-4	S
Germantown	49-4A	S
Seneca	49-5	S
Rockville	49-5A	S
Metropolitan Grove	49-6	S
North Bethesda	49-6A	S

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
Maryland Cont'd		
Shady Grove	49-7	S
Fields Road Site	49-7A	S
Brewer Corby Tract	49-8	S
University of Md. Plant Research Farm	49-9	S
State of	49-10	S
Boys' Village	49-11	S
Suitland Fed. Center	49-12	S
Riverdale	49-13	S
Beltsville Agricultural Research	49-14 (also 47A)	S
Largo Urban Center	49-15	S
Contee	49-16	S
Moore's Way Tract	49-17	S
P.G. Ind. Park	49-18	S
U.S. Army Radio Receiving Station	49-19	S
St. Mary's College	49-20	S
Patapsco River	49-21	S
Pfeiffer Corners	49-22	S
Md. & Va. Milk Producers	49-23	S
Fed. Comm. Site Howard County	49-24	S
Waterloo Site	49-25	S
Pedro Del Valle	49-26	S
Dorsey Run Road	49-27	S
Anne Arundel Police & Fire	49-28 (also 39A)	S
Cedar Knoll	49-29 (also 39B)	S

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
Maryland Cont'd		
Balt. Wash. Int. Airport	49-30 (also 39C)	S
Ft. George Meade	49-31 (also 39D 47B)	S
D.C. Children's Center	49-32 (also 39E)	S
Crownsville State Hosp.	49-33 (also 39F)	S
Md. House of Correction	49-34 (also 39G)	S
U.S. Naval Ac. Dairy Farm	49-35 (also 39H)	S
Whitneys Land	49-36 (also 39I)	S
St. Gabriel's Home	49-37	S
Seton Inst.	49-38	S
Mt. St. Agnes College	49-39	S
Maryland State of (General)	50	I
Amendale	132 (also 40)	S
Brady Associates Bowie	135	I
Michigan:		
Battle Creek	51	S
Massachusetts:		
Otis AFB	123	S
Minnesota:		
Ft. Snelling	52 (also 53)	I
Ft. Snelling	53	I

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
Mississippi:		
State of	54	I
Bay St. Louis	55	I
Jackson	56 (also 112)	S
Whitfield Site	112A (also 56)	S
Municipal Airport	112B	S
Lakeland	112C	S
South Jackson	112D	S
Edwards Hotel	112E	S
Heidelberg Hotel	112F	S
Missouri:		
State of	57	I
Kansas City Int'l Airport	58A	S
Kansas City-Richards Air Force Base	58B	S
Jackson Co. Hospital	58C	S
St. Louis Co.	59	I
Columbia	108	S
Montana:		
Montana Children's Center	60	S
Glasgow AFB	139	S
Nebraska:		
State of	61	I
Beatrice Pershing College	62	I
Omaha Riverfront Ind. Park	113A	S
Omaha-Industrial Foundation #3 & 4	113B	S
Omaha Gendler - Investment Company Site	113C	S

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
New Jersey:		
Atlantic County NAFEC	63 (also 64&114)	S
Ft. Hancock	65A	I
Union College of NJ	65B	I
Atlantic City	114 (also 63 & 64)	S
New Mexico:		
Albuquerque	66 (also 125)	S
Albuquerque	125 (also 66)	S
New York:		
Chemung Co.	67 (also 70 111)	S
N.Y. Inst. of Tech	68	I
Elmira Lakemont Academy	69 (also 70 & 67&111)	S
Ft. Totten	71	I
Montour Falls	72A	S
Schuyler County	72B (also 67)	S
Nassau Co.	73 (also 115)	S
Stewart Air Force Base	74 (also 122)	S
St. Albans	75	I
Ward's Island	76	S

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
New York Cont'd		
N.Y. Ind. Park	111A (also 67&70)	S
Horseheads Ind. Center	111B	S
Big Flate P.U.D.	111C	S
Oyster Bay	115 (also 73)	S
Newburgh	122 (also 74)	S
Syracuse Onandago Co. Manlius Prep School	127	S
Saranac Lake Will Rogers Memorial Hosp.	128A	S
Pius X Center	128B	S
Suffolk County Airport	133	S
North Carolina:		
Charlotte	77	I
Research Triangle	78	I
North Dakota:		
Langdon-Nekoma	79	I
Ohio:		
Athens	80 (also 134)	I
Cincinnati	81A	S
Union Term.; College of Applied Science	81B	S
Env. Protection Agency	81C	S
Queensgate	81D	S
East Wood	81E	S
Greater Cin. Airport	81F	S
Sharonville Commerce	81G	S

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
Ohio Cont'd		
Columbus	82 (also 116)	S
Reynoldsburg	116 (also 80)	S
Cleveland	130	S
Athens	134 (also 80)	S
Cleveland Interfaith Housing	138	S
Oklahoma:		
State of	83	I
Oklahoma State University	84	S
Pennsylvania:		
Pottstown	85	I
Honesdale	86	I
Valley Forge General Hospital	87	S
Pennsylvania-Philadlephia University City Science Center	124	S
Rhode Island:		
State of	88	I
Newport Naval Base	89	S
Quonset Point	90A	S
Davisville	90B	S
South Dakota:		
Sioux Falls	91	I
Yankton	92	I

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
Tennessee:		
State of	93	I
Memphis	94	I
Oak Ridge	95	I
Texas:		
Waco	96	I
Big Spring	121	S
Virginia		
State of	97 (also 136 & 129)	I
Ft. Belvoir	98 (also 97)	S
N.V.C. College	99	I
Quantico	100 (also 97)	S
Wallops Island	101	I
Richmond	120	S
Vint Hill	129 (also 97& 136)	S
Herndon	131	S
Dulles North	136 (also 97)	I
Washington:		
Moses Lake	102	I
Northern State Hospital near Sedro Woolley	109	I
Issaquah	119	S
West Virginia:		
State of	103	I
Beckley-Raleigh Co. Memorial Airport Ind. Park	104	S

PROPOSAL AUDIT SHEET

PROPOSED SITE	#	Information Compliance
West Virginia Cont'd		
Huntington-Cabell Co.	105	I
Parkersburg Community College	106	I
Wisconsin:		
Milwaukee	107	S

Matrix 1 Analysis

Matrix 1 analysis was applied to those site proposals which contained sufficient information, as determined in the previous step. Also included were sites identified on the Board's own initiative as provided in its instructions.

Procedure and Form

The purpose of the Matrix 1 process was to evaluate the site proposals against the most important general factors, thus permitting the most suitable sites to emerge for further detailed evaluation.

Most important for the successful selection of a site and future operation of a proposed facility are the following five factors as indicated in the criteria of the Instructions to the Board:

1) Acquisition Costs

The Board was instructed that the ideal site should have minimum or no acquisition costs attached to the Academy's use of the grounds and any existing improvements.

2) Existing Facility

The Board determined that the ideal site should contain existing buildings of sufficient square footage to accommodate the programmed space needs, and appropriate types of space to accommodate the programmed functions.

3) Availability

The Board determined that the ideal site should be immediately available for use in order to be considered.

4) Accessibility to Major Airport

The Board determined that the ideal site should be located within 30 minutes off-peak time and 40 minutes on-peak time of a major airport in order to minimize travel costs and inconvenience. In this case, a major airport is one which offers several regularly scheduled daily direct flights to most major cities.

5) Location Appropriate for a National Academy

The Board determined that the ideal site should be located in a city and area appropriate to the desired image of the Academy. In this case, the desired image is taken to mean association with a city offering good cultural and support services and a national image.

The Board evaluated each site against the five Matrix 1 factors and retained for further consideration all those sites which adequately met these factors. In addition the Board retained for further consideration those sites which demonstrated special merit and although not available at little or no cost were available on a lease basis. Of the 140 site proposals retained from Step 1, 13 were considered most suitable by the Board for further evaluation.

Site Number	Name	Location
6	Naval Net Depot	Tiburon, California
35A	Bluegrass Army Depot	Lexington, Kentucky
38	Michoud Assembly Facility	New Orleans, Louisiana
42	Bainbridge Naval Training Center	Bainbridge, Maryland
45	St. Joseph's College	Emmitsburg, Maryland
76	Fire Training Center	Ward's Island, N.Y.C., New York
89	Newport Naval Base	Newport, Rhode Island
90A	Naval Base	Quonset Point, Rhode Island
90B	Naval Base	Davisville, Rhode Island
129	Vint Hill Farms Station	Fauquier County, Virginia
133	Suffolk County Airport	Suffolk County, New York
137	Hamilton Air Force Base	Marin County, California
81A	Union Terminal	Cincinnati, Ohio

In addition to these sites, the Board, on its own initiative, identified and evaluated the Marjorie Webster College site on Kalmia Road and Seventeenth Street, N.W., in Washington, D.C. The Board considered this site to be worthy of evaluation; and, therefore, it was subjected to the Matrix 1 process and was passed on to Matrix 2 consideration.

