

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
FILE COPY

93D CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES } REPORT
2d Session } } No. 93-1244

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL
YEAR 1975

JULY 31, 1974.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. PIKE, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 16136]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 11, line 10, strike out the figure "\$20,648,000" and substitute the figure "\$20,948,000".

On page 11, line 13, strike out the word "Feld" and substitute the word "Field".

On page 18, line 24, strike out the figure "\$4,151,000" and substitute the figure "\$4,157,000".

On page 37, line 18, strike out the figure \$545,813,000" and substitute the figure "\$545,873,000".

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENTS

The amendments are all technical in nature and are designed to correct clerical and printing errors. The adjusted figures are those originally recommended by the subcommittee and approved by the full Committee, and represent no substantive change in the action recommended.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 16136 is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1975. The bill, as approved by the Committee on Armed Services, totals \$2,983,821,000 and provides construction

authorization in support of the active forces, and Reserve components, Defense agencies, and military family housing. Committee review resulted in a reduction of \$347,957,000.

A brief summary of the authorizations provided in H.R. 16136 follows:

TOTAL AUTHORIZATION GRANTED, FISCAL YEAR 1975

Brief of authorizations

Title I (Army):	
Inside the United States.....	\$490, 555, 000
Outside the United States.....	121, 098, 000
Subtotal.....	611, 653, 000
Title II (Navy):	
Inside the United States.....	492, 042, 000
Outside the United States.....	55, 331, 000
Subtotal.....	547, 373, 000
Title III (Air Force):	
Inside the United States.....	326, 203, 000
Outside the United States.....	75, 924, 000
Classified.....	8, 100, 000
Subtotal.....	410, 227, 000
Title IV (Defense Agencies).....	28, 400, 000
Title V (Military Family Housing and Homeowners Assistance).....	1, 185, 881, 000
Deficiency Authorizations:	
Title I (Army).....	8, 853, 000
Title II (Navy).....	21, 512, 000
Title III (Air Force).....	17, 655, 000
Subtotal.....	48, 020, 000
Title VII (Reserve Forces Facilities)	
Army National Guard.....	53, 800, 000
Army Reserve.....	38, 600, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.....	19, 867, 000
Air National Guard.....	26, 000, 000
Air Force Reserve.....	14, 000, 000
Subtotal.....	152, 267, 000
Total granted by titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VII.....	2, 983, 821, 000

BASIS OF THE BILL

Military construction requirements for fiscal year 1975 as contained in this legislation were developed on the same basis as the Department's request presented to Congress for military procurement. This concept involved the so-called package program method of identifying our military forces with their primary missions and then assigning to these forces the weapons, equipment, and facilities necessary to discharge effectively these assigned mission responsibilities.

The Department of Defense requested new authorization in the amount of \$3,278,380,000 for fiscal year 1975 as compared to the \$2.9 billion requested for fiscal 1974.

While your Armed Services Committee is well aware of the many facilities deficiencies, the bill, as submitted, suggested to us that a very close look at the individual requests was in order and necessary to assure that only those items essential to our national defense interests would be approved.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Military Construction Authorization Request, as introduced, was H.R. 14126. Hearings on this bill were conducted by Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on Armed Services. This subcommittee met on 25 separate occasions and reviewed in depth the line items contained in the Department of Defense request. The construction proposals contained in the bill as submitted to the Congress covered approximately 700 individual line items at approximately 300 military installations within the United States and overseas.

After these extensive hearings the subcommittee reduced the bill \$347,957,000 or 10.4 percent.

ORIGINAL DEPARTMENTAL REQUEST AS CONTAINED IN H.R. 14126 TOGETHER WITH THE COMMITTEE ACTION AS REFLECTED IN H.R. 16136

Title	Service	H.R. 14126 department request	Changes in amounts authorized for appropriations	Percent change	H.R. 16136 adjusted totals authorized for appropriations
I.....	Army.....	\$696,815,000	-\$85,162,000	-12.2	\$611,653,000
II.....	Navy.....	567,674,000	-21,801,000	-3.8	545,873,000
III.....	Air Force.....	468,276,000	-67,049,000	-14.3	401,227,000
IV.....	Defense agencies.....	47,400,000	-19,000,000	-40.1	28,400,000
V.....	Family housing and homeowners assistance.....	1,347,283,000	-161,402,000	-12.0	1,185,881,000
	Deficiency authorization.....	42,898,000	+5,122,000	+11.9	48,020,000
VII.....	Reserve forces.....	150,932,000	+1,335,000	+0.9	152,267,000
	Total.....	3,321,278,000	-\$347,957,000	-10.4	2,973,321,000

As is evidenced by the foregoing figures, the committee has made an attempt to substantially reduce the Department of Defense request where possible without depriving the services of the projects considered necessary to maintain a strong defense posture.

DEFICIENCY AUTHORIZATION

The Committee is deeply concerned over the recent rapid escalation of construction costs and the increasing number of deficiencies that are being requested. While many of these increases are attributable to

the abnormally rapid spiraling of labor, material, and financing costs, it is believed that more progress can be made in this area if stress were placed on more timely and realistic development of criteria, design, and estimates. For example, the Services were presenting to the Congress projects for construction which did not provide for cost increases anticipated at the time that a project was scheduled to be placed under contract. We believe that such budgeting procedures are unrealistic and reflect budgetary guidance which does not recognize the realities of current economic conditions. Rather than delay further those projects already approved by Congress the Committee has approved increases in prior years' authority in this bill which total \$48 million including \$8.8 million for Army, \$21.5 million for Navy, and \$17.7 million for Air Force. However, the Committee is serving notice on the Department of Defense and the Military Departments that unless definite steps are taken to correct this situation in future budgets, the Committee will take the necessary action to eliminate these faulty budget submissions. The Committee further expects the Department to advise us what steps are being taken to remedy the situation. The following table shows the approved deficiency authorizations in more detail:

DEFICIENCY AUTHORIZATION, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL--FISCAL YEAR 1975

[In thousands of dollars]

Public Law	Section	Installation	Existing amount authorized	As amended by bill	Additional authorized requested
ARMY (TITLE I)					
91-511	101	Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.....	2,750	3,650	900
92-545	101	Fort Myer, Va.....	1,815	3,615	1,800
92-545	101	Fort Sill, Okla.....	14,958	16,159	1,201
92-545	101	Canal Zone, various locations.....	8,129	9,238	1,109
93-166	101	Germany, various locations.....	12,517	16,360	3,843
Total, Army.....			40,169	49,022	8,853
NAVY (TITLE II)					
90-408	201	Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.....	2,000	4,391	2,391
91-511	201	Naval Air rework facility, Jacksonville, Fla.....	3,869	4,534	665
92-545	201	Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Va.....	3,319	7,019	3,700
92-545	201	Naval Hospital, New Orleans, La.....	11,680	14,609	2,929
93-166	201	Naval Home, Gulfport, Miss.....	9,444	14,163	4,719
93-166	201	Naval Hospital, New Orleans, La.....	3,386	4,157	771
93-166	201	Naval Air Sta., Alameda, Calif.....	3,827	7,756	3,929
93-166	201	Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif.....	3,802	6,210	2,408
Total, Navy.....			41,327	62,839	21,512
AIR FORCE (TITLE III)					
93-166	301	Peterson Field, Colo.....	7,843	9,733	1,890
93-166	301	Robins Air Force Base, Ga.....	4,628	7,324	2,696
93-166	301	Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.....	7,039	8,882	1,843
93-166	301	Keesler Air Force Base, Miss.....	8,786	10,733	1,947
93-166	301	Lackland Air Force Base, Tex.....	6,509	9,186	2,677
93-166	301	Reese Air Force Base, Tex.....	4,211	6,461	2,250
93-166	301	Vance Air Force Base, Okla.....	371	895	524
93-166	301	Altus Air Force Base, Okla.....	1,078	1,440	362
93-166	301	Francis E. Warren AFB, Wyo.....	3,834	8,265	2,431
93-166	301	Little Rock AFB, Ark.....	1,165	2,200	1,035
Total, Air Force.....			47,464	65,119	17,655
Grand total.....			123,960	176,980	48,020

REAL PROPERTY HOLDINGS

For fiscal year 1975, the committee was called upon to authorize the acquisition of 26,935 acres of land at a cost of approximately \$13.9 million. This committee has indicated many times in the past that it is opposed to additional land acquisitions by military departments unless strong proof is submitted that such purchases are absolutely essential. For that and other good and sufficient reasons the committee approved only the acquisition of 4,935 acres at a cost of \$6,683,000.

The real property under military control includes property owned, leased, or obtained subject to permit, license, easement, or other forms of agreement granting proprietary use and occupancy rights. As of June 30, 1973, the military departments controlled 28.2 million acres of land throughout the world. This land, together with the improvements, had an original cost to the United States of \$41.334 billion.

REAL ESTATE UNDER MILITARY CONTROL GROUPED AS FOLLOWS

Location	Acreage (actual thousands)	Cost of land and improvements (thousands)
United States.....	25,692	\$35,100,743
Possessions.....	297	1,680,414
Foreign countries.....	2,180	4,552,956
Total.....	28,169	41,334,113

The real property under military control in the United States consists of the following:

Type of interest	Controlled acreage	Percent of total
Fee owned.....	6,675,305	26.0
Public domain.....	16,302,597	63.4
Temporary use.....	1,333,989	5.2
Leased.....	1,117,765	4.4
Easement.....	263,844	1.0
Total.....	25,692,500	100.0

It is significant to note that only 26.0 percent of the military controlled land in the United States represents property removed from the tax rolls while 63.4 percent is public domain property and the remainder consists of land areas where lesser and proprietary interests have been obtained. Over 416,000 acres of military land controlled in the United States have been donated.

PROPOSED REAL ESTATE ACQUISITIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1975 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

[Dollar amount in thousands]

Military department and location	Fee interest		Lesser interest		Total	
	Acres	Estimated cost	Acres	Estimated cost	Acres	Estimated cost
Army: Fort Carson, Colo.....	22,000	\$7,292			22,000	\$7,292
Navy:						
Naval security group activity, Sabana Seca, P.R.....	1,000	1,800			1,000	1,800
Naval Research Laboratory, Washington D.C.....	198	205			198	205
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P.R.....	6	153			6	153
Naval Hospital, San Diego, Calif.....	103	3,843			103	3,843
Naval Air Station, Meridian, Miss.....	470	534	2,420	\$92	2,890	626
Total.....	1,777	5,535	2,420	92	4,197	5,627
Air Force:						
Eglin AFB, Fla.....	4	382			4	382
Scott AFB, Ill.....	246	333			246	333
Total.....	92	251	396	90	488	341
Total.....	342	966	396	90	738	1,056
Recapitulation:						
Army.....	22,000	7,292			22,000	7,292
Navy.....	1,777	5,535	2,420	92	4,197	5,627
Air Force.....	342	966	396	90	738	1,056
Total new authorization.....	24,119	13,793	2,816	182	26,935	13,975

¹ Authorization only.² Restrictive easement.³ Authorization only for land exchange. Includes \$106,000 funding for resettlement (Public Law 91-646).

NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER

The Committee has carefully examined the Department of the Navy request for authorization of \$14.9 million for the first phase of a multiphase redevelopment of the National Naval Medical Center. The importance of the total program stems from the necessity to update and replace the obsolete and dysfunctional clinical facilities which are inadequate to render quality care to all service personnel and support the substantial medical education and research program now in existence. The National Naval Medical Center compound will also be the site for the new Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. The new clinical facility will be one of the university's primary teaching hospitals.

Planning for this redevelopment program has spanned several years. This program is the result of several thorough studies which were initiated as it became clear that advancing medical technology and a vastly increasing work load had outstripped the capability of the institution. There has similarly been a significant increase in the number of residency programs, number of other trainees, and an expansion of the institution's role in training the undergraduate medical student. Superior medical education dictates availability of adequate resources.

The Committee desires that this renowned naval medical center continue to be one of the foremost in the world. The Committee believes the Navy plan assures the construction of a modern, flexible facility that will enable progressive patient management with attention given to functional relationship and ease and economy of expansion. The new hospital will provide increased capability for outpatient

care. Ancillary support facilities will serve the hospital and other medical activities at the Center (Health Science Education and Training Command, Naval Graduate Dental School, Naval Medical Research Institute, Naval School of Health Care Administration, and the Armed Forces Radio-biology Research Institute), other Navy medical activities in the region, and the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

The Committee concurs that it is absolutely essential to maintain ongoing operations and quality health care to the beneficiary population throughout redevelopment. For this reason, the Committee approves the redevelopment phasing concept as proposed by the Navy as the most viable alternative. The first phase, which is addressed in the FY-75 Military Construction Program, contains approximately \$14,900,000 for projects which largely meet current deficiencies as well as being basic to the redevelopment. The projects are for a medical warehouse, road improvements, public works shops, fire protection in an existing building, a parking structure, and utilities improvements.

The Navy advises that they are investigating the feasibility of seeking the remaining authorization of \$152,000,000 in FY-76 with phased funding over Fiscal Years 1976, 1978, and 1979. In FY-1976 the Navy expects to request the major portion of the funds for the hospital modernization. The current order of magnitude estimate is \$100,000,000 for this work.

It is planned to include \$20,000,000 in the Fiscal Year 1978 program to modernize certain portions of the existing hospital, which are suitable for continued medical use, provide personnel support facilities and satisfy remaining parking deficiencies.

The Navy will complete the modernization of the Center in Fiscal Year 1979 with a program which will include \$32,000,000 to complete modernization of existing hospital spaces that are suitable for continued medical use, and alter the tower to accommodate a consolidation of the medical activities at the Center and in the Washington area.

The new hospital will contain 518 acute care beds. Two existing buildings will be remodeled to provide 125 light care beds and 107 psychiatric beds for a total capacity of 750 beds. The hospital will be designed to accommodate 700,000 outpatient visits per year. It will also continue to support 25 residency training programs. There are currently 145 residents in training at the National Naval Medical Center which comprise 25 percent of all Navy medical specialty trainees. Additionally, it will be one three primary clinical training centers for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, which will have an eventual enrollment of 800 to 1,200 students. This facility, along with its tenant commands and Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, in conjunction with the adjacent National Institutes of Health and the National Library of Medicine, will comprise the most modern, sophisticated, and all-inclusive health care/research core in the world.

The Committee strongly supports the concept of program phasing, and recommends that the construction identified in the FY-75 request proceed so that the National Naval Medical Center can better serve its beneficiary population and support the requirements generated by the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences.

UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

The Military Construction Authorization bill as submitted contained no request for the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences. However, under date of 9 July 1974 the committee received a communication from the Department of Defense which stated that the Deputy Secretary of Defense had approved a plan to provide an initial increment of construction funding in the FY-75 military construction program for the initial facilities required for the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences.

The committee, during its markup session, requested that further information be furnished justifying the request from the Department of Defense to add \$15 million to the budget request. The committee was told that in order to meet the schedule as stated in Public Law 92-426, which requires 100 medical graduates by 1982, that time was of the essence in initiating the construction of the program envisioned by the initial legislation.

It was determined that a "Surge" facility containing approximately 160,000 sq. feet gross space would be constructed as first phase and it is hoped that this building will be ready by the fall of 1976. It will be a basic science building which will take an entering medical school class of up to 125 students. It will be a very flexible building so that it can easily be integrated as a permanent structure with the remainder of the university construction program.

The committee approved the request and added \$15 million to the Navy portion of the bill in an effort to help stay on the schedule contemplated by public law 92-426.

TACTICAL AIRCRAFT SHELTERS

This program is a continuation of the theater air base vulnerability reduction program that the Air Force initiated and the Congress approved in FY 1968. The merits of aircraft protective shelters, coupled with aggressive ground-based anti-aircraft defense, has been shown in the dramatic difference in the survival rates of the Egyptian Air Force in the 1967 war when its aircraft were destroyed on the ground, and the 1973 war when only an insignificant number of Egyptian and Arabian aircraft were destroyed on the ground. The major factor in this reversal of destruction was that in the 1973 conflict the Arabian aircraft were protected on the ground by hardened shelters that were surrounded by effective surface-to-air missiles and other anti-aircraft weapons. In light of this experience, we believe it is prudent to look to the survival of the U.S. aircraft we have committed to the NATO mission. The \$92.3 million of funds provided in earlier programs by the Congress have provided a shelter for every U.S. aircraft permanently based on the continent of Europe. However, we do have commitments to send additional aircraft squadrons to NATO in the event of force mobilization. Should the Warsaw Pact nations initiate an attack on western Europe using conventional weapons, as opposed to a surprise attack with nuclear armed missiles, there should be sufficient warning to NATO by troop movements, materiel stockage, and other unusual actions to allow a reactive NATO mobilization. United States aircraft that we are committed to deploy

to NATO during a mobilization would have no shelters at their assigned bases, and would be extremely vulnerable to destruction by conventional weapons even with dispersal, camouflage, and vigorous anti-aircraft defense. The merits of shelters have been recognized in NATO and the other NATO countries have in being, and under construction, protective aircraft shelters that provide for the major portion of their forces. The earliest NATO program that could produce additional shelters needed for mobilization type U.S. aircraft is at least 15 months later than the shelters that can be built with the funds requested in this FY-1975 MCP. To keep the momentum that the U.S. has generated in the shelter program, to provide a visible deterrent to potential enemies, and to protect our aircraft should hostilities occur, the Committee believes the shelter program should proceed. After detailed questioning of witnesses by the committee, it was determined that the full authorization be provided subject to the following considerations:

(1) Approval of the \$62 million in the FY 1975 program is not a commitment to authorize the balance of the shelters required in the European area. The committee directs the Department to take the necessary actions to secure recoupment of the \$62 million pre-financing.

(2) The House and Senate Armed Services Committees are to be notified 30 days in advance of the award of contracts for the shelter that the designs of the shelter have been completed and that they will meet all U.S. and NATO criteria for aircraft protection and infrastructure funding eligibility. Similarly, notification will be provided 30 days in advance of contract award for shelter doors that the design selected conforms to U.S. and NATO criteria. These notifications are required by the committee because we cannot subscribe to investments of this magnitude without being able to assure the Congress that they will perform the function promised.

NAVAL HOSPITAL, ORLANDO, FLA.

In FY-74 the Navy requested authorization for a 235 bed hospital at the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida. This Committee disapproved authorization for the hospital and requested the Navy to restudy their requirements for a hospital that large.

In the FY-75 program the Navy did not request authorization for a hospital at Orlando. When questioned about this, Navy witnesses replied that the requirement for Orlando has been restudied and the Navy has come up with a figure of 100 beds for the active hospitalized area and 50 beds for the light-care area. The Navy said "these are the new criteria now that we based our requirements on for the new hospital at Orlando." Navy witnesses further testified that it would take a year or a year and a half to redesign the hospital under existing criteria developed by the Navy and therefore they were not in a position to come forward in FY-75.

The Committee is aware of the need for a replacement hospital at Orlando and requests the Navy to go forward with their design effort so that their budget request can contain a request for this hospital if possible in the next fiscal year.

REDUCTION IN DEPARTMENTAL REQUESTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

The Military Departments and Defense Agencies submitted their original requests for new facilities in the total amount of \$3.9 billion which included \$1.4 billion for family housing and homeowners assistance.

The Department of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget evaluated each project submitted by the departments to verify that it was needed to support the approved Department of Defense program. Each project was then examined for compliance with Department of Defense standards covering size, cost, site location and design. In formulating the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Program, the Department of Defense stated that they also considered present and future deployment, the Total Force planning policy, the condition of the existing military plant and the immediate and long-range requirements for modernization and replacements of that plant together with overall priorities and specialized needs.

As a reflection of all of these factors, and as a result of this examination, the proposed military construction request for the Active and Reserve forces for fiscal year 1975 was reduced to \$3,278,380,000 before it was submitted to the Congress. That figure includes \$1,347,283,000 for family housing and homeowners assistance.

A comparison of this year's proposed authorization program with similar authorizations enacted for the past five years is shown below:

AUTHORIZATION ENACTED, COMPARED WITH FISCAL YEAR 1975 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

(In millions of dollars)

	1970 actual	1971 actual	1972 actual	1973 actual	1974 actual	1975 requested
I. Army.....	292.7	590.1	503.0	558.8	596.1	696.8
II. Navy.....	306.3	268.9	321.8	515.7	570.4	567.7
III. Air Force.....	269.0	256.2	247.3	284.2	260.7	468.3
IV. Defense agencies.....	16.2	9.3	10.6	15.5	10.0	17.4
Contingency.....	25.0	35.0	10.0	17.5		30.0
V. Family housing.....	689.5	804.2	915.2	1,050.7	1,172.0	1,342.3
Homeowners assistance.....			7.6		7.0	5.0
VII. Reserve components.....	41.0	37.5	80.3	107.2	112.3	150.9
Total.....	1,639.7	2,001.2	2,095.8	2,549.6	2,728.5	3,278.4

The construction proposals contained in this program include 263 major bases and 665 separate projects.

