AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

106TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 106–221

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

JULY 2, 1999.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. HOBSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2465]

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, 2000.

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of Committee Recommendation	2
Conformance With Authorization Bill	4
Permanent Party Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	4
Fiscal Year 2000 Barracks Request	5
Child Development Centers	6
Hospital and Medical Facilities	7
Environmental Compliance Projects	8
Transfer Authority	8
Annualization of Supervision, Inspection, and Overhead	8
Privatization of Utility Systems	9
Contingency Funding	9
Support for Deployed Troops	10
European Construction	10
Forward Operating Locations	10
Gas Valves in Federal Facilities	11
Alkali Silica Reactivity	11
Real Property Maintenance	11
Program, Project and Activity	12
Planning and Budgeting	12
Metric Conversion	12
Military Construction:	
Army	12
Navy	14
Air Force	16
Defense-wide	17

57–714

Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund 19
Reserve Components 19
NATO Security Investment Program 22
Family Housing Overview 22
Family Housing:
Army 28
Navy 29
Air Force 30
Defense-wide 31
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund 32
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense 35
Base Realignment and Closure:
Overview 36
Part I 41
Part II 41
Part III 41
Part IV 41
Changes in Application of Existing Law 41
Compliance with Rule XIII—Clause 3 44
Appropriations Not Authorized by Law 45
Transfer of Funds 45
Rescission of Funds 45
Constitutional Authority 45
Comparisons With Budget Resolution 46
Advance Spending Authority 46
Five-Year Projection of Outlays 46
Financial Assistance 46
State List 47
Comparative Statement of New Budget Authority 76

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Administration's fiscal year 2000 budget request of $5,438,443,000 represents a decrease of $3,695,791,000, or 40 percent, from the fiscal year 1999 appropriation of $9,134,234,000. This year's request is the lowest nominal request since fiscal year 1981. It's also lower than any enacted level, in nominal dollars since fiscal year 1981. The request only includes $1,616,845,000 for military construction, $3,115,687,000 for family housing and $705,911,000 for activities associated with base closure and realignment.

The proposal to significantly reduce funding for military facilities and infrastructure does not help solve the long-standing infrastructure problems faced by the Department of Defense. The Committee is deeply concerned over the two budgetary approaches implemented in the budget request to defer funding to future fiscal years. These approaches were utilized in an effort to realign military construction and family housing funding to readiness and modernization needs for fiscal year 2000.

The most noteworthy funding mechanism proposed by the Administration is an "incremental funding" concept. The Administration chose to build an $8,587,352,000 military construction program and spread its funding over two fiscal years. Instead of requesting fully executable projects in fiscal year 2000, the Department requests only 10–25% of individual project costs. To support the completion of the proposed projects, the Administration requests an advance appropriation of $3,060,800,000 to become available in fiscal year 2001.

Just last year, the Administration proposed a different and more limited version of this budgeting approach. In the fiscal year 1999

budget request, the Department requested advance appropriations of $568,550,000, spread over three fiscal years, for 15 major projects. The Committee rejected that proposal. This year, the Department requests advance appropriations of $3,060,800,000, spread over two fiscal years, for 328 projects, nearly every construction project regardless of its size or scope.

It remains the Committee's view that there is no precedence for incrementally funding military construction projects; especially, the broad-based approach proposed by the Administration for fiscal year 2000. Of concern to the Committee is the Department of Defense's optimism as to whether all projects will be executed within the fiscal year. Additionally, the Department is unable to provide any assurances to the Committee that they will be able to meet operating schedules under the Administration's proposal. Lastly, the Department notes the proposal will require additional engineering and oversight management. Therefore, the Committee concludes these uncertainties will lead to increased project costs and delay the delivery of needed facilities.

The second unprecedented budgeting approach proposed by the Administration is an initiative to annualize the cost for supervision, inspection and overhead (SIOH) of construction projects. The proposal would spread this funding over several fiscal years. The Committee concludes that annualization merely defers obligation authority to later fiscal years and does not save SIOH funds. Additionally, the Committee is concerned that annualization would make budgeting and management of these funds more costly.

The new budgeting approaches proposed by the Administration and the continued downward trend in military construction funding has raised the concerns of the Committee over several aspects of the request. For example, the Administration has committed itself to a serious barracks revitalization program. Yet, the request for barracks construction is $549,059,000 below last year's appropriation. And, family housing construction and operation and maintenance accounts are reduced by $423,596,000. The budget request would provide $141,341,000 for family housing construction, a reduction of $558,085,000 from current levels. Of this amount, $70,000,000 is requested for construction of new family housing units, a reduction of $248,703,000, or 78 percent, from current spending. And, the request for improvements to existing family housing units is reduced by $309,382,000, or 81 percent, from the current program.

The Committee believes it is imperative to address these serious shortfalls and the severe backlog in readiness, revitalization and quality of life projects. Therefore, the Committee has recommended an additional $3,011,299,000 above the Administration's fiscal year 2000 budget request to fully fund the planning, supervision, and construction of proposed projects and several other barracks, family housing and operational facilities.

The total recommended appropriation for fiscal year 2000 is $8,449,742,000, a decrease of $684,492,000, or 7 percent, from the net fiscal year 1999 appropriation and an increase of $3,011,299,000 above the fiscal year 2000 budget request. The appropriation includes $4,196,989,000 for military construction and $3,378,019,000 for family housing. The Committee recommends a

total of $705,911,000 for Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) for fiscal year 2000. This is equal to the appropriations request for fiscal year 2000. The Committee notes assurances from the Department that the requested amount is adequate to fully execute the requirements for the program in the coming fiscal year with no impact on meeting the targeted BRAC completion date of July 13, 2001. In addition, the Committee has recommended reductions to the budget request totaling $131,177,000. The following table provides a breakout of the highlights of the bill:

FY 1999:	
Enacted	$8.45 billion
Emergency Appropriation (P.L. 105–277)	0.20 billion
Emergency Appropriation (P.L. 106–31)	0.48 billion
Net Appropriation	9.13 billion
President's FY 2000 Request	5.44 billion
Subcommittee Recommendation	8.45 billion
Increase/Decrease Below FY 1999 Enacted	0
Decrease Below FY 1999 Net Appropriation	0.68 billion
Increase Over President's Request	3.01 billion

Military Construction: $4.1 billion (49% of total bill), including:
- $800 million for barracks
- $21 million for child development centers
- $165 million for hospital and medical facilities
- $69 million for environmental compliance
- $267 million for the chemical weapons demilitarization program
- $81 million for NATO Security Investment Program
- $497 million for Guard and Reserve components

Family Housing: $3.6 billion (43% of total bill), including:
- $747 million for new family housing units, and for improvements to existing units
- $2.8 billion for operation and maintenance of existing units

Base Realignment and Closure: $0.7 billion (8% of total bill), including:
- $61 million for military construction and family housing
- $360 million for environmental cleanup
- $264 million for operations and maintenance

CONFORMANCE WITH AUTHORIZATION BILL

The House passed the National Defense Authorization Act for 2000 (H.R. 1401) on June 10, 1999 by a vote of 365–58, which contains authorization for the military construction, family housing and base realignment and closure accounts included in this bill. Because conference action on the authorization had not been completed at the time this bill was prepared all projects included in this bill are approved subject to authorization.

PERMANENT PARTY UNACCOMPANIED PERSONNEL HOUSING

The Department of Defense estimates that 47 percent of the enlisted force and 28 percent of the officers are single or unaccompanied personnel. Although 31 percent live in private off-base housing, the Department has over 397,900 men and women living in permanent party unaccompanied personnel housing. Approximately one-half of the barracks were built 30 or more years ago, with an average age of over 40 years. And, over 48,300 spaces are still serv-

iced by gang latrines. Of the total inventory approximately 36% are considered substandard 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.

In fiscal year 1997, the respective Services deficit count due to the lack of barracks spaces to house single service members or the need to replace or improve current spaces was 238,000. As a result of the Congressional initiative to accelerate the barracks revitalization effort, current deficit estimates have been reduced to 124,974 single service members. The Department of Defense estimates current total costs to achieve desired end states at $10,100,000,000, as compared to $14,280,000,000 in fiscal year 1997. And, the timetable to accomplish the revitalization has decreased from over twenty years to thirteen years.

The Committee understands that improving troop housing does not lie solely in new construction and renovations. Retiring the backlog of maintenance and repair, which is under the jurisdiction of the Defense Subcommittee, and an adequate funding commitment to prevent future backlogs plays an important role in this process. It is necessary to use many different approaches to help meet the unaccompanied housing need. The challenge is for a sustained overall commitment, at funding levels that will reduce the backlog of substandard spaces, reduce the housing deficits, and increase the quality of living conditions in a reasonable period of time.

FISCAL YEAR 2000 BARRACKS REQUEST

The Department of Defense has requested $163,833,000 to construct or modernize 33 barracks in fiscal year 2000. This is a reduction of $549,059,000, or 77 percent, from the enacted fiscal year 1999 appropriation.

The Committee has approved the request of $163,833,000 in full. In order to help alleviate the deficit, an additional $636,217,000 is recommended. The total appropriation for unaccompanied housing recommended in this bill is $800,050,000.

The following troop housing construction projects are recommended for fiscal year 2000:

FISCAL YEAR 2000 TROOP HOUSING PROJECTS

Location	Request	Recommended
Army:		
Alaska-Fort Richardson	2,200,000	14,600,000
Georgia-Fort Hunter Stewart	7,000,000	46,000,000
Georgia-Fort Benning	7,100,000	47,000,000
Hawaii-Schofield Barracks	14,200,000	49,000,000
Kansas-Fort Leavenworth	3,900,000	26,000,000
Kentucky-Fort Campbell	4,800,000	32,000,000
Maryland-Fort Meade	2,700,000	18,000,000
North Carolina-Fort Bragg	16,508,000	52,000,000
North Carolina-Fort Bragg	0	14,400,000
Pennsylvania-Carlisle Barracks	750,000	5,000,000
Texas-Fort Hood	4,350,000	29,000,000
Virginia-Fort Eustis	5,800,000	39,000,000
Germany-Ansbach	3,150,000	21,000,000
Germany-Bamberg	860,000	5,700,000

FISCAL YEAR 2000 TROOP HOUSING PROJECTS—Continued

Location	Request	Recommended
Germany-Bamberg	1,400,000	9,300,000
Germany-Bamberg	1,230,000	8,200,000
Germany-Mannheim	675,000	4,500,000
Korea-Camp Casey	4,650,000	31,000,000
Subtotal, Army	81,273,000	451,700,000
Navy/Marine Corps:		
California-Camp Pendleton MCB	2,390,000	9,740,000
California-Twentynine Palms	4,840,000	19,130,000
California-San Diego CA NH	5,470,000	21,590,000
California-Naval Hospital Twentynine Palms	1,930,000	7,640,000
Hawaii-Pearl Harbor Naval Station	4,720,000	18,600,000
Illinois-Great Lakes Naval Training Center	7,700,000	31,410,000
Maine-Brunswick NAS	4,270,000	16,890,000
Mississippi-Gulfport	1,600,000	6,310,000
Mississippi-Gulfport	3,260,000	12,860,000
Texas-Fort Worth Naval Air Station	0	6,000,000
Virginia-Quantico	5,270,000	20,820,000
Virginia-Dam Neck	2,610,000	10,310,000
Virginia-Norfolk NSY	4,460,000	17,630,000
Bahrain Island-SW Asia	6,230,000	24,550,000
Bahrain Island-SW Asia	5,840,000	23,770,000
Subtotal, Navy	60,590,000	247,250,000
Air Force:		
Alabama-Maxwell AFB	0	10,600,000
Alaska-Elmendorf AFB	3,727,000	15,800,000
Florida-Eglin Auxiliary Field 9	2,161,000	9,100,000
Florida-Eglin AFB	1,635,000	7,000,000
Mississippi-Keesler AFB	4,679,000	19,900,000
Nebraska-Offutt AFB	1,941,000	8,300,000
Oklahoma-Tinker AFB	1,602,000	6,800,000
Texas-Lackland AFB	1,257,000	5,300,000
Virginia-Langley AFB	1,486,000	6,300,000
Korea-Osan AB	3,482,000	12,000,000
Subtotal, Air Force	21,970,000	101,100,000
Total	163,833,000	800,050,000

Child Development Centers

The Committee has recommended an additional $18,361,000 above the budget estimate of $2,159,000 for a total appropriation of $20,520,000 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 Department is encouraged to maintain all efforts possible to meet 80 percent of the child care need.

The following child development center projects are provided for fiscal year 2000:

FISCAL YEAR 2000 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

Location	Request	Recommended
Navy:		
Arizona-Yuma Marine Corps Air Station	640,000	2,620,000
Subtotal, Navy	640,000	2,620,000
Air Force:		
Colorado-Schriever AFB	0	6,700,000
Texas-Dyess AFB	0	5,400,000
United Kingdom-Royal Air Force Lakenheath	1,519,000	5,800,000
Subtotal, Air Force	1,519,000	17,900,000
Total	2,159,000	20,520,000

Hospital and Medical Facilities

The budget request includes $63,967,000 for 24 projects and for unspecified minor construction to provide hospital and medical support facilities, including both treatment facilities and medical support facilities. The Committee has recommended an additional $101,370,000 above the budget estimate of $63,967,000 for a total appropriation of $165,337,000 for hospital and medical facilities.

The following hospital and medical facilities are recommended for fiscal year 2000:

Location	Project title	Request	Recommended
Alaska-Fort Wainwright	Hospital Replacement, Phase I	18,000,000	18,000,000
Arizona-Davis Monthan AFB	Ambulatory Health Care Center Add/Alter	2,400,000	10,000,000
California-Los Angeles AFB	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	2,400,000	13,600,000
California-Travis AFB	WRM Warehouse/Engineering Support Facility.	2,000,000	7,500,000
Florida-Jacksonville Naval Air Station	Branch Medical/Dental Clinic Add/Alter	780,000	3,780,000
Florida-Patrick AFB	Medical Logistics Facility Replacement	200,000	1,750,000
Florida-Pensacola Naval Air Station	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,300,000	4,300,000
Georgia-Moody AFB	WRM Warehouse/BEE Facility	200,000	1,250,000
Kansas-Fort Riley	Consolidated Troop Medical Clinic	1,060,000	6,000,000
Maryland-Andrews AFB	Medical Logistics Facility Add/Alter	2,000,000	3,000,000
Maryland-Patuxent River Naval Air Station	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,200,000	4,150,000
North Carolina-Cherry Point MCAS	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,000,000	3,500,000
Ohio-Wright Patterson AFB	Occupational Health Clinic/BEE Replacement	2,800,000	3,900,000
Texas-Fort Sam Houston	Veterinary Instructional Facility	600,000	5,800,000
Virginia-Cheatham Annex	FHSO Container Holding Yard	500,000	1,650,000
Virginia-Norfolk Naval Air Station	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,150,000	4,050,000
Washington-Fort Lewis	North Fort Lewis Dental Clinic Replacement	4,950,000	5,500,000
Washington-Whidbey Island Naval Air Station.	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,300,000	4,700,000
Germany-Ramstein Air Base	Dental Clinic Addition/Alteration	2,550,000	7,100,000
Korea-Yongsan	Hospital Addition/Replacement	9,570,000	38,570,000
Korea-Yongsan	Medical Supply/Equip Storage Warehouse Repl.	2,300,000	2,550,000
Puerto Rico-Sabana Seca Naval Security Group Act.	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	1,120,000	4,000,000
United Kingdom-Royal Air Force Lakenheath	Dental Clinic Addition/Alteration	1,000,000	7,100,000
Worldwide-Various Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,587,000	3,587,000
Total		63,967,000	165,337,000

Environmental Compliance Projects

The total budget request and appropriation for 14 projects needed to meet environmental compliance is $16,728,000. 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 Committee has approved the request of $17,728,000 in full. In order to help address these Class I violations, an additional $50,782,000 is recommended. The total appropriation for environmental compliance projects in this bill is $68,510,000.

