

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

JUNE 13, 1995.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mrs. VUCANOVICH, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 1817]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignments and closures for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996.

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of Committee Recommendation	2
Fiscal Year 1996 Budget Request	3
Conformance with Authorization Bill	3
Quality of Life in the Military:	
Troop Housing	3
Barracks Standards	6
Child Development Centers	7
Child Care Services—Outsourcing Initiative	8
Hospital and Medical Facilities	8
Environmental Compliance Projects	9
Potential Canceled Projects Due to the Base Realignment and Closure Process	10
European Construction Program	10
Modular Construction	11
Parametric Cost Estimating	11
Hearing Transcripts	11
Foreign Currency Exchange Rates	11
Annual Report on Design and Construction Progress	12
Establishment of Audit Trail Documents	12
Program, Project and Activity	12
Military Construction:	
Army	12
Navy	15
Air Force	18
Defense-Wide	18

Reserve Components	21
NATO Security Investment Program	22
Family Housing Overview	23
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund Overview	26
Family Housing:	
Army	29
Navy and Marine Corps	30
Air Force	31
Defense-Wide	33
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund	33
Homeowners Assistance Fund	33
Base Realignment and Closure:	
Overview	34
Part I	42
Part II	42
Part III	43
Part IV	43
General Provisions	44
Changes in Application of Existing Law	44
Compliance with Rule XIII—Clause 3	47
Appropriations Not Authorized By Law	47
Transfer of Funds	48
Rescission of Funds	48
Inflationary Impact Statement	48
Comparisons with Budget Resolution	48
Advance Spending Authority	48
Five-Year Projection of Outlays	48
Financial Assistance to State and Local Governments	49
State List	49

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1995 ap- propria- tion	Fiscal year 1996 request	Fiscal year 1996 rec- ommend- ed	Recommended com- pared with	
				Fiscal year 1995 appro- piation	Fiscal year 1996 re- quest
Military construction	\$2,531	\$2,496	\$2,806	\$275	\$310
Family housing	3,520	4,125	4,333	813	208
Base realignment and closure	2,676	3,898	3,898	1,222	0
NATO Security Investment Program	119	179	161	42	(18)
Procurement reform	(10)	0	0	10	0
Fiscal year 1995 rescission	(101)	0	0	101	0
Total	8,735	10,698	11,198	2,463	500

Family Housing accounts represent \$4.3 billion and account for 40 percent of the total appropriations included in this bill. Funding for these programs include such items as:

 \$1.0 billion for construction and construction improvements;
 \$3.3 billion for operations and maintenance of existing inventory;

 \$76 million for the Homeowners Assistance Fund;
 \$22 million for start-up costs for a private sector pilot project.

Base Realignment and Closure accounts represent \$3.9 billion and account for 35 percent of the total appropriations included in this bill. The Committee notes that this is an increase of \$1.2 billion over fiscal year 1995 and includes \$785 million for implementation of the 1995 round of closures. Funding for these programs include such items as:

\$1.1 billion for military construction and family housing;
 \$457 million for environmental cleanup;
 \$2.3 billion for operations and maintenance.

Military Construction Accounts represent \$2.8 billion and account for 25 percent of the total appropriations included in this bill. Funding for these programs include such items as:

\$636 million for barracks construction;
 \$207 million for environmental compliance;
 \$178 million for medical related facilities;
 \$108 million for chemical demilitarization;
 \$57 million for child development centers.

FISCAL YEAR 1996 BUDGET REQUEST

The Committee notes that the Administration's fiscal year 1996 budget request of \$10,697,995,000 represents an increase of \$1,962,595,000 over the fiscal year 1995 appropriation of \$8,735,400,000. The majority of the increase results from quality of life requirements for family housing, \$604,777,000, or 31 percent, as well as requirements for the implementation of base realignments and closures, \$1,221,734,000, or 63 percent. The Committee commends the Department of Defense for following the Committee's guidance in last year's report and seeking increased appropriations for family housing due to the contributions this program makes to readiness and retention.

The Committee feels strongly that the increased emphasis on base realignment and closures, consuming over one third of the funding in this bill, has reduced the availability of funding for needed projects. While the Committee supports base realignment and closure funding, it is imperative the severe backlog in readiness, revitalization and quality of life projects be addressed. The Committee has added an additional \$500,000,000 over the Administration's fiscal year 1996 budget request to fund the planning and construction of several barracks, family housing and child development center projects. The Department of Defense is urged to maintain this level of funding and to give priority consideration to these types of projects in its fiscal year 1997 budget request.

CONFORMANCE WITH AUTHORIZATION BILL

The House National Security Committee has reported H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, which contains authorization for the military construction, family housing and base realignment and closure accounts included in this bill. Because Senate and conference action on the authorization had not been completed at the time this bill was prepared, the Committee is considering only projects recommended for authorization in H.R. 1530. All projects included in this bill are approved subject to authorization.

QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE MILITARY

TROOP HOUSING

The Department of Defense has over 600,000 men and women living in troop housing. Approximately one half of DOD's barracks

were built 30 or more years ago, with an average age of over 40 years. Of this inventory, over one fourth are considered sub-standard facilities and continuous maintenance is necessary to deal with such problems as asbestos, corroded pipes, inadequate ventilation, faulty heating and cooling systems, and peeling lead-based paint.

Based on the "2 plus 2" standard, and a definition of deficit as "characterizing adequacy of the existing inventory", there is a total DOD barrack space deficit of 160,000. The Army estimates a deficit of 75,600 barrack spaces; the Air Force 30,200; and the Navy/Marine Corps 54,300. The Department of Defense estimates it will cost approximately \$8.5 billion at the proposed new standard and take 10 years for the Air Force, 60 years for the Navy, 23 years for the Army and 32 years for the Marine Corps to eliminate this deficit.

The Department of Defense has requested \$433,330,000 for 9,916 barrack spaces in fiscal year 1996. The Committee has approved this request in full. In addition, to help alleviate the deficit an additional \$202,332,000 has been provided. The locations were determined by component priorities and all projects are capable for construction during fiscal year 1996. The total appropriation for troop housing included in this bill is \$635,662,000.

The Committee understands that improving troop housing does not lie solely in constructing new barrack spaces. Renovation plays an important role in this process. The Committee notes that not included in this bill, and under the jurisdiction of the National Security Subcommittee, is a total request of \$672 million to renovate 4,931 barrack spaces under the Real Property Maintenance Account.

In addition, the Quality of Life Task Force, chaired by the Honorable John O. Marsh, Jr., is in the process of reviewing other innovative strategies, assignment policy changes, and possibly diverting a larger share of troops off-base. The Committee looks forward to the results of the task force and encourages it to look at private sector initiatives similar to the proposed Family Housing Revitalization Act.

The following troop housing construction projects are provided for fiscal year 1996:

Location	Request	Recommended
Army:		
Fort Huachuca, Arizona	\$16,000,000	\$16,000,000
Fort Carson, Colorado	0	20,000,000
Fort Lesley J. McNair, District of Columbia	5,500,000	5,500,000
Fort Benning, Georgia	33,000,000	33,000,000
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii	0	15,000,000
Fort Bragg, North Carolina	18,500,000	18,500,000
Fort Sill, Oklahoma	0	8,000,000
Fort Jackson, South Carolina	32,000,000	32,000,000
Fort Bliss, Texas	48,000,000	48,000,000
Fort Hood, Texas	17,500,000	17,500,000
Fort Hood, Texas	0	15,000,000
Fort Eustis, Virginia	0	11,000,000
Camp Stanley, Korea	6,800,000	6,800,000
Camp Hovey, Korea	6,200,000	6,200,000
Camp Hovey, Korea	7,300,000	7,300,000

Location	Request	Recommended
Camp Pelham, Korea	5,600,000	5,600,000
Total, Army	196,400,000	265,400,000
Navy:		
Port Hueneme, California	0	16,700,000
Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base, California	11,940,000	11,940,000
Annapolis Naval Station, Maryland	3,600,000	3,600,000
Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base, North Carolina	8,300,000	8,300,000
New River Marine Corps Air Station, North Carolina	14,650,000	14,650,000
Beaufort, South Carolina	0	15,000,000
Corpus Christi, Texas	0	4,400,000
Portsmouth Naval Hospital, Virginia	9,500,000	9,500,000
Williamsburg Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Virginia	6,140,000	6,140,000
Norfolk, Virginia	0	18,000,000
Naval Computer and Telcom Area Mastersta WPAC, Guam	2,250,000	2,250,000
Naples Naval Support Activity, Italy	7,300,000	7,300,000
Sigonella Naval Air Station, Italy	11,300,000	11,300,000
Total, Navy	74,980,000	129,080,000
Air Force:		
Eielson AFB, Alaska	3,850,000	3,850,000
Elmendorf AFB, Alaska	7,350,000	7,350,000
Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona	3,800,000	3,800,000
Luke AFB, Arizona	5,200,000	5,200,000
Edwards AFB, California	10,600,000	10,600,000
Travis AFB, California	10,500,000	10,500,000
Travis AFB, California	6,400,000	6,400,000
Buckley ANG Base, Colorado	5,500,000	5,500,000
Peterson AFB, Colorado	3,000,000	3,000,000
Bolling AFB, District of Columbia	6,500,000	6,500,000
Bolling AFB, District of Columbia	5,600,000	5,600,000
Eglin AFB, Florida	0	7,300,000
Moody AFB, Georgia	0	2,500,000
Hickam AFB, Hawaii	3,100,000	3,100,000
Hickam AFB, Hawaii	3,050,000	3,050,000
Scott AFB, Illinois	8,000,000	8,000,000
Scott AFB, Illinois	4,700,000	4,700,000
McConnell AFB, Kansas	2,200,000	2,200,000
McConnell AFB, Kansas	0	6,500,000
Andrews AFB, Maryland	6,000,000	6,000,000
Keesler AFB, Mississippi	6,500,000	6,500,000
Keesler AFB, Mississippi	0	8,300,000
Nellis AFB, Nevada	9,900,000	9,900,000
McGuire AFB, New Jersey	0	7,300,000
Cannon AFB, New Mexico	0	3,000,000
Seymour-Johnson AFB, North Carolina	0	2,000,000
Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota	8,500,000	8,500,000
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma	5,100,000	5,100,000
Charleston AFB, South Carolina	5,600,000	5,600,000
Dyess AFB, Texas	0	5,400,000
Fairchild AFB, Washington	7,500,000	7,500,000
Fairchild AFB, Washington	0	8,200,000
McChord AFB, Washington	4,300,000	4,300,000
F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming	5,500,000	5,500,000
Spangdahlem AB, Germany	5,900,000	5,900,000
Araxos, Greece	1,950,000	1,950,000
Gheddi Airfield, Italy	1,450,000	1,450,000
Total, Air Force	157,550,000	208,050,000
Defense-Wide:		
Fort Bragg, North Carolina	0	8,000,000

Location	Request	Recommended
Total, Defense-Wide	0	8,000,000
Army National Guard:		
Rickenbacker ANGB, Ohio	0	1,750,000
Camp Rapid, South Dakota	0	2,650,000
Camp Williams, Utah	0	5,197,000
Total, Army National Guard	0	9,597,000
Air National Guard:		
McGhee-Tyson Airport, Tennessee	4,400,000	4,400,000
Total, Air National Guard	4,400,000	4,400,000
Naval Reserve:		
New Orleans, Louisiana	0	5,035,000
New Orleans, Louisiana	0	6,100,000
Total, Naval Reserve	0	11,135,000
Grand total	433,330,000	635,662,000

BARRACKS STANDARDS

The Committee understands the Department is attempting to develop a new standard for barracks construction and has tentatively developed a notional standard referred to as “1 plus 1”. However, this standard has yet to be accepted by the Department or formally approved. While the budget submission is described as being consistent with this standard, large discrepancies exist in the cost and amenities provided by each of the Services.

The current barrack standard referred to as “2 plus 2” consists of two E1’s through E4’s to a room, each person having 90 net square feet (NSF) of space, with two rooms or, 4 individuals, sharing a bath. E5’s and E6’s receive a 180 NSF room and share a bath. E7’s through E9’s receive two 180 NSF rooms with a private bath. The estimated cost for this standard is \$28,000 to \$30,000 per module, or approximately \$16,000 per junior enlisted.

The Army currently has a temporary OSD waiver to construct to the “1 plus 1” standard. This is referred to as the “waiver standard” and provides a 220 NSF room with a bath. Two E1’s through E4’s are to be assigned to this room—or one E5 through E9. The estimated cost for this standard is \$57,000 per module, or approximately \$28,000 per junior enlisted.

The proposed “improved 1 plus 1” standard would provide a module consisting of two 118 NSF rooms, a bath and a kitchenette. Two E1’s through E4’s would be assigned to the module (each having a private 118 NSF room) and share the bath and kitchenette. One E5 through E9 would be assigned to the module which would provide a private bath, kitchenette and a living room. The estimated cost for this standard is \$70,000 per module, or \$35,000 per junior enlisted.

The Committee is disappointed that the Department has not been able to agree on a Department-wide standard for barracks construction. It is imperative that a common barrack standard be developed by the Office of the Secretary of Defense in order to begin construction of all fiscal year 1996 barracks projects in a uni-

form manner and as quickly as possible. The Committee, in consideration of the increased priority on quality of life, approves the funding levels proposed. However, prior to award of any fiscal year 1996 barracks project, the Department is required to provide a report describing the accepted standard, the exceptions where that standard will not apply, the long-term plan to achieve the standard, and the cost implications of doing so. The long-term plan should identify the eligible population by location, number of spaces requiring upgrade, and the current barracks situation at that location (i.e. the reason why the barracks are considered sub-standard). Further, if the current "2 plus 2" standard is revised, the Committee directs that the report contain a cost comparison between the "2 plus 2" and the revised standard.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

The Committee has added an additional \$34,300,000 above the budget estimate of \$22,915,000 for a total appropriation of \$57,215,000 for new construction, or improvements, for child development centers. The Committee recognizes the increased importance of these centers due to the rising number of single military parents, dual military couples and military personnel with a civilian employed spouse.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense established a goal of providing quality child care to 65% of the potential need in 1992. Currently the Navy is meeting 39% of the potential need, the Marine Corps 60%, the Army 51% and the Air Force 53%, through either Child Development Centers or the Family Home Care program. In order to meet the 65% goal, approximately 93,402 additional spaces are necessary, broken out by component as follows: the Navy's deficit is 55,000 spaces, the Marine Corps deficit is 18,000 spaces, the Army's deficit is 15,824 spaces and the Air Force's deficit is 4,578 spaces. The Committee understands the DOD goal of 65% to meet the need for child care is in the process of being changed to 80%. Therefore, the deficit cited will be understated at the time of the change.

In order to reduce this deficit the Committee has added an additional \$34,300,000 for child development centers. The locations were determined by component priorities and all projects are capable for construction during fiscal year 1996.

The following Child Development Center projects are provided for fiscal year 1996:

Location	Request	Recommended
Alabama—Maxwell AFB	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000
Arizona—Fort Huachuca	0	2,550,000
California—Camp Pendleton	3,000,000	3,000,000
California—Pt. Mugu Naval Air Warfare Center	1,300,000	1,300,000
Colorado—U.S. Air Force Academy	4,200,000	4,200,000
Florida—Pensacola Naval Technical Training Center	2,565,000	2,565,000
Georgia—Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany	0	1,300,000
Georgia—Moody AFB	0	3,800,000
Missouri—Fort Leonard Wood	0	3,900,000
New Jersey—Lakehurst Naval Air Warfare Center	1,700,000	1,700,000
New York—U.S. Military Academy, West Point	0	8,300,000
Oklahoma—Altus AFB	0	4,000,000
Texas—Fort Bliss	0	4,000,000
Texas—Goodfellow AFB	0	1,000,000

Location	Request	Recommended
Wyoming—F.E. Warren AFB	0	4,000,000
Germany—Vogelweh	2,600,000	2,600,000
Korea—Yongsan Garrison, Seoul	0	1,450,000
Turkey—Incirlik AB	1,600,000	1,600,000
United Kingdom—RAF Mildenhall	2,250,000	2,250,000
Total	22,915,000	57,215,000

CHILD CARE SERVICES—OUTSOURCING INITIATIVE

The Department is conducting demonstration projects to contract for spaces in off-base civilian child care centers. The Navy has been selected as the Executive Agent for these demonstration projects. Plans to contract spaces in Norfolk, Virginia and Barber's Point, Hawaii during 1995 and to expand to three additional locations in 1996 (San Diego, California; Jacksonville, Florida; and Tacoma, Washington) are underway. The Navy estimates that outsourcing will provide up to an additional 4,900 spaces in fiscal year 1996. The Department is to report to the Committee on the status and success of these demonstration projects and any other efforts underway for third party contracting for child care services by February 1, 1996.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL FACILITIES

The budget request includes \$280,250,000 for 17 projects to provide hospital and medical facilities, including both treatment facilities and medical research and development facilities. As explained elsewhere in this report, the amounts requested for projects at Forest Glen, Maryland, and at Portsmouth, Virginia exceed the amounts that can be executed during fiscal year 1996, and the Committee recommends reducing these two projects accordingly. Therefore, the Committee recommends a total of \$164,250,000 for the 17 requested projects. The Committee recommends two projects in addition to those requested. The following hospital and medical projects are provided for fiscal year 1996:

Location	Request	Recommended
Alaska—Elmendorf AFB	\$28,100,000	\$28,100,000
Arizona—Luke AFB	8,100,000	8,100,000
Arizona—Papago Military Reservation	0	1,084,000
California—Camp Pendleton	1,700,000	1,700,000
California—Fort Irwin	6,900,000	6,900,000
California—Vandenberg AFB	5,700,000	5,700,000
Delaware—Dover AFB	4,400,000	4,400,000
Georgia—Fort Benning	5,600,000	5,600,000
Louisiana—Barksdale AFB	4,100,000	4,100,000
Maryland—Bethesda NH	1,300,000	1,300,000
Maryland—Forest Glen AFIP	1,550,000	1,550,000
Maryland—Forest Glen WRAIR	119,000,000	27,000,000
North Carolina—Fort Bragg	0	13,200,000
Texas—Fort Hood	5,500,000	5,500,000
Texas—Lackland AFB	6,100,000	6,100,000
Texas—Reese AFB	1,000,000	1,000,000
Virginia—Chesapeake NNSC	4,300,000	4,300,000
Virginia—Portsmouth NH	71,900,000	47,900,000
Italy—Naples (Capodichino) NSA	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total	280,250,000	178,534,000

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE PROJECTS

The total budget request and appropriation for 44 projects needed to meet environmental compliance is \$206,576,000. The Federal Facilities Compliance Act requires all federal facilities to meet both federal and State standards. These projects are considered Class I violations and are out of compliance; have received an enforcement action from the Environmental Protection Agency, the State, or local authority; and/or a compliance agreement has been signed or consent order received. Environmental projects that are Class I violations are required to be funded, and therefore are placed at the top of the priority list.

The Army has requested a total of \$21,230,000, or 5% of its total military construction request, for five projects. The Navy and Marine Corps have requested \$115,000,000, or 24% of the total military construction request, for eight projects. The Air Force has requested \$68,000,000, or 14% of its total military construction request, for 28 projects. In addition, the Air Force Reserve has requested one project at \$1,000,000, and the Air National Guard has requested two projects for a total of \$1,050,000.