The bill as reported authorizes construction for those projects which the Committee believes must be initiated in fiscal year 1975 to meet operational schedules, to support new missions, or which are essential for other compelling reasons such as health and safety of personnel and the improvement of the most seriously deficient facilities.

The fiscal year 1975 military construction authorization bill contains two distinct parts:

- (a) Authority to construct new operational facilities in the amount of \$1.749 million to support the Active and Reserve Forces.

A summary of this authority, identified by individual departments and agencies, is set out below:

Department	Active Forces	Reserve Forces	Total	Percen
Army.....	\$611,653,000	\$92,400,000	\$704,053,000	40
Navy.....	547,373,000	19,867,000	567,240,000	32
Air Force.....	410,227,000	40,000,000	450,227,000	26
Defense agencies.....	28,400,000		28,400,000	2
Total.....	1,597,653,000	152,267,000	1,749,920,000	100

(b) The authority for military family housing in the amount of \$1,185,881,000, including \$5 million for homeowners' assistance. Details of the committee actions and the content of the programs approved are set forth in the following material covering the separate titles of the bill.

TITLE I—ARMY

The Army request under title I of the bill amounted to \$696,815,000. The committee, after careful review and consideration of the Army request, approved the following program:

	Army request	Committee approved
Inside the United States.....	\$557,064,000	\$490,555,000
Outside the United States.....	139,751,000	121,098,000
Total.....	696,815,000	611,653,000
Deficiency authorization.....	10,127,000	10,127,000
Emergency construction.....	10,000,000	10,000,000

The Committee notes that the Army is continuing an aggressive program to improve its personnel support. Once again, as in fiscal years 1973 and 1974, the Army's program is heavily weighted toward soldier oriented projects. Exclusive of NATO Infrastructure, approximately 72 percent of the construction dollars are for bachelor housing, medical facilities and community support facilities.

The Army is also maintaining its effort in combating pollution. The fiscal year 1975 MCA program shows a 21-percent increase over that approved in fiscal year 1974 for pollution abatement projects. This year's program responds both to earlier requirements now technologically achievable and to new requirements generated by increasingly more stringent standards, in particular the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

Other projects submitted by Army will improve its operational capability. Of special significance is a nearly threefold increase in funds requested to construct maintenance facilities, an item directly related to the Army's readiness posture.

The following tables summarize the authorization request by Major Command and by facility class and the authorization provided by the Committee.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Army request	Committee approved
MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY		
U.S. Army Forces Command.....	209,494,000	185,088,000
U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.....	185,205,000	171,344,000
U.S. Army Military District of Washington.....	2,497,000	2,497,000
U.S. Army Materiel Command.....	44,972,000	40,461,000
U.S. Army Communications Command.....	12,373,000	5,422,000
U.S. Military Academy.....	9,720,000	7,720,000
U.S. Army Health Services Command.....	25,046,000	17,086,000
Corps of Engineers.....	2,515,000	2,515,000
Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service.....	4,550,000	0
U.S. Army, Alaska.....	15,726,000	13,456,000
U.S. Army, Hawaii.....	16,529,000	16,529,000
Air pollution abatement facilities, various locations.....	1,356,000	1,356,000
Water pollution abatement facilities, various locations.....	16,358,000	16,358,000
Dining facilities modernization, various locations.....	10,723,000	10,723,000
Subtotal inside the United States.....	557,064,000	490,555,000
U.S. Army Forces, Southern Command.....	4,138,000	324,000
U.S. Army, Pacific.....	5,139,000	1,663,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,862,000	0
Kwajalein Missile Range.....	2,241,000	1,272,000
U.S. Army Security Agency.....	148,000	148,000
U.S. Army Communications Command.....	532,000	532,000
United States Army, Europe:		
Germany.....	33,532,000	25,000,000
Italy.....	4,159,000	4,159,000
NATO Infrastructure.....	88,000,000	88,000,000
Subtotal outside the United States.....	139,751,000	121,098,000
Total.....	696,815,000	611,653,000
FACILITY CLASSES SUMMARY		
Operational and training facilities.....	40,527,000	27,237,000
Maintenance and production facilities.....	45,021,000	40,667,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation facilities.....	17,364,000	17,364,000
Supply facilities.....	22,841,000	19,811,000
Hospital and medical facilities.....	87,196,000	76,513,000
Administrative facilities.....	18,726,000	9,605,000
Housing and community facilities.....	325,828,000	299,104,000
Housing.....	(290,683,000)	(276,513,000)
Community facilities.....	(35,145,000)	(22,591,000)
Utilities and ground improvement.....	26,306,000	15,638,000
Air pollution abatement.....	1,356,000	1,356,000
Water pollution abatement.....	16,358,000	16,358,000
Real estate.....	7,292,000	0
NATO infrastructure.....	88,000,000	88,000,000
Total.....	696,815,000	611,653,000

U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND

Approval is granted for new authorization in the amount of \$185,088,000 to provide 31 projects at eight U.S. Army Forces Command installations. Major projects in the approved program are barracks complexes at Fort Carson, Fort Hood and Fort Stewart, barracks at Fort Hood and Fort Riley, barracks modernization at Fort Bragg, Fort Campbell, Fort Hood, Fort Lewis, Fort Stewart and Hunter Army Airfield, and company administrative and supply facilities at Hunter Army Airfield. Approved medical facilities include an addition to Irwin Army Hospital at Fort Riley and dental clinics at Forts Bragg, Campbell and Hood. Also included are aircraft parking aprons and maintenance hangars at Fort Bragg, rotary wing parking aprons and rotary wing hangar and hangar addition at Fort Carson, tactical equipment shops and facilities at Fort Hood and Fort Stewart, and an entrance road at Fort Bragg. Other projects approved are a

fire station at Fort Riley, alteration of administrative facilities for the Health Services Command at Fort Sam Houston, water storage tanks at Fort Stewart and Hunter Army Airfield, storm drainage improvements at Fort Sam Houston, improvement to the post water system at Fort Riley, modification of the electrical system at Fort Bragg and extension of utilities at Fort Carson.

The Committee deferred the following projects:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Fort Bragg, N.C.	EM service club	\$1,284
Fort Carson, Colo.	Land acquisition	7,292
	Utilities extension	1,750
Fort Devens, Mass.	Barracks mod.	3,377
Fort Hood, Tex.	Confinement fac.	3,622
	Entrance road	2,540
Fort Riley, Kans.	Dental clinic	1,141
	Support fac.	2,793
Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Ga.	Parachute drying and packing fac.	332
	Tactical equip shop and fac.	1,275
Total reduction		24,406

¹ Partial reduction.

The barracks project at Fort Devens, the parachute drying and packing facility at Fort Stewart and the tactical equipment shop at Hunter Army Airfield were deferred for questions of a hard requirement. The land acquisition at Fort Carson was deferred for questions of appraised value of cost per acre reflected and incomplete status of the draft environmental impact statement. The other projects were deferred for reasons of economy.

U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

The Committee approves \$171,344,000 for 43 projects at 17 U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command installations. Significant among the approved projects are barracks complexes at Forts Benning, Gordon, Jackson, and McClellan, barracks at Forts Eustis, Rucker and Leonard Wood and barracks modernization at Forts Benning, Bliss, Eustis, Lee, Rucker and Sill. The Committee approves medical facilities to provide an addition to the hospital at Fort Leavenworth, a medical/dental clinic for the Presidio of Monterey and dental clinics for Forts Benning, Jackson, Rucker, Sill and Leonard Wood. Also approved are tactical equipment shops and facilities at Forts Ord, Polk, and Sill, alteration and construction of training facilities at Fort Bliss, academic facilities at Fort Gordon, the Presidio of Monterey and Fort McClellan, facilities for basic combat training at Fort Sill battalion headquarters/classrooms and company administrative/supply facilities at Fort Polk, and instrument trainer building at Fort Rucker, aircraft parking aprons at Fort Eustis and a combat flight control and operations building at Fort Sill. Other projects approved are an electrical distribution system extension, a cook and bakers school and ammunition storage facilities at Fort Jackson, a night vision laboratory at Fort Belvoir, a gunnery range and commissary at Fort Bliss, an electronics and electrical maintenance shop

at Fort Gordon, a central processing system facility and an engineer developments building at Hunter Liggett, a steam line at Fort Rucker, and an electrical system alteration and addition at Fort Knox.

COMMITTEE-DEFERRED PROJECTS

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Fort Belvoir, Va.	Aircraft supply building	\$594
Fort Bliss, Tex.	Tactical equipment shops	2,514
Fort Gordon, Ga.	Printing plant addition	233
Fort Lee, Va.	Enlisted men's club	1,376
Do.	Administrative building	7,255
Fort Ord, Calif.	Dental clinic	1,211
Fort Sill, Okla.	Theater	678
Total reduction		13,861

Note: The committee felt these projects could be deferred for reasons of economy.

U.S. ARMY MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

The Committee approves authorization of \$2,497,000 for the U.S. Army Band training facility at Fort Myer.

U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

The Committee approves 17 projects at 14 Army Materiel Command installations for a total cost of \$40,461,000.

For the arsenals the Committee approves an addition to the explosive laboratory at Picatinny, and alteration for administrative facilities at Rock Island, fire protection shop buildings, interior electrical distribution and a weapons quality test facility at Watervliet. At the Army depots, the Committee approves a vehicle maintenance support facility and a depot headquarters and administrative building at Anniston, a care and preservation facility at Letterkenny, alterations to buildings for Logistics Data Center at Lexington-Blue Grass, security fencing at Red River, an industrial plating shop at Sacramento, a medical/dental clinic at Seneca, and a chapel center at Sierra. The Committee also approves igloo magazines at Yuma Proving Grounds, mobile optical sites at White Sands Missile Range, upgrade of lighting at the Aeronautical Maintenance Center and a new hospital at Redstone Arsenal.

The Committee deferred the following projects:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.	ADP and Communications Center addition	\$1,030
AMMRC, Maine	Boiler house modernization	558
Red River Army Depot, Tex.	Addition and alteration to Depot operations building	891
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.	Range power	1,766
Do.	Post chapel addition	266
Total reduction		4,511

The Committee felt these projects could be deferred for reasons of economy.

U.S. ARMY COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

(Inside the United States)

The Committee authorizes \$5,422,000 for the U.S. Army Communications Command. The authorization includes a consolidated test support facility and a commissary at Fort Huachuca and electric equipment maintenance storage, electric distribution reconfiguration and interior water supply at Fort Ritchie.

The Committee deferred the following project:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Fort Huachuca, Ariz.....	Academic building.....	\$6,951

In the original announcement to move the Intelligence activities from Fort Holabird to Fort Huachuca, the Department of Defense stated that facilities were available for the school at Fort Huachuca, therefore, the Committee feels that this project could be safely deferred for economy reasons.

U.S. ARMY MILITARY ACADEMY

The Committee approves new authorization of \$7,720,000 to provide alteration of cadet barracks, a public comfort station, and an addition to the gymnasium at the U.S. Army Military Academy.

The Committee denied full authorization for the following project:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
U.S. Military Academy, N.Y.....	Gymnasium.....	1 \$2,000

¹ Partial reduction.

While recognizing the need to improve and expand the West Point Gymnasium, the Committee is of the opinion that by careful modification of the design through value engineering, an adequate facility can be provided at a reduced cost.

U.S. ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

New authorization of \$17,086,000 is approved for the U.S. Army Health Services Command. The authorization includes electrical power improvement at Fort Detrick and electrical mechanical upgrade for five hospitals at various locations in the United States.

The Committee deferred three of the eight hospitals included in the electrical mechanical upgrade as follows:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Various.....	Electrical mechanical upgrade.....	1 \$7,960

¹ Partial reduction.

The Committee feels that the hospitals at Forts Devens, Bliss, and Jackson which were completed in 1971 and 1972 can be safely deferred without danger in loss of accreditation.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Approval is granted for a laboratory addition costing \$2,515,000 at the Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

The Committee denied the following project:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal, N.C.	Disposal dikes	\$1,550

The Committee is of the opinion that the construction of dikes to retain spoil from maintenance dredging should properly be charged to maintenance funds.

U.S. ARMY, ALASKA

The Committee approves five projects in Alaska amounting to \$13,456,000. The approval provides for a power distribution line at Fort Greely, a dental clinic at Fort Richardson, and a cold storage warehouse, barracks modernization and dining facilities improvement at Fort Wainwright.

The Committee deferred the following project:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Fort Richardson	Airfield paving and lighting	\$2,270

The Committee felt that this project could be deferred for reasons of economy and because Elmendorf AFB facilities can be utilized.

U.S. ARMY, HAWAII

For Hawaii, the Committee approves four projects totaling \$16,529,000. At Schofield Barracks, the Committee approves Phase I of aviation facilities, barracks modernization and a transformer substation. At Tripler General Hospital, a barracks modernization project is approved.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

In support of the national goal in reducing environmental pollution the Committee approves the Army request for \$17,714,000 to provide air and water pollution abatement facilities. Of this total \$1,356,000 are for air pollution abatement projects and \$16,358,000 for water pollution control projects. The total authorized is a 21 percent increase

over the amount requested and approved in FY 1974. This reflects the first onset of requirements growing from the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. As these requirements develop further, even larger sums are anticipated for pollution abatement efforts in future MCA programs.

DINING FACILITIES MODERNIZATION

(Inside the United States)

The Committee approves \$10,723,000 for modernization of dining facilities at ten installations at various locations in the United States. This project is an important facet in the Army's program to improve overall Service life. Modernization of these outdated, inefficient dining facilities will significantly increase the Army's capability to provide appealing wholesome meals so important to the soldiers well being.

U.S. ARMY, SOUTHERN COMMAND

The Committee approves the Army request for one project at the U.S. Army, Southern Command for a total of \$324,000. The approved project provides a commissary addition at Corozal.

The Committee deferred the following projects:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Fort Amador, C.Z.	EM barracks	\$1,948
Fort Clayton, C.Z.	Air-conditioning, administration building	1,633
Corozal, C.Z.	Air-conditioning, finance office	233
Total reduction		3,814

The barracks project at Fort Amador was deferred for questions of a hard requirement. The other projects were deferred for reasons of economy and low priority.

U.S. ARMY, PACIFIC

For Korea, the Committee approves two projects totaling \$1,663,000. These are a new barracks and community facilities.

The Committee deferred the following projects:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Korea	A/C Seoul Hospital, Yongsan	\$371
	Barracks modernization	3,105
Total reduction		3,476

The Committee felt that the air conditioning project for Yongsan hospital could be deferred since it is not in patient wards. The barracks modernization project was deferred for lack of a hard requirement.

PUERTO RICO

The Committee deferred the following project:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Fort Buchanan	Armed Forces examination and entrance station	\$1.862

The Committee felt this project could be deferred for reasons of economy. The present facility can continue in use for at least another year.

KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE

Two projects are approved by the Committee for the National Missile Range for a total cost of \$1,272,000. The approval provides for additional instrumentation and technical support facilities and an incinerator/compactor.

The Committee deferred the following projects:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Kwajalein Missile Range	Air conditioning barracks and dining facilities	\$465
	Ennylabegan power addition	504
Total reduction		969

The Committee feels these projects can be safely deferred as they are relatively low priority items.

U.S. ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

(Outside the United States)

One project at an ASA overseas location, for an electrical maintenance shop and warehouse, is approved for \$148,000.

U.S. ARMY COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

(Outside the United States)

The Committee approves the Army request for upgrading power at Futenma, Okinawa, an overseas communications site, at a cost of \$532,000.

U.S. ARMY, EUROPE

The Committee grants new authorization for U.S. Army, Europe in the amount of \$117,159,000. Included are \$83,000,000 for NATO Infrastructure, \$25,000,000 for various installations in Germany and \$4,159,000 for Camp Darby, Italy. Projects approved for installations in Germany are missile operational facilities at Zweibruecken, a vehicle maintenance facility at Nahbollenbach, maintenance facilities at Wildflecken, maintenance hardstands at various locations, improve ammunition storage at various locations, a radio relay site, and a

Defense satellite communications system facility. Other projects approved for Germany are alterations to the 97th General Hospital at Frankfurt, new dependent schools at Heidelberg and Ulm. The Committee also approves a medical clinic and improvement of ammunition storage facilities at Camp Darby, Italy.

The Committee deferred the following projects:

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Pruem.....	Upgrade operations facilities.....	\$1,177
	EM barracks with dining facility.....	2,482
Amberg.....	Improve ammo storage QRS.....	11,545
Kitzingen.....	Dependent school.....	12,463
	Commissary addition.....	865
Total reduction.....		8,532

¹ Partial reduction.

The operations facilities and EM barracks with mess at Pruem, the dependent school and commissary addition at Kitzingen were deferred for reasons of economy. While the need to improve the ammunition storage facilities is recognized, the Committee is of the opinion that through value engineering, an adequate facility can be provided for the Quick Reaction Storage Sites (QRS) at a reduced cost, therefore, the QRS portion of the project is deferred.

EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

As in previous years, the Committee has approved authorization of \$10,000,000 to meet unforeseen situations occasioned by (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons development, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules. Each project to be accomplished under this authority must meet strict criteria specified by the Committee and must be reported to the Committee before the project can be started.

AMENDMENTS TO PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS

The Army reported to the Committee that it is unable to build a confinement facility at Fort Sill, a barracks at Fort Myer, a barracks modernization project for the Panama Area, industrial waste treatment facilities at Cornhusker Army Ammunition Plant or the separation of the storm and sanitary sewer systems at Rock Island Arsenal within authorization granted in previous years. Increases in construction costs due to unexpected inflation growth and necessary changes in the projects require a deficiency authorization of \$6,284,000 for these five CONUS Army installations. In addition to the above deficiencies, the Army also reported that it is unable to build three projects in Germany within authorization granted in previous years. These are a barracks at Pruem Post, additions to dependent schools and new dependent schools at various locations in Germany. Extraordinary increases in construction costs in Europe accompanied by revaluations of the dollar have generated the need for a deficiency authorization of \$3,843,000 for these three projects in Germany. The Committee denied the Cornhusker AAP request for \$350,000 and reduced the Fort Sill request by \$924,000 and approves an Army deficiency request in the amount of \$8,853,000.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTIONS

A summary of the actions taken by the Committee on the program originally submitted by the Army are tabulated below by project:

Installation	Project	Action (thousands)
Fort Bragg, N.C.	EM service club	-\$1,284
Fort Carson, Colo.	Land acquisition	-7,292
	Utilities extension	1,750
Fort Devens, Mass.	Barracks mod.	-3,377
Fort Hood, Tex.	Confinement fac.	-3,622
	Entrance road	-2,540
Fort Riley, Kans.	Dental clinic	-1,141
	Support fac.	-2,793
Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Ga.	Parachute drying and packing fac.	-332
	Tactical equip shop and fac.	-1,275
Fort Belvoir	Aircraft supply bldg.	-594
Fort Bliss, Tex.	Tactical equip shops	-2,514
Fort Gordon, Ga.	Printing plant addn.	-233
Fort Lee, Va.	EM club	-1,376
	Administrative bldg.	-7,255
Fort Ord, Calif.	Dental clinic	-1,211
Fort Sill, Okla.	Theatre	-678
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.	ADP and comm center addn.	-1,030
AMM RC, Mass.	Boiler house mod.	-558
Red River Army Depot, Tex.	Addition and alt to depot op building	-891
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.	Range power	-1,766
	Post chapel addn.	-266
Fort Huachuca, Ariz.	Academic bldg.	-6,951
U.S. Military Academy, N.Y.	Gymnasium	1 -2,000
Various	Electrical mechanical upgrade	1 -7,960
	Fort Bliss, Tex.	(-2,627)
	Fort Devens, Mass.	(-2,160)
	Fort Jackson, S.C.	(-3,173)
Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal, N.C.	Disposal dikes	-4,550
Fort Richardson, Ark.	Airfield paving and lighting	-2,270
Fort Amador, C.Z.	EM barracks	-1,948
Fort Clayton, C.Z.	Air-conditioning admin bldg.	-1,633
Corozal, C.Z.	Air-conditioning finance Ofc.	-233
Fort Buchanan, P.R.	AFEE station	-1,862
Kwajalein Missile Range	Air-conditioning barracks and dining fac.	-465
	Ennylabegan power addn.	-504
Germany, Various	General cut	-8,532
Pruem	Upgrade operations fac.	(-1,177)
	EM barracks w/dining fac.	(-2,482)
Amberg	Improve ammo storage QRS	1 (-1,545)
Kitzingen	Dependent school	1 (-2,463)
	Commissary addition	(-865)
Korea	A/C Seoul Hospital	-371
	Barracks mod.	-3,105
Total reduction		85,162

¹ Partial reduction.

