

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1974

NOVEMBER 13, 1973.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11459]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill (H.R. 11459) making appropriations for military construction and family housing for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL AND COMMITTEE ACTION

Budget estimates of new obligational authority considered by the Committee are contained in the President's budget as set forth beginning on pages 310 and 343 in the Appendix thereof, and in House Document 93-155.

The estimates for new budget authority which the Committee was able to consider total \$2,944,900,000. An additional \$35,400,000, which was requested in House Document 93-155, the Committee was unable to consider due to lack of authorization. The Committee recommends new budget authority of \$2,609,090,000, an increase of \$285,869,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 1973 and \$335,810,000 below the requests considered for fiscal year 1974. The following tabulation lists, in summary form, appropriations for fiscal year 1973, estimates for fiscal year 1974, and the Committee action on the fiscal year 1974 request together with appropriate comparisons.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL AND COMMITTEE ACTION

Agency	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974
Department of the Army	\$492, 155, 000	1 \$740, 800, 000	\$627, 475, 000	+\$135, 320, 000	—\$113, 325, 000
Department of the Navy	538, 330, 000	705, 700, 000	610, 541, 000	+72, 211, 000	—95, 159, 000
Department of the Air Force	288, 652, 000	321, 900, 000	269, 702, 000	—18, 950, 000	—52, 198, 000
Defense Agencies	36, 704, 000	19, 100, 000	0	—36, 704, 000	—19, 100, 000
Family Housing	967, 380, 000	2 1, 150, 400, 000	1, 094, 372, 000	+126, 992, 000	—56, 028, 000
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense		3 7, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	+7, 000, 000	-----
Total 4	2, 323, 221, 000	2, 944, 900, 000	2, 609, 090, 000	+285, 869, 000	—335, 810, 000

2

1 Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$4,300,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.
 2 Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$31,100,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.

3 Includes \$7,000,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.
 4 Excludes permanent budget authority.

SUMMARY OF BUDGET REQUEST AND COMMITTEE ACTION

The estimates considered by the Committee represent an increase of \$621,679,000 over the amount approved for fiscal year 1973. In addition, the Committee was not able to consider supplemental items in the amount of \$4,300,000 for the NATO infrastructure program in the appropriation "Military construction, Army" and \$31,100,000 for operation and maintenance of Army family housing. These are included in House Document No. 93-155 and are required as the result of the devaluation of the dollar. However, the request was received too late to be considered in the authorizing bill for military construction. An amount of \$7,000,000 for the Homeowners Assistance Fund was included in the authorization bill, although this was also a late request. This is required as a result of the recently announced closure actions and is included in the appropriation bill recommended by the Committee.

The Committee has allowed a net increase of \$285,869,000 over fiscal year 1973. Several large programs account for the major part of this increase. Most important is the construction in support of the Trident submarine and underwater-launched ballistic missile systems. This construction, which is to be initiated in the fiscal year 1974 program, represents a net increase of \$112,320,000 over fiscal year 1973. The cost of properly operating and maintaining military family housing has increased substantially, and an increase of \$94,131,000 is recommended to meet these costs. In addition, the Army has increased the size of its bachelor housing program in fiscal year 1974. The amount recommended by the Committee represents an increase of \$130,084,000 over the amount provided in fiscal year 1973.

The size of the reduction of \$335,810,000 reflects, to some extent, the effect of announced and pending base closure actions upon the military construction and family housing programs. Substantial reductions in funds provided in fiscal year 1974 have been made possible as the result of the cancellation of projects at military bases which have been announced for closure. In addition, it has been possible, to some extent, to eliminate projects requested in fiscal year 1974 due to expected base utilization changes.

The bill recommended by the Committee represents a reduction of approximately 12% below the budget request.

The Committee feels that the amounts recommended in the bill represent a prudent annual program to continue the long-range objective of meeting outstanding facilities deficits of the military services. Obviously there are going to be continuing base realignment actions. Evidently our forces and their deployment around the world will change. At the same time, there are a great many very firm military installations with old facilities which are wearing out, facilities that are inefficient and that cannot be anything but a detriment to any effort to retain a ready, high quality, volunteer military force. We cannot afford to fail to meet these valid needs.

The reductions due to authorization actions are partially offset by funding provided for additional items allowed by the Congress for which the Committee feels there is a need. The net reduction resulting from these actions is \$221,189,000.

In addition, the Committee has made further reductions in funding and projects in the amount of \$114,621,000.

Of the reduction in both the authorization process and appropriation recommendations, \$88,648,000 represents funding adjustments and \$247,162,000 represents elimination or reductions in projects.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR OBLIGATION AND EXPENDITURE IN FISCAL YEAR
1974

The funds approved by the Committee for military construction, exclusive of family housing and the homeowners assistance program, when added to funds remaining unobligated from prior appropriations will make \$2,505,082,000 available for obligation in fiscal year 1974 for the regular forces and \$192,486,000 available for the reserve forces, as shown in the following tabulation.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR OBLIGATION IN FISCAL YEAR 1974

	Unobligated balance carried forward June 30, 1973	Recommended in bill, fiscal year 1974	Total available for obligation, fiscal year 1974
Regular forces:			
Department of the Army.....	\$545,497,000	\$551,575,000	\$1,097,072,000
Department of the Navy.....	314,437,000	587,641,000	902,078,000
Department of the Air Force.....	199,058,000	239,702,000	438,760,000
Defense agencies.....	67,172,000	0	67,172,000
Total.....	1,126,164,000	1,378,918,000	2,505,082,000
Reserve components:			
Department of the Army.....	35,575,000	75,900,000	111,475,000
Department of the Navy.....	19,573,000	22,900,000	42,473,000
Department of the Air Force.....	8,538,000	30,000,000	38,538,000
Total.....	63,686,000	128,800,000	192,486,000

Note: Excludes family housing and homeowners assistance. Actual rounded to nearest thousand.

The appropriations made available in the accompanying bill for military construction, exclusive of family housing and the homeowners assistance program, when added to unexpended balances remaining from prior appropriations will make \$4,058,947,000 available for expenditure in fiscal year 1974 for the regular forces and \$290,255,000 for the reserve forces, as shown in the following tabulation.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR EXPENDITURE IN FISCAL YEAR 1974

	Unexpended balance carried forward June 30, 1973	Recommended in bill, fiscal year 1974	Total available for expenditure, fiscal year 1974
Regular forces:			
Department of the Army.....	\$1,353,800,000	\$551,575,000	\$1,905,375,000
Department of the Navy.....	762,924,000	587,641,000	1,350,565,000
Department of the Air Force.....	473,528,000	239,702,000	713,230,000
Defense agencies.....	89,677,000	0	89,677,000
Total.....	2,680,029,000	1,378,918,000	4,058,947,000
Reserve components:			
Department of the Army.....	102,439,000	75,900,000	178,339,000
Department of the Navy.....	33,453,000	22,900,000	56,353,000
Department of the Air Force.....	25,563,000	30,000,000	55,563,000
Total.....	161,455,000	128,800,000	290,255,000

Note: Excludes family housing and homeowners assistance. Actual rounded to nearest thousand.

EXPENDITURE EFFECTS OF COMMITTEE'S ACTION

The net reduction in outlays from the budget request which will result from net reductions during the authorizing process and actions recommended by the Committee is estimated to be \$12,000,000.

TRIDENT

The Navy's Trident ballistic missile submarine program is comprised of three basic elements: A new, improved submarine which is larger and more survivable than our current submarines; new, long-range missiles which will increase the possible patrol area sixfold over current submarines; and a dedicated support facility which will assure maximum time on station for the submarine and minimum time undergoing repair and overhaul.

Present plans call for the support facility for ten Trident submarines to be sited at Bangor, Washington, with initial operational capability for the system and the site scheduled for late calendar year 1978.

Procurement of the submarine and missile systems is outside the purview of this subcommittee, but extensive classified and unclassified briefings have convinced it of the advisability of proceeding with the Trident program and, thus, with construction of the facilities which will support it.

Facilities to support the Trident submarine constitute the major portion of the fiscal year 1974 military construction program for strategic forces. The development of new longer-range Trident undersea-launched missiles as well as a modern Trident submarine to carry them should produce an effective and survivable strategic weapon. Their deployment at the end of this decade should provide a key element of our deterrence in the 1980s or beyond.

The Navy's original fiscal year 1974 budget request for military construction in support of Trident was \$125,223,000. Later the Navy reduced this estimate by \$6,903,000. The Committee recommends new budget authority in the amount of \$112,320,000, a reduction of \$12,903,000 from the original budget request and \$6,000,000 below the revised request. These funds are the initial increment for construction of facilities in support of the Trident. In fiscal year 1973 Congress provided funds only for planning of Trident facilities.

TOTAL COST OF FACILITIES FOR TRIDENT

Last year the Committee reported that the Navy's estimate of the cost to provide facilities to support the program through the first 10 Trident submarines was on the order of \$600 million to \$1 billion. The Committee still believes that the total cost of all of the facilities required as a result of the Trident program through the first 10 submarines will be in the range reported last year. The Navy, by narrowing its definition of Trident facilities and refining its estimates of the Trident construction program, has come up with a cost of \$543 million, including planning costs, for Trident construction. In the Committee's opinion, there are significant costs for family housing as well as for other supporting facilities which are not taken into account in

the Navy's Trident construction plans. First of all, the Navy admits that its cost estimate excludes the cost of military family housing. The housing program is managed by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the extent of Government investment required depends on the rate of growth of available housing in the community. Therefore, from the Navy's standpoint, these costs are not a part of the Navy program. Also, the Committee feels that the Navy has not made allowances in its cost estimates for modernization of medical facilities and other similar facilities which support Trident as well as other military activities in the area. These, like the family housing program, are influenced by other factors which are not directly controllable by the Trident project officer. In effect, the Navy has given the Trident program a ceiling of \$543 million, which it may not exceed, for those construction costs which are controlled by the Navy. This is a commendable management technique for holding down the amount of gold plating which might otherwise be associated with the construction of a high priority weapons system such as Trident. On the other hand, it is not useful in showing a realistic picture of the total cost of construction.

DEDICATED REFIT FACILITY

The Navy's long-range plans for shore support at the Trident base include the construction of a dedicated refit facility. Such a facility should provide, according to the Navy's estimates, a significant reduction in the time which each Trident submarine will be required to spend in refit between its patrols. Thus, it will provide more time on patrol for each submarine and for a limited number of submarines (which is the name of the game unless arms control efforts prove fruitless) the maximum number of survivable strategic missiles deployed at any time.

Currently, major Navy ship repair facilities are highly populated industrial complexes. The Navy expects that the existence of a refit facility which is not closely surrounded by areas of high population density will allow the maximum number of Trident missiles to remain undisturbed on board the submarines and reduce breakage of missiles due to loading and unloading operations.

The Committee is extremely interested in this concept and will follow it closely as it develops. There are no facilities funded in the fiscal year 1974 program which commit the Congress or the Navy to this method of operation at the Bangor site. The Committee will expect the Navy next year to be farther along in its overall planning and to be able to substantiate its projections with regard to the feasibility of this method of operation.

PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

The projects provided in fiscal year 1974 include flight test facilities at Cape Canaveral. These include a wharf, channel dredging, and a turning basin, which will provide facilities with a sufficient explosive safety radius to handle the new missile. There is also the addition and alteration to a guidance and telemetry building to accommodate equipment for the accurate testing of the longer range Trident missiles, a lifting device proofing facility, and alterations to launch complex 25. The total cost of these facilities, based upon preliminary cost esti-

mates by architect engineers, is \$35,150,000. The plans and specifications for these projects are virtually completed.

The Trident operating base is to be at the former Naval Torpedo Station, Bangor Annex, Washington. The facilities requested here in fiscal year 1974 include a covered explosive-handling pier for loading and unloading of Trident missiles and other munitions on Trident submarines, a refit pier and ship, the first increment of utilities for the site, land acquisition to provide appropriate safety areas, a weapons/navigation training building, a warehouse sized to support contractor requirements, and necessary site improvements. Unlike the projects at Cape Canaveral, the cost estimates at Bangor were not based upon preliminary cost estimates prepared by an architect engineer. In fact, the master planning contract for the Trident base at Bangor had not been awarded at the time the current estimates for the fiscal year 1974 projects were computed. The reason for this was the lateness of the Navy's decision to put the Trident base on the West Coast. The Committee understands that the original budget estimate of \$125,223,000 was based upon costs projected for an East Coast site. The Navy reduced its budget request by \$6,903,000 as a result of moving to the Bangor site. This will be discussed further in this report.

As a result of the lack of adequate time to accomplish proper planning, several items included in the revised request will not be required at the cost presented by the Navy. In view of these, the Committee feels safe in reducing the overall amount appropriated for Trident facilities by \$6,000,000. The land acquisition cost is currently estimated by the Navy at \$5.1 million. However, in the Committee's opinion, this figure contains unreasonably large contingency factors and can be reduced. The Navy, after restudy, decided that an explosion-proof crane at the explosive-handling pier was not required and that a less expensive crane could be used. Finally, the requirement for a sewage treatment plant, which is included in the first increment of the utilities request, appears doubtful as a result of plans which the county has, and of which the Navy was not aware, to build a sewage treatment facility in the area.

JUSTIFICATION FOR TRIDENT FACILITIES

In its hearings on the Trident program, the Committee looked into the size and design of the Trident submarine; the requirement for a new generation of more sophisticated ballistic missile submarines; the need for longer-range submarine-launched ballistic missiles; the decision to base the initial Trident submarines on the West Coast; the selection of the Bangor, Washington, site; and the plans for Trident support facilities. In general, the Navy appeared to have good justification for all of its decisions in these areas.

SITE SELECTION

The Committee examined with particular care the Navy's decisions with regard to facilities. In this area the Committee enjoyed excellent support from a very capable team from the General Accounting Office. Their report spells out in detail the Navy's efforts to define Trident base requirements and select a site. The Committee feels that the Navy was very thorough in its site selection process. It surveyed numerous possible locations on the East, West, and Gulf Coasts. It developed

criteria on requirements for a Trident base and applied these to each of the likely locations. Having narrowed the selection to one base on the West Coast and three on the East Coast, the Navy finally made its decision based upon strategic criteria involving, chiefly, targeting and antisubmarine warfare capabilities of possible adversaries. Although the decision was long delayed, the Committee believes the Navy's reasons for the choice of sites are justified.

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

The Committee notes that the current schedule for the delivery of the first Trident submarine barely leaves adequate time for an orderly construction program to provide the necessary testing, training, and operational facilities. Major delays in funding for the facilities requested in the fiscal year 1974 program would only result in an uneconomic concentration of work in progress toward the middle of the construction program, thus maximizing community impact and contractor mobilization and manning problems. The Committee feels that the amount of \$112,320,000, which is recommended, should be appropriated for fiscal year 1974.

BASE CLOSURES

This year the subcommittee devoted much time to the question of future base realignments. Substantial base closures were announced earlier this year. The Department of Defense has identified large savings associated with these realignments as well as significant first costs. The major reductions will have a sizable and concentrated impact on both losing and gaining communities. As the result of its hearings on this subject, the Committee has concluded that, despite Defense Department efforts to this end, not all of the pertinent costs or savings resulting from these actions were taken into account. On the other hand, the proposed closures appear to be consistent with reasonable criteria developed by the services and the Department of Defense for base utilization. The continuing reductions in military force levels and the probable net savings dictate significant reductions in military installations. Due to the same factors, further base reductions in the United States can be expected, and significant base closures overseas appear to be in order and should be carried out.

The Committee held over 92 hours of hearings on the fiscal year 1974 military construction request. This represents a 55% increase over the previous year. Much of this additional time was devoted to an examination in detail of base utilization and base realignments. The Committee studied the savings and disposition of missions and forces resulting from the announced base closures, and their effects on past, present, and future military construction programs. The Committee also looked carefully into base utilization criteria and trends and tried to gain insight into the factors governing possible future base realignments.

APRIL 1973 BASE REALIGNMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

On April 17, 1973, Secretary of Defense Elliot L. Richardson announced details of 274 specific actions to consolidate, reduce, realign or close military installations in the United States and Puerto Rico.

These actions were estimated to result in savings of approximately \$3.5 billion over the next 10 years. An estimated 42,800 military and civilian positions are to be eliminated as a result.

The closure announcement came late. The military services had completed the bulk of their work on their base closure recommendations by the end of 1972. However, it is the official position that the change in command of the Department of Defense from Secretary Laird to Secretary Richardson delayed the date of the announcement, first, to allow Secretary Richardson to take office before the announcement was made and, secondly, for the new secretary and his staff to exhaustively review the proposed realignments.

Parenthetically, the delay in the announcement of base realignments caused a substantial delay in the Department of Defense's submission of the military construction program to the Congress. It was not officially provided until May 3, 1973, less than two months before the beginning of the new fiscal year. The realignments also generated a number of late program changes, the last of which was not received until September 21, 1973. A more orderly and timely construction program would have resulted from an earlier base closure announcement.