Matrix 2 Analysis

Matrix 2 analysis was applied to the site proposals which satisfied the five factors of Matrix 1. In addition, Matrix 2 analysis was applied to those proposals, which in the judgment of the Board, had some special merit.

Procedure and Form

Whereas Matrix 1 evaluated proposals against five factors for general desirability, Matrix 2 is a more refined process composed of seven factors and designating relative degrees of performance, according to a numeric scoring method.

Factors	Weight
1. Rehabilitation	4
2. Access to Airport	4
3. Availability	4
4. Environmental	2
5. Other	2
6. Academy-Administration Program Relations	4
7. Potential for Shared Cost	4

To distinguish the relative importance of the seven factors, a numeric weight was assigned to each. In addition, four levels of performance were developed for each factor and given a value from 1 to 4. (See Exhibit D.) The product of the performance measure value and the factor weight yields a score for that factor. This afforded relative positioning for site visits by the Board.

The Board determined that those sites receiving the five highest ratings in the Matrix 2 evaluation would be given first priority in the site visitation process. In addition the Board chose to visit on its own initiative additional sites which demonstrated sufficient merit to justify a visit and which provided to the Board potential advantages for Academy location. The five highest ranking sites are listed below, along with their numerical rating.

Rank	Site Number	Name	Location	Numerical Rating
1	140	Marjorie Webster College	Washington, D. C.	86
2	38	Michoud Assembly Facility	New Orleans, Louisiana	79.5
3	76	Fire Training Center	Ward's Island, New York, New York	76
4	137	Hamilton Air Force Base	Marin County, California	68
5	45	St. Joseph's College	Emmitsburg, Maryland	63

The following additional sites selected for visitation were then identified and discussed in terms of the basis for the Board's decision to visit each site.

1. Vint Hill Farms, Virginia

Vint Hill Farms Station, located in Fauquier County, Virginia, was selected by the Board for visitation because at the time of its selection it was one of the three highest ranking sites in the general Washington, D. C. vicinity, and the Board had determined, based on its analysis of locational factors, that a location in the Washington area merits special consideration.

2. Naval Net Depot, Tiburon, California

The Board chose to visit this site located in Marin County, California, while in the Marin County area visiting the Hamilton Air Force Base, one of the five highest ranking sites.

3. Union Terminal, Cincinnati, Ohio

The Board chose to visit this site which it had in its original evaluation in the Matrix 2 process judged to have extremely high rehabilitation costs.

The Board later was informed that $2 million would be available to defray the rehabilitation costs of this structure from sources in the City of Cincinnati with intent for an historic preservation of the structure. The availability of these funds and the potential joint benefit of historic preservation caused the Site Selection Board to make this visit.

4. Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky

This facility, located in Lexington, Kentucky, was selected because it was suggested by GSA to be available at little or no cost.

5. Boys' Village, Maryland

The Board selected Boys' Village of Maryland for a visit based on the rationale of its decision to visit Vint Hill Farms Station: This site, located within the immediate Washington area, and having a high ranking, was judged by the Board to be worthy of visitation because of the substantial advantages of co-location. Before the Board could visit the site, the State of Maryland withdrew the availability of Boys' Village.

The foregoing ten sites constitute the field visit schedule of the Site Selection Board. Their visitation provided the basis for final selection and evaluation of the sites recommended for each of the four program options.

Procedure and Form

The site visitation process included two separate activities: a pre-visitation information request and a site visit form. (See Exhibit E.) In order to make full use of the limited time available at each site, a request for detailed site specifications was sent to the responsible agent of the site. This request proved useful not only for providing the proposers time to prepare information, but also it clearly focused attention on the specific information of interest to the Board.

V. EVALUATION OF EACH SITE VISITED

Based upon the information noted on the "Information Record Sheet" (Exhibit F), each site visited was evaluated. These observations are summarized as follows:

Marjorie Webster College - Washington, D. C.

This site is being represented on behalf of the owner by Mr. Don Butler of the Carey Winston Realty Company, Bethesda, Maryland.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Located in the northern corner of the District proper, the campus is situated off 16th Street, a major north-south artery and is situated within an established upper middle-income residential environment. Single family homes (estimated value of approximately $100,000 to $250,000+) adjoin the campus on three sides while a portion of the heavily wooded Rock Creek Park is directly south. Since the main access drive is on the southern edge and since the three main buildings are situated on a high northern portion of the site facing south, Rock Creek Park provides an attractive and appropriate entry and setting.

The site itself encompasses approximately 8.5 acres of land in roughly a square configuration. It is estimated that about 40% of the land area is covered with buildings and paving. Within the site are several buildings including three major buildings and four houses (used as dormitories while the college was functioning).

The primary structure, called Main Building, contains approximately 70,000 square feet of space, varying in height from three to four floors. Built in 1928, Main Building is the oldest structure. Spaces within Main Building and directly attached to it include: 50 dormitory rooms, 6 classrooms, 6 bath and shower rooms, a library, 7 offices, a 9-bed infirmary,

3 lounges, a 300-seat dining room and kitchen facility, a gymnasium, an indoor swimming pool, and maintenance, mechanical and storage spaces.

The second largest building, called Fraser Hall, is located immediately north of Main Building. Built in 1965, this building functioned primarily as a dormitory. It has three floors with a total of 78 rooms, mostly doubles, with lavoratories in each. Two bath and shower rooms per floor provide common conveniences, while on the ground floor there are other facilities such as a laundry room, snack bar, mail room and lobby.

Memorial Hall located south of Main Building is the smallest of the three major buildings. Within its four floors are 36 sleeping rooms, a 250-seat auditorium and two studios, one for radio and one for television.

The site contains approximately 90 hard surface parking spaces as well as two tennis courts, a grass playing field and an historic spring house.

The dominant impression is created by the attractive white stuccoed, red tiled, neo-Spanish architecture of the major buildings and the wooded environment of Rock Creek Park and the site itself. There are several positive features of this facility including its favorable location: good access, and attractive setting -- all of which contribute to the capability of providing a unique and appropriate identity. Of special value are the facilities themselves. The three major buildings provide an excellent array of space and rooms which more than adequately meet the requirements of program Options III and IV. In addition, the space is functionally well deployed, offering the potential for convenient adaptation to the Academy's needs. With this amount of space available, Option III could be well accommodated.

COSTS

Converting the campus for the Academy would necessitate some major renovation of Main Building, less extensive renovation to Memorial Hall and minor

renovation to Fraser Hall. In addition, approximately 80 to 100 new parking spaces will be needed. Those renovation costs are estimated at approximately $2,000,000. Acquisition cost is quoted at $2,500,000 while operating and maintenance costs are estimated at $200,000 a year.

Based upon the assumption that facility rent without services or rehabilitation costs should be equal to 10% of the purchase price, the Board estimates that annualized lease cost for this facility is $250,000.

CONCLUSIONS

Of the many positive attributes offered the most notable are:

1. Good identity is provided by the attractive architecture, independent control of the site and the attractive wooded setting.
2. Co-location is possible with the Administration on an Option III basis.
3. Spaces are functionally suitable for adaptation.
4. Types of spaces are available to meet the Academy's needs.

Michoud Assembly Facility - New Orleans, Louisiana

This proposed facility consists of a single building that is part of a large NASA assembly facility. Available due to the completion of certain phases of the space program, the facility is being offered through the State of Louisiana.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The Michoud Assembly Facility is located on the Mississippi River on the eastern edge of New Orleans. The immediate area is primarily industrial in nature with some scattered small commercial activity. Access to the site requires an hour's peak travel time. The physical setting is flat, with some scattered clusters of trees along the approach road. The site itself is in an industrial environment surrounded by a security fence and parking area.

This site proposal consists of second floor space within a building, called Building 350, which is itself within the security fence of the Assembly Facility. The building, completed in 1964, is a modern post-and-beam structure with a metal curtain wall facade. In the front-center of this H-shaped building is the main entrance and lobby. To the rear-center is located Building 351 which houses the kitchen-dining facilities which would be available to the Academy. Surrounding this two-building complex on three sides is parking; the front side faces the main approach road and security fence, encompassing a buffer zone of approximately 50 feet.

The space offered is located on the second floor of Building 350 and includes all of the west wing, plus some of the center connecting link; the

rest of the floor would be shared with another tenant. The U. S. Department of Agriculture occupies the first floor. The nature of the space (approximately 100,000 square feet) is a loft and consists of a large expanse (422 by 258 feet) with columns. The source of natural light is provided by the strip glazing of the perimeter walls. Adjacent to the proposed space is an auditorium with a present seating capacity of 183 and a potential for expansion to 300.