TITLE II--NAVY

The Navy requested \$567,674,000 under title II of the bill. After careful review and consideration of the Navy's request, the committee approved a program of \$545,873,000 as shown in the following tabulation:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Navy request	Revised	Committee approved
Inside the United States	532,021	531,820	492,042
Outside the United States	35,653	35,653	55,331
Total	567,674	567,473	547,343
General appropriations reduction	0	0	1,500
Total new authorization, title II	567,674	567,473	545,873

All projects requested in this year's authorization bill were included in the FY 1975 request for appropriations, except for the following:

Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca, P.R.----- *Thousands*
\$800

NAVY PROGRAM SUMMARY

On June 12, 1974, the Navy requested some changes to their program, which are reflected above, under the original and revised request, and which are detailed below:

NEW AUTHORIZATION—TITLE II

Installation/project	From—	To—	Change
Inside the United States:			
9th Naval District:			
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill; Bachelor enlisted quarters (Hospital Corps School)-----	2,468	0	(2,468)
14th Naval District:			
Commander in chief, Pacific, Oahu, Hawaii: Intelligence Center, Pacific	0	2,700	2,700
Marine Corps:			
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif.: Potable water system----	1,157	724	(433)
Net title II new authorization changes-----			(201)

This program contains the new facilities and replacement and modernization projects needed to support the operating forces of the Navy. Approximately 43 percent of the program was requested to support new missions of the Navy. Projects that are in support of current missions of the Navy were allocated 23 percent of the program and the remaining 34 percent was assigned to replacement and modernization projects. The Navy, this year, stressed in its program operational facilities which comprises 10.5 percent of the construction authorization request, maintenance and production facilities with 28 percent, medical facilities with 15.4 percent, bachelor housing and community facilities with 16.3 percent and pollution abatement with 10.4 percent.

Projects in the operational category include airfield runways, parking aprons, operational buildings, and waterfront operational facilities which range from berthing piers to a floating drydock facility.

Training facilities include applied instruction facilities and operational trainer projects that will provide space for the installation of aircraft simulators that will simulate the aircraft characteristics and tactical environment.

The maintenance and production category will provide support to aircraft engine and avionics maintenance activities and mine assembly and torpedo overhaul shops. The major portion of this category is for the refit facilities of the TRIDENT Submarine Weapons System.

This year's program for medical facilities has been allocated to accelerating the replacement of World War II and other substandard medical facilities.

Significant emphasis is again being placed this year on bachelor housing and messing facilities for improving the living environment for Navy and Marine Corps personnel.

This year's program will provide new and modernization of bachelor enlisted and officers' quarters as shown below:

	Bachelor enlisted			Bachelor officers		
	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Navy	Marine Corps	Total
New spaces.....	2,806	3,108	5,914	159	0	159
Modernization.....	585	524	1,109	0	0	0
Total.....	3,391	3,632	7,023	159	0	159

BREAKDOWN OF THE APPROVED NAVY BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS PROGRAM, BY RATE STRUCTURE

Ratings	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Percent
Recruits (open bay).....	0	0	0	0
E2 to E4.....	2,229	3,552	5,781	82.3
E5 to E6.....	1,055	80	1,135	16.2
E7 to E9.....	107	0	107	1.5

For pollution abatement, this year's request continues an aggressive program initiated by the Navy in 1968 to abate air and water pollution at Naval and Marine Corps installations.

The committee carefully considered all projects and the following table summarizes the authorization requested and approved for each Naval District.

PROGRAM SUMMARY (SEC. 201)

[In thousands of dollars]

Naval district	Navy request, fiscal year 1975	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
1st Naval District.....	7,001	5,430
3d Naval District.....	6,354	2,354
4th Naval District.....	9,982	7,646
Naval District, Washington, D.C.....	28,909	34,287
5th Naval District.....	48,848	46,247
6th Naval District.....	93,822	89,914
8th Naval District.....	6,338	6,338
9th Naval District.....	10,164	10,164
11th Naval District.....	94,817	84,849
12th Naval District.....	6,847	2,048
13th Naval District.....	¹ 114,501	² 102,199
14th Naval District.....	9,327	5,656
Marine Corps.....	40,810	40,810
Various locations:		
Trident facilities.....		
Pollution abatement, air.....	9,849	9,849
Pollution abatement, water.....	44,251	44,251
Total inside the United States.....	531,820	492,072
General appropriations reduction.....	0	³ 1,500
Total.....	531,820	490,542
Outside the United States:		
10th Naval District.....	5,159	5,159
15th Naval District.....	800	800
Atlantic Ocean area.....	6,059	4,183
European area.....	2,070	1,759
Indian Ocean area.....	0	29,000
Pacific Ocean area.....	16,468	9,333
Various locations:		
Pollution abatement, air.....	1,059	1,059
Pollution abatement, water.....	4,038	4,038
Total outside the United States.....	35,653	55,351
General support programs.....	567,473	545,873
Total authorization for appropriations.....	567,473	545,873

¹ Includes \$103,808,000 for Trident facilities.

² Includes \$95,000,000 for Trident facilities.

³ Applies to this program only.

The committee recognizes that all of the projects in this year's program are valid projects. However, the need for austerity in military construction required the committee to deny some projects which were shown as lower in priority than other projects in this year's program. Where the committee gives as reason for denial of the project "low priority", or "deferred" the project was denied without prejudice to a subsequent program.

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

The committee approved \$5,430,000 for 5 projects in the First Naval District. The most significant project approved was the bachelor enlisted quarter modernization project for the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, Maine.

The project will provide rehabilitated living spaces, dining facilities and a renovated EM Club for bachelor enlisted personnel utilizing three existing barracks buildings.

The committee denied the following projects:

Installation and project	Amounts (thousands)	Reason
Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, R.I.:		
Sims Hall alterations.....	\$971	Low priority.
Public works administration building.....	600	Deferred.
Total.....	1,571	

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

For the Third Naval District, a total of \$2,354,000 for two projects were approved.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project for the Submarine Base, (Submarine Medical Center) New London, Connecticut will house 137 men and the bachelor enlisted quarters project at the marine barracks will house 53 men.

The committee denied the following project:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.; Floating dry dock.....	\$4,000	Deferred.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

The committee approved \$7,646,000 for a total of 4 projects in the Fourth Naval District. The major projects approved at the Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst were an Industrial Building Modernization project which will provide industrial space for the manufacture of prototype equipment in support of research and development programs on catapults, arresting gear, ground support equipment and visual landing aids and an Engineering Building which will house 730 professional, technical and clerical personnel and a civilian cafeteria.

The Committee denied the following project:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pa.; Conversion to administrative area.	\$2,336	Deferred.

NAVAL DISTRICT—WASHINGTON, D.C.

A total of \$34,287,000 was approved for projects in the Naval District—Washington, D.C.

For the Commandant, Naval District—Washington, a Building Rehabilitation project to improve portions of 3 buildings was approved.

At the Naval Research Laboratory, a land acquisition project will acquire 198 acres for a buffer zone around the Maryland Point Observatory.

The Bulkhead replacement project at the Naval Academy, Annapolis was approved. The significant projects approved at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda were the medical warehouse project which will provide a medical supply facility to support the medical facilities in the region and the Medical Center Modernization (Parking and Utilities) project which will improve vehicle circulation and parking.

The committee denied the following projects:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C.: Air-conditioning plant.....	\$3,172	Low priority.
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Luce Hall addition and modernization project.....	6,450	Do.
The committee added the following project: Uniformed Services, University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, Md.: Surge facility.	15,000	See following remarks.

The committee added the Surge Facility project for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences at Bethesda, Maryland that will be used to provide space to accommodate 125 medical students. This facility is needed to permit orderly growth of the University and an ability to comply with Public Law 92-426 and graduate 100 medical students by 1982.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

The committee approved \$46,247,000 for 23 projects in the Fifth Naval District. The significant projects are discussed in the following paragraphs.

At the Naval Station, Norfolk, Va., there were two major projects approved. The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide space for 504 men.

The pier utilities project will provide utility services for piers so that ships may assume "cold iron" condition.

At the Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, the POL pipeline project provides storage tankage and provides for sludge piping between the Naval Station and Craney Island.

At the Norfolk Regional Medical Center, there were three significant projects approved. The Dispensary Replacement project will construct a dispensary at Sewells Point replacing two existing dispensaries

at the Naval Operating Base; the dispensary and dental clinic project at the Naval Air Station, Oceana, will replace the present facility which is undersized and functionally obsolete; and the hospital modernization project will construct new supporting facilities, updating of substandard utility systems and demolition of excess structures.

The committee denied the following projects:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Va.: Command control and administration building.	\$2,030	See remarks below.
Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.: Operational flight training facility.....	571	Deferred.
Total.....	2,601	

The Navy testified that on May 24, 1974 the Chief of Naval Operations announced a plan to consolidate fleet commands on July 1, 1975 and with this announcement the requirement was changed for the Command Control and Administrative Building at the Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia. The Navy explained that there was a large deficiency in administrative space at the base and that this facility was still needed. The committee accepts the fact of a deficiency, but feels this project should be deferred until thorough planning has been completed for the new requirement.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

For this district, the committee approved \$89,914,000 for 37 projects at 16 naval installations in the States of Florida, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

The significant projects approved are discussed in the following paragraphs.

At the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, the major project approved was an Aircraft Maintenance Hangar which will support 60 additional carrier based ASW Aircraft newly assigned to the Station.

At the Naval Regional Medical Center (Naval Hospital), the hospital modernization project will upgrade the hospital to meet National Fire Protection Association regulations and provide badly needed support facilities, the dispensary and dental clinic at NAS, Cecil Field will replace an operationally substandard facility, and a dispensary and dental clinic at Naval Station, Mayport will accommodate the anticipated 74,373 eligible medical beneficiaries at that Station.

At Naval Training Center (Service School Command), Orlando, a nuclear power training building project will allow the relocation of the Mare Island School and the Bainbridge school and consolidate them in a newly constructed building.

At the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, there were three major projects approved. The general warehouse project will replace a deteriorated, structurally unsound facility which was converted from a sea-plane hangar; the aircraft cleaning and disassembly facility project will consolidate the many preparatory operations into one modern and efficient building, and the consolidated public works center project will house the maintenance, administration and storage functions.

At the Naval Technical Training Center, the Bachelor Enlisted Quarters project will satisfy the programmed increases in housing requirements which resulted from the electronic warfare training mission.

For the Naval Hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina, the hospital modernization project will provide for the modernization of clinical and support spaces, alterations to provide adequate fire protection, provision of central air conditioning and the replacement of steam distribution and condensate return piping.

The berthing pier project at the Naval Station, Charleston will provide a berthing pier complete with utilities, dredging to 35 feet, extension of shore bulkhead and demolition of a small barge pier. Also at Naval Station, Charleston, there will be a berthing pier utilities project which will provide "cold-iron" utility services, thereby allowing better maintenance of shipboard equipment, and reducing watch standing requirements.

At the Naval Supply Center, Charleston, the conversion of Pier K to a fuelling pier will help meet the Coast Guard Pollution requirements and permit consolidation of tanker and barge operations in loading, issuing, and handling of bulk fuel, fuel oil, and oily wastes.

At the Naval Air Station, Memphis the dispensary and dental clinic project will include space for five holding beds, twenty-nine dental operating rooms and six oral hygiene treatment rooms.

The committee denied the following projects:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla.: Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	\$4,140	Deferred.
Naval Hospital, Memphis, Tenn.: Hospital improvements (electrical).....	1,888	Low priority.
Total.....	6,028	

The committee added the following projects:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Fla.: Riverine test facility and land acquisition.....	\$620	See remarks below.
Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.: Land acquisition.....	1,500	Do.
Total.....	2,120	

The Riverine Test Facility and Land Acquisition project was added to provide the Navy with a permanent capability in a river delta environment to develop Marine Corps techniques in swimmer defense, communications, position reporting and to develop other tactical doctrines peculiar to the riverine environment.

The Land Acquisition project was added to provide Navy control of acreage lying within high intensity aircraft noise zones on which construction of residential units and a shopping center is planned. The project was authorized under the Naval Air Station, Pensacola. Installation total of Title II, but the authorization for appropriations in Title VI, Section 602 was reduced by \$1,500,000, since appropria-

tions are available from the \$2,400,000 appropriated last year for the land acquisition project at the Naval Air Station at Jacksonville, Florida. This land acquisition at Jacksonville will be accomplished by an exchange of lands, therefore the appropriations are not required.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

For the Eighth Naval District, the committee approved \$6,338,000 for 4 projects at three Naval installations.

At the Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, the bachelor officers quarters project will accommodate 99 men. Presently this activity does not have any bachelor officers quarters. Also approved was a steam plant and electrical improvements project which will provide adequate heating and electrical utilities for present and future needs of the activity.

At the Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, a boiler replacement project will replace existing steam generating equipment dating back to 1941 that is subject to unpredictable shutdowns.

The runway restoration project at the Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas will restore runways 1-19 and 13-31 outlying landing field, Orange Grove which are required for training naval aviators in T2-C basic jet and TA-4 advanced jet aircraft.

All of the projects requested in this district were approved.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

The committee approved for this district \$10,164,000 for three projects at one naval installation in the State of Illinois.

The significant project approved was the Engineman's School at the Naval Training Center (Service School Command) Great Lakes. The Engineman's School will replace existing 30 year old buildings which are poorly organized, poorly lighted and ventilated and a potential fire hazard.

The committee denied the following project:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	\$2,468	See remarks below.

This project was withdrawn by the Navy under the program change of June 12, 1974. The reason given by the Navy was that a change in training curriculum for the hospital corpsmen has reduced the need for bachelor housing at the Naval Hospital Corps School. The number of corpsmen to be trained will not be changed, only the concentration of trainees at Great Lakes at a given time.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

For this district, the committee approved \$84,849,000 for 31 projects at 10 naval installations in the State of California.

The significant projects approved in this district are discussed in the following paragraphs.

At the Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Pendleton, the hospital support facilities project was approved to provide a medical warehouse building, public works and automotive maintenance shops and an ambulance garage; a dispensary alteration and addition project will expand critically needed space for the Del Mar clinic area; dispensary and dental clinic projects for the Edson Range area, the Las Pulgas area and the San Mateo area; a dispensary project will provide medical and dental care for respective areas at the Headquarters area and will include Industrial Health Services; and a dental clinic for the San Onofre area.

At the Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, the Laser Systems Research and Development Laboratory project was approved. The project will provide space to concentrate and integrate the center's geographically dispersed research and development effort in laser weapons systems.

The dispensary and dental clinic project will provide a facility with a 15 bed capacity in the dispensary and 4 dental operating rooms.

At the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, the Pier "E" Conversion (1st Increment) project was approved. This project will upgrade a berthing pier to full industrial capability with necessary utilities and weight handling capacities. This project is part of the shipyard modernization program.

At the Naval Air Station, Miramar the aircraft maintenance hangar project was approved. The project will provide a maintenance hangar in direct support of the E-2B squadrons recently assigned to the station.

The aircraft maintenance hangar project, was the most significant project approved at the Naval Air Station, North Island. This project will provide a maintenance hangar for the fixed-wing ASW aircraft.

The electronics development and testing laboratory (2d Increment) project at San Diego was approved. The project will provide a cafeteria and an engineering support wing with a roof structure designed for installation of real or mock-up radio frequency equipment.

At the Naval Regional Medical Center, San Diego, the major projects approved were the dental clinic and school project which was designed to accommodate 590 students, the dispensary and dental clinic project to care for 19,850 active duty personnel, and the Land Acquisition—Murphy Canyon project which will acquire land for future construction of a new hospital at Murphy Canyon Heights.

A berthing pier project was approved at the Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, This project will provide needed pier space for 2 submarine tenders and submarines, and for an auxiliary repair dry dock used for minor repairs to the attack aircraft.

The committee denied the following projects:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.: Hangar improvements	\$418	Low priority.
Naval Air Station, North Island, Calif.: Engine parts coating facility	893	Deferred.
Naval Training Center, Bachelor enlisted quarters San Diego, Calif.	8,657	Do.
Total	9,968	

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

For this district the committee approved \$2,048,000 for 3 projects at 3 naval installations in the State of California.

The significant project approved was the Avionics Building Environmental Control at the Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, CA. This project will provide environmental control in the avionics rework area that is essential to proper functioning of new and automated test equipment used for accurate rework of sensitive aircraft navigation and communications equipment.

The committee denied the following projects:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Supply Center, Oakland, Calif.: Wharf utilities.....	\$1,396	Deferred.
Naval Communication Station, Stockton, Calif.: Domestic water supply.....	1,102	Do.
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.: Engineering/management building.....	2,301	Low priority.
Total.....	4,799	

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

In this district, the committee approved \$102,199,000 for 5 projects at 4 naval installations in the States of Alaska and Washington. The significant projects are discussed in the paragraphs below.

At the Naval Station, Adak, Alaska the committee approved a runway and taxiway overlay project. This project will provide asphaltic concrete overlays and runway upgrading necessary to sustain the P-3 ASW patrol and other assigned aircraft.

At the Trident support site (Phase II), Bangor, Wash. the committee approved the majority of the request to provide second phase facilities for a complete refit facility for the Trident system which will maintain and improve the Nation's key strategic deterrent capability to meet the projected threat in the 1980's.

The committee denied the following projects:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Weapons security improvements.....	\$581	Deferred.
Power plant addition.....	2,511	Do.
Trident Support Site, Bangor, Wash.: Trident support (phase II).....	8,808	Reduction.
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.: Operational storage building.....	402	Low priority.
Total.....	12,302	

The authorized amount for the Trident Support Project has been reduced by \$8,808,000. The reduction is a general reduction since the committee does not believe the Navy will be able to place under contract this year all of the facilities included under the project. The Navy may proceed with any of the facilities shown on the project document within the authorized amount of \$95,000,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

The committee approved for this district \$5,656,000 for 4 projects at 3 naval installations in the State of Hawaii. The machine shop modernization project at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard was the major project approved. This project is a consolidation, rearrangement and modernization of the machine shop and central tool shop.

The committee denied the following projects:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Commander in Chief, Pacific, Oahu, Hawaii, Intelligence : Intelligence Center Pacific.	\$2,700	Deferred.
Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Wahiawa, Hawaii: Satellite communications terminal.	971	Do.
Total	3,671	

Under the program change of June 12, 1974, the Navy requested the addition of the Intelligence Center Pacific project for the Commander in Chief, Pacific, Oahu. The need for this project is recognized, but the committee believes the deferral of the project for a year will not seriously degrade intelligence gathering operations.

MARINE CORPS

The committee approved \$40,810,000 for 22 projects at 10 Marine Corps installations in the States of Virginia, North Carolina, Arizona, and California. Again this year the Marine Corps emphasized the correction of deficiencies in enlisted quarters and other personnel support facilities.

Bachelor Enlisted Quarters projects were approved for the Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia; the Courthouse Bay area, the Hadnot Point area, and the French Creek area of Camp Lejeune, North Carolina; and for the Horno area, the Pulgas area, and the Headquarters area of Camp Pendleton, California.

Other projects of significance were the Marine Corps Historical Center which will be available for practical study, maintenance of archives, records, and personal papers and will provide space for a historical library; and the electrical distribution system improvements projects at Cherry Point, N.C. and Lejeune, N.C.

The committee approved all of the projects requested but reduced the authorized amount of the potable water system project at the Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, CA by \$433,000. The authorized amount for the project will be \$724,000. This reduction was requested under the program change of June 12, 1974. The Marine Corps advised that they would be able to use a commercial source for obtaining water that will result in a capital savings of \$433,000 and an annual savings of \$48,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

(Inside the United States)

The committee approved \$54,100,000 for two projects located inside the United States.

Approved for air pollution abatement \$9,849,000 for 14 Naval and Marine Corps installations. At four installations, the facilities

will improve air emissions by installing collection systems, paint spray enclosures and other pollution control equipment and at five installations, the facilities will improve vapor collection and control systems to bring the systems into compliance with air quality standards.

For water pollution abatement \$44,251,000 was approved for 24 Naval and Marine Corps installations. At eight installations, the sewage treatment facilities will improve the level of treatment at the plants to a degree that enables the effluents to meet all water quality requirements. At nine installations, the ship waste water collection facilities will provide shore facilities for collection of ship generated wastes, and at three installations, the oily waste collection and reclamation facilities will help a navy-wide program which is underway to collect, treat, recycle or properly dispose of all waste oils and oily wastes.

The requested amounts were approved for the air and water pollution abatement projects.

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

For this district, the committee approved \$5,159,000 for 5 projects at three naval installations.

The major project approved was a communications operations building at the Naval Telecommunications Center, Roosevelt Roads. The project is required to permit relocation of remaining communication facilities from Ponce, Puerto Rico to Roosevelt Roads.

The committee approved all of the projects requested.

FIFTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

The committee approved the \$800,000 requested for a bachelor enlisted quarters project at the Naval Support Activity, Rodman, Canal Zone. The project will provide a new 72 man BEQ located at Rodman Station proper and also modernization of an existing building with space for 22 men at the Headquarters Annex.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

The committee approved \$4,183,000 in the Atlantic Ocean area for 3 projects at two naval installations in Bermuda and Keflavik, Iceland.

The most significant projects approved were a BEQ which was designed to accommodate 117 men at the Naval Air Station, Bermuda, and at the Naval Station Keflavik, Iceland an entrance to airport terminal which will provide acceptable, secure, unmanned customs, controlled access to the Iceland International Airport without Government of Iceland interference.

The committee denied the following projects:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland: EM dining facility modernization	\$1,097	Deferred.
Bachelor enlisted quarters with mess modernization and addition	779	Do.
Total	1,876	

EUROPEAN AREA

For the European area, the committee approved \$1,759,000 for two projects at two naval installations in Scotland.

The major approved project will provide new club facilities for enlisted personnel, E-6 and below at the Naval Activities Detachment, Holy Loch, Scotland.

The committee denied the following project:

Installations and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy: Swimming pool.....	\$311	Low priority.

INDIAN OCEAN AREA

The committee added the expansion of facilities project in the amount of \$29,000,000 for the Naval Communication Facility, Diego Garcia, Chagos Archipelago.

The committee believes it is important in carrying out national policy and is in our interest for the U.S. Navy, from time to time, to have a greater presence in the Indian Ocean. The logistics support facilities to be provided by this project will shorten the logistic tail for various task groups that periodically deploy to the Indian Ocean, and reduce the logistic support costs. The committee believes in the freedom of the seas and that these logistic support facilities are important assets for periodic deployments to the Indian Ocean, which should not be abandoned. Otherwise, we may lose political and diplomatic influence by default.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

In the Pacific Ocean area, the committee approved \$9,333,000 for 8 projects at 5 naval installations. A description of the major projects approved follows.

At the Navy Public Works Center, Guam, a utilities system expansion project was approved to provide telephone services in support of 510 units in the fiscal year 1974 family housing program and increase electric power reliability and compatibility with the Government of Guam distribution system.

Three projects were approved for the Naval Air Station, Cubi Point. The construction associated with the airfield improvements project will strengthen a weakened portion of the runway, extend taxiways and provide additional parking apron. The bachelor enlisted quarters and bachelor officers quarters projects will provide spaces for 192 and 60 men, respectively. At the Naval Station, Subic Bay, the bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide space for 283 men and the dependent school expansion and gym project will furnish the facilities needed to provide the dependents of military personnel an education that meets continental U.S. standards.

The committee denied the following projects:

Installation and project	Amount (thousands)	Reason
Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam: Enlisted mens club.....	\$728	Low priority.
Naval Communication Station, Finegagan, Guam: Satellite communication terminal addition.....	950	Deferred.
Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guzm: Sandblast and paint facility.....	1,782	Do.
Naval Hospital Fleet Activities, Yokosuka: Patient recreation building.....	360	Low priority.
Naval Hospital, Subic Bay: Dispensary and dental clinic.....	3,315	Do.
Total.....	7,135	

POLLUTION ABATEMENT OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The committee approved \$1,059,000 for one air pollution abatement project located outside the United States.

The power plant air emission control improvement item will provide new stacks that are sufficient in height to disperse smoke and particulates. The project is at the Public Works Center, Guam.

The committee approved \$4,038,000 for two water pollution abatement facilities outside the United States. The sewage treatment plant will provide a collection line from the submarine tender to the plant at the Naval Detachment, Holy Loch, Scotland and the ship waste collection ashore item will provide the shore facilities for collection of ship generated wastes at the Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads.

AMENDMENTS TO PRIOR YEAR PROGRAMS

This year the Navy requested six amendments with a total value of \$17,812,000. Three of these amendments are related to the energy crisis and the national policy to provide a coal burning capability for boilers with an output greater than 50 million British Thermal Units per hour or the requirement to design and construct to burn coal boilers and hot water generators with an output greater than 100 million British Thermal Units per hour. A summary of the amendments requested follows:

INSTALLATION AMOUNTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation/location/project	Authori- zation	Amendment	Authori- zation
Public Law 90-408 (fiscal year 1969) sec. 201: Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., land fill and site improvements (project cost from 2,000 to 4,391) ¹	2,000	2,391	4,391
Public Law 91-511 (fiscal year 1971) sec. 201: Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Fla., aircraft stripping and corrosion treatment shop (project cost from 2,481 to 3,146) ²	3,869	665	4,534
Public Law 92-545 (fiscal year 1973) sec. 201: Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Va., steam plant expansion (project cost from 2,326 to 6,026) ³	3,319	3,700	7,019
Public Law 93-166 (fiscal year 1974) sec. 201: Naval Home, Gulfport, Miss., new naval home (project cost from 9,444 to 14,163) ⁴	9,444	4,719	14,163
Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif., pier utilities (project cost from 3,827 to 7,756) ⁵	3,827	3,929	7,756
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif., heating plant and distribution system (project cost from 2,826 to 5,234) ⁵	3,802	2,408	6,210
Total.....		17,812	

¹ Construction revision.

² New safety standards.

³ Revision to burn coal.

⁴ Inflation.

⁵ Revision for coal burning capability.

At the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., the amendment for the landfill and site improvements project is required to provide the authority needed for construction to stabilize the landfill and provide a protecting seawall, sheet piling bulkhead, road and parking area. The stabilization of the landfill and protecting seawall and bulkhead are required to prevent further and perhaps serious damage to the library authorized in fiscal year 1970.

At the Naval Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Fla., the amendment for the aircraft stripping and corrosion treatment facility project is required to meet new occupational safety health standards and correct deficiencies in the large curtain dividers used to isolate several concurrent operations.

The amendment for the New Naval Home project at Gulfport, Miss., is required because the volume and cost of construction in the New Orleans-Baton Rouge corridor has increased significantly. The Navy advised that very competitive bids were received for the major construction contract for the Naval Home, but the bids exceeded by 25 percent the amount authorized. The committee concurred with the Navy's proceeding with the major contract by temporarily waiving supervision, inspection and overhead costs, and retaining a minimum contingency. The amendment of \$4,719,000 will restore the supervision inspection and overhead costs and permit the Navy to proceed with all of the facilities originally authorized for the Naval Home.

The committee approved all the amendments requested above and added the following amendment(s):

INSTALLATION AMOUNTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation/location/project	Author-ization	Amend-ment	Amended author-ization
Public Law 92-545 (fiscal year 1973) sec. 201: Naval Hospital, New Orleans, La., hospital ¹	11,680	2,929	14,609
Public Law 93-166 (fiscal year 1974) sec. 201: Naval Hospital, New Orleans, La., nursing bed addition ¹	3,386	771	4,157
Total		3,700	

¹ Inflation.

For the Naval Hospital, New Orleans the hospital project and nursing bed addition project amendments are required because current bidding experience in the New Orleans area show that construction costs have accelerated at a greater rate than was anticipated. It is unlikely that these projects can be constructed within current authorization and appropriations. Contracts have been awarded for the demolition and foundation work.

SUMMARY OF NAVY PROGRAM

[A summary of the actions taken, by project, are tabulated below]

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)	
1st Naval District: Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, R.I.	Sims Hall alteration.....	-\$971	
	Public works administration building.....	-600	
3rd Naval District: Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.	Floating drydock mooring facility.....	-4,000	
4th Naval District: Naval Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pa.	Conversion to administration area.....	-2,336	
	Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C.....	Air-conditioning plant (4th increment).....	-3,172
	Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.....	Luce Hall addition and modernization.....	-6,450
Uniformed University of the Health Sciences.....			
5th Naval District:			
	Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Va.....	Command control and administration building....	-2,030
	Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.....	Operational flight training facility.....	-571
6th Naval District:			
	Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla.....	Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	-4,140
	Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Fla.	Riverine test facility and land acquisition.....	+620
	Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.....	Land acquisition (authorization only—not included in grand total of bill).	¹ +1,500
	Naval Hospital, Memphis, Tenn.....	Hospital improvements (electrical).....	-1,888
9th Naval District: Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.	Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	² -2,468	
11th Naval District:			
	Naval Air Station, North Island, Calif.....	Engine parts coating facility.....	-893
	Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.....	Hangar Improvements (utilities).....	-418
	Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif. (Service School Command).	Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	-8,657
12th Naval District:			
	Naval Supply Center, Oakland, Calif.....	Wharf utilities.....	-1,396
	Naval Communication Station, Stockton, Calif.....	Domestic water supply.....	-1,102
	Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.....	Engineering/management building (1st increment).	-2,301
13th Naval District: Naval Station, Adaka, Alaska	Weapons security improvements.....	-581	
	Powerplant addition.....	-2,511	
Trident Support Site, Bangor, Wash.....	Trident support (phase II).....	³ -8,808	
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.....	Operational storage building.....	-402	
14th Naval District:			
	Commander in chief, Pacific, Oahu, Hawaii.....	Intelligence center, Pacific.....	⁴ (2,700)
	Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Hawaii.	Satellite communications terminal.....	-971
MARINE CORPS			
11th Naval District: Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif.	Potable water system.....	⁵ -433	
Atlantic Ocean area: Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland.	Enlisted men's dining facility modernization.....	-1,097	
	Bachelor enlisted quarters with mess modernization and addition.	-779	
European area: Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy.	Swimming pool.....	-311	
Indian Ocean area: Naval Communications Facility, Diego Garcia, Chagos Archipelago.	Expansion of facilities.....	+29,000	
Pacific Ocean area:			
	Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam.....	Enlisted men's club.....	-728
	Naval Communication Station, Finegagan, Guam.....	Satellite Communication Terminal addition.....	-950
	Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam.....	Sandblast and paint facility.....	-1,782
	Naval Hospital, fleet activities, Yokosuka, Japan.....	Patient recreation building.....	-360
	Naval Hospital, Subic Bay.....	Dispensary and dental clinic.....	-3,315
	Net reductions—New authorization.....	¹ -20,301	
General appropriations reduction.....		¹ -1,500	
Total reductions.....		-21,801	
Amendments:			
	Naval Hospital, New Orleans, La.—Hospital (fiscal year 1973).....	2,929	
	Naval Hospital, New Orleans, La.—Nursing unit addition.....	771	
Total.....		3,700	

¹ Added for authorization only under title II—excluded from total authorized for appropriations under title VI by general appropriations reduction.

² Withdrawn by Navy under program change of June 12, 1974.

³ Reduced by \$8,808,000 to a new project amount of \$95,000,000.

⁴ Added by Navy under program change of June 12, 1974. Denied by committee. (Non-add.)

⁵ Reduced by \$433,000 under program change of June 12, 1974, to a new project amount of \$724,000.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

The Air Force requested \$468,276,000 under Title III of the bill distributed as follows:

	Air Force request	Committee approved
Inside the United States	\$382,042,000	\$317,203,000
Outside the United States	78,134,000	75,924,000
Classified program	8,100,000	8,100,000
Grand total	468,276,000	401,227,000
Deficiency authorization	14,959,000	17,655,000
Emergency construction	10,000,000	10,000,000

All projects for which new authorization is being requested were included in the Fiscal Year 1975 appropriation request for Military Construction except for part of a land acquisition authorization request at Eglin AFB, Florida. This request in the amount of \$382,000 requires an appropriation of only \$106,000 and the balance of the authorization will be used in a land exchange program with private parties. This program contains the authorization requests for new facilities required to meet the force and deployment goals presented to the Congress in the Air Force Chief of Staff's Posture Statement.

The committee gave careful consideration to all projects and a summary of authorizations requested and approved follows:

PROGRAM CONTENT
[In thousands of dollars]

Command	Air Force request	Committee approval
Inside the United States:		
Aerospace Defense Command	\$9,660	\$8,201
Air Force Communications Service	805	805
Air Force Logistics Command	69,949	45,969
Air Force Systems Command	68,243	61,619
Air Training Command	44,472	37,626
Air University	3,758	3,758
Alaskan Air Command	15,552	15,272
Headquarters Command, USAF	17,854	9,084
Military Airlift Command	19,232	16,032
Pacific Air Forces	14,594	10,959
Strategic Air Command	44,712	44,712
Tactical Air Command	33,203	31,158
Pollution abatement	22,856	22,856
Special facilities	17,152	9,152
Aerospace Corp.	0	1 (9,000)
Total inside the United States	382,042	317,203
Outside the United States:		
Aerospace Defense Command	138	138
Pacific Air Forces	7,022	4,812
U.S. Air Force:		
In Europe	64,245	64,245
Security service	4,135	4,135
Pollution abatement	595	595
Special facilities	1,999	1,999
Total outside the United States	78,134	75,924
Classified (sec. 302): various worldwide (total)	8,100	8,100
Grand total	468,276	401,227

¹ Nonadd item for authorization only in lieu of sec. 304 proposal received from the Air Force.

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND (INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The primary mission of the Aerospace Defense Command (ADC) is to discharge Air Force responsibilities for the defense of the United States against aerospace attack. This program requests \$9,660,000 for eleven projects in support of ADC host responsibilities at two Air Force locations. Additionally, Sections 302 and Special Facilities (Inside the United States) of the program includes \$5,000,000 for radar support facilities at various world-wide installations. The total ADC construction program is \$14,660,000.

In considering the individual projects comprising the \$14,660,000 program for the Aerospace Defense Command, the committee determined that two projects for a total of \$1,459,000 were not of sufficient urgency to warrant current authorization. Accordingly projects were deferred as follows:

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
Peterson Field, Colo.....	Base photo laboratory.....	\$563
	Officers quarters.....	896
Total reduction.....		1,459

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

The mission of the Air Force Communications Service (AFCS) is to engineer, program, provide, install, operate, maintain, and manage communications electronics for the Air Force and for other agencies as directed by the Chief of Staff, USAF.

The construction requested is one project for \$805,000 at Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, to provide an aircraft flight control facility. Additionally, one project is listed in the Special Facilities Section (inside the United States) for \$234,000 and three projects in Special Facilities (outside the United States) for \$1,006,000. Total construction for Air Force Communication Service is \$2,459,000.

The program was approved as submitted.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

The mission of the Air Force Logistics Command is to provide an adequate and efficient system of procurement, production, surveillance, maintenance, and supply for the United States Air Force and train specialized units for accomplishment of logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters. This program contains a request for \$69,949,000 which provides facilities at seven locations where Air Force Logistics Command is the host command. Of this amount, \$8,651,000 is for items to support the Air Force Systems Command at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, and a \$3,500,000 project at Wright-Patterson for the Air Force Institute of Technology, Air University. Additionally, one project for \$674,000 in support of Air Force Logistics Command is located at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base. The total construction program in the United States in support of the Air Force Logistics Command is \$58,472,000.

In the committee's judgment, six projects in the amount of \$23,980 are not of sufficient urgency to warrant current authorization. Accordingly, projects are deferred as follows:

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
Kelly AFB, Tex.	Log. mat. stor. facility	\$7,071
	Water storage tanks	438
McClellan AFB, Calif.	Log. mat. processing fac.	8,856
	Academic facility	3,500
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	Human eng. lab	2,400
	Systems magn fac.	1,715
Total reduction		23,980

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The next major command to be considered is the Air Force Systems Command whose mission is to advance aerospace technology, adopt it into operational aerospace systems, and acquire qualitatively superior aerospace systems and material needed to accomplish the Air Force mission.

The construction program at bases with Air Force Systems Command as host, amounts to \$68,243,000. Of this amount, \$66,763,000 is for items to support the Air Force Systems Command mission and \$1,480,000 is in support of the Tactical Air Command on Eglin Auxiliary Airfield Number 9.

Presentations of the Air Force Logistics Command, the Tactical Air Command, and the Special Projects program include \$13,589,000 for the Air Force Systems Command. The total construction program in the United States in support of the Air Force Systems Command is \$80,352,000.

In considering the individual projects proposed for the Air Force Systems Command, the committee determined that four items could be deferred to a future program as follows:

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
Brooks AFB, Tex.	Human resources lab	\$3,100
Edwards AFB, Calif.	Elect power pit and systems	1,238
	Fuel storage and heat facility	1,449
Eglin AFB, Fla.	Airmen dormitory	1,837
Total reduction		6,624

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The mission of the Air Training Command is to provide flying training leading to an aeronautical rating; air crew training; basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty; basic military training; mobile training; and such other training as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

Construction projects totaling \$44,472,000 are requested by this program for eleven bases where Air Training Command is host.

In reviewing the program for the Air Training Command, the committee recognized that the Air Force had been unable to include a

project for an urgently needed airmen dormitory at Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, due to budgetary restrictions. The committee considers this to be an urgent current requirement and has therefore added \$6,267,000 in authorization to the Air Force Title. The committee also considered that three other projects in the command program could be deferred to a future year without adverse impact. The projects so deferred are:

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
Mather AFB, Calif.	Commissary	\$3,000
Vance AFB, Okla.	Simulator training fac.	4,800
Williams AFB, Ariz.	do.	5,313
Project added: Chanute AFB, Ill.	Airmen dormitory	6,267
Net reduction		6,846

AIR UNIVERSITY

The Air University (AU) is located on Maxwell Air Force Base at Montgomery, Alabama. Its mission is to prepare officers for command and staff duties of Air Force units. The assigned activities include Headquarters Air University, Air War College, Air Command and Staff College, Squadron Officers School and a Tactical Airlift Group (Reserve).

This program contains a request for \$3,758,000 for construction in support of the Air University mission.

The program was approved as submitted.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The Alaskan Air Command provides combat ready forces, defense weapons systems, aircraft control and warning elements, and air defense forces within Alaska for employment under the operational control of Command, Alaska NORAD/CONAD region. It also provides logistical support for the Strategic Air Command, the Military Airlift Command, the Command of the Alaskan Sea Frontier and the United States Army. This program provides \$15,552,000 at four locations. One project for \$310,000 is in support of Air Force Technical Application Center at Eielson Air Force Base. The total construction program for Alaskan Air Command is \$15,242,000.

In reviewing the program for the Alaskan Air Command, the committee deferred one item as follows:

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
Shemya AFB, Alaska	Water supply fac.	\$280

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND—ZONE OF INTERIOR

The mission of the Headquarters Command is to provide proficiency flying, training, and support of the United States Air Force personnel in the Washington, D.C. area. Specifically, this command provides

administrative and logistical support for units assigned directly to Headquarters United States Air Force, for those Air Force units stationed within the Washington area where inherent organizational structure does not permit other support, and such other missions as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

The construction program at bases where Headquarters Command is host amounts to \$17,854,000. Of this amount, \$17,229,000 is for items to support the Headquarters Command mission and \$625,000 is in support of the Military Airlift Command.

Last year the committee authorized \$13,500,000 for the special aircraft support facility at Andrews AFB. This authorization was not funded. Accordingly, the committee feels that the \$8,770,000 requested this year could safely be deferred until funding for last year's authorization is obtained. Therefore, a program deletion was made as follows:

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
Andrews AFB, Md.	Special acrfst sup facility	\$8,770

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

The mission of the Military Airlift Command (MAC) is to maintain the military airlift system in the constant state of readiness necessary for performance of all airlift tasks and emergency operations assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. MAC supervises and operates the Air Weather Service, the Aerospace Audio Visual Service, the Air Rescue and Recovery Service, an Aeromedical Evacuation System, and Military Airlift Wings. This program involves 10 projects at four locations where MAC is host and contains a request for \$19,232,000 for support of the MAC mission.

An additional \$625,000 is included for the Military Airlift Command in the Headquarters Command program and \$1,443,000 is included for the Military Airlift Command in the Strategic Air Command program. The total construction program to support the Military Airlift Command amounts to \$21,300,000.

In considering the individual requirements in the \$19,232,000 program for the Military Airlift Command, the Committee determined that one project could be deferred as follows:

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
Dover AFB, Del.	Fuel supply facility	\$3,200

PACIFIC AIR FORCES (INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Pacific Air Forces is to conduct, control, and coordinate offensive and defensive air operations in accordance with tasks assigned by the Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Command. As a major Air Command, it provides administrative and logistical support for Air Force units in the Pacific Command's geographical area of responsibility. The requested program for the Pacific Air Forces, inside the United States totals \$14,594,000 and is for Hickam Air Force Base.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Pacific Air Forces is to conduct, control, and coordinate offensive and defensive air operations in accordance with tasks assigned by the Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Command. As a major air command, it provides administrative and logistical support for Air Force units in the Pacific Command geographical area of responsibility. The program, to improve the combat readiness and capabilities to support advanced aerospace and defensive systems for the Pacific Air Forces Command outside the United States, totals \$7,022,000 and consists of Airmen dormitory construction and alteration at three bases.