It has been apparent for several years that substantial base closures were pending. The military services, particularly the Navy, had been requesting with increasing urgency, as each year passed, that they be allowed to reduce their installations to correspond to their reduced levels of forces and activities in order to reduce operating expenses. Examples of force reductions cited in the closure announcement were:

Army strength will be down from 1.6 million military personnel in 1968 to 804,000 in June 1974. Also, Army aviation training requirements will be reduced from 6,887 pilots in 1969 to 1,502 by June 1974.

The Navy's active fleet ship level will be down from 917 to 523 ships and active fleet aircraft from 5,014 to 3,956 between June 1964 and June 1974.

The number of active Air Force aircraft will be reduced from 12,535 during 1968 to 8,313 in 1974. Pilot training requirements will be down to a level of 3,425 from the peak 1972 requirement of 4,440.

To these could be added reductions in maintenance workloads at military depots and major reductions in recruit training workloads (due to lower manning and the change to the all volunteer force).

A marked imbalance had been building up over the years between forces and support structures. This allowed the base reductions, when finally approved, to be both rapid and concentrated. The recent closure actions were not dependent on future reduction in forces to allow them to take effect. The reductions already had occurred. Furthermore, the size of the gap between supporting bases and supported forces allowed whole complexes of bases to be closed. This has a snowballing effect on the savings which can be achieved. In many instances the whole military support structure in a given area can be eliminated. But the major closures, because of their size, speed, and concentration, will produce serious adverse impact on certain areas of the country. Hopefully, the various Federal programs aimed at ameliorating these impacts will be well run and will receive high priority.

MANAGEMENT OF BASE REALIGNMENTS

The Committee's hearings brought out the fact that, despite attempts by the Department of Defense and the military services to identify all of the costs associated with the April, 1973 realignments, this was not done in all cases. For instance, the supplemental request for additional budget authority for fiscal year 1974 of nearly \$25 million for the homeowners assistance program was a direct result of the April base realignments. Yet it was not identified as one of the costs of the realignments. There will be additional costs incurred under this program in later years, which cannot yet be estimated, which will also result from these realignments. Similarly, it is obvious that the full cost of additional housing allowance payments and the cost of construction of family housing required as a result of the realignments were not fully taken into account. The rate of this additional expenditure is very difficult to estimate since it is dependent on the extent to which additional housing is provided by community housing and by other than Government investment. Either way there are additional costs, and these are not fully accounted for. On the other hand, it appears that the services may have, in some instances, disregarded some legitimate savings in their estimates of construction costs which would have occurred at the installations to be closed.

COMMITTEE'S REVIEW OF BASE UTILIZATION

As part of its responsibility to carefully review annual military construction requests, the Committee has consistently attempted to develop information on base utilization options. The need to do this, despite the problems involved, was pointed out in the Committee's report on the fiscal year 1973 appropriations bill. The point was forcibly brought home by the April, 1973 base realignment announcement. It is further reinforced by recent statements by the Secretary of Defense regarding continuing base closure studies.

To develop base utilization information is a difficult task. Responsible Department of Defense officials are understandably reluctant to speculate in public or in private upon matters which can affect so many jobs and have such a major impact on communities, both in the United States and overseas. This is especially true when major base closure studies are under way at the higher levels of the Defense establishment. These studies are extremely closely held, and there are strong restrictions against the release of any of this information. Nevertheless, it is possible to follow the same logical steps as the Department of Defense must in its base utilization studies. As a preliminary step, the Committee has obtained the services' criteria used for base utilization decisions.

As pointed out in the report on the fiscal year 1973 military construction appropriation bill, the lack of good criteria hindered the Congress in making the most prudent use of the limited funds available for construction. This may be true to some extent of the military services themselves. The Committee last year directed the services to produce these criteria and provide them to the Congress. The difficulty which at least one of the services experienced in producing adequate information and the somewhat ad hoc criteria which were pro-

vided by another of the services indicate that this exercise may have been of benefit not only to the Congress but to the Department of Defense. Using the criteria supplied by the Department, the Committee tested the April realignment actions. It appears to the Committee that the majority of the proposed base closure actions follow logically from the criteria. Where they didn't meet these criteria, the services, in most cases, are reexamining their proposed actions.

The Committee also attempted to apply these criteria to possible future base closures. Obviously, even with adequate criteria in hand, the services are reluctant to indicate for the public record which bases are weak and which strong. However, by examining factors such as growth potential, physical plant, and the scope and number of current and projected missions, it is possible to get a general idea of how an installation stands. The Committee also explored in detail the present and projected rates of utilization and the extent of duplication of various types of facilities. Examples are depot activities such as shipyards; recruit training centers (particularly those of the Army); and research, development and test installations. In the last area, the Committee's surveys and investigations staff produced comprehensive reports on the structure and utilization of Navy and Air Force research, development, and testing facilities. The Committee also examined to some extent the thrust of developments in Defense programs and in overall community development upon certain installations. As the result of substantial efforts in this area and with the occasional cooperation of knowledgeable Defense officials, the Committee has, this year as in the past, avoided recommending appropriations for projects at installations whose tenure may be in doubt. To do otherwise would be a serious lapse in its responsibilities to the Congress and to the American taxpayer.

While not specifically advocating the closure of specific bases, the Committee has repeatedly urged the military services and the Department of Defense to make the maximum efficient use of existing facilities before requesting new facilities. This applies to facilities at single installations as well as to whole classes of installations. In addition, the Committee has tried to discourage the waste involved in the construction of facilities at installations which may be abandoned or underutilized. One way to achieve this is to encourage the services to concentrate the preponderance of their construction programs on support facilities at bases which have many missions instead of those which have only a few. The small post with only a few missions is apt to be drastically affected by fluctuations in defense requirements, whereas a large multipurpose installation is less vulnerable. Also, facilities which have general rather than specialized uses, such as barracks, family housing, warehouses, electric distribution systems, and similar infrastructure facilities, tend to be useful whatever mission is assigned to a base. They may continue to be of economic benefit to the Nation even if the installation is excessed by the military and turned over to the community. Conversely, exotic, highly specialized facilities may be abandoned even before they are completed. Examples are the manned orbiting laboratory launch complex at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, and the massive radar facilities at the Safeguard Malmstrom complex in Montana.

Even in times when base realignments must be a factor in construction planning, it cuts against the grain, in both the military services and the Congress, to shortchange some bases while concentrating on others which are more firm. But this is necessary if construction is to proceed at a rapid enough pace to meet needs for replacement, modernization, and to support new and ongoing missions without excessive waste. The Committee feels that the Department of Defense should use, and should be provided with, the facilities and installations which it actually needs, both to meet ongoing and projected requirements efficiently and economically and to provide a basis for required expansion of military efforts during emergencies. Anything more, either in terms of new construction or in the operation and maintenance of existing installations, is clearly unnecessary.

The Department of Defense, to some extent, becomes involved in other types of meritorious activities in its role as landlord. It acts as museum keeper for historic places, preserver of lands in their natural state, and provides economic and infrastructure support for depressed or underdeveloped areas. Much of this comes about as a result of legitimate defense requirements. To the extent that it becomes significantly more expensive to achieve these objectives as a part of our national defense effort, the Committee feels that a hard look should be taken at the costs. When forces decline drastically, it is realistic to expect the installations which support these to be reduced.

OVERSEAS INSTALLATIONS

The Committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is not pursuing the reduction of unnecessary functions overseas and the reduction and closure of excess overseas facilities with the same determination as it has applied to those functions and installations in the United States.

By way of preface, the Committee realizes it would be a grave mistake to be too hasty in removing U.S. combat units overseas, thereby undermining the military or political strength of the United States and its allies. By the same token, it would be imprudent to remove necessary support for these forces or to so dismantle our overseas support capabilities that we could not reinforce our forces or resupply our allies in areas of the world in which we have a commitment to do so. Our overseas bases must provide the capability to meet ongoing requirements, and our base planning must take into account the ability to expand during various types of contingencies. Moreover, having given up a foreign base, it may be difficult to reoccupy it. In general, civilian population pressures and land shortages are much more a problem to our allies than they are in the United States. Similarly political problems within the United States or for our allies may discourage the expansion of our foreign base structure in a timely manner when this is needed.

However, even taking all of these factors into account, our foreign base structure appears to the Committee to be excessive. That there is a good deal of water which can be squeezed out of our foreign base structure has been admitted by Department witnesses. There have been certain actions to reduce overhead overseas, such as the consolidations of U.S. military installations in the Kanto Plains near Tokyo,

Japan, and the reduction/realignment of the Air Force Headquarters to Ramstein Air Base in Germany. However, there are similar actions which are overdue. These should not affect our strength or negotiating positions. They would save money. They could increase the effectiveness of our forces. The Committee has seen no evidence that the Department of Defense is seriously studying overseas base closures at this time. The Committee feels strongly that much the same reasoning should apply to overseas base realignments that applies to domestic ones. If it is wise to reduce our overhead and support structure in the United States, then it is equally true abroad. The April 17, 1973, base closure announcement should have been closely followed by a similar package for overseas bases. Any future base realignment announcements must include a substantial amount of tightening up of our base structure overseas as well as in the United States.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

The Committee is aware of the recent strain which has been placed on NATO by the war in the Middle East. As a result, there have been questions about the desirability of NATO and on the use of our troops and equipment in Europe. While the Middle East poses severe problems for us and our allies, the situation there does not directly involve the survival of the Western World. It was this which NATO was established to protect and has very successfully protected. It would be a tremendous victory for our communist adversaries if their exploitation of Arab-Israeli hostility succeeded not only in geographically flanking NATO to the south but in driving a wedge between us and our European allies. Conversely, any strong indication that such a course of action might succeed in substantially weakening the NATO alliance might further encourage irresponsible actions in the Middle East. The Committee feels that action this year to reduce the United States' commitment to this part of the world and to NATO would be extremely imprudent.

One of the key programs carried in this bill is the appropriation for the NATO infrastructure program. The \$40,000,000 of new budget authority which is the U.S. portion of this NATO construction program is carried in the Military construction, Army appropriation. The resulting construction benefits all of the military services as well as further cementing our relations with our NATO allies.

The infrastructure program has proved a flexible and useful instrument in its more than two decades of service to NATO and has provided \$3.4 billion worth of installations in support of the common defense of Europe. It has been a model for cooperation and realistic burden sharing between the NATO allies. Furthermore, its past and present benefits to the defense of the United States and the NATO alliance are significant. If wisely used and managed in conjunction with our military construction program, it can continue to provide important benefits. It is true that the program is somewhat complex both in its administration and in its relationship to the remainder of the military construction program. This sometimes occasions disappointing delays. But it is a useful program, one that we need to understand better, which deserves more attention than it is getting.

FLEXIBILITY OF INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

The NATO commonly funded infrastructure program was inaugurated by the North Atlantic Council in 1951 as a follow-on to a similar program begun in 1950 by the Western European Union countries. Since that time it has provided a flexible vehicle for joint cooperation, adapting to changing conditions and program needs. Initially, under the NATO infrastructure program, the United States provided through common financing the installations required to support the military end items which we furnished to our European allies under the military defense assistance program. The early programs concentrated on airfields, naval facilities, and training areas. It also provided such essential support facilities as pipelines and oil storage which could not be provided by the severely crippled civilian economies of participating countries or were needed to support our own military deployment. In addition, the infrastructure program provided a means for integrating facilities planning among the NATO nations. It also served as a means of providing common projects which involved crossing borders, thus channeling the often difficult process of base acquisition in other countries through a single conduit. It made possible needed facilities in a timely manner and at the scope required in strategic areas for which the individual national governments might not have been able to pay, a role which the program still plays to some extent.

With the European economic recovery and the entrance of Germany into NATO in the mid-1950s, the geographical center of the NATO infrastructure program shifted to the east. West Germany's entrance into NATO allowed facilities constructed in Germany to be brought under the infrastructure program. Thus, the NATO infrastructure program was able to provide a large number of facilities in Germany to carry out a forward defense of Europe. The United States began, also, to press within NATO for a maximum number of projects in the program for United States use and the maximum common funding of facilities required by United States forces in the European NATO area. In addition, steps were taken to shift a greater portion of the cost of the program from the United States to the European countries. Later, after the United States was forced to relocate its forces from France, the NATO infrastructure program was revised to allow us to be reimbursed for the identifiable construction costs we incurred and to provide facilities which our forces require as a result of this relocation.

BENEFITS OF PROGRAM

The NATO infrastructure program has been a successful common endeavor and has been credited with fostering a large part of the cohesion among the Allies. Essential military facilities costing about \$3.4 billion have been completed, and facilities worth another \$1 billion are under construction or programmed. The program has given NATO a network of modern airfields, an efficient system of POL distribution and storage, common communications without which the NATO command structure could not function, essential air defense warning installations, and air and naval navigational aids. In addition, many of the facilities required for the day-to-day or wartime use

of United States forces have been provided by the NATO infrastructure program. At air bases in Germany, Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Italy, Greece, and Turkey, U.S. aircraft fly off runways provided by NATO, use NATO operational facilities and training ranges, and are provided fuel and ammunition storage funded by NATO. Our aircraft, while on the ground, are protected by shelters and other survival measures for which NATO is reimbursing the United States. In the Mediterranean and the north Atlantic, our fleet enjoys the use of NATO piers, fuel depots, repair facilities, munitions storage, and maritime airfields. Our Army forces stationed overseas use NATO training areas, storage sites, and anti-aircraft installations. Much of the prepositioned equipment for U.S.-based forces committed to NATO is stored in dehumidified NATO warehouses. In wartime, NATO-committed U.S. forces would integrate into the NATO command structure and utilize the NATO integrated air defense, communications, and headquarters facilities.

CHANGES IN PROGRAM

The program has provided many of the basic facilities required in the common defense, and its character is gradually changing. The requirement for major air and naval installations has given way to the new requirement for modernization and expansion of existing basic facilities. Airfields must be improved so that they can support today's more complex aircraft. The POL system should be modified to ensure its ability to function in an emergency independently of that part of the system located in France. Progress in communications technology has resulted in dramatic improvements to NATO's command and control and integrated defense efforts. For instance, the NATO Satellite Communications System will provide better and more survivable communications. Another example is the semiautomation and integration of NATO's early warning system to provide a control and reporting system for the air defense of Allied Command Europe. In order to make the program fully responsive to the needs of the NATO "flexible response" strategy and associated force planning, the infrastructure program is providing facilities to support reinforcement on the flanks, improved air defense, and conventional capabilities for NATO air forces.

The new orientation of the program is providing a larger portion of the facilities needed by U.S. forces. The controlled humidity storage for U.S. prepositioned equipment and the aircraft shelters are fairly recent examples. If and when the U.S. reduces its troops in Europe, the former may become increasingly important. In addition, expansion in NATO's criteria to include more sophisticated support facilities for complex modern weapons systems is generally to the benefit of the United States which has many systems requiring such facilities. Finally, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird proposed last December a new category of infrastructure projects in support of "stationed forces," those forces stationed outside of their own boundaries. With present force deployments, the United States must have sizable installations, both in the United States and overseas, which to some extent must be duplicative in order to provide logistics support and mobilization capability during contingencies. The economic value of military

installations and their supporting facilities benefit communities in the host countries rather than communities in the United States. It should be recognized that the additional costs of constructing and maintaining these military complexes in NATO countries are a direct result of our participation in NATO. The Committee urges that Secretary Laird's proposal be implemented as soon as possible.

UNITED STATES SHARE OF COSTS AND BENEFITS

Over the years, the U.S. share of the contributions to the infrastructure program has declined from above 43% in 1951 to an effective rate of below 20% in 1973. In the last few years the percentage of NATO national user projects for the United States has increased markedly.

There are several factors which serve to reduce our share of the total amount of money used in the infrastructure program. As shown on page 518 of Volume 1 of the Committee's hearings this year, the cost-sharing formula for the various nations has been revised periodically. In 1970, the Euro-Group (NATO less France, Portugal, United States, Iceland, and Canada) offered an additional \$420 million (closer to \$450 million in devalued dollars) over a 5-year period to the infrastructure program as part of the European defense improvement program (EDIP) to permit implementation of the NATO aircraft shelter program. This permitted early recoument of U.S. prefinancing funds spent on this program and relieved the pressure on programed infrastructure money to allow funding of additional NATO Integrated Communications System (NICS) projects. When the EDIP contribution is considered, the effective U.S. share reduced to approximately 18 to 20 percent. Another factor is that host nations provide the land, access roads, and utility connections for each NATO infrastructure project. These host nation contributions are estimated to average about 13% of costs paid by NATO common funding. If these costs were added to the total, the U.S. contribution would drop another 3 to 4%.