Following is a listing of all environmental compliance projects funded in this bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

Class	Installation or location	Project title	Recommended
Army:			
I	Fort Carson, CO	Sanitary Sewer Line	\$1,750
I	Fort Carson, CO	Sewer Treatment Plant Upgrade	9,100
I	Fort Lewis, WA	Consolidated Fuel Station	3,400
I	Watervliet Arsenal, NY	Oil Runoff Containment Facility	680
I	Fort Sill, OK	Central Vehicle Wash Facility	6,300
Navy:			
I	Navy Public Works Ctr, GU	Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades	16,180
I	Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico	Sanitary Landfill	11,500
I	Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, NC	Wastewater Treatment Plant (Phase II)	45,500
I	Naval Station, San Diego, CA	Oily Waste Collection and Treatment Fac	19,960
I	Naval Station, Norfolk, VA	Oily Waste Collection System (Phase I)	10,580
I	NAWC, China Lake, CA	Industrial Wastewater Col/Treatment Fac	3,700
I	NUWC, Keyport, WA	Metal Treatment Facility	5,300
I	Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, WA	Metal Preparation Facility Improvements	2,600
Air Force:			
I	Tin City Long Range Radar Site, AK	Aboveground Fuel Storage Tanks	2,500
I	Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ	Alter Aircraft Corrosion Control Facility	1,000
I	Tyndall AFB, FL	Fire Training Facility	1,200
I	Reese AFB, TX	Fire Training Facility	1,200
I	Laughlin AFB, TX	Fire Training Facility	1,400
I	Columbus AFB, MS	Fire Training Facility	1,150
I	Cape Canaveral AFS, FL	Fire Training Facility	1,600
I	Altus AFB, OK	Fire Training Facility	1,200
I	Kirtland AFB, NM	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	1,500
I	Minot AFB, ND	Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	1,550
I	Nellis AFB, NV	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	600
I	Arnold AFB, TN	Upgrade Engine Test Facilities	2,300
I	Andrews AFB, MD	Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	6,886
I	Langley AFB, VA	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	1,000
I	Mountain Home AFB, ID	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	800
I	Mountain Home AFB, ID	Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Plant	9,850
I	Pope AFB, NC	Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	2,150
I	McGuire AFB, NJ	Fire Training Facility	1,600
I	McConnell AFB, KS	Deicing Pad	1,150
I	Moody AFB, GA	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	690

[In thousands of dollars]

Class	Installation or location	Project title	Rec- ommended
I	Randolph AFB, TX	Fire Training Facility	1,200
I	Cannon AFB, NM	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	620
I	Little Rock AFB, AR	Upgrade Sanitary Sewer System	2,500
I	Seymour Johnson AFB, NC	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	830
I	Shaw AFB, SC	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	1,300
I	Beale AFB, CA	Landfill Closure	7,500
I	Cannon AFB, NM	Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Plant	9,800
I	Incirlik AB, Turkey	Upgrade Sewage Treatment Plant	2,900
	Air Force Reserve:		
I	Youngstown ARS, OH	Upgrade Base Water Distribution System	1,000
	Air National Guard:		
I	Atlantic City Airport, NJ	Upgrade Sanitary and Water Systems	650
I	Niagara Falls International Airport, NY	Upgrade Storm/Sanitary Sewer System	400
	Total	206,576

POTENTIAL CANCELED PROJECTS DUE TO THE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE PROCESS

The Committee notes that the pending base realignment and closure process will obviate the need for projects previously funded, as well as projects included in the fiscal year 1996 budget submission. In anticipation of savings due to 1995 base realignment and closure actions, the fiscal year 1995 Military Construction Appropriations Act contained general reductions totalling \$136,671,000.

Until a final decision is made on the 1995 base realignment and closure recommendations, it is not appropriate to rescind or eliminate any additional funding for specific projects that may be impacted. A list of those projects no longer required, along with reductions in funding, will be reflected in the fiscal year 1996 Military Construction Conference Report.

The Committee notes that bill language was included in the Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 104-6) which prohibits the obligation of funds, for any fiscal year, to initiate military construction or family housing projects on an installation proposed for closure or realignment that was included in the Secretary's recommendations, unless removed by the Commission, or is included in the recommendations submitted to Congress in 1995 in accordance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended (P.L. 101-510). Projects related to realignments are defined as projects which are affected by the function or activity being realigned. The prohibition on obligation of funds is in effect unless the Congress enacts a Joint Resolution of Disapproval in accordance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended.

EUROPEAN CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Committee has recommended the requested \$119,443,000 for 25 projects in Europe. This includes 12 quality of life projects, 12 operational projects and one environmental project. The draw-down to a 100,000 troop permanent force structure is virtually complete, and the U.S. has reduced its European base structure by 62% from the pre-1990 inventory. While overall infrastructure requirements

have been reduced, the European Command is faced with increased demands on quality of life facilities and the need for changing, modernizing, or increasing operational facility requirements. Safety and environmental concerns exist at older facilities that are in need of revitalization and modernization. In recent years, support for construction during the draw-down was minimal due to the uncertainty of permanent locations. Now that a stable European force structure is in place, and facing frequent deployments, it is imperative we reinvest in our quality of life and operational facilities, both essential components of readiness, in Europe.

The funding for facility improvements in Europe has been made in order not to deprive our service members and their families of decent living and working conditions. Additional issues concerning the European Construction program are addressed in the NATO Security Investment Program section, later in this report.

MODULAR CONSTRUCTION

The Committee believes that modular construction offers opportunity to reduce construction, design and administration costs as well as to provide for earlier construction completion of facilities. One area where modular construction may offer opportunities is with the standard designed barracks. Therefore, the Department is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations by February 1, 1996 on steps taken to utilize modular construction in the military construction and family housing program.

PARAMETRIC COST ESTIMATING

Parametric cost estimating uses actual historical costs, based on the size and type of a total facility or a compilation of its parts, to project the cost of a new facility. This technique is used in lieu of an engineered estimate which is based upon unit costs of labor and materials calculated to be included in the design. The Committee recognizes the Navy and the Air Force are using parametric cost estimating to reach the 35% design level for the majority of projects requested. The Army, however, continues to use the traditional engineered estimate. The Department is urged to provide unanimity in the design process used for the budget submission.

HEARING TRANSCRIPTS

The Committee reiterates its policy on time allotted for editing of hearing transcripts by the Department. Three weeks is more than adequate for grammatical editing, and transcripts are expected to be returned by the Department within that time. The Committee strongly believes that nearly eleven weeks, as was the case with the Overview Hearing, is not acceptable.

FOREIGN CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATES

The Department of Defense is directed in the future to include in its annual justification material all foreign currency exchange rates, including the NATO Security Investment Program average Infrastructure Accounting Unit (IAU), used in the formulation of its budget request.

In addition, the Department is to provide in its annual budget justification material a breakout of all prior year funds transferred into the Foreign Currency Centrally Managed Allotment to cover additional costs of overseas construction due to the dollar's devaluation against foreign currencies. This material should identify the fiscal year and the account from which funds have been transferred.

ANNUAL REPORT ON DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PROGRESS

The Department is instructed to reinstate the annual report on Design and Construction Progress (RCS DD-M(A) 1630). It is the intent of the Committee that this report be structured exactly the same as in the past and contain the following parts: (1) Performance Goals and Accomplishments; (2) Breakage and Lost Design; (3) Architect-Engineer Contract Activity and Design Accomplishment; (4) Project Status; (5) Supervision of Military Construction Programs; (6) Contingency Construction; (7) Unspecified Minor Construction; (8) NATO Security Investment Program; (9) Contracts Awarded on a Noncompetitive Basis; and (10) Cost Variations. Section numbers to the individual parts shall remain the same. The report is to include all projects funded under the Military Construction Accounts, the Family Housing Accounts, and the Base Realignment and Closure Accounts. This report shall be submitted to the Committee by February 1, 1996 and shall cover funds appropriated for fiscal year 1991 and thereafter.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AUDIT TRAIL DOCUMENTS

The Department is directed to reinstate the initial and semi-annual submission of audit trail documents as directed in House Report 99-275. These reports will include line item detail on projects as budgeted in the Construction Annex and also include line item detail on projects funded under Minor Construction and Family Housing Improvements. The semi-annual reports shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (a) project amount (appropriation); (b) changes due to formal and below threshold reprogrammings; and (c) the current working estimate for each project. The audit trail documents are to reflect fiscal year 1996 and all active years.

To ensure the Services comply with this directive, the Comptroller of the Department is to forward to the Committee copies of regulations implementing these procedures within sixty days following passage of the Military Construction Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996.

PROGRAM, PROJECT AND ACTIVITY

For the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177) as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987, (Public Law 100-119), the term "Program, Project and Activity" will continue to be defined as the appropriation account.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	¹ \$550,476,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	472,724,000

Committee recommendation in the bill	625,608,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+75,132,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	+152,884,000

¹ Excludes rescission of \$3,500,000 enacted in P.L. 104-6.

The Committee recommends a total of \$625,608,000 for Military Construction, Army for fiscal year 1996. This is an increase of \$152,884,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and an increase of \$75,132,000 above the amount appropriated for 1995.

CALIFORNIA—FORT IRWIN (BARSTOW-DAGGETT): NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AIRFIELD (PHASE II)

The Committee recommends continuation of the project initiated in fiscal year 1995 to provide an airfield for troop rotations at the National Training Center at Barstow-Daggett, California and recommends \$10,000,000 for this purpose. Until this airfield is operational, the Committee strongly supports the use of the former George Air Force Base as an interim airfield for the National Training Center. The Committee recommends a new General Provision [Section 124] directing this airfield usage.

CALIFORNIA—PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO: REGIONAL SEWER SYSTEM

The budget request includes \$3,000,000 to pay for a negotiated settlement with the City of San Francisco involving sewage treatment at the Presidio of San Francisco since the late 1970s. This project was requested because the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has canceled a portion of an EPA construction grant to the City of San Francisco that would have paid this bill. The Committee recommends denying this requested project as an Army military construction item, in light of the impacts of base realignment and closure at the Presidio of San Francisco. The Committee encourages the Army to review this matter with the EPA.

NEW MEXICO—WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE: NATIONAL RANGE CONTROL CENTER

The Committee is concerned that the existing National Range Control Center at the White Sands Missile Range is located in a potentially hazardous building, and closure of the facility would result in closure of all Real Time operations at the range for an extended period. A four-phase construction program has been developed for replacement of this facility. The Committee supports this project and directs the Army to include the appropriate amount for Phase I of this effort in the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

VIRGINIA—FORT MYER: ARMY MUSEUM LAND ACQUISITION

The budget request includes \$17,000,000 to acquire a site for the National Museum of the United States Army. The Committee recommends \$14,000,000 for this project.

VIRGINIA—FORT BELVOIR: ENGINEER PROVING GROUND

For several years, the Army has been exploring the possible third-party development of the Engineer Proving Ground at Fort Belvoir, Virginia. The concept was for a very large project, similar

in scope to the development of Tysons Corner or Reston, Virginia. It was planned in five phases and would take 25 to 30 years to complete. The original plan was to exchange Army-owned land for approximately three million square feet of office space, which would allow Army personnel to move out of high-cost leased space in the National Capital Region.

Last year, the Auditor General of the Army was asked to review this project and to validate its justification, and the Chief of Engineers was asked to conduct an independent assessment from an engineering perspective, including a market analysis. A draft Request for Proposal is being reviewed by the Army's leadership, and the Committee is awaiting further developments. However, it appears that the original economic assumptions have been overtaken by events, and that the project may no longer be economically viable. Therefore, the Committee directs the Army to report on the current status of this project no later than September 1, 1995. If final decisions have not been reached by that date, the Army will be expected to notify the appropriate Committees of Congress prior to the publication of any Request for Proposal.

KOREA—YONGSAN GARRISON (SEOUL): CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER

The South Post Child Development Center in Yongsan, Korea was located in a structurally unsound facility constructed of highly combustible materials. The facility was not originally designed for child care, was inefficiently configured, and did not meet standards. These deficiencies required staffing in excess of what would normally be required for the capacity of the facility. The Committee fully concurs with the Army's decision to close this center due to documented safety concerns and staffing difficulties. However, this has necessitated the placement of children in outlying child care facilities, which in turn has overburdened those facilities and has greatly inconvenienced families in need of child care. Therefore the Committee recommends \$1,450,000 for a replacement child development center, in order to relieve this situation immediately rather than endure the years required to program a military construction project.

PANAMA—RELOCATION OF THE SOUTHERN COMMAND

The Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 requires the withdrawal of United States military forces from Panama by December 31, 1999, including the relocation of the Southern Command (SOUTHCOM). The current plan to relocate SOUTHCOM headquarters has a target date of June of 1998, but no construction funds have been requested for fiscal year 1996.

The Southern Command's area of responsibility encompasses 19 countries, covering 7,000 miles from the Mexican-Guatemalan border to the southern tip of South America. The mission of SOUTHCOM is predominantly political rather than warfighting, involving face-to-face planning and coordination with key officials, as well as military-to-military contacts. The current focus of SOUTHCOM's efforts in Central and South America is counterdrug action, security cooperation, and support for democratic institutions.

The joint-service SOUTHCOM headquarters consists of about 700 Department of Defense civilians and military personnel, and approximately 1,500 family members. It is estimated that the establishment and construction of headquarters facilities will involve spending of approximately \$60 million in all categories of expenditure, including a requirement for an administrative facility of about 140,000 square feet.

On March 29, 1995, the Department of Defense announced its selection of South Dade County, Miami, as the future location for the headquarters of the United States Southern Command.

Given the size and significance of this relocation, and the treaty obligation to complete this relocation in a timely fashion, the Committee directs the Army to report by September 1, 1995 on all planning and design expenditures, all projected military construction and family housing expenditures, and all other expenses related to the relocation of SOUTHCOM. This report should include identification of the exact site preferred by the Army, and should also include a detailed description of consideration given to the disestablishment of SOUTHCOM.

MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES

The Army has undertaken a number of management initiatives to develop more efficient and innovative methods for managing Army installations. Two items of particular interest to the Committee are the Installation Status Report and a task force established by the Secretary of the Army which is known as the Base Efficiency Study Team. In order to follow the developments of these initiatives, the Committee requests that the budget request for fiscal year 1997 will be accompanied by a report on these and other initiatives undertaken by the Army for improved management of Army installations.

FIREFIGHTER TRAINING SYSTEMS

The Committee supports the need to provide training for firefighters that is both safe and effective. The Army currently trains its firefighters using techniques that have not only proven hazardous to trainees, but also have come under criticism due to possible violations of environmental regulations. Such regulations have closed all but 12 of the training centers. The Committee is aware of computer-controlled, natural gas/propane systems currently in the Navy's inventory which safely replicate the required training environment and which also satisfy all environmental requirements. It is the Committee's opinion that the Army should develop a program to establish regional training centers where multiple commands can take advantage of a single site. Therefore, the Committee directs the Army to identify the appropriate locations for such sites, as well as the required military construction funds to support the sites over a four-year period, and to report its findings to the Committee by October 1, 1995.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	¹ \$385,110,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	488,086,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	588,243,000

Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+203,133,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	+100,157,000

¹ Excludes rescission of \$3,500,000 enacted in P.L. 104-6.

The Committee recommends a total of \$588,243,000 for Military Construction, Navy for fiscal year 1996. This is an increase of \$100,157,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and an increase of \$203,133,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995.

ARIZONA—MARINE CORPS AIR STATION YUMA: SAFE ORDNANCE STORAGE

Last year, the Committee expressed its concern about safety issues related to the storage of ordnance at Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Yuma, Arizona. At the Committee's direction, the Secretary of the Navy studied these issues and prepared a report which identified specific remedial actions. The Navy study also recommended specific actions to modify on-base facilities and the purchase of sufficient property to move ordnance operations away from congested areas of the station.

The Committee puts a high priority on providing for the safe ordnance storage needs at MCAS Yuma, and instructs the Secretary to prepare a plan to fully implement the Department of the Navy study. This plan should be delivered to the Committee no later than February 15, 1996.

CALIFORNIA—NAVAL AIR STATION, NORTH ISLAND: BERTHING WHARF AND CONTROLLED INDUSTRIAL FACILITY

The budget request includes \$56,650,000 for a berthing wharf and \$42,500,000 for a controlled industrial facility at North Island. These projects represent the first phase of required construction to berth three nuclear aircraft carriers in San Diego at an estimated cost by the Navy of \$267.8 million.

The Committee understands that the General Accounting Office is in the process of reviewing the projected costs of berthing the three nuclear aircraft carriers at North Island and that discrepancies on the total cost of construction may exist. In addition, the GAO is evaluating the feasibility and costs associated with berthing the carriers at alternative locations. The GAO is directed to report to the Committee its findings on the accuracy of the construction estimates and alternative locations by the earliest possible date. The Committee is including the \$99,150,000 requested for North Island and anticipates that this matter will be addressed in final conference action on the fiscal year 1996 bill.

FLORIDA—MAYPORT NAVAL STATION: WHARF IMPROVEMENTS DESIGN

The Navy is directed to complete additional design for wharf improvements at Mayport Naval Station within the increased amount provided for planning and design. This design should include shore power and utility upgrades, mooring improvements and other mechanical improvements at Wharfs C-2 and F; the demolition of several small storage buildings for a retention pond site near Wharf F; construction of a heavy-duty concrete hardstand area and drive-ways/roadways near Wharf F; the construction of a stormwater col-

lection system and retention ponds at Wharf F, and related work at Wharfs C-2 and F.

GEORGIA—MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE, ALBANY: SEPARATE GAS
MAIN AND RAILROAD

The natural gas line that supplies gas to the Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, Georgia is located only a few feet away from the main railroad track into the base. In some places the cover over the gas line is only two feet deep. The potential for damage to the gas line and the surrounding community in the event of a derailment is very high. The Marine Corps is directed to fund this project, which is estimated at \$590,000, under Unspecified Minor Construction.

GEORGIA—MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE, ALBANY: ALTERNATE
RAILROAD

The primary railroad track at the Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, Georgia was built 44 years ago. It serves 19 warehouses, the vehicle loading ramp, the open loading area, the truck scale and the Marine Corps Multi-Commodity Maintenance Center. This track continuously needs repair and improvement, effecting the rail service for shipment of equipment and weapons systems. Should the primary track fail during a national crisis requiring mobilization of supplies, equipment, and weapons, then efforts to mobilize would be impeded. The Marine Corps is directed to construct an alternate railroad track, estimated at \$950,000, using Unspecified Minor Construction.

NEW JERSEY—NAVAL WEAPONS STATION EARLE: PIER 4 EXTENSION

The Committee understands that the Department of the Navy has programmed for fiscal year 1997 and fiscal year 1998 a total of \$70,790,000 for the construction of a pier extension at the Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey. The Committee directs the Navy to ensure this project is requested at the earliest possible time.

RHODE ISLAND—NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, NEWPORT:
STRATEGIC MARITIME RESEARCH CENTER

It is the intent of the Committee for the Navy to proceed with the Strategic Maritime Research Center at the Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island based upon the initial appropriation of \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 1995. The Committee understands the total amount necessary for this project is \$28,000,000. In the event the Navy's design for this project does not lend itself to providing a complete and usable \$10,000,000 segment, the Navy is directed to adjust the design to accomplish the same, and include provisions to complete the remaining portion when funds are available.

CUBA—GUANTANAMO BAY: LANDFILL

The budget request includes a fiscal year 1995 emergency supplemental request for \$18,000,000 to "support peacekeeping, peace enforcement and humanitarian assistance operations in and around

Cuba". The \$18,000,000 is for construction of a new landfill facility at Guantanamo Bay. The Committee did not address this issue in the Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations, P.L. 104-6. This project was based on population projections that will not be realized due to the Administration's change in policy on refugees. Therefore, the Committee denies funding for this project.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	¹ \$516,813,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	495,655,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	578,841,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+62,028,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	+83,186,000

¹ Excludes rescission of \$3,500,000 enacted in P.L. 104-6.