COSTS

Renovation costs are estimated to be $800,000 to $1,000,000. Operating and maintenance costs are projected to be $391,200 a year, based upon $3.9120 per square foot.

There is no annualized lease cost for this facility.

CONCLUSIONS

The main feature of this proposal is the good condition of Building 350. On the other hand, there are several problems:

1. An identity unique to the Academy is not possible because of the physical environment and the dominant military image reflected by the security force, guard houses, and other buildings. Control is relinquished to the larger facility.
2. Co-location with the Administration is not possible, because the location is at a distance from the Washington, D.C. area.
3. The type of space offered presents a challenge to the Academy's needs, suggesting a "landscape" approach (office cubicles created with low height partitions) in order to provide some sense of natural light and relationship to the outside environment. Only an Option III level could be supported, since no dormitory facilities exist.

4. Functionally there are two undesirable aspects. The main reception-lobby area is on the first floor, separated from the Academy's space and controlled by others. Secondly, the auditorium, dining facilities and circulation spaces are shared with the other tenants of the site.

Fire Training Center, Ward's Island - New York City, New York

The City of New York is offering this entire facility, or portions thereof, which is owned by the New York State Urban Development Corporation. This recently-completed center was built to the specifications of the New York City Fire Department and has never been occupied.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Located on Ward's Island within the East River, the site is adjacent to Manhattan Island on the west and the Borough of Queens on the east. Access to the Island is provided from the Triborough Bridge connecting Ward's Island from Manhattan to Queens.

The 27-acre site includes a main administration building, eight secondary buildings plus parking and circulation roads. Although there are some adaptable spaces in two of the eight secondary buildings, the value of those for the Academy's purposes is questionable, these buildings having been designed for fire simulation.

Of most interest to the Academy is the main administration building, a metal shed structure of rectangular shape containing 40,000 square feet. The main character of the building is a loft with only one wall providing natural light and outside views. The interior spaces are of two types--those created by interior partitions and those created by the space between the interior partitions and the exterior walls or envelope. It is an unusual floor plan of unique space developed on the orthogonal (45 degree angle) with the perimeter walls. This design results in many peculiar-shaped rooms and angles.

The building contains eight classrooms of varying sizes and configurations, an auditorium seating 550, a lecture room for 75, a library, a

studio, a conference room with a small kitchenette and office spaces for approximately 100 persons.

Since the main building provides only 40,000 square feet of space, it could support only the Option I program or possibly an Option II program. To consider this site for an Option III or IV, new space must be added.

COST

The annual lease costs for the main building (40,000 square feet) are quoted at $360,000, while operation and maintenance costs for the same space are estimated to be $75,000 a year. New construction to provide Option III and Option IV capability levels would be necessary.

CONCLUSIONS

The main features of the site are the numerous advantages New York City offers plus the newness of the building. The design reflects a hands-on fire training facility and would not project the image of an Academic institution which Congress and the Board consider as important for the National Fire Academy.

The most important problems concern the space in the main building. Dining space is proposed for the conference area which, however, is largely circulation space. Prepared food must be brought in due to the lack of kitchen facilities. Functionally, many of the spaces have limited value. Some are small, windowless enclosures accessible only through other spaces. Finally, co-location would not be feasible here.

Hamilton Air Force Base - Marin County, California

The space offered is part of a large Air Force base owned as excess Federal property by the General Services Administration.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Located in Marin County, the base is not far from the town of San Rafael in the California wine country. Although access routes are good from San Francisco to the south, the travel time is in excess of one hour. Since the site is so large, the dominant impression is one of a huge military base, consisting of hundreds of buildings.

The spaces of interest to the Board included eight buildings: numbers 420, 422, 424, 412, 500, 501, 502 and 624, with an aggregate area of 208,208 square feet. Generally, the buildings are in good condition. Types of spaces include offices, dormitories, a cafeteria-kitchen facility and an auditorium seating 50 persons. Classrooms would need to be created from office and dorm space.

COSTS

Although operating and maintenance costs were not available, it is projected that those would likely be in excess of $500,000 a year. In addition, renovation costs are estimated to be $1,000,000. The Board has been informed that this facility would probably be available at no cost.

CONCLUSIONS

Although the buildings appear to be in good condition, there are several problems of a serious nature. Functionally, spreading spaces over eight buildings presents some inconveniences, but the main problem is identity. Since the Academy would be located as part of a military base, a unique image is not possible. Furthermore, control is relinquished to the military security.

The types of space and the area available are sufficient for an Option III capability. There also is the potential for an Option IV capability. But due to the distance from Washington, D. C., co-location is not possible.

St. Joseph's College - Emmitsburg, Maryland

Owned and offered by the Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph, the facilities are part of a Catholic college campus, which recently ceased to function.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Located near the Maryland-Pennsylvania state line, this campus provides a pleasant rural atmosphere, consisting of scattered farms and houses, rolling, wooded hills and sweeping panoramic vistas. Access to the campus is provided along a scenic tree-lined road abutting U.S. Business Route 15 which connects to the Interstate highway system. Travel time to the major Washington, D.C. airports to the south is an hour or more.

The campus, consisting of more than 100 acres, is adjacent to the town of Emmitsburg. Adjacent, mostly undeveloped, lands are virtually all owned by the Sisters. The triangular-shaped campus contains 17 buildings of which 12 are offered to the Academy for a total of more than 350,000 square feet. Included would be 38 classrooms, an auditorium for 1,000 persons, a lecture hall for 200 persons, a cafeteria-kitchen facility for 500 persons, lodging for 470 persons and 65 offices. In addition, there is a library, a gymnasium, an indoor swimming pool, tennis courts and mechanical and maintenance facilities.

COSTS

The lease cost (which would not include renovation costs and operating costs exclusive of maintenance) is quoted at $750,000 a year with a stated willingness to negotiate. There has been no quoted sales price.

CONCLUSIONS

This campus offers the potential for a suitable national identity and makes possible NFPCA co-location. Because of the large area available, Option III or IV could be accommodated.

Close proximity to Washington, D.C. allows for co-location with the Administration.

The main problems are the functional characteristics of the space and its condition because some similar or interrelated functions may have to be dispersed among the 11 buildings. The condition of three of the buildings is such that major renovation is needed for desired accommodations. It is possible, however, not to use these three buildings initially, avoiding immediate renovation.

Vint Hill Farms Station - Fauquier County, Virginia

The facilities proposed are a portion of an Army base owned by the General Services Administration. Due to a reduction in the level of activities, these facilities have become available.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Vint Hill Farms Station is a military reservation, encompassing over 700 acres of land and 136 buildings. It is located 40 miles south of Washington, D.C., approximately an hour's travel time. The surrounding area is rolling wooded hills with a predominant rural character. Access is provided by Interstate highways to county routes to the base entry.

The buildings of interest to the Board include Buildings Numbered 160, 162 and 163, totaling 190,000 square feet. Facilities include a cafeteria-kitchen, two dormitory buildings capable of housing more than 400 persons and an office building of 115,000 square feet. No auditorium is immediately available and no classrooms presently exist in these buildings.

COSTS

It is estimated that operating and maintenance costs would be $630,000 a year. In addition, it is foreseen that renovations could cost over $1,500,000 to adapt the spaces for the Academy's needs. The General Services Administration has informed the Board that this facility, if available, could probably be acquired at no cost.

CONCLUSIONS

The main feature of this proposal is the potential for co-location afforded by the fairly close proximity to Washington, D.C. On the other hand, there are serious problems related to identity and space. Since the facilities available are part of a military base, there is no opportunity to develop a

unique image or self control. No auditorium is conveniently available and classrooms do not presently exist. Although the buildings available could be renovated, their dominant military architecture would be difficult to overcome. There is a serious question as to the availability of this site.

Naval Net Base - Tiburon, California

This site is being offered by the Department of the Interior, which acquired the facility in 1963. Prior to acquisition, the base was deactivated and allowed to deteriorate. Many of the structures have deteriorated beyond repair.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The 45-acre site is situated on the east side of the Tiburon Peninsula, approximately 20 miles north of San Francisco. The terrain, with the exception of several acres of level land, is a relatively steep bush-and-tree-covered hillside overlooking San Francisco Bay. The views are outstandingly beautiful, as is the wooded setting. There are 28 major buildings and 10 small ones, all in some state of disrepair. Connecting all buildings is a series of paved streets.

The buildings of interest to the Board provide approximately 88,000 square feet, including buildings numbered 12, 20, 49, 50, 55, 36, 53, 60, 78 and 39. Presently, facilities exist for offices, lodging and dining; however, no classrooms exist and there is no auditorium. The utilities are poor and in some cases not available.

COSTS

Although no operating and maintenance costs are available, it is estimated that these could be in excess of $300,000 a year. Extensive renovation would be required for most of the subject buildings and it would probably be necessary to construct some new facilities as well. Renovation costs could exceed $3,000,000. The General Services Administration has informed the Board that the site probably would be available at no acquisition cost.