We continue to enjoy a greater benefit from this NATO program than would be expected from the size of our contribution. If we exclude facilities which are used in common by all nations—facilities which would in any case have required common funding—we have had significant success in convincing NATO that U.S. projects are worthwhile. Slice XVIII (1967) included projects for U.S. forces in the amount of 40% of all projects for use by national forces. In slice XIX this percentage rose to 47%; for slice XX to 55%; for slice XXI, 68%; for slice XXII, 58%; and 59% for slice XXIII. In the six annual programs, therefore, well over 50% of all national user projects were programed for benefit of U.S. forces, but our formal contribution remains at 29.7% of the entire program. This does not take into account the additional financing by the EDIP which is discussed above. It is apparent, therefore, that we have a distinct financial interest in the continuing success of the NATO infrastructure program. As long as we can fit our national programs into the available common funds, the United States Treasury will benefit directly from this NATO effort. Thus, we derive major benefits from the infrastructure program and, for this reason as well as for the sake of honoring

our international commitments, it seems reasonable for the United States to pay its agreed-upon share of the programs as they become due. The United States commitment to NATO infrastructure occurs at the time of approval of the multi-year program by the North Atlantic Council/Defense Planning Committee and is reaffirmed in terms of specific projects of the time of approval of the annual slice program.

NATO REVIEW, APPROVAL, AND PAYMENT PROCEDURES

A description of the NATO review and approval procedures for infrastructure programs follows. Each year the major NATO commanders draw up a list of construction or modernization projects which they consider essential for the support of their forces. These projects are reviewed by all participating nations within the NATO Military Committee, the NATO Infrastructure Committee and finally within the Defense Planning Committee (which is the North Atlantic Council without France). The projects finally selected make up the yearly infrastructure program or slice. In the United States each proposed annual slice is reviewed thoroughly within the executive branch, starting with the interested U.S. subordinate military commands and continuing through the U.S. Commander-in-Chief, Europe and the Commander-in-Chief, Atlantic to Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military departments, the Department of State, and all interested offices within the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

After slice approval, the host country in which a project is to be built takes full responsibility for the work. It must obtain the necessary land (at its own expense), plan utilities connections and access roads (which it later builds at its own expense), prepare engineering plans and specifications, and develop cost estimates. When all is ready, the host country submits the project with all supporting data to the NATO Payments and Progress Committee for construction authorization and fund commitment. Before agreeing, the Payments and Progress Committee satisfies itself that the project still represents a valid military requirement, conforms to NATO criteria, is reasonable in cost, and is in other respects eligible under NATO infrastructure rules.

When the Payments and Progress Committee authorizes construction of an infrastructure project, the United States obligates funds from its annual appropriation for its share of that project. During fiscal year 1974, we will be paying for projects which we have agreed to in slice XXIV and prior-year slices at the rate agreed upon for each of these yearly slices. There will be, in the near future, negotiations which the Committee expects will lower the United States cost-share. However, these would affect slice XXV and subsequent slices. Accordingly, we would expect to see a reduction in our costs beginning in fiscal year 1976 from this cost-sharing adjustment.

PROPER UTILIZATION OF THE PROGRAM BY THE MILITARY SERVICES

In recent years the Committee has repeatedly emphasized to the military services the importance of using the NATO infrastructure program effectively to meet their needs for operational facilities in NATO countries. Using the NATO infrastructure program effectively

does not mean waking up late to operational requirements or support of new weapons systems when they arrive at a base. It does not mean programing projects in NATO countries in the military construction program, or providing them by reprograming or through the Defense Emergency Fund, and submitting a prefinancing statement to NATO in hopes that the projects may fit one or the other of NATO infrastructure criteria and thereby be eligible for some partial recoupment, and then forgetting about them. The use of prefinancing may be legitimate in a few real emergency situations. Otherwise, it results in an unfavorable gold flow impact on the United States, the unnecessary addition of interest costs on the public debt, and the denial of scarce dollars to other worthy programs. As can be seen on the table on page 529 (Volume 1) of the Committee's hearings, recoupments from prefinanced projects are often small and slow in coming. The alternative is to obtain approval of projects in NATO slice programs where these projects qualify under NATO criteria. Where they do not fully qualify under NATO criteria, the services and US NATO must first work to get NATO criteria extended and then to obtain their approval in slice programs. This requires effort, foresight, and adequate planning, which is why so many projects are prefinanced. To counteract this tendency, the Committee has recently adopted a policy of not providing funds for prefinanced projects. This makes it clear to any sponsor of a prefinanced project that he is depriving other worthy projects of funding since the resources must be obtained from other areas of his service's construction program. Moreover, he should feel embarrassed before his peers and before the Congress and the American taxpayer.

EFFECT OF DOLLAR DEVALUATION

The infrastructure program has suffered a substantial funding impact from two recent dollar devaluations. Upon official notification by the Secretary of the Treasury to the International Monetary Fund that the dollar has been devalued, the unliquidated obligations for NATO infrastructure carried upon the books of the United States Treasury were adjusted to reflect the higher costs of Infrastructure Accounting Units (IAUs) which are the official NATO infrastructure unit of account. The cost of the program which is to be undertaken in fiscal year 1974 will increase as a result of dollar devaluation, both due to the higher official rates and the difference between the value of the devalued dollar and foreign currencies on the current market. While the careful screening of prior obligations and deferral of some projects allowed the infrastructure program to operate within limits of authorization and appropriations in fiscal year 1973, there will be an increased cost in fiscal year 1974 due to projects which were temporarily deferred. The total additional net cost of all of the above factors in fiscal year 1974 is expected to be \$52.7 million. On the other hand, higher-than-expected payments of recoupments to the U.S. by other NATO countries and a small allowance for the earlier dollar devaluation which was included in the fiscal year 1974 budget will reduce the amount of devaluation to \$40 million for which no funds are available. The Army has identified unobligated Safeguard funds which will not be required in the amount of \$35,650,000. The transfer of these funds to meet the deficit in NATO infrastructure is approved.

With regard to the handling of this matter, the Committee notes that requests to the Congress for relief in both funding and authorization have been late, inadequately supported, and bungled by the Department of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget. In turn, the Congress has not given this program the favorable attention which it deserves.

The infrastructure program is one about which there is a large degree of ignorance and inattention. This applies to the military services which could and should use it to a greater extent. It includes the Department of the Army, which is the military service responsible for budgeting the dollars and managing the financial aspects of the program, including its presentation to the Congress. And it is true of several of the offices in the Office of the Secretary of Defense which deal with it. To some extent the mishandling of the program may be due to its complicated nature. This is perhaps understandable. What is not understandable is that it is not receiving appropriate emphasis and that effective management by the Department of Defense appears to have declined rather than improved. Perhaps a contributory factor is that responsibility for the program is not really fixed. In view of the Administration's concern about Europe this year, it would seem that ongoing programs which work well, provide cohesion with our allies, and are to the benefit of the United States should receive more consideration at all levels.

BACHELOR HOUSING

The Committee notes the importance being placed by the military departments on housing for bachelor personnel and concurs in this judgment. The fiscal year 1974 request includes \$501 million for construction and modernization of bachelor housing. This would provide 39,000 new enlisted spaces and modernize existing quarters for an additional 55,000 personnel. The fiscal year 1974 budget includes \$102 million more than was appropriated last year for new construction and an increase of about \$18 million for the modernization of quarters.

The Committee has had a long-standing interest in seeing that living conditions of our military personnel are improved. Year after year the Committee has expressed its concern in this area and has supported Defense efforts to provide better quarters for bachelor personnel. The Committee early expressed its objection to the construction of open bay barracks except for recruits. This interest in adequate quarters has been shared by the Department of Defense and reflected at the highest Administration levels for many years. President Johnson, in an address at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, in 1964, called for a review of housing, medical care, pay, and allowances for the military.

The present Defense criteria for enlisted housing is an outgrowth of a comprehensive study by a Department of Defense task force which was completed in 1966. This study was conducted by headquarters personnel from the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military departments, and involved input from base commanders as well as officer and enlisted personnel. The basic findings of this study were that there was a need to provide greater privacy in quarters and that im-

proved housing was necessary to boost morale, improve mission effectiveness and increase reenlistments. Based on the recommendations of the study, designs were developed which provided a 3-man room for E2-E4 personnel with central latrines; a 2-man room with shared bath for E5-E6 personnel; and a 1-man room with bath for E7-E9 personnel. A special Defense Department task group study on bachelor housing completed in August, 1971, confirmed the desirability of improved standards.

In the 1971 program, Congress approved the statutory limitations which permitted construction of 3-man rooms and raised the standard for E2-E4 personnel from 72 to 90 square feet per man. At the same time, E5 and E6 personnel were allotted 135 square feet and E7 through E9 senior personnel 270 square feet each. In its report on the fiscal year 1971 program, the Committee applauded this increase in space allowance for bachelor enlisted housing. Attendant to this policy decision in 1971 was the realization that increasing space allowances would also increase the cost of troop housing per man. Furthermore, it was recognized that the new criteria, by decreasing the loading of existing facilities, would create a need for a substantial amount of additional barracks construction at a significant cost. Congress has authorized and appropriated funds in the fiscal year 1971, fiscal year 1972, and fiscal year 1973 programs for new construction of about 124,000 barrack spaces and modernization of 235,000 spaces based upon these new standards. The criteria for these new barracks will provide 3-man rooms for the Army and Navy to be occupied by E2-E4 personnel. By special action, the Air Force was permitted to construct 2-man rooms provided that this could be accomplished within average cost constraints and still obtain livability standards. To the extent that architectural and engineering considerations permit, modernization projects have also been based on providing rooms for occupancy by three E2-E4 personnel.

In fiscal year 1973, plans were developed for the construction of standard barracks rooms, each to be 270 square feet in size. This design provides maximum flexibility to the military. With bath and latrine facilities for each room, lower grade enlisted men would be housed three to a room with a bath for their use. Intermediate grade enlisted men would be housed two to a room with a bath, and senior grade enlisted men would have a 270 square foot room of their own with private bath facilities. Thus, various types of military units with widely differing tables of organization and distributions of personnel by rank can use effectively this same standard barracks. The need for flexibility in assignment of quarters has been stressed by Congress and was particularly underlined in House Report 91-386.

Personal contact as well as the results of at least two studies indicate that, in the opinion of enlisted personnel, we are moving in the right direction. In the 1966 study, troop comments indicated about half those queried expressed dissatisfaction with their quarters. To determine the level of acceptability of the fiscal year 1973 design, the Committee commissioned a limited study conducted early in calendar year 1973 which disclosed that 75% of those enlisted personnel queried felt the proposed designs and criteria would be satisfactory.

Chief among the complaints noted, both in 1966 and in the most recent Committee study, were lack of soundproofing, lack of privacy,

and the requirement to use latrines and bath facilities which were used by great numbers of other troops. The 1973 design effectively met these complaints.

Modernization projects are, where it is possible, overcoming these deficiencies in existing barracks facilities. Had adequate standards been employed at the time these barracks were constructed, the sizable cost of this modernization program would not have been necessary. But because at the time of construction these barracks were not built with an eye to future needs, literally tens of thousands of barracks spaces are in need of modernization.

The criteria proposed for the fiscal year 1974 are the same as those provided in fiscal year 1973. Having already embarked on this construction and modernization program, the Committee would be extremely reluctant to endorse proposals to alter the criteria to provide larger rooms in which four lower grade enlisted men would be housed, and 270 square foot rooms in which two men or one man would be quartered. This suggested design change is, in the Committee's view, undesirable for several reasons. First and foremost, it would not provide adequate accommodations now and in the future. Secondly, it would reduce the flexibility of the military in quartering troops. While it is obvious that some military units would ideally fit into a prescribed mix of large and small rooms, any change in troop units likely would result in a differing mix of rank and seniority so that overcrowding and underutilization would occur at the same time. Also, having embarked upon the construction of superior barracks in the fiscal year 1973 program, it would be difficult to go back to less adequate standards, particularly where projects for 1973 and 1974 are at the same base. Next, design changes at this time would result in a loss of design funds already spent as well as a delay in project completion which would result in higher construction costs due to inflation. Lastly, the delay would mean that a sizable number of military personnel will be ill housed for an additional eight months to a year. Rather than taking arbitrary actions, the Committee prefers to rely on the results of careful study, sound planning, and deliberate decisions. The better standards will result, certainly, in bachelor housing spaces which are more expensive than those provided in prior years but, also, in spaces which afford the maximum in privacy, flexibility and livability. They are designed and built to be utilized for years to come without the need for expensive modernization such as is now proceeding on substandard barracks built just a few years ago.

The Committee encouraged the Department of Defense to develop quarters standards which would be acceptable to the troops, adaptable to the needs, and economical to the taxpayers. The Department has met this challenge. The Committee recognizes and commends the work that has been done, and it would be extremely reluctant to reverse the direction taken.

COMMISSARIES

The Committee has denied funding in many cases where requests were made for commissaries.

This action should not be construed as a policy decision that commissary facilities are not a traditional part of the military benefits. Rather, it is an action designed to stimulate the military into devising another means of providing such facilities without coming to the Congress for public monies.

It appears to the Committee that the Department of Defense could and should recommend new legislation which would allow for the imposition of an additional surcharge, the proceeds of which would go into a building fund for commissaries.

The Committee notes the Department of Defense subsidizes the commissary program at a level of \$288 million a year. Commissaries do not pay taxes. They have extremely low overhead, and as a general rule, their prices are one-quarter to one-third less than are available in the civilian community. Surely, a slight increase in prices could be instituted to provide a building fund.

The Committee recognizes that commissaries became an integral part of military life at a time when pay scales were extremely low. That is not now the case. Salary increases in recent years have brought military pay much nearer those in the civilian community. Further, commissaries were built in the past at a time when local supermarkets were an unacceptably long distance away from military installations. Today, one need drive only a short distance to food stores and shopping centers.

For these reasons, the Committee urges the Department of Defense to examine closely the role of the commissary in the modern military environment, to seek means of having commissary users pay for commissary facilities, and to submit requests for new commissaries only at those locations where there is overwhelming justification for the expenditure of tax money.

IMPACT OF OIL EXPLORATION ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Committee is concerned that proposed off shore oil drilling or exploration will adversely affect the operational availability of test ranges and other facilities of the Department of Defense. The Committee directed its Surveys and Investigations Staff to study the impact of oil leasing and production operations upon Department of Defense installations using the Eastern Gulf Test Range Area. The report submitted pointed out that the cost of the government's investment in Defense installations in the Mississippi, Alabama and Florida areas of the Gulf of Mexico is more than \$1.5 billion and that the estimated replacement value of these facilities is \$3.4 billion. The normal activities of these installations include hazardous activities such as the testing of live armament over water ranges. Such tests are essential to the maintenance of the combat readiness of the military services. The construction of permanent installations, such as oil rigs, in test areas could result in the creation of dangerous conditions both for military personnel and for those involved in oil exploration and production.

While recognizing the need to find additional sources of oil, the Committee does not believe that it is desirable that the usefulness of expensive military installations which have been paid for by the taxpayers be destroyed in the process. The Committee directs the De-

partment of Defense not to release test ranges or facilities which are required for national defense programs for the purpose of oil drilling or exploration until a determination has been made by the Secretary of Defense that there is no military requirement for the test range or facility involved and until full and complete environmental studies have been made by the Environmental Protection Agency. The Committee wants to prevent the disruption of the testing of equipment vital to the armed forces and the Committee wants to avoid the unnecessary and very heavy expenditures which would be required to relocate facilities which might be compromised by oil operations.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

Appropriation, 1973 -----	\$413, 955, 000
Estimate, 1974 -----	664, 900, 000
Recommended in bill -----	551, 575, 000
Reduction -----	113, 325, 000

The Committee has approved \$551,575,000 for Military construction, Army, a reduction of \$113,325,000 below the budget estimate and \$137,620,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1973.

The reductions include a net reduction of \$60,506,000 as a result of the action taken by the Congress on the authorizing legislation. The Committee recommends further cuts and additions which result in a net reduction of \$52,819,000. The Committee action on this program is reflected in the State list and tables at the end of this report. Additional specific actions relating to individual line items and installations are set forth in subsequent paragraphs.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RELATING TO INDIVIDUAL INSTALLATIONS

At Davison Army Airfield, Fort Belvoir, Va., the Army request includes a helicopter landing facility and parking apron in the amount of \$1,628,000. The Committee believes that this is a low-priority project and that utilization of this airfield does not justify these additional facilities at this time.

The Committee has denied the request for \$2,924,000 for a commissary at Fort Gordon, Ga. As mentioned earlier in this report, alternate methods of funding this project should be sought.

The request to alter training facilities, at a cost of \$558,000, at Fort McClellan, Ala., is denied.

At Fort Polk, La., a commissary requested in the amount of \$1,977,000 is denied.

The Committee has denied a request for \$762,000 to convert existing facilities to provide academic and orientation space for the Army Veterinarian School at Fort Sheridan, Ill.

Army veterinarians conduct food inspections for all the services, but the Committee has not been convinced this particular location is the only possible site for such a facility. A similar request was denied in fiscal year 1973, and the Army was instructed to look into alternative sites for the school. This year the Army listed several such sites and dismissed them in a single sentence: "None of these locations proved feasible."

The Committee does not accept this as valid justification for approving the requested expenditure. Rather, it feels that there is the

possibility of consolidating this mission into facilities now used by compatible medical orientation facilities. The Committee wishes to make clear this is not a veterinarian school where untrained personnel are converted into qualified veterinarians. It is, as explained by the Army, a facility where previously trained veterinarians are given military orientation and refresher courses, and where enlisted personnel are given technician training.

It is the Committee's feeling the Army presented insufficient hard data to warrant approval of this request.