The Committee recommends a total of \$578,841,000 for Military Construction, Air Force for fiscal year 1996. This is an increase of \$83,186,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and an increase of \$62,028,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995.

IDAHO—MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE: IDAHO TRAINING RANGE (NORTH SITE)

The Air Force budget request includes \$8,000,000 for the first phase of the construction of a training range in southwestern Idaho. On May 23, 1995 the Air Force announced that this project would no longer be pursued and terminated work on the supplemental environmental impact statement. Therefore, the Committee has denied funding for this project.

The Committee understands that the Secretary of the Air Force is committed to working with all interested parties to identify other opportunities in Idaho for expanded wing tactical training. The Air Force is expected to keep the Committee apprised of all developments related to the expansion of the training range and should an agreement be reached construction funding should be requested in the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	\$504,118,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	857,405,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	728,332,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+224,214,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	-129,073,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$728,332,000 for Military Construction, Defense-Wide for fiscal year 1996. This is a decrease of \$129,073,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and an increase of \$224,214,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM

The budget request includes a total of \$108,000,000 for the following funding increments for the chemical weapons demilitarization program for fiscal year 1996:

\$40,000,000 Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas
 \$55,000,000 Umatilla Depot Activity, Oregon
 \$13,000,000 Planning and Design

The approved military construction programs for prior fiscal years include an unobligated balance of \$110,900,000 for facilities at Anniston Army Depot, Alabama. The award date for this contract is dependent upon issuance of environmental permits by the State of Alabama.

Planned award/obligation dates for these three locations are as follows:

August, 1995 Anniston Army Depot, Alabama
 March, 1996 Umatilla Depot Activity, Oregon
 June, 1996 Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas

The Committee is concerned about continuing slippage in this program due to contracting, fiscal, programmatic, and other considerations. The Committee will expect to be notified in a timely fashion of any change in the planned award/obligation dates listed above. In particular, if the Anniston contract is not awarded during August of 1995, the Department is directed to report on the reasons for slippage, and the revised award date. This report is to be submitted to the appropriate Committees of Congress not later than September 15, 1995.

On December 26, 1994, the Chemical Weapons Demilitarization Program was designated an Acquisition Category identification under the Major Defense Acquisition list. As a result of this designation, an Independent Cost Estimate must be developed for the Chemical Stockpile Disposal Program. The Committee will expect to be kept fully advised of the progress of this Independent Cost Estimate.

The Army and the National Research Council have evaluated potential alternatives to incineration technology, and the Army has selected two low-temperature and low-pressure approaches for research and development: chemical neutralization as a stand-alone technology, and chemical neutralization followed by biodegradation. These efforts focus on bulk-only storage locations (Aberdeen, Maryland and Newport, Indiana). The Committee will expect to be kept fully advised of the progress of this research effort, as it relates to future military construction requirements at these locations.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM (ECIP)

The Energy Conservation Investment Program provides financing for individual projects that are evaluated, prioritized on the basis of technical merit and return on investment, and presented individually to Congress for approval. The budget request includes \$50,000,000 as the level of effort for this program for fiscal year 1996. The primary benefits of the program include improved facility conditions, reduced environmental pollution, and utility and maintenance cost reduction. The Department spends about \$3 billion each year to heat, cool, light and provide direct mission support energy to installations. As currently programmed, in coordination with the Defense-wide Operations and Maintenance funded Federal Energy Management Program, the Department of Defense expects to accomplish a 20 percent reduction in building and facilities energy by the year 2000. It is the view of the Department that

the savings from this program are comparable to the recent round of base closures.

In addition, the Department of Defense stands as the largest builder and facility operator in the country, contributing about five percent of the Nation's construction. Therefore, the Department's adoption of new, energy-efficient technology creates enough market pull to stimulate its manufacture and common acceptance throughout the country.

For fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995, the payback period of executed projects averaged approximately four years. The Committee believes this is a sound return on investment, and recommends full funding of the requested level of \$50,000,000 for this program. The Committee will expect that each individual project will continue to be supported with an economic analysis to show the savings-to-investment ratio and the simple payback, and that life-cycle cost analyses will continue to be performed as projects are modified by additional information and design detail. Most importantly, the Committee will expect the Department to give great consideration to further reduction in the payback period, especially in such areas as renewable energy, water conservation, emerging technologies, and contribution to environmental pollution prevention.

The Committee is aware of the Department's efforts to develop a multi-media energy manager's training program in partnership with a larger private consortium. The Committee supports the use of appropriated funds to improve the level of technical and programmatic knowledge of Defense energy managers, as well as design engineers and architects, and the leveraging of Federal funds through participation in public/private partnership such as this. Therefore, the Committee will expect the Department to continue to contribute such sums as may be required for the on-going multi-media software project.

PHASE-FUNDED PROJECTS

The Committee supports incremental funding of large projects in such a manner that annual funding increments will not exceed the amount of construction that can be executed in a single fiscal year. The Committee notes that the budget request for the Chemical Weapons Demilitarization Program conforms with this view by proposing phase-funding for projects at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas and at Umatilla Depot Activity, Oregon.

Three other projects requested in the budget do not conform with this view. Therefore, the Committee has reduced the amount provided for these three projects to the level that can be executed during fiscal year 1996, as follows:

Location/project	Budget request	Recommended
Forest Glen, Maryland: Army Institute of Research (phase III) (WRAIR)	\$119,000,000	\$27,000,000
Columbus, Ohio: DFAS Operations Facility (phase I)	72,403,000	37,400,000
Portsmouth, Virginia: Hospital replacement (phase VII)	71,900,000	47,900,000

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Statutory language included under this account provides that the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds from this account to the military construction and family housing accounts. The Committee

directs that any exercise of this authority must fall under the Committee's standing procedures for approval of reprogramming requests.

OHIO—COLUMBUS: DFAS OPERATIONS FACILITY (PHASE I)

Upon completion of the DFAS Operations Facility in Columbus, Ohio, the General Services Administration (GSA) intends to sell Air Force Plant #85 (which currently houses DFAS operations) at public auction. The Department of Defense will use the proceeds from this sale to pay GSA costs for administering the sale, and the remainder of the proceeds will be returned to the Air Force for industrial plant environmental cleanup projects. The Committee will expect to be kept advised of the timetable for this auction, the proceeds from this sale, and the projects financed with the proceeds.

The Committee commends the Department for savings of approximately \$3,600,000 in planning and design costs that will be realized based on a decision to use a "mirror image" of the Defense Construction Supply Center building which was recently constructed at the same location.

The budget request for this project provided full funding of \$72,403,000 to complete construction, which will require approximately three years to execute. The Committee recommends funding of \$37,400,000, the level that can be executed during fiscal year 1996.

TEXAS—DYESS AIR FORCE BASE: CLINIC FACILITIES

The Committee is concerned that radiology, pharmacy, and other clinic facilities at Dyess Air Force Base are badly undersized and outdated. The Committee directs that the design of a project to correct this problem proceed in order to enable the project to be funded in fiscal year 1997.

BELGIUM—BRUSSELS: EXPAND AND RENOVATE HEALTH/DENTAL CLINIC

Within funds provided for Unspecified Minor Construction, the Committee directs the Department to expand and renovate the Army health/dental clinic in Brussels, Belgium at an estimated cost of \$850,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, RESERVE COMPONENTS

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	\$574,302,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	182,012,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	284,924,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	– 289,378,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	+102,912,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$284,924,000 for Military Construction, Reserve Components for fiscal year 1996. This is an increase of \$102,912,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and a decrease of \$289,378,000 below the amount appropriated for 1995.

The Committee's recommended action on each Reserve Component project is reflected in the State list at the end of this report.

The Committee recommends approval of Military Construction, as follows:

Component	Request	Recommended
Army National Guard	\$18,480,000	\$72,537,000
Air National Guard	85,647,000	118,267,000
Army Reserve	42,963,000	42,963,000
Naval Reserve	7,920,000	19,655,000
Air Force Reserve	27,002,000	31,502,000
Total	182,012,000	284,924,000

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

The Committee is very concerned over the execution rates for the military construction programs of the Reserve Components. According to the budget request for fiscal year 1996, the following amounts will remain unobligated at the end of each fiscal year:

[In millions of dollars]

Component	1994 actual	1995 estimate	1996 estimate	1997 estimate
Army National Guard	\$366.1	\$281.8	\$143.5	\$59.1
Air National Guard	237.6	250.0	186.2	143.8
Army Reserve	121.3	62.5	41.9	30.2
Naval Reserve	59.7	25.1	7.1	5.6
Air Force Reserve	42.8	35.5	25.7	23.3

The Committee understands that these amounts remain available for completion of prior year approved budget plans, that funds remain available for five years, and that the Reserve Components face a number of difficult challenges in program execution. However, the Committee will expect to see increased attention given to assure that contracts are awarded during the fiscal year in which funds are provided. The Committee intends to follow closely the reinstated Annual Report on Design and Construction Progress and the reinstated semi-annual submission of Audit Trail Documents in order to track improvement in program execution.

NEVADA—RENO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

The Committee is aware that the mission of the Nevada Air National Guard will change in the near future. It is the expectation of the Committee that the Air National Guard will work closely with the Nevada National Guard to develop and design a workable and cost effective plan for the construction of a modified Guard facility at the Reno-Tahoe airport. The Air National Guard is to include the appropriate projects for this effort in the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

(FORMERLY NATO INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM)

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	¹ \$119,000,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	179,000,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	161,000,000

Comparison with:

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+42,000,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	- 18,000,000

¹ Excludes rescission of \$33,000,000 enacted in P.L. 104-6.

The Committee recommends a total of \$161,000,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program. This is a decrease of \$18,000,000, or 10 percent, below the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and an increase of \$42,000,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995.

For 1996, the NATO nations have agreed on a funding level of approximately \$765,000,000. Of this amount, the U.S. requirement totals \$199,000,000 and is based on a previously agreed cost share that averages about 26%. The Committee notes that this program is becoming predominately geared toward projects other than construction. Larger percentages are being spent on procurement costs, largely for communications and other command and control equipment and software. It is not the intent of the Committee to disrupt communication plans; however, the Committee is concerned that perhaps U.S. construction needs are taking a lower priority to procurement costs. The Committee directs the Department to review the mix of construction versus procurement costs under this program and the possibility of seeking alternative funding for procurement costs. Findings are to be included in the justification documentation accompanying the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

The Committee is also concerned about the budgetary implications to the construction program connected with the expansion of NATO and the Partnership for Peace program. The Department of Defense is directed to report to the Committee by February 1, 1996 on the expected impacts these programs will have on U.S. contributions to the Security Investment Program.

Beginning with fiscal year 1996, the Department of Defense is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations, on a quarterly basis, the following information:

- (1) NATO Nations shares of construction costs based on fund authorizations;
- (2) NATO Nations shares of procurement costs based on fund authorizations; and
- (3) A listing of all obligations incurred that quarter broken out by infrastructure category and procurement category. This listing should show the total project cost, the U.S. cost share and all other NATO Nations cost shares.

FAMILY HOUSING

OVERVIEW

The need for military family housing has changed with the all-volunteer structure of the force. In the mid-1950s forty-two percent of the force was married, compared to sixty-one percent today. The percentage of service members with families will continue to grow, and the nature of an all-volunteer force implies greater expectations for the availability, size and amenities of family housing. At the same time, we are faced with a changing military environment due to overseas reductions, domestic base closures, major force reductions, and increased deployments.

Today, the family housing program is even more important because it provides a quality of life incentive which attracts and retains dedicated individuals to serve in the military. However, the housing deficiencies are a severe disincentive to reenlistment. Testimony before the Committee states that it costs over \$29,000 to recruit and train an enlisted soldier for the first assignment. This investment is lost each time a soldier must be replaced. The Committee has no question that housing is directly linked to readiness, morale, and retention.

While this Committee has focused on the need for adequate family housing over the years, resources have been scarce. This problem has recently been brought to the forefront with several articles in the press and an increased focus by the Department of Defense. The family housing crisis exists today due to the majority of housing in the Department's inventory being substandard; high cost areas where housing deficits exist; and problems young families are facing who cannot afford to live in local communities.

DOD policy is that married couples will live off-base when the economy can support them, and about two-thirds, or 614,928 families, reside off-base. Where there is sufficient affordable housing in the community and commuting distances are not over one hour, most of these families are doing well. However, 12 percent of military families living in civilian communities are in substandard housing. This is often the case when rents are excessive or a family can only afford to live in distant, isolated, and sometimes unsafe neighborhoods. This is occurring more often because housing allowances are covering only 75 percent of the cost of civilian housing, on average. Many younger families only have one car and are faced with driving distances of over an hour to the installation. In some instances, families are choosing to remain separated simply because suitable, affordable housing is not available at a new assignment.

The Department of Defense has a total of 350,799 on-base housing units in its inventory, with an average age of 32 years. Two-thirds of the inventory is over 30 years old and requires a substantial annual investment to meet maintenance requirements. Over the years, the majority of these homes have gone without adequate maintenance and repair. And over two-thirds of the inventory, or 218,551 units, is considered unsuitable. Unsuitable units require a major investment to correct deteriorated infrastructure, provide basic living standards and meet contemporary code requirements for electrical and mechanical systems, and for energy efficiency. Examples provided to the Committee of a typical scenario military families are facing include: severe health and safety deficiencies such as electrical systems and water pipes needing replacement; non-working or inefficient heating and cooling systems; nails coming through the ceilings and floors; kitchen cabinets water-logged and sinking; ceiling and wall paint chipped and peeling; screens with holes in them; doors coming apart; malfunctioning smoke detectors; light fixtures broken, and stoves and ovens with elements not working.

The current backlog of deferred maintenance and repair totals in excess of \$2,000,000,000. When housing units are not adequately maintained, eventually they must be closed and abandoned or de-

molished. Families who could have been housed in these units must then live off-base. In turn, this creates an additional expense for payment of housing allowances.

It will be necessary to use many different approaches to help meet the current family housing need. The challenge is for a sustained overall commitment, at funding levels that will reduce the backlog of inadequate houses, reduce the housing deficits, and increase the quality of living conditions in a reasonable period of time. The Department estimates it will take \$3,000,000,000 and over thirty years to correct the existing problem.

The Secretary of Defense has proposed to Congress a plan for a private sector initiative which is discussed later in this report. The Committee is hopeful this initiative will be successful and help to resolve the problem in a more timely fashion. In the meantime, this bill provides a total of \$4,235,569,000, and an increase of \$715,125,000 over last year, for family housing related items. This includes the construction of new homes, the replacement of older homes, improvements to existing inventory, and operation and maintenance funds to properly manage and improve the current inventory. An additional \$22,000,000 is also provided for startup costs for the private sector initiative, which fully funds the authorized level for this program.

NEW HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

The fiscal year 1996 request is \$355,088,000 to build 2,633 units of new family housing. This is an increase of 15 percent over the fiscal year 1995 enacted level and reflects a specific initiative by the Department to improve family housing. The Committee is in total agreement with the Department's initiative and has approved all requested projects for new housing construction. In addition, the Committee has provided an additional \$110,180,000 to build 790 units of new family housing. The total appropriation for new construction is \$465,268,000 and will provide 3,423 new units. Details of the Committee's recommendations for new construction are provided in this report under the individual component accounts. The Committee expects that none of the approved projects will be reduced in scope. It is the understanding of the Committee, that upon a 30-day notification from the Secretary of Defense, and approval of the Committee, funds appropriated for a new construction project may be transferred to the Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund for the purpose of a private sector pilot project at the same location.

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

A total of \$350,508,000 has been requested for post-acquisition construction for all Services to improve 4,725 housing units. Post-acquisition construction is focused on modernizing existing units that are uneconomical to repair. The Committee recommends full funding of the request. In addition, the Committee has provided an additional \$83,754,000 for eight construction improvement projects which are listed in this report under the individual component accounts, to improve an additional 1,250 units. The total appropriation for post-acquisition construction is \$434,262,000 and will improve 5,975 units of family housing.

It is the understanding of the Committee, that upon a 30-day notification from the Secretary of Defense, and approval of the Committee, funds appropriated for a construction improvement project may be transferred to the Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund for the purpose of a private sector pilot project at the same location.

The Committee continues the restriction on the amount invested in improving foreign source housing units. The three-year limitation on overseas units is \$35,000. If the components intend to program improvements to specific units which exceed \$35,000 over a period of three years, total funding should be requested in one year. The justification for each unit should identify all improvements and major maintenance work done in the past three years, and all improvements and major maintenance planned in the following three years.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The request for operation and maintenance expenses totals \$3,265,605,000, an increase of \$460,422,000, or 16 percent, above the fiscal year 1995 appropriation. The Committee recommends full funding of the request. These accounts provide for annual expenditures for maintenance and repair, furnishings, management, services, utilities, leasing, interest, mortgage insurance and miscellaneous expenses. Of the total appropriations provided for operation and maintenance, \$1,578,083,000 is for maintenance and repair of existing housing. This is an increase of \$405,792,000, or 35 percent, over fiscal year 1995 levels and is due to an effort on behalf of the Services to concentrate on taking better care of the current housing inventory. In addition, the Committee has provided an additional \$14,000,000 for maintenance of Air Force family housing units.

Expenditures from this account for general and flag officer quarters are to be reported in accordance with the guidelines previously established and reiterated later in this report. The Committee also continues the direction that the details of all other expenditures from this account which exceed \$15,000 per unit, per year for major maintenance and repair of non-general and flag officer quarters be included as part of the justification material. The general provision limiting obligations from this account to no more than 20 percent of the total in the last two months of the fiscal year is included in this year's bill.

The Committee continues the restriction on the transfer of funds between the operation and maintenance accounts. The limitation is ten percent to all primary accounts and subaccounts. Such transfers are to be reported to the Committee within thirty days of such action.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

OVERVIEW

The Secretary of Defense has proposed legislation which addresses the housing crisis by authorizing a five year, \$1,000,000,000 private sector pilot project to replace or renovate approximately 200,000 units of family housing within the United States, its territories and possessions, and in Puerto Rico, but not overseas. The

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, H.R. 1530, as reported, contains the authorization for this program. New authority is granted to: guarantee mortgage payments and rental contracts to developers as incentives to build family housing; authorize commercial-style lease agreements for family housing; and engage in joint ventures with developers to construct family housing on government property.

The legislation combines existing build/lease, rental guarantee, and limited partnership authority with new authority to guarantee loans and mortgages. It authorizes the Service Secretaries to enter into contracts providing for direct loans, guarantees, insurance and other payments to owners or mortgagors of military family housing and supporting facilities, e.g., child development centers. The Service Secretaries are also authorized to lease or sell land, family housing and supporting facilities for the purposes of providing additional family housing, or to improve existing family housing. However, this authority may not be exercised at any installation approved for closure. As part of the consideration for the sale or lease of property, an ancillary agreement under which the person receiving the property agrees to give priority to military members and their dependents in the leasing of existing or new housing units is required. Leases and sales are not subject to the provisions of the Military Leasing Act, the Federal Property and the Administrative Services Act, or the Economy Act. The authority to outlease or sell land and improvements will bypass the General Services Administration and is expected to reduce project costs substantially.

Further, the legislation authorizes the establishment of a Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund for alternative means of financing military family housing and ancillary supporting facilities. Funds in this account will be used to build or renovate family housing, mixing or matching various authorities in the authorization, and utilizing private capital and expertise to the maximum extent possible. The Fund is to contain appropriated and transferred funds from family housing construction accounts, and the total value in budget authority of all contracts and investments undertaken may not exceed \$1,000,000,000. Transfers are authorized contingent upon a 30-day notification by the Secretary of Defense to the appropriate committees of Congress. Proceeds from investments, leases, and conveyances are to be deposited into this Fund, and any use of the Fund is subject to annual appropriations. The Family Housing Improvement Fund is to be administered as a single account without fiscal year limitations.

