

## Calendar No. 169

109TH CONGRESS }  
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT  
{ 109-105

---

---

### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 2006

---

JULY 21, 2005.—Ordered to be printed

---

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

### REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2528]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2528) making appropriations for military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with an amendment, and an amendment to the title, and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

*Amounts in new budget authority*

Total of bill as reported to the Senate .....	\$82,984,618,000
Amount of 2005 appropriations .....	76,171,363,000
Amount of 2006 budget estimate considered by House .....	79,749,037,000
Amount of 2006 budget estimate by Senate .....	81,726,037,000
Amount of House allowance <sup>1</sup> .....	80,531,818,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
Amount of 2005 appropriations .....	+ 6,813,255,000
Amount of 2006 budget estimate .....	– 5,554,674,000
Amount of House allowance .....	– 782,781,000

<sup>1</sup> Excludes \$41,251,800,000 to be addressed in another bill.

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Background:	
Purpose of the Bill .....	4
Comparative Statement .....	4
Compliance With Section 308 of the Budget Control Act .....	4
Committee Recommendation .....	5
Overview and Summary of the Bill:	
Supporting the Defense Department Through Infrastructure .....	6
Base Closure and Realignment 2005 .....	7
Family Housing .....	8
Supporting Our Veterans Through Better Healthcare .....	8
Supporting Our Veterans Through Facilities and Research .....	9
Supporting Our Veterans Through Information Technology .....	10
Responding to the Changing Population of our Veterans .....	11
Title I—Military Construction:	
Items of Special Interest .....	12
Hearings .....	12
Central Command .....	12
Military Construction Spending Growth .....	13
Summary of Committee Recommendations .....	13
Barracks Construction .....	14
Reprogramming Guidelines .....	17
Real Property Maintenance .....	17
Military Construction, Army .....	18
Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps .....	19
Military Construction, Air Force .....	20
Military Construction, Defense-wide .....	22
Military Construction, Reserve Components .....	23
Military Construction, Army National Guard .....	24
Military Construction, Air National Guard .....	26
Military Construction, Naval Reserve .....	26
North Atlantic Treaty Organization .....	26
Family Housing Construction, Army .....	27
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Army .....	28
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps .....	29
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps .....	30
Family Housing Construction, Air Force .....	30
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Air Force .....	34
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide .....	34
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide .....	35
Family Housing Improvement Fund .....	35
Base Closure Account 1990 .....	36
Base Closure Account 2005 .....	37
Title I—General Provisions .....	39
Title II—Department of Veterans Affairs .....	41
Veterans Benefits Administration .....	43
Compensation and Pensions .....	43
Readjustment Benefits .....	44
Veterans Insurance and Indemnities .....	45
Veterans Housing Benefit Program Fund Program Account .....	45
Vocational Rehabilitation Loans Program Account .....	46
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account .....	46
Veterans Health Administration .....	47
Medical Services .....	48
Medical Administration .....	54

	Page
Title II—Department of Veterans Affairs—Continued	
Veterans Health Administration—Continued	
Information Technology .....	56
Medical Facilities .....	57
Medical and Prosthetic Research .....	58
Medical Care Cost Recovery Collections .....	60
Departmental Administration .....	60
General Operating Expenses .....	61
National Cemetery Administration .....	61
Office of the Inspector General .....	62
Construction, Major Projects .....	62
Construction, Minor Projects .....	64
Grants for Construction of State Extended Care Facilities .....	65
Grants for The Construction of State Veterans Cemeteries .....	66
Title II—General Provisions .....	67
Title III—Related Agencies .....	69
American Battle Monuments Commission:	
Salaries and Expenses .....	69
Foreign Currency Fluctuations .....	69
U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims: Salaries and Expenses .....	70
Department of Defense—Civil: Cemeterial Expenses, Army: Salaries and Expenses .....	71
Armed Forces Retirement Home .....	71
Compliance With Paragraph 7, Rule XVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	72
Compliance With Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	72
Compliance With Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	73
Military construction project listing by location .....	74

## BACKGROUND

### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies appropriation bill provides necessary funding for the planning, design, construction, alteration, and improvement of military facilities worldwide, both for Active and Reserve forces. It also finances the cost of military family housing and the U.S. share of the NATO Security Investment Program. In addition, the bill provides funding to implement base closures and realignments authorized by law. The bill provides resources to the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans benefits and care. The bill also provides funding for U.S. cemeteries and battlefield monuments both in the United States and abroad; U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims; and Armed Forces Retirement Homes.

### COMPARATIVE STATEMENT

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling \$82,984,618,000 for fiscal year 2006 military construction, family housing, base closure, veterans care and benefits, as well as related agencies. The table at the end of the report displays the Committee recommendation in comparison with the current fiscal year, and the President's fiscal year 2006 request.

### COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 308 OF THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT

Section 308(a) of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) requires that the Committee include in its report a comparison of its recommendations with levels contained in the first concurrent resolution. Appropriate data are reflected below:

## BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC.  
308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation <sup>1</sup>	Amount of bill	Committee allocation <sup>1</sup>	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the Budget Resolution for 2006: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Department of Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies:				
Discretionary .....	44,382	44,382	42,053	<sup>1</sup> 41,962
Mandatory .....	36,198	36,198	36,108	<sup>1</sup> 36,108
Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2006 .....				<sup>2</sup> 69,137
2007 .....				8,368
2008 .....				4,000
2009 .....				1,370
2010 and future years .....				832
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2006 .....	NA	646	NA	444

<sup>1</sup> Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends new fiscal year 2006 appropriations of \$82,984,618,000. This is \$7,016,575,000 over the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$1,258,581,000 above the budget request. The basis for this recommendation is contained in the following "Overview and summary of the bill," and under the discussions pertaining to each individual appropriation. Complete project detail is provided in the tables at the end of the report.

Title I of the Committee recommendation does not contain certain items addressed in the House bill, H.R. 2582. The Committee believes that it is more appropriate to fund these items as part of the Senate Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 2006, H.R. 2863. For ease of comparison, the Committee report sets forth in title I a "House allowance" as if these items had not been contained in the House passed bill.

## OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The total amount of new budget authority recommended by the Committee in this bill for fiscal year 2006 is \$82,984,618,000. The new budget authority represents an increase of \$7,016,575,000 over the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and an increase of \$1,258,581,000 over the President's budget request for fiscal year 2006. The amount of discretionary budget authority recommended by this Committee, as defined by the Budget Act of 1980, is \$46,359,000,000.

This bill makes appropriations for the Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs, and other related agencies for fiscal year 2006. It provides for military construction, family housing and base realignment and closure activities of the Defense Department. In addition, the bill includes funds for the operation of medical facilities and medical care for the Department of Veterans Affairs, as well as providing for the benefits and pensions of our Nation's veterans. This bill also provides resources for the construction and maintenance of cemeteries and monuments, both domestically and abroad, that commemorate American servicemen and women who have served and died in combat. It also provides resources for the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims and for the Armed Forces Retirement Homes.

### SUPPORTING THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT THROUGH INFRASTRUCTURE

Providing the necessary resources to the Department of Defense (the Department) to carry out its mission is a critical function of the Federal Government. This task is complicated by budgetary constraints and the Nation's changing defensive posture necessitated by the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. With this shift in the defense posture and the Global War on Terrorism, a reevaluation of the Nation's defense and the means to carry it out is essential. Given this environment, the Committee understands the importance of the funding provided to support the security of the Nation, in addition to the importance of providing the necessary tools to those tasked with defending it. The Committee has made a concerted effort to provide resources for infrastructure projects that are necessary components of the Department's mission.

While undergoing a shift in posture, the Department has also focused a considerable amount of effort analyzing the need for improvements to the force structure. The Department is modernizing its military services in an effort to equip them with the latest technology and to provide for a new construct for our forces, both of which require supporting infrastructure. The services have determined how to more effectively and efficiently structure themselves in order to respond to the new threat environment and prepare for future threats. Accompanying these broader decisions are fundamental issues that must be addressed, such as the placement of re-

sources and assets globally, as well as the centralization of armament and personnel to achieve our global security goals. This effort manifests itself in the types and locations of projects for the Department around the world, and the military construction appropriation is the nexus.

The Committee remains watchful and cautions the Department to proceed carefully as it assesses its needs in a fluid threat environment, while simultaneously conducting a war. Through the restructuring of forces and realignment of facilities, the Committee is mindful that there are many intricacies which will need strict oversight and management by the Department of Defense, as these components are interdependent. Given the Committee's limited resources, it has focused on those projects that fit into the Department's current and projected needs. Constructing a supporting infrastructure and restructuring our forces takes time and sustained effort under the best of circumstances. The Committee is aware that the Department is bearing a heavy burden and reminds the Department that a consistent and concerted decisionmaking process, and timely budgetary resources are the most critical elements to success.

#### BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT 2005

The Base Closure and Realignment Commission has initiated its review of the Defense Department's recommendations of installations to be closed or realigned as part of the Base Closure and Realignment [BRAC] 2005 process. The fiscal year 2006 military construction appropriation provides the resources not only for the previous BRAC activities, but also the first significant resources for the 2005 BRAC round, should it be approved by the President and Congress. Though it is a significant sum, totaling over \$1,500,000,000, in fact, given the work required for the 2005 round of BRAC, this is only the initial appropriation. Through the BRAC process, the Department of Defense must catalogue many acres of land, facilities and assets; identify excess property; and begin the clean up and disposal of assets determined for closure or realignment. This painstaking process is preceded by months and years of detailed work requiring permitting actions and the environmental remediation of lands, facilities and other Defense Department assets. The Committee has provided the Department the resources necessary to begin the first stage of work related to the 2005 BRAC round. The Committee is mindful of the Department's mandated 6-year timeline for the 2005 BRAC process and has provided resources which are commensurate with this timeline.

The Committee reminds the Department that, while undergoing the BRAC 2005 process, it must pay particular attention to coordinating all BRAC-related moves with the return of overseas troops during the overseas re-basing initiative. A failure to do so would most certainly jeopardize the success of the BRAC 2005 effort, in addition to creating untenable circumstances for returning troops, should there not be sufficient facilities to house and support these troops and their families. In addition, if the Department fails to plan and secure sufficient resources to construct the necessary supporting base infrastructure in a timely fashion, this too shall lead to a failure of both the BRAC 2005 round and the re-basing effort,

something which the Committee will not permit. Therefore, the Committee looks forward to continuing this joint effort with the Department to provide the necessary resources in a timely fashion and to streamline the resources and measures to maximize the efforts of all concerned to make the 2005 BRAC round as successful as its predecessors.

#### FAMILY HOUSING

At a time of war when those who serve our country are called to combat, the Department and the Congress must provide the resources to support not only our military but also the military family. This is a responsibility the Committee takes very seriously because of the sacrifice that service members make when joining the military, as it impacts the lives of not only the troops but their families. After accounts of acquisition and contractor missteps throughout the modern history of the Department of Defense, the Committee wants to highlight one of the successes of the Federal Government: privatization of military family housing. The Committee continues to strongly believe in the importance of this program for it provides for a quality of life not previously possible for both our troops and their families given Federal budget constraints.