CONCLUSIONS

There are a number of serious problems with this site proposal in addition to the deteriorated condition of the buildings and grounds.

Identity would be difficult to establish because of the tenant relationship, and co-location is not possible.

The worst problem is that of readapting the subject buildings for the Academy's needs. Functional buildings for classrooms and an auditorium do not exist and must be created. In addition, the existing space is disjointed and spread out over a number of military-style buildings that do not lend themselves to major readaptation. Most of the mechanical equipment, wiring and utilities are in poor condition and should be replaced. It may prove more suitable to construct new buildings, rather than to attempt to renovate the existing ones.

Union Terminal - Cincinnati, Ohio

This site is being offered by the City of Cincinnati. An historic structure, it is subject to regulations as a national landmark.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The station is an historic landmark located within the Cincinnati central business district. The first floor of this six-story stone structure houses the monumental terminal. This hall and its elaborate paintings and murals must be maintained and kept open to the public. The remaining space was designed for specific functions and built in such a manner as to discourage major readaptation. Generally, the building has deteriorated. Major structural renovation, as well as mechanical and electrical repairs and alterations, is needed in addition to the configuration adaptations.

COSTS

The City of Cincinnati has offered this facility to the NFPCA at no cost and will contribute $2,000,000 to the rehabilitation effort. Very substantial rehabilitation costs would be required for this facility.

CONCLUSIONS

Because of the historic nature of the building, the functional and economic difficulties that would arise in readapting the space and the enormous operating and maintenance costs that would have to be met, the Board concluded that this building is not appropriate for the Academy.

Blue Grass Army Depot - Lexington, Kentucky

Under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, this depot is experiencing a decrease in its level of activity, making possible the availability of space.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Located outside the city, the site presents a rural atmosphere with farm lands and open fields. Access is good; the airport is less than 30 minutes travel time away. However, the depot was an industrial warehouse complex composed of many large, low structures, and is visually depressing. The types of space which may be available to the Academy are warehouse structures with few or no conveniences. There is limited cafeteria space, but all of the other needed space -- such as classrooms, offices, and an auditorium -- would have to be created.

COSTS

The General Services Administration has informed the Board that this facility probably would be available at no cost.

CONCLUSIONS

Because of the lack of most of the functional facilities, the nature of the warehouse buildings, and the problem that will exist with identity in an Army depot-type atmosphere, the Board decided that this proposal would not be appropriate for the Academy.

Other Sites Visited on Individual Board Member Initiative

Other sites visited by an individual Board member without a quorum and at the initiative of the Board member were: East Camden, Arkansas; Rockford, Illinois; and Jackson, Mississippi.

VI. SUMMARY

The Board in its evaluation compared each of the sites visited as candidates for each of the four program options described in Section II. The Board's findings relative to each of the four program options are summarized below.

Option I. Administer the National Academy System Existing Budget Level

This option restricts curriculum development by the Academy staff and by contractors as well as the administration of other Academy programs. The operation would be limited. The staff would number 30, and the budget would amount to slightly more than $2 million annually. The Board estimates that from 6,000-8,000 square feet of floor area would be required for the Academy under this option.

The Board does not believe that the program levels contemplated in either Option I or II are adequate to fulfill the mission of the Academy, envisioned by Congress as "a small but excellent campus with first class . . . facilities." The Board's own analysis summarized in Section II concludes that the Academy could not succeed at this level and mode of operation.

Should the programs be restricted to levels described in Options I and II, the Board concludes that there are many sites both in Washington and elsewhere in the country which would meet the minimal requirements of these options. Since no significant student presence at the Academy site was included in Option I and II, administration concerns are clearly dominant. The Academy is now functioning at approximately the Option I level at 2400 M Street, N. W., in Washington, D. C.

Option II. Administer the National Academy System
Slightly Higher Budget Level

This option, similar to the first, involves little on-site instruction and no accommodations. Staffing and budget requirements would be greater. Limited classroom space would be provided. The Board estimates that from 15,000-20,000 square feet of space would be necessary for this option.

As the Board stated under Option I, it is its judgment that the program levels contemplated under Option I or II would not allow for the accomplishment of the mission of the Academy as intended under the Act. Again as noted, if Option II were selected, the present NFPCA facility at 2400 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., as well as other sites both in Washington, D.C., and elsewhere would meet such space needs.

Option III. On-Site Instructional Capability

This option has a total space demand of 95,700 square feet. Full instructional facilities would be provided on-site under this option.

The Board has concluded that the most efficient site for accommodation of the Option III program level would be the Marjorie Webster College campus, located west of upper 16th Street in Washington, D.C.

The strength of the Marjorie Webster site is in two dominant areas. First, the facility was designed and built as an educational facility and as a result, it offers a wide range of appropriate and fully equipped spaces. The campus itself, while modest in size, is well-designed and provides an environment conducive to the concentrated study mode basic to the proposed Academy method of instruction. While significant rehabilitation would be required, new building construction would not be necessary. Location at the Marjorie Webster campus would project a strong identity for the Academy.

The second category relates to the Washington location of the campus and the opportunities which this presents for co-location with other Administration programs.

The Board found that, among those sites which fully met the needs for the Academy under Option III, the most suitable was Marjorie Webster College.

The Board concluded that this site, among all those evaluated, would best accommodate the early-year Academy objectives of:

1) developing an instructional program of excellence; and

2) demonstrating this excellence through widely ranging instructional activities attracting the highest level of the fire specific and general population.

The Board strongly recommends this choice to the Secretary.

Option IV. <u>On-Site Training and Residence Accommodations</u>

This option (listed as Option II in the Instructions) has a total space demand of 154,300 square feet which eliminates all but a few of the sites. Full instructional and student sleeping and eating accommodations would be provided on-site under this option.

The Board recommends for Option IV the Marjorie Webster campus previously discussed under Option III. In so doing, the Board is recommending that the Option IV operating mode of on-site instruction and accommodations, if selected by the Secretary, be carried out first at a "scaled down" level which would be housed in the roughly 100,000 square feet of campus floor space available at Marjorie Webster. The site allows for modest growth and maturation yet permits co-location with other NFPCA program activities. As the Academy programs develop to Option IV levels, the Academy could expand to occupy the entire facility with the other activities of NFPCA withdrawing to off-site office facilities,

but thus still retaining nearly all the advantages of co-location. In this way, the Academy could refine curriculum and operating procedures and establish a proven program before expanding its facility area to 154,300 square feet of operation.

The Marjorie Webster campus successfully meets the requirements of Option IV. A substantial share of the floor space is divided into rooms that could easily adapt to either office use or dormitory needs.

The Board considers the second ranking site for Option IV to be the Emmitsburg, Maryland campus of St. Joseph's College. This facility has adequate square footage for accommodation of this option and has existing residence facilities. It too was specially designed for educational use. This site would provide potential for co-location, although the travel distances of 1-1 1/2 hours would make it less convenient than the Marjorie Webster site.

The primary strengths of the St. Joseph's College site are its adequate facility size and its educational character. Although somewhat distant, its proximity to related activities is still appropriate for co-location considerations.

No other site offered special-purpose designed space of adequate size with the required proximity.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of its findings and its considered judgment, the Site Selection Board presents the recommendations that follow to the Secretary of Commerce for his consideration and adoption.

The Board's convictions are based on the recognition that the issues of Academy program levels and site selection are so interwoven that they cannot be effectively separated. The Board recognizes that the specific instructional and facility needs for the Academy are dependent upon program goals and plans which have as yet not been developed in final form. The Board also recognizes the Secretary's proper concern for a clear definition of Academy programs, but believes that it is unlikely any definition will remain static. In fact, as the impact of NFPCA expands in the fire protection community, the definition will change to meet dynamic requirements.

Accordingly, the Board believes that the program levels inherent in Option IV accurately reflect what the Academy should and will become in its maturing years as envisioned by the authors and supporters of the legislation (P.L. 93-498). The Board, therefore, fully supports an Academy program operation at the Option IV level and strongly recommends against any decision which would impede or deny sound development to that level.

The Board believes that the program level under Option III would be appropriate for the early years of the Academy's development and maturing process, but that such process would itself be expedited and enhanced by providing for a resident student capability. This approach is the one which the Board recommends; it is actually a combination of Options III and IV that allows for a full, but reduced scale, academic and facility environment

during the program development and testing phase of the Academy's formative years. This approach provides a conducive setting for a critical evaluation of the Academy's performance and progress.