This new authority to enter into contracts and partnerships and to make investments shall expire on September 30, 2000.

FISCAL YEAR 1996 APPROPRIATIONS

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, H.R. 1530, as reported, contains authorization in the amount of \$22,000,000 for the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund for fiscal year 1996. The President submitted a budget amendment on June 2, 1995, to reflect a request of \$22,000,000 for the fund. The Committee supports this level of funding and has recommended it in the bill.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Committee reiterates the reporting requirements contained in the enabling legislation. The Service Secretary concerned may not enter into any contract until after the end of the 21-day period beginning on the date the Secretary concerned submits written notice of the nature and terms of the contract to the appropriate committees of Congress.

In addition, no transfer of appropriated funds into the account may take place until after the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the Secretary of Defense submits written notice and justification for the transfer to the appropriate committees of Congress. The Appropriations Committee expects to receive prior notification of all such transfers of funds.

GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER QUARTERS

The existing reporting requirements for general and flag officer quarters continue in full force and effect, in order to control expenditures for high cost quarters. The purpose of these requirements is to ensure that the total amount of all obligations for maintenance and repair (excluding operations) on each general or flag officer quarters is limited to \$25,000 per year, unless specifically included in the annual budget justification material. This continues the policy initiated in 1984 and developed and elaborated over several years, to ensure that separate controls are established for orderly planning and programming to accomplish this work.

Recognizing the uncertainties involved in accurately forecasting "change in occupancy" work, the Committee continues the following previously established notification requirement. The Committee must be notified when maintenance and repair costs for a unit will exceed the amount submitted in the budget justification by 25 percent or \$5,000, whichever is less. The Committee must also be notified when maintenance and repair costs will exceed \$25,000 for a unit not requested in the budget justification.

Notifications of each proposed expenditure must be submitted over the signature of the Service Secretary for case-by-case review and approval. Each Service is directed to continue to limit out-of-cycle submissions to one per year, except for situations which are justified as emergencies or safety-related.

LEASING REPORTING REQUIREMENT

The Committee continues the reporting requirement for both domestic and foreign leases. For domestic leases (not funded by the Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund), the Department is directed to report quarterly on the details of all new or renewal domestic leases entered into during the previous quarter which exceed \$12,000 per unit per year, including certification that less expensive housing was not available for lease. For foreign leases, the Department is directed to: perform an economic analysis on all new leases or lease/contract agreements where more than 25 units are involved; report the details of any new or renewal lease exceeding \$20,000 per year (as adjusted for foreign currency fluctuation from October 1, 1987, but not adjusted for inflation), 21 days prior

to entering into such an agreement; and base leasing decisions on the economic analysis.

EXCLUSION OF ASBESTOS AND LEAD-BASED PAINT REMOVAL FROM MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR LIMITS

The Committee continues the requirement of an after-the-fact notification where asbestos and/or lead-based paint removal costs cause the maintenance and repair thresholds of \$15,000 for a military family housing unit, or \$25,000 for a General or Flag Officer Quarters to be exceeded. The notification shall include work scope, cost break-out and other details pertinent to asbestos and/or lead-based paint removal work and shall be reported on a semi-annual basis.

EXECUTION RATES

The Committee notes that the average percentage obligation for conventionally constructed new family housing over the last five years is only 33 percent. The result is very few family housing construction projects are executed in the first year. The Department is directed to review the turn-key method to determine if this design process is indeed slowing program execution. In addition, the Department is to review the benefits of requiring the Services to modify the process to assure conventional family housing new construction projects are ready for award when the funds become available. This review should also take into account the possibility of using site-adapted standardized designs which have undergone value engineering studies to speed the process.

It is also noted that family housing construction improvement projects average obligation rates in the first year are only 43%. The Department is to report to the Committee on what actions are being taken to increase this execution rate to a more acceptable rate.

The Department should report its findings and actions being taken to improve the execution rates to the Committee no later than March 1, 1996.

REPROGRAMMING CRITERIA

The reprogramming criteria that apply to military construction projects (25 percent of the funded amount or \$2,000,000, whichever is less) also apply to new housing construction projects and to improvement projects over \$2,000,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	\$1,183,710,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	1,381,096,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	1,463,996,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+280,286,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	+82,900,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$1,463,996,000 for Family Housing, Army for fiscal year 1996. This is an increase of \$82,900,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and an increase of \$280,286,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has approved \$126,400,000 for new construction, instead of the \$43,500,000 requested, as shown below:

Location/Project	Requested	Recommended
Alabama: Redstone Arsenal (118 units)		\$12,000,000
Kentucky: Fort Knox (150 units)		19,000,000
New York: U.S. Military Academy (119 units)	\$16,500,000	16,500,000
Virginia: Fort Lee (135 units)		19,500,000
Washington: Fort Lewis (84 units)	10,800,000	10,800,000
Construction improvements	14,200,000	46,600,000
Planning	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total	43,500,000	126,400,000

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

The following projects are to be accomplished within the additional amount provided above the budget request for construction improvements:

Location	Number of units	Recommended
Kentucky—Fort Campbell	262	\$19,000,000
New Mexico—White Sands	36	3,400,000
North Carolina—Fort Bragg	96	10,000,000
Total	394	32,400,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The budget request includes \$1,445,283 for 27 projects where anticipated maintenance and repair obligations will exceed \$25,000 per dwelling unit for General Officer Quarters. In the face of all of the Army's unmet requirements for barracks, child development centers, family housing, and other quality of life facilities, the Committee questions the need for such a level of effort for maintenance and repair of General Officer Quarters. The Committee has not reduced the amount available for operation and maintenance of family housing. However, the Committee directs the Army to cancel the 27 proposed projects for General Officer Quarters, and to apply these funds to reduction of the backlog of maintenance and repair of enlisted family housing units.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	\$1,205,064,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	1,514,084,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	1,579,618,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+374,554,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	+65,534,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$1,579,618,000 for Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps for fiscal year 1996. This is an increase of \$65,534,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and an increase of \$374,554,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has approved \$531,289,000 for new construction, instead of the \$465,755,000 requested, as shown below:

Location/Project	Requested	Recommended
California:		
Lemoore Naval Air Station (240 units)	\$34,900,000	\$34,900,000
Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (community center)	1,438,000	1,438,000
Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (housing office)	707,000	707,000
Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (69 units)	10,000,000	10,000,000
Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (136 units)		20,080,000
Pacific Missile Test Center Point Mugu (housing office/self help center)	1,020,000	1,020,000
Public Works Center San Diego (346 units)	49,310,000	49,310,000
Hawaii: Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor (252 units)	48,400,000	48,400,000
Maryland:		
Naval Air Test Center Patuxent River (housing warehouse/self help center)	890,000	890,000
USNA Annapolis (housing office/self help center)	800,000	800,000
North Carolina: Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point (community center)	1,003,000	1,003,000
Pennsylvania: NSCC Mechanicsburg (housing office)	300,000	300,000
Virginia:		
Dahlgren Naval Surface Warfare Center (housing office/self help center)	520,000	520,000
Public Works Center Norfolk (housing office/housing warehouse)	1,390,000	1,390,000
Public Works Center Norfolk (320 units)	42,500,000	42,500,000
Puerto Rico: NS Roosevelt Roads (housing office)	710,000	710,000
Construction improvements	247,477,000	292,931,000
Planning	24,390,000	24,390,000
Total	465,755,000	531,289,000

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

The following projects are to be accomplished within the additional amount provided above the budget request for construction improvements:

Location	Number of units	Recommended
Florida—Mayport	400	\$14,575,000
Illinois—Great Lakes	150	15,300,000
Rhode Island—Newport	64	8,795,000
South Carolina—Beaufort	176	6,784,000
Total	790	45,454,000

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	\$1,102,289,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	1,098,216,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	1,157,716,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+55,427,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	+59,500,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$1,157,716,000 for Family Housing, Air Force for fiscal year 1996. This is an increase of \$59,500,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and an increase of \$55,427,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has approved \$294,503,000 for new construction, instead of the \$249,003,000 requested, as shown below:

Location/Project	Requested	Recommended
Alaska: Elmendorf AFB (housing office/maintenance facility)	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
Arizona: Davis-Monthan AFB (80 units)	9,498,000	9,498,000
Arkansas: Little Rock AFB (1 unit)	210,000	210,000
California:		
Beale AFB (housing office)	842,000	842,000
Edwards AFB (67 units)	11,350,000	11,350,000
Edwards AFB (60 units)	—	9,400,000
Vandenberg AFB (housing office)	900,000	900,000
Vandenberg AFB (143 units)	20,200,000	20,200,000
Colorado: Peterson AFB (housing office)	570,000	570,000
District of Columbia: Bolling AFB (32 units)	4,100,000	4,100,000
Florida:		
Eglin AFB (housing office)	500,000	500,000
Eglin AFB Hurlburt Field (housing service center)	880,000	880,000
MacDill AFB (housing office)	646,000	646,000
Patrick AFB (70 units)	7,947,000	7,947,000
Tyndall AFB (52 units)	5,500,000	5,500,000
Tyndall AFB (30 units)	—	4,300,000
Georgia: Moody AFB (3 units)	513,000	513,000
Idaho: Mountain Home AFB (housing office)	844,000	844,000
Kansas: McConnell AFB (39 units)	5,193,000	5,193,000
Louisiana: Barksdale AFB (62 units)	10,299,000	10,299,000
Massachusetts: Hanscom AFB (24 units)	—	4,900,000
Mississippi: Keelser AFB (98 units)	9,300,000	9,300,000
Missouri: Whiteman AFB (72 units)	9,948,000	9,948,000
Nevada:		
Nellis AFB (6 units)	1,357,000	1,357,000
Nellis AFB (137 units)	—	21,000,000
New Mexico:		
Holloman AFB (1 unit)	225,000	225,000
Kirtland AFB (105 units)	11,000,000	11,000,000
North Carolina:		
Pope AFB (104 units)	9,984,000	9,984,000
Seymour Johnson AFB (1 unit)	204,000	204,000
South Carolina: Shaw AFB (maintenance facility)	715,000	715,000
Texas:		
Dyess AFB (maintenance facility)	580,000	580,000
Lackland AFB (67 units)	6,200,000	6,200,000
Sheppard AFB (housing office)	500,000	500,000
Sheppard AFB (maintenance facility)	600,000	600,000
Washington: McChord AFB (50 units)	9,504,000	9,504,000
Guam: Andersen AFB (housing office)	1,700,000	1,700,000
Turkey: Incirlick AB (150 units)	10,146,000	10,146,000
Construction improvements	85,059,000	90,959,000
Planning	8,989,000	8,989,000
Total	249,003,000	294,503,000

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

The following project is to be accomplished within the additional amount provided above the request for construction improvements:

Location	Number of units	Recommended
Ohio—Wright-Patterson AFB	66	\$5,900,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The budget request includes \$408,971,000 for maintenance of real property. The Committee recommends an increase of \$14,000,000, providing a total of \$422,971,000 for this purpose.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	\$29,381,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	34,239,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	34,239,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+4,858,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	0

The Committee recommends a total of \$34,239,000 for Family Housing, Defense-Wide for fiscal year 1996. This is equal to the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and an increase of \$4,858,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	\$0
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	22,000,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	22,000,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+22,000,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	0

The Committee recommends a total of \$22,000,000 for the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund for fiscal year 1996. This is equal to the budget request for fiscal year 1996, and an increase of \$22,000,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	\$0
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	75,586,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	75,586,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+75,586,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	0

The Committee recommends the budget request of \$75,586,000 for the Homeowners Assistance Fund. The Committee notes that no funding was provided for fiscal year 1995 since unobligated balances were to be carried over from prior years and revenue was expected from the resale of homes during fiscal year 1995.

The Homeowners Assistance Fund is a non-expiring revolving fund which finances a program for providing assistance to homeowners by reducing their losses incident to the disposal of their homes when military installations at or near where they are serving or employed are ordered to be closed or the scope of operations is reduced. The Fund was established in recognition of the fact that base closure and reduction actions can have serious economic effects on local communities. The Fund receives funding from several sources: appropriations, borrowing authority, reimbursable authority, prior fiscal year unobligated balances, revenue from sale of acquired properties, and recovery of prior year obligations.

Recent base closure and realignment actions have had a significant impact on this account. The total estimated requirements for fiscal year 1996 are \$238,478,000. Funding for this requirement will come from the following sources: appropriations in the amount of \$75,586,000; estimated revenue of \$122,307,000; and prior year carryover of \$40,585,000.

The budget request included a new General Provision to provide transfer authority among the Homeowners Assistance Fund and the Base Realignment and Closure Accounts. The Committee recommends including this provision as Section 123 of the bill. However, the Committee directs that any exercise of this authority must fall under the Committee's standing procedures for approval of reprogramming requests.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

OVERVIEW

The Congress has appropriated to date, \$9,500,000,000 for realignment and closure since fiscal year 1990. In the bill for fiscal year 1996, the Committee is recommending total funding of \$3.9 billion under three accounts, as requested. The request represents a \$1,221,734,000 increase, or 44 percent, over fiscal year 1995 appropriations. These funds are necessary to ensure closure schedules can be met and anticipated savings will be realized. In addition, funding is essential for accelerated cleanup which is necessary for reuse of surplus properties and future job creation.

The Committee, in appropriating such funds, has provided the Department with the flexibility to allocate funds by Service, by function and by base. The Committee, in recognizing the complexities of realigning and closing bases and providing for environmental restoration, has provided such flexibility to allow the Office of the Secretary of Defense to monitor the program execution of the Services and to redistribute unobligated balances as appropriate to avoid delays and to effect timely execution of realignment and closures along with environmental restoration.

The following table displays the total amount appropriated for each round of base closure including amounts recommended for fiscal year 1996:

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

[Total funding, fiscal year 1990 through fiscal year 1996]

	Fiscal year 1990 through fiscal year 1994	Fiscal year 1995 en- acted	Fiscal year 1996 rec- ommended	Total
Part I	\$2,585,230,000	\$87,600,000	NA	\$2,672,830,000
Part II	3,476,610,000	² 398,700,000	\$964,843,000	4,840,153,000
Part III	¹ 636,308,000	³ 2,290,858,000	2,148,480,000	5,075,646,000
Part IV	NA	NA	784,569,000	784,569,000
Total	6,698,148,000	2,777,158,000	3,897,892,000	13,373,198,000

¹ Includes rescission of \$507,692,000 (P.L. 103-211).

² Includes transfer of \$133,000,000 from "Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense."

³ Includes rescission of \$32,000,000 (P.L. 104-6).

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

Since the start of the current process for Base Realignment and Closure, Military Construction Appropriations Acts have appropriated a total of \$9,475,306,000 for the entire program for fiscal years 1990 through 1995. Within this total, statutory language has provided that not less than \$1,965,700,000 has been available for activities associated with environmental restoration. Against this

“floor,” the Department has allocated \$2,330,000,000 for environmental restoration.

The Committee is concerned that the design and cost of environmental restoration efforts should be tailored to match the proposed re-use of an installation in order to assure that costs are reasonable and affordable. Therefore, for funds provided for fiscal year 1996, the Committee recommends statutory language to establish a ceiling on the level of funding for environmental restoration, as follows:

Account	Total program	Ceiling on environmental restoration costs
BRAC I	NA	NA
BRAC II	\$964,843,000	\$224,800,000
BRAC III	2,148,480,000	232,300,000
BRAC IV	784,569,000	NA

The statutory ceiling established by the Committee is equal to the Department's execution plan for fiscal year 1996.

CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

The Department of Defense has requested a total of \$1,100,000,000 within the fiscal year 1996 budget request for base realignment and closure for construction projects funded under the Base Realignment and Closure Accounts, Parts II and III. The Committee recommends full funding for these important projects. The Committee finds it important that the Congress be advised of any programmatic changes. Therefore, any change in a project shall be considered a change in a specifically authorized and appropriated project and all limitations and notification procedures shall apply to these construction projects in the same manner as within the “Active and Reserve Component” accounts. The Committee provides approval and appropriated funds for the following construction projects:

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

[Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate, Base Realignment and Closure, fiscal year 1996 BRAC military construction projects]

Component/State/project description	BRAC round	Recommended (thousands)
Army 91 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996:		
Arizona:		
Fort Huachuca:		
Hospital/Dental Clinic (38300)	II	\$2,250
Subtotal, Army, Arizona		2,250
California:		
Sacramento Army Depot:		
Reserve Center Renovation (45589)	II	2,000
Subtotal, Army, California		2,000
Colorado:		
Fort Carson:		
Prime Care Clinic (38437)	II	4,300
Subtotal, Army, Colorado		4,300

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE—Continued

[Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate, Base Realignment and Closure, fiscal year 1996 BRAC military construction projects]

Component/State/project description	BRAC round	Recommended (thousands)
Maryland:
Adelphi Research Laboratory:
Scale Model Facility (27365)	II	1,500
Subtotal, Army, Maryland	1,500
Massachusetts:
Fort Devens:
Ammo Supply Point (41792)	II	2,750
Subtotal, Army, Massachusetts	2,750
South Carolina:
Fort Jackson:
Hospital Addition/Clinic (38310)	II	5,400
Bachelor Officers Quarters (38289)	II	10,400
Subtotal, Army, South Carolina	15,800
Planning and design	II	215
Total for Army 91 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996	28,815
Army 93 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996:
Michigan:
Detroit Arsenal:
Mobility Center Laboratory (42673)	III	5,141
Subtotal, Army, Michigan	5,141
Virginia:
Fort Belvoir:
Operations and Training Facility (42678)	III	4,950
Subtotal, Army, Virginia	4,950
Total for Army 93 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996	10,091
Navy 91 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996:
California:
Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton:
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (518T)	II	38,230
Subtotal, Navy, California	38,230
Pennsylvania:
Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia:
Utilities Reconfiguration (597S)	II	13,000
Subtotal, Navy, Pennsylvania	13,000
Planning and design	II	16,950
Total for Navy 91 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996	68,180
Navy 93 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996:
California:
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center:
Reserve Center Addition, Alameda (149T)	III	7,900
Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton:
Aircraft Parking Apron (026T)	III	14,320
Bachelor Enlisted Quarters and Physical Fitness Center (028T)	III	10,750

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE—Continued

[Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate, Base Realignment and Closure, fiscal year 1996 BRAC military construction projects]