The committee determined that one project in the amount of \$2,210,000 was not of sufficient urgency to warrant approval. A deferral was made as follows:

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
Kunsan AB, Korea.....	Airmen dormitory.....	\$2,210

U.S. AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The mission of the United States Air Force in Europe (USAFE) is to conduct, control and coordinate, offensive and defensive air operations in accordance with tasks assigned by the Commander-in-Chief, United States European Command. It also fulfills responsibilities assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in areas not included in either the NATO or the United States Commanders-in-Chief, European area of responsibility. This program contains a request for \$64,245,000 for facilities in support of USAFE missions. This amount includes \$280,000 in support of the Air Force Communications Service (AFCS). Additionally, Section 302 of the program includes \$2,000,000 for security improvements.

The program is approved.

U.S. AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the United States Air Force Security Service is to provide communications security services. The total construction program to support United States Air Force Security Service amounts to \$4,135,000 for two projects at San Vito Dei Normanni Air Station, Italy.

The first project is add to and alter a Dependent School. The existing facilities provide less than 35 percent of the required space. All existing classrooms are crowded beyond capacity and are widely dispersed. The project will provide a facility to conduct a full educational program for 1,110 students in grades kindergarten through 12.

The second project is the construction of additional Water Supply Facilities. With the addition of 150 family housing units to be constructed under the FY 73 Military Construction Program, the existing water supply system must be supplemented. The project will provide additional water supply and storage tank to meet 25% increased requirements.

The program is approved.

other locations, where simulators are currently in operation, have facilities inadequate to house the new equipment.

Three of the seven items in this program were determined by the committee to be of insufficient urgency to warrant current authorization. Project deferrals are as follows:

	<i>Thousands</i>
Radar support facility.....	\$1, 200
Command control communication facility.....	800
Operational flight simulator facilities.....	6, 000
Total reduction.....	8, 000

AEROSPACE CORPORATION

The Aerospace Corporation is an Air Force-sponsored non-profit corporation engaged primarily in scientific research and development efforts for the Air Force, though about 17% of its effort is now directed towards contracts with states and local governments. Section 609 of P.L. 89-188 requires that construction or acquisition of facilities for the Aerospace Corporation be "authorized to the Air Force by the Congress". The Aerospace Corporation has proposed that it construct new facilities at El Segundo, California, in the amount of \$9 million, using the proceeds of the sale of its former building at San Bernardino, California, and other corporate funds. The Air Force proposed an amendment to Section 609 that would delete the requirement for authorization for facilities funded entirely from non-Government sources and require for such facilities only that they be reported to the Armed Services Committees of both houses under the procedures of 10 U.S.C. 2662. That Section requires that certain real property actions not take place until 30 days after they have been reported to the committees.

The Committee feels that the Aerospace Corporation is so uniquely and closely associated with the Air Force that Congressional control of corporate acquisition and construction of facilities should be equivalent to that for military facilities, regardless of the apparent source of funding. It is not the Committee's intent that the authorized facilities should be subject to the laws governing Federally owned or constructed facilities.

The Committee has no objection to the specific proposal by the Aerospace Corporation, as transmitted to the Committees by the Secretary of the Air Force on December 7, 1973. Authorization for the proposed work in the amount of \$9 million is included in Title III of the bill.

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
El Segundo, Calif.....	Admin facility.....	\$9, 000

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The Aerospace Defense Command primary mission is to discharge Air Force responsibilities for the defense of the United States against an aerospace attack. Construction requested totals \$138,000 for one project at one location.

The program was approved as submitted.

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
Cannon AFB, N. Mex.....	Recreation center.....	\$832
George AFB, Calif.....	Aircraft maint shop.....	948
MacDill AFB, Fla.....	Aircrew target study.....	265
Total reduction.....		2,045

POLLUTION ABATEMENT—(INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The pollution abatement program amounts to \$22,856,000 at various locations in the United States, of which \$9,156,000 is for air pollution abatement with the remainder of \$13,700,000 for water pollution abatement.

The air pollution abatement program, consisting of a fire training facility, modification of a central heating plant and alteration of fuel storage facilities to control vapor emission, is required to comply with federal, state, and local air pollution regulations at 9 Air Force installations in the United States.

The water pollution abatement program at 19 Air Force installations in the United States includes provisions for water pollution abatement through the construction of collection and treatment facilities for industrial and sanitary wastes and upgrading of existing facilities.

The program is required to comply with federal, state, and local water pollution regulations.

The program was approved as submitted.

SPECIAL FACILITIES INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The Special Facilities Program amounts to \$17,152,000 at various locations in the Zone of Interior.

The first item provides for construction of radar tower foundations and associated utilities and alteration of two existing facilities to accommodate height finder radars at five locations. These facilities will provide collocation of height finder and FAA radar systems.

The second item is construction of one building and alteration of five others in support of an intra-command communications network. Existing inadequate and undersized facilities cannot properly house new equipment.

The third item will provide concrete slabs for mobile equipment and concrete antenna pedestals in support of the global positioning satellite system. There are no existing facilities available to provide adequate support of this system.

The fourth item provides for construction of new satellite communications facilities including antenna and radome foundations for two new antennas with technical equipment buildings. Increased and complex communications traffic cannot be supported with existing equipment and facilities.

The fifth item is for facilities in support of the Air Force Satellite Communications System.

The sixth item is for construction of an addition to an Aerospace Data Facility. Existing facilities cannot accommodate the new computer scheduled for delivery in support of this mission.

The seventh item is for construction of facilities to house new flight simulators. Many locations have no existing facilities available;

Of the amount submitted, the committee considered that two projects were not of sufficient urgency to warrant current authorization. Accordingly, project deferrals were made as follows:

Base	Project	Amount (thousands)
Hickam AFB, Hawaii	Aircraft fuel systems maintenance facility	\$919
	Officers quarters	2,716
Total reduction		3,635

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) is to organize, train, equip, administer, prepare and maintain a bomber and tanker force in a state of readiness capable of conducting intensive and conclusive worldwide aerial bombardment against enemies of the United States.

This program requests \$44,712,000 for construction of facilities at 15 bases where the Strategic Air Command is the host command. Of this amount, \$40,745,000 is for items to support the Strategic Air Command mission; the balance of \$3,967,000 consists of \$674,000 in support of AFLC, \$1,443,000 in support of MAC and \$1,850,000 in support of the Air Force Security Service. Additionally, one project is listed under Special Facilities for \$800,000. Total construction for Strategic Air Command is \$41,545,000.

The program was approved as submitted.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The Tactical Air Command participates in tactical air operations employing air operations and air power independently, or in coordination with ground or Naval forces, to gain and maintain air superiority; to prevent movement of enemy forces; to seek out and destroy these forces and their supporting installations; and to assist ground or Naval forces in obtaining their immediate operational objectives.

The mission of this command is to organize, equip, train, administer, and operate the assigned or attached forces and participate in prompt and sustained tactical air operations. The Commander, Tactical Air Command, is charged with two missions. He is a major air commander under the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, and concurrently is a component commander under the Commander-in-Chief, United States Readiness Command (REDCOM).

The construction program at bases where the Tactical Air Command is host amounts to \$33,203,000 for both operational and support type facilities. Of this amount \$32,183,000 is for items to support the Tactical Air Command mission and \$1,020,000 is in support of the Air Force Systems Command mission. An additional \$1,480,000 for Tactical Air Command is included in the program of the Air Force Systems Command. The grand total construction program to support Tactical Air Command amounts to \$33,663,000.

Of the amount submitted, the committee has determined that projects in the amount of \$2,045,000 may be deferred to a later programming cycle. The projects to be deferred are:

POLLUTION ABATEMENT (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The overseas pollution abatement program amounts to \$595,000 for a water pollution abatement project at Misawa Air Base, Japan. The project is for a sewage collection, treatment, and disposal system.

The program was approved as submitted.

SPECIAL FACILITIES (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The Special Facilities (Outside the United States) program includes five items for a total of \$1,999,000.

The first item is for construction and expansion of facilities to accommodate defense communications technical control functions at six locations. The function is currently housed in inadequate and poorly configured space, making effective and efficient accomplishment extremely difficult.

The second item is for alteration of a satellite control facility, antenna and radome foundation to accept an additional antenna. Increased volume and complexity of communications to and from military satellites necessitates expansion of current capabilities.

The third item is for facilities in support of the Air Force Satellite Communications System.

The fourth item provides construction of two new communications facilities and alteration of twelve others. Currently the microwave communications system uses unreliable and obsolete equipment. Discontinuance of production of replacement parts will make maintenance impossible, thus forcing replacement of equipment, which will result in additional facility requirements.

The fifth item provides construction at two locations to house solar optical telescopes and associated functions. Existing facilities are incapable of housing the new observation and data processing equipment.

The program was approved as submitted.

SECTION 302

Section 302 of the military construction program includes three items for a total of \$8,100,000.

The first item is for construction of various facilities including an operational apron and fuel and munitions storage at Diego Garcia Naval Installation, Indian Ocean. Existing accommodations cannot support the aircraft scheduled for operation at this location.

The second item is for construction associated with phased array radar systems. Phased array radars, in this program, are for detection of sea-launched ballistic missiles in the event of an attack upon the continental United States.

The third item provides alteration of weapons storage and armed aircraft alert facilities to improve security. Existing systems lack modern detector sensors, hardened observation towers, and adequate fencing, area lighting, and communications.

The program is approved.

SUMMARY OF AIR FORCE PROGRAM

Installation	Project	Amount (thousands)
Aerospace Defense Command: Peterson Field, Colo.	Base photo lab	-\$563
	Officers quarters	-396
Air Force Logistics Command: Kelly AFB, Tex.	Logistical materials stor. fac.	-7,071
	Water storage tanks	-438
McClellan AFB, Calif.	Log. Mat. Processing Fac.	-8,856
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	AF Inst. of Tech. Acad. fac.	-3,500
	Add to and alter human eng. lab.	-2,400
	Alter s/s magn eng fac.	-1,715
Air Force Systems Command: Brooks AFB, Tex.	Human resources fac.	-3,100
Edwards AFB, Calif.	Elec power plant and dist sys.	-1,238
	Add to and alter fuel oil storage and heat fac.	-449
Eglin AFB, Fla.	Alter airmen dorms.	-1,837
Air Training Command: Chanute AFB, Ill.	Airmen dormitory	-4,267
Mather AFB, Calif.	Commissary	-3,000
Vance AFB, Okla.	Simulator training fac.	-4,800
Williams AFB, Ariz.	do.	-5,313
Alaskan Air Command: Shemya AFB	Water supply fac.	-280
Headquarters Command: Andrews AFB, Md.	Spec aircraft sup fac.	-8,770
Military Airlift Command: Dover AFB, Del.	Fuel supply fac.	-3,200
Pacific Air Forces (21), Hickam AFB, Hawaii	Aircraft fuel sys maint fac.	-919
	Officers quarters	-2,716
Tactical Air Command: Cannon AFB, N. Mex.	Recreation center	-832
George AFB, Calif.	Aircraft maint shop	-948
MacDill AFB, Fla.	Aircrew target study fac.	-265
Special Facilities, various	Radar support fac.	-1,200
	Command and control comm. fac.	-800
	Operational flight sim.	-6,000
Aerosapce Corp., El Segundo	Admin facility	1 (+9,000)
Pacific Air Forces (O/S): Kunsan, Korea	Airman dorm	-2,210
Net reductions		67,049

¹ Nonadd item for authorization only in lieu of sec. 604 proposal received from the Air Force.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

Defense Mapping Agency (sec. 401)	\$3,243,000
Defense Supply Agency (sec. 401)	6,336,000
National Security Agency (sec. 401)	2,363,000
Defense Nuclear Agency (sec. 401)	1,458,000
Subtotal	13,400,000
OSD emergency construction (sec. 402)	15,000,000
Total	28,400,000

The Secretary of Defense requested \$47,400,000 of which \$17,400,000 was to provide for the construction of new facilities and rehabilitation of existing facilities for the Defense Agencies at 12 named installations. With few exceptions Defense Agencies' activities are located at military installations, either utilizing existing facilities or siting required new facilities on these installations in the interest of economy. \$30,000,000 was for emergency construction authorization for the Secretary of Defense to provide for unforeseen construction requirements in emergency situations.

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY (DMA)

The Defense Mapping Agency, for which \$3,243,000 in new authorization is requested, was formed in 1972 by Presidential and DoD

directives by consolidating the resources of the Military Services to furnish mapping, charting and geodesy (MC&G) support to the DoD with optimum efficiency and economy. The DMA basic mission is to furnish the operating forces maps, charts and position data needed by troops on the ground, aircraft, ships and missiles to navigate, operate and hit their targets.

This authorization will provide two additional floors on the existing cartographic and geophysical facility at the DMA Aerospace Center at St. Louis, Missouri; and ventilation and air conditioning of the Defense Mapping School at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY (DSA)

The Defense Supply Agency, for which \$6,336,000 in new authorization is requested, is responsible for the organization, direction, management and administration, and control of supply and service functions or departmental activities including the operation of a wholesale distribution system for supplies. Also included in the Defense Supply Agency responsibilities are the administration and supervision of the Department of Defense coordinated procurement program, the Federal catalog system, excess and surplus disposal (personal property) program, the defense material utilization program, the item entry control program, the industrial plant equipment program, the technical (RDT&E) report services and the centralized referral system for displaced DoD employees. In fulfilling the designated mission, the Defense Supply Agency continues toward the full assumption of its responsibilities for providing uniform policies and procedures in the field of inventory control, accounting, cataloging, standardization, procurement, requirements computation, inspection and quality control, mobilization and industrial readiness planning, storage, inventory and distribution, maintaining technical logistics data and information, and initiating value engineering projects. In addition, the Defense Supply Agency has been assigned the mission for consolidation of the Contract Administration Services of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This authorization will provide for alterations of a two-story industrial-type structure, water quality control and road drainage improvements at the Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio; warehouse lighting and power improvements at the Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania; flammable storage facility improvements, upgrade restroom facilities, fire protection and safety devices and warehouse lighting and power improvements at the Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee; warehouse lighting and power improvements at the Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, facility improvements and heating plant pollution control at the Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio; upgrade interior electrical system and facility improvements at the Defense Industrial Plant Equipment Facility, Atchison, Kansas; and an operations facility, environmental improvements and upgrade restaurant facility at the Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY (NSA)

The National Security Agency, for which \$2,363,000 in new authorization is requested, replaced the former Armed Forces Security Agency and was created by the Secretary of Defense in 1949 to unify the separate organizations within each military department. The National Security Agency, under the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense, performs highly specialized technical and coordinating functions relating to its mission of national security and intelligence production.

This authorization will provide for an operations building addition and modernization of bachelor enlisted quarters at NSA Headquarters, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY (DNA)

The Defense Nuclear Agency for which \$5,458,000 in new authorization was requested has four major areas of responsibility as its mission: (1) Staff advice and assistance on nuclear weapons matters to the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Military Departments, and other Government Agencies; (2) consolidated management of the DoD Nuclear Weapons Stockpile; (3) management of DoD Nuclear Weapons Testing and Nuclear Weapons Effects Research Programs; and (4) performing technical studies and analysis, and coordinating directives on nuclear related matters for the Department of Defense.

This authorization will provide waterfront improvements at Johnston Atoll, Marshall District/Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The Committee denied authorization of \$4,000,000 for the initial phase of radiological cleanup of Eniwetok Atoll on the grounds that insufficient planning had been completed to the point that a firm estimate of overall cost could be predicted.

OFFICE, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The Office, Secretary of Defense is provided \$15,000,000 in new authorization for emergency construction authorization for the Secretary of Defense to provide for unforeseen construction requirements which he considers vital to the security of the United States. The Committee denied \$15,000,000 of the requested authorization in view of the existing balances of prior year authorizations and funds now on hand in the Department of Defense.

TITLE V—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING AND HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Department of Defense presented an authorization request for appropriations for military family housing and the Homeowners Assistance Program as follows:

	<i>Thousands</i>
Construction of new housing (10,460 units)	\$337, 422
Army (4,360 units)	136, 285
Navy, including Marine Corps (3,900 units)	136, 038
Air Force (2,200 units)	65, 099
Construction of mobile home facilities	1, 848
Army (240 spaces)	960
Air Force (200 spaces)	888
Improvements to existing quarters	60, 000
Army	20, 000
Navy, including Marine Corps	20, 000
Air Force	20, 000
Minor construction	3, 720
Planning	900
Less: Amounts available from prior year	(20)
Total appropriation request, construction	403, 870
Operating expenses	360, 722
Leasing	468, 438
Maintenance of real property	353, 299
Debt payment, principal	110, 901
Debt payment, interest and other expense	54, 187
Mortgage insurance premiums, Capehart and Wherry	2, 042
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums	3, 722
Less: Anticipated reimbursements and amounts available from prior years	(14, 898)
Total appropriation request, operation, maintenance, and debt payment	938, 413
Total requested authorization for appropriations for family housing	1, 342, 283
Homeowners assistance program	5, 000

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Department of Defense requested 10,462 new family housing units for the Fiscal Year 1975 program in which Army would have 4,360 units, Navy 3,000 units, Air Force 2,200 units and Defense Intelligence Agency 2 units. The number of units requested for new construction continues the high level attained in the previous four years and brings the total program to just over 50,000 units in five years. It was pointed out by the Defense witness that this significant progress could only have been accomplished with the complete support of the Committee without whose cooperation it would not have been possible.

The Defense witness testified that the program reflected the continuing emphasis placed by the Department of Defense on the maintenance of the forces and the welfare of the individual serviceman. He indicated that the objective of the program was to assure that married members of the Armed Forces had suitable housing—a morale factor of prime importance, and stated that as a corollary the objective of the program was closely aligned and dovetailed with the objectives of the all-volunteer force. He reported continued and significant

progress in providing more adequate housing on-base, in upgrading the condition of the existing inventory and in securing suitable quarters off-base.

The Defense witness stated that the policy of Defense was to rely on the local civilian market in communities near military installations as the primary source of family housing. Only where community support was limited or inadequate as to cost, distance or quality was authority requested to construct on-base housing. Additionally, particular care had been taken in the programming review to assure that requests for new construction reflected requirements only at hardcore installations. Because of this concentration on hardcore bases, coupled with the recent build-up of new construction and continued reliance on the local community, the programmable deficit was currently estimated to be 26,000 units. This compared with prior estimates in recent years of 90,000 to 110,000. The Defense witness pointed out that the reduction of the deficit to a manageable level was due to the declining force structure, the contraction of the base establishment and the cumulative effect of recent military pay raises, particularly in the lower grades, which put more community housing within the economic means of the serviceman. He indicated that, as in previous years, Defense continued to place most attention on construction for enlisted men and junior officers, and pointed out that this year it amounted to 98.3% of the total program.

The Defense witness observed that because the deficit of adequate housing had been reduced to a manageable level, Defense felt that the corner had been turned with regard to large-scale new housing construction projects on a Defense-wide basis. Accordingly, Defense in the next five years will concentrate on a select and perhaps more modest new construction program to meet specialized needs, such as realignment or consolidation of forces, new bases or locations; upgrading and modernization of the existing Defense inventory; special programs in select areas such as "special risk insurance" in cooperation with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to stimulate community growth in non-metropolitan areas at or around military installations; and leasing or lease-construct agreements in overseas areas where feasible.

The Defense witness noted that 3,000 of the units planned for the Fiscal Year 1975 construction program were intended for the lower pay grades of enlisted personnel previously considered "ineligible" for the programming of family housing. An additional 3,000 domestic leases also were programmed for those lower grades. He indicated that this was in keeping with the current thrust of Defense to give more recognition to the needs of married personnel in the lower pay grades as evidenced by the proposal of Defense in the Fiscal Year 1975 program to extend entitlements for travel and transportation allowance to all enlisted grades, currently restricted to personnel in grades E-4 with more than two years service and higher. As a result of this decision Defense was expanding the programming base for determining requirements for family housing to include all married personnel, which blankets all former "ineligibles" into the requirements base. The Defense witness pointed out that this initiative partially filled the void created by the non-availability of low and moderate income subsidized housing; exhibited the trend and intent of Defense housing policies to enhance the attractiveness of a military career; and con-

tributed toward the objective of Defense to assure adequate housing for all military families.

In this connection the Defense witness observed that Defense at one time intended that the primary source of housing assistance for the married personnel in the lower pay grades would be through the implementation of the Section 236 low income community housing program as provided by Section 120 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970. Defense took effective steps to fully employ this program but the program was curtailed by the Administration's "freeze" on subsidized housing programs in January 1973. Defense also has proposed new legislation to resolve the problem of non-availability of FHA insured programs in "military-impacted" areas by arranging for including in the Revised National Housing Act provisions that would permit the Department of Housing and Urban Development to insure private housing under the Special Risk Insurance Fund in areas heretofore considered uninsurable. This would provide that in areas where the residual housing requirements might be insufficient to sustain the housing market in the event of curtailment of employment, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may require the Secretary of Defense to certify that force levels will remain stable for the foreseeable future at the installations concerned. It was indicated that Defense would continue to pursue this matter as a vital part of the Defense housing program.