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

Installation	Project title	Request	Recommended
Army:			
Fort Wainwright, AK	Emissions Reduction Facility	2,300,000	15,500,000
Fort Lewis, WA	Tank Trail Erosion Mitigation, Yakima Range Ph V.	2,000,000	2,000,000
Navy:			
NSY Pearl Harbor, HI	Abrasive Blast and Paint Shop	2,690,000	10,610,000
NSWC Div, Indian Head, MD	Sewage Treatment Plant	2,550,000	10,070,000
Air Force:			
Falcon AFS, CO	Sanitary Sewer Line	1,296,000	5,500,000
Andersen AFB, GU	Landfill Closure	2,097,000	8,900,000
Hickam AFB, HI	Fire Training Facility	785,000	3,300,000
RAF Feltwell, UK	Wastewater Treatment Facility	786,000	3,000,000
RAF Mildenhall, UK	Hazardous Materials Storage Facility	267,000	1,000,000
RAF Molesworth, UK	Wastewater Treatment Facility	445,000	1,700,000
Defense Logistics Agency:			
Various Locations	Conforming Storage Facility	1,300,000	1,300,000
Air National Guard:			
Savannah IAP, GA	Regional Fire Training Facility	368,000	1,700,000
Navy Reserve:			
NAS Willow Grove, PA	Hazardous Materials Storage Facility	320,000	1,930,000
Air Force Reserve:			
Homestead AFB, FL	Fire Fighting Training Facility	524,000	2,000,000
Total		17,728,000	68,510,000

Transfer Authority

The budget request proposed a general provision which would allow the transfer of up to $67,000,000 between any accounts in the bill, and this could be accomplished at the determination of the Secretary of Defense and upon the approval of OMB. Congress would be given an "after the fact" notification. The Committee believes that the existing reprogramming procedures are sufficient in solving urgent, high priority funding problems within available resources and denies this request.

Annualization of Supervision, Inspection, and Overhead

The Department has requested that funding for supervision, inspection and overhead (SIOH) of military construction projects be

annualized over several fiscal years, as opposed to the long-standing practice of fully funding these costs with the projects in the initial budget year. The Committee recognizes the SIOH as required by 10 U.S.C. 2851 and 10 U.S.C. 18233 is necessary for the efficient, expeditious and cost-effective completion of military construction projects. Without adequate and timely funding, SIOH cannot keep pace with construction placement, and this would pose an unacceptable risk of work suspension and delay costs to the government. Annualization would make budgeting and management of these funds more difficult and potentially more costly since SIOH funding for each project must be appropriated and accounted for across several fiscal years. Since annualization merely defers obligation authority and does not save SIOH funds, the Committee concludes that fully funding SIOH in the initial budget year of a construction project is the most cost effective and efficient method for ensuring continuity of these critical activities and completion of the project. Thus, the Committee does not approve the annualized method of financing SIOH and, in providing appropriations for fiscal year 2000 military construction projects, has provided funds in fiscal year 2000 to cover the full cost of SIOH. Further, the Committee directs the Department to include full SIOH funding in the initial budget year when requesting construction funds for future year projects.

PRIVATIZATION OF UTILITY SYSTEMS

Section 2688 of Title 10, United States Code, provides authority to convey to the private sector all Defense utility systems, including electric, water, waste water, and natural gas, as well as steam, hot and chilled water, and telecommunications systems. The Defense Reform Initiative directed all utility systems be privatized unless uneconomical or exempt for security reasons by 2003. The objective of the Department is to get out of the business of owning, managing and operating utility systems through privatization.

While supporting the privatization of military utility systems, the Committee is concerned that sale of these systems may result in a substantial increase in long-term utility costs to the Government and a concomitant increase in O&M requirements. For instance, Committee investigators determined at Fort Lewis, Washington, that privatization of on-base utilities and subsequent capitalization and improvement of utilities infrastructure will double utilities cost to the Government. Although it is too early to determine the cost to the Government of utilities privatization, the Committee urges the Department to study carefully the economic consequences of privatization before divesting the Government's interest in any military utility system. Additionally, the Committee encourages the Department to assure the military services are coordinating their utility privatization efforts in co-located areas.

CONTINGENCY FUNDING

The Committee believes that the amount requested for construction contingencies, 5 percent for new construction and 10 percent for alterations or additions, is excessive. The Committee supports the requirement established for unforeseen needs, such as environ-

mental and regulatory requirements, unanticipated subsurface requirements conditions and changes in the bid climate. However, the Committee has learned that this contingency funding is being used to fund upgrades on projects, which have already been awarded and satisfy the basic requirement. Therefore, the Committee has included a provision (Section 128) which reduces the funding available for contingency within the Department. The Committee believes this funding will be sufficient to satisfy the Department of Defense contingency requirement.

SUPPORT FOR DEPLOYED TROOPS

The Committee has been made aware of the Department's intent to construct two base camps that will house the troops deployed with the NATO peacekeeping force in Kosovo. The Committee has a long history of supporting quality of life issues for deployed troops. However, the Committee has not been notified by the Department of Defense of the exact intent, details, schedule, cost, and source of funds for this effort. In particular, the Committee is concerned over the use of operation and maintenance funds for camps which may be permanent in nature. The Department is reminded of Section 110 contained in Public Law 105–237 which prohibits construction of new bases overseas without prior notification to this Committee.

EUROPEAN CONSTRUCTION

For the past seven years, as we have quadrupled our military operations in Europe, we have spent less than $100 million per year for European Construction, compared to $650 million per year in the 1980's. Yet, less than one percent of the fiscal year 2000 budget request is for mission critical facilities in Europe. The United States European Command is faced with a $4.7 billion backlog in maintenance and repair. This lack of funding and the numerous deployments and contingency operations over the past few years has put an enormous amount of stress on the infrastructure in the region. Through the inclusion of $475,000,000 in the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, the Congress has recognized the severe need for facility upgrades in the European theatre. The Department is directed to appropriately budget to correct these deficiencies.

FORWARD OPERATING LOCATIONS

The fiscal year 2000 budget request included $42,800,000 for three forward deployment sites using funds from the "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense" appropriation. Due to the presentation of the budget request, it is the Committee's intent to deal with this matter in the Defense Appropriations bill. In the future, the Committee directs that future needs for military construction be requested under the "Military Construction, Defense-wide" account.

GAS VALVES IN FEDERAL FACILITIES

The current standard of gas valves in government facilities may pose a significant danger to federal facilities. The Committee is concerned about fires or explosions which could be caused by breaks in natural and propane gas lines in Federal facilities as a result of seismic activity, floods, tornadoes, and other natural and man-made disasters. The Committee directs the Department to ensure that appropriate gas valves are in place that will protect personnel and facilities from all types of disasters due to gas explosions or fires. The Committee believes that a safety cut-off valve that halts the flow of gas whenever there is a break in the line and keeps gas shut off until repairs are made could save lives and prevent millions of dollars in property loss. The Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report on the progress being made to ensure that appropriate gas valves are in place by January 15, 2000.

ALKALI SILICA REACTIVITY

The Corps of Engineers has selected Fort Campbell, Kentucky as the initial defense installation to mitigate/prevent the deletrious effects of alkali silica reactivity (ASR) associated with concrete aprons, taxiways, and tarmacs. However, the Committee recommends that the Corps, in conjunction with the Department of Defense, undertake a broader investigation of ASR problems at all domestic defense installations. Further, the Committee understands the Corps has already developed a list of high priority sites where ASR problems exist. The investigation should continue the prioritization of sites and include the development of specifications to prevent and mitigate ASR in new and existing concrete structures as well as associated cost estimates per installation. The Committee directs the Department to report to congressional defense committees on its strategy to deal with ASR no later than March 15, 2000.

REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE

The Department is directed to continue to provide the real property maintenance backlog at all installations for which there is a requested construction project in future budget submissions. This information is to be provided on Form 1390. In addition, for all troop housing requests, the Form 1391 is to continue to show all real property maintenance conducted in the past two years and all future requirements for unaccompanied housing at that installation.

REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE: REPORTING REQUIREMENT

The Committee continues to expect the general rules for repairing a facility under Operation and Maintenance account funding will be as follows:

Components of the facility may be repaired by replacement, and such replacement can be up to current standards or codes.

Interior arrangements and restorations may be included as repair, but additions, new facilities, and functional conversions must be performed as military construction projects.

Such projects may be done concurrent with repair projects, as long as the final conjunctively funded project is a complete and usable facility.

The appropriate Service Secretary shall submit a 21-day notification prior to carrying out any repair project with an estimated cost in excess of $10,000,000.

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.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING

The Committee relies on officials in the Department of Defense to provide the most honest assessment of competing facilities needs, based on the most informed judgment of military requirements. The Committee understands and supports the process the Department employs to identify requirements, to prioritize those requirements, and to live within budgetary constraints. It is the view of the Committee that the best way to accomplish this task is to have a disciplined long-range planning process, with annual adjustments to meet changing circumstances. The Committee supports efforts within the Services and within the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to formulate and present a coherent Future Years Defense Plan at the project level of detail, and encourages efforts to reconcile annual adjustments in this plan.

METRIC CONVERSION

The Committee directs the Comptroller of the Department of Defense to assure that any Form 1390/1391 which is presented as justification in metric measurement shall include parenthetically the English measurement.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999:	
Appropriation	$865,726,000
Emergency Appropriations (P.L. 105–277)	118,000,000
Total	983,726,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	656,003,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	1,223,405,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+239,679,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	+567,402,000

The Committee recommends a total of $1,223,405,000 for Military Construction, Army for fiscal year 2000. This is an increase of $567,402,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2000, and an increase of $239,679,000 above the appropriation for 1999.

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM

The budget request proposes that a total of $267,100,000 should be appropriated under the "Military Construction, Army" account

for chemical demilitarization facilities. As in prior years, the Committee recommends that these amounts be appropriated under the "Military Construction, Defense-wide" account, in order to facilitate the tracking of expenses for the Chemical Demilitarization Program, and to avoid distorting the size of the Army's military construction program. It is the Committee's view that this is an accounting decision, and that it will have no impact on the operation of the program or on administrative overhead expenses within the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

KENTUCKY-FORT KNOX: BASIC TRAINING FACILITIES

The Committee is aware that the number of recruits being assigned to Fort Knox for basic training is increasing. As those levels continue increasing, the need for adequate accommodations to support trainees will become a priority. The Committee is encouraged to learn that the Army is developing plans to establish trainee barracks complexes that will provide a full range of support needs for trainees. However, it is unclear to the Committee how or when the Army will implement these plans. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army is directed to report by January 15, 2000 on (1) the future of basic training at Fort Knox, and; (2) the status and plans for implementation of any basic training complex proposals at Fort Knox.

NEW YORK-U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY: CADET PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

The Department of the Army estimates its current backlog of physical fitness centers to be $219,300,000. This backlog consists of 30 different projects at an average cost of $7,310,000. In spite of this backlog, the Army is in the midst of a three phase, multi-year project to revitalize, by partial replacement, the Arvin Cadet Physical Development Center at the U.S. Military Academy, New York. The total cost of this project is estimated at $85,000,000, more than 10 times the average cost for a physical fitness center. In fiscal year 1999, Congress appropriated $12,000,000 for the first phase of this project. Phase II and III are currently under design and plan to be awarded as an incrementally funded contract for $73,000,000.

The Committee recommends deferring $28,500,000 budgeted for phase II of this project in fiscal year 2000. In order for the Department to the Army to address its backlog of physical fitness centers, the Committee believes the Army needs to explore the possibility of funding at least 50% of the contract for Phases II and III utilizing a non-appropriated fund account and/or alumni contributions. Funds made available by this funding approach should be reprogrammed to reduce the physical fitness center backlog. The Secretary of the Army is directed to report to the Committee by January 15, 2000 on the feasibility of using a non-appropriated fund account or alumni contributions to partially fund this project and the plan for addressing the Army's current backlog of physical fitness centers.

In addition, the Committee has redirected $12,000,000 of this request to two physical fitness centers for the Army in Korea.

GERMANY-LANDSTUHL HOSPITAL: CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER

The Committee is very concerned over the poor ventilation, insufficient day light, flooding in the basement pre-school and Kindergarten rooms, and various other safety and health hazards at the Landstuhl Child Development Center. The Committee understands $2,950,000 is necessary for a replacement child development center and directs the Army to use design build and to program this facility in the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

Fiscal year 1999:	
Appropriation	$602,593,000
Emergency Appropriations (P.L. 105–277)	5,860,000
Total	608,453,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	319,786,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	968,862,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+360,409,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	+649,076,000

The Committee recommends a total of $968,862,000 for Military Construction, Navy for fiscal year 2000. This is an increase of $649,076,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2000, and an increase of $360,409,000 above the appropriation for fiscal year 1999.

CALIFORNIA-CONCORD NAVAL WEAPONS STATION

Earlier this year, the Navy announced that the Army would take over the main operations at the Concord Naval Weapons Station. The Committee is aware the Army and Navy have confirmed that they are planning a dramatic reduction of force at the station. The significant downsizing at the station raised the issue of potential use of the property by the surrounding community. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a study examining the potential for joint use and outgrants of the Concord Naval Weapons Station, by civilian and military entities that is consistent with the missions of the Navy and Army and the needs of the surrounding community. The study shall be conducted by the Navy in conjunction with the Army and the cities of Concord, Martinez, and Pittsburgh, Contra Costa County, the communities of Clyde and Bay Point, and the East Bay Regional Parks District. The report is to be submitted to the Committee no later that January 15, 2000.

CALIFORNIA-LEMOORE NAVAL AIR STATION: QUALITY OF LIFE CONDITIONS

The Committee is concerned that living conditions at Lemoore Naval Air Station have become a serious impediment to the base's growth and are incompatible with the increased flight activity and personnel associated with the establishment of five squadrons of the new F/A–18E Super Hornet Fighter aircraft at the installation. Lemoore NAS currently supports 27,000 military, civilian, dependent, and retired personnel. It is estimated this number will grow to 33,000 over the next five years. Because of its increasing population, secluded location and deteriorating facilities, quality of life projects and pilot retention rates have become critically important

to the future of the base. The Committee has been informed that a recent survey at Lemoore confirmed that the living conditions diminish morale and threaten pilot retention rates if they are not addressed. Considering the cost of training these pilots, as well as the critical importance of the F/A–18's to the Navy's future, the Navy is directed to accelerate the design of quality of life projects at Lemoore NAS, and to include the required construction funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request. Additionally, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to report to the Committee by January 15, 2000 on the plan and schedule for addressing the critical quality of life conditions at Lemoore NAS.

CALIFORNIA-PORT HUENEME: COMBAT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION LAB

The Navy is directed to accelerate the design of the Combat Systems Integration Lab at the Port Hueneme Division of the Naval Surface Warfare Center, and to include funding for this project in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

HAWAII-PEARL HARBOR NAVAL STATION: CINCPAC HEADQUARTERS (PHASE I)

The Committee denies $15,870,000 for the budgeted Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Fleet (CINCPACFLT) Headquarters. This amount would provide the first phase of an $86,050,000 project to construct a headquarters in support of CINCPACFLT and associated command elements at Camp H.M. Smith, Hawaii. The Committee recommendation is based on authority recommended in section 2802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000 to further the development of Ford Island, Hawaii. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to report to the Committee by January 15, 2000 on the feasibility of using authorities granted for the development of Ford Island in relocating the CINCPACFLT headquarters to that site.

NEW JERSEY-EARLE NAVAL WEAPONS STATION: PIER 2

Pier and Trestle 2 located at Naval Weapons Station Earle, New Jersey was built in 1944. The Committee has learned that structural testing and engineering analyses of the pier have found major areas of deterioration. Accordingly, the Committee has concerns about the safety of conducting operations at Pier 2. Therefore, the Navy is directed to accelerate the design of this project, and to include the required construction funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

PUERTO RICO-ROOSEVELT ROADS NAVAL STATION

More than 40 years ago, the Navy acquired land abutting Roosevelt Roads Naval Station from the Municipality of Ceiba, Puerto Rico. Concerned about reports that this land had never been utilized and aware of proposals by the City of Ceiba to utilize the unused land, the Committee directed the Navy to report on plans for taking appropriate cooperative actions for land utilization in the fiscal year 1998 Military Construction Appropriations Bill. In the report submitted to the Committee, the Navy stated they would work with the City of Ceiba regarding increased use of the land.

The Committee continues to be concerned with reports that this land dispute has not been resolved. Furthermore, the Committee is aware the City of Ceiba has developed several cooperative use proposals and would like to reach an agreement with the Navy on a mutually beneficial plan for this land. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to report to the Committee by January 15, 2000 on plans and schedule for developing, in cooperation with the Municipality of Ceiba, a plan agreeable to both the Navy and City of Ceiba to resolve this land dispute.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999:	
Appropriation	$612,809,000
Emergency Appropriations (P.L. 105–277)	29,200,000
Total	642,009,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	179,479,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	752,367,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+110,358,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	+572,888,000

The Committee recommends a total of $752,367,000 for Military Construction, Air Force for fiscal year 2000. This is an increase of $572,888,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2000, and an increase of $110,358,000 above the appropriation for fiscal year 1999.