The Board, therefore, supports an Academy site selection at either the Option III or Option IV program level. However, the Board strongly recommends that the Secretary select the Marjorie Webster College site. Marjorie Webster offers a location and facility which could be utilized immediately at the Option III instructional level, plus a student resident capability. It also provides for on-site co-location of the other NFPCA programs. The site allows for modest maturing Academy growth yet permits co-location with other divisions. As the Academy programs develop to Option IV levels, the Academy could grow to occupy the entire facility with the other activities of the NFPCA withdrawing to nearby office facilities. This would retain nearly all the advantages of co-location.

As a second, but acceptable choice, the Board recommends selection of the St. Joseph College facility at Emmitsburg, Maryland. This facility, like Marjorie Webster, would allow for Academy operations at the Option III level but with resident capability and full operation at Option IV program levels. Co-location of other NFPCA activities at St. Joseph's, while possible, would be less feasible.

Options I and II are, in the judgment of the Board, not in the best interest of the ultimate attainment of the mission of the Academy as defined in the legislation and Instructions and, more particularly, as envisioned by the fire services and others concerned with fire prevention and control.

Options I and II are in reality largely limited to categorical grant funding and contracting programs which are not consistent with current thinking as to the efficiency of Federal programs and would provide only a weak foundation from which to seek resident instruction and accommodations in the future. The growth in Academy operating levels will require support generated by proven success in operating the full range of functions. This requires a facility which will accommodate such a program pattern.

Should the programs of the Academy be restricted to the levels of Options I and II, the Board concludes that there are many sites both in Washington, D.C., and elsewhere in the country which would meet the minimal office-type requirements of these options. The Academy is now functioning at approximately the Option I level at 2400 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL ACADEMY FOR FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL SITE SELECTION BOARD

Open Meetings and Solicitation of Site Proposals

The National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control Site Selection Board was established on July 25, 1975 (40 FR 27711, July 1, 1975) to advise the Secretary of Commerce, through the Administrator, National Fire Prevention and Control Administration, as to the site upon which the National Academy should be located. The Site Selection Board shall survey the most suitable sites for the location of the Academy after giving consideration to the training and facility needs of the Academy, environmental effects, the possibility of using a surplus government facility, and such other factors as are deemed important and relevant.

The meetings and their agenda are as follows:

Dates and places:

March 22 and 23, 1976, Room 6802, Department of Commerce, 14th Street between Constitution and E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

March 25 and 26, 1976, Ballroom, Holiday Inn Civic Center, 50 Eighth Street, San Francisco, California.

Time: 9 a.m.–12 noon; 1:30–5 p.m.

Proposed agenda:

9 a.m.–12 noon: 1. Statement of mission and programs of National Fire Academy; 2. Description of site selection process; 3. Discussion of Academy training and facility needs; 4. Presentation of oral comments and proposals (limited to 15 minutes per commentor or proposal).

1:30–5 p.m.: Presentation of oral comments and proposals.

Dates and Place: April 26–30, 1976, Room 320, NFPCA, 2400 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

Time: 9 a.m.–12 noon; 1:30–5 p.m.

Proposed agenda:

9 a.m.–12 noon: Evaluation of sites for Academy in relation to training and facility needs and such other factors deemed important and relevant.

1:30–5 p.m.: Evaluation of sites (continued).

Dates and Place: June 24–25, 1976, Room 320, NFPCA, 2400 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

Time: 9 a.m.–12 noon; 1:30–5 p.m.

Proposed agenda:

9 a.m.–12 noon: Final evaluation, recommendation and development of report.

1:30–5 p.m.: Continuation of evaluation, recommendation and development of report.

Interested persons, organizations or jurisdictions may submit written proposals to the Site Selection Board for their consideration. All proposals must be postmarked no later than April 25, 1976, and addressed to the Chairman, Site Selection Board, National Fire Prevention and Control Administration, P.O. Box 19518, Washington, D.C. 20036. The Site Selection Board shall not be limited to considering only those proposals submitted to it but may also consider those sites identified by its own initiative. The public may file written statements with the Board concerning any matter pertaining to the Board's responsibilities at any time before or after any meeting.

Each site proposal submitted for the Site Selection Board's consideration shall be in writing and include the following basic information which shall appear in the forepart of the proposal documentation in the sequence shown:

1. Name and address of proposer(s). Name, address and telephone number of contact person for proposer(s).

2. Name, location and legal owner of proposed site. Name, address and telephone number of contact person for owner.

3. General description of proposed site, including:

a. Acreage, topography and natural features.

b. Size, type, number, utility and physical condition of existing buildings and equipment.

c. Statement of zoning or land use restrictions for site.

d. Description of surrounding land use and continguous environment.

e. Description of natural or man-made barriers to expansion.

4. Statement of availability and approximate cost of the site and the improvements thereon.

5. Description of nearby training and education institutions and respositories of knowledge and information.

6. Description of nearby fire research and testing facilities.

7. Description of nearby "hands on" firefighting training facilities, fire service organizations and allied professions.

8. Description of the proximity of public transportation services and highways.

9. Description of surrounding or nearby communities with respect to health facilities, public education, religious and cultural opportunities, family housing and transient residential services (hotels, motels).

10. Description of community support or interest in serving as the Academy location.

11. Description of local climate and environmental characteristics.

12. Description of availability of local vendors and other support services.

13. Description of the availability of water, utilities and sewer facilities.

The above information shall be submitted for each site proposed. However, proposers are encouraged to furnish the Site Selection Board with such further and additional documentation which would assist the Board in determining the desirability of the site with respect to the functional needs of the National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control.

The meeting on March 22 and 23 in Washington, D.C. and the March 25 and 26 meeting in San Francisco will be primarily for the purpose of receiving written and/or oral comments including discussion of proposals from interested persons, organizations or jurisdictions concerning the identification and selection of potential Academy sites. Attendance and participation shall be on a first-

come, first-served basis. Oral presentations shall be limited to 15 minutes per comment or proposal with additional time being allowed by the Chairman at his discretion if time permits. Advanced scheduling of presentations is encouraged and may be made by writing: Chairman, Site Selection Board, National Fire Prevention and Control Administration, P.O. Box 19518, Washington, D.C. 20036. A transcript of all meetings will be prepared by the Board and will be available for public viewing in Room 302, National Fire Prevention and Control Administration, 2400 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

The National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control Site Selection Board will conduct its activities in accordance with the following schedule of activities and meetings. All Board metings will be open to the public.

Date: March 22 & 23, 1976.
Place: Conference Room 6802, Department of Commerce, 14th Street between Constitution Avenue and E Street, NW., Washington, D.C. (Seating capacity: 60).
Purpose: Receipt of oral comments and proposals for site.
Date: March 25 & 26, 1976.
Place: Ballroom, Holiday Inn Civic Center, 50 Eighth Street, San Francisco, California (Seating capacity: 150).
Purpose: Receipt of oral comments and proposals for site.
Date: Postmarked no later than April 25, 1976.
Place: National Fire Prevention and Control Administration, P.O. Box 19518, Washington, D.C. 20036 (not a Board meeting).
Purpose: Last date proposals will be received.
Date: April 26–30, 1976.
Place: NFPCA, Room 320, 2400 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. (Seating capacity: 50).
Purpose: Evaluation and screening of proposals.
Date: May 10–21, 1976.
Place: Site visit to most suitable sites meeting Academy training and facility needs (not a Board meeting).
Purpose: Visits to most suitable sites for final evaluation.
Date: June 24 & 25, 1976.
Place: NPFCA, Room 320, 2400 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. (Seating capacity: 50).
Purpose: Final evaluation, recommendation and development of report.
Date: June 30, 1976.
Place: Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. (not a Board meeting).
Purpose: Delivery of report to Secretary of Commerce.
Date: Sept. 30–Oct. 29, 1976.
Place: Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. (not a Board meeting).
Purpose: Secretary announces site selection.

Dated: February 10, 1976.

HOWARD D. TIPTON,
Administrator, National Fire Prevention and Control Administration.

[FR Doc.76-4226 Filed 2-12-76:8:45 am]

National Fire Prevention and Control Administration

NATIONAL ACADEMY FOR FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL SITE SELECTION BOARD

Training and Facility Needs of the Academy and Certain Other Administrative Matters

In accordance with the Charter of the National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control Site Selection Board filed on July 29, 1975, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Administrator, National Fire Prevention and Control Administration, has issued the following instructions to the Site Selection Board in a letter dated March 12, 1976 concerning the training and facility needs of the Academy to include certain administrative considerations for the guidance of the Board during the conduct of its activities.

Dated: March 12, 1976.

HOWARD D. TIPTON,
Administrator, National Fire Prevention and Control Administration.

In accordance with the provisions of section 7(g) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, the Charter of the National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control Site Selection Board and the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the following information and guidance are provided you to assist in the execution of your responsibilities.