The Defense witness advised that Defense has begun consultations with the Department of Housing and Urban Development as to the availability of adequate housing at locations in the domestic part of the program. The Committee after review in detail felt that much of the construction program proposed by Defense was fully justified. However, the Committee felt that a number of items were questionable and accordingly withheld approval from them. The Committee did not approve expanding the programming base to include lower enlisted pay grades because the Committee felt that the deficit for the higher grades should be eliminated before programming was extended to the lower grades. The Committee did not feel that it was necessary for the government to invest in constructing housing units for personnel who may have enlisted for the minimum period of time on a trial basis or for those personnel who have not seriously considered a career in the military service. Rather than everyone having a right to family housing, the Committee felt that housing should be retained as a form of career inducement for those personnel who intended to stay in the military service for a reasonable period of time. Furthermore, the Committee felt that it was premature for Defense to embark on a housing program for a new group of personnel while career military personnel were still unsuitably housed. Accordingly, the Committee did not authorize the 3,000 units planned for construction for the lower pay grades nor for the 3,000 domestic leases also planned for the lower grades. In addition, the Committee did not authorize the construction of 422 units (which included 122 for the lower pay grades) for the Naval Complex in Norfolk, Va.

The Committee noted that there was considerable opposition to the program from local individuals who contended that there was no need for additional military housing in Norfolk. The Committee also did not authorize 1,000 Army and 700 Navy units requested for Hawaii be-

cause it noted the large number of units which had been previously authorized for Hawaii and the fact that action had not been taken to put a sizable number of units already authorized for Hawaii under contract. The Committee also did not authorize 60 units for Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois because there was a reasonable doubt that the project may not be required and the Committee felt that under the circumstances it would be prudent to defer the project for further study. In addition, the Committee did not approve the deficiency authorization requested for construction at the Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland of 150 units authorized by Public Law 93-166. Recognizing the vast backlog of construction of Keflavik and that a family housing project was requested for authorization in Fiscal Year 1975 for this location, the Committee did not feel it advisable to provide an increase in cost for a project previously authorized. The Committee authorized the construction of all other family housing projects and the request of Defense to construct 440 mobile home spaces for privately-owned mobile homes to provide safe, sanitary and reasonably priced accommodations for those servicemen who own mobile homes and who cannot find adequate parking spaces in the community.

COST LIMITATIONS ON NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Defense witness in discussing the need for an increase in the statutory cost limitations on the construction of military family housing stated that Defense had carefully considered the acceleration of cost growth, actual as well as predicted, to the mid-point of construction for the Fiscal Year 1975 program, and then had developed program cost estimates on a project by project basis. This revealed that successful accomplishment of the Fiscal Year 1975 program would require that the average unit cost limitation on construction in the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) should be raised from \$27,000 to \$30,000, and the average cost of all units in other areas from \$37,000 to \$40,000; and that the cost of any one unit should not exceed \$46,000.

The Committee noted that Defense had requested that unusual site development costs be excluded from the cost limitations. The Defense witness pointed out that this had been requested so that a project would not be penalized by the inclusion of such extraordinary costs not normally encountered in a typical project.

The Committee also noted that Defense had requested that the application of the average unit cost for units constructed in the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) be on a DOD-wide basis as against an individual military department basis as heretofore.

The Committee recognizing the sharp escalation in construction costs, approved the increase in the cost limitations requested. The Committee also approved the request of Defense to apply the average unit cost for units constructed in the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) on a DOD-wide basis. The Committee did not approve the request to exclude unusual site development costs from the cost limitations because it felt this provision provided too wide a latitude to Defense. The Committee also did not approve a requested provision to make the new cost limitations applicable to projects authorized in previous years, but not yet under contract. It felt that this provided Defense with a blank check for deficiency authorization and that if a

need arose for this sort of action, it could be handled on a case by case basis. The Committee approved an exception to the cost limitations for the construction or acquisition of 200 family housing units at the Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland and 2 units at Warsaw, Poland. The units in Warsaw are to be funded by use of excess foreign currency when so provided in Department of Defense Appropriation Acts.

IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING FAMILY HOUSING

The Defense witness stated that the Defense program included a total of \$60 million for improvement and alteration of existing public quarters and for the modernization and renovation of older and deteriorated units. He indicated that the backlog of such necessary work to upgrade the inventory was estimated at \$700 million and that there was no other single program that would pay quicker dividends and provide such substantial benefits in terms of increased morale to the military families who occupy on-base housing, plus the fact that it would provide increased life and livability to the structures themselves. The Committee recognizing the necessity for such a program approved improvements to existing family housing in the amount of \$60 million. The Committee also approved the exemption of improvement projects at Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, and Fort Sam Houston, Texas from the \$15,000 cost limitation on improvements, because of exceptional circumstances. It did not approve a similar request for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, because it felt too much money was being requested to provide air-conditioning for a single home.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN LEASING PROGRAMS

The Defense witness stated that the Defense program included a request to increase the limitation on the number of domestic leases from 10,000 to 13,000 to provide leased housing for the lower pay grades of enlisted personnel, previously ineligible for consideration. He indicated that the leasing program was effective in providing necessary family housing accommodations for military personnel, especially those on recruiting duty in metropolitan areas, and in providing an important supplement to Defense's balanced effort to acquire adequate housing both in the community and on-base. He also pointed out that because of escalation of rental costs, increases were being requested in the statutory average cost and maximum cost limitations. In addition, he indicated that a request was being made to exempt 1,000 units from the requested amount of \$310 per month for any one unit in the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) but not to exceed \$400 per month, for occupancy by personnel on detached duty in metropolitan areas. This would include such personnel as recruiters and ROTC instructors. The Committee approved the requested increases in the statutory average cost and maximum cost limitations for domestic leases, except that in the case of Alaska and Hawaii the average cost would be increased only to \$295 and the maximum to \$365. The Committee felt the increases requested for Alaska and Hawaii were too extreme. As indicated previously, the Committee did not approve the request for an additional 3,000 leases for the lower pay grades. The Committee also did not approve the request to exempt 1,000 units from the \$310 per month maximum

because it felt this late starter request was not sufficiently justified to support a change of this magnitude. It felt that with proper management, the domestic leasing program could be utilized fully to take care of those requiring this type of housing.

The Defense witness stated that leasing of family housing in foreign countries, particularly lease-construct agreements in selected overseas locations, represented a viable potential for providing additional housing for military families in foreign countries at a minimum risk to the United States Government, especially in areas where United States military tenure would be subject to change. Accordingly, he indicated that Defense was proposing an expansion of the program from 7,500 to 12,000 units, with the increase being used primarily to alleviate the severe deficit of housing for Army troops in Germany. In addition, he stated that increases in the statutory cost limitations were being requested on the basis of a 9 percent cost escalation in rents in foreign countries. The Committee approved the requested increase in the number of foreign leases and the increase in the average unit rental from \$325 per month to \$355 per month, but did not approve the requested increase in the maximum unit rental of \$625 per month because it felt the increase was unwarranted.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Defense witness stated that an additional appropriation of \$5 million was needed for the Homeowner Assistance Program because it was established that carry-over funds in the Homeowners Assistance Fund and revenue from sale of homes acquired under the Program would be insufficient to see the Program through FY 1975. Besides the usual residual operations of the Program, the base realignment announcement of April 17, 1973 will continue to have a significant impact on the Program in FY 1975. Applications for assistance continue to come in as the various Departments of Defense elements gradually phase out their operations, especially the Naval installations in Rhode Island. Since there is a time interval involved in the processing of applications now being received, the funding effect of these applications as well as applications still to be received will be felt in FY 1975. Also, changes affecting 59 overseas locations ordered last fall and the realignment announcements of February 4, 7 and 8, 1974 covering actions at Army and Air Force installations will have most of their effect in FY 1975. In addition, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Military Departments have announced or indicated elimination of or significant reductions in headquarters installations throughout the world. All of these actions will have an impact in FY 1975. Additional realignments of military installations, both at home and abroad, are presently under consideration and it was expected that within a short time frame a variety of installations will be realigned as the result of internal Military Department management improvements. It was anticipated that personnel at some of these will also require assistance in FY 1975. Accordingly, the Committee approved the additional \$5 million for the Homeowners Assistance Program.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

Authorization for appropriation of \$245,366,000 for the construction and acquisition portions of the military family housing program were

approved by the Committee. The Committee also approved \$935,515,-000 for operation, maintenance and debt payment, and in addition approved \$5,000,000 for the Homeowners Assistance Program.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

With few exceptions virtually all of the general provisions contained in this year's authorization are identical to those contained in prior years' legislation. Those exceptions are discussed along with the standardized sections in synopsis form in the following:

Section 601 is authorization language identical to section 601 in last year's Act (P.L. 93-166). It has the effect of continuing authorization to the Secretary of each military department to develop installations and facilities under this Act free of the following limitations:

31 USC 529 which specifies the general prohibition against advances of public monies,

10 USC 4774 and 9774 which establishes limitations upon construction of permanent structures, in the absence of other authorization, and

40 USC 255 which prohibits acquisition of land by purchase until a written opinion in favor of Title validity has been obtained.

The prohibitions specified in the first and third limitations cited above, if applied, would preclude timely construction in instances of military necessity. Section 601 grants exceptions to these limitations.

Section 602 is language which customarily appears in each annual military construction Act and corresponds to the equivalent section in prior years Acts (e.g., Sec. 602, P.L. 93-166), except that the dollar amounts are changed to the amounts of authorization for projects contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V, of the Act. It limits the amount which may be appropriated to carry out the projects authorized by separate titles of the Act.

Section 603 is identical to section 603 in last year's Act (P.L. 93-166). This section has the effect of authorizing the Secretary concerned, at his discretion, to increase the amount of authorization as it appears in titles I, II, III, or IV of this Act for bases inside the United States other than Hawaii and Alaska by 5% and for bases outside the United States or in Hawaii and Alaska by 10% provided that he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising and in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, when the authorization involves only one project at a named military installations, the amount authorized may be increased up to 25%. The total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

At multi-project military installations, contracts for an individual project may not be awarded until 30 days after a report is furnished the Armed Services Committees, if the estimated cost of the project is \$250,000 or more and the current working estimate of the Department of Defense, based on bids received exceeds 25% of the amount authorized for the project (normally on Forms DD-1391). An annual report is required covering any project on which the current working estimate based upon bids received exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress by more than 25% and also on projects whose scope has been reduced to permit awards within available authorization.

Section 604 is similar to section 604 in last year's Act (P.L. 93-166). This section has the effect of directing that construction executed under this Act (1) be done by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves to assure efficient, expeditious and cost-effective accomplishment; (2) that the Secretaries of the military departments report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House a breakdown of the dollar value of contracts completed by the construction agencies, together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charged by such agencies; (3) that all contracts (except for architect and engineering contracts which, unless otherwise authorized, shall continue to be awarded in accordance with presently established procedures, customs and practice) be awarded insofar as practicable on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder; and (4) the Secretaries of the military departments report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Section 605 is similar to the repeal set out in last year's Act (Sec. 605, P.L. 93-166) and continues in effect the previously established policy of repealing military construction authorizations that have not been used within a specified period after enactment. As a result, after October 1, 1975, only those authorizations, with certain exceptions, which are contained in Public Laws and enacted subsequent to November 29, 1973, would continue to remain available.

Section 606 corresponds to section 606 of last year's Act (P.L. 93-166). This section prescribes the cost limitations for permanent barracks and bachelor officer quarters, but increases these limitations.

Under this section, the cost limitations as stated in dollar amounts in the Act are applicable where the area construction cost index is 1.0. The cost limitations in areas where the area construction cost index is more or less than 1.0 will be computed and would be proportionately higher or lower. For example, if the area construction cost index was 1.05, the cost limitation for permanent barracks would be \$29.92 per square foot.

This section would leave in effect the existing cost limitations of \$28.50 per square foot for permanent barracks and \$30.50 per square foot for bachelor officer quarters retroactive to projects which have been previously authorized, but not contracted for as of the time of enactment. The Department of Defense had requested an increase in these limitations from \$28.50 per square foot to \$31.00 for barracks and from \$30.50 per square foot to \$33.00 for bachelor officer quarters. The Committee declined to increase these limits on grounds that the existing amounts were considered adequate.

Section 607 has been added to revise upward the current A/E contract cost "floor" above which the Military Services must report to the Armed Services Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate 30 days prior to obligation of any A/E contract estimated to cost \$150,000 or more. This notification procedure 30 days prior to obligation applies to all advance planning, design and architectural services for projects to be financed from monies hereafter appropriated. Since this provision was enacted into law some eight years ago, construction costs have escalated approximately 80 percent. Accordingly,

the current \$150,000 figure should be revised upward to more accurately reflect the intent for control of such obligations as measured in terms of today's costs. Although the Department of Defense had requested that this limitation be increased to \$300,000, the Committee felt that a lower figure would be more in consonance with increased costs experienced to date and has approved a revised limit of \$225,000.

Section 608. This provision provides authority for use of the proceeds from the sale of recycleable materials at military installations. First the cost of collection, handling and sale including purchase of equipment necessary to the recycling could be financed from these proceeds, and then remaining funds up to a maximum of \$50,000 per year at any one installation could be used for environmental improvement and energy conservation projects. The balances if any after such expenditures would be returned to the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Section 609. This provision has been added to provide for the conveyance by the Secretary of the Navy to the Boy Scouts of America of approximately 12.46 acres of the Naval Education and Training Program Development Center at Ellyson, Florida. This conveyance would be at fair market value to the Boy Scouts of America including costs for surveys and preparation of such legal documents as may be necessary. The Navy has interposed no objection to this transfer and the property would substantially benefit the training and camping programs of the Boy Scouts in the Gulf Coast Council of that organization.

Section 610. This is a new provision designed to authorize the Secretary of Defense to take all practicable actions to ameliorate and lessen the local community impact of new TRIDENT installations at Bangor, Washington. It directs the Secretary to consult with other Federal Agencies concerned with implementing Federal financial assistance programs to governmental entities and to help such entities to pay their share of the costs of such programs. This is similar in nature to the authorization provided for the SAFEGUARD program where sudden large influxes of workers in low population density communities produced severe financial burdens related to provision of health, education, utilities and similar community services to such employees of federally sponsored projects.

Section 611. This provision amends Section 2662 of Title 10, U.S. Code to prohibit the termination of an existing license or permit held by a military department for real property owned by the United States Government if the military department has made or proposes to make substantial investments in connection with their use of the property. This would avoid the capricious cancellation or modification of licenses or permits of public lands to the military departments when large amounts of public monies had already been expended or were to be programed in support of essential military activities on such lands unless the Armed Services Committees of the Congress were notified 30 days prior to such action.

Section 612. This provision would authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Army to the State of Louisiana of approximately 1,710 acres of U.S. land in Saint Tammany Parish now known as Camp Villere. This property has for many years been under license to the State for Louisiana National Guard use and will continue to be used for these purposes under the proposed conveyance. This con-

veyance would facilitate planned improvements to this property for National Guard purposes by the State and would reserve to the United States the right to reoccupy and use the property in time of war or emergency. This provision is similar to a number of other like conveyances in past years where the U.S. Government has passed title to such National Guard camps to the States in order to facilitate militarily essential improvements by the States which in a great number of instances are prohibited by State law unless title to the property is vested in the State.

TITLE VII—RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Army National Guard.....	\$53,800,000
Army Reserve.....	38,600,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.....	19,867,000
Air National Guard.....	26,000,000
Air Force Reserve.....	14,000,000
	152,267,000

Title VII provides authorization required in fiscal year 1975 to support the facilities programs of the Guard and Reserve Components of the Military Departments in the amounts indicated above.

The total amount provided this fiscal year represents an increase of nearly 39 percent over the FY 1974 authorization request of \$109,658,000. For the fourth consecutive year, the Committee has approved a substantial increase in the Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities Construction program thereby reflecting the continuing joint conviction of this Committee and the Department of Defense that a viable, well-trained and fully-equipped Reserve Force is an indispensable element of the planned Total Military Force. The Committee also supports the views of Department of Defense witnesses that adequate facilities have become an increasingly important factor not only in achieving the requisite combat readiness but in aiding the recruiting and retention of Reserve personnel in the present all-volunteer environment. Accordingly, the Committee has approved the totals indicated in the above table. However, the Naval and Marine Corps total reflects an added \$1,335,000 which the Committee approved to facilitate the Naval Reserve expansion of an existing excess Air Force facility concurrent with a similar action by the Army Reserve.

Under the lump sum authorization procedures, the Congress will be furnished advance notification concerning the location, nature, and estimated cost of all projects over \$100,000 which are to be undertaken within the total lump sum authorization available. This procedure is identical to that used in previous years except that it reflects the Committee's acknowledgement of the Department of Defense proposal to amend 10 USC 2233a(1) by increasing the current minimum project cost for which Congressional notification must be made from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

Consistent with the usual lump sum authorization procedures, specific projects supporting the total fiscal year 1975 authorization request can only be tentatively identified at this time. However, current indications are that \$52,521,000 would be used to construct or expand 79 armories or centers for the Army National Guard and Army Re-

serve, while \$39,879,000 would be used for 87 additional projects to provide essential maintenance, aviation support, field training and other miscellaneous non-armory facilities. Similarly, \$8,223,000 would be used for seven Navy and/or Marine Corps Reserve Centers, and \$11,644,000 for aviation maintenance, personnel support, and other operational requirements. The remaining proposed authorization would provide the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve \$14,542,000 for operational facilities, \$19,038,000 for aviation maintenance facilities, \$4,710,000 for training facilities, and \$1,710,000 for personnel support and storage facilities, and a major site preparation requirement.

The following summary indicates the status of the lump sum authorization provided since the Reserve Forces facilities program reverted to that method of authorization in 1963.

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES—ESTIMATED STATUS OF LUMP SUM AUTHORIZATIONS (AS OF APR. 1, 1974)
(In thousands of dollars)

	Army		Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	Air Force		Total
	National Guard	Reserve		National Guard	Reserve	
1. Lump-sum authorization (cumulative fiscal year 1963-74).....	160,306	144,700	107,153	134,373	56,570	603,282
2. Estimate of authorization to be committed through fiscal year 1974...	156,489	142,837	105,290	134,012	56,650	595,278
3. Uncommitted balance.....	3,817	1,863	1,863	361	100	8,004
4. Added by present bill.....	53,800	38,600	18,532	26,000	14,000	150,932
5. Total available for fiscal year 1975..	57,617	40,463	20,395	26,361	14,100	158,936
6. Estimated commitments in fiscal year 1975.....	53,800	40,463	18,532	26,361	14,000	153,156
7. Estimated residual authorization, end fiscal year 1975.....	3,817	0	1,863	0	100	5,780

FISCAL DATA

The original submission for the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Authorization Bill was in the amount of \$3,278,380,000. Committee action resulted in a net reduction of \$347,957,000 so that the enactment of this measure will authorize the expenditure of \$2,925,301,000 of which \$152,267,000 represents construction for the Reserve components.

FIVE-YEAR COST PROJECTION

The committee, in complying with the requirement of Section 252(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-510), requested a letter from the Department of Defense containing a five-year projection of the costs that would be engendered by this legislation. The reply, which is self-explanatory, is set out below:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1974.

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to the requirement of section 252(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (Public

Law 91-510). Our estimate of the cost to be incurred in carrying out the proposed Military Construction Authorization Bill, FY 1975 (\$2,925,301,000) in Fiscal Year 1975 and in each of the five succeeding fiscal years is as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1975-----	\$888, 613, 000
1976-----	861, 027, 000
1977-----	603, 999, 000
1978-----	318, 734, 000
1979-----	212, 008, 000
1980 and later-----	40, 920, 000
Total-----	2, 925, 301, 000

If we can be of any further assistance in this regard, please advise.
Sincerely yours,

SIGMUND I. GERBER,
(For Perry J. Fliakas,
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense,
(Installations and Housing)).

The committee did point out to the House that this is an annual authorization act. The authorizations herein provided are reviewed annually by the committee and the Congress.

COMMITTEE POSITION

On Tuesday, July 30, 1974, the Armed Services Committee by a unanimous vote agreed to report H. R. 16136 to the House.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

This measure is part of the legislative program of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1975. The submission by the Department in the amount of \$3,278,380,000 was dated 4 April 1974 as shown by the letter from the Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger which is set out below:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1974.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for FY 1975. The Office of Management and Budget on March 19, 1974, advised that its enactment would be in accordance with the program of the President.

This legislation would authorize military construction needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in essential construction previously authorized. Appropriations in support of this legislation are provided for in the Budget of the United States Government for the FY 1975.