KANSAS-MCCONNELL: BASE CIVIL ENGINEER COMPLEX

The Air Force is directed to accelerate the design of the Base Civil Engineer Complex at McConnell AFB, and to include the required construction funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

OKLAHOMA-TINKER AFB: PRIMARY RUNWAY

The primary runway at Tinker AFB was installed in 1942 and has reached the end of its useful life. The Committee is concerned this runway will no longer be able to serve the needs of the base if it is not replaced. Additionally, increased use of an alternative runway would not only diminish the base's operational capabilities, but would require use of a flight path that would greatly increase noise and safety concerns in local communities. Therefore, the Air Force is directed to accelerate the design of this project, and to include the required construction funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

GERMANY-RAMSTEIN AB: PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER

The Committee is aware of the severe need for a new physical fitness center at Ramstein AB and understands this is very high on USAFE's priority list. Current facilities are over 45 years of age, overcrowded, and require constant repair and maintenance. Lack of offbase facilities further complicates the need for maintaining physical fitness levels. The Secretay of the Air Force is directed to seek funding for this facility with the funds provided in the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$551,114,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	193,005,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	755,718,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+204,604,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	+562,713,000

The Committee recommends a total of $755,718,000 for Military Construction, Defense-wide for fiscal year 2000. This is an increase of $562,713,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2000 and an increase of $204,604,000 above the appropriation for fiscal year 1999.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM

The budget request includes a total of $267,100,000 for the following funding increments for the chemical weapons demilitarization program for fiscal year 2000:

State	Installation	Project	Request	Recommended
Alabama	Anniston AD	Ammunition demilitarization facility (Phase VII).	7,000,000	7,000,000
Arkansas	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition demilitarization facility (Phase IV).	61,800,000	61,800,000
Colorado	Pueblo AD	Ammunition demilitarization facility (Phase I).	11,800,000	11,800,000
Indiana	Newport AAP	Ammunition demilitarization facility (Phase II).	61,200,000	61,200,000
Kentucky	Blue Grass AD	Ammunition demilitarization facility (Phase I).	11,800,000	11,800,000
Kentucky	Blue Grass AD	Ammunition demilitarization support	11,000,000	11,000,000
Maryland	Aberdeen Proving Ground.	Ammunition demilitarization facility (Phase II).	66,600,000	66,600,000
Oregon	Umatilla AD	Ammunition demilitarization facility (Phase V).	35,900,000	35,900,000
Total			267,100,000	267,100,000

The budget request proposes that these amounts should be appropriated under the "Military Construction, Army" account. As in prior years, the Committee recommends that these amounts be appropriated under the "Military Construction, Defense-wide" account, in order to facilitate the tracking of expenses for the Chemical Demilitarization Program, and to avoid distorting the size of the Army's military construction program.

The following chart displays the scope of the military construction investment in the overall chemical demilitarization program:

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM MILITARY CONSTRUCTION COSTS

[Current year dollars in millions/fiscal year]

Project	Fiscal years—							Total
	1998 and prior	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	
PM-Chem Demil Training Facility	16.1							16.10
Tooele, UT Facility	198.0							198.00
Anniston, AL Facility	174.2		7.0					181.20
Umatilla, OR Facility	144.63	23.95	35.9					204.48
Pine Bluff, AR Facility	59.0	9.0	61.8	34.4				164.20

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM MILITARY CONSTRUCTION COSTS—Continued

[Current year dollars in millions/fiscal year]

Project	Fiscal years—							Total
	1998 and prior	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	
Pueblo, CO [1] Facility	6.3	.....	11.8	51.0	96.2	33.9	9.0	208.20
Blue Grass, KY [1] Facility	.....	.....	22.8	51.0	91.1	30.7	9.0	204.60
Aberdeen, MD Facility	.....	28.35	66.6	78.3	11.4	.....	.....	184.65
Newport, IN Facility	.....	13.5	61.2	75.3	39.9	.....	.....	189.90
Planning & Design	114.5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	114.50
Total	712.73	74.8	267.1	290.0	238.6	64.6	18.0	1,665.83

[1] Funding requirement may change pending assessment of Assembled Chemical Weapon Assessment Program in consonance with Public Law 104–208.

The following chart displays the timetable and the milestones for completion of the chemical demilitarization program:

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM TIMETABLE AND MILESTONES

Locaiton	Start of construction	Start of systemization [4]	Operations
Johnston Atoll [1]	.....	.....	3QFY90–4QFY00
Tooele, UT	.....	.....	4QFY96–4QFY03
Anniston, AL	3QFY97	2QFY00	2QFY02–1QFY06
Umatilla, OR	3QFY97	3QFY00	2QFY02–3QFY05
Pine Bluff, AR	2QFY99	4QFY01	4QFY03–1QFY07
Pueblo, CO [2]	On Hold	.....	
Blue Grass, KY [2]	On Hold	.....	
Aberdeen, MD [3]	1QFY00	3QFY02	2QFY04–1QFY05
Newport, IN [3]	1QFY00	4QFY02	3QFY04–1QFY05

[1] Full-scale operations began 2QFY94.
[2] Schedule on-hold as directed by Public Law 104–208 pending technology evaluation by Program Manager for Assembled Chemical Weapon Assessment.
[3] Schedule represents employment of neutralization-based technology.
[4] Some systemization activities are started in the construction phase.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

In future budget submissions, the Committee will expect project-level information on the Energy Conservation Investment Program (ECIP) to be presented in tabular form, rather than in Form 1391 level of detail.

MARYLAND-UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES (USUHS)

The Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences had been precluded from participating in the Military Construction Program from September 1993 until December 1997, when the Secretary of Defense determined that the University should remain open. The Committee is aware that on April 4, 1997 the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs validated the need for the construction of a fifth building at USUHS in fiscal year 2001. The fifth building would eliminate leasing costs and consolidate Graduate School of Nursing/Conference Center functions on the campus, thereby increasing staffing efficiency, the use of distance learning, and the effectiveness of the educational environment. The Tricare Management Agency is directed to accelerate the design of this

project, and to include the required construction funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY UNACCOMPANIED HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

MILITARY UNACCOMPANIED HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

The budget request proposed a general provision, which would allow the transfer of funds from the military construction accounts to the Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund. The Committee has always supported privatization and encourages the Department to continue to explore the feasibility of this initiative. However, due to the absence of any programmed or anticipated projects under this fund, the Committee denies the Department's request for transfer authority and encourages the Department to properly budget for any future unaccompanied housing privatization efforts.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, RESERVE COMPONENTS

Fiscal year 1999:	
Appropriation	$486,715,000
Emergency Supplemental Appropriation (P.L. 105–277)	18,400,000
Total	505,115,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	77,572,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	496,637,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 total appropriation	−8,478,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	+419,065,000

The Committee recommends a total of $496,637,000 for Military Construction, Reserve Components for fiscal year 2000. This is an increase of $419,065,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2000, and a decrease of $8,478,000 below the total appropriation for fiscal year 1999.

The Committee's recommended action on each Reserve Component 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	$16,045,000	$135,129,000
Air National Guard	21,319,000	180,870,000
Army Reserve	23,120,000	92,515,000
Naval Reserve	4,933,000	21,574,000
Air Force Reserve	12,155,000	66,549,000
Total	77,572,000	496,637,000

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT—BACKLOG

The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army and the Director of the Army National Guard to continue to make a joint report annually on the current backlog of facilities requirements of the Army National Guard to be submitted concurrently with the annual budget request.

ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT—ARMORY INFRASTRUCTURE

The Secretary of the Army, the Director of the National Guard Bureau, and the Director of the Army National Guard are directed to continue to report jointly to the Committee by January 1, 2000 on the status of armory infrastructure.

ARIZONA-PEORIA AND YUMA: READINESS CENTERS AND ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP

The Committee directs the National Guard Bureau to prepare itemized costs for design, construction and land for community-based Readiness Centers in the Arizona cities of Yuma and Peoria. The Peoria center plan should also include an Organization Maintenance Shop and the Yuma center plan should incorporate the proposed partnership between the community and the Guard. Both the Peoria and Yuma facilities are urgently needed in order that the Arizona Army National Guard can be prepared for activation and deployment; whereas existing facilities do not promote the mission.

GEORGIA-FORT STEWART: STORM DAMAGE

The Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act for fiscal year 1998 dated May 1, 1998 (P.L. 105–574) appropriated $3,700,000 for the Army National Guard to demolish and replace buildings destroyed by storm damage at Fort Stewart, Georgia. These funds were designated as an emergency and were only available for obligation during fiscal year 1998. The Army National Guard failed to obligate the money in fiscal year 1998 and the funds expired. The Committee has learned there is still a requirement to replace these buildings at Fort Stewart, Georgia. If this project is a requirement to the Army National Guard, the Committee directs the Army National Guard to use the normal reprogramming procedures to meet the requirement or include the required funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

OKLAHOMA-SAND SPRINGS: ARMED SERVICES RESERVE CENTER

The Army National Guard is directed to accelerate the design of the Armed Services Reserve Center project at Sand Springs, Oklahoma, and to include the required construction funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

NEW YORK-HANCOCK FIELD: READINESS CENTER ADDITION

The Army National Guard is directed to accelerate the design of the Readiness Center Addition at Hancock Field, New York, and to include the required construction funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

MASSACHUSETTS-BARNES AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE: SUPPORT FACILITY

The Army National Guard is currently relocating a UH–1 helicopter unit to the Barnes Air National Guard Base in Massachusetts. The Committee has learned space is required to support the UH–1 helicopter unit in the base's Army Aviation Support Facility

(AASF). Therefore, within funds provided for Unspecified Minor Construction, the Committee directs the Army National Guard to execute a project in the amount of $1,233,000 to provide a support facility for the unit at the Barnes Air National Guard Base.

WASHINGTON-BREMERTON: READINESS CENTER

The Army National Guard is directed to accelerate the design of the Readiness Center at Bremerton, Washington, and to include the required construction funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

WISCONSIN-GENERAL MITCHELL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON

Currently, the 128th Air Refueling Wing stationed at General Mitchell International Airport in Wisconsin has ten aircraft, with one more scheduled for delivery this year. The existing aircraft parking apron has parking spots for eight aircraft. As a result, within funds provided for Unspecified Minor Construction, the Committee directs the Air National Guard to execute a project in the amount of $1,500,000 to provide an addition to the aircraft parking apron at the General Mitchell International Airport.

WISCONSIN-VOLK FIELD: AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWER

The current air traffic control tower located at Volk Field, Wisconsin does not provide ample space for equipment or an adequate line-of-sight. Additionally, the facility is in a serious state of deterioration in spite of previous efforts to maintain, repair and improve it. Therefore, the Air National Guard is directed to accelerate the design of this project and include the required construction funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

NAVAL RESERVE

UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION

Within funds provided for Unspecified Minor Construction, the Committee directs the Naval Reserve to execute a project in the amount of $720,000 to provide a fire training facility at the Fort Worth Joint Reserve Base in Texas.

FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PLAN

It is the Committee's view that section 123 of Public Law 104–196 constitutes a continuing permanent requirement for the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard to present the Future Years Defense Plan to Congress concurrent with the President's budget submission for each fiscal year. The Committee will expect subsequent submissions of the Future Years Defense Plan to include explanatory notes justifying any modification of prior year plans.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Fiscal year 1999:	
Appropriation	$155,000,000
Revised Economic Assumption	−1,000,000
Total	154,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	191,000,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	81,000,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−73,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	−110,000,000

The Committee recommends a total of $81,000,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP). This is a decrease of $110,000,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $73,000,000 below the appropriation for fiscal year 1999. The Committee notes that the actual requirement for the NATO Security Investment Program has been reduced to $172,000,000 since the budget request was provided to the committee. Therefore, the Committee expects the Department to use funds that were appropriated in the Fiscal Year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31) to provide adequate funding for this account in accordance with the amount authorized for fiscal year 2000.

The Department of Defense is directed to continue to report to the Committees on Appropriations, on a quarterly basis, the following information:

(1) NATO nations share 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 costs, the U.S. cost share and all other NATO nations cost shares.

NATO EXPANSION

The Committee continues the requirement that no funds will be used for projects (including planning and design) related to the enlargement of NATO and the Partnership for Peace, unless Congress is notified 21 days in advance of the obligation of funds. In addition, the Committee's intent is that Section 110 of the General Provisions shall apply to this program.

The Department of Defense is directed to identify separately the level of effort anticipated for NATO enlargement and for Partnership for Peace for that fiscal year in future budget justifications.

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 expecta-

tions for the availability, size and amenities of family housing. At the same time, the Department is 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 $34,200 to recruit, enlist, and train a member of the Army 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. 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 of all military families do 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 80 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 313,000 on-base housing units in its inventory, with an average age of 35 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 fifty percent of the inventory, or 184,715 units, is in need of major improvements or replacement at a total cost of $15,195,634,000.

Unsuitable units require a major investment in maintenance and repair 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 face 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. When

housing units are not adequately maintained, eventually they must be closed and abandoned or demolished. 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.

Aside from the problems confronting the current inventory, the Department estimates a new construction deficit of 52,715 units at a cost of $5,619,850,000. 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 over $20,815,484,000 to correct the existing problem.

The following chart provides a Service breakout of the current family housing deficit, both in units and in cost of new construction, replacement, improvements and deferred maintenance and repair:

DEFICITS (CURRENT PROJECTIONS)

[Dollars in thousands]

	New construction	Replacement	Improvement	Grand total
Army:				
Number of Units [1]	10,442	36,244	52,612	99,298
Costs [2]	$1,350,000	$3,440,000	$2,500,000	$7,290,000
Navy:				
Number of Units	15,900	4,450	21,200	41,550
Costs [3]	$731,400	$689,750	$1,144,750	$2,565,900
Marine Corps:				
Number of Units	10,373	3,724	30,000	44,097
Costs	$1,490,450	$706,222	$2,430,000	$4,626,672
Air Force:				
Number of Units	16,000	29,000	7,485	52,485
Costs	$2,048,000	$3,712,000	$572,912	$6,332,912
Total DoD:				
Number of Units	52,715	73,418	111,297	237,430
Costs	$5,619,850	$8,547,972	$6,647,662	$20,815,484

[1] Based on end of fiscal year 1998 inventory of 116,916 on-post houses.

[2] Based on traditional military construction estimates. Actual costs for units in the U.S. to be built/revitalized under privatization are expected to be lower.

[3] The Navy's new construction deficit reflects the total family housing shortage. The Navy plans to rely on an overall strategy that includes public/private venture initiatives, leasing, aggressive housing referral programs, and the improved Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) to address the total deficit. The cost identified here reflects estimated costs to build out the military construction portion of the total Navy deficit.

CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW

The Committee is concerned over the fiscal year 2000 budget request for family housing new construction and construction improvements of $141,341,000. Housing continues to be a top priority, yet the Department's budget represents a reduction of $558,085,000 or 80%, from the fiscal year 1999 appropriation for new construction and construction improvements. The Committee strongly believes it is imperative that construction funding levels must be maintained, along with any privatization efforts, to help resolve the serious family housing deficits. The Committee recommends total funding of $707,697,000 for family housing construction and improvements for fiscal year 2000, an increase of $566,356,000 above the budget request.

NEW HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

The fiscal year 2000 request is $70,000,000 to build 1545 units of new family housing for all Services. This is $248,703,000 or 78 percent, under the fiscal year 1999 enacted level. The Committee has approved all requested projects for new construction. In addition, the Committee has recommended an additional $84,887,000 to construct 558 units of new family housing. The total appropriation for new construction is $371,085,000. Details of the Committee's recommendations for new construction are provided in this report under the individual component accounts and the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund. 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 $71,341,000 has been requested for post-acquisition construction for all services to improve 3889 housing units. This is a decrease of $309,382,000, or 81 percent, from the fiscal year 1999 enacted level. Post-acquisition construction is focused on modernizing existing units that are uneconomical to repair. In addition, the Committee has provided an additional $265,271,000 for construction improvement projects which are listed in this report under the individual component accounts, to improve an additional 294 units. The total appropriation for post-acquisition construction is $336,612,000 and will improve 4,119 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 fiscal year 2000 request for operation and maintenance expenses totals $2,856,482,000, an increase of $29,389,000 from the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,848,214,000 for fiscal year 2000. These accounts provide for annual expenditures for maintenance and repair, furnishings, management, services, utilities, leasing, interest, mortgage insurance and miscellaneous expenses. Of the total request for

operation and maintenance, $1,283,281,000 is for maintenance and repair of existing housing, an increase of $10,714,000 from fiscal year 1999 levels.