I. *Objectives and Duties.* The Board will survey the most suitable sites for the location of the Academy and make recommendations to the Secretary. The Act also requires that the Board, in making its recommendations, give consideration to the training and facility needs of the Academy, environmental effects, the possibility of using excess Government property, and such other factors as are deemed important and relevant. Accordingly, the Board will:

Function solely as an advisory body. The duties and meetings of the Board will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. I (Supp. IV 1974), and 5 U.S.C. 301. Specifically, all meetings and other activities and operations of the Board shall be open to the public. The public must be advised of each meeting by means of a notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER at least 35 days before the meeting.

Transmit its recommendations in the form of a written report to the Secretary, through the Administrator of the National Fire Prevention and Control Administration.

Recommend at least one suitable site for each of the feasible Academy options set forth in II below. The Board may also recommend sites they consider suitable falling between options 1 and 2 of II below. Specific training and facility needs for the Academy will depend upon program goals, objectives and plans which have not yet been developed in final form. Furthermore, these factors are expected to change over a period of time, i.e., Academy programs in the long term (5 to 10 years) are likely to be much different than in the near term (1 to 5 years). Accordingly, the training and facility needs of the Academy can be described only in terms of broad ranges of possible options, each based on a somewhat diferent set of assumptions, at the present time. The Board should recommend to the Secretary sites which would be suitable for carrying out each of those options.

In recommending suitable sites, the Board will not be limited only to those proposals submitted to it, but may also consider those sites identified by its own initiative.

They should give primary and preferential consideration to the identification and recommendation of sites which can be acquired from the public or private sector at no cost, or at nominal cost, to the Federal Government, and which contain existing structures generally meeting the facility requirements.

The Board will take into account, in making its recommendations, that the Act authorizes no more than $9 million for the construction (or modification/rehabilitation) of facilities on whatever site the Secretary selects.

II. *Academy Mission and Mode of Operations.* The mission of the National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control is to help reduce the Nation's losses caused by fire through advancing the ability of fire service personnel, and others concerned with fire safety problems, to prevent and control fires. The Academy will serve as a delivery mechanism for other programs of the NFPCA and will encourage the development of new education and training programs, or the strengthening of existing programs, offered by local fire services, units and departments; state and local governments; and private institutions. The focus of the Academy program will be on fire prevention and control; fire suppression training will not be conducted by the Academy.

Specific, long-term objectives and suitable plans for their implementation have not yet been fully developed and approved. Accordingly, a firm list of training and facility requirements cannot be provided to the Board. Instead, the Board should identify and recommend sites which would be suitable for carrying out programs within the broad range of options listed below. Estimates of the training and facility requirements associated with the option at either end of the range of possible sites have been indicated.

Option 1: With Minimal Direct Federal Training. Under this option, Academy program emphasis would be directed to carrying out the authorities specified in Section 7(d), paragraphs (1) through (5) of the Act, at current authorized FY 77 program levels, namely:

Train fire service personnel in such skills and knowledge as may be useful to advance their ability to prevent and control fires.

Development of model curricula, training programs, and other educational materials suitable for use at other educational institutions.

Development of a program of correspondence courses.

Provision of model questions suitable for use in conducting entrance and promotional examinations for fire service personnel.

Encouragement of educational and professional practices which include fire prevention and detection technology.

Under this option only minimal direct training would be conducted by the Federal Academy.

The training and facility requirements associated with this program option are, for the most part, those associated with a minimum training and education operation. A special audio-visual facility and four or five classrooms might also be needed. However, special purpose facilities would not be required to carry out an acedemy program of this type.

Option 2: With Direct Federal Training. Under this option, direct Federal training would be added to the functions listed in option (1) above. The Academy would conduct actual courses in such fields as:

Techniques of fire prevention, fire inspection, fire fighting, and fire and arson investigation.

Tactics and commands of fire fighting.

Administration and management of fire services.

Tactical training in specialized fields, such as aircraft fires and fires aboard waterborne vessels.

In each of the above areas, emphasis would be given to the training of present and future instructors in these fields.

The training and facility needs associated with this option are flexible and will depend on the extent of direct training to be conducted. However, a maximum set of training and facility requirements is set forth below for consideration by the Board:

1. Maximum operating conditions:

Facility will be in operation 250 days per year.

Maximum resident enrollment of 300; maximum attendance on any one day of 1,000.

Approximately 210 employees, both resident and visiting faculty and support personnel.

2. Maximum facility requirements:

Twenty classrooms, including seminars, demonstration, and audio-visual rooms.

Auditorium seating 500 persons.

Library and reference center.

Dormitory space for 300 resident students.

Cafeteria.

Instructional media center.

Administration office space.

Maintenance and support facilities for approximately 35 people.

Sufficient land to insure an appropriate instructional setting and room for some potential future growth. Estimated maximum need

of 50 to 100 acres, but may be less for initial use.

Neither of the above options make special provisions for other potential Academy programs mentioned in the Act, such as technical and financial assistance. No special site or facility requirements are associated with these programs and they need not be considered during the site selection process.

III. *Environmental, Physical and Geographic Factors.* The following are factors which you should consider important in your evaluation of sites:

A. Favorable land use/zoning, air quality, water quality, sewage and noise level.

B. Ready access to a variety of transportation arrangements, including airports.

C. Ready access (30–50 miles) to a major urban center having metropolitan fire department facilities.

D. Readily serviced by vendors.

E. Community receptivity to the Academy with adequate health, education, religious and cultural opportunities and adequate housing for staff and faculty.

IV. *Other Important Factors Governing Site Selections.* The mission of the Academy is interrelated with the overall mission of the NFPCA and its other major elements. Academy programs are and will be dependent on on-going research of the National Fire Safety and Research Office. The National Fire Data Center is an indispensable store of data feeding directly to Academy programs and curricula. The Public Education Office will provide information and techniques used by the Academy, and, in turn, the Academy will serve that Office with its instructional resources. Generally these other programs will be major generators of new knowledge for inclusion in the Academy programs. Therefore, close interaction is essential.

For purposes of efficiency and cost effectiveness in sharing resources such as the library and computer systems, consideration should be given to the selection of a site which can either house the Academy, together with the NFPCA, or be in such close proximity as to make conference facilities and resource sharing practical and administration more effective.

V. *Time Schedule.* Because of the statutory requirement that the Secretary of Commerce make his final selection of a site for the Academy no later than October 29, 1976, you are to adhere to the following schedule of Board proceedings.

Date	Place	Purpose
March 22 and 23, 1976	Conference Room 6802, Department of Commerce, 14th St. between Constitution Ave. and E St N.W., Washington, D.C.	Receipt of oral comments and proposals for site.
March 25 and 26, 1976	Ballroom, Holiday Inn Civic Center, 50 Eighth St., San Francisco, Calif.	Do.
Postmarked no later than April 25, 1976.	National Fire Prevention and Control Administration, P.O. Box 19518, Washington, D.C. 20036.	Last date proposals will be received.
April 26–30, 1976	NFPCA, Room 320, 2400 M St. NW., Washington, D.C.	Evaluation and screening of proposals.
May 10–21, 1976	Site visit to most suitable sites meeting academy training and facility needs.	Visits to most suitable sites for final evaluation.
June 24 and 25, 1976	NFPCA, Room 320, 2400 M St. NW., Washington, D.C.	Final evaluation, recommendation and development of report.
June 30, 1976	Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.	Delivery of report to Secretary of Commerce.
September 30–October 29, 1976	do	Secretary announces site selection.

VI. *Proposals for Site Location.* Despite the severe time coustraints indicated in the schedule above, in fairness to interested localities, proposals and/or revisions may be sent to the Board so as to be postmarked no later than April 25, 1976. NFPCA has on file, at present, 103 proposals previously submitted. These are being turned over to you for consideration. Previous proposers need not resubmit proposals but may revise or furnish additional supportive material. All proposals will be directed to the Chairman, Site Selection Board, National Fire Prevention and Control Administration, P.O. Box 19518, Washington, D.C. 20036.

VII. *Attendance at Site Selection Board Meetings.* The meeting on March 22 and 23 in Washington, D.C. and the March 25 and 26 meeting in San Francisco will be primarily for the purpose of receiving written and/or oral comments including discussion of proposals from interested persons, organizations or jurisdictions concerning the identification and selection of potential Academy sites. Attendance and participation shall be on a first-come, first-served basis. Oral presentations shall be limited to 15 minutes per comment or proposal with additional time being allowed by the Chairman at his discretion if time permits. Advanced scheduling of presentations is encouraged and may be made by writing: Chairman, Site Selection Board, National Fire Prevention and Control Administration, P.O. Box 19518, Washington, D.C. 20036. All meetings will be open to the public. A transcript of all meetings will be prepared by the Board and will be available for public viewing in Room 302, National Fire Prevention and Control Administration, 2400 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. The public may file written statements with the Board concerning any matter pertaining to the Board's responsibilities at any time before or after any meeting.

VIII. *Administrative Provisions.* A. The Site Selection Board will report to the Secretary of Commerce through the Administrator, NFPCA.