Titles I, II, III, and IV of this proposal would authorize \$1,780,-165,000 in new construction for requirements of the Active Forces,

of which \$696,815,000 are for the Department of the Army; \$567,-674,000 for the Department of the Navy; \$468,276,000 for the Department of the Air Force; and \$47,400,000 for the Defense Agencies.

Title V contains legislative recommendations considered necessary to implement the Department of Defense family housing program and authorizes \$1,347,283,000 for costs of that program for FY 1975.

Title VI contains General Provisions generally applicable to the Military Construction Program.

Title VII totaling \$150,932,000 would authorize construction for the Reserve Components of which \$53,800,000 is for the Army National Guard; \$38,600,000 for the Army Reserve; \$18,532,000 for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves; \$26,000,000 for the Air National Guard; and \$14,000,000 for the Air Force Reserve. These authorizations are in lump sum amounts and will be utilized in accordance with the requirements of chapter 133, title 10, United States Code.

The projects which would be authorized by this proposal have been reviewed to determine if environmental impact statements are required in accordance with Public Law 91-190. Required environmental statements will be submitted to the Congress by the military departments when necessary procedures have been completed.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER.

Enclosure.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, there is herewith printed in parallel columns the text of provisions of existing law which would be repealed or amended by the various provisions of the bill as reported.

EXISTING LAW

ACT OF NOVEMBER 29, 1973 (87 STAT. 661, PUBLIC LAW 93-166)

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, various locations, \$12,517,000.

SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V shall not exceed—
(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$485,827,000; outside the United States, \$107,257,000; section 102, \$3,000,000; or a total of \$596,084,000.

THE BILL

SEC. 103. (a) Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY EUROPE," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Germany, Various Locations" strike out "\$12,517,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,360,000."

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$107,257,000" and "\$596,084,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$111,100,000" and "\$599,927,000," respectively.

ACT OF OCTOBER 25, 1972 (86 STAT. 1135, PUBLIC LAW 92-545), AS AMENDED

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Fort Myer, Virginia, \$1,815,000
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, \$14,958,000

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND
Canal Zone, Various Locations, \$8,129,000.

Sec. 702. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$444,767,000; outside the United States, \$117,311,000; or a total of \$562,078,000.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Fort Myer, Virginia," strike out "\$1,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,615,000."

With respect to "Fort Sill, Oklahoma," strike out "\$14,958,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,159,000."

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND" in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Canal Zone, Various Locations" strike out "\$8,129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,238,000."

(c) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 702 "\$444,767,000," "\$117,311,000," and "\$562,078,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$447,768,000," "\$118,420,000," and "\$566,188,000," respectively.

THE BILL

EXISTING LAW

ACT OF OCTOBER 26, 1970 (84 STAT. 1204, PUBLIC LAW 91-511) AS AMENDED

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, \$2,750,000.

SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States \$181,834,000; outside the United States, \$83,197,000; section 102, \$2,000,000; or a total of \$267,031,000.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois," strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,650,000."

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$181,834,000," and "\$267,031,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$182,734,000" and "\$267,931,000," respectively.

ACT OF NOVEMBER 29, 1973 (87 STAT. 661, PUBLIC LAW 93-166)

SEC. 106. Public Law 93-166 is amended in section 105 as follows:

Sec. 105. (b) Public Law 92-145, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 702 "\$41,374,000" and "\$404,500,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$41,981,000" and "\$405,107,000", respectively.

ACT OF JULY 21, 1968 (82 STAT. 367, PUBLIC LAW 90-408), AS AMENDED

Sec. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, \$2,000,000. Sec. 802. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$241,668,000; outside the United States, \$5,356,000; section 202, \$1,509,000; or a total of \$248,533,000.

Public Law 93-166, section 105(b), amending Public Law 92-145, section 702, clause (1) as amended, having inserted erroneous figures, is amended by striking out "\$404,500,000" and "\$405,107,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$405,000,000" and "\$405,607,000," respectively.

SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland," strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,391,000."

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802 "\$241,668,000" and "\$248,533,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,059,000" and "\$250,924,000," respectively.

THE BILL

EXISTING LAW

ACT OF OCTOBER 26, 1970 (84 STAT. 1204, PUBLIC LAW 91-511), AS AMENDED

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Florida, \$3,869,000.

SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(2) for title II: Inside the United States \$247,204,000; outside the United States, \$26,164,000; Section 202, \$974,000; or a total of \$274,342,000.

ACT OF OCTOBER 25, 1972 (86 STAT. 1135, PUBLIC LAW 92-545), AS AMENDED

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

Sec. 204. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Florida," strike out "\$3,869,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,534,000."

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$247,204,000" and "\$274,342,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$247,869,000" and "\$275,007,000," respectively.

Sec. 205. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia," strike out "\$3,319,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,019,000."

With respect to "Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana," strike out "\$11,680,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,609,000."

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 702 "\$477,664,000" and "\$518,881,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$484,293,000" and "\$525,510,000," respectively.

Sec. 206. (a) Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Home, Gulfport, Mississippi," strike out "\$9,444,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,163,000."

With respect to "Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana," strike out "\$3,386,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,157,000."

With respect to "Naval Air Station, Alameda, California," strike out "\$3,827,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,756,000."

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES
Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$3,319,000.

Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$11,680,000.

Sec. 702. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$477,664,000; outside the United States, \$41,217,000; or a total of \$518,881,000.

ACT OF NOVEMBER 29, 1973 (87 STAT. 661, PUBLIC LAW 93-166)

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Naval Home, Gulfport, Mississippi, \$9,444,000.

Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$3,386,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, \$3,827,000.

EXISTING LAW

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif., \$3,802,000.

Sec. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(2) for title II, inside the United States \$511,606,000; outside the United States, \$58,833,000; or a total of \$570,439,000.

ACT OF NOVEMBER 29, 1973 (87 STAT. 661, PUBLIC LAW 93-166)

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$7,843 000.

Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia, \$4,628,000.

THE BILL

With respect to "Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California," strike out "\$3,802,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,210,000."

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$511,606,000" and "\$570,439,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$523,433,000" and "\$582,266,000," respectively.

Sec. 304(a) Section 301 of Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

(1) Under the sub-heading "AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, strike out "\$7,843,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,733,000."

(2) Under the sub-heading "AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND" with respect to Robins Air Force Base,

Warner Robins, Georgia, strike out "\$4,628,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,324,000."

(3) Under the sub-heading "AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND" with respect to Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, strike out "\$7,039,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,882,000."

(4) Under the sub-heading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, strike out "\$8,786,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,733,000."

(5) Under the sub-heading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "\$6,509,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,186,000."

(6) Under the sub-heading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, strike out "\$4,211,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,461,000."

(7) Under the sub-heading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out "\$371,000" and insert in place thereof "\$895,000."

(8) Under the sub-heading "MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND" with respect to Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma, strike out "\$1,078,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,440,000."

(9) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, strike out "\$5,834,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,265,000."

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$7,039,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, \$8,786,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$6,509,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, \$4,211,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, \$371,000.

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma, \$1,078,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, \$5,834,000.

EXISTING LAW

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, \$1,165,000.

SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V shall not exceed—

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$238,439,000; outside the United States, \$21,302,000; section 302, \$1,000,000; or a total of \$260,741,000.

ACT OF NOVEMBER 29, 1973 (87 STAT. 661, PUBLIC LAW 93-166)

SEC. 502. (a) Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures.

(b) The average unit cost for each military department for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) shall not exceed \$27,500 including the cost of the family unit and the pro-

THE BILL

(10) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, strike out "\$1,165,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,200,000."

(b) Public Law 93-166 is further amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "\$238,439,000" and "\$260,741,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$256,094,000" and "\$278,396,000", respectively.

SEC. 502. (a) Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in section 501 of this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures, the cost of the family unit, and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation and installation of utilities.

(b) The average unit cost for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) shall not exceed \$30,000 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

portionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(c) No family housing unit in the area specified in subsection (b) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding \$44,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(d) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than that specified in subsection (b) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$37,000 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$44,000. The cost limitations of this subsection shall include the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

- (1) for the Department of the Army, \$28,160,000.
- (2) for the Department of the Navy, \$10,600,000.
- (3) for the Department of the Air Force, \$23,750,000.

ACT OF JULY 15, 1955 (69 STAT. 324, 352, PUBLIC LAW 84-161), AS AMENDED

SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1974 and 1975, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, without rental charge, at or near any military installation in the United States, Puerto Rico, or Guam, if the Secre-

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than that specified in subsection (b) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$40,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

- (1) for the Department of the Army, \$20,000,000.
- (2) for the Department of the Navy, \$20,000,000.
- (3) for the Department of the Air Force, \$20,000,000.

SEC. 506. (a) Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended by (1) striking out "1974 and 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975 and 1976", and (2) revising the third sentence to read as follows: "Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities, including the cost of utilities and maintenance

EXISTING LAW

tary of Defense, or his designee, finds that there is a lack of adequate housing at or near such military installation and that (1) there has been a recent substantial increase in military strength and such increase is temporary, or (2) the permanent military strength is to be substantially reduced in the near future, or (3) the number of military personnel assigned is so small as to make the construction of family housing uneconomical, or (4) family housing is required for personnel attending service school academic courses on permanent change of station orders, or (5) family housing has been authorized but is not yet completed or a family housing authorization request is in a pending military construction authorization bill. Such housing facilities may be leased on an individual unit basis and not more than ten thousand such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation, may not exceed: For the United States (other than Hawaii), Puerto Rico, and Guam an average of \$210 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$290 per month for any one unit; and for Hawaii, an average of \$255 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$300 per month for any one unit.

THE BILL

and operation, may not exceed: For the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii), Puerto Rico, and Guam an average of \$235 per month for each military department or the amount of \$310 per month for any one unit; and for Alaska and Hawaii, an average of \$295 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$365 per month for any one unit."

ACT OF NOVEMBER 29, 1973 (87 STAT. 661, PUBLIC LAW 93-166)

(b) The average unit rental for Department of Defense family housing acquired by lease in foreign countries may not exceed \$325 per month for the Department and in no event shall the rental for any one unit exceed \$625 per month, including the costs of operation, maintenance, and utilities; and not more than seven thousand five hundred family housing units may be so leased at any one time. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, may waive these cost limitations for not more than three hundred units leased for: incumbents of special positions, personnel assigned to Defense Attaché Offices, or in countries where excessive costs of housing would cause undue hardship on Department of Defense personnel.

ACT OF NOVEMBER 29, 1973 (87 STAT. 661, PUBLIC LAW 93-166)

SEC. 605. As of October 1, 1974, all authorizations for military public works, including family housing, to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135), and such authorizations contained in Acts approved before October 26, 1972, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(b) Section 507(b) of Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 676) is amended by striking out “§325”, and “seven thousand five hundred”, and inserting in lieu thereof “§355”, and “twelve thousand”, respectively.

SEC. 605. As of October 1, 1975, all authorizations for military public works including family housing, to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before November 30, 1973, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

EXISTING LAW

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts, land acquisition, or payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in whole or in part, before October 1, 1974, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135, 1153), all authorizations for construction of family housing, including mobile home facilities, all authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansion, or extensions to existing family housing, and all authorizations for related facilities projects under said Act are hereby continued and shall remain in effect until October 1, 1974; and

THE BILL

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts, land acquisition, or payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in whole or in part before October 1, 1975, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 605 of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 681), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1976:

(a) Sanitary sewer connection in the amount of \$2,200,000 at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204), as amended and extended in section 705(a) (3) (A) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1153).

(b) Cold storage warehouse construction in the amount of \$1,215,000 at Fort Dix, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(4) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(a) of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135, 1153), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1975:

(A) Enlisted women's barracks construction in the amount of \$437,000 for Fort Rucker, Alabama, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" of the Act of October 27, 1971 (85 Stat. 394, 395), as amended.

(B) Airfield expansion in the amount of \$882,000 for the United States Army Security Agency, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" of the Act of October 27, 1971 (85 Stat. 394, 395), as amended.

(C) Environmental Health Effects Laboratory in the amount of \$4,500,000 for the Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland, that is contained in title II, section 201, under heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" of the Act of October 27, 1971 (85 Stat. 394, 397).

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

(c) Enlisted men's barracks complex construction in the amount of \$12,160,000 at Fort Knox, Kentucky, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(d) Enlisted women's barracks construction in the amount of \$245,000 and bachelor officer's quarters construction in the amount of \$803,000 at Fort Lee, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(e) Chapel center construction in the amount of \$1,088,000 at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(f) Enlisted men's barracks construction in the amount of \$7,996,000 at Ford Ord, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(g) Enlisted men's barracks and mess construction in the amount of \$699,000 at Sierra Army Depot, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1136), as amended.

(h) Test facilities Solid State Radar in the amount of \$7,600,000 at Kwajalein National Missile Range, Kwajalein, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1137).

(i) Land acquisition in the amount of \$10,000,000 for the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1140).

(j) Message center addition, aircraft fire and crash station, aircraft maintenance hangar shops, bachelor enlisted quarters, mess hall, bachelor officers' quarters, exchange and recreation building, and utilities construction in the amounts of \$110,000; \$199,000; \$837,000; \$1,745,000; \$377,000; \$829,000; \$419,000; and \$792,000 respectively for the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece that is contained in Title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1141).

(k) Authorization for exchange of lands in support of the Air Installation Compatible Use Zones at Various Locations in the amount of \$12,000,000 that is contained in title III, section 301 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1145), as amended.

(4) Notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135, 1153) as modified by section 605(3) of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 681), the authorization to construct 600 family housing units at Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, contained in title V, section 501(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1148) shall remain in effect until October 1, 1975.

ACT OF SEPTEMBER 12, 1966 (80 STAT. 757, PUBLIC LAW 89-568, 31 U.S.C. 723a).

SEC. 612. In the case of any public works project for which advance planning, construction design and architectural services are estimated to cost \$150,000 or more, which are to be funded from moneys hereafter appropriated for such purposes pursuant to authority of section

SEC. 607. Section 612 of Public Law 89-568 (80 Stat. 756, 757), is amended by deleting the figure \$150,000 wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof \$225,000.

SEC. 608. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the sale of recyclable material shall be credited first,

EXISTING LAW

723 of title 31, U.S.C., the Secretary of Defense shall describe the project and report the estimated cost of such services not less than 30 days prior to initial obligation of funds therefor to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

THE BILL

to the cost of collection, handling and sale of the material including purchasing of equipment to be used for recycling purposes and second, to projects for environmental improvement and energy conservation at camps, posts, and bases establishing recycling programs in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense. The amount expended for environmental improvement and energy conservation projects shall not exceed \$50,000 per installation per annum. Any balance shall be returned to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of each military department shall make an annual report to Congress on the operation of the program.

SEC. 610. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to assist counties and communities located near the TRIDENT Support Site Bangor, Washington, in meeting the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities to the residents of such areas, if the Secretary determines that there is a substantial increase in the need for such services and facilities as a direct result of work being carried out in connection with the construction, installation, testing, and operation of the TRIDENT Weapon System and that an excessive financial burden will be incurred by such governmental entities as a result of the increased need for such services and facilities.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall carry out the provisions of this section through existing Federal programs. The Secretary is authorized to supplement funds made available under such Federal programs to the extent necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and is authorized to provide financial assistance to governmental

entities described in subsection (a) of this section to help such entities pay their share of the costs under such programs. The heads of all departments and agencies concerned shall cooperate fully with the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provisions of this section on a priority basis.

(c) In determining the amount of financial assistance to be made available under this section for any service or facility, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the head of the department or agency of the Federal Government concerned with the type of service or facility for which financial assistance is being made available and shall take into consideration (1) the time lag between the initial impact of increased population in any area and any increase in the local tax base which will result from such increased population, (2) the possible temporary nature of the increased population and the long-range cost impact on the permanent residents of any such area and (3) such other pertinent factors as the Secretary of Defense deems appropriate.

SECTION 2662, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 2662. Real property transactions: Reports to the Armed Services Committees

(a) The Secretary of a military department, or his designee, may not enter into any of the following listed transactions by or for the use of that department until after the expiration of 30 days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed transaction is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives:

EXISTING LAW

- (1) An acquisition of fee title to any real property, if the estimated price is more than \$50,000.
 - (2) A lease of any real property to the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than \$50,000.
 - (3) A lease or license of real property owned by the United States, if the estimated annual fair market rental value of the property is more than \$50,000.
 - (4) A transfer of real property owned by the United States to another Federal agency or another military department or to a State, if the estimated value is more than \$50,000.
 - (5) A report of excess real property owned by the United States to a disposal agency, if the estimated value is more than \$50,000.
- if a transaction covered by clause (1) or (2) is part of a project, the report must include a summarization of the general plan for that project, including an estimate of the total cost of the lands to be acquired or leases to be made.
- (b) The Secretary of each military department shall report quarterly to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on transactions described in subsection (a) that involve an estimated value of more than \$5,000 but not more than \$50,000.

(c) This section applies only to real property in the United States and Puerto Rico. It does not apply to real property for river and harbor projects or flood-control

THE BILL

SEC. 611. Section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) a new paragraph:

“(6) Any termination or modification by either the grantor or grantee of an existing license or permit of real property owned by the United States to a military department, under which substantial investments have been or are proposed to be made in connection with the use of the property by the military department.”

projects, or to leases of Government-owned real property for agricultural or grazing purposes.

(d) A statement in an instrument of conveyance, including a lease, that the requirements of this section have been met, or that the conveyance is not subject to this section, is conclusive.

(e) No element of the Department of Defense shall occupy any general purpose space leased for it by the General Services Administration at an annual rental in excess of \$50,000 (excluding the cost of utilities and other operation and maintenance services), if the effect of such occupancy is to increase the total amount of such leased space occupied by all elements of the Department of Defense, until the expiration of 30 days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed occupancy is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Summary of the construction authority approved by the House Armed Services
Committee in the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Authorization Bill

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

State, Department or component, and name of installation	Total
Alabama	\$44,000,000
Army:	
Anniston Army Depot	7,648,000
Fort McClellan	17,344,000
Fort Rucker	4,928,000
Redstone Arsenal	10,322,000
Air Force:	
Maxwell AFB, Montgomery	3,758,000
Alaska	33,333,000
Army:	
Fort Greely	251,000
Fort Richardson	1,732,000
Fort Wainwright	11,473,000
Navy:	
Naval Station, Adak	4,605,000
Air Force:	
Eielson AFB, Fairbanks	310,000
Various locations	14,962,000
Arizona	12,006,000
Army:	
Fort Huachuca	3,399,000
Yuma Proving Ground	1,859,000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma	3,203,000
Air Force:	
Davis Monthan AFB, Tucson	3,009,000
Williams AFB, Chandler	536,000
Arkansas	5,816,000
Air Force:	
Blytheville AFB, Blytheville	675,000
Little Rock AFB, Little Rock	5,141,000
California	141,902,000
Army:	
Fort Ord	3,660,000
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation	1,108,000
Presidio of Monterey	3,107,000
Sacramento Army Depot	2,599,000
Sierra Army Depot	717,000
Navy:	
Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Pendleton	10,021,000
Naval Weapons Center, China Lake	8,371,000
Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach	6,011,000
Naval Air Station, Miramar	11,354,000
Naval Air Station, North Island	12,050,000
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme	1,048,000
Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego	3,238,000
Naval Regional Medical Center, San Diego	26,375,000
Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego	4,234,000
Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach	2,147,000
Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda	1,638,000
Naval Hospital, Lemoore	333,000
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field	77,000
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow	1,463,000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	7,271,000
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms	7,271,000

Summary of the construction authority approved by the House Armed Services
Committee in the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Authorization
Bill—Continued

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—continued

State, Department or component, and name of installation

California—Continued

	<i>Total</i>
Air Force:	
Aerospace Corporation, Los Angeles.....	\$9,000,000
Edwards AFB, Muroc.....	1,198,000
George AFB, Victorville.....	3,846,000
Mather AFB, Sacramento.....	2,143,000
McClellan AFB, Sacramento.....	7,017,000
Travis AFB, Fairfield.....	8,800,000
	<u>41,042,000</u>
Colorado.....	
Army:	
Fort Carson.....	27,731,000
Air Force:	
Lowry AFB, Denver.....	7,885,000
Peterson Field, Colorado Springs.....	5,426,000
	<u>2,354,000</u>
Connecticut.....	
Navy:	
Naval Submarine Base, New London.....	2,354,000
	<u>1,373,000</u>
Delaware.....	
Air Force:	
Dover AFB, Dover.....	1,373,000
	<u>8,117,000</u>
District of Columbia.....	
Navy:	
Naval District Commandant, Washington.....	2,883,000
Naval Research Laboratory, Washington.....	205,000
Marine Barracks, Washington.....	1,874,000
Air Force:	
Bolling AFB, Washington.....	3,155,000
	<u>69,079,000</u>
Florida.....	
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field.....	6,893,000
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville.....	446,000
Naval Regional Medical Center, Jacksonville.....	12,413,000
Naval Station, Mayport.....	3,239,000
Naval Training Center, Orlando.....	4,569,000
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City.....	620,000
Naval Air Station, Pensacola.....	20,948,000
Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola.....	4,478,000
Naval Air Station, Whiting Field.....	1,561,000
Air Force:	
Eglin AFB, Valparaiso.....	10,475,000
Patrick AFB, Cocoa.....	642,000
Tyndall AFB, Panama City.....	2,775,000
	<u>89,441,000</u>
Georgia.....	
Army:	
Fort Benning.....	36,827,000
Fort Gordon.....	9,625,000
Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield.....	42,197,000
Air Force:	
Robins AFB, Warner Robins.....	792,000