Component/State/project description	BRAC round	Recommended (thousands)
Maintenance Facility (031T)	III	18,210
Training and Administrative Facility (027T)	III	3,160
Marine Corps Air Station Miramar		
Aircraft Maintenance Complex (006T)	III	61,193
Airfield Parking and Pads (001T)	III	47,552
Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (002T)	III	38,654
Admin and Training Facilities (003T)	III	16,300
Operational Support Complex (008T)	III	14,420
Utilities Improvement (009T)	III	19,750
Maintenance Facilities (010T)	III	22,940
Naval Exchange Laundry and Dry Cleaning (389T)	III	2,440
Building Conversion (720T)	III	1,700
Fleet Combat Training Center, Pacific, San Diego		
Medical Research Laboratory (384T)	III	685
Fleet Training Center, San Diego		
Applied Instruction Building (023T)	III	8,403
Navy Public Works Center, San Diego		
Public Works Shop (175T)	III	2,920
Subtotal, Navy, California		291,297
District of Columbia:		
Strategic Systems Program, Washington:		
Building Renovation (003T)	III	4,500
Washington Navy Yard:		
Building Renovation (002T)	III	18,354
Subtotal, Navy, District of Columbia		22,854
Florida:		
Navy Air Station, Pensacola:		
Consolidate Training Building (686T)	III	27,100
Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (687T)	III	39,700
Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville:		
Administrative Building (220T)	II	11,000
Subtotal, Navy, Florida		77,800
Hawaii:		
Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor:		
Utility System Modification (539T)	III	2,800
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay:		
Helicopter Landing Pad (287T)	III	1,250
Maintenance Hangar Alterations (0270T)	III	13,400
Ordnance Facilities (508T)	III	2,800
Aircraft Rinse Facility Modification (269T)	III	1,850
Subtotal, Navy, Hawaii		22,100
Illinois:		
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes:		
Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (619T)	III	23,700
Brig (579T)	III	420
Child Development Center (583T)	III	1,700
Elevator Trainer School (601T)	III	2,650
Medical Clinic Addition (584T)	III	6,090
Training Building Renovations (581T)	III	3,250
Fire Station (164T)	III	2,560
Recruit Training Command, Great Lakes:		
Dental Clinic Alterations (604T)	III	9,595
Medical Clinic Alterations (590T)	III	3,218

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE—Continued

[Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate, Base Realignment and Closure, fiscal year 1996 BRAC military construction projects]

Component/State/project description	BRAC round	Recommended (thousands)
Medical Clinic Addition (586T)	III	4,047
Subtotal, Navy, Illinois		57,230
Maryland:		
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head:		
Explosive Test Facility (146T)	III	10,300
Naval Air Warfare Center, Patuxent River:		
Administrative Facilities (960T)	III	29,400
Propulsion System Evaluation Facility (953T)	III	25,750
Subtotal, Navy, Maryland		65,450
Nevada:		
Naval Air Station, Fallon:		
Battalion Unit Equipment Shop (316T)	III	1,050
Domestic Water Storage (319T)	III	2,230
Waste Water System Improvement (320T)	III	1,300
Subtotal, Navy, Nevada		4,580
Tennessee:		
Engineering Development Center, Arnold AFB, Tullahoma:		
Propulsion System Laboratory (159T)	III	51,405
Naval Air Station, Memphis:		
Building Conversion (323T)	III	1,300
Building Conversion (324T)	III	7,400
Installation of Telephone Switch (322T)	III	5,010
Subtotal, Navy, Tennessee		65,115
Texas:		
Naval Air Station, Fort Worth:		
Aircraft Support Facilities (102T)	III	19,886
Administrative and Supply Building (140T)	III	860
Administrative/Supply Building Alterations (106T)	III	4,730
Building Alterations and Additions (101T)	III	9,523
Child Development Center (121T)	III	2,010
Jet Engine Test Cell (104T)	III	13,840
Medical and Dental Clinic (103T)	III	4,510
Reserve Training Building (108T)	III	17,300
Subtotal, Navy, Texas		72,659
Virginia:		
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek:		
Underway Replenishment Operator Training Facility (390T)	III	4,300
Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico:		
Marine Corps Manpower Center (465T)	III	17,406
Subtotal, Navy, Virginia		21,706
Washington:		
Naval Weapons Station Detachment, Port Hadlock:		
High Explosive Magazines (298T)	III	5,100
Pudget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton:		
Parking Garage (300T)	III	14,400
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island:		
Aircraft Parking Apron Alterations (603T)	III	4,500
Engine Maintenance Shop Addition (612T)	III	4,300
Flight Simulator Building Addition (605T)	III	4,090
Ground Support Equipment Shop (600T)	III	3,660

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE—Continued

[Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate, Base Realignment and Closure, fiscal year 1996 BRAC military construction projects]

Component/State/project description	BRAC round	Recommended (thousands)
Hangar Alteration (608T)	III	4,690
Sonobuoy Storage Facility (615T)	III	2,200
Subtotal, Navy, Washington		42,940
Midway Island:		
Naval Air Facility:		
Demolition (401T)	III	3,000
Subtotal, Navy, Midway Island		3,000
Total Navy 93 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996		746,731
Navy 93 BRAC family housing, fiscal year 1996:		
California:		
Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton:		
Family Housing (Community Center) (506T)	III	1,332
Subtotal, family housing, Navy, California		1,332
Florida:		
Naval Air Station, Pensacola:		
Family Housing—116 units (406T)	III	10,790
Subtotal, family housing, Navy, Florida		10,790
Illinois:		
Naval Public Works Center, Great Lakes:		
Family Housing—100 units (401T)	III	13,580
Subtotal, family housing, Navy, Illinois		13,580
Rhode Island:		
Naval Engineering Training Center, Newport:		
Demolish Family Housing—400 units (500T)	III	2,000
Subtotal, family housing, Navy, Rhode Island		2,000
Washington:		
Naval Submarine Base, Bangor:		
Family Housing—34 units (404T)	III	4,840
Subtotal, family housing, Navy, Washington		4,840
Total 93 BRAC family housing, Navy, fiscal year 1996		32,542
Air Force 91 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996:		
California:		
Vandenberg AFB:		
Site Utilities (XUMU963007)	II	2,900
Subtotal, Air Force, California		2,900
Colorado:		
Buckley ANGB:		
Enlisted Dormitory (CRWU953050)	II	5,600
Subtotal, Air Force, Colorado		5,600

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE—Continued

[Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate, Base Realignment and Closure, fiscal year 1996 BRAC military construction projects]

Component/State/project description	BRAC round	Recommended (thousands)
Maryland:		
Fort Meade:		
AFIS Audio Visual School (41524)	II	14,000
Subtotal, Air Force, Maryland		14,000
North Carolina:		
Pope AFB:		
Munitions Storage Complex (TMKH933621)	II	4,450
Subtotal, Air Force, North Carolina		4,450
Ohio:		
Rickenbacker ANGB:		
Alter Base Maintenance Shops (NL26939686)	II	1,050
Alter Support Shops (NLZ6939687)	II	1,250
Alter Fencing and Utilities (NLZ26939690)	II	620
Alter Fuel System Maintenance Dock (NLZ26939700)	II	600
Jet Fuel Storage/Distribution (NLZ26939729)	II	9,100
Wright-Patterson AFB:		
NECAP Complex (NHTV943204)	II	8,500
Subtotal, Air Force,		21,120
Oklahoma:		
Altus AFB:		
Flight Simulator/Academic Facility (AGGN953006)	II	10,000
Subtotal, Air Force, Oklahoma		10,000
Texas:		
Bergstrom Air Reserve Base:		
Conventional Munitions Complex (BJHZ949003R)	II	2,100
Add/Alter BCE Complex (BJHZ949005R)	II	2,000
Add/Alter Maintenance Shop (BJHZ949006R)	II	2,900
Isolate Utilities/Fence (BJHZ949004R)	II	680
Alter Vehicle Maintenance Complex (BJHZ949010)	II	500
Airmen Dining Hall (BJHZ949009)	II	2,400
Base Supply Warehouse (BJHZ949001R)	II	2,900
Goodfellow AFB:		
Base Pavements (JCGU953002)	II	1,000
Lackland AFB:		
Alter Technical Training (MPLS913333)	II	2,250
Randolph AFB:		
Base Streets (TYMX953003)	II	1,700
Sheppard AFB:		
Base Roads (VNV9530015)	II	1,800
Central Preparation Kitchen/Bakery (VNV953004)	II	1,800
Subtotal, Air Force, Texas		22,030
Total Air Force 91 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996		80,100
Air Force BRAC 91 family housing, fiscal year 1996:		
Oklahoma:		
Altus AFB:		
Family Housing—180 units (AGGN954015)	II	18,500
Subtotal, family housing, Air Force, Oklahoma		18,500
Total Air Force BRAC 91 family housing, fiscal year 1996		18,500

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE—Continued

[Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate, Base Realignment and Closure, fiscal year 1996 BRAC military construction projects]

Component/State/project description	BRAC round	Recommended (thousands)
Air Force BRAC 93 construction, fiscal year 1996:		
California:		
March AF Reserve Base:		
Alter Wing HQ Admin (PCZ959001)	III	1,350
Alter Medical Training Facilities (PCZ959003)	III	1,550
Alter Weapons Storage (PCZ959008)	III	1,850
BCE Maintenance Shop/Storage (PCZ959002)	III	970
Alter Dining Hall (PCZ959005)	III	1,100
Isolate Utilities/Perimeter Fence (PCZ959004)	III	2,250
Alter Support Facilities (PCZ959007)	III	300
Travis AFB:		
Upgrade Roads (XOAT953320)	III	300
Combat Camera Squadron Facilities (XDAT963100)	III	9,900
Subtotal, Air Force, California		19,570
Florida:		
MacDill AFB:		
Isolate Utilities (NVZR940081)	III	400
Subtotal, Air Force, Florida		400
Louisiana:		
Barksdale AFB:		
HAVE NAP Missile Complex (AWUB962401)	III	2,600
Subtotal, Air Force, Louisiana		2,600
Massachusetts:		
Westover AF Reserve Base:		
Alter Aero-Medical Training (YTPM950047)	III	480
Subtotal, Air Force, Massachusetts		480
New Jersey:		
McGuire AFB:		
Upgrade Roads (PTFL943167)	III	1,400
Add/Alter Aero-Med Services Clinic (PTFL943174)	III	1,950
Subtotal, Air Force, New Jersey		3,350
New York:		
Griffiss AFB:		
Northeast Air Defense Sector Support Facility (JREZ959501)	III	1,900
10th Mountain Complex ANG (JREZ9449512)	III	3,150
Alter Consolidated Logistical Facility (JREZ940055)	III	3,750
Subtotal, Air Force, New York		8,800
North Dakota:		
Minot AFB:		
Aircraft Ground Equipment Corrosion Control (QJVF952104)	III	600
Subtotal, North Dakota		600
South Carolina:		
Shaw AFB:		
Special Operations Facility (VLSB943013)	III	8,400
Subtotal, Air Force, South Carolina		8,400

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE—Continued

[Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate, Base Realignment and Closure, fiscal year 1996 BRAC military construction projects]

Component/State/project description	BRAC round	Recommended (thousands)
Texas:		
Lackland AFB:		
IAAFA Student Officers Quarters (MPLS963240)	III	4,250
IAAFA Tech Training Classroom (MPLS963241)	III	4,250
IAAFA Enlisted Dormitory (MPLS963244)	III	8,100
Subtotal, Air Force, Texas		16,600
Total Air Force 93 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996		60,800
Air Force 93 BRAC family housing, fiscal year 1996:		
New Jersey:		
McGuire AFB:		
Family Housing Improvements (142 Units) (PTFL95400X)	III	15,900
Subtotal, Air Force, family housing, New Jersey		15,900
Total Air Force 93 BRAC family housing, fiscal year 1996		15,900
Defense Logistics Agency 93 BRAC construction fiscal year 1996:		
Ohio:		
Defense Electronic Supply Center, Dayton:		
Renovate Operations Space	III	10,654
Subtotal, Defense Logistics Agency, Ohio		10,654
Total DLA 93 BRAC construction, fiscal year 1996		10,654

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE, PART I

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	\$87,600,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	0
Committee recommendation in the bill	0
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	–87,600,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	0

The Committee notes that fiscal year 1995 was the last year for appropriations into this account.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE, PART II

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	\$265,700,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	964,843,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	964,843,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+699,143,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	0

The Committee recommends a total of \$964,843,000 for Base Realignment and Closure, Part II for fiscal year 1996. This is equal to the budget request for fiscal year 1996 and an increase of \$699,143,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995. Below is the recommended distribution of funds as requested:

Activity	Recommended
Military Construction	\$177,100,000
Family Housing	18,800,000
Environmental	224,800,000
Operation and Maintenance	554,200,000

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Recommended</i>
Military Personnel (PCS)	200,000
Other	69,843,000
Revenues	- 79,300,000
Total	964,843,000

FORT BENJAMIN HARRISON, INDIANA

The Committee understands that the Secretary of the Army is considering using the existing medical clinic building at Fort Benjamin Harrison for a VA-run clinic, to include a family practice clinic, a laboratory, a pharmacy and other facilities to support all active duty soldiers, military retirees and their families. The Committee directs the Secretary to follow through with this proposal and report back to the Committee within thirty days after enactment of this Act with the status of this directive.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE, PART III

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	¹ \$2,322,858,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	2,148,480,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	2,148,480,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	- 174,378,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	0

¹ Excludes rescission of \$32,000,000 enacted in P.L. 104-6, and excludes transfer of \$133,000,000 from "Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense".

The Committee recommends a total of \$2,148,480,000 for Base Realignment and Closure, Part III for fiscal year 1996. This is equal to the budget request for fiscal year 1996 and a decrease of \$174,378,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995. Below is the recommended distribution of funds as requested:

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Recommended</i>
Military Construction	\$828,200,000
Family Housing	48,700,000
Environmental	232,300,000
Operation and Maintenance	921,000,000
Military Personnel (PCS)	24,900,000
Other	93,380,000
Revenues	0
Total	2,148,480,000

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE, PART IV

Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	\$784,569,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	784,569,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	+784,569,000
Fiscal year 1996 estimate	0

The Committee recommends the budget request of \$784,569,000 for Base Realignment and Closure, Part IV for fiscal year 1996 provided that such funds will be available for construction only to the extent an official budget justification is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, and that such funds are available solely for approved 1995 base realignments and closures.

The Committee notes that the budget estimate was derived in a notional manner. To date, the Department has not indicated how these funds will be distributed except that a portion of the funds

will be used for site surveys and for planning and design. Therefore, the Committee directs that no funds be obligated except for site surveys and for planning and design until the Committees on Appropriations have been provided with a five year program for executing the 1995 base realignment and closure plan with justifications (Form 1391) for fiscal year 1996 funds. This five year program shall include planned fiscal year 1996 expenditures for environmental restoration.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The bill carries a number of routine General Provisions that have been included for several years.

The Committee recommends three General Provisions which have not been included heretofore as follows:

Section 123. This section provides transfer authority among the Homeowners Assistance Fund and the Base Realignment and Closure Accounts. The Committee directs that any exercise of this authority must fall under the Committee's standing procedures for approval of reprogramming requests.

Section 124. This section requires the Army to use George Air Force Base as the interim airhead for the National Training Center at Fort Irwin until Barstow-Daggett reaches Initial Operational Capability as the permanent airhead.

Section 125. This section requires the Army to convey a portion of the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois to the Lake County Forest Preserve District, in consideration for which the District shall provide maintenance and care to the remaining Fort Sheridan cemetery. This section also permits the Army to convey remaining surplus property at the former Fort Sheridan to the Fort Sheridan Joint Planning Committee or its successor, for fair market value.

CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law.

Language is included in various parts of the bill to continue ongoing activities which require annual authorization or additional legislation, which to date has not been enacted.

The bill includes a number of provisions which place limitations on the use of funds in the bill or change existing limitations and which might, under some circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law.

The bill provides that appropriations shall remain available for more than one year for some programs for which the basic authorizing legislation does not presently authorize such extended availability.

A provision of the "Military Construction, Defense-Wide" account which permits the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds to other accounts for military construction or family housing.

A new account has been established, "Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund", for limited partnership ar-

rangements with private developers to provide affordable timely housing for service members.

A provision of the "Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part II" states that not more than \$224,800,000 of the funds appropriated shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

A provision of the "Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part III" states that not more than \$232,300,000 of the funds appropriated shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

A provision of the "Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part IV" states that funds will be available for construction only to the extent detailed budget justification is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations.

A provision of the "Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part IV" states that funds are available solely for the approved 1995 base realignments and closures.

Section 101 of the General Provisions states that none of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense, except in the case of contracts for environmental restoration at base closure sites.

Section 102 of the General Provisions permits use of funds for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

Section 103 of the General Provisions permits use of funds for Defense Access Roads.

Section 104 of the General Provisions prohibits construction of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

Section 105 of the General Provisions limits the use of funds for purchase of land or land easements.

Section 106 of the General Provisions prohibits the use of funds to acquire land, prepare a site, or install utilities for any family housing except housing for which funds have been made available.

Section 107 of the General Provisions limits the use of minor construction funds to transfer or relocate activities among installations.

Section 108 of the General Provisions prohibits the procurement of steel unless American producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been allowed to compete.

Section 109 of the General Provisions prohibits payment of real property taxes in foreign nations.

Section 110 of the General Provisions prohibits construction of new bases overseas without prior notification.

Section 111 of the General Provisions establishes a threshold for American preference of \$500,000 relating to architect and engineer services in Japan, in any NATO member country, and in the Arabian Gulf.

Section 112 of the General Provisions establishes preference for American contractors for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in the Arabian Gulf.

Section 113 of the General Provisions requires the Secretary of Defense to give prior notice to Congress of military exercises involving construction in excess of \$100,000.

Section 114 of the General Provisions limits obligations during the last two months of the fiscal year.

Section 115 of the General Provisions permits funds appropriated in prior years to be available for construction authorized during the current session of Congress.

Section 116 of the General Provisions permits the use of expired or lapsed funds to pay the cost of supervision for any project being completed with lapsed funds.

Section 117 of the General Provisions permits obligation of funds from more than one fiscal year to execute a construction project, provided that the total obligation for such project is consistent with the total amount appropriated for the project.

Section 118 of the General Provisions allows expired funds to be transferred to the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense" account.

Section 119 of the General Provisions directs the Secretary of Defense to report annually regarding the specific actions to be taken during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Korea, and United States allies in the Arabian Gulf to assume a greater share of the common defense burden.

Section 120 of the General Provisions allows transfer of proceeds from "Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part I" to the continuing Base Realignment and Closure accounts.

Section 121 of the General Provisions prohibits expenditure of funds except in compliance with the Buy American Act.

Section 122 of the General Provisions states the Sense of the Congress notifying recipients of equipment or products authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided in this Act to purchase American-made equipment and products.

Section 123 of the General Provisions permits the transfer of funds among the "Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense" and the Base Realignment and Closure accounts.

Section 124 of the General Provisions directs the Army to use George AFB as the interim airhead for the National Training Center at Fort Irwin until Barstow-Daggett reaches Initial Operational Capability as the permanent airhead.

Section 125 of the General Provisions requires the Army to convey a portion of the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois to the Lake County Forest Preserve District, in consideration for which the District shall provide maintenance and care to the remaining Fort Sheridan cemetery. This section also permits the Army to convey remaining surplus property at the former Fort Sheridan to the Fort Sheridan Joint Planning Committee or its successor, for fair market value.

The Committee recommends deleting the following General Provisions which were included in the fiscal year 1995 Military Construction Appropriations Act (P.L. 103-307), because these provisions are no longer required [section numbers refer to P.L. 103-307]:

Section 114, regarding Family Housing Management Account transfers.

Section 122, regarding supplemental appropriations act provisions for Guam earthquake.

Section 123, regarding cancellation of budgetary resources based on procurement reform.

Section 126, regarding fraudulent use of "made in America" labels.

Section 127, regarding Naval Reserve Center land conveyance.

Section 128, regarding Army research facility land conveyance.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII—CLAUSE 3

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the Committee reports that it recommends no changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law:

Military Construction, Army	
Military Construction, Navy	
Military Construction, Air Force	
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	
Military Construction, Army National Guard	
Military Construction, Air National Guard	
Military Construction, Army Reserve	
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	
North Atlantic Treaty Organization	Security Investment
Program	
Family Housing, Construction, Army	
Family Housing, Operation and Maintenance, Army	
Family Housing, Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	
Family Housing, Operation and Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps	
Family Housing, Construction, Air Force	
Family Housing, Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	
Family Housing, Construction, Defense-Wide	
Family Housing, Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund	
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense	
Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part II	
Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part III	
Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part IV	

The Committee notes that authorization for appropriations in this bill is contained in H.R. 1530, reported by the National Security Committee on May 24, 1995. It is anticipated the authorization will be enacted into law later this year.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule X of the House of Representatives, a statement is required describing the transfer of funds provided in the accompanying bill. Sections 115, 118, 120, and 123 of the General Provisions, and language included under "Military Construction, Defense-Wide" and "Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund" provide certain transfer authority.