The Committee directs that any savings from foreign currency re-estimations in the family housing operation and maintenance accounts be applied for maintenance of existing family housing units. The Comptroller is directed to report to the Committee on the allocation of this savings by December 1, 1999.

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.

FAMILY HOUSING MASTER PLANS

Section 129 of the bill directs that the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force to submit to the appropriate committees of Congress by June 1, 2000, a Family Housing Master Plan demonstrating how they plan to meet the Department's goal to eliminate all inadequate housing by 2010 with traditional construction, demolition, operation and maintenance support, as well as privatization initiative proposals. Each plan shall include projected life cycle costs for family housing construction, basic allowance for housing, operation and maintenance, demolition, other associated costs, and a time line for housing completions each year. The Committee commends the Air Force for recently completing its two year effort which involved installation visits to document the existing conditions of base housing units, initially assess the feasibility of housing privatization and to produce an installation plan. The Army, Navy and Marine Corps are directed to mirror the Air Force's efforts.

GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER QUARTERS: MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

In previous reports, the Committee has sought to encourage the Department to control the inordinate expenditures associated with maintaining general and flag officer quarters through expense thresholds, reporting requirements and notifications. In spite of these restrictions, the Department's expenditures on general and flag quarters have continued to rise beyond reason. In fact, the Committee has learned that the Navy and Air Force have in recent years supplemented family housing funds with the Services regular operations and maintenance funds on the so-called historic homes.

The Committee is concerned that previously established expense thresholds, reporting requirements and notifications have not controlled the inordinate expenditures associated with maintaining general and flag officer quarters. Therefore, the Committee has no recourse but to include a provision (Section 126) which statutorily prohibits the mixing of operations and maintenance and family housing funds on general and flag officer quarters. Furthermore, not more than $15,000 per unit can be spent annually for the maintenance and repair of any general or flag officer quarters without the prior notification of the appropriate committees of Congress. Out of cycle notifications are prohibited unless justified as emergencies or safety related. Finally, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is required to submit a quarterly report detailing the total amount spent on operation and maintenance of individual general and flag officer quarters to the appropriate committees of Congress.

Additionally, each Service Secretary is directed to submit a detailed report to the Committee no later than September 15, 1999 that identifies the total costs associated with maintenance of general and flag officer living quarters for the past five fiscal years. Each report should provide a determination as to whether recent funding practices for maintaining general officer quarters have been in violation of current law and what, if any, corrective actions against the responsible parties have been taken by the Service to preclude future occurrences of these violations.

General and Flag Officer Quarters: Change in Occupancy Work

The Committee continues the notification requirement when maintenance and repair costs for change in occupancy work for a unit will exceed the amount submitted in the budget justification by 25 percent or $5,000, whichever is less.

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 $15,000 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.

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 1999:	
Appropriation	$1,246,987,000
Emergency Appropriations (P.L. 105–277)	5,200,000
Total	1,252,187,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	1,112,083,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	1,179,012,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−73,175,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	+66,929,000

The Committee recommends a total of $1,179,012,000 for Family Housing, Army for fiscal year 2000. This is an increase of $66,929,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2000, and a decrease of $73,175,000 below the appropriation for fiscal year 1999.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends $49,500,000 for new construction, instead of $4,400,000, as requested, as shown below.

Location/Project	Number of units	Requested	Recommended
Army:			
Virginia-Fort Lee	97	0	16,500
Washington-Fort Lewis	48	0	9,000
Korea-Camp Humphreys	60	4,400	24,000
Subtotal, Army	205	4,400	49,500

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

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

Location/Project	Number of units	Requested	Recommeded
Kentucky-Fort Campbell	26	0	2,800,000
Germany-Hanau	64	1,150,000	7,000,000
Germany-Wiesbaden	198	1,303,000	8,100,000
Germany-Baumholder	162	2,850,000	17,500,000
Total, Army	450	5,303,000	35,400,000

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

The request of $1,098,080,000 has been reduced by $8,268,000, as contained in the House-passed authorization bill. It is the Committee's intent that the appropriations of $469,211,000 for the maintenance of real property not be reduced.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Fiscal year 1999:	
Appropriation	$1,204,883,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105–277)	10,599,000
Total	1,215,482,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	959,675,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	1,207,629,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 total appropriation	−7,853,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	+247,954,000

The Committee recommends a total of $1,207,629,000 for Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps for fiscal year 2000. This is an increase of $247,954,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2000, and a decrease of $7,853,000 below the total appropriation for fiscal year 1999.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends $118,174,000 for new construction, instead of $15,182,000, as requested, as shown below.

Location/Project	Number of units	Requested	Recommended
Navy:			
California-Lemoore Naval Air Station	116	0	20,188
Hawaii-Kaneohe Bay MCAS	100	5,320	26,615
Hawaii-Pearl Harbor Naval Complex	96	3,831	19,167
Hawaii-Pearl Harbor Naval Complex	133	6,031	30,168
North Carolina-Cherry Point MCAS	180	0	22,036
Subtotal, Navy	625	15,182	118,174

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

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

Location/Project	Number of units	Requested	Recommended
Arizona-MCAS Yuma	113	2,724,000	14,364,000
California-CNB San Diego	8	632,000	0
California-MCB Camp Pendleton	100	842,000	4,441,000
California-NAWC China Lake	(1)	822,000	4,139,000
California-Twentynine Palms MCAGCC	692	0	5,100,000
District of Columbia-Marine Barracks 8th & I	1	36,000	181,000
District of Columbia-Marine Barracks 8th & I	1	31,000	158,000
Hawaii-CNB Pearl Harbor (Hospital Point)	19	822,000	4,156,000
Hawaii-CNB Pearl Harbor (Hospital Point)	112	3,572,000	18,055,000
Hawaii-CNB Pearl Harbor (Makalapa)	25	906,000	0
Hawaii-CNB Pearl Harbor (NCTAMS Pacific)	28	737,000	3,730,000
Hawaii-MCB Kaneohe Bay	1	37,000	191,000
Illinois-Great Lakes NTC	127	0	14,400,000
North Carolina-Camp Lejeune	91	0	9,100,000
North Carolina-MCAS Cherry Point	103	397,000	2,024,000
Pennsylvania-Philadelphia NICP	2	0	200,000
South Carolina-Parris Island MCRD	48	0	4,932,000

Location/Project	Number of units	Requested	Recommended
Iceland-NAS Keflavik	101	3,158,000	15,977,000
Japan-NAF Atsugi	7	272,000	0
Japan-NAF Atsugi	96	2,568,000	10,520,000
Japan-NAF Atsugi	36	721,000	2,955,000
Japan-MCAS Iwakuni	44	66,000	310,000
Japan-MCAS Iwakuni	44	397,000	1,882,000
Japan-CFA Saesbo	88	169,000	692,000
Japan-CFA Saesbo	(2)	110,000	447,000
Japan-CNFJ Yokosuka	104	2,776,000	11,374,000
Japan-CNFJ Yokosuka	46	1,120,000	4,588,000
Japan-CNFJ Yokosuka	7	348,000	0
Puerto Rico-NS Roosevelt Roads	294	5,813,000	29,440,000
Marianas Island-PWC Guam	72	2,632,000	13,314,000
Total, Navy	2410	31,708,000	176,670,000

[1] Demolish 120 units.
[2] Site improvements.

NAVY OFFICER HOUSING

The Navy has requested funding for 47 units of senior officer housing in its fiscal year 2000 budget submission. The Committee recommends deferring $10,312,000 budgeted for these units. The projects are as follows:

Location/Project	Number of units	Recommended
California-San Diego CNB-Point Loma	8	−3,185,000
Hawaii-Pearl Harbor CNB-Makalapa	25	−4,582,000
Japan-Atsuga NAF	7	−1,117,000
Japan-Yokosuka CNFJ	7	−1,428,000
Total	47	−10,312,000

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999:	
Appropriation	$1,060,169,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105–277)	22,233,000
Total	1,082,402,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	923,683,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	1,166,888,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 total appropriation	+84,486,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	+243,205,000

The Committee recommends a total of $1,166,888,000 for Family Housing, Air Force for fiscal year 2000. This is an increase of $243,205,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2000, and an increase of $84,486,000 above the total appropriation for fiscal year 1999.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends $203,411,000 for new construction, instead of $50,418,000 as requested, as shown below.

Location/Project	Number of units	Requested	Recommended
Air Force:			
Arizona-Davis-Monthan AFB	64	2,707	10,000

Location/Project	Number of units	Requested	Recommended
California-Beale AFB	60	2,301	8,500
California-Edwards AFB	98	4,404	16,270
California-Edwards AFB	90	4,472	16,520
California-Vandenberg AFB	91	4,548	16,800
District of Columbia-Bolling AFB	48	2,537	9,375
Florida-Eglin AFB	130	3,812	14,080
Florida-MacDill AFB	54	2,446	9,034
Kansas-McConnell AFB	(1)	0	1,363
Mississippi-Columbus AFB	100	3,327	12,290
Montana-Malmstrom AFB	34	2,050	7,570
Nebraska-Offutt AFB	72	3,343	12,352
New Mexico-Hollomon AFB	76	0	9,800
North Carolina-Seymour Johnson AFB	78	3,300	12,187
North Dakota-Grand Forks AFB	42	2,720	10,050
North Dakota-Minot AFB	72	2,912	10,756
Oklahoma-Tinker AFB	41	0	6,000
Texas-Lackland AFB	48	2,030	7,500
Portugal-Lajes AFB	75	3,509	12,964
Subtotal, Air Force	1,273	50,418	203,411

[1] Improve area safety.

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

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

Location/Project	Number of units	Requested	Recommended
Alaska—Elmendorf AFB	76	2,902,000	10,536,000
Arkansas—Little Rock AFB	83	1,156,000	4,196,000
Colorado—USAF Academy	(1)	179,000	650,000
District of Columbia—Bolling AFB	6	125,000	455,000
Florida—Eglin Auxilliary Field 9	(2)	179,000	650,000
Hawaii—Hickam AFB	87	4,655,000	16,900,000
Hawaii—Hickam AFB	62	3,429,000	12,450,000
Maryland—Andrews AFB	80	2,379,000	8,635,000
Maryland—Andrews AFB	54	1,595,000	5,791,000
Montana—Malmstrom AFB	46	1,600,000	5,810,000
Nebraska—Offutt AFB	352	425,000	1,541,000
New Jersey—McGuire AFB	34	1,129,000	4,100,000
Virginia—Langley AFB	23	1,102,000	4,000,000
Germany—Ramstein AB (Landstuhl)	65	2,454,000	8,910,000
Germany—Ramstein AB (Vogelweh)	96	3,209,000	11,650,000
Germany—Ramstein AB (Vogelweh)	62	2,341,000	8,500,000
Germany—Ramstein AB	(3)	1,406,000	5,100,000
Germany—Spangdahlem AB	20	863,000	3,134,000
Germany—Spangdahlem AB	20	866,000	3,144,000
United Kingdom—RAF Lakenheath	42	1,267,000	4,600,000
United Kingdom—RAF Mildenhall	24	1,019,000	3,700,000
Worldwide—Unspecified	0	0	40,000
Total, Air Force	1,232	34,280,000	124,492,000

[1] Community improvement.
[2] Improve neighborhood.
[3] Bath/Laundry additions.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$37,244,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	41,490,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	41,490,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+4,246,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	0

The Committee recommends a total of $41,490,000 for Family Housing, Defense-wide for fiscal year 2000. This is equal to the budget request for fiscal year 2000, and an increase of $4,246,000 above the appropriation for fiscal year 1999.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$2,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	78,756,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	2,000,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	−76,756,000

The Committee recommends a total of $2,000,000 for the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund for fiscal year 2000. This is a decrease of $76,756,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 2000, and equal to the appropriation for fiscal year 1999. In order for the Department to address its current and anticipated housing requirements, the Committee believes the Department should include necessary funding in the traditional family housing financing accounts until further progress has been made with the Military Housing Privatization Initiative. As a result, the Committee has reallocated $76,756,000 from the Family Housing Improvement Fund to the military services family housing construction accounts. Further, at locations where housing privatization is not economically feasible nor in the long-term interest of the Department of Defense, the Committee directs that the services execute those projects for which funds are being withheld. The funds reallocated are as follows:

Location	Account	Amount
Army:		
Washington—Fort Lewis	New Construction	9,000,000
Navy:		
California—Lemoore Naval Air Station	New Construction	20,188,000
Illinois—Great Lakes Naval Training Center	Construction Improvements.	14,400,000
North Carolina—Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	New Construction	22,036,000
Pennsylvania—Philadelphia Naval Inventory Control Point	Construction Improvements.	200,000
South Carolina—Parris Island Marine Corps Recruit Depot	Construction Improvements.	4,932,000
Air Force:		
Oklahoma—Tinker AFB	New Construction	6,000,000
Total		76,756,000

OVERVIEW

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (P.L. 104–106) addressed the family housing crisis by authorizing a five year 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 Privatization Initiative provides the military services with several authorities designed to leverage appropriated housing construction funds and government-owned assets to attract private

investment in military family housing. Authority was 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 Family Housing Improvement Fund is 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 $850,000,000. 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 authority to enter into contracts and partnerships and to make investments shall expire on September 30, 2000.

CONGRESSIONAL INTENT

The Congress intended that the Department test the military housing privatization authorities as a supplement to, not a replacement for, traditional family housing financing. Yet, for fiscal year 2000, the Army has requested no funds whatever for conventional military family housing construction and improvements in the United States, and the Navy's request would fail to construct a single new family housing unit in the continental United States. In view of the sluggish implementation of the Privatization Initiative to date, the Committee believes abandonment of traditional family housing construction, as a means of improving the quality of life of military families, is an inappropriate strategy for the military services to pursue.

Further, the Committee is concerned that Office of Management and Budget scoring requirements are driving privatization transactions rather than good business practices. The Committee is also concerned that the Department is permitting the military services, in an apparent breach of fiduciary responsibility, to give away valuable Federal land and facilities without adequate consideration in order to facilitate privatization deals with developers. To acquire new housing in the short term, the military services appear to understate basic allowance for housing (BAH) costs over the lives of the privatization projects creating the illusion the projects are cost efficient. In all likelihood, inflated BAH costs will obligate the Government to even greater funding commitments in future years. The Committee is concerned about other vexing Privatization Initiative questions including soft estimates of housing requirements, un-addressed post-award costs, the potential for retained Operations and Maintenance obligations, and legal and taxation issues consistent with the intent of Congress. In this regard, the Committee believes a "pilot project" approach is the best method to warrant success for each of the military services, and urges the Department to reflect this approach in future budget requests.

LIFE CYCLE COSTS INCLUDING VALUATION OF ASSETS

The committee is concerned that the Department has embarked on a course of action that fails to completely address the total life cycle cost of individual privatization projects. Such a failure could commit the Department, and ultimately the taxpayers, to significant unintended future expenses which would impact on the ability to effectively fund future defense requirements. To alleviate this concern, the Committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense to exert the oversight necessary to assure consistency is achieved in the definition of housing requirements, the true cost of housing allowances over the life of a project, and what is considered inadequate.

Procedures and standards are to be established for valuation of assets transferred as part of all housing privatization projects. When computing government participation, the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) should prescribe that the Military Departments use the same established and consistent methodologies, to arrive at all valuations of all assets. This consistency should take into account assets whose use is restricted (housing units) as well as other property and facilities used to increase the government's contribution to the project.

PROGRAMMING

The Committee is concerned that both the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Army failed to request funding for a single new family housing unit in the Continental United States (CONUS). Additionally, the Army did not request any funding for improvement of an existing unit in the United States. Once again, given the scope of the housing crisis and the slow pace of the housing privatization initiative, the Committee does not believe that this disinvestment in family housing construction funding is appropriate. The original intent of the privatization initiative was to provide for the expedited reduction of inadequate housing and to provide for the reduction of family housing backlog in a balanced manner, incorporating traditional family housing financing and these new authorities. Therefore, the Committee reiterates its desire to see the services properly budget for family housing in future budget requests to ensure that our military servicemen and women live in quality housing.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

The Committee continues its intent that the sole source of funds available for planning, administrative, and oversight costs relating to military family housing privatization initiatives be provided from the appropriations contained in this account. Administrative costs have been limited to $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Budget justification documents are to continue to display project and administrative costs. In addition, projects slated for Public-Private Ventures are to be requested under the Family Housing Improvement Fund instead of the Family Housing, Construction accounts.