The Department is to be commended for utilizing the private sector in a manner that improves the daily lives of Department personnel, while maximizing limited resources, merely through innovative thinking and inventive Federal contracting. The Committee believes that this approach has provided benefits both in terms of savings and in the quality of life for military families. The Committee encourages the Department to continue its efforts in this arena. Therefore, the Committee has provided the necessary resources requested by the Department for family housing appropriations for fiscal year 2006 and looks forward to the continuing success of this program.

#### SUPPORTING OUR VETERANS THROUGH BETTER HEALTHCARE

After decades with a reputation as the healthcare provider of last resort for indigent and struggling veterans, the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA] has successfully reformed its healthcare system to become a provider of world-class care for our Nation's veterans. The VA has assembled a first-class cadre of healthcare providers, be they doctors, nurses, or administrative personnel, who believe in the importance of caring for our Nation's veterans. This dedication and determination is a large part of the VA's success in healthcare delivery. The Committee will continue to place the utmost importance on providing the necessary resources to the VA personnel who carry out this very important mission.

The Committee remains frustrated by successive administrations' under-budgeting for veterans' healthcare and the reliance on the Congress to bridge the gap between what is requested to fulfill the Nation's responsibility to veterans and what is actually needed. As a result of this cycle, in fiscal year 2005, the VA experienced a significant budgetary shortfall within the healthcare system half-way through the fiscal year; current Committee estimates total over \$1,000,000,000. It is evident that the same crisis will occur in fiscal

year 2006 unless Congress provides additional resources. The Committee remains very concerned that if these trends in under-budgeting and the reliance on budgetary gimmicks continue, it will be to the detriment of our veterans and will erode all of the remarkable healthcare successes the VA has achieved. The Committee and the Congress remain steadfast that the VA healthcare system will not be jeopardized due to inadequate budgets, particularly at a time when the VA is being called upon to care for a new population of veterans: those returning from Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom [OEF/OIF]. In addition, veterans already in the system are recognizing the quality of care provided by the VA and are relying increasingly on the VA for their regular healthcare needs.

A significant factor contributing to the VA's budgetary shortfall is the reliance on outdated models that did not take into account the thousands of service members returning from OEF/OIF. Therefore, the Committee strongly encourages the VA to update its models and replace them with costing models that account for the new demographic and geographic changes in veteran population concentrations that our Nation has experienced as a result of the Global War on Terrorism. Though this new group of veterans is small, relative to the overall veteran population, it is driving a substantial portion of the increased costs the VA is experiencing. The Committee strongly believes that the administration must budget for these lifecycle costs associated with combat actions within the same rubric of resources provided to the Department of Defense. These costs should not be considered separate from the resources requested to carry out the war itself.

In order to maintain the VA's current healthcare system, the Committee believes it is not sufficient to provide the minimum amount of resources needed by the VA. By providing the Department of Veterans Affairs minimal funding, the Federal Government will not be able to maintain the facilities in which we have already invested. The VA is at the forefront of providing specialized medical care to the Nation's veterans, and the Committee remains dedicated to the promise to provide care to those who have already given so much to the Nation.

The Committee is pleased that the VA is turning to efficient and innovative ideas such as the mail-in prescription drug program. Given the current budgetary constraints, the VA will continually be challenged to provide care in a more efficient and cost-effective manner.

The Committee commends the VA for the work that it does and the care it provides to our Nation's veteran population. VA personnel are the crucial link enabling the Nation to repay our veterans for the sacrifices they have made in defending our freedom.

#### SUPPORTING OUR VETERANS THROUGH FACILITIES AND RESEARCH

Mental healthcare is rapidly becoming one of the most critical needs of our Nation's veterans. Many veterans, particularly those returning from Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, are experiencing Post Traumatic Stress Disorder [PTSD] at an alarmingly increasing rate. Many illnesses and diseases are being

categorized as Gulf War Illness Syndrome when the medical community cannot definitively determine a cause.

The Committee was very disappointed to see that the administration's request for research funds was less than the previous fiscal year's request. The areas of mental health, PTSD, and the overall Gulf War Illness research are uncovering issues that must be confronted, so much so that it is imperative research be stepped up to try to find more effective treatment as quickly as possible. Nothing is more important to the Committee than the health of our veterans, as well as providing benefit services to our compensable, service-disabled veterans.

To this end, the Committee has increased the appropriation level dedicated to research over and above the administration's request. In addition, the Committee has directed the VA to establish a center specifically dedicated to Gulf War Illness research and to dedicate a medical center as a "Mental Health Center of Excellence" so that it can concentrate all of the best resources and care into a national center that will make more rapid advances and will lead our Nation in this field.

The Committee also encourages the VA to establish additional "Centers of Excellence" for other medical specialties, to concentrate resources and capabilities into nationally recognized highly specialized treatment centers.

The Committee was disappointed to see the administration did not request an appropriation for the construction of State extended care facilities. The Committee does not agree with the "pause" in the construction grants. Securing these facilities for our most needy veterans is a top priority of the Committee and as such, the Committee provided funds at the fiscal year 2005 level.

#### SUPPORTING OUR VETERANS THROUGH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The development of Information Technology [IT] systems to make the medical care system more efficient is a goal of the VA and the Committee. In these times of scarce resources, it is even more important to use the taxpayers' funds in the most efficient way possible. The Committee is concerned that in its present structure, the VA is not doing this. There is not any one office with the authority to oversee and manage the entire VA technology budget or processes. This fragmentation is inefficient and non-productive. Too many Government agencies fail in their IT endeavors for this reason alone. The Committee will not allow the VA to go down this path, doomed for failure.

Therefore, the Committee recommendation creates an Information Technology account and directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reorganize the Department so that one office has the authority to manage the entire IT portfolio for the VA. In this scenario, a trained IT project management professional will oversee the IT needs of the entire Department and ensure that a coordinated and systematic IT effort is the most efficient use of these dollars.

The HealtheVet project is an idea that has the potential to revolutionize health care for our veterans, but the VA is not in a position at this time to effectively use the funds requested for such a massive IT endeavor. The Committee has restricted the use of IT

funds for this project until such time that the VA's IT portfolio management process matures to a level that can take on this project with a predictable chance of success.

#### RESPONDING TO THE CHANGING POPULATION OF OUR VETERANS

In the current Global War on Terrorism, our Nation has mobilized Guard and Reserve forces at a level we have not experienced in decades. These forces are joining the regular forces on the front lines and are enduring the same injuries and trauma. Entire sections of our country have had Guard and Reserve forces mobilized at once. As a result, when these units are demobilized, they are returning to areas not traditionally associated with needing high concentrations of VA medical care. Our Nation is committed to providing the best medical care possible to our returning veterans. As a result, the VA has to contract medical services at a rate that was never predicted, and at a cost never before imagined. The VA does not have a model to prepare it for this geographic shift in potential healthcare needs.

In response to this increasing need for healthcare in areas not anticipated, the Committee directs the VA to reexamine the need to consolidate and realign facilities. The Committee believes that the VA should take another hard look at the healthcare needs of our veterans and the facilities needed to deliver these services before making large infrastructure changes.

## TITLE I—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs held three hearings related to the fiscal year 2006 Military Construction budget request. On March 8, 2005, the subcommittee heard testimony from representatives of the Department of Defense (the Department) and the United States Navy concerning fiscal year 2006 budget priorities, base realignment and closure [BRAC], and the impending restructuring of United States military facilities overseas. On March 16, 2005, the subcommittee held a hearing on the budget requests of the United States Army and United States Air Force. On June 28, 2005, the subcommittee held a hearing for the purpose of receiving the report of the Commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States, commonly known as the Overseas Basing Commission, at which it received testimony from the Overseas Basing Commission and the Departments of Defense and State.

#### CENTRAL COMMAND

Over the past several years, as the United States has prosecuted the Global War on Terrorism, there has been a substantial increase in the U.S. presence in the Central Command [CENTCOM] Area of Responsibility [AOR]. As a part of this increased presence, the footprint of U.S. military installations in the AOR has subsequently expanded to sustain a much greater number of forward-deployed personnel. This rapid change in posture has led to a considerable increase in military construction in the region and likewise to an increased burden on the United States to fund military construction in CENTCOM.

Emerging requirements have been funded largely through emergency supplemental spending bills in recent years. However, the requirements in CENTCOM have now reached a sufficient level of maturity to facilitate a master basing plan for the region. Previously, the Committee urged CENTCOM to take this action and encourages the continued development of a long-term plan. With the progress in its planning, CENTCOM now has context within which to implement its military construction projects. As such, it should now be able to budget within the regular budget and appropriations process, and projects with long-term implications should be included in future budget requests to be authorized and appropriated in the regular order. For instance, in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13), the Air Force requested \$75,500,000 for the first phase of an aerial port facility

at Ali Al Salem Air Base, Kuwait. With a total cost of almost \$500,000,000 spanning several phases of construction, this aerial port is a long-term investment of the United States Government rather than an emergency requirement. While the Committee fully supports this project and the concept behind it, it was not able to fund the project as part of an emergency spending bill because the project clearly is a major undertaking that will anchor U.S. presence in the region for many years. It should be considered in the regular order so its part in our military posture can be properly understood.

The Committee urges the Office of the Secretary of Defense to consider CENTCOM construction requests, as they evolve, within its normal budgeting process as it would consider the requests of any other Command. Likewise, as Central Command increases its construction activity both in theater and at its headquarters at MacDill Air Force Base, FL, it is commensurately important that the Command fully develop its construction requirements before seeking an appropriation. Recognizing the enormous burden borne by CENTCOM and the tremendous growth it has undergone in the short period of time since September 11, 2001, the Committee believes it is important, as CENTCOM transitions to a more sustained budgeting approach, to focus on improving budgeting fidelity.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION SPENDING GROWTH

While the budget of the Department of Defense [DOD] has grown dramatically in recent years, the growth of the military construction and family housing budget has failed to keep pace, persisting as a very small portion of the Department's overall budget. In fact, during the period of the most precipitous rise in DOD's budget, fiscal years 2002 through 2004, the military construction and family housing budget actually declined as a percentage of the overall budget. It dropped to roughly 2.5 percent of the DOD budget until the current request, which, at 3 percent, is inflated by a substantial addition for expenses related to the 2005 round of Base Realignment and Closure.

The current backlog of unfunded military construction requirements will only grow more severe as troops return to the United States from installations overseas and are reorganized through Army modularity and in BRAC. While the Committee supports the transformation ongoing in the Defense Department, particularly the return to the United States of troops from overseas, a greater commitment to military construction is needed. The Department of Defense must make a substantially larger investment in its infrastructure in the near term to ensure adequate support of the troops, families, and communities of which it asks so much.

#### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 reflects an increase of \$1,944,361,000 from the amount enacted in fiscal year 2005.

The Committee recommends \$12,116,611,000, equal to the fiscal year 2006 budget request.

BARRACKS CONSTRUCTION

The fiscal year 2006 budget request includes \$1,132,335,000 to construct or modernize 38 barracks projects.

The Committee recommends \$1,107,623,000 for 39 barracks construction projects in fiscal year 2006, a decrease of \$24,712,000 from the budget request.