B. You will be provided by the National Fire Academy with such professional consulting expertise, clerical and supporting services as the Administrator, NFPCA, deems appropriate.

C. Members of the Board will not be compensated for their services, but, upon request, will be reimbursed for travel and per diem expenses.

IX. *Duration.* The Board shall terminate on October 29, 1976, unless earlier terminated or renewed by proper authority and by appropriate action.

Sincerely,

HOWARD D. TIPTON,
Administrator.

[FR Doc.76-7591 Filed 3-16-76;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

EARLY EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Closing Date for Receipt of Applications for Implementation of Statewide Early Education Plans

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the authority contained in sections 623

Exhibit B: Compliance Form

PROPOSAL NO: _____

NATIONAL ACADEMY FOR FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL - SITE SELECTION STUDY

Proposal Information Compliance Sheet: for proposals received in response to Federal Register, Vol. 41, No. 31, Friday, February 13, 1976

Item No. In Federal Register	Short Title of Required Information	"S"=sufficient "I"=insufficient "n.a."=not available
1.	--Name, address of proposer --Proposer contact-Name, address, telephone number	
2.	--Legal owner-Name, address --Legal owner contact-Name, address, telephone number	
3.	General description of site as relating to --acreage, topography, etc. --existing building facilities, number, size, condition, type --surrounding land use --expansion barriers --zoning restrictions	
4.	Site availability and cost	
5.	Nearby training, education facilities	
6.	Nearby fire research and testing facilities	
7.	Nearby firefighting training facilities and organizations	
8.	Proximity to public transportation services-highways	
9.	Nearby health, public education, religious, cultural opportunity, housing, hotel-motel facility description	
10.	Community support statement	
11.	Local climate and environment	
12.	Availability of local vendors and support services	
13.	Availability of utilities, water and sewer facilities	

SUMMARY

--The proposal has sufficient information for evaluation.
--The proposal does not have sufficient information for evaluation.
--The proposal has no information for evaluation.

Exhibit C: Matrix 1

Phase I

Matrix 1

NATIONAL FIRE ACADEMY

SITE SELECTION BOARD

PHASE I. SITE SELECTION FORM

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION AND SITE IDENTIFICATION _____

_____

_____

Phase I. Evaluation Factors	Comments	Evaluation
Acquisition Costs None or Limited _____ _____		
Existing Facility Adequate Size Adequate Configuration _____ _____		
Availability Confirmed _____ _____		
Accessibility to Major Airport 20 Minutes Off-Peak 40 Minutes On-Peak _____ _____		

Exhibit C cont'd.

Phase I. Evaluation Factors	Comments	Evaluation
Location Appropriate National Academy		
Image		
Support Facilities		
_____		
_____		

Completed by _____

Date Completed _____

Exhibit D: Matrix 2

PROPOSAL # LOCATION

MATRIX 2

WEIGHT		VALUE	TOTAL
	1. Rehabilitation		
4	a) Minor b) Major c) Extensive d) Temporary		
	2. Access to Airport		
4	a) Less than 30 min. b) 30 min. - 1 hr. c) 1 hr. - 2 hr. d) Over 2 hours		
	3. Availability		
4	a) Immediate b) Less than 1 yr. c) 1 - 2 yrs. d) Undetermined		
	4. Environmental		
2	a) Adjacent land use b) Utilities c) Work Force d) Lodgings		
	5. Other		
2	a) Location of the site relative to population centroid b) Availability of support services c) Highway quality d) Expansion capability		
	6. Academy Administration Communications		
4	a) Excellent c) Fair b) Good d) Poor		
	7. Potential for Shared Cost		
4	a) Excellent c) Fair b) Good d) Poor		

SCORE _____

Initials _____

Date _____

COMMENTS

Exhibit E: Field Visit Data Requirements

NATIONAL FIRE ACADEMY
FIELD VISIT DATA REQUIREMENTS

Existing Facilities

Floor plans and floor space measurements.
Age and type construction.
Exterior facade and aerial photos of structures, complex and surrounding neighborhoods.
Mechancial systems.
On site lodging, auditorium, classroom, cafeteria and office facilities.

Utilities

Size and available capacity for line hookups to existing public systems.
Type, capacity and age of on-site systems.

Operating Costs

Historic experience of operating cost for all categories for the various individual component facilities both during periods of occupancy and periods of vacancy.

Proposed Adaptive Reuse Strategy

Based upon consideration of the Option III and Option IV preliminary space programs response in schematic floor plan form as to how the existing facility could meet part or all of the programmed space needs, what rehabilitation and general costs would be involved and the proposed stragegy for financing. Comment also on potential for future expansion at this site in terms of additional building space and land available.

Traffic Capacity

Calculated capacity on roads within the site providing major access to the site.
Existing traffic volumes on these roads and trends in the growth of this volume.
Description and mapping of regional highway system.

Environmental Features

Air pollution measurements.
Wastewater loads and processing.
Solid waste loads and processing.
Ground water restrictions.
Soil quality and capability.
Drainage and flood plain characteristics.
Description of public and private lodging facilities in area including present rates.
Description of other present or anticipated users of the site.
Description of available work force in the area.
Description and mapping of surrounding area land use.
Jurisdictional plans for vicinity.
Jurisdictions having authority over this facility and nature of authority.
Description of police, fire and other critical services provided.
Driving time (peak and off-peak) to nearest major airport.
Detailed steps in the process by which the Academy would take ownership and/or occupancy of the facility including any acquisition or occupancy costs involved and the likely time schedule for occupancy.

Exhibit F: Site Visit Information Record Sheet

NAFPC SITE SELECTION STUDY

SITE VISIT: INFORMATION RECORD SHEET

A. GENERAL

1. Name of Proposer Proposal File No:_____

2. Name of Owner

3. Site Address

4. Date of Visit

5. Site Selection Board and Team Members Visiting the Site

i
ii
iii
iv
v
vi

B. INFORMATION CHECKLIST, OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

1. Regional Accessiblity and Regional Highway System

2. Region-wide Support Services and Their Sufficiency

2.1 Testing and Research Labs

2.2 Fire Fighting Training Facilities

2.3 Education Facilities

2.4 Health Facilities

2.5 Housing Availability - Cost

2.6 Work Force, Type and Productivity

2.7 Police, Fire Fighting, Public Transportation Facilities

3. Support Services-Immediate Neighborhood

3.1 Hotel-Motels

3.2 Restaurants

4. Land Use Compatibility - Immediately Adjacent Uses

5. Zoning and Land Use Restrictions, Unusual Building Codes Applicable to the Site

6. Site Accessibility, Adjacency to Major Roads and Ease of Ingress-Egress

7. Public Transportation Availability and Distance of Transit Stop from the Site

8. Generalized Site Information - Environmental and Suitability Factors (U.S.G.S. Map, Aerial Photo, Site Plan)

   8.1 Slope

   8.2 Vegetation - Coverage and Type (tree, middle story, ground cover)

   8.3 Soil-Erosion Hazards and Bearing Characteristics

   8.4 Flood and Wet Areas

   8.5 Man-made Features - Pavements, Play Areas, Open Air Facilities

9. Existing Site Improvements and Their Condition

10. Buildings and Their Condition (Collect plans, section, construction drawings, slides, photographs, site plans, utility plans, aerial photos, etc.)

   10.1 Building Size, Floor Area, Ceiling Height, and its adaptability to academy uses

   10.2 On-site Lodging, Cafeteria, Classroom Facilities, and Capacity

   10.3 Configuration of Spaces and its adaptability to academy uses (floor plans) and proposed use strategy

10.4 Building Condition - Interior and Exterior - and Degree of Rehabilitation Required and Rehabilitation Costs

10.5 Building's Code Compliance Status (exits, electrical, ventilation, structure, plumbing, etc.). List all violations, required alterations for code compliance and its costs.

10.6 Building Image; Identity and Appearance

11. Operating and Maintenance Cost History during Occupancy and Vacancy Conditions

11.1 Taxes, Rent, Insurance, etc.

11.2 Equipment and its maintenance

11.3 Utility Costs - Actual History for Year-round Conditions

11.4 Utility, Unit Rates for the Site

11.5 Support - Maintenance Staff Costs

11.6 Repair and Maintenance Supplies

12. Site Availability and Costs

12.1 Time Required for Acquisition and Detailed Steps Towards Ownership

12.2 Site Area Available for Present Functions and Future Expansions

12.3 Site Acquisition Cost Per Acre and Total

12.4 Buildings Acquisition - Rent Costs per Sq. Ft. and Total

13. Special Inducements: Land, Building Renovation, Site Improvement Cost Sharing, Sharing of Existing Facilities, Sharing of Maintenance and Other Staff, etc.