The budget request includes \$73,000 for barracks modernization at Frankford Arsenal, Pennsylvania. The Committee feels that this item can be deferred.

A medical equipment maintenance facility is requested in the amount of \$456,000. Originally, the Army requested that this be located at Memphis Defense Depot, Tennessee. The Army later determined that this activity, which is relocating from Atlanta Army Depot, would be better located at Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania. However, the authorizing legislation retained the Memphis location. Because of the conflicting situations the Committee has denied funding for this project.

At Savanna Army Depot, Illinois, security lighting is requested in the amount of \$113,000. The Committee feels this project should be deferred.

The Committee has denied funding for a proposed \$25 million hospital at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, New York.

Planning of a new hospital facility at the Academy has been on-going for 10 years. The Congress appropriated \$4.9 million for such a facility in 1966, but the funds were withheld due to the war in Southeast Asia. Again in 1969, Congress appropriated additional funds so that work could go forward on what was then to be a \$6.45 million facility. Bid estimates proved to be low and the hospital, twice approved by Congress, was not built.

This year the Army requested \$25 million. This request was not accompanied by an economic analysis as were the earlier requests which were supported by a 1963 study indicating the feasibility of first a \$5 million and then a \$6.45 million investment. Logically, the Army would have conducted such an economic analysis, especially with the proposed cost now five times that of the initial proposal.

The present hospital is a 113,398 square foot facility, designed for a normal bed capacity of 130 beds and an expanded capacity of 187 beds. The proposed facility would contain 157,350 square feet with a normal bed capacity of 100.

Aside from the lack of meaningful economic analysis of the proposed project, the Committee also is concerned over inadequate planning with regard to the new hospital. The present hospital is located in the heart of the cadet area and is easily accessible to cadets for routine sick call. The new hospital would be built more than a mile and a half from the cadet area and would require transporting cadets to the facility for the most routine of treatment. No study or consideration has been given the question of cadet transportation.

When pressed to offer alternatives to the \$25 million hospital, the Army provided figures indicating it would cost \$21 million to construct a smaller 65-bed hospital and \$21.2 million to renovate the pres-

ent hospital. These estimates were not based, however, on adequate design or detailed data and, therefore, their validity, accuracy, or representativeness is not substantiated.

There is no question the hospital provides excellent medical care. As recently as October 1972, the present facility was fully accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals. While shortcomings and recommendations were cited in the accreditation report in such areas as dietetic service, environmental service, records keeping, pharmaceutical services, and physical medicine services, no mention is made of the inadequacy of the physical plant itself.

A study of this facility was made by the surveys and investigations staff of the Committee. This report was completed in August, 1973, and it suggests questions on the justification of the \$25 million expenditure. Among them, the report points out that the present hospital served a cadet strength of 2,488 in 1963, at the time recommendations for a new hospital first were put forward. Today the same hospital serves a cadet population of 4,005, still maintaining a high quality of medical service without serious overcrowding. Clearly, this would indicate the hospital has not impeded cadet population expansion.

The study also pointed out that the Army's plans for future cadet care may include a dispensary, to be provided in the current hospital facility, at a substantial additional cost.

It is the Committee's feeling that proper studies should be conducted as to alternatives, economics, and siting. While this Committee fully supports adequate medical care for all members of the armed forces, it does not believe it prudent nor a proper use of tax money to replace the hospital at the Military Academy on the basis of the data presented during the hearings and the questions which subsequently arose during the staff investigation.

The budget request includes \$597,000 for a logistics and storage facility at the Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, New Hampshire. The Committee feels that this is a low-priority project which can be deferred.

The Committee has denied two projects requested at the Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey: administrative facilities, \$3,203,000; and an electric substation, \$400,000.

At Fort Shafter Military Reservation, Hawaii, a medical/dental clinic requested in the amount of \$1,233,000 has been deferred. The Committee feels the Army should restudy the requirements here.

Within the Army's request for air pollution abatement, the Committee has deferred a project for stack emission controls at Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado.

Finally, the Committee recommends funding reductions in two specific areas. The Committee believes that the appropriation for fiscal year 1974 can safely be reduced by \$8,500,000 as a result of unobligated balances of funds appropriated for Southeast Asia construction in prior years. Similar reductions of \$7,500,000 for anticipated savings in Army projects provided in prior years as a result of base utilization changes and other factors can be made.

The Committee has increased the amount provided for minor construction in fiscal year 1974 by \$2,500,000 in order to cover unanticipated large requirements in this area.

The Committee notes that hospital facilities at Madigan General Hospital, Washington, are unsatisfactory. The Committee feels that a modern hospital facility should be provided to military personnel associated with ongoing missions at Fort Lewis and other installations in the area. The Committee directs the Department of Defense to initiate planning for facilities to provide modern hospital care in this area.

AUTHORIZATION ACTIONS

A summary of the additions and deletions made by the Congress in the authorizing legislation follows:

Fort Belvoir, Va. : Enlisted men's barracks complex-----	-\$11, 878, 000
Carlisle Barracks, Pa. : Physical conditioning facility-----	-2, 465, 000
Fort Dix, N.J. : Convert buildings to administrative facilities---	-339, 000
Fort Lee, Va. : Confinement facility—200 men-----	-4, 443, 000
Fort George G. Meade, Md. : USMA prep school facilities-----	-1, 521, 000
Fort Monroe, Va. : Barracks modernization-----	-867, 000
Fort Bragg, N.C. : Enlisted men's service club-----	-1, 071, 000
Fort Gordon, Ga. : Automotive self-help garage-----	-626, 000
Fort McPherson, Ga. : Barracks modernization-----	-1, 804, 000
Fort Hood, Tex. : Improve Robert Gray Army Airfield-----	-5, 270, 000
Fort Riley, Kans. :	
Support facilities for enlisted men's barracks complexes---	-2, 635, 000
Outdoor athletic facilities, Custer Hill-----	-1, 340, 000
Fort MacArthur, Calif. : Barracks modernization (enlisted women)-----	-428, 000
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif. : Barracks modernization-----	-2, 677, 000
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md. :	
Human factors engineering research laboratory-----	-2, 962, 000
Chapel center-----	-1, 500, 000
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Mass. Dynamic deformation of materials laboratory-----	-325, 000
Atlanta Army Depot, Ga. : Security fencing-----	-119, 000
Fort Monmouth, N.J. :	
Alter classrooms for language labs-----	-2, 097, 000
R. & D. electronic installations facility-----	-590, 000
Dental clinic—32 chair-----	-1, 198, 000
Picatinny Arsenal, N.J. : Explosive laboratory additions-----	-2, 660, 000
Savanna Army Depot, Ill. :	
Enlisted men's barracks with mess-----	-859, 000
Bachelor officer quarters-----	-1, 774, 000
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex. :	
SAM-D remote area test facilities-----	-116, 000
Post library-----	-339, 000
Addition to Bell Gymnasium-----	-157, 000
Water wells-----	-316, 000
Vint Hill Farms Station, Va. : Storm drainage-----	-287, 000
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, D.C. :	
Patient visitor facility-----	-1, 997, 000
Laundry (deficiency)-----	+2, 705, 000
Oakland Army Base, Calif. : Security lighting-----	-142, 000
Fort Greely, Alaska : Automotive self-help garage-----	-429, 000
National Missile Range, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands :	
Additional instrumentation and technical support facilities--	-849, 000
Ennylabegan power addition-----	-475, 000
Various, U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command (Overseas) : Upgrade power (deficiency)-----	+237, 000
Various, Germany : Dependent school additions (deficiency)-----	+607, 000
Appropriation limitation-----	-7, 500, 000
Total-----	-60, 508, 000

SUMMARY OF THE ARMY PROGRAM

The fiscal year 1974 military construction program requested by the Army reflects the impact of three major actions which will have a lasting effect on the U.S. Army. These actions are: Army reorganization; base realignments; and implementation of the zero draft concept.

The Committee commends the goals of the Army in its reorganization plan which is designed, in the words of one Army witness, to "modernize, reorient, and streamline the Army's organization . . . to improve readiness, training, the materiel and equipment acquisition process, the quality and responsiveness of management, and better support for the soldier. . . ."

These are goals with which the Committee does not quarrel, but it does have serious reservations as to the adequacy of the base utilization and facilities planning aspects of this reorganization.

While the other services were directing their attention toward base closures and realignment, the Army concentrated on reorganization. A recent statement by the Secretary of Defense that additional base closures are planned and statements by Army witnesses that training installations and small bases were currently under study reinforced the Committee's determination to appropriate construction dollars only at firm bases. Requests for facilities at bases which could be candidates for realignment or closure were carefully screened by the Committee.

It should be pointed out that the great majority of the Army's fiscal year 1974 requests are at bases with obvious firm long term requirements. For example, an analysis of the program of the Continental Army Command shows that two-thirds of the money requested would go to major bases which would be required in the interest of national security even under the most austere of budgets.

Consistent with its policy of providing modern bachelor quarters for enlisted men, the Committee has recommended funding for numerous major barracks complexes at various Army installations.

At Fort Bragg, North Carolina, approval has been given to construct an \$18.2 million complex to house 1,649 enlisted men. Similar facilities to house 3,300 enlisted men have been approved at Fort Campbell, Kentucky at a cost of \$31.4 million. At Fort Gordon, Georgia, \$19.2 million is recommended for construction of a 2,028 man barracks complex. The Committee also recommends approval of \$9.4 million to provide modern bachelor enlisted spaces for 1,100 men at Fort Sam Houston, Texas. At Fort Polk, Louisiana, \$26 million was requested and approved for a complex to house 2,550 enlisted personnel. More than 1,600 enlisted men will benefit from approval of \$22.5 million for a complex at Fort Riley, Kansas, and at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, it is recommended \$32.2 million be approved to construct quarters for 2,522 bachelor spaces. Finally, at Ford Ord, California, \$8.6 million is approved to construct spaces for 1,170 enlisted personnel.

Other, smaller barracks complexes also are included in the recommended program. In all, the Army requested appropriations to provide 24,553 new bachelor enlisted spaces and to modernize 46,896 existing substandard spaces.

While some projects, notably a major complex at Fort Belvoir, did not survive the authorization process, this Committee has approved the vast majority of bachelor quarters projects, both large and small and both for new and modernized quarters.

Clearly it was not size alone nor was it historical or urgent operational requirements which solely dictated the Army program. Examples are to be found in requests, granted by this Committee, for facilities for active duty personnel assigned to bases where Reserve or National Guard forces train. These bases are Camp Drum, N.Y., Camp A.P. Hill, Va., Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pa., Camp Pickett, Va., and Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico.

The Committee notes, however, that in its reorganization plan, the Army seemed overly anxious to establish headquarters operations at bases with historical rather than military values.

The Committee is concerned over what appears to be a general trend to locate training bases in the more moderate climatic regions of the United States. There is ample justification for the location of air training facilities in such regions, but there is an equally overriding need to have combat troop training facilities available in adverse weather regions. The Committee is aware of the fact that combat is not always carried out in ideal weather and that there is a very real requirement for troops trained to perform their mission in colder climates. The Committee also feels that geographical factors should be given proper weight in the Army's plans for its basic training installations.

It is clear little progress is being made in controlling the backlog of deferred construction. Although this year's backlog of \$6.5 billion is \$1.6 billion less than that reported last year, the Army said this is due largely to a purging of the list and base realignment actions rather than a vigorous program of modernization and construction.

Equally clear is the situation with regard to adequate maintenance of facilities. Maintenance funds are insufficient. Dollars which are available are spread too thinly to properly maintain many facilities which potentially have long life but which, for lack of maintenance, will need replacement within a few years. This Committee urges the Army to embark on a meaningful maintenance program so as to avoid unnecessary expenditures for replacement of facilities.

The Army continues to move forward with its pollution abatement program and the Committee is heartened to have been told it appears "the corner has been turned" on this expensive but necessary program. It is expected however, that more rigid standards will generate future requirements for the control of pollution and that this program will be ongoing for some time.

Construction is to continue on the new Walter Reed Medical Center. This is only a part of the Army's long range program to modernize or replace medical facilities. The full impact of this program is not expected to be reflected in requests until fiscal year 1975. This Committee expects the Army to carefully study this program so that facilities to provide health care are located only as needed at locations with long term requirements.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$517, 830, 000
Estimate, 1974-----	683, 400, 000
Recommended in bill-----	587, 641, 000
Reduction -----	97, 759, 000

The Committee has approved \$587,641,000 for Military construction, Navy, a reduction of \$97,759,000 below the budget estimate and an increase of \$69,811,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1973.

The Committee's action reflects a net funding reduction of \$47,251,000 as a result of Congressional action on the authorizing legislation. The Committee recommends further cuts totalling \$50,508,000. The Committee action on this program is reflected in the State list and tables at the end of this report. Additional specific actions relating to individual line items and installations are set forth in subsequent paragraphs.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RELATING TO INDIVIDUAL INSTALLATIONS

The Navy's request includes \$3,600,000 for an engineering building at the Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London Laboratory, Connecticut. The Committee feels there is too much duplication in Navy research in this area and that the missions of the various laboratories involved should be restudied. Accordingly, it has denied this project.

At the Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey, a project to support the relocation of the Military Sealift Command, Atlantic, is denied.

At the Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania, a low-priority request for \$215,000 for a primary substation expansion has been deferred.

At the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, the Navy is requesting \$4,334,000 to rehabilitate Maury Hall. The Committee feels that the cost per square foot for this rehabilitation is excessive. Accordingly, the Committee has reduced the cost of this project by \$300,000.

The Committee has provided no funds to meet an additional authorization of \$3,400,000 for a land acquisition project at Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia. The \$3,400,000 was to be used for lease termination and building demolition on land recently acquired by the Navy with funds provided in fiscal year 1972. The prior owner of the land, Norfolk and Western Railway, had entered into a total of 41 leases with individuals and businesses. The Navy now desires to terminate these leases and demolish the buildings. While it might be desirable to accomplish this, there appears to be no immediate necessity to make the land available for construction or other requirements for the Navy.

Of the 41 leases, only four are long term in nature, with expiration dates ranging from 1976 to 1996. The remaining leases are either on a month-to-month basis or are renewed yearly, some with special provisions.

The Committee feels it is unnecessary to provide money to the Navy with which to purchase a lease and relocate a business when such lease is subject to cancellation or expiration within a year. The Committee further questions the Navy's liability to pay relocation costs to a business upon the legal expiration of a lease.

The Navy is requested to restudy this matter and to submit to the Committee a revised and realistic estimate of what it will cost to purchase the leases of and relocate businesses with long-term commitments. The Navy is further requested to provide the Committee construction schedules for the area in question together with a phased plan to terminate short-term leases.

The budget request includes \$2,470,000 to provide a nuclear training building at the Nuclear Weapons Training Group, Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia. This is a low-priority project to replace present training facilities at this location. The Committee feels the existing spaces should continue to be utilized by this training function until there is further justification for this project.

The Committee has approved \$299,000 to provide utilities to the Naval Air Museum, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida.

Private donations provided \$1.4 million to construct the museum which will be the focal point in the entire Navy where the history of Naval Aviation will be chronicled. The Secretary of the Navy has officially accepted the facility on behalf of the Navy and the building will be completed in March, 1974.

The Navy made a commitment to the Naval Museum Association that, provided private funds were used to construct the basic facility, Navy funds would be used to support it. The time has come to honor this commitment.

This Committee commends the Naval Museum Association for its work in raising the money to provide the Navy with this historic facility and it trusts the Navy will attach significant importance to making it the repository for the documents and displays befitting the official Naval Air Museum.

At the Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, the budget request includes \$1,321,000 for a communication facility. The Navy testified that it recently conducted a joint survey with the Coast Guard of the overall communications needs in the Charleston Harbor area. This survey shows the present plan to move only the Navy transmitter may not offer the best solution. Also, a joint project on a cost-sharing basis might offer the most economical approach to a new communications facility there. The present project emphasizes high frequency equipment and antennas. It now appears that most needs can be met with VHF and UHF equipment, and a small band transmitter and receiver can serve the high frequency needs.

The Committee feels it could be wasteful to provide funding for this project without additional study.

The Committee has approved \$10 million for the construction of a new pier at San Diego, California. Approval is based on sound justification for a new pier. The scope and size of the pier apparently would not vary significantly regardless of whether or not a proposed transfer of surface vessels from Long Beach, California, to San Diego takes place.

Because of testimony presented to the Committee from various sources, serious reservations are held by the Committee as to the advisability of carrying out the proposed move of these ships. It was pointed out time and again that the stationing of large numbers of ships at San Diego could well place in jeopardy the safety of these vessels in time of emergency. The length of the San Diego channel and the resulting delay and risk in movement of vessels was detailed. Apprehension also was expressed that a bridge across the channel could be felled by an adversary to effectively trap our naval vessels in the harbor.

The Committee recognizes the fact that base closures and base realignments are not within its sphere of authority. Nevertheless, the Committee is not convinced the move of nuclear surface ships from Long Beach to San Diego is wise or economical. Therefore, the Committee feels strongly that the Navy should restudy this proposal, and directs the Navy to submit to the Committee a report as to possible dangers, economic savings, and time factor data in connection with moving such ships to new combat stations.