BARRACKS CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Service	Installation	Project title	Budget request	Committee recommendation
Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	Special Operations Command Lodging Facility	14,900	14,900
Alaska	Air Force	Clear AFS	Dormitory (100 Rm)	20,000	20,000
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Barracks Complex	33,560	33,560
Arizona	Air Force	Luke AFB	Dormitory (144 Rm)	13,000	13,000
California	Air National Guard	Fresno Yosemite JAP ARS	Alert Crew Quarters Facility	3,000	3,000
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	BEQ—Headquarters	19,620	19,620
California	Navy	North Island	BEQ—Shipboard Ashore Privatization	13,700	13,700
Colorado	Army	Fort Carson	Barracks Complex	25,522	25,522
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Dormitory (144 Rm)	13,000	13,000
Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Dormitory (120 Rm)	9,000	9,000
Florida	Navy	Mayport	BEQ—Homeport Ashore	7,820	7,820
Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Barracks Complex	37,566	37,566
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Barracks Complex (Phase 1)	48,000	48,000
Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes	Barracks	38,720	38,720
Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes	Barracks	33,840	33,840
Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Barracks Complex (Increment 2)	24,650	24,650
Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Barracks Complex—52nd St	49,575	49,575
Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Barracks Complex—Glider Rd	43,000	43,000
Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Trainee Barracks—Complex 1 (Increment 2)	21,000	21,000
Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Student Dormitory (300 Rm)	30,100	30,100
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Barracks Complex—10300 Block (Increment 1)	38,500	38,500
New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara Falls JAP	Visiting Quarters	9,200	9,200
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex—3rd Brigade (Increment 1)	50,000	50,000
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex (Increment 1)	35,600	35,600
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex (Increment 2)	30,611	30,611
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex—2nd Brigade (Increment 1)	32,000	32,000
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	BEQ—Camp Johnson	20,340	20,340
Ohio	Air National Guard	Camp Perry ANG Station	Replace Troop Training Quarters	4,700	4,700
Texas	Army	Fort Sam Houston	Renovate Barracks Wings And Battalion Command Area	7,000	7,000
Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Student Dormitory (300 Rm)	33,000	33,000
Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Barracks Complex-North Fort	49,949	49,949
Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Barracks Complex	50,000	50,000
Washington	Navy	Everett	BEQ—Homeport Ashore (Increment 1)	49,950	49,950
Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Barracks Complex	40,000	40,000

**BARRACKS CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS—Continued**  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Location	Service	Installation	Project title	Budget request	Committee recommendation
Germany	Army	Wiseck	Barracks Complex (Phase 2)	13,600	13,600
Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Dormitory (382 Rm)	44,100	37,388
Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Dormitory (156 Rm)	21,750	20,750
Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	28,000	25,000
Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	45,637	38,637
Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	40,525	35,525
Total				1,132,335	1,107,623
Army Total				737,295	729,295
Navy Total				183,990	170,290
Air Force Total				198,850	191,138
Air National Guard Total				3,000	7,700
Air Force Reserve Total				9,200	9,200

## REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The following guidelines apply for all military construction and family housing project reprogrammings. A project or account (including the sub-elements of an account) which has been specifically reduced by the Congress in acting on the budget request is considered to be a congressional interest item and as such, a prior approval is required. Accordingly, no reprogrammings to an item specifically reduced below the threshold by the Congress are permitted.

The reprogramming criteria that apply to military construction projects (25 percent of the funded amount or \$2,000,000, whichever is less) continue to apply to new housing construction projects and to improvements over \$2,000,000. To provide the individual services the flexibility to proceed with construction contracts without disruption or delay, the costs associated with environmental hazard remediation such as asbestos removal, radon abatement, lead-based paint removal or abatement, and any other legislated environmental hazard remediation may be excluded, provided that such remediation requirements could not be reasonably anticipated at the time of the budget submission. This exclusion applies to projects authorized in the budget year and also to projects authorized in prior years for which construction has not been completed.

Furthermore, in instances where a prior approval to a reprogramming request for a project or account has been received from the Committee, the adjusted amount approved becomes the new base for any future increase or decrease via below-threshold reprogrammings (provided that the project or account is not a congressional interest item as defined above).

## REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE

The Committee recommends a continuation of the following general rules for repairing a facility under "Operation and Maintenance" account funding:

- Components of the facility may be repaired by replacement, and such replacement may be up to current standards or code.
- Interior arrangements and restorations may be included as repair, but additions, new facilities, and functional conversions must be performed as military construction projects.
- Such projects may be done concurrent with repair projects, as long as the final conjunctively funded project is a complete and usable facility.
- The appropriate Service Secretary shall submit a 21-day notification prior to carrying out any repair project with an estimated cost in excess of \$7,500,000.

The Department is directed to continue to report on the real property maintenance backlog at all installations for which there is a requested construction project in future budget requests. This information is to be provided on Form 1390. In addition, for all troop housing requests, the Form 1391 is to continue to show all real property maintenance conducted in the past 2 years and all future requirements for unaccompanied housing at that installation.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$1,962,108,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	1,479,841,000
House allowance .....	1,652,552,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,640,641,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The military construction appropriation for the Army provides for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army. This appropriation also provides for facilities required as well as funds for infrastructure projects and programs required to support bases and installations around the world.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,640,641,000 for the Army for fiscal year 2006. This amount is \$321,467,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$160,800,000 above the budget request. Further detail of the Committee's recommendation is provided in the State table at the end of this report.

## ARMY MODULARITY

The Army has embarked on an ambitious plan to "modularize" its force in order to more efficiently organize itself and thus more effectively fight the Global War on Terrorism. While the military construction needed to accompany this reorganization will be substantial, the Army military construction budget request for fiscal year 2006 is down 16 percent, at \$1,479,841,000 compared to \$1,771,285,000 requested in fiscal year 2005.

Modularity is intertwined with two other initiatives currently underway that will also significantly impact Army installations: the 2005 round of Base Realignment and Closure and the return of troops from overseas to installations in the United States. These two major troop movements will facilitate modularity by allowing modular brigades to be made whole by troops who will come from other installations both overseas and inside the United States.

The Army has tried various budgetary approaches to meet the immediate needs of its modularity initiative, including its request of funds for temporary facilities in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109-13). While the Committee supported this funding and supports Army modularity, it is imperative that the Army begin investing in infrastructure to support the permanent stationing of its troops. This will require a dramatic increase in the Army military construction budget over the near term.

*Barracks, Camp Humphreys, Korea.*—Due to a favorable bid environment in Korea in recent years, every barracks project undertaken by the Army within the past 5 fiscal years at Camp Humphreys has resulted in savings from the appropriated amount, with an overall average savings of 21 percent, and average savings of 28 percent in fiscal year 2004, the most recent year in which similar

projects were appropriated. The Committee anticipates this favorable trend will continue. For this reason, the Committee has reduced the appropriation below the request for three barracks projects at Camp Humphreys.

The Committee fully expects contracts for the following projects to be awarded, as early in fiscal year 2006 as practical:

*Biggs Gate, Fort Bliss, TX.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$137,000 be made available for design of this facility and urges the Army to include this project in its Future Years Defense Plan [FYDP].

*Company Operations Facility, Camp Rudder, Eglin Air Force Base, FL.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,500,000 be made available for the construction of this facility.

*Dome Housing, Kwajalein Atoll.*—In congressional testimony this year, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) indicated the budget was on track to eliminate all substandard housing worldwide by 2009. It does not appear that Kwajalein Atoll is included in this assessment.

Kwajalein Atoll provides critical support to the Space and Missile Defense Command as a missile test and space surveillance facility. The facilities on the Atoll are subjected to fierce weather conditions and are aging to a point where many are uninhabitable. Many of the residents of the Atoll live in 1960-era trailers that have fallen victim to the harsh environment. The trailers are long past their service life, and annual cost to maintain these structures exceeds \$5,000 per unit. These trailers are no longer cost-effective to maintain and are consequently being condemned. The Command expects to run out of housing for the residents before sufficient replacements can be constructed.

Of the funds provided for unspecified minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,500,000 be made available for continued replacement of these 1960-era trailers with dome housing consistent with recent housing upgrades.

Further, the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committee no later than December 1, 2005, detailing the timeline for the replacement of substandard housing on Kwajalein Atoll.

*Heavy Equipment Transport Access Road, Fort Knox, KY.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,300,000 be made available for the construction of this road.

*Storage Tank Facility, Godman Airfield, Fort Knox, KY.*—Of the funds provided for unspecified minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,200,000 be made available for construction of this facility.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

(INCLUDING RECESSION OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$1,180,397,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	1,029,249,000
House allowance .....	1,109,177,000
Committee recommendation (including rescission) .....	953,528,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The military construction appropriation for the Navy and Marine Corps provides for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy and the Marine Corps. This appropriation also provides for facilities required as well as funds for infrastructure projects and programs required to support bases and installations around the world.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$953,528,000 for Navy and Marine Corps military construction for fiscal year 2006. This amount is \$226,869,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$75,721,000 below the budget request. Further detail of the Committee's recommendation is provided in the State table at the end of this report.

NAVY BUDGET REQUEST

Rather than request the full amount needed to execute its fiscal year 2006 military construction projects, the Navy knowingly and systematically requested smaller appropriations for many projects than were necessary to execute them. The Committee has acquiesced to the Navy's wishes in this regard, providing the Navy with the exact appropriation it requested for each funded military construction project.

The Navy also identified \$92,354,000 in savings from past military construction appropriations and presumed to reserve these previously appropriated funds to obligate against fiscal year 2006 military construction projects which were deemed a priority solely by the Navy. The Committee is concerned about the precedent this would set. While the Committee commends the Navy for identifying savings in its program, it is clear that decisions regarding the expenditure of funds by the United States Government are the responsibility of Congress, not the Navy. Moreover, the Navy currently has an avenue to request savings be reallocated, a prior approval reprogramming, not by knowingly requesting an insufficient budget in attempt to tie the hands of Congress in the budget decision process. Thus, the Committee recommends rescission of these savings and encourages the Navy to request the full amount needed to fund its requirements in future years.

The Committee fully expects a contract for the following project to be awarded, as early in fiscal year 2006 as practical:

*Regional Training Center, Everett Naval Base, WA.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$600,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$844,531,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	1,069,640,000
House allowance .....	1,171,338,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,209,128,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The military construction appropriation for the Air Force provides for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force. This appropriation also provides for facilities required as well as funds for infrastructure projects and programs required to support bases and installations around the world.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,209,128,000 for the Air Force in fiscal year 2006. This amount is \$364,597,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$139,488,000 above the budget request. Further detail of the Committee's recommendation is provided in the State table at the end of this report.

*Dormitories, Kunsan Air Base and Osan Air Base, Korea.*—Much like Army barracks construction in Korea in recent years, Air Force dormitory projects undertaken within the past 5 fiscal years at Kunsan and Osan Air Bases in Korea have resulted in significant savings from the appropriated amount. The average savings has been 20 percent over that period, increasing to 31 percent over the past 2 fiscal years. The Committee anticipates this favorable trend will continue. For this reason, the Committee has reduced the appropriation below the request for one dormitory project at Kunsan Air Base and one dormitory project at Osan Air Base.

The Committee fully expects contracts for the following projects to be awarded, as early in fiscal year 2006 as practical:

*Base Chapel, Eielson Air Force Base, AK.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,196,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

*Kennel Facility, Hickham Air Force Base, HI.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,480,000 be made available for the construction of this facility.