The Committee notes Section 124 of the General Provisions of this bill which requires the Service Secretaries to notify Congressional Committees sixty days prior to issuing a solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing.

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.

To clarify existing reporting requirements, this 21-day notification requirement applies to any project, regardless of whether it is financed entirely by transfer of funds into the Family Housing Improvement Fund, or it is fully financed within funds available in the Family Housing Improvement Fund, or it is funded by combining transferred funds with funds available in the Family Housing Improvement Fund.

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.

TRANSFER AUTHORITY

The budget request proposed a general provision which would allow the transfer of funds from the family housing operation and maintenance accounts to the military personnel appropriations in Title I of the Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2000 in amounts not greater than those necessary to offset the additional housing allowance costs that result from the privatization of military housing. In addition, the provision proposes an "after the fact" notification of the transfer. The Committee has consistently voiced its concern that housing privatization would only shift the costs from one account to another. The original intent of the initiative was to provide a balance between privatized housing and traditional family housing construction allowing the remaining operations and maintenance dollars to help address the backlog of maintenance and repair more quickly. Therefore, the Committee denies the Department's request for transfer authority and encourages the Department to properly budget for any future privatization effort.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$0
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	0
Committee recommendation in the bill	0
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	0

The Committee recommends no appropriation for the Homeowners Assistance Fund. This is equal to the budget request for fiscal year 2000, and equal to the appropriation for fiscal year 1999. Requirements for fiscal year 1999 were financed by revenue and transfers from other accounts.

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.

The total estimated requirements for fiscal year 2000 are estimated at $62,687,000 and will be funded with transfers from the Base Realignment and Closure account and revenue from sales of acquired property.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

OVERVIEW

The Congress has appropriated, to date, a net total of $19,438,428,000 for the Base Realignment and Closure program for fiscal years 1990 through 1999. In the bill for fiscal year 2000, the Committee is recommending total funding of $705,911,000 under one account, as requested. 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 2000:

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

[Total funding, fiscal year 1990 through fiscal year 2000]

	Fiscal year 1990 through fiscal year 1998 [3]	Fiscal year 1999 enacted	Fiscal year 2000 recommended	Total
Part I	$2,672,830,000	N/A	N/A	2,672,830,000
Part II [1]	5,274,316,000	N/A	N/A	5,274,316,000
Part III [2]	6,740,635,000	427,164,000	N/A	7,167,799,000
Part IV	3,119,745,000	1,203,738,000	705,911,000	5,029,394,000
Total	17,807,526,000	1,630,902,000	705,911,000	20,144,339,000

[1] Includes transfer of $133,000,000 from "Homeowners Assistance fund, Defense."
[2] Includes: Rescission of $507,692,000 (P.L. 103–211); rescission of $32,000,000 (P.L. 104–6).
[3] Includes rescissions enacted inPublic Law 105–18, as follows: Part II—$35,391,000; Part III—$75.638,000 and Part IV—$22,971,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

Since the start of the current process for Base Realignment and Closure, Military Construction Appropriations Acts have appropriated a net total of $19,438,428,000 for the entire program for fiscal years 1990 through 1999. Within this total, the Department has allocated $5,631,158,000 for activities associated with 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, the Committee continues to recommend statutory language to establish a ceiling on the level of funding for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines additional obligations are necessary and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of his determination and the necessary reasons for the increase.

The following table displays the statutory ceiling established by the Committee and is equal to the Department's execution plan for fiscal year 1999.

Account	Total program	Ceiling on environmental restoration year costs
BRAC IV	705,911,000	360,073,000

The Committee directs the Department of Defense to devote the maximum amount of resources to actual cleanup and, to the greatest extent possible, to limit resources expended on administration, support, studies, and investigations.

CALIFORNIA—CASTLE AIR FORCE BASE

The Committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to report by September 15, 1999 on the current status of the environmental remediation at Castle Air Force Base, including the estimated dates for completion of such activities.

CALIFORNIA—HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD

The Committee recognizes the important progress that is being made to complete final transfer of Hunters Point Naval Shipyard to the City of San Francisco. It is the belief of the Committee that the necessary funding to achieve the environmental cleanup goals at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard should be allocated by the Navy to coincide with the implementation of the City's land re-use and redevelopment plans. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Committee no later than January 15, 2000, on the progress being made to complete the timely transfer and redevelopment of Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, in conjunction with the local government revitalization plans.

CALIFORNIA-NORCO NAVAL WARFARE ASSESSMENT STATION: EXCESS FEDERAL PROPERTY

The Committee is aware the Army Reserve unit occupying excess land formerly part of the Norco Naval Warfare Assessment Station (NWAS) is currently in the process of transferring to a new facility

located at March Air Reserve Base in Riverside, California. Under current law, the State has first priority over excess federal property. However, in an ongoing effort to revitalize the economic impact of the personnel and resource reductions at the NWAS, the City of Norco hopes to utilize this land to spurn economic growth in the area. The Committee directs the Army to report by September 15, 1999 on the Army's plan for this excess federal property. The report should address the option of transferring or leasing the land to the City of Norco.

KENTUCKY-LOUISVILLE NAVAL ORDNANCE STATION

The Louisville Naval Ordnance Station was privatized-in-place in August 1996, at the direction of the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Due to continued discussion between the State of Kentucky Department of Natural Resources and the Department of the Navy over the extent of the cleanup for external environmental remediation, the property has not been conveyed to the Louisville/Jefferson County Redevelopment Authority (LJCRA). Yet, the LJCRA is currently paying for the day-to-day expenses of the Station, including insurance, fire protection, security, and utilities, and they continue to have difficulty attracting new lessors to offset these costs until substantial upgrades are made to the property.

The LJCRA should not be expected to make the necessary upgrades and then pay an enhanced price for a facility they revitalized. Therefore, the Committee directs the Navy to immediately begin Economic Development Conveyance (EDC) negotiations with the LJCRA. The Committee believes the EDC should provide an early transfer of the land and facilities, at no cost, to the LJCRA. In addition, the conveyance should be subject to the following conditions, the Navy will continue to address the cost of groundwater remediation and continue to be responsible for, and defend and indemnify the LJCRA against, any and all environmental concerns created by the Navy, as specified under the current lease, state, and federal regulations; and the LJCRA will assume responsibility for all remaining necessary repairs, code violations, and infrastructure modifications unrelated to environmental investigations or remediation at the Station. The Committee believes this to be the most beneficial solution to the parties involved. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to report to the Committee no later than September 15, 1999, on the status of negotiations and the estimated date for the early conveyance of the Station.

TEXAS-DALLAS NAVAL AIR STATION

The Dallas Naval Air Station was slated for closure by the 1993 Base Realignment and Closure Commission. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to report to the Committee by January 15, 2000 on the current status of ongoing efforts at the Dallas Naval Air Station, with an emphasis on the following activities:

Building demolition;
Building fireproofing; and
Drinking water remediation

This report is to include the estimated dates for completion of all remediation activities.

COLORADO-DENVER

The Committee is encouraged by the Department's progress in remediating the environmental contamination at the both the former Lowry Air Force Base and Fitzsimons Army Medical Center sites near Denver, Colorado, and by their progress in facilitating the successful conversion and reuse of the properties. The Committee strongly encourages the Department to continue to prioritize cleanup and conversion projects at these sites.

FUTURE COSTS OF OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

Since the first appropriations were enacted for the Base Realignment and Closure Program in fiscal year 1990, the Committee has been concerned that the full cost of this effort should be clearly defined and displayed. In hearings before the Committee this year, the Department has testified that, upon completion of the Base Realignment and Closure Program, it intends to program and budget for all further costs of environmental restoration at base realignment and closure sites in the Operations and Maintenance accounts. The Committee strongly objects to this approach, based on the Department's estimate that such requirements will total $686,900,000 in fiscal year 2001 and approximately $500,000,000 annually thereafter until completion.

In order to continue the consolidation of all expenses related to base realignment and closure, the Department is directed to submit a legislative proposal for the establishment of a Treasury account entitled "Base Realignment and Closure Operations, Maintenance and Environmental Restoration". Further, the Department is directed to program and budget for operations, maintenance and environmental restoration efforts related to the four rounds of Base Realignment and Closure performed from 1988 through 1995 under such account for all such expenses.

CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

The Department of Defense has requested a total of $46,242,000 within the fiscal year 2000 budget request for base realignment and closure for construction projects funded under the Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part IV. The Committee recommends full funding for these important projects. The Committee provides approval and appropriated funds for the following construction projects as contained in Executive Summary of Justification Data submitted to Congress February, 1998, as subsequently revised and as modified by reprogramming actions requested through May 26, 1998:

Component/State/Project description	BRAC round	Amount (thousands)
Army BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000:		
Alabama:		
Fort McClellan:		
Alabama ARNG Enclave	IV	11,000
Ammunition Transfer Point Holding Area	IV	1,600
Subtotal Army Alabama		12,600

Component/State/Project description	BRAC round	Amount (thousands)
Colorado:		
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center:		
Reserve Center	IV	2,250
Subtotal Army Colorado		2,250
Missouri:		
Fort Leonard Wood:		
Expand Dining Facility	IV	3,250
Subtotal Army Missouri		3,250
New Jersey:		
Camp Pedricktown:		
Sewage Treatment Plant Bypass	IV	1,100
Subtotal Army New Jersey		1,100
Pennsylvania:		
Tobyhanna Army Depot:		
Guided Missile Maintenance Facility	IV	6,700
Subtotal Army Pennsylvania		6,700
Total for Army BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000		25,900
Navy BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000:		
California:		
Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton:		
Warehouse and Special Storage Facilities	IV	5,994
Subtotal Navy California		5,994
Virginia:		
Naval Station, Norfolk:		
Building Renovations and Alterations	IV	1,523
Naval Air Station, Oceana:		
Hanger Renovation	IV	21,313
Subtotal Navy Virginia		22,836
Total for Navy BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000		28,830
Air Force BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000:		
Texas:		
Kelly AFB:		
Alter Base Maintenance Shop	IV	820
Alter Communications Facility	IV	750
Lackland AFB:		
Add/Alter Base Engineer Facility	IV	3,100
Subtotal Air Force Texas		4,670
Total Air Force BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000		4,900
Defense Logistics Agency BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000:		
Utah:		
Defense Distribution Region West, Depot Hill AFB:		
Construct Hardstand	IV	1,100
Subtotal Defense Logistics Agency Utah	IV	1,100
Total DLA BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000		1,100

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Department of Defense is required to notify the appropriate Committees of Congress 21 days prior to the initiation of any new project which has not been included in the Department's budget request for the current (or any previous) fiscal year. If the Department wishes to finance a previously approved prior year project in the current fiscal year, no notification is required.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE, PART I

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

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE, PART II

The Committee notes that fiscal year 1998 was the last year for appropriations into this account.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE, PART III

The Committee notes that fiscal year 1999 was the last year for appropriations into this account.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE, PART IV

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,203,738,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	705,911,000
Committee recommendation in the bill	705,911,000
Comparison with:	
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−497,827,000
Fiscal year 2000 estimate	0

The Committee recommends a total of $705,911,000 for Base Realignment and Closure, Part IV for fiscal year 2000. This is equal to the budget request for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $497,827,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999. The Committee notes assurances from the Department that the requested amount is adequate to fully execute the requirements for the program in the coming fiscal year with no impact on meeting the targeted BRAC completion date of July 13, 2001. Below is the recommended distribution of funds:

Military Construction	$60,512,000
Family Housing	0
Environmental	360,073,000
Operations and Maintenance	263,819,000
Military Personnel (PCS)	1,507,000
Other	3,282,000
Revenues	(7,820,000)
Homeowner's Assistance Program	24,538,000
Total	$705,911,000

CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3 (f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules 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 authority 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 provision of the "Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part IV" states that not more than $xxxx of the funds appropriated shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

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 construction, 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.

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, except bids by Marshallese contractors for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll.

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 from Family Housing, Construction accounts to the DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund.

Section 124 of the General Provisions requires the Secretary of Defense to notify Congressional Committees sixty days prior to issuing a solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing or military unaccompanied housing.

Section 125 of the general provisions provides transfer authority to the Homeowners Assistance Program.

Section 126 of the general provisions requires that all Military Construction Appropriation Acts be the sole source of all operation and maintenance for flag and general officer quarter houses and limits the repair on these quarters of $15,000 per year without prior notifications to the committees of Congress. Out of cycle notifications are prohibited. And, a quarterly report is required on all operations and maintenance expenditures for each individual quarters.

Section 127 of the general provisions amends the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act to allow the Department of Defense to transfer military construction funding to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

Section 128 of the general provisions reduces various accounts in the bill which include excess contingency funding.

Section 129 of the general provisions directs that the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force submit to the appropriate committees of Congress by June 1, 2000, a Family Housing Master Plan.

The Committee recommends deleting the following General Provisions which were included in the fiscal year 1999 Military Construction Appropriations Act (Public Law 105–237), because these provisions are no longer required [section numbers refer to sections contained in Public Law 105–237]:

Section 124 regarding the use of NATO funds for the Partnership for Peace program. Section 125 regarding the use of proceeds from the sale of land and family housing units at Paine Field, Washington. Section 128 stating the sense of the Congress on the naming of a road at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII—CLAUSE 3

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (new matter is printed in italic and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

CHAPTER 6 OF TITLE II OF THE 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

CHAPTER 6

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For emergency expenses incurred by United States military forces in support of overseas operations; $475,000,000, to remain available for transfer until September 30, 2003: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military construction accounts *and to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code: Provided further,* That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this or any other Act: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated or expended to carry out military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further,* That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That this amount shall be available only to the extent that the President transmits to the Congress an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3 (f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules 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
Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part IV

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, a statement is required describing the transfer of funds provided in the accompanying bill. Sections 115, 118, 120, 123, and 125 of the General Provisions, and language included under "Military Construction, Defense-wide" provide certain transfer authority.

RESCISSION OF FUNDS

In compliance with clause 3 (f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee reports that it recommends no rescissions in the bill, as reported.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that:

> Each report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character, shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

The Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America which states:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law * * *

Appropriations contained in this bill are made pursuant to this specific power granted by the Constitution

COMPARISONS WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Clause 3 (c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an explanation of compliance with section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, which 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 302 of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year from the Committee's section of 302(a) allocation.

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) Allocation		This bill—	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	$8,450	$8,807	$8,450	$8,789
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)(B) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the following table contains five-year projections associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget authority, fiscal year 2000	$8,450,000
Outlays:	
2000	2,473,000
2001	3,133,000
2002	1,667,000
2003	623,000
2004 and beyond	512,000

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)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

New budget authority	0
Fiscal year 2000 outlays resulting therefrom	0

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of the rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

There were no recorded votes.