14. Environmental Features

14.1 Air Quality

14.2 Waste Water Disposal

14.3 Solid Waste Disposal

14.4 Storm Water Run-off and Disposal

ROADS AND STREETS - INFORMATION

(Include Site Plan)

1. Street Characteristics (On Site, Site Periphery)

Street Name	Street Width	Direct. Restrict.	Traffic Volume	Adja. St. Speed Limits	Material (Type)	Condition	Drainage

2. Accessibility of ingress and egress (as related to distance from major intersections)

3. Method of street drainage handling (esp. adjacent public streets), e.g., ditch, etc.

UTILITIES INFORMATION

(Include Site Plan Showing Location)

A. WATER

1. Water Requirement Estimated (for 300 resident, 700 non-resident and 210 staff): 48,200 G.P.D. maximum

2. Type and Size of Main and Service Connections

3. Condition (or age) of Main and Service Connections

4. Line Pressure to be expected

B. SANITARY SEWER

1. Waste Water Estimate: 0.95 x 48,200 = 45,790 G.P.D.

2. Type and Size of Main and Service Connections

3. Capability of System to Handle Load, Including Treatment Facility

4. Age of Sanitary System

5. Condition of Manholes, Pipes, etc. (Do manholes have a tendency to surcharge?)

C. SANITARY SEWAGE TREATMENT (If Applicable)

Type of Facility

a) Lagoon

- size, in acres
- aerated or not
- single or multiple cells
- chlorinated
- capacity

b) Biological

- activated sludge or trickling filter
- package plant? If so, manufactures
- date installed
- capacity

D. STORM SEWER

1. Surface or Underground?

2. If Underground

a) Capacity

b) Size and Type

c) Age of System

E. ELECTRIC

1. Capacity, Power Available to Site

2. Underground or Overhead?

3. Age of Internal Wiring and Power Capacity of Lines

4. Single or Multiple Phase (120, 120-240, 120-360, etc.)

F. GAS

1. Capacity

2. Age of System

3. Size and Type

4. Pressure Available

G. STEAM

1. Capacity Including Temperature (High pressure, etc.)

2. Age

3. Size and Type

4. Pressure

H. WATER STORAGE

1. Potable

a) Type Facility (e.g., underground, elevated, etc.)

b) Material (e.g., concrete, wood, steel, etc.)

c) Capacity

d) Age

2. Fire Protection

a) Type of Facility (e.g., underground, elevated, etc.)

b) Material (e.g., concrete, wood, steel, etc.)

c) Capacity

d) Age

e) With or Without Booster Fire Pumps

f) If so, capacity in gallons per minute against total head

g) Size and type of fire mains, if separate from potable

MECHANICAL SYSTEMS - AIR CONDITIONING, HEATING, ELEVATORS

(Include all available drawings and photographs)

A. AIR CONDITIONING

1. Capacity of system in tons

2. What type of system:

   a) Direct Expansion Reciprocating

   b) Chilled Water Reciprocating

   c) Chilled Water Centrifugal

   d) Chilled Water Absorption

3. Age and Type of Equipment (condition of duct work, equipment, etc.)

   a) If there is a cooling tower, its capacity and condition

4. Temperature of suction refrigerant or chilled water

5. Is there river, lake or well water available for condensing water? (Storage capacity, quality of water, system in use or proposed, etc.)

B. HEATING

1. What Kind of System and Its Age or Condition?

2. What Size of Boiler (capacity of system)?

3. Type of Boiler:

   a) Hot Water

   b) Steam

      i) high pressure

      ii) low pressure

4. What Fuel?

   a) Gas

   b) Oil

   c) Coal

   d) Electricity

C. ELEVATORS

1. Number of Elevators

Elev. No.	Type or Speed ft./min.	Capacity Pounds	Use - Freight or Passenger	No. of Floors Served	Total travel Distance (Max: In ft.)

2. Age and Condition

NAFPC SITE SURVEY

REQUIRED STRUCTURAL INFORMATION

1.01 LOCATION:

A. Site location: _____

B. Building identification: _____

1.02 DRAWINGS:

	YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
A. Are structural drawings available?	_____	_____	_____
1. Percent complete _____			
B. Are architectural drawings available?	_____	_____	_____
1. Percent complete _____			

1.03 BASEMENT:

A. Is there a basement?	_____	_____	_____
B. Are basement walls masonry _____ concrete _____			
C. General condition of walls:			
1. Can walls be inspected?	_____	_____	_____
2. Are walls plumb and straight?	_____	_____	_____
If no, how extensive are the areas not plumb and straight?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
3. Do walls have cracks?			
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			

	YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
4. Are walls watertight?	_____	_____	_____
If no, how extensive is water leaking through?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
D. Condition of masonry walls:			
1. Are joints soft?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
2. Are joints full of mortar?			
If not, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
E. Condition of concrete walls:			
1. Is there concrete that has peeled off of the wall?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
2. Is there any exposed reinforcement?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermedieate _____ Great _____			
1.04 COLUMNS:			
A. Are there interior columns?	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
B. Are there exterior columns?	_____	_____	_____
C. Are columns:			
Concrete _____ Steel _____ Wood _____ Do Not Know _____			
D. General condition of columns:			
1. Can columns be inspected?	_____	_____	_____
2. Are columns straight and plumb?	_____	_____	_____
If no, how many? _____			
E. Concrete columns condition:			
1. Is there any exposed reinforcement?	_____	_____	_____
2. Has any concrete peeled off of columns?	_____	_____	_____
3. Are there any cracks in columns?	_____	_____	_____
F. Steel columns condition:			
1. Is there any rust on columns?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
G. Timber columns condition:			
1. Do columns have splits and/or checks?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
2. Do columns have any rot?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			

	YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
1.05 FLOORS:			
A. Are floors:			
Concrete _____ Steel _____ Timber _____ Do Not Know _____			
B. General condition of floors:			
1. Are floors level?	_____	_____	_____
If no, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
2. Does floor seem solid to walk on?	_____	_____	_____
C. Concrete floors:			
1. Are floors concrete joist and beams?	_____	_____	_____
2. Are floors concrete slabs and beams?	_____	_____	_____
3. Are floors concrete slabs with no beams?	_____	_____	_____
D. Steel floors:			
1. Are floors timber on steel joist?	_____	_____	_____
2. Are floors concrete slab on steel joist?	_____	_____	_____
3. Are floors concrete slab on steel beams?	_____	_____	_____
4. Are floors concrete on metal deck spanning between steel beams?	_____	_____	_____
E. Wood floors:			
1. Are floors wood planking (plywood) on wood joist spanning between wood beams?	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
2. Are floors wood planking (plywood) on wood beams?	_____	_____	_____
3. Are floors wood planking (plywood) on wood joist spanning between steel beams?	_____	_____	_____
F. Condition of concrete:			
1. Are there any cracks?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
2. Has any concrete peeled off the floors?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
G. Condition of steel:			
1. Is there any rust?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
H. Condtion of timber:			
1. Has timber rotted?			
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
2. Has timber split?			
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			

	YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
1.06 ROOF:			
A. Is roof:			
Concrete _____ Steel _____ Timber _____			
B. General condition of roof:			
1. Is roof level?	_____	_____	_____
If no, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
2. Does roof seem level to walk on?	_____	_____	_____
C. Concrete roof:			
1. Is roof concrete joist and beams?	_____	_____	_____
2. Is roof concrete slabs and beams?	_____	_____	_____
3. Is roof concrete slabs with no beams?	_____	_____	_____
D. Steel roof:			
1. Is roof timber on steel joist?	_____	_____	_____
2. Is roof concrete slab on steel joist?	_____	_____	_____
3. Is roof concrete slab on steel beams?	_____	_____	_____
4. Is roof concrete on metal deck spanning between steel beams?	_____	_____	_____
E. Wood roof:			
1. Is roof wood planking (plywood) on wood joist spanning between wood beams?	_____	_____	_____
2. Is roof wood planking (plywood) on wood beams?	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
3. Is roof wood planking (plywood) on wood joist spanning between steel beams?	_____	_____	_____
F. Condition of concrete:			
1. Are there any cracks?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
2. Has any concrete peeled off the roof?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
G. Condition of steel:			
1. Is there any rust?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
H. Condition of timber:			
1. Has timber rotted?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
2. Has timber split?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			

	YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
1.07 EXTERIOR WALLS ABOVE GRADE:			
A. Are walls:			
Masonry _____ Precast Concrete _____ Wood _____ Metal _____ Other _____			
B. General conditions:			
1. Are walls plumb and straight?	_____	_____	_____
If no, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
C. Masonry wall:			
1. Are there cracks at end of walls?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
2. Are there cracks at windows?	_____	_____	_____
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
3. Are there cracks in parapet?			
If yes, how extensive?			
Slight _____ Intermediate _____ Great _____			
4. Are joints full of mortar?	_____	_____	_____
5. Are joints soft?	_____	_____	_____