In the event of a change in the Navy's plans for this transfer of ships, the Navy will be expected to submit new plans for a pier at San Diego based on the actual requirements of the ships which will utilize its facilities.

The Committee does not expect the Navy to award a construction contract for this project until the Navy has certified that it will not pursue additional overseas homeporting which will affect the need for this pier.

At the Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, the Navy requested the replacement of an enlisted men's dining facility. In the opinion of the Committee, the present facility is adequate. The request is denied.

The Committee has provided \$7,168,000 to replace barracks at the Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

An entire Marine division is based at Camp Lejeune and there are long range plans to bring all bachelor enlisted quarters up to current Department of Defense standards. Funds provided in this year's program will replace six substandard facilities with a new facility with room configurations for up to three men per room. At present, the Marines are quartered in 1942 era open bay barracks with gang latrines.

Marine Corps officials have said the replacement of the remaining 70 buildings is not scheduled to begin until 1980 and that until that time, Marines based at Camp Lejeune will be living under conditions below DOD standards. The Committee is concerned about this situation, but it commends the Marine Corps for its long range planning to replace substandard facilities on an orderly basis and as the facilities in use reach the end of economical utilization.

The Marine Corps requested a commissary at Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, in the amount of \$999,000. The Marine Corps testified that previously all of their commissaries have been provided with surcharge funds. The Committee feels that a further effort should be made to provide for this project in a similar manner.

As explained earlier in this report, the Committee has reduced the amount provided for the Trident support complex by \$6,000,000. This

should leave sufficient funds to complete the facilities requested in fiscal year 1974.

The Committee has approved \$6,092,000 to construct bachelor officers and enlisted quarters at Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland.

This approval comes despite continuing reports the government of Iceland may terminate our base agreements in that country. Final disposition of this matter is expected within a reasonably short time, and the Navy is instructed to have assurances of our tenure in Iceland before proceeding with these projects. If we are to remain there, these facilities will be needed. If we are to shortly leave, the money is not to be obligated.

At the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, the Committee has deleted some of the funding but not the authority to proceed with projects requested at this strategic installation. The amounts of funds deleted, totalling \$3,208,000, represent those portions of the aircraft parking apron, the air passenger/cargo terminal, and the general warehouse which are NATO eligible. The Committee will expect the Navy to proceed with these projects by absorbing this funding reduction through savings or through cancellation of other lower priority projects. The Committee believes that the Navy should have been alert to these needs several years ago and should have programed these facilities in a NATO infrastructure slice program.

At the Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy, the Committee has reduced funding for a photographic building by \$164,000 for the reasons that are cited above.

The Committee included funds which were authorized for airfield support facilities in Athens, Greece, to support the homeporting of a carrier task force there. The Committee is hopeful that homeporting will prove to be a workable concept which will allow us to keep our commitments to NATO and others with a limited number of active fleet ships. The airfield support facilities in the amount of \$1,948,000 are critical to the homeporting of a carrier in Athens. The Committee expects the Navy to press for recoupment from NATO for this project and to obtain any future projects in support of Navy forces here through NATO slice programs without resorting to prefinancing.

At the Naval Complex, Guam, the budget request contained \$1,480,000 for a theatre. The Committee believes, in view of the costly nature of this construction, that present facilities will have to suffice.

As with the Army, the Committee has reduced Navy appropriations for fiscal year 1974 to reflect balances available from prior-year appropriations. A reduction of \$4,700,000 is recommended as a result of unobligated balances of funds made available for Southeast Asia in prior years. A reduction of \$7,500,000 has been made to reflect savings due to cancellation of projects due to base realignments.

The Committee approves the transfer of \$4,000,000 into the Navy's planning account in order to allow for orderly planning of the fiscal year 1975 Navy program. These funds are to come from projects cancelled or reduced as the result of base realignments.

The Committee recommends no funding for construction at the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range.

AUTHORIZATION ACTIONS

A summary of the additions and deletions made by the Congress in the authorizing legislation follows:

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine: Theater...	-\$232,000
Naval Support Activity, Brooklyn, N.Y.:	
Relocate telephone switchboard.....	-75,000
Bachelor enlisted quarters modernization.....	-1,056,000
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Penn.: Electronics equipment facility	-735,000
Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia:	
Acoustic research facility.....	-740,000
Naval Station, Annapolis, Md.: Bulkhead replacement.....	-1,080,000
National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.:	
Navy Exchange retail store.....	-1,764,000
Roads.....	-1,546,000
Naval Communication Station, Cheltenham, Md.: VLF antenna modifications	-1,300,000
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md.: Electromagnetic propagation facility.....	-680,000
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Hypervelocity wind tunnel	-448,000
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Va.: Electronics Building...	-139,000
Naval Station, Norfolk, Va.:	
Vehicle parking area.....	-310,000
Land acquisition.....	+3,400,000
Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va.: Utilities.....	-576,000
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.: Naval Regional Medical Center, Jacksonville, dispensary addition.....	-107,000
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Land acquisition.....	+2,400,000
Naval Hospital, Orlando, Fla.: Hospital replacement.....	-20,981,000
Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla.:	
Dental clinic.....	-1,481,000
Basic electricity and electronics training building.....	-1,274,000
Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Fla.: Petty officers mess.....	+831,000
Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla.: Outlying fields.....	+1,400,000
Naval Complex, Great Lakes, Ill.: Naval Training Center bachelor enlisted quarters.....	-4,760,000
Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.: Applied instruction building (reduction).....	-419,000
Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Calif.: Bachelor enlisted quarters with mess.....	-721,000
Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.: Naval Air Rework Facility avionics building environmental control.....	-1,409,000
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, Calif.:	
Taxiway overlay.....	-2,115,000
Operational trainer building addition.....	-430,000
Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Dry dock support facility	-250,000
Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island, Calif.: Dispensary and dental clinic.....	-641,000
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.: Electronic shop alterations	-200,000
Naval Complex, Adak, Alaska: Naval Station runway and taxiway overlay	-4,158,000
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Calif.: Ship waste water collection ashore	-3,700,000
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii: Municipal sewer connection facility.....	-5,868,000
Navy Support Office, Athens, Greece: Aircraft support facilities...	+1,948,000
Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland: Bachelor enlisted quarters.....	-90,000

AUTHORIZATION ACTIONS—continued

Naval Complex, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines :	
Naval Station bachelor enlisted quarters modernization-----	-1, 411, 000
Naval Station dependent school expansion-----	-1, 034, 000
Appropriation limitation-----	-7, 500, 000
Sec. 204 -----	+12, 000, 000
Total -----	-47, 251, 000

SUMMARY OF THE NAVY PROGRAM

In terms of fleet readiness facilities, the Navy's fiscal year 1974 military construction request actually is considerably less than that approved by the Congress for fiscal year 1973.

This reduction in the budget request for the more ordinary types of shore facilities is caused by several factors: Trident submarine base construction (\$118.3 million), and acceleration of the medical facilities program (\$89.5 million). The remainder of the Navy's 1974 request is an austere military construction budget of \$448.7 million, 36 percent of which is earmarked for projects aimed at enhancing the all volunteer concept and for pollution abatement projects.

Submission of the fiscal year 1974 program to the Congress was delayed, largely because of program adjustments needed to accommodate the shore establishment realignment plan announced earlier this year. The program which was ultimately presented by the Navy reflected requests totaling \$45.5 million which were generated because of the Navy's shore establishment realignment. This figure later was refined to \$40.7 million, and included such facilities as a new berthing pier at San Diego, estimated to cost \$10 million and academic facilities at locations such as Naval Station, Mirimar, California and Dam Neck, Virginia. Navy witnesses also testified that the realignment plan will result in the cancellation of \$33.7 million in projects approved in prior years which have not yet gone to contract.

Of all the services, it was the Navy which made the most significant base adjustments under the Department of Defense approved base closure and realignment plan. For this reason, it has also been the Navy which has attracted the majority of attention as to the wisdom of these decisions. The Committee believes the Navy to have generally conducted exhaustive studies to determine which bases were to be closed or curtailed and it commends Navy officials for the resultant decisions. The net result of the Navy's base utilization plan will be a more compact Navy, but a Navy with firepower and strength sufficient to give pause to any would-be aggressor.

Despite the upheaval attendant to base closures, the Navy still has presented requests for a great many projects which are intended to enhance the all-volunteer concept. Twenty six percent of the Navy request was for such items as bachelor housing, community support facilities, medical facilities and "cold iron" facilities.

Chief among the "people oriented" projects requested are those dealing with medical facilities for the men and women of the Navy and Marine Corps. Navy's earmarking of 9.4 percent of its total program for medical facilities reflects the Department of Defense directive to upgrade medical services to the armed forces. A total of 18 medical facilities were included in the Navy request, either for replace-

ment or upgrading. The Committee agrees with the Department of Defense that medical services are of prime importance, but it cautions against attempts to replace still useable facilities or the construction of facilities where need has not been proven.

Training facilities continue to receive proper attention in the Navy's request for construction funds. It would appear the Navy has been successful in efforts to design a reasonable program to provide adequate training for recruits and new officers as well as training facilities to maintain a high level of proficiency in the many skills required by a modern Navy.

It is hoped continuing efforts will be made to coordinate training requirements with the other services to avoid needless duplication of expensive facilities. There is little doubt, for example, that the Navy would have differing requirements from the Army in helicopter pilot skills, for instance, but it is just as obvious that academic facilities, if available for joint service use, would be interchangeable.

Perhaps the greatest potential for duplication among the services is in the area of research and laboratory facilities. The Committee encourages research and development programs. It believes a major factor in national defense is technological excellence and superiority. Needed R&D facilities and laboratories will pay rich dividends to the nation and its people, but caution must be exercised to avoid a race among the services to see which can build the most facilities first. This is particularly true in such research areas such as those dealing with human behavior. While there is no question humans will behave differently when in the air than they do when submerged in a submarine and to predetermine behavior is invaluable, it remains that the study of humans, whether in the air or under water probably could and should be done at common locations rather than by each of the services utilizing expensive laboratories and highly skilled staffs.

A total of 15 Navy and Marine Corps installations were included in the Navy request for pollution abatement projects. Most have been approved by the Committee. It was noted however, that a trend might be developing which, if gone unchecked, could be misleading to the Congress and the people of the nation. Several so-called pollution abatement projects requested this year, notably a pier and several sand-blasting and paint shops, would more normally have been included as regular line items in the military construction appropriation request rather than coming under the blanket of pollution abatement projects. The Committee recognizes the desire of the Navy and the other services, to include as many projects as possible under the heading of pollution abatement, but the Committee also must insist that projects which properly should be included in normal construction requests not be hidden under pollution.

The Navy is making significant progress in the "Cold Iron" program to provide pier support facilities which allow most crew members to be with their families when in port rather than standing watch aboard ship. This year, the Navy requested \$26 million for eight projects, an amount \$3 million over the request in fiscal year 1973.

Included in this year's request is \$9.4 million to continue work on the construction of a new Naval Home at Gulfport, Mississippi. This new facility will replace the Home now at Philadelphia and will accommodate up to 600 former Navy personnel who have served our

nation in time of need and who now deserve the gratitude and support of their country.

The old Naval Home at Philadelphia is an historic site, but the buildings also are of a vintage which makes them unreasonable to maintain. There is no room for expansion at Philadelphia. The New Naval Home will provide the finest of environment and service to those who live there and the Committee has encouraged its construction.

The Navy's program to modernize shipyards and air rework facilities is progressing. Budget constraints do not allow this program to proceed at as rapid a rate as the Navy would desire, but this year's request includes projects at six shipyards and two air rework facilities.

The Committee understands studies currently are underway to determine what steps should be taken to best utilize naval shipyards. Testimony developed during the course of hearings on the Navy request indicated shipyards are underutilized. The Committee recognizes the need for a Navy capability in ship repair and overhaul, but it does not concede the requirement for more capability than can be used.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AIR FORCE

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$265, 552, 000
Estimate, 1974.....	291, 900, 000
Recommended in bill.....	239, 702, 000
Reduction	-52, 198, 000

The Committee has approved \$239,702,000 for Military construction, Air Force, a reduction of \$52,198,000 below the budget estimate and \$25,850,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1973.

The reductions above include a net reduction of \$27,804,000 as a result of the action taken by the Congress on the authorizing legislation. The Committee recommends additional reductions totalling \$24,394,000. The Committee action on this program is reflected in the State list and tables at the end of this report. Additional specific actions relating to individual line items and installations are set forth in subsequent paragraphs.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RELATING TO INDIVIDUAL INSTALLATIONS

The Air Force budget request contains an amount of \$2,480,000 for a weapons systems components plating shop at McClellan Air Force Base, California. This is actually the fourth increment of an aircraft repair complex at this installation. The Committee directs that construction of this project be held up until the third increment of this program has been approved by the Department of Defense.

At Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, the Committee recommends the deletion of \$1,887,000 requested for an aircraft engine component research facility. It seems to the Committee that this type of research should be carried on by private industry.

The Committee has approved \$11 million to complete the technical intelligence operations facility at Wright-Patterson.

Work is not yet complete on the first increment of this facility, and the Committee is concerned insufficient planning has gone into how best to phase the incremental construction so as to avoid confusion and waste caused by two projects—and possibly two contractors—working at the same site on the same building at the same time.

The Air Force is instructed to notify the Committee before awarding the construction contract for the second increment and to be prepared to provide evidence and data to substantiate its contention that no confusion or conflict will result from such an award.

At the Satellite Control Facility, Kodiak, Alaska, the Committee has deleted an automotive maintenance facility because of its high cost and low priority.

The budget request for \$13,500,000 for special aircraft support facilities at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, is denied.

At Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, the Committee has not provided additional funding for dormitory facilities in the amount of \$213,000, believing that the Air Force can absorb this amount through savings.

The commissary requested at a cost of \$2,273,000 at Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, is denied. The Air Force testified that this is the lowest priority commissary in their fiscal year 1974 program.

The Committee has deleted \$1,933,000 for a low-priority base personnel office at Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada.

The Committee has approved \$1,355,000 for Air Force facilities to be built at Keflavik, Iceland. Earlier in this report, the Navy was instructed not to obligate funds for Iceland projects until the matter of our tenure there is clarified. The same admonition should be observed by the Air Force.

The Committee has applied a reduction in funding in the amount of \$1,326,000 for various projects in Germany for which the Air Force experienced cost overruns. This is consistent with reductions in funding for NATO-eligible projects in prior years.

The Committee has denied \$1,000,000 for a classified project authorized under section 302 of the authorization act.

As discussed earlier in the other services, the Committee has made a reduction of \$1,800,000 to reflect unobligated balances of prior-year appropriations for Southeast Asia.

AUTHORIZATION ACTION

A summary of the additions and deletions made by the Congress in the authorizing legislation follows:

Tyndall Air Force Base, Fla.:	
Theater	-\$751,000
Gymnasium	+820,000
Hill Air Force Base, Utah:	
Ballistic missile processing support facility	-3,000,000
Advanced logistics system utility support	-625,000
McClellan Air Force Base, Calif.: Advanced logistics system utility support	-599,000
Robins Air Force Base, Ga.: Depot aircraft run-up facility	-240,000
Tinker Air Force Base, Okla.: Add to and alter composite medical facility	-3,879,000
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio:	
Aircraft fuels and lubricants laboratory	-4,857,000
Airmen dormitories	-1,117,000
Advanced logistics system utility support	-300,000
Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Mass.: Add to and alter base roads	-480,000
Keesler Air Force Base, Miss.: Runway extension	+1,200,000
Lowry Air Force Base, Colo.: Airmen open mess	-1,260,000
Mather Air Force Base, Calif.: Base personnel office	-1,683,000
Williams Air Force Base, Ariz.: Add to and alter chapel center	-450,000

AUTHORIZATION ACTIONS—continued

Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala. :	
Add to and alter NCO academic facility (Gunter)-----	—562, 000
Add to and alter composite medical facility-----	—4, 900, 000
Andrews Air Force Base, Md. : Add to and alter air passenger terminal-----	—296, 000
Altus Air Force Base, Okla. : Base flight operations facility-----	—692, 000
Dover Air Force Base, Del. : Base facilities maintenance complex--	—829, 000
McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. : Air-condition base personnel office--	—162, 000
Travis Air Force Base, Calif. : Aircraft hydrant refueling system--	—1, 024, 000
Barksdale Air Force Base, La. . Air-condition base headquarters facility-----	—543, 000
Blytheville Air Force Base, Ark. : Security police facility-----	—140, 000
Grissom Air Force Base, Ind. : Alter airmen dormitories-----	—1, 600, 000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont. : Dormitory facilities-----	+213, 000
Various : Aircraft instrument landing facilities (reduction)-----	—321, 000
Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex. : Weapons guidance test facility--	—908, 000
U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado : Add to and alter base telephone exchange facility-----	—162, 000
Air Installation Compatible Use Zones : Land-----	—2, 000, 000
Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas : Hospital-----	+6, 115, 000
Clark Air Base, Philippine Islands : Noncommissioned officers open mess-----	—2, 000, 000
Kunsan Air Base, Korea : Airmen dormitories-----	—1, 838, 000
Ramstein Air Base, Germany : Taxiway shoulder pavement-----	—465, 000
Various, Germany :-----	+7, 333, 000
RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom :	
Aircraft fueling support facility-----	—166, 000
Composite medical facility-----	—5, 525, 000
Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone : Air-condition chapel center--	—111, 000
Total-----	—27, 804, 000

SUMMARY OF THE AIR FORCE PROGRAM

Air Force requests for fiscal year 1974 reflect a continuing policy of personnel support and an accelerated program to modernize or replace outmoded and uneconomical facilities.