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	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ALABAMA		
ARMY		
ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE VII)..	7,000	---
REDSTONE ARSENAL		
TEST MEASUREMENT LAB/SUPPORT FACILITY.....	---	9,800
AIR FORCE		
MAXWELL AFB		
OFFICER TRAINING SCHOOL CADET DORMITORY.....	---	10,600
DEFENSE-WIDE		
ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE VII)..	---	7,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
BIRMINGHAM ANGB		
BASE ENGINEER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX.....	---	4,200
TOTAL, ALABAMA.....	7,000	31,600
ALASKA		
ARMY		
FORT RICHARDSON		
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	2,200	14,600
FORT WAINWRIGHT		
EMISSION REDUCTION FACILITY.....	2,300	15,500
MOUT COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY.....	---	17,000
AIR FORCE		
EIELSON AFB		
REPAIR KC-135 PARKING RAMP.....	941	4,000
REPAIR RUNWAY.....	3,334	14,000
WEAPONS RELEASE SYSTEM FACILITY.....	1,451	6,100
ELMENDORF AFB		
CONSTRUCT C-130 PARKING RAMP.....	3,995	17,000
DORMITORY.....	3,727	15,800
DEFENSE-WIDE		
EIELSON AFB		
HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM.....	9,000	26,000
ELMENDORF AFB		
HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM.....	4,700	23,500
FORT WAINWRIGHT		
HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT (PHASE I).....	18,000	18,000
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
FORT RICHARDSON		
CSMS/MATES.....	2,940	13,850
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
KULIS ANGB		
COMPOSITE SUPPORT COMPLEX.....	2,170	10,000
TOTAL, ALASKA.....	54,758	195,350
ARIZONA		
ARMY		
FORT HUACHUCA		
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT.....	---	3,700

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NAVY		
CAMP NAVAJO NAVY DETACHMENT		
MAGAZINES MODERNIZATION	1,910	7,560
YUMA MARINE CORPS AIR STATION		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER ADDITION	640	2,620
LAND ACQUISITION	3,650	21,600
AIR FORCE		
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB		
AIRCRAFT PROCESSING RAMP	1,847	7,800
DEFENSE-WIDE		
DAVIS MONTHAN AFB		
ADD/ALTER AMBULATORY HEALTH CARE CENTER	2,400	10,000
TOTAL, ARIZONA	10,447	53,280
ARKANSAS		
ARMY		
PINE BLUFF ARSENAL		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE IV)	61,800	---
AIR FORCE		
LITTLE ROCK AFB		
C-130 SQUAD OPERATIONS/AIRCRAFT MAINT UNIT FAC	---	7,800
DEFENSE-WIDE		
PINE BLUFF ARSENAL		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE IV)	---	61,800
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
LITTLE ROCK AFB		
VEHICLE/BASE ENGINE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	1,881	8,699
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
LITTLE ROCK AFB		
ALTER AERIAL PORT TRAINING FACILITY	209	800
TOTAL, ARKANSAS	63,890	79,099
CALIFORNIA		
ARMY		
FORT IRWIN		
LAND ACQUISITION (PHASE I)	---	19,000
ROTATIONAL UNIT FACILITY MAINTENANCE AREA	3,300	13,400
PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY		
GENERAL INSTRUCTION FACILITY	---	7,100
VIDEO TELETRAINING FACILITY	---	1,400
NAVY		
BARSTOW MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE		
TEST TRACK/TEST POND FACILITY	1,150	4,670
CAMP PENDLETON MARINE CORPS BASE		
ARMORY	660	2,620
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	2,390	9,740

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
INTEGRATED COMMUNICATIONS HUB	960	3,810
MARINE EXPEDITIONARY FORCE OPS/COMMAND CENTER	---	6,800
STAFF NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER'S ACADEMY	1,640	6,480
TACTICAL VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	2,210	9,010
CHINA LAKE NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER		
CONTROL TOWER	---	4,000
CORONA NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER		
MEASUREMENT SCIENCE LABORATORY	---	7,070
LEMOORE NAVAL AIR STATION		
AIRCRAFT ORDNANCE LOADING FACILITIES	3,010	11,900
AVIATION ARMAMENT FACILITY	1,460	5,800
ENGINE MAINTENANCE SHOP ADDITION	600	2,360
GYMNASIUM ADDITION	---	6,300
STRIKE FIGHTER WEAPONS TRAINING FACILITY	1,000	3,960
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL (MONTEREY)		
GYMNASIUM	---	5,100
NORTH ISLAND NAVAL AIR STATION		
BERTHING WHARF (PHASE I)	40,760	40,760
POINT MUGU NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER		
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES (PHASE I)	---	6,190
SAN DIEGO MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT		
PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER ADDITION	810	3,200
SAN DIEGO NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS MODERNIZATION	5,470	21,590
TWENTYNINE PALMS MARINE CORPS BASE		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	4,840	19,130
CAST TRAINER ADDITION	420	1,670
TACTICAL VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	3,420	13,960
TWENTYNINE PALMS NAVAL HOSPITAL		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1,930	7,640
AIR FORCE		
BEALE AFB		
FLIGHTLINE FIRE STATION	2,086	8,900
EDWARDS AFB		
CONSTRUCT SPURS SOUTH BASE	---	5,500
TRAVIS AFB		
ADD TO PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	1,754	7,500
SUPPORT FACILITY	---	3,700
DEFENSE-WIDE		
CORONADO NAVAL AMPHIBIOUS BASE		
NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE C2 ADDITION	2,272	6,000
LOS ANGELES AIR FORCE BASE		
MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	2,400	13,600
PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY		
DOD CENTER RENOVATION	6,712	28,000
TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE		
WAR READINESS MATERIALS WAREHOUSE/ENGINEERING SUPP	2,000	7,500
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
MOFFETT FIELD		
REPLACE AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	3,033	14,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NAVY RESERVE		
CAMP PENDLETON MARINE CORPS RESERVE CENTER		
RESERVE TRAINING COMPLEX	1,649	9,940
TOTAL, CALIFORNIA	97,936	349,300
COLORADO		
ARMY		
FORT CARSON		
MOBILIZATION MATERIAL WAREHOUSE	---	4,400
PETERSON AFB		
US ARMY SPACE COMMAND HEADQUARTERS	3,700	25,000
PUEBLO DEPOT ACTIVITY		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE I)	11,800	---
AIR FORCE		
PETERSON AFB		
FIRE/CRASH RESCUE STATION	---	7,000
USSPACECOM/NORAD HEADQUARTERS	7,887	33,000
SCHRIEVER AFB		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	---	6,700
PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	929	3,900
SANITARY SEWER LINE	1,296	5,500
US AIR FORCE ACADEMY		
UPGRADE ACADEMIC FACILITY	4,056	17,500
DEFENSE-WIDE		
PUEBLO ARMY DEPOT		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE I)	---	11,800
TOTAL, COLORADO	29,668	114,800
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
ARMY		
FORT MCNAIR		
CHAPEL	380	1,250
WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER		
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	1,020	6,800
NAVY		
MARINE CORPS BARRACKS, 8TH & I STREETS		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS AND SUPPORT FACILITY	---	8,990
TOTAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	1,400	17,040
FLORIDA		
NAVY		
JACKSONVILLE (BLOUNT ISLAND)		
LAND ACQUISITION	---	5,000
MAYPORT NAVAL STATION		
HARBOR OPERATIONS/SMALL CRAFT BERTH	---	9,560

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
WHITING FIELD NAVAL AIR STATION		
JPATS T-6A TRAINER FACILITY	1,200	4,750
POWER CHECK PAD/APRON MODIFICATIONS	---	600
AIR FORCE		
EGLIN AFB		
DINING FACILITY	---	4,700
DORMITORY	1,635	7,000
SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	1,566	6,600
EGLIN AFB AUXILIARY FIELD 9		
DORMITORY	2,161	9,100
REPAIR RUNWAY/TAXIWAY	2,269	9,700
MACDILL AFB		
ADD/ALTER PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	1,302	5,500
MISSION PLANNING CENTER (PHASE I)	---	10,000
PATRICK AFB		
AIR FREIGHT/PASSENGER TERMINAL FACILITY	1,967	8,300
BASE SUPPLY/TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMPLEX	2,238	9,500
TYNDALL AFB		
UPGRADE AIRFIELD	---	10,800
DEFENSE-WIDE		
JACKSONVILLE NAVAL AIR STATION		
ADD/ALTER BRANCH MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC	780	3,780
PATRICK AFB		
MEDICAL LOGISTICS FACILITY REPLACEMENT	200	1,750
PENSACOLA NAVAL AIR STATION		
AIRCREW WATER SURVIVAL TRAINING FACILITY	1,300	4,300
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
PENSACOLA		
READINESS CENTER	---	4,628
ARMY RESERVE		
ORLANDO		
LAND ACQUISITION, JOINT RESERVE COMPLEX	690	690
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
HOMESTEAD ARB		
FIRE FIGHTER TRAINING FACILITY	524	2,000
FIRE STATION	---	4,950
TOTAL, FLORIDA	17,832	123,208
GEORGIA		
ARMY		
FORT BENNING		
AMMUNITION HOLDING AREA	420	1,400
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	7,100	47,000
FORT GORDON		
CONSOLIDATED FIRE STATION	---	2,750
FORT STEWART		
CONTINGENCY LOGISTICS FACILITY	---	18,500
MULTI-PURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	1,100	7,200
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL W/DINING	7,000	46,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NAVY		
ALBANY MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE		
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT SHOP	1,540	6,260
AIR FORCE		
FORT BENNING		
AIR SUPPORT OPERATIONS SQUADRON FACILITY	911	3,900
MOODY AFB		
SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	763	3,200
TAXIWAY	---	2,750
ROBINS AFB		
KC-135 FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY	789	3,350
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FORT BENNING		
REGIMENTAL COMMAND AND CONTROL FACILITY	2,272	10,200
MOODY AFB		
WAR READINESS MATERIALS WAREHOUSE/BIOENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING FACILITY	200	1,250
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
SAVANNAH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT		
COMPOSITE SUPPORT COMPLEX	2,116	9,800
REGIONAL FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	368	1,700
ARMY RESERVE		
FORT GILLEM		
USAR CENTER/ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP/DIRECT SUPPORT/WAREHOUSE	3,610	22,121
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
DOBBINS AFB		
ADD/ALTER FACILITY FOR C130-H AIRCREW TRAINING	558	2,130
ROBINS AFB		
ADD/ALTER AIR FORCE RESERVE COMMAND HEADQUARTERS AND ALTERNATE TANKER AIRLIFT CONTROL CENTER	3,666	14,000
TOTAL, GEORGIA	32,413	203,511
HAWAII		
ARMY		
SCHOFIELD BARRACKS		
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	14,200	49,000
NAVY		
CAMP H.M. SMITH		
CINCPAC HEADQUARTERS (PHASE I)	15,870	---
KANEOHE BAY MARINE CORPS AIR STATION		
CONTROL TOWER AND AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITY	1,460	5,790
PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SHIPYARD		
ABRASIVE BLAST AND PAINT FACILITY	2,690	10,610
PEARL HARBOR NAVAL STATION		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS MODERNIZATION	4,720	18,600
PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE		
BERTHING WHARF	7,470	29,460

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
AIR FORCE		
HICKAM AFB		
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	785	3,300
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
BELLOWS AFS		
REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE (PHASE II)	---	12,105
TOTAL, HAWAII	47,195	128,865
IDAHO		
NAVY		
BAYVIEW NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER		
UNDERWATER EQUIPMENT LABORATORY	2,540	10,040
AIR FORCE		
MOUNTAIN HOME AFB		
DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD	564	2,400
ENHANCED TRAINING RANGE (PHASE II)	3,487	14,600
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
BOISE AIRPORT (GOWEN FIELD)		
A-10 EXPAND ARM/DISARM APRON	350	1,600
TOTAL, IDAHO	6,941	28,640
ILLINOIS		
NAVY		
GREAT LAKES NAVAL TRAINING CENTER		
ALL WEATHER RUNNING TRACK	354	1,380
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS ("A" SCHOOL)	7,700	31,410
DRILL HALL REPLACEMENT	2,830	11,190
RECRUIT IN-PROCESS BARRACKS	3,370	13,310
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
MARSEILLES		
BATTALION TRAINING COMPLEX	2,325	10,952
TOTAL, ILLINOIS	16,579	68,242
INDIANA		
ARMY		
NEWPORT ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE II)	61,200	---
NAVY		
CRANE NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER		
STRATEGIC WEAPONS SYSTEMS ENGINEERING FACILITY	---	7,270
DEFENSE-WIDE		
NEWPORT ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE II)	---	61,200
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP ATTERBURY		
WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	---	7,598

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
FORT WAYNE		
MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY/DINING HALL	---	7,200
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
GRISSOM ARB		
SERVICES COMPLEX (PHASE I)	---	10,800
TOTAL, INDIANA	61,200	94,068
IOWA		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
SIOUX GATEWAY AIRPORT		
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	---	3,600
KANSAS		
ARMY		
FORT LEAVENWORTH		
US DISCIPLINARY BARRACKS (PHASE III)	18,800	18,800
WATER TREATMENT PLANT	1,200	8,100
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	3,900	26,000
FORT RILEY		
MODIFIED RECORD FIRE/COMBAT PISTOL RANGE	---	3,900
AIR FORCE		
MCCONNELL AFB		
KC-135 SQUAD OPERATIONS/AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE UNIT.	2,280	9,600
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FORT RILEY		
CONSOLIDATED TROOP MEDICAL CLINIC	1,060	6,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
MCCONNELL AFB		
B-1 AIRCRAFT LIVE MUNITIONS LOADING RAMP	---	9,300
TOTAL, KANSAS	27,240	81,700
KENTUCKY		
ARMY		
BLUEGRASS ARMY DEPOT		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILTIY (PHASE I)	11,800	---
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION SUPPORT	11,000	---
AMMUNITION SURVEILLANCE FACILITY	900	6,000
FORT CAMPBELL		
MOUT TRAINING COMPLEX	2,150	14,400
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	900	6,000
SABRE HELIPORT IMPROVEMENTS	2,475	19,500
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL (PHASE II)	4,800	32,000
FORT KNOX		
AUTOMATED RECORD FIRE RANGE	---	1,300
MULTI-PURPOSE DIGITAL TRAINING RANGE (PHASE II)	2,400	16,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
AIR FORCE		
FORT CAMPBELL		
AIR SUPPORT OPERATIONS SQUADRON FACILITY.....	1,472	6,300
DEFENSE-WIDE		
BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE I)....	---	11,800
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION SUPPORT.....	---	11,000
TOTAL, KENTUCKY.....	37,897	124,300
LOUISIANA		
ARMY		
FORT POLK		
CONSOLIDATED RANGE OPERATIONS/WAREHOUSE FACILITY..	---	6,700
MAINE		
NAVY		
BRUNSWICK NAVAL AIR STATION		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS REPLACEMENT.....	4,270	16,890
MARYLAND		
ARMY		
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE II)...	66,600	---
FORT MEADE		
MILITARY ENTRANCE PROCESSING STATION.....	1,350	4,450
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	2,700	18,000
NAVY		
INDIAN HEAD NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER DIVISION		
SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT.....	2,550	10,070
PATUXENT RIVER NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER		
AIRCRAFT/SHIPS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION LABORATORIES...	---	3,060
INDOOR FIRING RANGE.....	---	1,500
DEFENSE-WIDE		
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE II)...	---	66,600
ANDREWS AFB		
ADD/ALTER MEDICAL LOGISTICS FACILITY.....	2,000	3,000
FORT MEADE		
PERIMETER FENCE (EAST).....	903	903
RECONFIGURE OPS1 CHILLED WATER.....	2,043	2,043
PATUXENT RIVER NAVAL AIR STATION		
AIRCREW WATER SURVIVAL TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,200	4,150
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND (WEIDE ARMY AIRFIELD)		
UH-60 TIE-DOWN PADS.....	---	1,085
ARMY RESERVE		
CURTIS BAY		
ADD/ALTER USARC/MARINE AMSA.....	---	5,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
TOTAL, MARYLAND	79,346	119,861
MASSACHUSETTS		
ARMY		
WESTOVER AFB		
MILITARY ENTRANCE PROCESSING STATION	1,200	4,000
AIR FORCE		
HANSCOM AFB		
ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT FACILITY RENOVATION	---	8,000
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
BARNES ANGB (WESTFIELD)		
ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY #2	---	3,933
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
BARNES ANGB		
BASE SUPPLY COMPLEX	---	5,900
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
WESTOVER ARB		
CONTROL TOWER	---	4,250
TOTAL, MASSACHUSETTS	1,200	26,083
MICHIGAN		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
SELFRIDGE ANGB		
REPLACE FIRE CRASH/RESCUE STATION	---	7,400
MINNESOTA		
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
MINNEAPOLIS/ST PAUL AIR RESERVE STATION		
CONSOLIDATED LODGING FACILITY (PHASE II)	---	8,140
MISSISSIPPI		
NAVY		
GULFPORT NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION CENTER		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS MODERNIZATION	3,260	12,860
GULFPORT NAVAL CONSTRUCTION TRAINING CENTER		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS RENOVATION	1,600	6,310
MERIDIAN NAVAL AIR STATION		
ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING	---	7,280
AIR FORCE		
COLUMBUS AFB		
CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	---	5,100
KEESLER AFB		
STUDENT DINING FACILITY	1,686	7,100
STUDENT DORMITORY	4,679	19,900
DEFENSE-WIDE		
MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT		
SMALL CRAFT TRAINING COMPLEX	9,600	9,600