RESCISSION OF FUNDS

In compliance with clause 1(b) of rule X of the House of Representatives, the Committee reports that it recommends no rescissions in the bill, as reported.

INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, the Committee estimates that enactment of this bill would have no overall inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

COMPARISONS WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how that authority compares with the reports submitted under section 602(b) of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year. This information follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	602(b) Allocation		This bill	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	\$11,198	\$9,613	\$11,198	\$9,613
Mandatory	0	0	0	0

ADVANCE SPENDING AUTHORITY

This bill provides no advance spending authority.

FIVE-YEAR PROJECTION OF OUTLAYS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, the following information was provided to the Committee by the Congressional Budget Office:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget authority, fiscal year 1996	\$11,197,995
Outlays:	
1996	3,126,178
1997	3,287,378
1998	2,157,623
1999	1,404,004
2000 and beyond	1,222,812

The bill will not affect the levels of revenues, tax expenditures, direct loan obligations, or primary loan guarantee commitments under existing law.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(D) of Public Law 93-344, the new budget authority and outlays provided by the accompanying bill for financial assistance to State and local governments are as follows:

	[In millions of dollars]	
New budget authority		0
Fiscal year 1996 outlays resulting therefrom		0

STATE LIST

The following is a complete listing, by State and country, of the Committee's recommendations for military construction and family housing projects:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HWSC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ALABAMA			
ARMY			
REDSTONE ARSENAL			
HYPERVELOCITY BALLISTIC RANGE FACILITY.....	---	5,000	5,000
FORT RUCKER			
AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT.....	---	5,900	5,900
AIR FORCE			
MAXWELL AFB			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX.....	3,700	3,700	3,700
DEFENSE-WIDE			
DEF DISTRIBUTION AMMUNITION (DDAA)			
VEHICLE STORAGE SHELTER (DBOF).....	3,550	3,550	3,550
MAXWELL AFB			
ADD/ALTER MAXWELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.....	5,479	5,479	5,479
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
BIRMINGHAM MAP			
ALTER KO-135 AIRCRAFT SHOPS.....	4,400	4,400	4,400
DANIELLY FIELD			
FIRE STATION.....	1,445	1,445	1,445
ARMY RESERVE			
JASPER			
ADD/ALTER USARC/ONS/AMSA.....	2,500	2,500	2,500
AIR FORCE RESERVE			
MAXWELL AFB			
COMPOSITE MAINTENANCE SHOPS.....	3,508	3,508	3,508
TOTAL, ALABAMA.....	24,582	35,582	35,582
ALASKA			
AIR FORCE			
EIELSON AFB			
ALTER DORMITORY.....	3,850	3,850	3,850
ELMENDORF AFB			
MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL.....	850	850	850
REPAIR AIRFIELD TAXIWAY.....	900	900	900
VISITING OFFICERS QUARTERS.....	7,350	7,350	7,350
TIN CITY			
ABOVE GROUND FUEL TANKS.....	2,500	2,500	2,500
DEFENSE-WIDE			
ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE			
HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT (PHASE IV).....	28,100	28,100	28,100
ARMY RESERVE			
FORT WALSWRIGHT			
USARC/ONS/STORAGE.....	4,779	4,779	4,779
TOTAL, ALASKA.....	48,329	48,329	48,329
ARIZONA			
ARMY			
FORT HUACHUCA			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	---	2,550	2,550
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENOVATION.....	15,000	15,000	15,000
AIR FORCE			
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB			
ALTER AIRCRAFT CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
DORMITORY.....	3,800	3,800	3,800
LUKE AFB			
DORMITORY.....	5,200	5,200	5,200
DEFENSE-WIDE			
LUKE AIR FORCE BASE			
ADD/ALTER HOSPITAL LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE.....	8,100	8,100	8,100
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
PAPAGO MILITARY RESERVATION (PHOENIX)			
MEDICAL FACILITY.....	---	1,084	1,084
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
TUCSON IAP			
ADD/ALTER AIRCRAFT SPT EQUIPMENT SHOP.....	500	500	500
TOTAL, ARIZONA.....	34,700	38,334	38,334
ARKANSAS			
AIR FORCE			
LITTLE ROCK AFB			
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM.....	2,500	2,500	2,500
DEFENSE-WIDE			
PINE BLUFF ARSENAL			
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FAC (PHASE II).....	40,000	40,000	40,000
TOTAL, ARKANSAS.....	42,500	42,500	42,500
CALIFORNIA			
ARMY			
FORT IRWIN			
CONSOLIDATED MAINTENANCE FACILITY.....	15,500	15,500	15,500
FORT IRWIN (BARSTON-DAGGETT)			
NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AIRFIELD (PHASE II).....	---	10,000	10,000
PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO			
REGIONAL SEWER SYSTEM.....	3,000	3,000	---
NAVY			
CAMP PENDLETON MARINE CORPS BASE			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	11,940	11,940	11,940
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	3,000	3,000	3,000
MULTI-PURPOSE MARINE GUN RANGE.....	3,900	3,900	3,900
PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER.....	4,100	4,100	4,100
SENSITIVE COMPARTMENTED INFO FACILITY ADD.....	2,248	2,248	2,248
TACTICAL VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY.....	1,088	1,088	1,088
WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.....	1,410	1,410	1,410
CHINA LAKE NAVAL AIR WARFARE CTR WPMS DIV			
INDUSTRIAL WWTWR COLLECT AND TREATMENT FAC (DBOF)....	3,700	3,700	3,700

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	MMSC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
LEMOORE NAVAL AIR STATION	7,600	7,600	7,600
JET ENGINE TEST CELL.....			
NORTH ISLAND NAVAL AIR STATION	58,650	58,650	58,650
BERTHING WHARF.....	42,500	42,500	42,500
CONTROLLED INDUSTRIAL FACILITY.....			
PORT HUENEME		16,700	16,700
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....			
PT MUGU NAVAL AIR WARFARE CTR NPNS DIV	1,300	1,300	1,300
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF).....			
SAN DIEGO NAVAL STATION	19,960	19,960	19,960
OILY WASTE COLLECTION AND TREATMENT FACILITY.....			
SAN DIEGO NAV CRD CTRL AND OCEAN SUR CEN ROTE DIV	3,170	3,170	3,170
TEST FACILITY DEMOLITION.....			
TWENTYNINE PALMS MARCORP AIR-GND COMB CTR	2,490	2,490	2,490
INFANTRY SQUAD BATTLE COURSE.....			
AIR FORCE			
BEALE AFB	7,500	7,500	7,500
LANDFILL CLOSURE.....			
EDWARDS AFB	11,100	11,100	11,100
ADD/ALTER ANECHOIC CHAMBER.....	10,600	10,600	10,600
DORMITORY.....	12,100	12,100	12,100
ADD/ALTER F-22 ENGINEERING TEST FACILITY.....			
TRAVIS AFB	10,500	10,500	10,500
DORMITORIES.....	6,400	6,400	6,400
DORMITORY.....	2,400	2,400	2,400
HC-10 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY.....	7,400	7,400	7,400
SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE UNIT.....			
VANDENBERG AFB	2,000	2,000	2,000
FIRE STATION.....	4,000	4,000	4,000
SLFI - CHEMICAL TEST AND ANALYSIS LABORATORY.....			
DEFENSE-WIDE			
CAMP PENDLETON MARINE CORPS BASE	1,700	1,700	1,700
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH/INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE.....	5,200	5,200	5,200
SOF TRAINING COMPLEX.....			
DEF DISTRIBUTION STOCKTON - DDJC	15,000	15,000	15,000
GENERAL PURPOSE WARE REPLACEMENT (DBOF).....			
DFSC POINT MUGU	750	750	750
FUEL STORAGE (DBOF).....			
FORT IRWIN	6,900	6,900	6,900
AMBULATORY HEALTHCARE CLINIC.....			
VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE	5,700	5,700	5,700
LIFE SAFETY/SEISMIC/UTILITY UPGRADE.....			
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
SEPULVEDA ANG (VAN NUYS)		1,800	1,800
SUPPLY AND CIVIL ENGINEER COMPLEX.....			
SEPULVEDA ANG ANNEX	320	320	320
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....			
ARMY RESERVE			
CAMP PARKS	5,888	5,888	5,888
BATTLE PROJECTION CENTER.....			
AIR FORCE RESERVE			
MARCH AFB	1,550	1,550	1,550
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY.....			
TOTAL, CALIFORNIA.....	300,442	326,942	326,942
COLORADO			
ARMY			
FORT CARSON	1,750	1,750	1,750
SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM.....	8,100	8,100	8,100
SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT.....		20,000	20,000
WHOLE BARRACKS RENEVAL (PHASE I).....			
AIR FORCE			
BUCKLEY AND BASE	5,500	5,500	5,500
TROOP SUPPORT FACILITIES.....			
PETERSON AFB	3,000	3,000	3,000
ADD/ALTER DORMITORY.....	1,390	1,390	1,390
FINE STATION.....			
US AIR FORCE ACADEMY	4,200	4,200	4,200
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	3,724	3,724	3,724
SAILPLANE HANGAR.....	4,950	4,950	4,950
UPGRADE FACILITIES HEATING SYSTEM.....			
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
BUCKLEY ANG	450	450	450
BASE ENGINEER PAVEMENTS AND GROUNDS FACILITY.....	950	950	950
UPGRADE HEATING SYSTEMS.....			
TOTAL, COLORADO.....	55,014	55,014	55,014
DELAWARE			
AIR FORCE			
DOVER AFB	5,500	5,500	5,500
C-5 500 OPERATIONS/ACFT MAINT (DBOF).....			
DEFENSE-WIDE			
DFSC DOVER AFB	15,554	15,554	15,554
REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM (DBOF).....			
DOVER AIR FORCE BASE	4,400	4,400	4,400
LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE.....			
TOTAL, DELAWARE.....	25,454	25,454	25,454
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
ARMY			
FORT LESLEY J MCNAIR	6,000	6,000	6,000
NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIV FAC RENOVATION (PHASE I)....	5,500	5,500	5,500
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEVAL.....			
AIR FORCE			
BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE	6,500	6,500	6,500
ALTER DORMITORY.....			

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HWBC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
HONOR GUARD DORMITORY.....	5,600	5,600	5,600
DEFENSE-WIDE			
BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE			
BOILER DIAC.....	498	498	498
PARKING DIAC.....	1,245	1,245	1,245
TOTAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.....	27,343	27,343	27,343
FLORIDA			
NAVY			
EGLIN AFB NAVSICM EXPL ORDNANCE DISP DET			
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL TRNG COMPLEX.....	14,200	14,200	14,200
UNDERWATER ORDNANCE DISPOSAL TRNG FAC.....	1,950	1,950	1,950
PENACOLA NAVAL TECH TRAINING CTR (CARRY STATION)			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	2,585	2,585	2,585
AIR FORCE			
CAPE CANAVERAL AFB			
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,600	1,600	1,600
EGLIN AFB			
UPGRADE DORMITORY.....	---	7,300	7,300
REPAIR RUNWAY.....	6,200	6,200	6,200
TYNDALL AFB			
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,200	1,200	1,200
DEFENSE-WIDE			
DFSC EGLIN AFB			
SOF FUEL STORAGE (DBOF).....	2,400	2,400	2,400
EGLIN AFB			
SOF SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AMU.....	2,400	2,400	2,400
EGLIN AUX FIELD 9 (HURLBURT FIELD)			
SOF BENSON TANKS STORAGE FACILITY.....	1,550	1,550	1,550
SOF HELICOPTER HANGAR.....	5,500	5,500	5,500
SOF SQUADRON OPS/AMU HH-52.....	7,100	7,100	7,100
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
CAMP BLANDING			
WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM UPGRADE.....	---	4,200	4,200
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (PHASE II).....	---	5,300	5,300
TOTAL, FLORIDA.....	46,865	63,485	63,485
GEORGIA			
ARMY			
FORT BENNING			
CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER BUILDING.....	4,900	4,900	4,900
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	33,000	33,000	33,000
FORT GEORGE			
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS.....	3,150	3,150	3,150
GENERAL PURPOSE WAREHOUSE.....	2,600	2,600	2,600
FT STEWART/HUNTER AAF			
DEPLOYMENT STAGING AREA.....	8,400	8,400	8,400
NAVY			
MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE (ALBANY)			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (PHASE II).....	---	1,300	1,300
KINGS BAY STRATEGIC WEAPONS FAC (ATLANTIC)			
SECURITY FORCE FACILITY.....	2,450	2,450	2,450
AIR FORCE			
MOODY AFB			
ALTER DORMITORY.....	---	2,500	2,500
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	---	3,800	3,800
C-130 AERIAL DELIVERY FACILITY.....	4,600	4,600	4,600
C-130 AIRCRAFT WAREHOUSE FACILITY.....	1,700	1,700	1,700
C-130 SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AMU.....	3,200	3,200	3,200
CONTROL TOWER.....	2,700	2,700	2,700
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM.....	690	690	690
ROSBURG AFB			
JSTARS AIRCRAFT FUEL SYSTEM MAINTENANCE DOCK.....	6,900	6,900	6,900
DEFENSE-WIDE			
FORT BENNING			
LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE.....	5,600	5,600	5,600
FAITH MIDDLE SCHOOL ADDITION.....	1,116	1,116	1,116
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
GLYN COUNTY ANG (BRUNSWICK)			
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....	320	320	320
UPGRADE COMMUNICATION SQUADRON COMPLEX.....	---	5,000	5,000
HUNTER ANG SITE			
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....	400	400	400
SAVANNAH BAP			
ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SHOPS.....	1,300	1,300	1,300
TOTAL, GEORGIA.....	83,026	95,826	95,826
HAWAII			
ARMY			
SCHOFIELD BARRACKS			
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL (PHASE I).....	---	15,000	15,000
NAVY			
HONOLULU COMP AND TELCOMM AREA MASTER STA EPAC			
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM.....	1,980	1,980	1,980
PEARL HARBOR INTELLIGENCE CENTER PACIFIC			
OPERATIONS BUILDING ALTERATIONS.....	2,200	2,200	2,200
PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE			
BERTHING PIER.....	22,500	22,500	22,500
AIR FORCE			
HICKAM AFB			
ALTER DORMITORY.....	3,100	3,100	3,100
ALTER TRANSIENT DORMITORY.....	3,080	3,080	3,080
REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS.....	4,560	4,560	4,560

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HWSC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
TOTAL, HAWAII.....	37,380	52,380	52,380
IDAHO			
AIR FORCE			
MOUNTAIN HOME AFB			
IDAHO TRAINING RANGE (NORTH SITE).....	8,000	8,000	---
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM.....	800	800	800
WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL PLANT.....	9,850	9,850	9,850
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
GOWEN FIELD			
REMOVE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....	320	320	320
TOTAL, IDAHO.....	18,970	18,970	10,970
ILLINOIS			
NAVY			
GREAT LAKES NAVAL TRAINING CENTER			
UNIFORM ISSUE BUILDING.....	12,440	12,440	12,440
AIR FORCE			
SCOTT AFB			
DORMITORY.....	8,000	8,000	8,000
GLOBAL REACH PLANNING CENTER VISITING QUARTERS....	4,700	4,700	4,700
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
MARSEILLES			
TRNG SITE, UTIL UPGRADE.....	1,350	1,350	1,350
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT			
ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR.....	1,200	1,200	1,200
ADD TO AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON.....	630	630	630
ADD/ALTER SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY.....	970	970	970
AIRCRAFT DEICING FACILITY.....	400	400	400
ALTER AERIAL PORT TRAINING FACILITY.....	710	710	710
ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SHOPS.....	1,450	1,450	1,450
ARMY RESERVE			
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS			
BATTLE PROJECTION CENTER.....	4,860	4,860	4,860
FORT SHERIDAN			
ADD/ALTER RTS-INTELLIGENCE.....	3,300	3,300	3,300
TOTAL, ILLINOIS.....	40,010	40,010	40,010
INDIANA			
NAVY			
CRANE NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER			
HYDROACOUSTICS TEST COMPLEX.....	---	3,300	3,300
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
STOUT FIELD (INDIANAPOLIS)			
COMBINED SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP.....	---	10,846	10,846
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
MULMAN FIELD (TERRE HAUTE)			
BASE CIVIL ENGINEER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX.....	---	4,100	4,100
AIR FORCE RESERVE			
GRISWOLD AFB			
FIRE STATION.....	---	4,250	4,250
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,500	1,500	1,500
TOTAL, INDIANA.....	1,500	23,996	23,996
IOWA			
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
SIOUX GATEWAY AIRPORT (SIOUX CITY)			
RUNWAY UPGRADE.....	---	4,050	4,050
KANSAS			
AIR FORCE			
MC CONNELL AFB			
ALTER DORMITORY.....	2,200	2,200	2,200
DORMITORY.....	---	6,500	6,500
DEICING PAD.....	1,150	1,150	1,150
KC-135 SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AMU.....	6,100	6,100	6,100
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
FORT LEAVENWORTH			
CORPS SIM CENTER (PHASE II).....	4,400	4,400	4,400
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
MC CONNELL AFB			
ALTER B-1 SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY.....	800	800	800
ARMY RESERVE			
GLATHE			
LAND ACQUISITION.....	539	539	539
TOPEKA			
USARC/OMBS/AMBA.....	6,487	6,487	6,487
TOTAL, KANSAS.....	21,676	28,176	28,176
KENTUCKY			
ARMY			
FORT KNOX			
CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER BUILDING.....	5,600	5,600	5,600
LOUISIANA			
AIR FORCE			
BARKSDALE AFB			
B-52 TRAINING COMPLEX.....	2,500	2,500	2,500
DEFENSE-WIDE			
BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE			
LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE.....	4,100	4,100	4,100