One-third of the Air Force request is dedicated to troop housing, medical facilities, and community support. The remainder of the program presented by the Air Force is to support new and continuing missions, training requirements, research and development laboratories, and pollution abatement projects.

Included in this year's requests were projects totaling \$31 million to continue the depot modernization program. This is an important part of the Air Force's readiness posture. The most modern air force in the world soon would become impotent without ready supplies of fuel, spare parts, and support items, each of which must be made quickly available wherever needed in the world. This is the mission of the Logistics Command and the function of the Air Force depots.

For the first time in several years, the Air Force requested funding for major administrative space facilities, the largest of which is a replacement for the Air Force Accounting and Finance Center at Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado. This facility is to cost an estimated \$20 million and the Committee recommends it be approved.

A major program to upgrade or replace medical care facilities is now well underway by the Air Force as well as by the other services. This year, the Air Force request includes \$28 million for hospital facilities including requests to replace three outmoded hospitals; at

F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, at Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, and at RAF, Upper Heyford, United Kingdom.

The Air Force is to be commended for continuing to request funding for bachelor housing, even in the face of budget constraints.

This year, the request is for \$40 million to modernize or replace dormitory space. The Committee encourages efforts to make service life more attractive to career minded personnel, and make comfortable living quarters are an important part of this effort.

In recommending for approval portions of the Air Force's requests for fiscal year 1974, the Committee took into account recent and anticipated base closures and realignments. A majority of projects recommended for approval, aside from highly technical or specialized projects, are facilities which ultimately could be utilized by the community in the event of base closure years from now. Barracks, shops, maintenance facilities, and base support items included in the Committee's recommendations can be used for many things, even in the unlikely event of base closure at a base which is today considered firm.

With regard to research and development facilities, the Committee encourages the Air Force to engage in a vigorous effort to develop joint service use of these expensive and exotic laboratories. While the Committee enthusiastically supports work which will keep the United States technologically superior, it does question the need for each service to build laboratories in which to engage in nearly identical research.

The Air Force pollution abatement program continues in fiscal year 1974 with requests for \$9.8 million in this important area. As technology advances and new standards are developed, there will be a continuing need for many years to provide funding for projects to protect the environment.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE AGENCIES

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$36, 704, 000
Estimate, 1974-----	19, 100, 000
Recommended in bill-----	0
Reduction -----	19, 100, 000

The Committee has provided no additional funding for this appropriation for fiscal year 1974. Unobligated balances in the Defense contingency fund, at the beginning of the fiscal year, totalled some \$54 million. This should be sufficient to meet the \$30 million program for the contingency fund as well as the \$15,571,000 program which the Committee recommends for the remainder of the Defense Agencies' program for fiscal year 1974. The Congress' action on the authorizing legislation reduced the authorization for appropriation by \$7,100,000. The Committee has deleted the remaining \$12,000,000 of new budget authority requested. This includes the deletion of a logistic support facility at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, requested in the amount of \$3,529,000, which does not appear to be urgent or cost effective.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, RESERVE COMPONENTS

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$121, 800, 000
Estimates, 1974-----	126, 200, 000
Recommended in the bill-----	128, 800, 000

The Committee has approved \$128,800,000 for the reserve components of the military forces, an increase of \$7,000,000 over the 1973 appropriation. It is also \$2,600,000 above the budget estimates for fiscal year 1974, an amount added by the authorizing committee to compensate for construction funds used to transfer Naval Reserve headquarters from Glenview, Illinois and Omaha, Nebraska to New Orleans, Louisiana.

The Committee is distressed by the difficulties facing the Reserve and Guard forces in recruiting and retaining personnel. It hopes that incentives proposed for these forces will stimulate interest in them and improve morale.

As weapons costs escalate, less and less of the limited defense dollar is available for personnel in the regular establishment. If the defense capability of the nation is to be maintained, it is obvious that ever increasing reliance must be placed on the reserve components as active forces are reduced. For example, nearly half of today's Army is composed of Reserve and Guard units. If the expanding air fleet, new generation vehicles, and more complex, more sophisticated weapons systems inherited from the active forces are to be utilized effectively, added aviation facilities, more specialized maintenance facilities, and increased storage space must be provided. Likewise, more and better training areas and facilities are needed. And modern armories and training centers must be built to replace overcrowded facilities and ease an ever growing backlog of construction requirements. The Committee applauds the efforts of the services to jointly utilize existing facilities and urges even closer scrutiny in this regard in the future.

Very careful planning is necessary to properly balance growing facilities needs due to modernization with streamlining of force structure dictated by personnel and management requirements. The rapidity with which such changes have taken place may explain why some of the projects requested this year are for units which are not considered combat ready. Facilities play a comparatively minor role in the achievement of combat readiness, and the Committee feels that, for noncombat ready units, attention should be directed less to facilities and more to equipment and training. The Committee expects that future requests by Reserve and Guard forces will include specific data as to how the requested facility will impact on the unit's ready status.

The Committee is deeply concerned that reserve components, for the most part, are not used in times of national emergency and that apparently many of the units would not be combat ready if called to duty. Being ready to defend our nation is the *raison d'être* for the Reserve and Guard forces. Thus, if future facilities requests will enhance the capability of meeting this mission requirement, the Committee will look favorably on such requests. Otherwise, it will not recommend funding, particularly for units which do not have the capability of performing their assigned mission.

Committee action together with balances remaining from prior years are shown for each of the Reserve components in the following tabulation.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR RESERVE FORCES IN FISCAL YEAR 1974

	Balance carried forward June 30, 1973		Recommended in bill, fiscal year 1974	Total available for fiscal year 1974	
	Unobligated	Unexpended		Obligation	Expenditure
Army National Guard.....	\$3,043,000	\$43,424,000	\$35,200,000	\$38,243,000	\$78,624,000
Air National Guard.....	5,273,000	17,021,000	20,000,000	25,273,000	37,021,000
Army Reserve.....	32,532,000	59,015,000	40,700,000	73,232,000	99,715,000
Naval Reserve.....	19,573,000	33,453,000	22,900,000	42,473,000	56,353,000
Air Force Reserve.....	3,265,000	8,542,000	10,000,000	13,265,000	18,542,000
Total.....	63,686,000	161,455,000	128,800,000	192,486,000	290,255,000

Note: Actual rounded to nearest thousand.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE

New budget authority, 1973.....	\$967,380,000
1974 budget request.....	1,150,400,000
Revised budget request.....	1,181,500,000
Recommended in bill.....	1,094,372,000
Increase over 1973.....	126,992,000
Decrease from budget request.....	56,028,000
Decrease from revised budget request.....	87,128,000

The Committee recommends new budget authority of \$1,094,372,000 for Family housing, Defense. This is \$56,028,000 under the budget, and \$126,992,000 above the amount provided for fiscal year 1973. It is \$87,128,000 lower than the revised budget request, which reflects a more accurate picture of the needs in this program due to the effect of the devaluation of the dollar and cost escalation. The Committee was unable to consider the revised budget request because authorization for the request has not been acted upon.

The family housing program represents a substantial portion of the military construction appropriation bill. In addition to construction of new units, modernizing, relocating, operating, maintaining, and leasing military family housing, as well as debt principal and interest payments on military family housing indebtedness, constitute the major costs. Also covered are construction of trailer spaces, minor construction, acquisition of Wherry housing, planning, furniture procurement, payments under the rental guarantee and section 809 housing programs, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation for housing built with funds obtained from the surplus commodity program, and servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums. Other costs associated with housing military families are carried in the military personnel appropriations. Housing allowances and cost of transportation of personnel and of household goods are examples.

The amount provided will allow for the construction of 10,691 new units authorized for fiscal year 1974. To some extent, savings resulting from cancellation of prior-year projects as the result of base closures or other changes in requirements can be applied to finance the fiscal year 1974 program. However, sufficient funds have been provided to allow for the construction of adequate units for those projects which remain valid in the fiscal year 1972 and 1973 family housing programs.

The Committee on Appropriations has been deeply concerned with ensuring that military families have a sufficient amount of housing on and off military installations. The Committee is equally concerned that such housing be adequate in quality as well as in quantity. The Subcommittee on Military Construction has encouraged the military to provide the construction of housing which is suitable in terms of size, livability, attractiveness, and privacy where it is required on base. It has also encouraged other departments of government, such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to assist the communities around military installations to provide good housing for military families.

The Committee has noted in its reports in previous years the size of the family housing deficit for the military services. This deficit is based upon their projected long-range strengths. Using the latest estimates available to the Committee, the total deficit of military family housing, based upon projected force levels for fiscal year 1978, is 212,000. Of this amount, 170,000 consists of military personnel in pay grades of E4 and above. The remainder of the deficit, 42,000, is for married personnel in pay grades E1 through E3. This represents a deficit of 17% in the higher grades and 30% in the lower grades. The Committee has encouraged efforts of the Department of Defense, the military services, and other governmental and nongovernmental programs to significantly reduce these deficits within a reasonable period of time. The Committee has supported the construction of housing on base as well as becoming involved in efforts to supply more adequate off-base housing through programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Committee is very concerned that housing be built of a type which will be an inducement for people to enter and stay in the military service and which will stand the test of time. Too large a part of the present inventory of military-owned housing does not meet these tests. Much of the housing constructed at military bases under the Lanham and Wherry housing programs was poorly designed, poorly constructed, or both. Rather than being serviceable housing which can continue to be used for many scores of years, too often it is too small, too crowded, or too noisy. In most cases Lanham Act housing has been disposed of and, in many cases, Wherry housing which could not be upgraded has been declared substandard or should be declared substandard.

To some extent it has been true even of more recent family housing programs that the family housing being built at military installations is not meeting current or future needs in terms of size and quality. Often desirable features, such as garages, sidewalks, etc., are left out of the original construction. These will only have to be added back some years later under the improvements program. Furthermore, in the opinion of the members of the Committee, both individually and collectively, and in the opinion of many military wives, some of the housing designed and built under the direction of the military does not seem to be very livable in terms of function and the provision of agreeable space and amenities for families.

In order to overcome these problems and provide good housing, good imaginative management in the Department of Defense and cooperation by the Congress are required. Statutory size limitations for mili-

tary family housing basically have not been altered since 1948. Unit cost allowances have not kept pace with cost increases in home construction. It is the responsibility of the Department of Defense to propose adequate standards and cost limits as it is the job of Congress to approve suitable standards. It is also the job of the Department of Defense to use the authority which it obtains from Congress in the most effective way possible. Hopefully, some progress is being made in both areas.

Some improvement has been made in the type of housing being built as a result of growing use by the Department of Defense to turnkey procurement of family housing. In general, the turnkey procedure allows a better, more acceptable house for the money than does the more conventional technique of housing construction, to which the Department of Defense and its construction agencies seemed wedded for a long time. This is, first of all, because the turnkey procedure allows negotiation with bidders to obtain the maximum house within the dollar limits. Secondly, in order to provide flexibility and to allow the maximum possible use of existing homebuilder's designs, the turnkey program, in 1969, was allowed a variance of up to 15% from the statutory space allowances. Thus, within dollars available more space can be provided. Next, the turnkey procedure reintroduces the key element of consumer preferences into the design of family housing. In other words, the experience of homebuilders as to what features housewives like or dislike in houses cannot help but be factored into the houses that they design. The military construction agencies do not have this marketplace experience. Finally, the use of turnkey eliminates many of the obstacles which had kept experienced homebuilders from bidding on military family housing projects. They can use their own designs, the suppliers with whom they are familiar. This has resulted in substantial savings to the military. Thus, by the use of turnkey the defense housing program has been able to move forward to produce better houses and has been able, to some extent, to absorb part of the growth in housing costs.

However, it is not sufficient for the commercial builder to be the only one in the Defense housing procurement process who is sympathetic to or reflects the housing preferences of housewives. For this reason the Committee has repeatedly requested the managers of the housing program in the Department of Defense to survey military housewives to determine their preferences in housing. This has resulted in a request by Department of Defense of proposed new space standards. These new standards were developed as a result of a survey conducted to solicit opinions from servicemen and their wives as to the adequacy of military family housing and how it could be improved. The Committee recognizes that the increases being sought probably will not allow the provision of additional rooms for family units, but will alleviate the most prevalent deficiencies indicated in the survey by increasing the size of dining rooms, secondary bedrooms, and the bathroom area to permit two full baths on the second floor of three-bedroom, two-story units and proportionately to increase interior storage indicated to be a strong need by those families surveyed. The Committee concurs in the Defense proposal for increasing square foot limitations on new construction.

Experience with costs of the fiscal year 1972 and 1973 housing programs indicate that the statutory average cost limitations are too tight. The average cost limitations which have so far applied to the fiscal year 1972 and 1973 housing programs are \$24,000 inside the United States (excluding Alaska and Hawaii) and \$33,500 overseas. These have been barely adequate to award contracts for units in the fiscal year 1972 program. They have caused delay of much of the fiscal year 1973 program pending the enactment of new statutory limits which will then apply to these units. The projects which have been delayed will have to be built at costs approaching the new statutory average unit costs allowed for fiscal year 1974 which are \$27,500 and \$37,000, respectively. Sufficient funds have been provided to meet the additional cost of these units at the higher prices.

In calendar year 1973 construction costs increased by about 10%. For calendar year 1974 they are expected to increase by a similar amount. Therefore, for the fiscal year 1974 program, the Committee expects there probably will be similar problems awarding projects within the average unit cost limit proposed by Defense. This is because the new unit cost was conservative in the first place and was rapidly overtaken by inflation in the homebuilding industry. The Committee feels that it may be necessary for the Department of Defense to defer the full implementation of certain new proposals, such as providing higher standard quarters for senior noncommissioned officers and the construction of a significant number of 5-bedroom housing units, in order to ensure that fully adequate housing is built for the remainder of the program. Finally, if cost escalation reaches the point where it becomes necessary to significantly reduce the size or quality of units in the fiscal year 1974 program, the Committee would rather see whole projects deferred rather than allow the construction of substandard housing.

The Committee ranks adequate family housing along with pay and job satisfaction as one of the primary factors influencing the retention of qualified married military personnel in the services. At the present time, it is probably not a major factor in recruitment of military personnel. One reason may be that there is not adequate housing available for new personnel of the lowest enlisted grades on or off base. Current policies in the provision of military controlled housing definitely favor the higher ranking personnel. Although attempts have been made to provide low-cost housing on and off base, they have met only with limited success so far. Since there is not enough housing for all military families the services have tended to give preference to senior personnel in allocating existing housing. As a result, the military services may be, at some locations, unduly distorting the distribution of moderate- and low-income housing between the installation and the community, by constructing or providing housing for higher income personnel on base while forcing those in the lowest pay grades to seek their housing in the community. In view of the problems encountered in attempting to subsidize low-cost housing and the extremely tight supply of adequate low-cost housing throughout the United States, this seems unwise. If the continuance of the program of on-base housing construction is not to meet increasing opposition in local communities from those organizations or individuals in the business of providing moderate-income housing, and if it is to retain the

relatively strong support which it has had from this Committee and the support it has had from other committees in the Congress, it would seem that policies which impede a more balanced program for on-base housing should be revised.

One area in which the military services can move fairly rapidly to lessen the inequitable housing burden of their lower rank personnel is through the use of existing substandard housing to meet their needs. The Committee is not happy with the fact that any military personnel must use substandard housing, but due to extreme shortages it does represent a temporary solution to housing problems. As a result of a joint effort of the military services and the Congress last year, an additional 20,000 units which did not meet criteria for adequacy were declared to be substandard. The Committee feels that the existence of this substandard housing represents an opportunity for the military services to utilize these smaller and less well appointed units for the needs of the lower rank servicemen who generally have small families, little furniture, and scant opportunity to obtain housing on the economy. The Committee will expect the services to report upon their progress in this area.

A balanced program of providing for lower grade personnel housing on base in existing substandard units and the revival of HUD-assisted low-cost housing off base would help to meet the deficit in housing for E1 through E3 enlisted grades.

The Committee also believes that programs must be undertaken to better enable communities to meet military housing needs. Until the recent freeze, fairly good progress was being made in the area of providing housing for low-income military personnel through HUD programs. Also, the Committee on Banking and Currency had under consideration legislation to allow HUD support of housing loans in areas impacted by military installations. If base closure actions to be announced early next year are of the scope anticipated, a good deal of the risk to HUD in undertaking such a program should be eliminated. Hopefully, efforts can be resumed to increase HUD support to military housing in the community.