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CAMP SHELBY		
MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX, HEAVY (PHASE III)....	---	14,800
TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI.....	20,825	82,950
MISSOURI		
ARMY		
FORT LEONARD WOOD		
ACCESS ROAD.....	---	16,500
WOLVERINE/GRIZZLY SIMULATOR FACILITY.....	1,600	10,600
AIR FORCE		
WHITEMAN AFB		
B-2 LOW OBSERVABLE RESTORATION FACILITY.....	5,428	23,000
PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER.....	447	1,900
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
SEDALIA		
READINESS CENTER.....	---	3,774
TOTAL, MISSOURI.....	7,475	55,774
MONTANA		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
GREAT FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT		
BASE SUPPLY WAREHOUSE.....	---	1,450
NEBRASKA		
AIR FORCE		
OFFUTT AFB		
DORMITORY.....	1,941	8,300
NEVADA		
NAVY		
FALLON NAVAL AIR STATION		
CORROSION CONTROL HANGAR.....	---	7,000
AIR FORCE		
NELLIS AFB		
F-22 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR.....	1,859	7,800
F-22 COMPOSITE AND FABRICATION SHOP.....	1,756	7,500
F-22 PARTS WAREHOUSE AND OPERATIONS ADDITION.....	773	3,300
LAND ACQUISITION.....	---	11,600
TOTAL, NEVADA.....	4,388	37,200
NEW JERSEY		
ARMY		
PICATINNY ARSENAL		
ARMAMENT SOFTWARE ENGINEERING CENTER (PHASE I)....	---	9,900

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NAVY		
EARLE NAVAL WEAPONS STATION		
SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS	---	1,250
LAKEHURST NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER		
AIRCRAFT/PLATFORM INTERFACE LABORATORY	3,970	15,710
AIR FORCE		
MCGUIRE AFB		
VISITING QUARTERS	2,765	11,800
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
FORT DIX		
TRAINING/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY BATTLE LAB (PHASE II)	---	10,015
ARMY RESERVE		
FORT DIX		
CENTRALIZED TACTICAL VEHICLE WASH FACILITY	1,607	5,624
TOTAL, NEW JERSEY	8,342	54,299
NEW MEXICO		
AIR FORCE		
KIRTLAND AFB		
REPAIR APRONS (PHASE I)	---	14,000
NEW YORK		
ARMY		
FORT DRUM		
CONSOLIDATED SOLDIER/FAMILY SUPPORT CENTER	---	23,000
UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY		
CADET PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (PHASE II)	28,500	---
AIR FORCE		
ROME RESEARCH SITE		
CONSOLIDATE INTELLIGENCE AND RECONNAISSANCE LAB	3,002	3,002
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
HANCOCK FIELD ANGB		
COMM-ELECTRONICS TRAINING/ASE COMPLEX	---	8,900
ARMY RESERVE		
FORT WADSWORTH		
ADD/ALTER USAR CENTER/ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP/AREA MAINT SUPPORT ACTIVITY (PHASE II)	2,066	5,786
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
NIAGRA FALLS AIR RESERVE STATION		
LODGING FACILITY	---	6,445
TOTAL, NEW YORK	33,568	47,133
NORTH CAROLINA		
ARMY		
FORT BRAGG		
HEAVY DROP RIGGING FACILITY	4,500	30,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MOUT TRAINING COMPLEX (PHASE II)	5,600	7,000
UPGRADE BARRACKS/D-AREA (PHASE III)	---	14,400
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	16,508	52,000
SUNNY POINT MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL		
AMMUNITION SURVEILLANCE FACILITY	550	3,800
NAVY		
CAMP LEJEUNE MARINE CORPS BASE		
MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FACILITY	2,120	8,400
PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	1,070	4,230
ROAD AND UTILITY CONSTRUCTION	2,140	8,750
NEW RIVER MARINE CORPS AIR STATION		
AIRCRAFT TAXIWAY ADDITION	130	520
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	330	1,340
PROPERTY CONTROL FACILITY	910	3,610
AIR FORCE		
FORT BRAGG		
AIR SUPPORT OPERATIONS GROUP FACILITY	1,076	4,600
POPE AFB		
DANGEROUS CARGO PAD	1,802	7,700
DEFENSE-WIDE		
CAMP LEJUNE MCB		
TARAWA TERRACE II ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	2,387	10,570
CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION		
AIRCREW WATER SURVIVAL TRAINING FACILITY	1,000	3,500
FORT BRAGG		
BATTALION OPERATIONS COMPLEX	2,272	18,600
DEPLOYABLE EQUIPMENT FACILITY	1,500	1,500
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
CHARLOTTE		
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	912	4,297
READINESS CENTER	1,504	7,087
TOTAL, NORTH CAROLINA	46,311	191,904
NORTH DAKOTA		
AIR FORCE		
MINOT AFB		
ADD TO MISSILE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	---	3,000
OHIO		
AIR FORCE		
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB		
CONSOLIDATE AEROSPACE STRUCTURES RESEARCH LAB	---	17,500
CONSOLIDATE AVIONICS RESEARCH LABORATORY	3,230	13,600
CONTROL TOWER	934	4,000
DEFENSE-WIDE		
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB		
OCCUPATIONAL HEATH CLINIC/BIOENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING REPLACEMENT	2,800	3,900

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
MANSFIELD LAHM AIRPORT		
REPLACE SECURITY FORCES COMPLEX	---	2,700
SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY MUNICIPAL AIRPORT		
RELOCATE POWER CHECK PAD WITH SUPPRESSOR	---	2,500
TOLEDO EXPRESS AIRPORT		
UPGRADE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	---	8,400
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
YOUNGSTOWN AIR RESERVE STATION		
APRON RUNOFF/STORM WATER/DEICING COLLECTION SYSTEM	---	3,400
TOTAL, OHIO	6,964	56,000
OKLAHOMA		
ARMY		
MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT		
AMMUNITION ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE	1,020	6,800
FIRE STATION	900	3,000
RAILYARD INFRASTRUCTURE	2,000	6,800
FORT SILL		
RAIL AND CONTAINERIZATION FACILITY	2,000	13,200
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP (PHASE I)	---	9,900
AIR FORCE		
TINKER AFB		
AIR DRIVEN ACCESS OVERHAUL AND TEST FACILITY	4,001	17,000
DORMITORY	1,602	6,800
VANCE AFB		
UPGRADE CENTER RUNWAY	---	12,600
TOTAL, OKLAHOMA	11,523	76,100
OREGON		
ARMY		
UMATILLA ARMY DEPOT		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE V)	35,900	---
DEFENSE-WIDE		
UMATILLA ARMY DEPOT		
AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY (PHASE V)	---	35,900
PENNSYLVANIA		
ARMY		
CARLISLE BARRACKS		
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	750	5,000
LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT		
AMMUNITION CONTAINERIZATION COMPLEX	570	3,650
NAVY		
MECHANICSBURG NAVAL INVENTORY CONTROL POINT		
WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	760	2,990

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
PHILADELPHIA NAVAL SHIPYARD		
FOUNDRY CASTING PITS MODERNIZATION	---	13,320
DEFENSE-WIDE		
DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY CENTER		
PUBLIC SAFETY CENTER	867	5,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
JOHNSTOWN ANGS		
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL TRAINING COMPLEX	---	6,200
ARMY RESERVE		
JOHNSTOWN		
CONSOLIDATE AREA MAINTENANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITY	---	6,300
NAVY RESERVE		
WILLOW GROVE NAVAL AIR STATION		
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL STORAGE FACILITY	320	1,930
TOTAL, PENNSYLVANIA	3,267	44,390
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ARMY		
FORT JACKSON		
EMERGENCY SERVICES CENTER	1,100	7,400
NAVY		
BEAUFORT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION		
ARMORY FACILITY	450	1,790
CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	2,200	8,700
JET ENGINE TEST CELL	---	7,800
CHARLESTON NAVAL WEAPONS STATION		
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL ENGINEERING FACILITY	1,930	7,640
AIR FORCE		
CHARLESTON AFB		
C-17 CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	4,389	18,200
DEFENSE-WIDE		
LAUREL BAY ISLAND		
INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL ADDITION	642	2,874
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
MCENTIRE ANGS		
CONTROL TOWER	---	8,000
TOTAL, SOUTH CAROLINA	10,711	62,404
SOUTH DAKOTA		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
SIOUX FALLS		
CONSOLIDATED BARRACKS/EDUCATION FACILITY	---	4,818
TENNESSEE		
AIR FORCE		
ARNOLD AFB		
UPGRADE JET ENGINE AIR INDUCT SYSTEM (PHASE III)	1,851	7,800

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
MCGHEE-TYSON ANGB		
KC-135 HYDRANT REFUELING SYSTEM	---	9,500
TOTAL, TENNESSEE	1,851	17,300
TEXAS		
ARMY		
FORT BLISS		
AIR DEPLOYMENT FACILITY COMPLEX	2,550	17,000
AIRCRAFT LOADING APRON	3,300	22,000
AMMUNITION HOT LOAD FACILITY	1,700	11,400
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	---	1,950
FORT HOOD		
DEPLOYMENT READY REACTIVE FIELD AND TRAILS	2,000	8,000
FIXED WING AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	4,600	31,000
FORCE XXI, SOLDIER DEVELOPMENT CENTER (PHASE II)	14,000	14,000
RAIL HEAD FACILITY (PHASE II)	14,800	14,800
SOLDIER SERVICE CENTER	---	16,500
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	4,350	29,000
NAVY		
INGLESIDE NAVAL STATION		
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FACILITY	---	11,780
AIR FORCE		
DYESS AFB		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	---	5,400
LACKLAND AFB		
DORMITORY	1,257	5,300
SECURITY FORCES CENTER	1,893	8,100
LAUGHLIN AFB		
ADD/ALTER JPATS BEDDOWN VARIOUS FACILITIES	766	3,250
RANDOLPH AFB		
CONTROL TOWER (WEST)	---	3,600
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FORT SAM HOUSTON		
VETERINARY INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITY	600	5,800
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
KELLY AFB		
F-16 ADD/ALTER SQUAD OPS/FLIGHT TRAINING FACILITY	---	9,700
ARMY RESERVE		
FORT HOOD		
AREA MAINTENANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITY/EQUIPMENT CONCENTRATION SITE	2,684	9,431
NAVY RESERVE		
FORT WORTH JRB		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	---	6,000
TOTAL, TEXAS	54,500	234,011
UTAH		
AIR FORCE		
HILL AFB		
CAD/PAD SPARES STORAGE FACILITY	1,081	4,600

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
SALT LAKE CITY INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT		
OPERATIONS/TRAINING/SQUAD OPERATIONS COMPLEX.....	---	10,400
NAVY RESERVE		
CAMP WILLIAMS		
MARINE CORPS RESERVE TRAINING CENTER ADDITION.....	150	890
TOTAL, UTAH.....	1,231	15,890
VIRGINIA		
ARMY		
FORT BELVOIR		
FIRE STATION.....	500	1,700
MILITARY POLICE STATION.....	640	2,150
FORT EUSTIS		
EDUCATION CENTER.....	---	4,800
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL.....	5,800	39,000
FORT MYER		
PUBLIC SAFETY CENTER.....	870	2,900
FORT STORY		
OFFSHORE BREAKWATER SYSTEM.....	---	8,000
NAVY		
DAM NECK FLEET COMBAT TRAINING CENTER		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	2,610	10,310
NORFOLK NAVAL STATION		
BERTHING PIER (PHASE II).....	12,690	12,690
PIER ELECTRICAL UPGRADES (PHASE II).....	4,720	18,660
PIER REPLACEMENT.....	8,600	40,000
WATERFRONT ATHLETIC COMPLEX.....	2,760	10,890
NORFOLK NAVAL SHIPYARD		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS REPLACEMENT.....	4,460	17,630
OCEANA NAVAL AIR STATION		
AIRCRAFT ACOUSTICAL ENCLOSURE.....	2,910	11,490
QUANTICO MARINE CORPS COMBAT DEVELOPMENT COMMAND		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS.....	5,270	20,820
YORKTOWN NAVAL WEAPONS STATION		
TRESTLE REPLACEMENT AND PIER UPGRADE.....	6,330	25,040
AIR FORCE		
LANGLEY AFB		
DORMITORY.....	1,486	6,300
DEFENSE-WIDE		
CHEATHAM ANNEX		
FLEET HOSPITAL SUPPORT OFC CONTAINER HOLDING YARD.	500	1,650
DAM NECK		
MISSION SUPPORT FACILITY.....	2,273	4,700
NORFOLK NAVAL AIR STATION		
AIRCREW WATER SURVIVAL TRAINING FACILITY.....	1,150	4,050

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
TOTAL, VIRGINIA	63,569	242,780
WASHINGTON		
ARMY		
FORT LEWIS		
AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT	1,560	5,200
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	1,850	6,200
TANK TRAIL EROSION MITIGATION - YAKIMA (PHASE V)	2,000	2,000
NAVY		
BANGOR STRATEGIC WEAPONS FACILITY		
D5 MISSILE SUPPORT FACILITY	1,600	6,300
KEYPORT NUWC		
PIER REPLACEMENT	---	6,700
PORT HADLOCK NAVAL ORDNANCE CENTER (PACIFIC)		
TOMAHAWK MAGAZINE	870	3,440
PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD		
DREDGING	3,950	15,610
AIR FORCE		
FAIRCHILD AFB		
FLIGHTLINE SUPPORT FACILITY	---	9,100
RUNWAY CENTERLINE LIGHTING	---	1,950
SURVIVAL TRAINING LOGISTICS COMPLEX	1,071	4,500
MCCHORD AFB		
C-17 SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE UNIT	1,858	7,900
DEFENSE-WIDE		
FAIRCHILD AFB		
ADD TO HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	1,500	12,400
FORT LEWIS		
NORTH DENTAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	4,950	5,500
WHIDBEY ISLAND NAVAL AIR STATION		
AIRCREW WATER SURVIVAL TRAINING FACILITY	1,300	4,700
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
YAKIMA		
MANEUVER AREA TRAINING EQUIPMENT SITE (PHASE I)	3,464	16,316
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
MCCHORD AFB		
ADD/ALTER C-17 SQUADRON OPERATIONS AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE UNIT FACILITY	864	3,300
TOTAL, WASHINGTON	26,837	111,116
WISCONSIN		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
VOLK FIELD		
REPLACE TROOP TRAINING QUARTERS	1,923	8,900
CONUS CLASSIFIED		
ARMY		
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS		
CLASSIFIED PROJECT	36,400	36,400

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
AIR FORCE		
CLASSIFIED LOCATION		
AIR CONTROL SQUADRON OPERATIONS COMPLEX	1,200	5,100
CLASSIFIED PROJECT	1,093	1,093
CLASSIFIED PROJECT	9,700	9,700
SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY	244	977
TOTAL, CONUS CLASSIFIED	48,637	53,270
ASCENSION ISLAND		
AIR FORCE		
ASCENSION ISLAND AUXILIARY AIR FIELD		
GPS SATELLITE CONTROL STATION	512	2,150
BAHRAIN ISLAND		
NAVY		
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT UNIT (SOUTHWEST ASIA)		
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS (SECURITY FORCE)	6,230	24,550
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS (TRANSIENT)	5,840	23,770
OPERATIONS CONTROL CENTER	8,550	34,770
TOTAL, BAHRAIN ISLAND	20,620	83,090
DIEGO GARCIA		
NAVY		
DIEGO GARCIA NAVY SUPPORT FACILITY		
AIRCRAFT INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	2,070	8,150
GERMANY		
ARMY		
ANSBACH		
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	3,150	21,000
BAMBERG		
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	860	5,700
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	1,400	9,300
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	1,230	8,200
MANNHEIM		
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	675	4,500
DEFENSE-WIDE		
RAMSTEIN AIR BASE		
ADD/ALTER DENTAL CLINIC	2,550	7,100
TOTAL, GERMANY	9,865	55,800
GREECE		
NAVY		
SOUDA BAY CRETE NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY		
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FACILITIES	1,620	6,380