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HNHC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
DFSC BARKSDALE AFB			
REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM (DBOF).....	13,100	13,100	13,100
NEW ORLEANS NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY			
SOF SMALL CRAFT BREAKWATER.....	---	730	730
NAVY RESERVE			
NEW ORLEANS HAS JOINT RESERVE BASE			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS ADDITION.....	---	5,035	5,035
NEW ORLEANS NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	---	6,100	6,100
TOTAL, LOUISIANA.....	19,700	31,665	31,665
MARYLAND			
NAVY			
ANNAPOLIS NAVAL STATION			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	3,600	3,600	3,600
AIR FORCE			
ANDREWS AFB			
DORMITORY.....	5,000	5,000	5,000
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....	5,885	5,885	5,885
DEFENSE-WIDE			
BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL			
POTABLE WATER LINE REPLACEMENT.....	1,300	1,300	1,300
FOREST GLEN (WPAIR)			
ARMED FORCES INST OF PATH REPOSITORY ADD.....	1,550	1,550	1,550
ARMY INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH (PHASE III).....	119,000	27,000	27,000
FORT MEADE			
CRITICAL UTILITIES CONTROL (PHASE I).....	3,301	3,301	3,301
FRIENDSHIP AIRPORT ANNEX II PURCHASE.....	14,800	14,800	14,800
SPL STEAM GENERATION PLANT.....	532	532	532
TOTAL, MARYLAND.....	157,069	55,069	55,069
MASSACHUSETTS			
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
BARNES MAP			
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX.....	2,000	2,000	2,000
NORCESTER ANG			
PAINT AND REFUELING VEHICLES MAINT BAYS.....	350	350	350
NAVY RESERVE			
MARINE CORPS RESCEN (CAMP EDWARDS)			
RESCEN/COMBAT VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FAC ADDITION....	3,130	3,130	3,130
TOTAL, MASSACHUSETTS.....	5,480	5,480	5,480
MICHIGAN			
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
SELFIDGE ANG			
UPGRADE HEATING SYSTEMS.....	2,900	2,900	2,900
MINNESOTA			
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
MINN-ST PAUL IAP			
AIRCRAFT DEICING FACILITY.....	400	400	400
UPGRADE HEATING SYSTEM.....	780	780	780
TOTAL, MINNESOTA.....	1,180	1,180	1,180
MISSISSIPPI			
AIR FORCE			
COLUMBUS AFB			
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,150	1,150	1,150
KEESLER AFB			
DORMITORY.....	---	8,300	8,300
UPGRADE STUDENT DORMITORY.....	6,500	6,500	6,500
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
GULFPORT			
AVCRAV EQUIPMENT ELECTRONIC TEST FACILITY.....	1,100	1,100	1,100
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
KEY FIELD (MERIDIAN)			
ADD/ALTER BASE COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY.....	---	1,500	1,500
THOMPSON FIELD (JACKSON)			
ADD/ALTER COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY.....	---	2,400	2,400
TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI.....	8,750	20,950	20,950
MISSOURI			
ARMY			
FORT LEONARD WOOD			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	---	3,900	3,900
AIR FORCE			
WHITEMAN AFB			
B-2 ADD TO ACFT APRON/CONVOY ROAD/TAXIWAY.....	1,500	1,500	1,500
B-2 ADD/ALTER DOCK FIRE PROTECTION.....	3,500	3,500	3,500
B-2 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATOR TRAINING FACILITY.....	4,100	4,100	4,100
B-2 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCKS/HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	15,500	15,500	15,500
DEFENSE-WIDE			
DMA AEROSPACE CENTER, ARNOLD			
REPLACE DESTROYED/DAMAGED FAC W/LAND ACQ.....	40,300	40,300	40,300
TOTAL, MISSOURI.....	64,900	68,800	68,800
NEVADA			
AIR FORCE			
NELLIS AFB			
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM.....	600	600	600
VISITING QUARTERS.....	9,900	9,900	9,900

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
TOTAL, NEVADA.....	10,500	10,500	10,500
NEW JERSEY			
ARMY			
PICATINNY ARSENAL			
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM (PHASE II).....	---	5,500	5,500
NAVY			
LAKEHURST NAVAL AIRCRAFT DIV			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DSOF).....	1,700	1,700	1,700
AIR FORCE			
MCGUIRE AFB			
DORMITORY.....	---	7,300	7,300
DINING FACILITY.....	---	5,000	5,000
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,500	1,500	1,500
KC-10 SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AMU.....	7,500	7,500	7,500
DEFENSE-WIDE			
DFSC MCGUIRE AFB			
REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM (DSOF).....	12,000	12,000	12,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
ATLANTIC CITY			
UPGRADE SANITARY AND WATER SYSTEM.....	550	550	550
MCGUIRE AFB			
FUEL CELL AND CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY.....	5,700	5,700	5,700
WARREN GROVE RANGE			
COMPOSITE RANGE OPERATIONS FACILITY.....	1,100	1,100	1,100
TOTAL, NEW JERSEY.....	30,350	48,150	48,150
NEW MEXICO			
ARMY			
WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE			
STALLION RANGE CENTER WATER DEVELOPMENT.....	---	2,050	2,050
AIR FORCE			
CANNON AFB			
ADD/ALTER DORMITORY.....	---	3,000	3,000
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM.....	520	520	520
WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL PLANT.....	9,500	9,500	9,500
KIRTLAND AFB			
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.....	7,555	7,555	7,555
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM.....	1,500	1,500	1,500
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
KIRTLAND AFB			
AIRCRAFT CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY.....	1,500	1,500	1,500
ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINT HANGAR AND SHOPS.....	900	900	900
COMPOSITE ENGINE AND NOI SHOP.....	2,700	2,700	2,700
LANTIRN MAINTENANCE FACILITY.....	520	520	520
TOTAL, NEW MEXICO.....	25,595	30,545	30,545
NEW YORK			
ARMY			
FORT DRUM			
INFANTRY PLATOON BATTLE COURSE.....	---	3,500	3,500
ANTI-ARMOR TRACKING AND LIVE-FIRE RANGE.....	---	5,000	5,000
SHIPPING AND RECEIVING BUILDING.....	---	2,550	2,550
U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY (WEST POINT)			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	---	8,300	8,300
WATERVLIET ARSENAL			
OIL RUNOFF CONTAINMENT FACILITY (DSOF).....	580	580	580
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
HANCOCK FIELD (SYRACUSE)			
COMPOSITE MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,990	1,990	1,990
NIAGARA FALLS IAP			
UPGRADE RUNWAY OVERRUN.....	1,950	1,950	1,950
UPGRADE STORM WATER AND SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM.....	400	400	400
STRATTON ANG (SCHENECTADY)			
MAINTENANCE HANGAR AND SHOPS.....	---	10,000	10,000
NAVY RESERVE			
NAV AND MARINE CORPS RESOEN (BUFFALO)			
RESERVE TRAINING BUILDING ADDITION.....	3,535	3,535	3,535
AIR FORCE RESERVE			
NIAGARA FALLS IAP			
FUEL SYSTEM MAINTENANCE HANGAR.....	4,595	4,595	4,595
TOTAL, NEW YORK.....	13,751	43,501	43,501
NORTH CAROLINA			
ARMY			
FORT BRAGG			
STAGING AREA COMPLEX.....	11,200	11,200	11,200
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	15,500	15,500	15,500
NAVY			
CAMP LEJEUNE MARINE CORPS BASE			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	5,300	5,300	5,300
INFANTRY PLATOON BATTLE COURSE.....	5,500	5,500	5,500
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (PHASE II).....	45,500	45,500	45,500
CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION			
ENCLOSE WATER SURVIVAL TRAINING TANK.....	2,050	2,050	2,050
JET ENGINE TEST CELL.....	7,730	7,730	7,730
MISSILE MAGAZINE.....	1,590	1,590	1,590
NEW RIVER MARINE CORPS AIR STATION			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	14,550	14,550	14,550
AIR FORCE			
POPE AFB			
C-130 SQUADRON OPS/AMU & AUDIOVISUAL SERVICES CTR.....	5,100	5,100	5,100

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HNSC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....	2,150	2,150	2,150
SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB			
VISITING OFFICERS QUARTERS.....	---	2,000	2,000
DINING HALL AND TROOP ISSUE WAREHOUSE.....	---	4,700	4,700
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM.....	830	830	830
DEFENSE-WIDE			
FORT BRAGG			
COSCOM HEALTH CLINIC.....	---	13,200	13,200
SOF BARRACKS.....	---	8,000	8,000
SOF GROUP HEADQUARTERS BUILDING.....	2,800	2,800	2,800
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
CHARLOTTE ANGFB			
AEROMEDICAL EVACUATION TRAINING FACILITY.....	---	1,900	1,900
ARMY RESERVE			
HICKORY			
USARV.....	2,713	2,713	2,713
TOTAL, NORTH CAROLINA.....	129,473	159,273	159,273
NORTH DAKOTA			
AIR FORCE			
GRAND FORKS AFB			
DORMITORY.....	8,500	8,500	8,500
RC-135 SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AMU.....	5,300	5,300	5,300
MINOT AFB			
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....	1,550	1,550	1,550
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
CAMP GRAFTON (DEVILS LAKE)			
COMBINED SUPPORT MAINTENANCE AND PAINT SHOP.....	---	2,050	2,050
TOTAL, NORTH DAKOTA.....	15,350	18,400	18,400
OHIO			
AIR FORCE			
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB			
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.....	4,100	4,100	4,100
DEFENSE-WIDE			
COLUMBUS			
DFAB OPERATIONS FACILITY (DFOB) (PHASE I).....	72,403	37,400	37,400
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
RICKENBACKER ANGFB			
BARRACKS.....	---	1,750	1,750
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
BLUE ASH ANG STATION			
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....	380	380	380
CAMP PERRY			
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....	320	320	320
RICKENBACKER ANGFB			
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS.....	310	310	310
AIR FORCE RESERVE			
YOUNGSTOWN SHIP			
ADD/ALTER ELECTRIC SUBSTATION.....	4,230	4,230	4,230
CONSTRUCT AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON.....	3,350	3,350	3,350
UPGRADE BASE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
TOTAL, OHIO.....	85,093	52,840	52,840
OKLAHOMA			
ARMY			
FORT SILL			
CENTRAL VEHICLE WASH FACILITY.....	5,300	5,300	5,300
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENOVATION.....	---	5,000	5,000
AIR FORCE			
ALTUS AFB			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	---	4,000	4,000
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,200	1,200	1,200
TINNIER AFB			
ADD/ALTER DORMITORIES.....	5,100	5,100	5,100
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
LAWTON (FORT SILL)			
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP (MLRS).....	2,400	2,400	2,400
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
TULSA TAP			
COMPOSITE COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY.....	1,900	1,900	1,900
WILL ROGERS WORLD AIRPORT			
AERIAL PORT TRAINING FACILITY.....	2,550	2,550	2,550
COMPOSITE FIRE STATION.....	1,950	1,950	1,950
PETROLEUM OPERATIONS FACILITY.....	400	400	400
TOTAL, OKLAHOMA.....	21,800	33,800	33,800
OREGON			
DEFENSE-WIDE			
UNATILLA DEPOT			
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE II)....	55,000	55,000	55,000
PENNSYLVANIA			
NAVY			
PHILADELPHIA NAVAL SHIPYARD			
FOURTH RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION (PHASE III)...	---	5,000	5,000
DEFENSE-WIDE			
DEF DISTRIBUTION NEW CUMBERLAND - DDBP			
TRANSPORT CONTROL FACILITY (DFOB).....	4,500	4,500	4,500
QUASTAD FIELD, HARRISBURG TAP			
SOF REFUELING VEHICLE SHOP.....	443	443	443
SOF MOBILITY STORAGE WAREHOUSE.....	1,200	1,200	1,200
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
SCANTON REGIONAL MAINTENANCE FACILITY			
REGIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP.....	---	3,320	3,320

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HWSC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
GREATER PITTSBURGH IAP			
FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE FACILITY.....	5,332	5,332	5,332
TOTAL, PENNSYLVANIA.....	11,578	20,895	20,895
SOUTH CAROLINA			
ARMY			
CHARLESTON NAVAL WEAPONS STATION			
ARMY STRATEGIC MAINT COMPLEX (PHASE II) (DBOF)....	16,500	16,500	16,500
WHARF ADDITIONS (DBOF).....	9,200	9,200	9,200
FORT JACKSON			
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	32,000	32,000	32,000
NAVY			
BEAUFORT MCAS			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	---	15,000	15,000
AIR FORCE			
CHARLESTON AFB			
C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY.....	1,300	1,300	1,300
C-17 SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AMU.....	5,600	5,600	5,600
COMMITORY.....	5,600	5,600	5,600
SHAW AFB			
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM.....	1,300	1,300	1,300
DEFENSE-WIDE			
FT JACKSON			
PIERCE TERRACE ELEM SCHOOL ADDITION.....	576	576	576
TOTAL, SOUTH CAROLINA.....	72,078	87,078	87,078
SOUTH DAKOTA			
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
CAMP RAPID (RAPID CITY)			
COMBINED BATTALION BARRACKS/MESS/ADMIN AREA.....	---	2,650	2,650
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
JOE FOSS FIELD			
BASE SUPPLY COMPLEX.....	4,000	4,000	4,000
TOTAL, SOUTH DAKOTA.....	4,000	6,650	6,650
TENNESSEE			
AIR FORCE			
ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEV CENTER			
UPGRADE ENGINE TEST FACILITIES REFRIGERATION.....	2,300	2,300	2,300
UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS.....	2,700	2,700	2,700
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
JOHNSON CITY			
ONS/ARMA/ARF.....	---	1,937	1,937
TULLAMORE TRAINING SITE			
MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE.....	---	2,623	2,623
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
MCONEE-TYSON AIRPORT			
PMSC SCHOOL TRAINING QUARTERS.....	4,400	4,400	4,400
MEMPHIS IAP			
ADD/ALTER BASE ENGINEER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX.....	990	990	990
ADD/ALTER SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS FACILITY.....	1,100	1,100	1,100
TOTAL, TENNESSEE.....	11,490	16,050	16,050
TEXAS			
ARMY			
FORT BLISS			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	---	4,000	4,000
DINING FACILITY.....	---	4,900	4,900
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	48,000	48,000	48,000
FORT HOOD			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS (PHASE I).....	---	15,000	15,000
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	17,500	17,500	17,500
FORT SAM HOUSTON			
IH-35 OVERPASS.....	---	7,000	7,000
NAVY			
CORPUS CHRISTI NAS			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS EXPANSION AND UPGRADE..	---	4,400	4,400
INGLESIDE NAS			
SMALL CRAFT BERTHING PIER.....	---	2,640	2,640
KINGSVILLE NAS			
LAND ACQUISITION FOR AIRFIELD SAFETY CLEAR ZONES..	---	2,710	2,710
AIR FORCE			
DYESS AFB			
ADD/ALTER COMMITORIES.....	---	5,400	5,400
GOODFELLOW AFB			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER ADDITION.....	---	1,000	1,000
KELLY AFB			
WING HEADQUARTERS FACILITY.....	3,244	3,244	3,244
LAUGHLIN AFB			
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,400	1,400	1,400
RANDOLPH AFB			
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,200	1,200	1,200
UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING.....	1,900	1,900	1,900
REESE AFB			
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,200	1,200	1,200
SHEPPARD AFB			
UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING.....	1,500	1,500	1,500
DEFENSE-WIDE			
FORT BLISS			
THEATER AREA DEFENSE FACILITIES.....	13,600	13,600	13,600
FORT HOOD			
CONSOLIDATED TROOP MEDICAL CLINIC.....	5,500	5,500	5,500

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HWSC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE			
ADD/ALTER EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT.....	6,100	6,100	6,100
REESE AIR FORCE BASE			
LIFE SAFETY/UTILITY UPGRADE.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
KELLY AFB			
UPGRADE HEATING AND COOLING SYSTEMS.....	1,400	1,400	1,400
TOTAL, TEXAS.....	103,544	103,544	103,544
UTAH			
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
CAMP WILLIAMS (LEHI)			
REGION V BARRACKS.....	---	5,197	5,197
REPLACE/UPGRADE POTABLE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.....	---	800	800
TRAINING SITE, STORAGE FACILITY.....	340	340	340
TOTAL, UTAH.....	340	6,337	6,337
VIRGINIA			
ARMY			
FORT EUSTIS			
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	---	11,000	11,000
DEPLOYMENT TRAINING FACILITY.....	5,400	5,400	5,400
FORT MYER			
ARMY MUSEUM LAND ACQUISITION.....	17,000	17,000	14,000
NAVY			
NORFOLK NAVAL STATION			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	---	18,000	18,000
OILY WASTE COLLECTION SYSTEM (PHASE I).....	10,580	10,580	10,580
PORTSMOUTH NAVAL HOSPITAL			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	9,500	9,500	9,500
QUANTICO MARINE CORPS COMBAT DEV COMMAND			
AMMUNITION STORAGE FACILITY.....	3,500	3,500	3,500
WILLIAMSBURG FLEET AND INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY CTR			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	6,140	6,140	6,140
ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYS ALTERATIONS.....	2,250	2,250	2,250
YORKTOWN NAVAL WEAPONS STATION			
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL OPS FAC (DBOF).....	1,300	1,300	1,300
AIR FORCE			
LAHLEY AFB			
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
DEFENSE-WIDE			
FLEET COMBAT TRAINING CENTER (DAM NECK)			
SOP AMPHIBIOUS OPERATIONS SUPPORT BUILDING.....	4,500	4,500	4,500
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT - COMV (NORFOLK)			
GENERAL PURPOSE WARE REPLACEMENT (DBOF).....	10,400	10,400	10,400
NAVAL AMPHIBIOUS BASE (LITTLE CREEK)			
SOP OPERATIONS SUPPORT FACILITY.....	6,100	6,100	6,100
NORTHWEST NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY (CHESAPEAKE)			
MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC.....	4,300	4,300	4,300
PORTSMOUTH NAVAL HOSPITAL			
HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT (PHASE VII).....	71,900	47,900	47,900
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
CAMP PENDLETON ANG			
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX.....	2,000	2,000	2,000
RICHARD S BYRD TAP (RICHMOND)			
ADD/ALTER F-15 AC MAINTENANCE COMPLEX.....	2,700	2,700	2,700
TOTAL, VIRGINIA.....	156,870	163,570	160,570
WASHINGTON			
ARMY			
FORT LEWIS			
CONSOLIDATED FUEL STATION.....	3,400	3,400	3,400
MULTI-PURPOSE TRAINING RANGE (YAKIMA).....	8,500	8,500	8,500
RAIL SPUR AND TANK TRAILS (YAKIMA).....	3,200	3,200	3,200
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP.....	15,000	15,000	15,000
TANK TRAIL EROSION MITIGATION (YAKIMA).....	2,000	2,000	2,000
NAVY			
BREMERTON PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD			
FLEET SUPPORT FACILITIES (DBOF).....	6,870	6,870	6,870
METAL PREPARATION FAC IMPROVEMENTS (DBOF).....	2,600	2,600	2,600
PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER.....	---	10,400	10,400
KEYPORT NAVAL UNDERSEA WARFARE CENTER DIV			
METAL TREATMENT FACILITY (DBOF).....	5,300	5,300	5,300
AIR FORCE			
FAIRCHILD AFB			
ALTER DORMITORIES.....	7,500	7,500	7,500
DORMITORY.....	---	8,200	8,200
MOCHORD AFB			
DORMITORY.....	4,300	4,300	4,300
SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AMU.....	5,600	5,600	5,600
TOTAL, WASHINGTON.....	64,270	62,670	62,670
WISCONSIN			
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
TRUXAV FIELD			
ALTER MUNITIONS FACILITY.....	670	670	670
ARMY RESERVE			
GREEN BAY			
USARV/OMR/AMBA.....	6,523	6,523	6,523
TOTAL, WISCONSIN.....	7,193	7,193	7,193
WYOMING			
AIR FORCE			
FE WARREN AFB			
ALTER DORMITORIES.....	5,500	5,500	5,500