Furthermore, it is within the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense to do more to enable its personnel to obtain and pay for community housing. As mentioned earlier, housing allowances are paid from the military personnel accounts. It would seem that a more flexible use of housing allowances could be made to include variable housing allowances in high- or low-cost areas. In addition, the costs of providing some sort of reimbursement for loss from expenses of home ownership transactions should be explored. Furthermore, it does not seem inconsistent with the present recruiting options of the all-volunteer Army to encourage greater stability of assignment of military personnel to particular units. This might hopefully encourage home ownership and take the pressure off of rental units. In any case, the Committee feels that the Department should give more serious consideration to such proposals.

CONSTRUCTION

The amount of new budget authority recommended for construction is \$367,746,000, an increase of \$34,649,000 over fiscal year 1973. The

program approved by the Committee includes increases in funds for new construction, improvements to existing quarters, trailer spares, and Wherry acquisition. There is a decrease in the amount provided for minor construction. However, this is more than offset by the fact that the improvements programs has nearly doubled.

A summary of the program approved for fiscal year 1974 follows:

CONSTRUCTION					
Item	Army	Navy	Air Force	Defense agencies	Total
Construction of new housing.....	\$153,170,000	\$109,397,000	\$52,646,000	\$520,000	\$315,733,000
Trailer spaces.....	3,300,000	400,000	2,000,000		5,700,000
Wherry acquisition (utilities).....	240,000				240,000
Improvements.....	28,160,000	10,600,000	23,750,000		62,510,000
Minor construction ¹	1,500,000	800,000	400,000	20,000	2,720,000
Planning ¹	200,000	200,000	300,000		700,000
Subtotal.....	186,570,000	121,397,000	79,096,000	540,000	387,603,000
Financing adjustments ²	-7,250,000	-17,450,000	+4,843,000		-19,857,000
Total.....	179,320,000	103,947,000	83,939,000	540,000	367,746,000

¹ Not dependent upon annual authorization.

² Adjustments for savings and funding of prior-year authorizations.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Funds made available for operation and maintenance provide for the maintenance and repairs of units and supporting facilities, including exterior and interior utilities systems and minor alterations, as well as the cost of furniture for housing at overseas locations, utilities services, and other items connected with the normal operation of any housing project. Funds requested in the budget and approved by the Committee will provide for the operation and maintenance of 380,006 housing units budgeted for fiscal year 1974. The following tabulation shows a comparison of the average number of units maintained by each military service for fiscal year 1973 and the average number budgeted for fiscal year 1974.

AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS MAINTAINED

	Fiscal year 1973	Fiscal year 1974
Army.....	132,331	136,132
Navy/Marine Corps.....	87,446	91,569
Air Force.....	149,664	152,131
Defense agencies.....	174	174
Total.....	369,615	380,006

¹ Excludes leased units.

For operation and maintenance and leasing in fiscal year 1974, the Committee has approved \$667,616,000, the amount included in the budget request and \$94,131,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1973.

There has been an alarming increase in the backlog of essential maintenance for family housing. At least a part of the increase is due to dollar devaluation. Inflation is another factor impacting on the backlog. But the fact remains there is a backlog of essential maintenance which amounts to more than a quarter billion dollars and there appears to be little hope of even controlling the figure let alone lowering it.

In fiscal year 1974, for example, the Department of Defense intends to spend \$42 million on family housing essential maintenance. Yet, by the end of the fiscal year, the backlog will actually have increased \$500,000. A supplemental appropriation request (House Document 93-155) proposed an additional \$31 million for operation and maintenance of family housing but it was not considered by the authorizing committee. The committee believes this money is essential and denial of it will do nothing but bring the backlog to near unmanageable proportions.

As more and more houses come into the military inventory, more maintenance will be required to keep them habitable and in use. But, clearly from the figures cited above, we spend more and more on maintenance and continually get farther behind. The Committee fears that soon, military requests for family housing will be to replace units which simply have gone beyond rescue due to a lack of maintenance. If we ever reach that point, the entire military housing program will be in jeopardy and decisions will have to be made as to whether dollars are to go for new housing or to save existing housing. The military should immediately begin studies as to whether we are approaching this point and programs should be undertaken to stop the current slide into a maintenance morass.

LEASED HOUSING PROGRAM

This program provides funds for the leasing of family housing units for assignment as public quarters, including both domestic and foreign leases. Under the domestic program, leases are provided at installations in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

Funds in the amount of \$44,703,000 were requested in the budget. The Committee feels that the leasing program, particularly overseas, is a very useful adjunct to family housing construction. A recent survey by the General Accounting Office indicated that leasing overseas represents a very economical way of obtaining housing, particularly if it is employed as lease-construction. Although leased units overseas are generally not quite up to the standards of housing provided by other programs, this may be outweighed by the critical housing shortage at many installations in foreign countries. Leasing is also useful where we are not sure of the tenure of our military installations. The Committee is pleased to see that greater emphasis is being placed upon this program. The Committee has funded the total amount requested, which is \$7,060,000 above the amount appropriate for 1973.

A summary of the program approved for fiscal year 1974 is shown in the following tabulation.

LEASED HOUSING PROGRAM

	Number of units, end of fiscal year 1974			Amount
	Domestic	Foreign	Total	
Army.....	3,241	3,688	6,929	\$16,056,000
Navy.....	3,944	438	4,382	11,639,000
Air Force.....	2,815	2,690	5,505	13,577,000
Defense Intelligence Agency.....		274	274	12,770,000
National Security Agency.....		172	172	661,000
Total.....	10,000	7,262	17,262	44,703,000

¹ Includes certain support to other units not counted in the total of Department of Defense's leased units.

DEBT PAYMENT

The funds approved by the Committee for debt payment provide for the payments of principal, interest, mortgage insurance premiums, and other expenses which result from the assumption by the Government of mortgages on Capehart and Wherry housing as well as the payment of premiums due on mortgage insurance provided by the Federal Housing Administration for mortgages assumed by active military personnel for housing purchased by them. The approved program also includes repayment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for remaining indebtedness for housing constructed in foreign countries with foreign currencies derived from the sale of surplus commodities.

The Committee has approved the total budget program of \$159,177,000 for these purposes. This includes a new appropriation for the payment of mortgage principals on Capehart, Wherry, and Commodity Credit Corporation indebtedness in the amount of \$100,167,000. In addition, an estimated \$8,802,000 of other resources will be applied to debt reduction, including \$3,418,000 for advance principal payments. An amount of \$53,024,000 of new budget authority is allowed for payment of interest in mortgage indebtedness on Capehart and Wherry housing and for other expenses relating to the construction and acquisition of such housing in prior years, and \$5,986,000 is approved for payment to the Federal Housing Administration for premiums on Capehart and Wherry housing mortgage insurance and for the payment of premiums on insurance provided by the FHA for mortgages assumed by active military personnel for housing purchased by them.

The following table reflects the status of the Capehart and Wherry housing acquisition programs:

DEBT PAYMENT				
	Number of units	Original mortgage	Amount owed as of July 1, 1973	Funds to be applied in fiscal year 1974
Capehart housing:				
Army.....	35, 316	\$559, 150, 189	\$338, 506, 909	\$36, 259, 000
Navy.....	19, 843	319, 447, 635	205, 164, 276	20, 957, 000
Air Force.....	59, 100	944, 627, 221	552, 821, 217	63, 948, 000
Subtotal.....	114, 259	1, 823, 225, 045	1, 096, 492, 402	121, 164, 000
Wherry housing:				
Army.....	19, 823	148, 526, 271	87, 012, 622	9, 056, 000
Navy.....	22, 162	150, 013, 669	93, 832, 525	9, 235, 000
Air Force.....	35, 786	269, 801, 674	155, 498, 423	16, 538, 000
Subtotal.....	77, 771	568, 341, 614	336, 343, 570	34, 829, 000
Total.....	192, 030	2, 391, 566, 659	1, 432, 835, 972	155, 993, 000

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

Appropriations, 1973.....	0
Budget estimate, 1974.....	0
Revised budget estimate, 1974 (H. Doc. 93-155).....	\$7, 000, 000
Recommended in bill.....	7, 000, 000

For the homeowners assistance program the Committee has approved the revised budget request for \$7,000,000 in new obligational authority. Spending of agency debt receipts, authorized in permanent legislation, will provide an additional \$17,443,000. Thus, the Fund is

expected to have \$24,443,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 1974.

The program is authorized by Public Law 89-754. It originally provided assistance to qualified military and civilian employee homeowners by reducing, to a specified extent, their losses incident to disposal of their homes when a military installation was closed. However, as amended by Public Law 91-511, it also provides such assistance when the scope of operations at a military installation is reduced. In such cases, the Secretary is authorized to acquire title to, hold, manage, and dispose of, or—in lieu thereof—to reimburse for certain losses upon private sale of or foreclosure against any property improved with a one- or two-family dwelling which is situated at or near the affected military base or installation.

The additional funding required in fiscal year 1974 is to pay for the estimated effects of the April 1973 base closure actions.

STATE LIST

SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM APPROVED IN THE BILL (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT)

State/Service/Installation	Total (in thousands of dollars)		
	Installation	Service	State
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES			
Alabama			31,650
Army		31,650	
Anniston Army Depot	3,745		
Fort McClellan	18,947		
Redstone Arsenal	4,971		
Fort Rucker	3,987		
Alaska			21,188
Army		7,915	
Fort Greely	3,060		
Fort Richardson	2,140		
Fort Wainwright	2,715		
Navy		4,615	
Naval Complex, Adak	4,615		
Air Force		8,658	
Cape Newenham AFS	5,403		
Eielson AFB, Fairbanks	1,557		
Indian Mountain AFS	397		
Shemya AFB, Chicago	956		
Sparrevohn AFS	345		
Arizona			17,504
Army		13,304	
Fort Huachuca	6,832		
Yuma Proving Ground	6,472		
Navy		635	
Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma	635		
Air Force		3,565	
Davis-Monthan AFB, Tucson	232		
Luke AFB, Phoenix	2,986		
Williams AFB, Maricopa	347		
Arkansas			1,459
Army		294	
Pine Bluff Arsenal	294		
Air Force		1,165	
Little Rock AFB, Little Rock	1,165		
California			111,192
Army		21,797	
Fort Ord	9,812		
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation	7,776		
Presidio of San Francisco	3,074		
Oakland Army Terminal	343		
Sacramento Army Depot	412		
Sierra Army Depot	380		
Navy		83,374	
Naval Weapons Center, China Lake	3,163		
Naval Hospital, Long Beach	878		
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach	6,808		
Naval Air Station, Miramar	1,454		
Naval Air Station, North Island	4,055		
Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Pacific, San Diego	1,118		
Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego	3,518		
Naval Station, San Diego	11,996		
Naval Training Center, San Diego	2,944		
Navy Public Works Center, San Diego	2,471		
Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego	3,920		
Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach	807		
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow	3,802		
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	10,920		
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro	747		
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego	3,825		
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms	2,992		
Naval Air Station, Alameda	3,827		
Naval Air Station, Lemoore	3,266		
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field	3,150		
Naval Hospital, Oakland	5,839		
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo	1,874		
Air Force		5,274	
Edwards AFB, Rosamond	889		
Mather AFB, Sacramento	310		
McClellan AFB, Sacramento	2,572		
Norton AFB, San Bernardino	1,283		
Vandenberg AFB, Lompoc	220		
OSD			747
DSA—Defense Depot, Tracy Annex, Stockton	747		

STATE LIST

SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM APPROVED IN THE BILL (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT)—Continued

State/Service/Installation	Total (in thousands of dollars)		State
	Installation	Service	
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—Continued			
Colorado.....			34,327
Army.....		5,651	
Fort Carson.....	5,651		
Air Force.....		28,676	
Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs.....	483		
Lowry AFB, Denver.....	20,350		
Peterson Field, Colorado Springs.....	7,843		
Connecticut.....			6,158
Navy.....		6,158	
Naval Submarine Base, New London.....	6,158		
Delaware.....			2,558
Air Force.....		2,558	
Dover AFB, Dover.....	2,558		
District of Columbia.....			19,690
Army.....		13,535	
Walter Reed Army Medical Center.....	13,535		
Navy.....		4,655	
Naval Research Laboratory.....	4,655		
Air Force.....		1,500	
Bolling AFB.....	1,500		
Florida.....			59,679
Army.....		2,950	
Eglin AFB, Valparaiso.....	2,950		
Navy.....		46,013	
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field.....	3,636		
Naval Air Station, Elyson Field.....	75		
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville.....	13,966		
Naval Training Center, Orlando.....	4,628		
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City.....	5,649		
Naval Air Station, Pensacola.....	2,699		
Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola.....	10,690		
Naval Air Station, Whiting Field.....	3,586		
Naval Aerospace Regional Medical Center, Pensacola.....	1,084		
Air Force.....		10,716	
Eglin AFB, Valparaiso.....	7,039		
MacDill AFB, Tampa.....	2,657		
Tyndall AFB, Springfield.....	1,020		
Georgia.....			43,258
Army.....		33,426	
Fort Benning.....	12,932		
Fort Gordon.....	20,230		
Fort Stewart.....	264		
Navy.....		5,204	
Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany.....	5,204		
Air Force.....		4,628	
Robins AFB, Warner Robins.....	4,628		
Hawaii.....			37,260
Army.....		9,592	
Schofield Barracks.....	9,592		
Navy.....		20,337	
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point.....	4,306		
Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu.....	457		
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor.....	2,715		
Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor.....	2,562		
Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor.....	1,985		
Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Wahiawa.....	2,324		
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay.....	5,988		
Air Force.....		7,331	
Hickam AFB, Honolulu.....	7,331		
Idaho.....			253
Air Force.....		253	
Mountain Home AFB, Mountain Home.....	253		
Illinois.....			18,644
Navy.....		15,148	
Naval Complex, Great Lakes.....	15,148		
Air Force.....		3,092	
Scott AFB, Shiloh.....	3,092		
OSD.....		404	
DSA—Defense Contract Administration Regional Office, Chicago.....	404		
Indiana.....			5,393
Army.....		3,893	
Fort Benjamin Harrison.....	3,893		
Air Force.....		1,500	
Grissom AFB, Bunker Hill.....	1,500		

STATE LIST

SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM APPROVED IN THE BILL (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT)—Continued

State/Service/Installation	Total (in thousands of dollars)		
	Installation	Service	State
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—Continued			
Kansas			31,985
Army		30,943	
Fort Riley	30,943		
Air Force		1,042	
McConnell AFB, Wichita	1,042		
Kentucky		59,186	59,186
Army			
Fort Campbell	51,881		
Fort Knox	7,305		
Louisiana		27,299	45,948
Army			
Fort Polk	27,299		
Navy		17,266	
Naval Hospital, New Orleans	3,386		
Naval Support Activity, New Orleans	13,880		
Air Force		1,383	
Barksdale AFB, Shreveport	1,200		
England AFB, Alexandria	183		
Maine		2,952	2,952
Navy			
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery	2,817		
Naval Air Station, Brunswick	135		
Maryland		14,790	35,050
Army			
Aberdeen Proving Ground	7,472		
Fort George G. Meade	5,924		
Fort Ritchie	1,394		
Navy		12,494	
Naval Academy, Annapolis	4,034		
Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda	6,372		
Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head	1,528		
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River	560		
Air Force		3,139	
Andrews AFB, Camp Springs	3,139		
OSD		4,627	
NSA—Fort George G. Meade	4,627		
Massachusetts		3,215	3,215
Army			
Fort Devens	2,749		
Natick Laboratories	466		
Michigan		3,046	3,206
Air Force			
Kincheloe AFB, Kinross	2,430		
Wurtsmith, AFB, Oscoda	616		
OSD		160	
DSA—Defense Logistic Services Center, Battle Creek	160		
Mississippi		14,569	24,555
Navy			
Naval Air Station, Meridian	5,125		
Naval Home, Gulfport	9,444		
Air Force		9,986	
Keesler AFB, Biloxi	9,986		
Missouri		44,482	52,337
Army			
Fort Leonard Wood	44,482		
Air Force		7,855	
Richards-Gebaur AFB, Grandview	3,963		
Whiteman AFB, Knob Noster	3,892		
Montana		1,507	1,507
Air Force			
Malmstrom AFB, Great Falls	1,507		
Nebraska		617	617
Air Force			
Offutt AFB, Omaha	617		
Nevada		655	855
Air Force			
Nellis AFB, Las Vegas	655		
OSD		200	
DNA—Atomic Energy Commission Test Site	200		
New Hampshire		526	526
Air Force			
Pease AFB, Portsmouth	526		
New Jersey		8,656	10,354
Army			
Fort Monmouth	8,401		
Picatinny Arsenal	255		
Air Force		1,698	
McGuire AFB, Wrightstown	1,698		

STATE LIST

SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM APPROVED IN THE BILL (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT)—Continued