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
GUAM		
AIR FORCE		
ANDERSEN AFB		
LANDFILL CLOSURE	2,097	8,900
DEFENSE-WIDE		
ANDERSEN AFB		
ANDERSEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	10,026	44,170
DEF FUEL SUPPORT POINT GUAM		
REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	2,600	24,300
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
BARRIGADA		
READINESS CENTER (PHASE I)	---	8,238
ARMY RESERVE		
BARRIGADA		
USAR CENTER/ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP/AREA MAINTENANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITY	1,116	17,546
TOTAL, GUAM	15,839	103,154
ITALY		
NAVY		
NAPLES NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY		
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FACILITY	7,370	26,750
AIR FORCE		
AVIANO AB		
RADAR APPROACH CONTROL FACILITY	966	3,700
TOTAL, ITALY	8,336	30,450
KOREA		
ARMY		
CAMP CASEY		
WHOLE BARRACKS COMPLEX RENEWAL	4,650	31,000
CAMP HOWZE		
WATER SYSTEM UPGRADE	920	3,050
CAMP KYLE		
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	---	6,000
CAMP STANLEY		
ELECTRICAL SYSTEM UPGRADE	1,100	3,650
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	---	6,000
AIR FORCE		
OSAN AB		
ADD/ALTER PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	2,229	7,600
DORMITORY	3,482	12,000
DEFENSE-WIDE		
YONGSAN		
ADD/ALTER HOSPITAL	9,570	38,570

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MEDICAL SUPPLY/EQUIP STORAGE WAREHOUSE REPLACEMENT	2,300	2,550
TOTAL, KOREA	24,251	110,420
KWAJALEIN		
ARMY		
KWAJALEIN ATOLL		
POWER PLANT - ROI NAMUR ISLAND (PHASE II)	35,400	35,400
PORTUGAL		
AIR FORCE		
LAJES FIELD (AZORES)		
APRON SECURITY LIGHTING	479	1,800
PUERTO RICO		
DEFENSE-WIDE		
NSGA SABANA SECA		
MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	1,120	4,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
PUERTO RICO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT		
C-130 ADD TO AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	490	2,250
C-130 FUEL CELL AND CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	1,212	5,600
C-130 UPGRADE AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	825	3,800
ARMY RESERVE		
FORT BUCHANAN		
USAR CENTER	1,431	10,101
TOTAL, PUERTO RICO	5,078	25,751
SPAIN		
DEFENSE-WIDE		
MORON AIR BASE		
REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	4,100	15,200
ROTA NAVAL STATION		
ROTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	3,854	17,020
TOTAL, SPAIN	7,954	32,220
UNITED KINGDOM		
AIR FORCE		
ROYAL AIR FORCE FELTWELL		
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	786	3,000
ROYAL AIR FORCE LAKENHEATH		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	1,519	5,800
CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT COMPLEX	3,221	12,400
ROYAL AIR FORCE MILDENHALL		
CONSOLIDATE CORROSION CONTROL/MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	2,693	10,200
OPERATIONS FACILITY	1,076	4,100

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL STORAGE FACILITY	267	1,000
KC-135 FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY	600	2,300
ROYAL AIR FORCE MOLESWORTH		
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	445	1,700
DEFENSE-WIDE		
ROYAL AIR FORCE FELTWELL		
CONSTRUCT MULTIPURPOSE FACILITY	1,023	4,570
LAKENHEATH MIDDLE SCHOOL		
CONSTRUCT GYMNASIUM BUILDING	841	3,770
MENWITH HILL STATION		
MEDICAL CENTER EXPANSION	500	500
ROYAL AIR FORCE LAKENHEATH		
ADD/ALTER DENTAL CLINIC	1,000	7,100
TOTAL, UNITED KINGDOM	13,971	56,440
NATO		
NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	191,000	81,000
WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED		
ARMY		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
HOST NATION SUPPORT	21,300	21,300
MINOR CONSTRUCTION	9,500	9,500
PLANNING AND DESIGN	60,705	65,905
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD	30,689	---
FINANCING ENTRY	-30,689	---
NAVY		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
PLANNING AND DESIGN	65,630	65,010
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,342	7,342
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD	6,178	---
FINANCING ENTRY	-6,178	---
AIR FORCE		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	8,741	8,741
PLANNING AND DESIGN	28,004	32,104
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD	3,376	---
FINANCING ENTRY	-3,376	---
DEFENSE-WIDE		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	6,558	1,268
CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	938	938
PLANNING AND DESIGN		
TRI-CARE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY	9,500	9,500
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	5,700	5,700
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	124	124

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
DEFENSE LEVEL ACTIVITIES	18,000	18,000
SUBTOTAL, PLANNING AND DESIGN	33,324	33,324
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION		
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,000	1,000
TRI-CARE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY	3,587	3,587
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	2,300	2,300
DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	1,500	1,500
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	1,248	1,248
DEFENSE LEVEL ACTIVITIES	2,900	2,900
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	6,083	6,083
SUBTOTAL, UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	18,618	18,618
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,129	8,129
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	771	3,504
AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,951	5,671
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	2,000	3,500
ARMY RESERVE		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
PLANNING AND DESIGN	8,500	8,500
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	1,416	1,416
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD	712	---
FINANCING ENTRY	-712	---
NAVY RESERVE		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
PLANNING AND DESIGN	1,778	1,778
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	1,036	1,036
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD	32	---
FINANCING ENTRY	-32	---
AIR FORCE RESERVE		
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS		
PLANNING AND DESIGN	1,867	1,867
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	4,467	4,467
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD	407	---
FINANCING ENTRY	-407	---
TOTAL, WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	291,575	303,918
WORLDWIDE VARIOUS		
DEFENSE-WIDE		
VARIOUS LOCATIONS		
POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES	1,300	1,300

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY		
VIRGINIA		
FORT LEE (97 UNITS)	---	16,500
WASHINGTON		
FORT LEWIS (48 UNITS)	---	9,000
KOREA		
CAMP HUMPHREYS (60 UNITS)	4,400	24,000
FINANCING ENTRY	-286	---
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	5,303	35,400
FINANCING ENTRY	-345	---
PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,300	4,300
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD	631	---
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	14,003	89,200
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	92,453	84,185
SERVICES ACCOUNT	47,715	47,715
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	220,952	220,952
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	44,970	44,970
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	482	482
LEASING	222,294	222,294
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	469,211	469,211
INTEREST PAYMENTS	3	3
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,098,080	1,089,812
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY	1,112,083	1,179,012

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS		
CALIFORNIA		
LEMOORE NAVAL AIR STATION (116 UNITS)	---	20,188
HAWAII		
KANEOHE BAY MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (100 UNITS)	5,320	26,615
PEARL HARBOR NAVAL COMPLEX (133 UNITS)	6,031	30,168
PEARL HARBOR COMPLEX (96 UNITS)	3,831	19,167
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (180 UNITS)	---	22,036
FINANCING ENTRY	-908	---
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	31,708	176,670
FINANCING ENTRY	-1,897	---
PLANNING AND DESIGN	17,715	17,715
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD	2,805	---
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	64,605	312,559
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	82,925	82,925
SERVICES ACCOUNT	63,589	63,589
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	170,991	170,991
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	32,636	32,636
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,180	1,180
LEASING	145,953	145,953
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	397,723	397,723
MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS	73	73
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	895,070	895,070
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS	959,675	1,207,629

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE		
ARIZONA		
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB (64 UNITS)	2,707	10,000
CALIFORNIA		
BEALE AFB (60 UNITS)	2,301	8,500
EDWARDS AFB (98 UNITS)	4,404	16,270
EDWARDS AFB (90 UNITS)	4,472	16,520
VANDENBERG AFB (91 UNITS)	4,548	16,800
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
BOLLING AFB (72 UNITS)	2,537	9,375
FLORIDA		
EGLIN AFB (130 UNITS)	3,812	14,080
MACDILL AFB (54 UNITS)	2,446	9,034
KANSAS		
MCCONNELL AFB	---	1,363
MISSISSIPPI		
COLUMBUS AFB (100 UNITS)	3,327	12,290
MONTANA		
MALMSTROM AFB (34 UNITS)	2,050	7,570
NEBRASKA		
OFFUTT AFB (72 UNITS)	3,343	12,352
NEW MEXICO		
HOLLOMON AFB (76 UNITS)	---	9,800
NORTH CAROLINA		
SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB (78 UNITS)	3,300	12,187
NORTH DAKOTA		
GRAND FORKS AFB (42 UNITS)	2,720	10,050
MINOT AFB (72 UNITS)	2,912	10,756
OKLAHOMA		
TINKER AFB (41 UNITS)	---	6,000
TEXAS		
LACKLAND AFB (48 UNITS)	2,030	7,500
PORTUGAL		
LAJES AFB (AZORES) (75 UNITS)	3,509	12,964
FINANCING ENTRY	-1,033	---
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	34,280	124,492
FINANCING ENTRY	-128	---
PLANNING AND DESIGN	17,093	17,093
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD	1,161	---
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	101,791	344,996
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	56,413	56,413
SERVICES ACCOUNT	31,450	31,450
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	160,117	160,117
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	36,997	36,997
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	2,640	2,640
LEASING	118,509	118,509
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	415,733	415,733
MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS	33	33
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	821,892	821,892
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE	923,683	1,166,888

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE		
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS (NSA)	50	50
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT (NSA)	67	67
SERVICES ACCOUNT (NSA)	265	265
UTILITIES ACCOUNT (NSA)	515	515
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT (NSA)	132	132
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT (NSA)	50	50
LEASING (NSA)	13,374	13,374
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (NSA)	244	244
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT (DIA)	3,401	3,401
LEASING (DIA)	22,265	22,265
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT (DLA)	247	247
SERVICES ACCOUNT (DLA)	75	75
UTILITIES ACCOUNT (DLA)	414	414
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT (DLA)	21	21
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (DLA)	370	370
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	41,440	41,440
TOTAL, FAMILIY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE	41,490	41,490

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

INSTALLATION & PROJECT	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND		
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND.	78,756	2,000
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART IV		
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART IV.....	705,911	705,911
GENERAL PROVISIONS		
CONTINGENCY REDUCTION.....	---	-131,177
GRAND TOTAL.....	5,438,443	8,449,742

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Military construction, Army	865,726	656,003	1,223,405	+357,679	+567,402
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	118,000	.....	.....	-118,000	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	659,536	.....	.....	-659,536
Total	983,726	1,315,539	1,223,405	+239,679	-92,134
Military construction, Navy	602,593	319,786	968,862	+366,269	+649,076
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	5,860	.....	.....	-5,860	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	502,812	.....	.....	-502,812
Total	608,453	822,598	968,862	+360,409	+146,264
Military construction, Air Force	612,809	179,479	752,367	+139,558	+572,888
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	29,200	.....	.....	-29,200	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	379,867	.....	.....	-379,867
Total	642,009	559,346	752,367	+110,358	+193,021
Military construction, Defense-wide	551,114	193,005	755,718	+204,604	+562,713
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	337,900	.....	.....	-337,900
Total	551,114	530,905	755,718	+204,604	+224,813
Total, Active components	2,785,302	3,228,388	3,700,352	+915,050	+471,964

Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund:					
Rescission (FY 1997, P.L. 104-196)	-5,000	.....	.....	+5,000	.....
Military construction, Army National Guard	148,803	16,045	135,129	-13,674	+119,084
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	2,500	.....	.....	-2,500	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	41,357	.....	.....	-41,357
Total	151,303	57,402	135,129	-16,174	+77,727
Military construction, Air National Guard	169,801	21,319	180,870	+11,069	+159,551
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	15,900	.....	.....	-15,900	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	51,981	.....	.....	-51,981
Total	185,701	73,300	180,870	-4,831	+107,570
Military construction, Army Reserve	102,119	23,120	92,515	-9,604	+69,395
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	54,506	.....	.....	-54,506
Total	102,119	77,626	92,515	-9,604	+14,889
Military construction, Naval Reserve	31,621	4,933	21,574	-10,047	+16,641
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	10,020	.....	.....	-10,020
Total	31,621	14,953	21,574	-10,047	+6,621
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	34,371	12,155	66,549	+32,178	+54,394
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	15,165	.....	.....	-15,165
Total	34,371	27,320	66,549	+32,178	+39,229
Total, Reserve components	505,115	250,601	496,637	-8,478	+246,036

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Military contruction transfer fund (emergency appropriations) (P.L. 106-31)	475,000	.....	.....	-475,000	.....
Total, Military construction	3,760,417	3,478,989	4,196,989	+436,572	+718,000
Appropriations	(3,118,957)	(1,425,845)	(4,196,989)	(+1,078,032)	(+2,771,144)
Rescissions	(-5,000)	.....	.....	(+5,000)	.....
Emergency appropriations	(646,460)	.....	.....	(-646,460)	.....
Advance appropriations	.....	(2,053,144)	.....	.....	(-2,053,144)
NATO Security Investment Program	155,000	191,000	81,000	-74,000	-110,000
Revised economic assumptions	-1,000	.....	.....	+1,000	.....
Total, NATO	154,000	191,000	81,000	-73,000	-110,000
Family housing, Army:					
New construction	107,100	4,400	49,500	-57,600	+45,100
Construction improvements	48,479	5,303	35,400	-13,079	+30,097
Planning and design	6,350	4,300	4,300	-2,050	.....
General reduction	-2,639	.....	.....	+2,639	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	43,991	.....	.....	-43,991
Subtotal, construction	159,290	57,994	89,200	-70,090	+31,206

Operation and maintenance	1,087,697	1,098,080	1,089,812	+2,115	-8,268
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	5,200	.....	.....	-5,200	.....
Total, Family housing, Army	1,252,187	1,156,074	1,179,012	-73,175	+22,938
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:					
New construction	58,504	15,182	118,174	+59,670	+102,992
Construction improvements	227,791	31,708	176,670	-51,121	+144,962
Planning and design	15,618	17,715	17,715	+2,097	.....
General reduction and revised economic assumptions	-7,323	.....	.....	+7,323	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	171,167	.....	.....	-171,167
Subtotal, construction	294,590	235,772	312,559	+17,969	+76,787
Operation and maintenance	910,293	895,070	895,070	-15,223	.....
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	10,599	.....	.....	-10,599	.....
Total, Family housing, Navy	1,215,482	1,130,842	1,207,629	-7,853	+76,787
Family housing, Air Force:					
New construction	175,099	50,418	203,411	+28,312	+152,993
Construction improvements	104,108	34,280	124,492	+20,384	+90,212
Planning and design	11,342	17,093	17,093	+5,751	.....
General reduction and revised economic assumptions	-10,584	.....	.....	+10,584	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	215,222	.....	.....	-215,222
Subtotal, construction	279,965	317,013	344,996	+65,031	+27,983
Operation and maintenance	780,204	821,892	821,892	+41,688	.....
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	22,233	.....	.....	-22,233	.....
Total, Family housing, Air Force	1,082,402	1,138,905	1,166,888	+84,486	+27,983

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Family housing, Defense-wide:					
Construction improvements	345	50	50	-295	.....
Operation and maintenance	36,899	41,440	41,440	+4,541	.....
Total, Family housing, Defense-wide	37,244	41,490	41,490	+4,246	.....
Family housing revitalization	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,000	78,756	2,000	.....	-76,756
Total, Family housing	3,589,315	3,546,067	3,597,019	+7,704	+50,952
New construction	(340,703)	(70,000)	(371,085)	(+30,382)	(+301,085)
Construction improvements	(380,723)	(71,341)	(336,612)	(-44,111)	(+265,271)
Planning and design	(33,310)	(39,108)	(39,108)	(+5,798)	.....
General reduction	(-20,546)	.....	.....	(+20,546)	.....
Operation and maintenance	(2,815,093)	(2,856,482)	(2,848,214)	(+33,121)	(-8,268)
Family Housing Improvement Fund	(2,000)	(78,756)	(2,000)	.....	(-76,756)
Emergency appropriations	(38,032)	.....	.....	(-38,032)	.....
Advance appropriations	.....	(430,380)	.....	.....	(-430,380)
Base realignment and closure accounts:					
Part III	427,164	.....	.....	-427,164	.....
Part IV	1,197,338	705,911	705,911	-491,427	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	577,306	.....	.....	-577,306
Total, Base realignment and closure accounts	1,624,502	1,283,217	705,911	-918,591	-577,306

Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps (FY99 Sec. 125)	6,000	.....	.....	-6,000	.....
General Provisions					
Contingency reduction (sec. 125)	.....	.....	-131,177	-131,177	-131,177
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	9,134,234	8,499,273	8,449,742	-684,492	-49,531
Appropriations	(8,454,742)	(5,438,443)	(8,449,742)	(-5,000)	(+3,011,299)
Rescissions	(-5,000)	.....	.....	(+5,000)	.....
Emergency appropriations	(684,492)	.....	.....	(-684,492)	.....
Advance appropriations	.....	(3,060,830)	.....	.....	(-3,060,830)