*Library & Education Center, Andrews Air Force Base, MD.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,188,000 be made available for the design of this structure. The Committee also urges the Air Force to fund the initial phase of this project in its fiscal year 2007 budget request. Completion of this project will avoid further delay in providing professional military education to deploying Guardsmen and Reservists. Qualifying airmen must complete professional military education courses prior to deployment to avoid delaying scheduled promotions until their return. Professional military education courses are not available upon deployment, and, in this environment of increased operational tempo, the existing facility lacks sufficient space to accommodate seminars needed to provide these courses.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$663,318,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	1,042,730,000
House allowance .....	976,664,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,072,165,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The military construction appropriation for the Department of Defense provides for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property Defense-wide. This appropriation also provides for facilities required as well as funds for infrastructure projects and programs required to support bases and installations around the world.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,072,165,000 for projects considered within the "Defense-wide" account. This amount is \$408,847,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$29,435,000 above the budget request. Further detail of the Committee's recommendation is provided in the State table at the end of this report.

The Committee fully expects contracts for the following projects to be awarded, as early in fiscal year 2006 as possible:

*Integrated Office Building, Joint Systems Manufacturing Center, Lima, OH.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$522,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

*Special Operations Forces, Special Boat Team Operations Support Facility, Naval Base Coronado, CA.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$990,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

## MEDICAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The fiscal year 2006 budget request includes \$223,820,000 for 12 major construction projects, equal to the Committee recommendation.

## MEDICAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Service	Installation	Project title	Budget request	Committee recommendation
California .....	Defense-wide ...	Beale AFB .....	Clinic Addition/Alteration .....	18,000	18,000
California .....	Defense-wide ...	NMC San Diego.	Patient Parking Facility .....	15,000	15,000
Colorado .....	Defense-wide ...	Peterson AFB ...	Life Skills Support Center .....	1,820	1,820
Maryland .....	Defense-wide ...	Fort Detrick .....	Joint Medical Logistics Center .....	34,000	34,000
Maryland .....	Defense-wide ...	USUHS Bethesda.	Academic Program Center Grad School Nursing Addition.	10,350	10,350
Maryland .....	Defense-wide ...	Fort Detrick .....	USAMRIID Sterilization Plant .....	21,200	21,200
Mississippi .....	Defense-wide ...	Keesler AFB .....	Surgery Suite Addition/Alteration ...	14,000	14,000
Nevada .....	Defense-wide ...	Nellis AFB .....	Bio Environmental Engineering Facility Replacement.	1,700	1,700
South Carolina .....	Defense-wide ...	Charleston .....	Consolidated Medical Clinic .....	35,000	35,000

MEDICAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Service	Installation	Project title	Budget request	Committee recommendation
Texas .....	Defense-wide ...	Lackland AFB ..	Veterinary Medical Facility Replacement.	11,000	11,000
Virginia .....	Defense-wide ...	Fort Belvoir .....	Hospital Replacement (Phase 2) ....	57,000	57,000
Bahrain .....	Defense-wide ...	Bahrain .....	Medical Clinic Addition/Alteration ..	4,750	4,750
Total .....	.....	.....	.....	223,820	223,820

CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has provided \$10,000,000 for the Secretary of Defense “Contingency Construction” account in accordance with the budget request. This account provides funds which may be used by the Secretary of Defense for unforeseen facility requirements. The Committee believes the funding provided in the account is adequate to meet the needs of the Department.

*Renewable Energy Assessment.*—On March 14, 2005, the Department of Defense submitted to Congress a short- and long-term strategy to increase DOD’s use of renewable energy. The Committee originally requested this assessment in the report accompanying the fiscal year 2002 Military Construction Appropriation Bill in response to severe energy shortages in California and heightened national security concerns over the vulnerability of conventional fuel supplies and power delivery systems. The Defense Department remains the largest electricity consumer in the Nation. Steep escalations in the price of oil, and continued concerns over the security of the Nation’s fuel supply sources, transmission lines, and power supply system, validate the need for a strategy to increase DOD’s ability to draw on renewable energy resources. The Committee supports the findings of the Renewable Energy Assessment and directs the Secretary of Defense to pursue the Implementation Plan included in the Assessment, and to report to the Committee no later than March 31, 2006, on the steps the Department has taken to execute the Implementation Plan.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The Committee recommends the full budget request of \$60,000,000 for the Energy Conservation Investment Program [ECIP]. The Committee maintains a strong interest in renewable energy resources, including wind, solar, and geothermal, and commends the services for the awards they have received for renewable energy initiatives, including the Presidential Awards for Leadership in Federal Energy Management.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, RESERVE COMPONENTS

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$958,441,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	722,831,000
House allowance .....	930,849,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,018,315,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The military construction appropriation for Reserve Components provides for acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Reserve Components. This appropriation also provides for facilities required as well as funds for infrastructure projects and programs required to support bases and installations.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,018,315,000 for military construction projects for the Guard and Reserve Components. This amount is \$59,874,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$295,484,000 above the budget request. The Committee believes funding for the Reserve Components falls woefully short of requirements, particularly in the face of the extensive demands made on the Guard and Reserve in the current war effort. Accordingly, the Committee recommends significant increases to Reserve Component funding. Further detail of the Committee's recommendation is provided in the State table at the end of this report.

The Committee recommends approval of military construction, Reserve Component, as outlined in the following table:

## RESERVE COMPONENT

Component	Budget request	Committee recommendation
Army National Guard .....	\$327,012,000	\$467,146,000
Air National Guard .....	165,256,000	279,156,000
Army Reserve .....	106,077,000	136,077,000
Naval Reserve .....	45,226,000	46,676,000
Air Force Reserve .....	79,260,000	89,260,000
Total .....	722,831,000	1,018,315,000

The Committee has added funding for specific Reserve Component planning and design initiatives. The Committee recommendation also provides additional funding over the budget request for minor construction activities for the Reserve Components.

The Committee fully expects contracts for the following projects to be awarded, as early in fiscal year 2006 as practical:

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

*126th Medevac, Resurface Pavement, Mather Air Force Base, CA.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,350,000 be made available for this project.

*Antiterrorism/Force Protection Upgrade, Camp Rapid, SD.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,498,000 be made available for the construction of these upgrades.

*Armory Addition/Alteration, Gassaway, WV.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,500,000 be made available for the construction of this addition.

*Army Aviation Support Facility Addition/Alteration, New Castle, DE.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,080,000 be made available for the design of this facility.

*Combined Support Maintenance Shop, Fort Chaffee, AR.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$400,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

*Eastern Army Aviation Training Site—Technical Training and Aircraft Maintenance Facility, Fort Indiantown Gap, PA.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$2,900,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

*Field Maintenance Shop, Bethel, AK.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$441,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

*Joint Forces Headquarters, Salem, OR.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$941,000 be made available for the design of this facility.

*Range Improvements, Camp Dawson, WV.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,500,000 be made available for the construction of these range improvements.

*Readiness Center Addition/Alteration, Kodiak, AK.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,500,000 be made available for the construction of this facility.

*Readiness Center, Logan County, WV.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$800,000 be made available for the design of this facility.

*Readiness Center, Miles City, MT.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$440,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

*Readiness Center/Organizational Maintenance Shop, Middletown, IA.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,057,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

*Regional Training Institute, Camp Dawson, WV.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$2,000,000 be made available for the design of these facilities.

*Replace Aircraft Maintenance Hangar and Shops, March Air Reserve Base, CA.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$960,000 be made available for the design of these structures.

*Replace Vehicle Maintenance Complex, Fresno Yosemite International Airport, CA.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$340,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

*Troop Medical Clinic Addition, Camp Shelby, MS.*—Of the funds provided for unspecified minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$849,000 be made available for this project.

*Unit Training and Equipment Site Addition, Camp Grafton, ND.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this ac-

count, the Committee directs that \$197,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

*Unit Warm Storage, Camp Denali, AK.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,100,000 be made available for the construction of this facility.

*Upgrade/Harden Perimeter, Camp Grafton, ND.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$870,000 be made available for the hardening of this facility's perimeter.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

*C-5 Beddown, Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport, Martinsburg, WV.*—The Committee continues to support the timely execution of the C-5 beddown and has included an additional \$17,000,000 for expenses associated with restoration and repair of the existing runway. This is an additional requirement which was recently identified and does not eliminate the need for fully funding the planned fiscal year 2007 C-5 project to Upgrade/Extend Runway and Taxiways associated with that project.

*Poor Farm Road Land Purchase, Burlington, VT.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$1,500,000 be made available for the purchase of this land.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

*Aircraft Rescue Firefighting Facility, Joint Reserve Base, Naval Air Station, New Orleans, LA.*—Of the funds provided for minor construction in this account, the Committee directs that \$750,000 be made available for the construction of this facility.

*Joint Ground Support Equipment Complex, Joint Reserve Base, Naval Air Station, Fort Worth, TX.*—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the Committee directs that \$300,000 be made available for the design of this structure.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$160,800,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	206,858,000
House allowance .....	206,858,000
Committee recommendation .....	206,858,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] appropriation provides for the U.S. cost-share of the NATO Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the NATO Treaty Area.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$206,858,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] Security Investment Program for fis-

cal year 2006, fully funding the budget request. This amount is \$46,058,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

The Committee continues the requirement that no funds will be used for projects (including planning and design) related to the enlargement of NATO and the Partnership for Peace program, unless Congress is notified 21 days in advance of the obligation of funds. In addition, the Committee's intent is that section 121 of the General Provisions of this title shall apply to this program.

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

The Committee continues to direct that none of the funds appropriated in this, or any other Act, for the NATO Security Investment Program be obligated or expended for missile defense studies.

FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Committee recommends \$4,133,683,000 for family housing construction, operations and maintenance, and the Department's family housing improvement fund. This amount is \$108,486,000 below the fiscal year 2006 budget request but \$59,080,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2005.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$615,099,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	549,636,000
House allowance .....	549,636,000
Committee recommendation .....	549,636,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The family housing appropriation for the Army provides for expenses of family housing for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration. This appropriation provides for the financing of all costs for construction, improvements and leasing of all Army housing. In addition to quality of life enhancements, the program contains initiatives to reduce operating costs and conserve energy by upgrading or replacing facilities which can be made more efficient through relatively modest investments in improvements. The Department of Defense is authorized to use limited partnerships, make direct and guaranteed loans, and convey Department-owned property to stimulate the private sector to increase the availability of affordable, quality housing for the Army.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$549,636,000 for family housing construction, Army, in fiscal year 2006, which is equal to the budget request. This amount is \$65,463,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends \$231,700,000 for new construction, as shown below:

## ARMY FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Installation	Project title	Budget request	Committee recommendation
Alaska .....	Fort Richardson .....	Family Housing Replacement Construction (117 Units).	49,000	49,000
Alaska .....	Fort Wainwright .....	Family Housing Replacement Construction (96 Units).	49,000	49,000
Alaska .....	Fort Wainwright .....	Family Housing Replacement Construction (84 Units).	42,000	42,000
Arizona .....	Fort Huachuca .....	Family Housing Replacement Construction (131 Units).	31,000	31,000
Arizona .....	Yuma .....	Family Housing Replacement Construction (35 Units).	11,200	11,200
Oklahoma .....	Fort Sill .....	Family Housing Replacement Construction (129 Units).	24,000	24,000
Virginia .....	Fort Lee .....	Family Housing Replacement Construction (96 Units).	19,500	19,500
Virginia .....	Fort Monroe .....	Family Housing Replacement Construction (21 Units).	6,000	6,000
<b>Total</b> .....	.....	.....	<b>231,700</b>	<b>231,700</b>

## CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

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

## ARMY CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Installation	Project title	Budget request	Committee recommendation
Arizona .....	Fort Huachuca .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	9,000	9,000
California .....	Fort Irwin .....	Family Housing Privatization .....	28,000	28,000
Georgia .....	Fort McPherson .....	Family Housing Privatization .....	11,000	11,000
Kansas .....	Fort Riley .....	Family Housing Privatization .....	67,000	67,000
Kentucky .....	Fort Campbell .....	Family Housing Privatization .....	28,000	28,000
New Mexico .....	White Sands .....	Family Housing Privatization .....	4,000	4,000
New York .....	U.S. Military Academy ..	Family Housing Improvements .....	6,700	6,700
Virginia .....	Fort Lee .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	13,600	13,600
Germany .....	Ansbach .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	9,000	9,000
Germany .....	Garmisch .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	5,000	5,000
Germany .....	Stuttgart .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	23,000	23,000
Germany .....	Stuttgart .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	17,500	17,500
Germany .....	Stuttgart .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	4,700	4,700
Germany .....	Vilseck .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	11,400	11,400
Germany .....	Wiesbaden .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	13,800	13,800
Germany .....	Wiesbaden .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	15,500	15,500
Germany .....	Wiesbaden .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	20,000	20,000
Germany .....	Wiesbaden .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	13,200	13,200
<b>Total</b> .....	.....	.....	<b>300,400</b>	<b>300,400</b>

## FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$927,707,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	812,993,000
House allowance .....	803,993,000
Committee recommendation .....	812,993,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The family housing operation and maintenance appropriation for the Army provides for the operation and maintenance of family housing. This includes debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums of Army family housing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$812,993,000 for family housing operation and maintenance, Army, in fiscal year 2006, which is equal to the budget request. This amount is \$114,714,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$126,806,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	218,942,000
House allowance .....	218,942,000
Committee recommendation .....	218,942,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The family housing appropriation for the Navy and Marine Corps provides for expenses of family housing for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration. This appropriation provides for the financing of all costs for construction, improvements, and leasing of all Navy and Marine Corps housing. In addition to quality of life enhancements, the program contains initiatives to reduce operating costs and conserve energy by upgrading or replacing facilities which can be made more efficient through relatively modest investments in improvements. The Department of Defense is authorized to use limited partnerships, make direct and guaranteed loans, and convey Department-owned property to stimulate the private sector to increase the availability of affordable, quality housing for the Navy and Marine Corps.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$218,942,000 for family housing construction, Navy and Marine Corps, in fiscal year 2006, which is equal to the budget request. This amount is \$92,136,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends \$40,298,000 for new construction of a 126-unit family housing project in Guam.

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

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

## NAVY AND MARINE CORPS CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Installation	Project title	Budget request	Committee recommendation
California .....	Camp Pendleton .....	Family Housing Privatization .....	8,400	8,400
Hawaii .....	Kaneohe Bay .....	Family Housing Privatization .....	66,247	66,247
North Carolina .....	Camp Lejeune/Cherry Point .....	Family Housing Privatization .....	37,680	37,680
Guam .....	South Finegayan .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	25,698	25,698
Guam .....	Nimitz Hill .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	495	495
Guam .....	Nimitz Hill and Flag Circle .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	6,243	6,243
Japan .....	Atsugi .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	24,470	24,470
Japan .....	Yokosuka .....	Family Housing Improvements .....	9,411	9,411
Total .....	.....	.....	178,644	178,644

## FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$705,404,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	593,660,000
House allowance .....	588,660,000
Committee recommendation .....	593,660,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The family housing operation and maintenance appropriation for the Navy and Marine Corps provides for the operation and maintenance of family housing. This includes debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums of Navy and Marine Corps family housing.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$593,660,000 for family housing operation and maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps, in fiscal year 2006, which is equal to the budget request. This amount is \$111,744,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

## FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$801,788,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	1,251,108,000
House allowance .....	1,236,220,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,142,622,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The family housing appropriation for the Air Force provides for expenses of family housing for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration. This appropriation provides for the financing of all costs for construction, improvements and leasing of all Air Force housing. In addition to quality of life enhancements, the program contains initiatives to reduce operating costs and conserve energy by upgrading or replacing facilities which can be made more efficient through relatively modest investments in improvements. The Department of Defense is authorized to use limited partnerships, make direct and guaranteed loans, and convey Department-owned property to stim-

ulate the private sector to increase the availability of affordable, quality housing for the Air Force.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,142,622,000 for family housing construction, Air Force, in fiscal year 2006. This amount is \$340,834,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$108,486,000 below the budget request.

*Family Housing, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, DC.*—The Air Force has taken an especially aggressive approach to its family housing program in recent years in attempt to meet the DOD-wide goal of having contracts in place to replace all substandard family housing in the United States by 2007. Because the Air Force was slower than the other services in moving to the privatization of family housing, this aggressive approach has been necessary. The family housing privatization program has been an unqualified success, garnering steadfast support from this Committee and drawing the increasing allegiance of the Air Force, as it has emerged as the only viable approach to achieving the 2007 goal.

However, the Air Force has not requested budgets to reflect this aggressive move to family housing privatization, choosing instead to budget for traditional family housing projects and convert these projects to privatization after funds have been appropriated, thereby rendering meaningless the original budget justification documents submitted to support them. The Committee understands that family housing privatization projects are complex transactions, but it is evident that the Air Force intends to privatize a much greater portion of its family housing program than it has indicated in its budget submission for several reasons, not least of which is the fact that traditional construction of family housing, if executed as submitted by the Air Force in its budget request, will not result in the elimination of substandard housing by 2007.

One specific example of this practice is Bolling Air Force Base. It has been made clear to the Committee, since before the submission of the fiscal year 2006 budget request, that Bolling Air Force Base family housing is intended to be privatized at no cost to the Government. The Committee does not recommend funding for the traditional family housing project requested at Bolling Air Force Base, as it will not be needed for this purpose.

*Family Housing, Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany.*—The Air Force's fiscal year 2006 budget request to spend \$45,385,000 to build family housing at Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany, conflicts with the Committee's understanding of prudent planning for family housing. Adequate housing for Spangdahlem Air Base currently exists in the Air Force inventory at Bitburg, Germany, located just over 10 miles from Spangdahlem. The Air Force's desire to divest this adequate housing only to build more housing is not in keeping with the need to maximize the utility of family housing funds.

Additionally, determinations are not yet final regarding the disposition of force structure at Spangdahlem. The status of forces may remain unchanged at Spangdahlem, or some of the forces may be relocated within the ongoing Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy [IGPBS] moves of the Department of Defense. This determination will have a material effect on the size of the popu-

lation at Spangdahlem and consequently on the level of need for family housing. Thus, the Committee does not recommend funding for this family housing project until the steady-state population of Spangdahlem Air Base can be determined and the ability of housing currently in the inventory to meet the needs of the population can then be confirmed or disproved.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends \$696,405,000 for new construction, as shown below:

**AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION**

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Installation	Project title	Budget request	Committee recom- mendation
Alaska	Eielson AFB	Replace Family Housing (92 Units)	37,650	37,650
Alaska	Eielson AFB	Purchase Build/Lease Housing (300 Units)	18,144	18,144
California	Edwards AFB	Replace Family Housing (226 Units)	59,699	59,699
District of Columbia	Bolling AFB	Replace Family Housing (159 Units)	48,711	48,711
Florida	MacDill AFB	Replace Family Housing (Phase 7) (109 Units)	40,982	40,982
Idaho	Mountain Home AFB	Replace Family Housing (Phase 7) (194 Units)	56,467	56,467
Missouri	Whiteman AFB	Replace Family Housing (111 Units)	26,917	26,917
Montana	Malmstrom AFB	Replace Family Housing (296 Units)	68,971	68,971
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Family Housing (Phase 9) (255 Units)	48,868	48,868
North Dakota	Grand Forks AFB	Replace Family Housing (Phase J) (300 Units)	86,706	86,706
North Dakota	Minot AFB	Replace Family Housing (Phase I2) (223 Units)	44,548	44,548
South Carolina	Charleston AFB	Replace Family Housing (10 Units)	15,935	15,935
South Dakota	Ellsworth AFB	Replace Family Housing (60 Units)	14,383	14,383
Texas	Dyess AFB	Replace Family Housing (Phase 6) (190 Units)	43,016	43,016
Germany	Ramstein AB	Replace Family Housing (101 Units)	62,952	62,952
Germany	Spangdahlem AB	Replace Family Housing (79 Units)	45,385	45,385
Turkey	Incirlik AB	Replace Family Housing (100 Units)	22,730	22,730
United Kingdom	Royal Air Force Lakenheath	Replace Family Housing (107 Units)	48,437	48,437
<b>Total</b>			<b>790,501</b>	<b>696,405</b>

## CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

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

## AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Installation	Project title	Budget request	Committee recommendation
California .....	Los Angeles AFB, Fort MacArthur Housing Annex.	Whole House Upgrade .....	19,803	19,803
Colorado .....	Air Force Academy .....	Privatize Family Housing ....	10,082	10,082
Colorado .....	Peterson AFB .....	Privatize Family Housing ....	15,124	15,124
District of Columbia ....	Bolling AFB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	11,090	.....
Florida .....	MacDill AFB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	2,246	2,246
Idaho .....	Mountain Home AFB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	4,026	4,026
Kansas .....	McConnell AFB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	699	699
Maryland .....	Andrews AFB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	28,216	28,216
North Carolina .....	Pope AFB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	16,625	16,625
Tennessee .....	Arnold AFB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	1,930	1,930
Wyoming .....	F.E. Warren AFB .....	Privatize Family Housing ....	39,936	39,936
Germany .....	Ramstein .....	Improve Family Housing ....	4,519	4,519
Japan .....	Kadena AB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	107,469	107,469
Japan .....	Misawa AB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	58,046	58,046
Japan .....	Yokota AB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	54,913	54,913
Portugal .....	Lajes Field .....	Improve Family Housing ....	16,183	16,183
Spain .....	Moron AB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	7,128	7,128
Turkey .....	Incirik AB .....	Improve Family Housing ....	20,081	20,081
United Kingdom .....	RAF Mildenhall .....	Improve Family Housing ....	2,038	2,038
Classified Location .....	Classified .....	Improve Infrastructure .....	49	49
<b>Total .....</b>	.....	.....	<b>420,203</b>	<b>409,113</b>

## FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$864,784,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	766,939,000
House allowance .....	755,319,000
Committee recommendation .....	766,939,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The family housing operation and maintenance appropriation for the Air Force provides for the operation and maintenance of family housing. This includes debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums of Air Force family housing.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$766,939,000 for family housing operation and maintenance, Air Force, in fiscal year 2006, which is equal to the budget request. This amount is \$97,845,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

## FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$49,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	.....
House allowance .....	.....
Committee recommendation .....	.....