State/Service/Installation	Total (in thousands of dollars)		
	Installation	Service	State
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—Continued			
New Mexico			5,903
Army		3,843	
White Sands Missile Range	3,843		
Air Force		1,686	
Cannon AFB, Clovis	162		
Holloman AFB, Alamogordo	1,524		
OSD		374	
DNA—Kirtland AFB	374		
New York		6,244	6,530
Army			
Camp Drum	1,099		
U.S. Military Academy, West Point	5,145		
Air Force		286	
Plattsburgh AFB, Plattsburgh	286		
North Carolina		34,028	47,996
Army			
Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal	1,628		
Fort Bragg	32,400		
Navy		13,968	
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune	8,902		
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point	1,821		
Marine Corps Air Station, New River	3,245		
Ohio		11,390	12,578
Air Force			
Wright-Patterson AFB, Dayton	11,390		
OSD		1,188	
DSA—Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus	1,188		
Oklahoma		9,447	24,734
Army			
Fort Sill	9,447		
Navy		2,442	
Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester	2,442		
Air Force		12,845	
Altus AFB, Altus	1,078		
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma City	11,396		
Vance AFB, Enid	371		
Pennsylvania		1,657	4,445
Army			
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation	1,657		
Navy		180	
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia	180		
OSD		2,608	
DSA—Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg	2,048		
Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia	560		
South Carolina		2,902	8,538
Army			
Fort Jackson	2,902		
Navy		3,135	
Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston	252		
Naval Station, Charleston	177		
Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort	126		
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island	2,580		
Air Force		2,501	
Shaw AFB, Sumter	2,501		
South Dakota		514	514
Air Force			
Ellsworth AFB, Rapid City	514		
Tennessee		4,478	4,838
Navy			
Naval Air Station, Memphis	4,478		
OSD		360	
DSA—Defense Depot, Memphis	360		
Texas		33,933	75,519
Army			
Aeronautical Maintenance Center	6,284		
Fort Bliss	6,087		
Fort Hood	9,824		
Fort Sam Houston	11,738		
Navy		5,915	
Naval Air Station, Chase Field	2,875		
Naval Air Station, Kingsville	3,040		
Air Force		35,671	
Dyess AFB, Abilene	730		
Kelly AFB, San Antonio	6,101		
Lackland AFB, San Antonio	6,509		
Laughlin AFB, Del Rio	4,635		
Randolph AFB, San Antonio	1,463		

STATE LIST

SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM APPROVED IN THE BILL (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT)—Continued

State/Service/Installation	Total (in thousands of dollars)		
	Installation	Service	State
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—Continued			
Texas—Continued			
Air Force—Continued			
Reese AFB, Lubbock	4,211		
Sheppard AFB, Wichita Falls	2,753		
Webb AFB, Big Spring	3,154		
Goodfellow AFB, San Angelo	6,115		
Utah			8,593
Air Force		8,343	
Hill AFB, Ogden	8,343		
OSD		250	
DSA—Defense Depot, Ogden	250		
Virginia			78,826
Army		25,016	
Camp A. P. Hill	535		
Camp Pickett	476		
Fort Eustis	4,782		
Fort Belvoir	897		
Fort Lee	18,326		
Navy		50,654	
Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren	249		
Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck	6,531		
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek	3,211		
Naval Air Station, Norfolk	2,525		
Naval Station, Norfolk	18,183		
Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk	567		
Naval Air Station, Oceana	3,386		
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth	11,133		
Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown	1,327		
Naval Hospital, Quantico	484		
Marine Corps Air Station, Quantico	831		
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico	1,541		
Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic, Norfolk	686		
Air Force		503	
Langley AFB, Hampton	503		
OSD		2,653	
DSA—Defense General Supply Center, Richmond	2,653		
Washington			10,627
Army		8,327	
Fort Lewis	8,327		
Navy		2,300	
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton	2,300		
Wyoming			5,834
Air Force		5,834	
Francis E. Warren AFB, Cheyenne	5,834		
Various locations			216,317
Army		13,999	
Air pollution abatement	6,900		
Water pollution abatement	7,099		
Navy		191,068	
Trident facilities	112,320		
Air pollution abatement	27,636		
Water pollution abatement	51,112		
Air Force		11,250	
Air pollution abatement	3,689		
Water pollution abatement	5,381		
Satellite control facilities	192		
Strategic Air Command, various	1,000		
SRAM	988		
Classified			3,000
Army		3,000	
Classified project	3,000		
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES			
Australia			1,192
Navy		1,192	
Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth	1,192		
Bermuda			3,010
Navy		3,010	
Naval Air Station, Bermuda	3,010		
Canal Zone			9,022
Army		8,095	
Panama Area	8,095		
Air Force		927	
Howard AFB	927		

STATE LIST

SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM APPROVED IN THE BILL (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT)—Continued

State/Service/Installation	Total (in thousands of dollars)		
	Installation	Service	State
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—Continued			
Cuba			8,376
Navy		8,376	
Naval Complex, Guantanamo Bay	8,376		
Germany			25,638
Army		13,124	
Various locations	13,124		
Air Force		12,514	
Bitburg AB, Bitburg	3,936		
Sembach AB, Sembach	1,245		
Various locations	7,333		
Greece			6,322
Navy		6,101	
Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete	4,153		
Navy Support Office, Athens	1,948		
Air Force		221	
Iraklion AS	221		
Guam, Marshall Islands			9,508
Navy		9,508	
Naval Complex, Guam	9,508		
Iceland			7,447
Navy		6,092	
Naval Station, Keflavik	6,092		
Air Force		1,355	
Naval Station, Keflavik	1,355		
Italy			3,086
Navy		3,086	
Naval Air Facility, Sigonella	3,086		
Japan			417
Air Force		417	
Misawa AB	417		
Korea			6,674
Army		1,568	
Various locations	1,568		
Air Force		5,106	
Osan AB, Song Tan	4,162		
Various locations	944		
Kwajalein Island			1,029
Army		1,029	
National Missile Range	1,029		
Philippines			2,705
Navy		278	
Naval Complex, Subic Bay	278		
Air Force		2,427	
Clark AB, Angeles	2,427		
Puerto Rico			2,224
Army		517	
Fort Buchanan	517		
Navy		1,707	
Naval Complex, Puerto Rico	1,707		
Scotland			778
Navy		778	
Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell	778		
Spain			85
Navy		85	
Naval Station, Rota	85		
Turkey			800
Air Force		800	
Incirlik AS, Incirlik	800		
United Kingdom			3,788
Air Force		3,788	
RAF, Mildenhall	768		
RAF, Upper Heyford	3,020		
West Indies			1,145
Navy		1,145	
Naval Facility, Grand Turk	1,145		
Various locations			104,493
Army		99,418	
USAREUR, infrastructure	95,650		
Army Security Agency	1,434		
STRATCOM	2,334		
Navy		3,995	
Water pollution abatement	3,995		
Air Force		1,080	
Water pollution abatement	750		
Technical control facilities	330		

STATE LIST

SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM APPROVED IN THE BILL (EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT)—Continued

State/Service/Installation	Total (in thousands of dollars)		
	Installation	Service	State
OTHER ITEMS			
Planning.....			115,800
Army.....		39,000	
Navy.....		57,800	
Trident.....	10,800		
Other.....	47,000		
Air Force.....		18,000	
OSD.....		1,000	
Minor construction.....			46,000
Army.....		15,000	
Navy.....		15,000	
Air Force.....		15,000	
OSD.....		1,000	
Access roads.....			1,000
Navy.....		1,000	
Emergency construction.....			30,000
OSD.....		30,000	

AIR POLLUTION

State/Service/Installation	Total (in thousands of dollars)		
	Installation	Service	State
Alabama			\$115
Air Force		\$115	
Maxwell AFB, Montgomery	\$115		
Alaska			5,827
Army		3,227	
Fort Wainwright	3,227		
Air Force		2,600	
Eielson AFB	2,600		
California			13,891
Navy		13,891	
Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach	4,152		
Naval Air Station, North Island	227		
Navy Public Works Center, San Diego	684		
Navy Supply Center, Oakland	300		
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro	1,698		
Marine Corps Air Station, Santa Ana	344		
Florida			532
Air Force		532	
Lynn Haven Retail Distribution Station, Lynn Haven	532		
Hawaii			1,527
Navy		1,302	
Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor	1,302		
Air Force		225	
Hickam AFB, Honolulu	225		
Louisiana			350
Army		350	
Fort Polk	350		
Nevada			98
Air Force		98	
Nellis AFB, Las Vegas	98		
New Jersey			170
Navy		170	
Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle	170		
North Dakota			119
Air Force		119	
Minot AFB, Minot	119		
Pennsylvania			1,539
Navy		1,539	
Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia	1,539		
South Carolina			351
Navy		351	
Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston	351		
Tennessee			730
Army		730	
Holston Army Ammunition Plant	730		
Texas			800
Army		800	
Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant	800		
Virginia			5,101
Army		730	
Radford Army Ammunition Plant	730		
Navy		4,371	
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth	3,621		
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico	750		
Washington			6,012
Navy		6,012	
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton	6,012		
Various locations			1,063
Army		1,063	
Various	1,063		

WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT

State/Service/Installation	Total (in thousands of dollars)		
	Installation	Service	State
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES			
Alabama			\$2,229
Army		\$2,229	
Anniston Army Depot	\$2,229		
Alaska			300
Army		300	
Fort Richardson	300		
Arkansas			276
Air Force		276	
Blytheville AFB, Blytheville	276		
California			12,925
Navy		10,947	
Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach	3,242		
Naval Supply Center, San Diego	113		
Naval Station, San Diego	5,945		
Naval Air Station, Alameda	527		
Naval Supply Center, Oakland	578		
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	542		
Air Force		1,978	
Beale AFB, Marysville	1,978		
Connecticut			1,524
Navy		1,524	
Naval Submarine Base, New London	1,524		
District of Columbia			444
Navy		444	
Commandant, Naval District, Washington	444		
Florida			5,182
Navy		4,323	
Naval Fuel Depot, Jacksonville	4,095		
Naval Public Works Center, Pensacola	228		
Air Force		859	
Eglin AFB, Valparaiso	859		
Georgia			988
Army		175	
Military Ocean Terminal, Kings Bay	175		
Navy		449	
Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany	449		
Air Force		364	
Robins AFB, Warner Robins	364		
Hawaii			7,973
Navy		7,693	
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point	500		
Navy Ammunition Depot, Oahu	351		
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor	6,389		
Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor	453		
Air Force		280	
Wheeler AFB, Oahu	280		
Indiana			972
Navy		972	
Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane	972		
Kansas			178
Army		178	
Fort Leavenworth	178		
Louisiana			717
Army		717	
Fort Polk	717		
Maine			136
Air Force		136	
Charleston AFS, Charleston	136		
Maryland			304
Air Force		304	
Andrews AFB, Camp Springs	304		
Michigan			229
Air Force		229	
K. I. Sawyer AFB, Marquette	229		
Mississippi			276
Navy		276	
Naval Air Station, Meridian	276		
Nebraska			82
Air Force		82	
Offutt AFB, Omaha	82		

WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT—Continued

State/Service/Installation	Total (in thousands of dollars)		
	Installation	Service	State
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES—Continued			
Nevada.....			\$4,955
Navy.....		\$4,955	
Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne.....	\$4,955		
New Hampshire.....			197
Air Force.....		197	
Pease AFB, Portsmouth.....	197		
North Carolina.....			1,198
Navy.....		1,198	
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point.....	1,198		
Rhode Island.....			425
Navy.....		425	
Navy Public Works Center, Newport.....	425		
South Carolina.....			864
Navy.....		447	
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island.....	116		
Naval Supply Center, Charleston.....	331		
Air Force.....		417	
Myrtle Beach AFB, Myrtle Beach.....	417		
Tennessee.....			107
Navy.....		107	
Naval Air Station, Memphis.....	107		
Texas.....			66
Air Force.....		66	
Kelly AFB, San Antonio.....	66		
Virginia.....		11,423	11,423
Navy.....		11,423	
Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren.....	221		
Fleet Combat Direction System Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck.....	600		
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek.....	433		
Naval Air Station, Norfolk.....	268		
Naval Communication Station, Norfolk.....	620		
Naval Station, Norfolk.....	1,977		
Naval Supply Center, Norfolk.....	1,777		
Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk.....	325		
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth.....	3,114		
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico.....	2,088		
Washington.....			6,122
Navy.....		5,929	
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton.....	5,291		
Naval Supply Center, Bremerton.....	204		
Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport.....	434		
Air Force.....		193	
Fairchild AFB, Spokane.....	193		
Various locations.....			3,500
Army.....		3,500	
Various.....	3,500		
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES			
Guam.....			3,237
Navy.....		3,237	
Naval Complex, Guam.....	3,237		
Philippines.....			400
Air Force.....		400	
Clark AFB.....	400		
Phoenix Islands.....			350
Air Force.....		350	
Canton Island.....	350		
Puerto Rico.....			758
Navy.....		758	
Naval Complex, Puerto Rico.....	758		

Summary of the military family housing new construction approved

State, service, and installation:	<i>Number of units</i>
Arkansas:	
Air Force: Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville.....	100
California:	
Navy:	
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.....	800
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms.....	200
Naval complex, San Diego.....	325
Colorado:	
Army: Fort Carson, Colorado Springs.....	200
Florida:	
Army: Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso.....	25
Navy: Naval complex, Jacksonville.....	400
Air Force:	
Avon Park Weapons Range.....	50
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso.....	250
Hawaii:	
Army: U.S. Army installations, Oahu.....	600
Navy: Naval complex, Oahu.....	400
Air Force: Hickam Air Force Base, Oahu.....	400
Kansas:	
Army: Fort Riley.....	901
Kentucky:	
Army: Fort Campbell.....	1,000
Louisiana:	
Army: Fort Polk, Leesville.....	500
Navy: Naval complex, New Orleans.....	100
Maryland:	
Air Force: Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs.....	300
Mississippi:	
Navy:	
Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport.....	100
Naval Home, Gulfport.....	5
North Carolina:	
Army: Fort Bragg/Pope Air Force Base, Fayetteville.....	136
North Dakota:	
Air Force: Grand Forks Air Force Base.....	100
Pennsylvania:	
Army: Tobyhanna Army Depot.....	86
Navy: Naval complex, South Philadelphia.....	350
South Carolina:	
Navy: Naval complex, Charleston.....	270
Texas:	
Army:	
Fort Hood, Killeen.....	900
Red River Army Depot.....	21
Air Force: Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls.....	200
Virginia:	
Army:	
Fort Belvoir.....	700
Fort Eustis.....	300
Australia:	
DIA: Defense Attaché Office, Canberra.....	5
Iceland:	
Navy: Naval Station, Keflavik.....	150
Marianas Islands:	
Navy: Naval complex, Guam.....	510
Air Force: Andersen Air Force Base, Guam.....	300
Netherlands:	
DIA: Defense Attaché Office, The Hague.....	4
Peru:	
DIA: Defense Attaché Office, Lima.....	3
	<hr/>
	10,691

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1974

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—FEDERAL FUNDS

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, 1973 (2)	Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1974 (3)	Increase (+) or decrease(-) (4)
Family housing, Defense, Homeowners assistance fund, authorization to spend debt receipts (permanent, indefinite)-----	-0-	\$17, 443, 000	+\$17, 443, 000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES
AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1974**

Item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (6)
Military construction, Army-----	\$413, 955, 000	¹ \$664, 900, 000	\$551, 575, 000	+ \$137, 620, 000	-\$113, 325, 000
Military construction, Navy-----	517, 830, 000	685, 400, 000	587, 641, 000	+ 69, 811, 000	- 97, 759, 000
Military construction, Air Force-----	265, 552, 000	291, 900, 000	239, 702, 000	- 25, 850, 000	- 52, 198, 000
Military construction, Defense Agencies---	36, 704, 000	19, 100, 000	0	- 36, 704, 000	- 19, 100, 000
<i>Transfer, not to exceed</i> -----	<i>(20, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(20, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(20, 000, 000)</i>	-----	-----
Military construction, Army National Guard-----	40, 000, 000	35, 200, 000	35, 200, 000	- 4, 800, 000	-----

Military construction, Air National Guard.....	16, 100, 000	20, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	+ 3, 900, 000	-----
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	38, 200, 000	40, 700, 000	40, 700, 000	+2, 500, 000	-----
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	20, 500, 000	20, 300, 000	22, 900, 000	+2, 400, 000	+ 2, 600, 000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	7, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	+3, 000, 000	-----
Total, military construction.....	1, 355, 841, 000	1, 787, 500, 000	1, 507, 718, 000	+151, 877, 000	- 279, 782, 000
Family housing, Defense.....	1, 064, 046, 000	² 1, 250, 567, 000	1, 194, 539, 000	+130, 493, 000	- 56, 028, 000
Portion applied to debt reduction.....	- 96, 666, 000	- 100, 167, 000	- 100, 167, 000	- 3, 501, 000	-----
Subtotal, family housing.....	967, 380, 000	1, 150, 400, 000	1, 094, 372, 000	+126, 992, 000	- 56, 028, 000
Homeowners assistance fund, Defense.....	-----	³ 7, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	+7, 000, 000	-----
Grant total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	2, 323, 221, 000	2, 944, 900, 000	2, 609, 090, 000	+285, 869, 000	- 335, 810, 000

¹ Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$4,300,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.

H. Doc. 93-155.

² Includes \$7,000,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.

³ Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$31,100,000 requested in