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HNHC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	---	4,000	4,000
UPGRADE CENTRAL HEAT PLANT.....	3,500	3,500	3,500
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
CODY			
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SUBSHOP.....	342	342	342
NEWCASTLE			
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SUBSHOP.....	348	348	348
TOTAL, WYOMING.....	9,690	13,680	13,680
CONUS CLASSIFIED			
ARMY			
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS			
CLASSIFIED PROJECT.....	1,900	1,900	1,900
AIR FORCE			
CLASSIFIED LOCATION			
SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY.....	700	700	700
DEFENSE-WIDE			
CSD WILCON			
CLASSIFIED LOCATION.....	11,500	11,500	11,500
TOTAL, CONUS CLASSIFIED.....	14,100	14,100	14,100
CONUS VARIOUS			
NAVY			
CONUS VARIOUS			
SUPPLY WAREHOUSE.....	1,200	1,200	1,200
GERMANY			
AIR FORCE			
SPANGDAHLEM AB			
ADD TO MISSILE MAINTENANCE FACILITY.....	930	930	930
DORMITORY.....	5,900	5,900	5,900
SOUND SUPPRESSOR FOUNDATION.....	980	980	980
SOUND SUPPRESSOR FOUNDATION.....	600	600	600
VOEGELINEN			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	2,600	2,600	2,600
DEFENSE-WIDE			
RAMSTEIN			
ELEMENTARY/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL ADDITIONS.....	19,205	19,205	19,205
TOTAL, GERMANY.....	30,185	30,185	30,185
GREECE			
AIR FORCE			
ARAXOS			
DORMITORY.....	1,950	1,950	1,950
GUAM			
NAVY			
NAVAL COMP AND TELCOMM AREA MASTER STA WPAC			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS MODERNIZATION.....	2,250	2,250	2,250
NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER			
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADES.....	16,180	16,180	16,180
DEFENSE-WIDE			
NS GUAM			
SOF OPERATIONS SUPPORT FACILITY.....	8,800	8,800	8,800
TOTAL, GUAM.....	27,230	27,230	27,230
ITALY			
NAVY			
NAPLES NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY			
OPERATIONS SUPPORT CENTER.....	10,000	10,000	10,000
QUALITY OF LIFE FACILITIES (PHASE III).....	14,950	14,950	14,950
SIGONELLA NAVAL AIR FACILITY			
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM.....	870	870	870
SIGONELLA NAVAL AIR STATION			
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	11,300	11,300	11,300
AIR FORCE			
AVIANO AB			
COMMUNICATIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY.....	1,400	1,400	1,400
SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY.....	950	950	950
GHEDI AIRFIELD			
DORMITORY.....	1,450	1,450	1,450
DEFENSE-WIDE			
SIGONELLA NAVAL AIR STATION			
ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL ADDITIONS.....	7,595	7,595	7,595
U.S. NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY (NAPLES)			
DISPENSARY (CAPPOICHIINO).....	5,000	5,000	5,000
TOTAL, ITALY.....	53,515	53,515	53,515
KOREA			
ARMY			
CAMP STANLEY			
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	6,800	6,800	6,800
CAMP CASEY			
DINING FACILITY.....	4,150	4,150	4,150
CAMP NOVEY			
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	6,200	6,200	6,200
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	7,300	7,300	7,300
CAMP PELHAM			
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	5,600	5,600	5,600
YONGSAN GARRISON (SEOUL)			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.....	---	1,450	1,450
TOTAL, KOREA.....	30,050	31,500	31,500

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HWBC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
PUERTO RICO			
NAVY			
ROOSEVELT ROADS NAVAL STATION			
SANITARY LANDFILL	11,500	11,500	11,500
SABANA SECA NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY			
ROAD IMPROVEMENTS	2,200	2,200	2,200
DEFENSE-WIDE			
DEFENSE FUEL SUPPORT POINT ROOSEVELT ROADS			
FUEL STORAGE (DBOF)	5,200	5,200	5,200
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
PUERTO RICO IAP			
ADD/ALTER COMPOSITE SUPPORT FACILITY	510	510	510
MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE AND STORAGE COMPLEX	3,800	3,800	3,800
UPGRADE SECURITY SYSTEM	1,350	1,350	1,350
TOTAL, PUERTO RICO	25,560	25,560	25,560
SPAIN			
DEFENSE-WIDE			
DFSC ROTA			
HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM (DBOF)	7,400	7,400	7,400
TURKEY			
AIR FORCE			
ANKARA			
LONG PERIOD SEISMIC ARRAY	3,000	3,000	3,000
SHORT PERIOD SEISMIC ARRAY	4,000	4,000	4,000
INCIRLIK AB			
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	1,500	1,500	1,500
UPGRADE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	2,900	2,900	2,900
TOTAL, TURKEY	11,500	11,500	11,500
UNITED KINGDOM			
AIR FORCE			
RAF LAKENHEATH			
ADD TO MISSILE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1,820	1,820	1,820
RAF MILDENHALL			
ADD/ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,250	2,250	2,250
DEFENSE-WIDE			
MENWITH HILL STATION			
WAREHOUSE SPRINKLERS	577	577	577
TOTAL, UNITED KINGDOM	4,747	4,747	4,747
OVERSEAS CLASSIFIED			
AIR FORCE			
OVERSEAS CLASSIFIED			
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1,800	1,800	1,800
WAR READINESS MATERIAL WAREHOUSES	15,500	15,500	15,500
TOTAL, OVERSEAS CLASSIFIED	17,100	17,100	17,100
OVERSEAS VARIOUS			
ARMY			
VARIOUS LOCATIONS			
STRATEGIC LOGISTICAL PREP COMPLEX (PHASE I)	48,000	48,000	48,000
NATO			
NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	175,000	161,000	161,000
WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED			
ARMY			
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS			
ARMY - HOST NATION SUPPORT	20,000	20,000	20,000
PLANNING AND DESIGN	32,894	50,778	50,778
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	8,000	8,000	8,000
NAVY			
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS			
PLANNING AND DESIGN	45,477	65,184	65,184
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,200	7,200	7,200
AIR FORCE			
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS			
PLANNING AND DESIGN	30,835	48,021	48,021
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	9,030	9,030	9,030
DEFENSE-WIDE			
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS			
CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	11,037	11,037	11,037
ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM	50,000	50,000	50,000
PLANNING AND DESIGN			
CHEMICAL DEBILITIZATION PROGRAM	13,000	13,000	13,000
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	5,407	5,407	5,407
DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	8,500	8,500	8,500
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	500	500	500
DEFENSE MEDICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY	28,330	28,330	28,330
DEFENSE LEVEL ACTIVITIES	13,000	13,000	13,000
SUBTOTAL, PLANNING AND DESIGN	58,837	58,837	58,837
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION			
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,700	1,700	1,700
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	2,809	2,809	2,809
DEFENSE MEDICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY	5,100	5,100	5,100
DEFENSE LEVEL ACTIVITIES	3,100	3,100	3,100
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	5,198	5,198	5,198
DOD DEPENDENT SCHOOLS	4,000	4,000	4,000
SUBTOTAL, UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	23,007	23,007	23,007

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HNSC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS			
PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,900	15,200	15,200
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,300	5,300	5,300
AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS			
PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,560	5,450	5,450
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	4,100	4,100	4,100
ARMY RESERVE			
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS			
PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,594	3,594	3,594
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	1,700	1,700	1,700
NAVY RESERVE			
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS			
PLANNING AND DESIGN	954	1,554	1,554
AIR FORCE RESERVE			
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS			
PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,700	2,950	2,950
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	4,169	4,169	4,169
TOTAL, WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	336,414	409,211	409,211
FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY			
ALABAMA			
REDSTONE ARSENAL (118 UNITS)	---	12,000	12,000
KENTUCKY			
FORT KNOX (150 UNITS)	---	19,000	19,000
NEW YORK			
U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY (119 UNITS)	16,500	16,500	16,500
VIRGINIA			
FORT LEE (135 UNITS)	---	19,500	19,500
WASHINGTON			
FORT LEWIS (84 UNITS)	10,800	10,800	10,800
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	14,200	46,600	46,600
PLANNING	2,000	2,000	2,000
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	43,500	126,400	126,400
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	48,822	48,822	48,822
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	84,726	84,726	84,726
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,266	1,266	1,266
SERVICES ACCOUNT	53,243	53,243	53,243
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	271,376	271,376	271,376
VA LOAN BUY-DOWN PILOT PROJECT OFFSET	---	4,000	---
LEASING	243,840	243,840	243,840
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	634,292	634,292	634,292
INTEREST PAYMENTS	11	11	11
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,337,596	1,333,596	1,337,596
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY	1,381,096	1,459,996	1,463,996
FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY			
CALIFORNIA			
LEMOORE NAVAL AIR STATION (240 UNITS)	34,900	34,900	34,900
MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP PENDLETON (COMMUNITY CENTER)	1,438	1,438	1,438
MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP PENDLETON (HOUSING OFFICE)	707	707	707
MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP PENDLETON (89 UNITS)	10,000	10,000	10,000
MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP PENDLETON (138 UNITS)	---	20,080	20,080
PACIFIC MISSILE TEST CENTER POINT MUGU (HOUSING OFFICE/SELF HELP CENTER)	1,020	1,020	1,020
PUBLIC WORKS CENTER SAN DIEGO (346 UNITS)	49,310	49,310	49,310
HAWAII			
PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, PEARL HARBOR (282 UNITS)	48,400	48,400	48,400
MARYLAND			
NAVAL AIR TEST CENTER PATUXENT RIVER (HOUSING WAREHOUSE/SELF HELP CENTER)	890	890	890
USNA ANNAPOLIS (HOUSING OFFICE/SELF HELP CENTER)	800	800	800
NORTH CAROLINA			
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION CHERRY POINT (COMMUNITY CENTER)	1,003	1,003	1,003
PENNSYLVANIA			
NSCC MECHANICSBURG (HOUSING OFFICE)	300	300	300
VIRGINIA			
DAWSON NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER (HOUSING OFFICE/SELF HELP CENTER)	520	520	520
PUBLIC WORKS CENTER NORFOLK (HOUSING OFFICE/HOUSING WAREHOUSE)	1,390	1,390	1,390
PUBLIC WORKS CENTER NORFOLK (320 UNITS)	42,600	42,600	42,600
PUERTO RICO			
NS ROOSEVELT ROADS (HOUSING OFFICE)	710	710	710
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	247,477	292,931	292,931
PLANNING	24,390	24,390	24,390
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	465,755	531,289	531,289

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HNSC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	35,320	35,320	35,320
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	93,170	93,170	93,170
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,252	1,252	1,252
SERVICES ACCOUNT	66,363	66,363	66,363
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	214,537	214,537	214,537
VA LOAN BUY-DOWN PILOT PROJECT OFFSET	---	-3,000	---
LEASING	103,582	103,582	103,582
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	534,023	534,023	534,023
MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS	82	82	82
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,048,329	1,045,329	1,048,329
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY	1,514,084	1,576,618	1,579,618
FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE			
ALASKA			
ELMENDORF AFB (HOUSING OFFICE/MAINTENANCE FACILITY)	3,000	3,000	3,000
ARIZONA			
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB (80 UNITS)	9,498	9,498	9,498
ARKANSAS			
LITTLE ROCK AFB (1 UNIT)	210	210	210
CALIFORNIA			
BEALE AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	842	842	842
EDWARDS AFB (87 UNITS)	11,350	11,350	11,350
EDWARDS AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	---	9,400	9,400
VANDENBERG AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	900	900	900
VANDENBERG AFB (143 UNITS)	20,200	20,200	20,200
COLORADO			
PETERSON AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	570	570	570
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
BOLLING AFB (32 UNITS)	4,100	4,100	4,100
FLORIDA			
EGLIN AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	500	500	500
EGLIN AFB HURLBURT FIELD (HOUSING SERVICE CENTER)	880	880	880
MACDILL AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	646	646	646
PATRICK AFB (70 UNITS)	7,947	7,947	7,947
TYNDALL AFB (52 UNITS)	5,500	5,500	5,500
TYNDALL AFB (30 UNITS)	---	4,300	4,300
GEORGIA			
MOODY AFB (3 UNITS)	513	513	513
IDAHO			
MOUNTAIN HOME AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	844	844	844
KANSAS			
MCCONNELL AFB (39 UNITS)	5,193	5,193	5,193
LOUISIANA			
BARKSDALE AFB (62 UNITS)	10,299	10,299	10,299
MASSACHUSETTS			
HANSCOM AFB (24 UNITS)	---	4,900	4,900
MISSISSIPPI			
KEESLER AFB (98 UNITS)	9,300	9,300	9,300
MISSOURI			
WHITEMAN AFB (72 UNITS)	9,948	9,948	9,948
NEVADA			
NELLIS AFB (6 UNITS)	1,357	1,357	1,357
NELLIS AFB (137 UNITS)	---	21,000	21,000
NEW MEXICO			
HOLLOWAY AFB (1 UNIT)	225	225	225
KIRTLAND AFB (105 UNITS)	11,000	11,000	11,000
NORTH CAROLINA			
POPE AFB (104 UNITS)	9,984	9,984	9,984
SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB (1 UNIT)	204	204	204
SOUTH CAROLINA			
SHAW AFB (MAINTENANCE FACILITY)	715	715	715
TEXAS			
DYESS AFB (MAINTENANCE FACILITY)	580	580	580
LACKLAND AFB (87 UNITS)	6,200	6,200	6,200
SHEPPARD AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	500	500	500
SHEPPARD AFB (MAINTENANCE FACILITY)	600	600	600
WASHINGTON			
MCCHORD AFB (50 UNITS)	9,504	9,504	9,504
GUAM			
ANDERSEN AFB (HOUSING OFFICE)	1,700	1,700	1,700
TURKEY			
INCIRLIK AB (150 UNITS)	10,146	10,146	10,146
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	85,059	90,959	90,959
PLANNING	8,989	8,989	8,989
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	249,003	294,503	294,503
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	43,000	43,000	43,000
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	45,154	45,154	45,154
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	5,678	5,678	5,678
SERVICES ACCOUNT	33,177	33,177	33,177
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	197,539	197,539	197,539
VA LOAN BUY-DOWN PILOT PROJECT OFFSET	---	-3,000	---
LEASING	115,665	115,665	115,665
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	408,971	408,971	422,971
MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS	29	29	29
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	848,213	846,213	863,213
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE	1,098,216	1,140,716	1,157,716

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HNHC AUTH	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE			
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS (NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY/UNITED KINGDOM).....	50	50	50
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS (NEW CUMBERLAND, PA).....	3,722	3,722	3,722
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION.....	3,772	3,772	3,772
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT.....	3,400	3,400	3,400
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.....	231	231	231
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT.....	36	36	36
SERVICES ACCOUNT.....	383	383	383
UTILITIES ACCOUNT.....	746	746	746
VA LOAN BUY-DOWN PILOT PROJECT.....	---	10,000	---
LEASING.....	24,874	24,874	24,874
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY.....	797	797	797
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.....	30,487	40,467	30,467
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE.....	34,239	44,239	34,239
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND.....	22,000	22,000	22,000
HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND			
HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND.....	75,586	75,586	75,586
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II			
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II.....	964,843	964,843	964,843
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III			
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III.....	2,148,480	2,148,480	2,148,480
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART IV			
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART IV.....	784,569	784,569	784,569
TOTAL, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT.....	3,697,892	3,897,892	3,897,892
GRAND TOTAL.....	10,697,995	11,197,995	11,197,995

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1995 AND
BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1996**

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1995 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget esti- mates, 1996 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appro- priated, 1995 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1996 (6)
Military construction, Army	550,476,000	472,724,000	625,608,000	+ 75,132,000	+ 152,884,000
Military construction, Navy	385,110,000	488,086,000	588,243,000	+ 203,133,000	+ 100,157,000
Military construction, Air Force	516,813,000	495,655,000	578,841,000	+ 62,028,000	+ 83,186,000
Military construction, Defense-wide	504,118,000	857,405,000	728,332,000	+ 224,214,000	-129,073,000
Total, Active components	1,956,517,000	2,313,870,000	2,521,024,000	+ 564,507,000	+ 207,154,000
Military construction, Army National Guard	188,062,000	18,480,000	72,537,000	-115,525,000	+ 54,057,000
Military construction, Air National Guard	249,056,000	85,647,000	118,267,000	-130,789,000	+ 32,620,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	57,370,000	42,963,000	42,963,000	-14,407,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve	22,748,000	7,920,000	19,655,000	-3,093,000	+ 11,735,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	57,066,000	27,002,000	31,502,000	-25,564,000	+ 4,500,000
Total, Reserve components	574,302,000	182,012,000	284,924,000	-289,378,000	+ 102,912,000
Total, Military construction	2,530,819,000	2,495,882,000	2,805,948,000	+ 275,129,000	+ 310,066,000
NATO Security Investment Program	119,000,000	179,000,000	161,000,000	+ 42,000,000	-18,000,000
Family housing, Army:					
Construction	170,002,000	43,500,000	126,400,000	-43,602,000	+ 82,900,000
Operation and maintenance	1,013,708,000	1,337,596,000	1,337,596,000	+ 323,888,000
Total, Family housing, Army	1,183,710,000	1,381,096,000	1,463,996,000	+ 280,286,000	+ 82,900,000

Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:					
Construction.....	267,465,000	465,755,000	531,289,000	+263,824,000	+65,534,000
Operation and maintenance.....	937,599,000	1,048,329,000	1,048,329,000	+110,730,000	
Total, Family housing, Navy.....	1,205,064,000	1,514,084,000	1,579,618,000	+374,554,000	+65,534,000
Family housing, Air Force:					
Construction.....	277,444,000	249,003,000	294,503,000	+17,059,000	+45,500,000
Operation and maintenance.....	824,845,000	849,213,000	863,213,000	+38,368,000	+14,000,000
Total, Family housing, Air Force.....	1,102,289,000	1,098,216,000	1,157,716,000	+55,427,000	+59,500,000
Family housing, Defense-wide:					
Construction.....	350,000	3,772,000	3,772,000	+3,422,000	
Operation and maintenance.....	29,031,000	30,467,000	30,467,000	+1,436,000	
Total, Family housing, Defense-wide.....	29,381,000	34,239,000	34,239,000	+4,858,000	
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund 1/.....		22,000,000	22,000,000	+22,000,000	
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense.....		75,586,000	75,586,000	+75,586,000	
Total, Family housing.....	3,520,444,000	4,125,221,000	4,333,155,000	+812,711,000	+207,934,000
Construction.....	(715,261,000)	(762,030,000)	(955,964,000)	(+240,703,000)	(+193,934,000)
Operation and maintenance.....	(2,805,183,000)	(3,265,605,000)	(3,279,605,000)	(+474,422,000)	(+14,000,000)
Family Housing Improvement Fund.....		(22,000,000)	(22,000,000)	(+22,000,000)	
Homeowners Assistance Fund.....		(75,586,000)	(75,586,000)	(+75,586,000)	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1995 AND
BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1996—Continued**

(1) Agency and item	(2) Appropriated, 1995 (enacted to date)	(3) Budget esti- mates, 1996	(4) Recommended in bill	(5) Bill compared with appro- priated, 1995	(6) Bill compared with budget estimates, 1996
Base realignment and closure accounts:					
Part I.....	87,600,000			-87,600,000	
Part II.....	265,700,000	964,843,000	964,843,000	+699,143,000	
(By transfer).....	(133,000,000)			(-133,000,000)	
Part III.....	2,322,858,000	2,148,480,000	2,148,480,000	-174,378,000	
Part IV.....		784,569,000	784,569,000	+784,569,000	
Total, Base realignment and closure accounts	2,676,158,000	3,897,892,000	3,897,892,000	+1,221,734,000	
Procurement: General provisions 2/	-10,421,000			+10,421,000	
FY 1995 Emergency Supplemental (P.L. 104-6)	-100,600,000			+100,600,000	
Grand total	8,735,400,000			+2,462,595,000	+500,000,000
Appropriations	(8,735,400,000)	10,697,995,000	11,197,995,000	+2,462,595,000	(+500,000,000)
(By transfer)	(133,000,000)	(10,697,995,000)	(11,197,995,000)	(-133,000,000)	

1/ Budget amendment submitted 6/2/95 (H. Doc. 104-80).

2/ Budget amendment submitted 3/15/94 (H. Doc. 103-220, page 10).