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The family housing appropriation for Defense-wide provides for expenses of family housing for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration. This appropriation provides for the financing of all costs for construction, improvements and leasing of housing Defense-wide. In addition to quality of life enhancements, the program contains initiatives to reduce operating costs and conserve energy by upgrading or replacing facilities which can be made more efficient through relatively modest investments in improvements. The Department of Defense is authorized to use limited partnerships, make direct and guaranteed loans, and convey Department-owned property to stimulate the private sector to increase the availability of affordable, quality housing Defense-wide.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The fiscal year 2006 budget request included no request for family housing construction, Defense-wide. Therefore, the Committee recommends no funding for this account.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$49,575,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	46,391,000
House allowance .....	46,391,000
Committee recommendation .....	46,391,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The family housing operation and maintenance appropriation for Defense-wide provides for the operation and maintenance of family housing. This includes debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums of Defense family housing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$46,391,000 for family housing operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, which is equal to the budget request. This amount is \$3,184,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

Appropriations, 2005 .....	-\$16,609,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	2,500,000
House allowance .....	2,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,500,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The family housing improvement appropriation provides for the Department of Defense to undertake housing initiatives and to provide an alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities. This account provides "seed" money for housing privatization initiatives.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$2,500,000 for the Family Housing Improvement Fund. This amount is equal to the budget request.

BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 1990

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$246,166,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	377,827,000
House allowance .....	377,827,000
Committee recommendation .....	377,827,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The base closure appropriation (1990) provides for clean up and disposal of property consistent with the four closure rounds required by the base closure Acts of 1988 and 1990.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of \$377,827,000 for the Base Closure Account 1990. This is an amount equal to the budget request and an increase of \$131,711,000 from the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. The Military Departments have assured the Committee that this level of funding is adequate to address urgent requirements for fiscal year 2006 resulting from prior BRAC rounds.

Since the start of the current process for BRAC, Military Construction Appropriations Acts have appropriated a net total of \$23,203,727,000 for the entire program for fiscal years 1990 through 2005. The total amount appropriated for BRAC 1990, combined with the Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2006 is \$23,581,554,000.

In appropriating these funds, the Committee continues to provide the Department with the flexibility to allocate funds by service, by function, and by installation. The following table displays the total amount appropriated for each round of base closure, including amounts recommended for fiscal year 2006 for BRAC 1990.

BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 1990

[Total funding, fiscal year 1990 through fiscal year 2006]

	Fiscal year 1990 through fiscal year 2004	Fiscal year 2005 enacted	Fiscal year 2006 Committee recommended	Total
Part I .....	\$2,684,577,000	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	\$2,684,577,000
Part II .....	4,915,636,000	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	4,915,636,000
Part III .....	7,269,267,000	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	7,269,267,000
Part IV .....	8,088,131,000	\$246,116,000	\$377,827,000	8,712,074,000
Total .....	22,957,611,000	246,116,000	377,827,000	23,581,554,000

<sup>1</sup> Not Applicable

*Groundwater Remedy, McClellan Air Force Base, CA.*—The Committee is concerned with the Air Force’s proposed changes to the selected groundwater remedy at the former McClellan Air Force Base. The Committee views the remedy as adopted by the Air Force as a commitment to the community. Any and all changes to the remedy should be undertaken with appropriate consultation with Federal and State regulatory agencies as well as the local community. The Air Force is directed to provide quarterly updates

to the Committee on its consideration of changes to the groundwater remedy at the site, with the first such report due by December 31, 2005.

*Lowry Air Force Base, CO.*—The Committee is concerned about asbestos contamination and remediation at the former Lowry Air Force Base, CO. The Committee understands that, in 1993, the Base Cleanup Team [BCT], comprising the Air Force, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the State of Colorado, conducted an environmental baseline study for Lowry Air Force Base in order to deem the property suitable for transfer. The Committee notes that study did not disclose the presence of buried construction waste containing asbestos from a former Air Force hospital at the base.

The buried construction waste containing asbestos from the former Lowry hospital was discovered by local residential developers in 2002. The Air Force has acknowledged that it was responsible for the asbestos-containing construction waste. The Committee understands that the Air Force has rejected claims submitted by most of the local residential developers for the costs they incurred while testing, sampling, and remediating the site. The developers are currently considering legal action. The Committee urges the Air Force to resolve these claims at the earliest possible date.

The Committee is concerned that the Air Force's refusal to pay for the remediation of hazardous waste at Lowry Air Force Base may discourage other communities from pursuing redevelopment or reuse options for military facilities that are closed or realigned as part of the BRAC process. In many cases, the closure or realignment of a military facility can create significant opportunities for economic and residential growth. The Committee encourages the Department of Defense to be mindful of the importance of working closely with local communities to fully identify hazardous waste before the military facility is transferred and to resolve, at the earliest possible date, those disputes that arise from the remediation of the hazardous waste discovered after the facility is transferred.

*Sewer Remediation, McClellan Air Force Base, CA.*—The Committee supports the Air Force's agreement to program \$15,100,000 in BRAC funding for sewer remediation at the former McClellan Air Force Base. The Committee notes that funds for the community's share of the McClellan sewer remediation project have been included in the Office of Economic Adjustment [OEA] account in the Defense appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006. It is the Committee's intention that the OEA funds be used for the purpose for which they were appropriated and not used to supplant the BRAC environmental remediation funds that the Air Force has already committed to the project.

#### BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005

Appropriations, 2005 .....	.....
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	\$1,880,466,000
House allowance .....	1,570,466,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,504,466,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The base realignment and closure appropriation for 2005 provides for clean up and disposal of property consistent with the 2005 closure round required by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. section 2687 note).

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of \$1,504,466,000 for the Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005. This amount is \$376,000,000 below the budget request.

The Department of Defense requested \$1,880,466,000 to begin implementation of the 2005 round of Base Closure. The funds provided are essential if the Department is to maintain the BRAC-mandated 6-year timeline. However, the Appendix transmitting the President's budget request noted that \$376,000,000 of that request would remain unobligated at the end of the fiscal year. For this reason, the Committee has reduced the recommended appropriation by the same amount.

This reduction leaves the Department with \$1,504,466,000 to expend on BRAC implementation for the 2005 round. This remains a very sizable portion of the military construction budget of the Department of Defense, equaling 13 percent of this title and accounting for the vast majority of the increase in the military construction budget request from fiscal year 2005 to fiscal year 2006. In fact, the military construction budget request for fiscal year 2006, not including funds for BRAC, actually increased from last year's enacted level by only 2.4 percent. This illustrates the high premium placed upon military construction funds. Given the scarcity of these funds, the Committee directs, as included in the General Provisions of this title, that no appropriated funds be expended on military construction or family housing projects at installations that are ultimately designated to be closed or realigned if the 2005 round of Base Realignment and Closure becomes law. However, if it is conclusively shown by the Department that it would be less expensive to complete an ongoing project than to cancel it, the Committee has provided the Department the authority to complete such a project. Additionally, in order to maintain appropriate oversight of the money to be expended in BRAC 2005, the Committee's recommendation includes a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to submit and receive approval of a spending plan for BRAC 2005 before moving to obligate funds in this account.

The Committee is aware of the Department's plan to bring over 75,000 troops home to the United States from installations overseas, some troops moving due to the BRAC process and others moving independent of BRAC. The Committee supports the funding of BRAC 2005, if it becomes law. The Committee urges the Department of Defense to implement an expedited process of obligating and expending BRAC 2005 funds to facilitate the timeline for returning troops to the United States, especially with respect to the Army, which faces the largest movement of personnel.

## TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Restricts payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work, except in cases of contracts for environmental restoration at base closure sites.

SEC. 102. Permits use of funds for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Permits use of funds for defense access roads.

SEC. 104. Prohibits construction of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. Limits the use of funds for purchase of land or land easements.

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

SEC. 107. Limits the use of minor construction funds to transfer or relocate activities among installations.

SEC. 108. Prohibits the procurement of steel unless American producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been allowed to compete.

SEC. 109. Prohibits payments of real property taxes in foreign nations.

SEC. 110. Prohibits construction of new bases overseas without prior notification.

SEC. 111. Establishes a threshold for American preference of \$500,000 relating to architect and engineering services.

SEC. 112. Establishes preference for American contractors for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific, and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea.

SEC. 113. Requires notification of military exercises involving construction in excess of \$100,000.

SEC. 114. Limits obligations during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

SEC. 115. Permits funds appropriated in prior years to be available for construction authorized during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. Permits the use of expired or lapsed funds to pay the cost of supervision for any project being completed with lapsed funds.

SEC. 117. Permits obligation of funds from more than 1 fiscal year to execute a construction project, provided that the total obligation for such project is consistent with the total amount appropriated for the project.

SEC. 118. Directs the Department to report annually on actions taken to encourage other nations to assume a greater share of the common defense budget.

SEC. 119. Allows transfer of proceeds from earlier base closure accounts to the continuing base closure account (1990, parts I–IV).

SEC. 120. Permits the transfer of funds from Family Housing Construction accounts to the DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund and from Military Construction accounts to the DOD Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund.

SEC. 121. Restricts the use of funds for the Partnership for Peace program.

SEC. 122. Requires the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees of all family housing privatization solicitations and agreements which contain any clause providing consideration for base realignment and closure, force reductions and extended deployments.

SEC. 123. Provides transfer authority to the Homeowners Assistance Program.

SEC. 124. Requires that all acts making appropriations for military construction be the sole funding source of all operation and maintenance for family housing, including flag and general officer quarters, and limits the repair on flag and general officer quarters to \$35,000 per year without prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 125. Limits funds from being transferred from this appropriation measure into any new instrumentality without authority from an appropriation Act.

SEC. 126. Prohibits funds appropriated for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program from being obligated or expended for the purpose of missile defense studies.

SEC. 127. Provides authority to expend funds from the “Ford Island Improvement” account.

SEC. 128. Prohibits the expenditure of funds at installations or for projects no longer necessary as a result of BRAC 2005, should it become law, and requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a prior-approval reprogramming request before redirecting such funds.

SEC. 129. Clarifies the intent of Congress regarding the recipients of reports and notifications submitted by the Department of Defense.

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$65,838,832,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	69,454,300,000
House allowance .....	68,112,300,000
Committee recommendation .....	70,710,881,000

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Veterans Administration [VA] was established as an independent agency by Executive Order 5398 of July 21, 1930, in accordance with the Act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 1016). This act authorized the President to consolidate and coordinate Federal agencies especially created for or concerned with the administration of laws providing benefits to veterans, including the Veterans' Bureau, the Bureau of Pensions, and the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. On March 15, 1989, the VA was elevated to Cabinet-level status as the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The VA's mission is to serve America's veterans and their families as their principal advocate in ensuring that they receive the care, support, and recognition they have earned in service to the Nation. The VA's operating units include the Veterans Benefits Administration, Veterans Health Administration, National Cemetery Administration, and staff support offices.

The Veterans Benefits Administration [VBA] provides an integrated program of non-medical veteran benefits. The VBA administers a broad range of benefits to veterans and other eligible beneficiaries through 57 regional offices and the records processing center in St. Louis, MO. The benefits provided include: compensation for service-connected disabilities; pensions for wartime, needy, and totally disabled veterans; vocational rehabilitation assistance; educational and training assistance; home buying assistance; estate protection services for veterans under legal disability; information and assistance through personalized contacts; and six life insurance programs.