Summary of the construction authority approved by the House Armed Services Committee in the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Authorization Bill—Continued

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—continued

<i>State, Department or component, and name of installation</i>	<i>Total</i>
Hawaii-----	\$38,641,000
Army:	
Schofield Barracks-----	15,324,000
Tripler General Hospital-----	1,205,000
Navy:	
Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu-----	795,000
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor-----	1,505,000
Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor-----	3,356,000
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay-----	5,497,000
Air Force:	
Hickam AFB, Honolulu-----	10,959,000
Illinois-----	24,613,000
Army:	
Rock Island Arsenal-----	2,731,000
Navy:	
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes-----	10,164,000
Air Force:	
Chanute AFB, Rantoul-----	6,267,000
Scott AFB, Belleville-----	5,451,000
Indiana-----	323,000
Air Force:	
Grissom AFB, Peru-----	323,000
Kansas-----	38,073,000
Army:	
Fort Leavenworth-----	9,911,000
Fort Riley-----	24,478,000
Air Force:	
McConnell AFB, Wichita-----	3,038,000
Defense Supply Agency:	
Defense Industrial Plant Equipment Facility, Atchinson-----	646,000
Kentucky-----	12,622,000
Army:	
Fort Campbell-----	9,742,000
Fort Knox-----	2,264,000
Lexington/Blue Grass Army Depot-----	616,000
Louisiana-----	11,025,000
Army:	
Fort Polk-----	7,304,000
Navy:	
Naval Support Activity, New Orleans-----	3,080,000
Air Force:	
Barksdale AFB, Shreveport-----	641,000
Maine-----	2,848,000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Brunswick-----	261,000
Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor-----	255,000
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery-----	2,332,000

Summary of the construction authority approved by the House Armed Services Committee in the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Authorization Bill—Continued

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—continued

<i>State, Department or component, and name of installation</i>	<i>Total</i>
Maryland-----	\$42,000,000
Army:	
Fort Detrick-----	486,000
Fort Ritchie-----	2,023,000
Navy:	
Naval Academy, Annapolis-----	1,256,000
National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda-----	14,943,000
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda-----	15,000,000
Air Force:	
Andrews AFB, Camp Springs-----	5,929,000
National Security Agency:	
Fort George G. Meade-----	2,363,000
Michigan-----	7,885,000
Air Force: Kincheloc AFB, Kinross-----	835,000
K. I. Sawyer AFB, Marquette-----	7,050,000
Mississippi-----	8,951,000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Meridian-----	1,485,000
Air Force:	
Columbus AFB, Columbus-----	169,000
Keesler AFB, Biloxi-----	7,297,000
Missouri-----	13,430,000
Army:	
Fort Leonard Wood-----	3,360,000
Air Force:	
Richard-Gebaur AFB, Grandview-----	805,000
Whiteman AFB, Knob Noster-----	6,692,000
Defense Mapping Agency:	
DMA Aerospace Center (St. Louis AFS), St. Louis-----	2,573,000
Montana-----	3,740,000
Air Force:	
Malmstrom AFB, Great Falls-----	3,740,000
Nebraska-----	5,595,000
Air Force:	
Offutt AFB, Omaha-----	5,595,000
Nevada-----	6,495,000
Air Force:	
Nellis AFB, Las Vegas-----	6,495,000
New Hampshire-----	2,630,000
Army:	
Cold Regions Laboratories-----	2,515,000
Air Force:	
Pease AFB, Portsmouth-----	115,000

Summary of the construction authority approved by the House Armed Services Committee in the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Authorization Bill—Continued

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—continued

<i>State, Department or component, and name of installation</i>	<i>Total</i>
New Jersey-----	\$10,578,000
Army:	
Picatinny Arsenal-----	2,820,000
Navy:	
Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst-----	7,350,000
Air Force:	
McGuire AFB, Wrightstown-----	408,000
New Mexico-----	4,222,000
Army:	
White Sands Missile Range-----	1,542,000
Air Force:	
Cannon AFB, Clovis-----	833,000
Holloman AFB, Alamogordo-----	1,565,000
Kirtland AFB, Albuquerque-----	232,000
New York-----	14,447,000
Army:	
Seneca Army Depot-----	815,000
U.S. Military Academy-----	7,720,000
Watervliet Arsenal-----	3,256,000
Air Force:	
Griffiss AFB, Rome-----	1,774,000
Plattsburgh AFB, Plattsburgh-----	882,000
North Carolina-----	47,013,000
Army:	
Fort Bragg-----	26,170,000
Navy:	
Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Lejeune-----	290,000
Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point-----	252,000
Marine Corps Air Station, New River-----	499,000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune-----	13,864,000
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point-----	1,260,000
Air Force:	
Pope AFB, Fayetteville-----	730,000
Scymour-Johnson AFB, Goldsboro-----	3,948,000
North Dakota-----	238,000
Air Force:	
Minot AFB, Minot-----	238,000
Ohio-----	14,782,000
Air Force:	
Newark AFS, Newark-----	1,977,000
Wright Patterson AFB, Dayton-----	10,371,000
Defense Supply Agency:	
Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus-----	1,862,000
Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton-----	572,000
Oklahoma-----	27,424,000
Army:	
Fort Sill-----	15,587,000
Air Force:	
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma City-----	9,839,000
Vance AFB, Enid-----	1,998,000

Summary of the construction authority approved by the House Armed Services Committee in the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Authorization Bill—Continued

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—continued

<i>State, Department or component, and name of installation</i>	<i>Total</i>
Pennsylvania-----	\$6,352,000
Army:	
Letterkenny Army Depot-----	4,726,000
Navy:	
Naval Hospital, Philadelphia-----	296,000
Defense Supply Agency:	
Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg-----	394,000
Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia-----	936,000
	<u>2,582,000</u>
Rhode Island-----	2,582,000
Navy:	
Naval Education and Training Center, Newport-----	2,582,000
	<u>48,356,000</u>
South Carolina-----	48,356,000
Army:	
Fort Jackson-----	19,078,000
Navy:	
Naval Hospital, Beaufort-----	7,112,000
Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston-----	200,000
Naval Station, Charleston-----	15,352,000
Naval Supply Center, Charleston-----	3,750,000
Naval Weapons Station, Charleston-----	2,564,000
Air Force:	
Myrtle Beach AFB, Myrtle Beach-----	300,000
	<u>10,105,000</u>
South Dakota-----	10,105,000
Air Force:	
Ellsworth AFB, Rapid City-----	10,105,000
	<u>53,923,000</u>
Tennessee-----	53,923,000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Memphis-----	4,284,000
Air Force:	
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma-----	48,240,000
Defense Supply Agency:	
Defense Depot, Memphis-----	1,399,000
	<u>77,682,000</u>
Texas-----	77,682,000
Army:	
Aeronautical Maintenance Center-----	541,000
Fort Bliss-----	13,704,000
Fort Hood-----	40,214,000
Fort Sam Houston-----	4,286,000
Red River Army Depot-----	269,000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi-----	1,830,000
Naval Air Station, Kingsville-----	1,428,000
Air Force:	
Kelly AFB, San Antonio-----	4,079,000
Laughlin AFB, Del Rio-----	298,000
Randolph AFB, San Antonio-----	790,000
Reese AFB, Lubbock-----	836,000
Sheppard AFB, Wichita Falls-----	8,631,000
Webb AFB, Big Spring-----	776,000

Summary of the construction authority approved by the House Armed Services Committee in the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Authorization Bill—Continued

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—continued

<i>State, Department or component, and name of installation</i>	<i>Total</i>
Utah-----	\$12, 421, 000
Air Force:	
Hill AFB, Ogden-----	11, 894, 000
Defense Supply Agency:	
Defense Depot, Ogden-----	527, 000
Virginia-----	78, 268, 000
Army:	
Fort Belvoir-----	9, 031, 000
Fort Eustis-----	9, 288, 000
Fort Lee-----	5, 218, 000
Fort Myer-----	2, 497, 000
Navy:	
Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Dam Neck-----	2, 034, 000
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek-----	896, 000
Atlantic Command Operations Control Center, Norfolk-----	633, 000
Naval Air Station, Norfolk-----	2, 900, 000
Naval Station, Norfolk-----	8, 364, 000
Naval Supply Center, Norfolk-----	4, 990, 000
Norfolk Naval Regional Medical Center, Portsmouth-----	15, 801, 000
Naval Air Station, Oceana-----	1, 047, 000
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth-----	5, 602, 000
Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown-----	3, 438, 000
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico-----	2, 803, 000
Air Force:	
Langley AFB, Hampton-----	3, 056, 000
Defense Mapping Agency:	
Fort Belvoir-----	670, 000
Washington-----	107, 864, 000
Army:	
Fort Lewis-----	10, 270, 000
Navy:	
Trident Support Site, Bangor-----	95, 000, 000
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton-----	393, 000
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island-----	2, 201, 000
Various locations (Zone of Interior)-----	42, 501, 000
Army:	
Various-----	27, 323, 000
Air Force:	
Various-----	15, 178, 000
Classified (Zone of Interior)-----	2, 800, 000
Air Force:	
Various-----	2, 800, 000
Bermuda-----	1, 866, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Bermuda-----	1, 866, 000

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Summary of the construction authority approved by the House Armed Services Committee in the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Authorization Bill—Continued

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—continued

<i>State, Department or component, and name of installation</i>	<i>Total</i>
Canal Zone.....	\$1,124,000
Army:	
Panama Area.....	324,000
Navy:	
Naval Support Activity.....	800,000
Chagos Archipelago.....	29,000,000
Navy:	
Naval Communication Facility, Diego Garcia.....	29,000,000
Germany.....	25,280,000
Army:	
Various locations.....	25,000,000
Air Force:	
Various locations.....	280,000
Guam.....	1,262,000
Navy:	
Naval Communication Station, Finegayan.....	355,000
Navy Public Works Center.....	907,000
Iceland.....	2,317,000
Navy:	
Naval Station, Keflavik.....	2,317,000
Italy.....	4,159,000
Army:	
Camp Darby.....	4,159,000
Johnston Atoll.....	1,458,000
Defense Nuclear Agency:	
Various locations.....	1,458,000
Korea.....	1,663,000
Army:	
Various locations.....	1,663,000
Kwajalein Island.....	1,272,000
Army:	
Kwajalein Missile Range.....	1,272,000
Okinawa.....	532,000
Army:	
Fort Buckner.....	532,000
Puerto Rico.....	5,159,000
Navy:	
Naval Telecommunications Center, Roosevelt Roads.....	3,186,000
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads.....	947,000
Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca.....	1,026,000

*Summary of the construction authority approved by the House Armed Services
Committee in the fiscal year 1975 Military Construction Authorization
Bill—Continued*

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—continued

<i>State, Department or component, and name of installation</i>	<i>Total</i>
Republic of the Philippines.....	\$8,071,000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Cubi Point.....	4,052,000
Naval Hospital, Subic Bay.....	278,000
Naval Station, Subic Bay.....	3,741,000
United Kingdom.....	2,643,000
Navy:	
Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland.....	571,000
Naval Activities Detachment, Holy Loch, Scotland.....	1,188,000
Air Force:	
Various locations.....	884,000
Various locations (overseas).....	162,313,00
Army:	
Various.....	88,148,000
Air Force:	
Various.....	74,165,000
Classified (overseas).....	5,300,000
Air Force:	
Various.....	5,300,000
Locations not specified.....	15,000,000
Office, Secretary of Defense:	
Various.....	15,000,000
Reserve components.....	152,267,000
Army National Guard:	
Various.....	53,800,000
Army Reserve:	
Various.....	38,600,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve:	
Various.....	19,867,000
Air National Guard:	
Various.....	26,000,000
Air Force Reserve:	
Various.....	14,000,000

SUMMARY OF THE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY APPROVED BY THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1975 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION
BILL

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

State, department or component, and name of installation	Cost		State total	
	Air	Water	Air	Water
Arizona				\$970,000
Air Force:				
Luke AFB, Gila Bend		\$421,000		
Williams AFB, Chandler		549,000		
Arkansas				500,000
Army:				
Fort Chaffee		213,000		
Air Force:				
Little Rock AFB, Little Rock		287,000		
California			\$4,459,000	7,135,000
Army:				
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation		113,000		
Fort Ord		362,000		
Presidio of San Francisco		81,000		
Navy:				
Naval Air Station, North Island	\$542,000			
Naval Air Rework Facility, North Island	818,000			
Naval Supply Center, San Diego	360,000	2,453,000		
Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda	1,667,000			
Naval Weapons Station, Concord		626,000		
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	231,000	1,935,000		
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro	195,000			
Marine Corps Air Station, Santa Ana	87,000			
Air Force:				
Castle AFB, Merced	184,000			
George AFB, Victorville		1,470,000		
March AFB, Riverside	375,000			
Norwalk AF POL Retail Distribution Station, Norwalk		95,000		
Colorado				514,000
Army:				
Fort Carson		514,000		
Connecticut			442,000	
Navy:				
Naval Submarine Base, New London	442,000			
Delaware				101,000
Air Force:				
Dover AFB, Dover		101,000		
District of Columbia			305,000	
Army:				
Walter Reed Army Medical Center	305,000			
Florida			1,078,000	2,603,000
Navy:				
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field		894,000		
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville	99,000			
Naval Station, Mayport	893,000			
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City		267,000		
Naval Air Station, Pensacola		826,000		
Air Force:				
MacDill AFB, Tampa		616,000		
Tampa Air Force Retail Distribution Station, Tampa	86,000			
Georgia				1,333,000
Army:				
Fort Benning		710,000		
Fort Gordon		268,000		
Air Force:				
Moody AFB, Valdosta		355,000		
Hawaii				6,549,000
Navy:				
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor		4,896,000		
Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor		1,653,000		
Illinois			1,027,000	2,560,000
Army:				
Joliet Army Ammunition Plant	500,000			
Fort Sheridan		52,000		
Navy:				
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	527,000			
Air Force:				
Chanute AFB, Rantoul		2,508,000		
Indiana			260,000	665,000
Navy:				
Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane	260,000	665,000		
Kentucky			164,000	1,948,000
Army:				
Fort Campbell		1,948,000		
Fort Knox	164,000			

SUMMARY OF THE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY APPROVED BY THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1975 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—Continued

State, department or component, and name of installation	Cost		State total	
	Air	Water	Air	Water
Louisiana.....			\$515,000	\$1,544,000
Army:				
Fort Polk.....				
Air Force:		\$1,544,000		
Barksdale AFB, Shreveport.....	\$450,000			
England AFB, Alexandria.....	65,000			
Maine.....				290,000
Air Force:				
Loring AFB, Limestone.....		290,000		
Maryland.....			2,945,000	635,000
Navy:				
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River.....		635,000		
Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head.....	2,945,000			
Michigan.....				2,046,000
Air Force:				
K. I. Sawyer AFB, Marquette.....		2,046,000		
Mississippi.....				2,216,000
Air Force:				
Keesler AFB, Biloxi.....		2,216,000		
Missouri.....				3,980,000
Army:				
Fort Leonard Wood.....		3,980,000		
Nevada.....				7,022,000
Navy:				
Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne.....		7,022,000		
New Hampshire.....				639,000
Air Force:				
Pease AFB, Portsmouth.....		639,000		
New Jersey.....				416,000
Army:				
Picatinny Arsenal.....		416,000		
New York.....			387,000	343,000
Army:				
U.S. Military Academy.....	387,000			
Air Force:				
Griffiss AFB, Rome.....		343,000		
North Carolina.....				1,503,000
Navy:				
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune.....		1,068,000		
Marine Corps Air Station, New River.....		435,000		
Ohio.....			7,717,000	537,000
Air Force:				
Cincinnati Air Force POL Retail Distribution Station.....	140,000			
Wright Patterson AFB, Dayton.....	7,577,000	537,000		
Oklahoma.....				2,527,000
Army:				
Fort Sill.....		2,104,000		
Air Force:				
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma City.....		423,000		
Pennsylvania.....				2,726,000
Army:				
Letterkenny Army Depot.....		183,000		
Navy:				
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia.....		2,543,000		
South Carolina.....			783,000	6,492,000
Navy:				
Naval Supply Center, Charleston.....		495,000		
Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston.....	783,000	4,217,000		
Naval Weapons Station, Charleston.....		1,360,000		
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island.....		280,000		
Air Force:				
Charleston AF POL Retail Distribution Station, Charleston.....		140,000		
Tennessee.....				181,000
Army:				
Milan Army Ammunition Plant.....		181,000		
Texas.....			279,000	804,000
Army:				
Fort Hood.....		98,000		
Longhorn AAP.....		102,000		
Air Force:				
Laughlin AFB, Del Rio.....		604,000		
Randolph AFB, San Antonio.....	172,000			
Kelly AFB, San Antonio.....	107,000			

SUMMARY OF THE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY APPROVED BY THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1975 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—Continued

State, department or component, and name of installation	Cost		State total	
	Air	Water	Air	Water
Virginia.....				\$12,778,000
Army:				
Fort Belvoir.....		\$932,000		
Fort Eustis.....		155,000		
Fort Lee.....		60,000		
Camp Pickett.....		173,000		
Navy:				
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek.....		2,740,000		
Naval Supply Center, Norfolk.....		5,647,000		
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico.....		1,771,000		
Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown.....		1,300,000		
Washington.....				652,000
Army:				
Fort Lewis.....		69,000		
Navy:				
Naval Supply Center, Bremerton.....		259,000		
Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport.....		264,000		
Air Force:				
Mukilteo AF POL Retail Distribution Station, Everett.....		60,000		
Various locations (inside the United States).....				2,100,000
Army:				
Various.....		2,100,000		
Inside the United States, total Army.....			\$1,356,000	16,358,000
Inside the United States, total Navy.....			9,849,000	44,251,000
Inside the United States, total Air Force.....			9,156,000	13,700,000
Inside the United States, grand total.....			20,361,000	74,309,000
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES				
Guam.....				\$1,059,000
Navy:				
Navy Public Works Center, Guam.....	\$1,059,000			
Japan.....				\$595,000
Air Force:				
Misawa AB.....		\$595,000		
Scotland, United Kingdom.....				2,650,000
Navy:				
Naval Detachment, Holy Loch.....		2,650,000		
Puerto Rico.....				1,388,000
Navy:				
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads.....		1,388,000		
Outside the United States, total Navy.....			1,059,000	4,038,000
Outside the United States, total Air Force.....				595,000
Outside the United States, grand total.....			1,059,000	4,633,000
Worldwide grand total, Army.....			1,356,000	16,358,000
Worldwide grand total, Navy.....			10,908,000	48,289,000
Worldwide grand total, Air Force.....			9,156,000	14,295,000
Worldwide total.....			21,420,000	78,942,000

Summary of the military family housing new construction authority approved by the House Armed Services Committee in the fiscal year 1975 military construction authorization bill

State, service, and installation:

	<i>Number of units</i>
California:	
Navy:	
Naval complex, San Diego.....	500
Florida:	
Navy:	
Naval complex, Jacksonville.....	200
Georgia:	
Army:	
Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield.....	400
Hawaii:	
Air Force:	
U.S. Air Force installations, Oahu.....	200
Kansas:	
Army:	
Fort Riley.....	100
Kentucky:	
Army:	
Fort Campbell.....	1,000
Louisiana:	
Navy:	
Naval complex, New Orleans.....	200
New Hampshire:	
Air Force:	
Pease Air Force Base.....	100
North Carolina:	
Navy:	
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point.....	300
Oklahoma:	
Air Force:	
Altus Air Force Base.....	100
South Carolina:	
Navy:	
Naval complex, Charleston.....	350
Virginia:	
Army:	
Fort Eustis.....	100
Washington:	
Navy:	
Naval complex, Bremerton.....	300
Canal Zone:	
Army:	
Atlantic side.....	100
Pacific side.....	200
Cuba:	
Navy:	
Naval complex, Guantanamo Bay.....	200
Japan:	
Air Force:	
Misawa Air Base.....	200
Okinawa:	
Air Force:	
Kadena Air Base.....	300
Philippines:	
Air Force:	
Clark Air Base.....	500
Poland:	
DIA:	
Defense Attaché Office, Warsaw.....	2