The Veterans Health Administration [VHA] develops, maintains, and operates a national healthcare delivery system for eligible veterans; carries out a program of education and training of healthcare personnel; carries out a program of medical research and development; and furnishes health services to members of the Armed Forces during periods of war or national emergency. A system of 157 hospitals, 944 outpatient clinics, 134 nursing homes, and 42 VA domiciliary residential rehabilitation treatment programs (formerly called "domicilaries") is maintained to meet the VA's medical mission.

The National Cemetery Administration provides for the interment of the remains of eligible deceased servicepersons and discharged veterans in any national cemetery with available grave space; permanently maintains these graves; marks graves of eligi-

ble persons in national and private cemeteries; and administers the grant program for aid to States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans' cemeteries. The National Cemetery Administration includes 158 cemeterial installations and activities.

Other VA offices include the general counsel, inspector general, Boards of Contract Appeals and Veterans Appeals, and the general administration, which supports the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretary for Benefits, Under Secretary for Health, and the Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$70,710,881,000 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, including \$36,625,618,000 in mandatory spending and \$34,085,263,000 in discretionary spending. The amount provided for discretionary activities represents an increase of \$3,354,515,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$3,233,581,000 above the budget request.

*Improving Medical Care.*—The Committee is vitally concerned with ensuring our veterans receive the best quality medical care possible. Nothing is more important to our veterans than our commitment to their healthcare needs. This Committee was disappointed that the Department of Veterans Affairs budget request would not adequately provide this level of medical care without imposing a new fee and an increased co-payment for prescription medications. Therefore, the Committee recommendation provides more than \$1,250,000,000 above the budget request, in the areas of medical services, grants to States for extended care services, and research to alleviate this concern. This level of funding will ensure that our veterans will receive the best care, in a more timely manner.

*Personnel Issues.*—The Committee is concerned that the current operating budget has caused an overall hiring freeze and a shortage of nurses at many VA facilities. The recommended funding level will be sufficient to address these issues. The Committee directs the Department of Veterans Affairs to report to the Committees on Appropriations in both Houses of Congress, no later than 45 days after enactment of this Act, on the steps the Department is taking to remediate these personnel problems.

The Committee has chosen not to use the administration's proposed budget account structure due to the changes already made by the Conferees in the fiscal year 2005 appropriations Act. The Committee is sensitive to the administrative burden on VA staff in implementing such major changes. However, even knowing the Committee will stay with the current structure, the VA continues to inefficiently keep two sets of budgetary data costing an unnecessary expenditure of time and money. The Committee will continue to use the current account structure and directs the VA to use this current format for all future budget submissions.

The VA has included in its budget submission a proposal to realize \$590,000,000 in management efficiencies and savings without an explanation of how these efficiencies and savings will materialize. To compound the problem, the proposed budget request is based on these savings and proposed legislation dictating new user fees. If these savings do not materialize or the new user fees are

not enacted, the VA would not be able to provide services at the current rate, much less meet the demands of our new veterans. Therefore, in future budget submissions, the VA should request funding at a level that can meet the real needs of our veterans without relying on new fees requiring legislation to be enacted or expecting Congress to appropriate more than the budget request in order to maintain existing service to our veterans.

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$35,261,848,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	36,780,131,000
House allowance .....	36,780,131,000
Committee recommendation .....	36,780,131,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Veterans Benefits Administration [VBA] is responsible for the payment of compensation and pension benefits to eligible service-connected disabled veterans. This administration also provides education benefits and housing loan guarantees.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$36,780,131,000 for the Veterans Benefits Administration. This amount is composed of \$33,412,879,000 for Compensation and pensions; \$3,214,246,000 for Readjustment benefits; \$45,907,000 for Veterans insurance and indemnities; \$64,586,000 for Veterans housing benefit program fund program account, with -\$112,000,000 in Credit subsidies and \$153,575,000 for Administrative expenses; \$53,000 for the Vocational rehabilitation loans program account and \$305,000 for Administrative expenses; and \$580,000 for the Native American veteran housing loan program account.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$32,607,688,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	33,412,879,000
House allowance .....	33,412,879,000
Committee recommendation .....	33,412,879,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Compensation is payable to living veterans who have suffered impairment of earning power from service-connected disabilities. The amount of compensation is based upon the impact of disabilities on a veteran's earning capacity. Death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to the surviving spouses and dependents of veterans whose deaths occur while on active duty or result from service-connected disabilities. A clothing allowance may also be provided for service-connected veterans who use a prosthetic or orthopedic device.

Pensions are an income security benefit payable to needy wartime veterans who are precluded from gainful employment due to non-service-connected disabilities which render them permanently and totally disabled. Under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act

of 1990, veterans 65 years of age or older are no longer considered permanently and totally disabled by law and are thus subject to a medical evaluation. Death pensions are payable to needy surviving spouses and children of deceased wartime veterans. The rate payable for both disability and death pensions is determined on the basis of the annual income of the veteran or their survivors.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$33,412,879,000 for compensation and pensions. This is an increase of \$805,191,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same as the budget request. The amount includes funds for a projected fiscal year 2006 cost-of-living increase of 2.3 percent for pension recipients.

The appropriation includes \$23,491,000 in payments to the “General operating expenses” and “Medical services” accounts for expenses related to implementing provisions of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, the Veterans’ Benefits Act of 1992, the Veterans’ Benefits Improvements Act of 1994, and the Veterans’ Benefits Improvements Act of 1996.

*Annual Benefits Report.*—The Annual Benefits Report produced by the Veterans Benefits Administration shall continue the practice of reporting select veteran data for all VA benefit programs by State including, for each State, its relative ranking among all of the States for the various program measures reported.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$2,556,232,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	3,214,246,000
House allowance .....	3,214,246,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,214,246,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The readjustment benefits appropriation finances the education and training of veterans and servicepersons whose initial entry on active duty took place on or after July 1, 1985. These benefits are included in the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program (Montgomery GI bill) authorized under 38 U.S.C. section 30. Eligibility to receive this assistance began in 1987. Basic benefits are funded through appropriations made to the readjustment benefits appropriation and transfers from the Department of Defense. This account also finances vocational rehabilitation, specially adapted housing grants, automobile grants with the associated approved adaptive equipment for certain disabled veterans, and educational assistance allowances for eligible dependents of those veterans who died from service-connected causes or have a total permanent service-connected disability, as well as dependents of servicepersons who were captured or missing in action.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$3,214,246,000 for readjustment benefits. This is an increase of \$658,014,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$44,380,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	45,907,000
House allowance .....	45,907,000
Committee recommendation .....	45,907,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The veterans insurance and indemnities appropriation consists of the former appropriations for military and naval insurance, applicable to World War I veterans; National Service Life Insurance, applicable to certain World War II veterans; Servicemen's indemnities, applicable to Korean conflict veterans; and veterans mortgage life insurance to individuals who have received a grant for specially adapted housing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$45,907,000 for veterans insurance and indemnities. This is an increase of \$1,527,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same as the budget request. The Department estimates there will be 7,385,456 policies in force in fiscal year 2006 with a value of \$756,138,000,000.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Program account	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 2005 .....	<sup>1</sup> \$43,784,000	\$152,842,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	64,586,000	153,575,000
House allowance .....	64,586,000	153,575,000
Committee recommendation .....	64,586,000	153,575,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects credit subsidy estimate from last year's report. The new estimate for 2005 is -\$144,000,000.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation provides for all costs, with the exception of the Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program and the Guaranteed Transitional Housing Loans for Homeless Veterans Program, of the VA's direct and guaranteed housing loans, as well as the administrative expenses to carry out these programs, which may be transferred to and merged with the "General operating expenses" account.

VA loan guaranties are made to service members, veterans, reservists and unremarried surviving spouses for the purchase of homes, condominiums, manufactured homes and for refinancing loans. VA guarantees part of the total loan, permitting the purchaser to obtain a mortgage with a competitive interest rate, even without a downpayment, if the lender agrees. The VA requires that a downpayment be made for a manufactured home. With a VA guaranty, the lender is protected against loss up to the amount of the guaranty if the borrower fails to repay the loan.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends such sums as may be necessary for funding subsidy payments, estimated to total \$64,586,000; and \$153,575,000 for administrative expenses for fiscal year 2006. The

administrative expenses may be transferred to the “General operating expenses” account. Bill language limits gross obligations for direct loans for specially-adapted housing to \$500,000.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Program account	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$47,000	\$309,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	53,000	305,000
House allowance .....	53,000	305,000
Committee recommendation .....	53,000	305,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation covers the funding subsidy cost of direct loans for vocational rehabilitation of eligible veterans and, in addition, it includes administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program. Loans of up to \$948.54 (based on the indexed chapter 31 subsistence allowance rate) are available to service-connected disabled veterans enrolled in vocational rehabilitation programs, as provided under 38 U.S.C. chapter 31, when the veteran is temporarily in need of additional assistance. Repayment is made in 10 monthly installments, without interest, through deductions from future payments of compensation, pension, subsistence allowance, educational assistance allowance, or retirement pay. Most loans are repaid in full in less than 1 year.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$53,000 for program costs and \$305,000 for administrative expenses for the “Vocational rehabilitation loans program” account. The administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the “General operating expenses” account. Bill language is included limiting program direct loans to \$4,242,000. It is estimated that the VA will make 4,634 loans in fiscal year 2006, with an average amount of \$926.00.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$566,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	580,000
House allowance .....	580,000
Committee recommendation .....	580,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program tests the feasibility of enabling VA to make direct home loans to Native American veterans who live on U.S. trust lands. It is a pilot program that began in 1993 and expires on December 31, 2008. Subsidy amounts necessary to support this program were appropriated in fiscal year 1993.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of \$580,000 for administrative expenses associated with this program. This is \$14,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same as

the budget request. These funds may be transferred to and merged with the “General operating expenses” account.

GUARANTEED TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOANS FOR HOMELESS  
VETERANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program was established by Public Law 105–368, the Veterans Programs Enhancement Act of 1998. The program is a pilot project designed to expand the supply of transitional housing for homeless veterans and to guarantee up to 15 loans with a maximum aggregate value of \$100,000,000. The project must enforce sobriety standards and provide a wide range of supportive services such as counseling for substance abuse and development of job readiness skills.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

All funds authorized for the Guaranteed Transitional Housing Loans for Homeless program have been appropriated. Therefore, additional appropriations are not required. Administrative expenses of the program, limited to \$750,000 for fiscal year 2006, will be borne by the “Medical administration” and “General operating expenses” accounts.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$28,188,875,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	30,180,684,000
House allowance .....	28,820,684,000
Committee recommendation .....	31,332,943,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Department of Veterans Affairs operates the largest Federal medical care delivery system in the country, with 157 hospitals, 42 VA domiciliary residential rehabilitation treatment programs (formerly called “domiciliaries”), 134 nursing homes, and 944 outpatient clinics, which include independent, satellite, community-based, and rural outreach clinics.

The Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund [MCCF] was established by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–33). In fiscal year 2004, Public Law 108–199 allowed the Department to deposit first-party and pharmacy co-payments; third-party insurance payments and enhanced use collections; long-term care co-payments; Compensated Work Therapy Program collections; Compensation and Pension Living Expenses Program collections; and Parking Program fees into the MCCF.

The Parking Program provides funds for the construction, alteration, and acquisition (by purchase or lease) of parking garages at VA medical facilities authorized by 38 U.S.C. section 8109. The Secretary is required under certain circumstances to establish and collect fees for the use of such garages and parking facilities. Receipts from the parking fees are to be deposited into the MCCF and are used for medical services activities.

The Committee has included bill language under the General Provisions of this title to allow the Secretary to transfer funds be-

tween the medical services appropriation, medical administration appropriation, and medical facilities appropriation after notifying the Committees on Appropriations in both Houses of Congress.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$31,332,943,000 for the Veterans Health Administration, without collections. This amount is composed of \$23,308,011,000 for Medical services; \$2,858,442,000 for Medical administration; \$1,456,821,000 for Information technology; \$3,297,669,000 for Medical facilities; and \$412,000,000 for Medical and prosthetic research. Medical care collections are expected to be \$2,170,000,000. Therefore, the VHA will have total resources of \$31,525,943,000, plus any carryover from fiscal year 2005, available in fiscal year 2006.

*Administrative Policy and Legislative Proposals.*—The Committee is concerned that the VA has underfunded its real fiscal needs and proposes to cover the resulting deficit by recommending several policy proposals stipulating new fees, co-payments for on-going and existing services, and restricting long-term care in State nursing homes and VA community nursing homes. The Committee is not supportive of these new proposals which would force hundreds of thousands of needy veterans to leave the VA system. To this end, the Committee recommendation reflects the real fiscal needs of the VA without charging the veteran population to make up the shortfall and has included direct appropriations to cover the differences. In future budget submissions, the VA should request a funding level that adequately represents the real needs of the veterans in the VA system without devising new fees. Therefore, the Committee directs that the VA not implement any of the new policy proposals, as submitted in the budget request, without concurrence from the Committees on Appropriations in both Houses of Congress.

MEDICAL SERVICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$19,316,995,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	21,972,141,000
House allowance .....	20,995,141,000
Committee recommendation .....	23,308,011,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The “Medical services” account provides for medical services of eligible veterans and beneficiaries in VA medical centers, outpatient clinic facilities, contract hospitals, State homes, and outpatient programs on a fee basis. Hospital and outpatient care is also provided by the private sector for certain dependents and survivors of veterans under the civilian health and medical programs for the VA.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$23,308,011,000 for medical services, of which \$1,977,000,000 shall be designated as emergency appropriation. This amount is an increase of \$3,991,016,000 over the

fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$1,335,870,000 above the budget request. In addition, the VA has the authority to retain co-payments and third-party collections, estimated to total \$2,170,000,000 in fiscal year 2006.

The bill includes requested language in the Compensation, Pension, and Burial Benefits appropriation transferring up to \$13,751,000 for the administrative expenses of implementing cost-saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, and the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992.

The Committee has included bill language to make available through September 30, 2007, up to \$1,500,000,000 of the medical services appropriation. This provides flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs as it continues to implement significant program changes.

The Committee commends the VA for the mental health services that it provides to the Nation's veterans and encourages the VA to continue to transform its mental health delivery system, where appropriate, particularly to address the emerging needs of veterans currently serving in combat situations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Committee urges the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to continue to work with the Secretary of Defense to provide the highest standard of early intervention, including mental health programs, as part of its seamless transition to assist members of the Armed Forces returning from combat.

In response to the thousands of returning veterans, the VA has taken a number of steps to ensure a smooth and seamless transition for these veterans from the Department of Defense to the VA. For example, the VA has detailed veterans service representatives and social workers to military treatment facilities, such as Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, MD.

*Colorectal Cancer.*—The Committee notes the lengthy wait at some veterans facilities for those seeking flexible sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopies for colorectal cancer screening, as well as the fact that millions of veterans have never made the decision to be screened. Accordingly, the Committee strongly encourages the Department to aggressively pursue new, more efficient, non-invasive colorectal cancer screening technologies, which improve patient access, are more cost-effective, and are more clinically effective than older methods.

*Intelligent Actuator.*—The Committee encourages the Department of Veterans Affairs to investigate, and if warranted, take advantage of intelligent actuator technology for the design and manufacture of lighter and more functional prosthetic medical equipment.

*DOD/VA Health Care Sharing.*—The bill includes requested language for the DOD/VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund, as authorized by section 721 of the fiscal year 2003 National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 107-314) to transfer a minimum of \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended, for any purpose authorized by 38 U.S.C. section 8111. The Department of Defense and the VA are required to establish a joint incentives program through the creation of a DOD/VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund. The purpose of the program is to identify, provide incentives

to, implement, fund, and evaluate creative coordination and sharing initiatives at facilities, both intra-regionally and nationally. There is a minimum contribution of \$15,000,000 by each Department each year for 4 fiscal years.

#### CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE

This Committee feels the Department of Veterans Affairs should consider designating specialized medical treatment facilities as "Centers of Excellence". Establishing these centers would allow the VA to consolidate personnel, training and specialized resources. This will ensure the VA utilizes these resources in the most efficient manner, while providing better service to our Nation's veterans. At a minimum, the VA should consider establishing centers in the areas of psychiatric care, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, prosthetics, and diabetes care. The VA shall submit a report within 6 months of enactment to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress on the progress in this area, and any other unique areas needing this specialized emphasis.

*Psychiatric Care.*—The Committee is concerned that mental healthcare is one of the most critical needs of our Nation's veterans, particularly those veterans returning from Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom [OIF/OEF]. The need is so great in this area that it is fast becoming a public health crisis. The number of beds/capacity required is increasing at unpredicted levels. The Committee is aware that the Waco, Texas Medical Center [Waco VAMC] is leading the Nation in this specialized endeavor. The Waco VAMC is achieving this success due to the dedication and professionalism of the doctors and staff at this facility. They are working in close collaboration with the research facilities at Baylor University, Texas A&M University Medical School, Ft. Hood Army Hospital, and the Mental Health Association from the State of Texas to devise new and inventive ways to care for this segment of the VA population.

The Waco VAMC is achieving great success in the area of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder [PTSD]. A special PTSD section and staff are dedicated to this specific problem. The successes in this area warrant increasing the scope of the program, but it is being held back due to a hiring freeze. The Committee has included funds in this appropriation account to alleviate this hurdle.

In addition, the Waco VAMC is doing research and providing state of the art services in the areas of blind/low vision and geriatric patients. The doctors and staff in both of these programs are to be commended.

The Committee understands that patients from facilities outside of Waco's Veterans Integrated Service Network [VISN] are traveling to Waco on their own just to take advantage of Waco's programs. The Committee is committed to supporting the Waco VAMC, and other such facilities across the country, and its role as a nationally renowned leader in psychiatric care. Therefore, the Committee directs the VA to place more emphasis on psychiatric care of our veterans by designating the Waco VAMC as a "Mental Health Center of Excellence," as well as several others across the country the Secretary deems appropriate, and supporting them as such with the appropriate resources.

*Post Traumatic Stress Disorder [PTSD].*—The Committee is very concerned that our returning veterans are experiencing PTSD at an extremely high rate. In many instances, PTSD does not manifest itself until years after our veterans return from combat. The Committee is concerned that our veterans are reluctant to seek treatment for this disorder and go untreated until the disorder reaches a critical state. As a result, the facilities are not sufficiently resourced to handle the actual and real need. To overcome this hurdle, this Committee requests that the VA establish a minimum of three PTSD “Centers of Excellence” across the country, one of which shall be at the San Diego VA Medical Center, and to resource them accordingly. In this way, the VA will be better positioned to handle this serious health issue.

The Committee recognizes the accomplishments of the National Center for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder at White River Junction VA Medical Center in Vermont, which has successfully kept up to date with the latest knowledge about the condition and suggested innovative treatment approaches. The Committee expects that the new centers of excellence will closely cooperate and coordinate with the National Center to increase efficiency and avoid redundancy.

*Prosthetics.*—The Committee is deeply committed to the care of our newest veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. The VA has already treated over 100,000 returning soldiers, and the numbers will continue to grow. Advances in body armor and improved combat healthcare are saving more lives on the battlefield than ever before. However, this means that more soldiers are returning with lost limbs and other very severe and lasting injuries. In addition, many returning service members also bear less visible, psychological wounds of war. The Committee believes that the VA must provide these veterans with the best of both modern medicine and integrative holistic therapies for rehabilitation, such as those currently being employed at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. Therefore, the VA should consider establishing centers for this purpose.

*Diabetes.*—This Committee is concerned about the unusually high rate of diabetes among our veterans, which far exceeds the rate of the rest of the Nation. In addition, there is a considerable amount of discussion concerning glucose home monitoring equipment and how best to distribute the equipment. Therefore, the VA should consider establishing several “Centers of Excellence” for diabetes care to address these and other critical quality of life issues.

#### AREAS OF INTEREST

*Joint Research.*—The Committee understands that the VA has been involved in discussions with the Israeli Ministry of Defense regarding a number of research issues including Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, virtual reality rehabilitation for motor recovery and ambulatory training for veterans with prosthetic limbs, and robotic rehabilitation trials for the neurologically impaired and for veterans with missing limbs. The Committee recognizes Israel’s expertise in handling veteran’s issues due to its requirement that all Israelis serve in its military. The Committee is supportive of continued discussions regarding the possibility of developing a working group composed of Veterans Health Administration, the Israeli

Ministry of Defense, clinicians, and researchers that would guide collaborative research in these areas.

*Mefloquine Use.*—The Committee is aware that the VA participated in a special meeting of the Department of Defense's Armed Forces Epidemiology Board charged with helping to plan studies on long-term health effects among OEF and OIF veterans from mefloquine. The Committee encourages the VA to continue to participate, where appropriate, with the Department of Defense on studies regarding the effects of mefloquine use. The Committee commends the VA for issuing an Information Letter providing information to clinicians who examine and provide care to veterans who may have taken mefloquine as a malaria prophylaxis while on active duty. The VA's healthcare system is likely to be the first line of treatment for service members who have returned from active duty and have separated from the military. Additionally, the VA will bear much of the cost and burden of treatment and rehabilitation for service members with mefloquine toxicity. Therefore, the VA should continue to work closely with the Department of Defense to ensure that adequate notations are included in service member's medical records with regard to mefloquine use and adverse side effects prior to separation from the military.

*Lung Cancer Screening.*—Lung cancer is the second most common cancer and the most common cause of cancer-related death in both men and women. Not only have recent associations been suggested between Gulf War Veterans and exposure to combustible agents, it is estimated that 30 percent of the veteran population continues to smoke. Lung cancer survival rates are 49 percent for cases detected when the disease is localized, but only 15 percent of lung cancers are discovered that early. The Committee directs the VA to submit a report no later than March 15, 2006, outlining current preventative screening procedures and processes for veterans with elevated risks of lung cancer.

*Supportive Housing.*—The Committee is aware that the Department of Veterans Affairs is currently in discussions regarding the establishment of a therapeutic housing program on the campus of the VA's Sepulveda Ambulatory Care Center in North Hills, CA, for homeless veterans with multiple physical and mental health issues. It is estimated that 27,000 homeless veterans in Los Angeles need housing, medical, and mental health services. The Committee is supportive of efforts designed at reducing the number of homeless veterans and commends the VA for its efforts in these areas.

*Returning Veterans.*—The Committee is aware that large numbers of returning veterans from OEF and OIF are returning to Veterans Integrated Service Network [VISN] 22. There has been evidence that suggests that OEF/OIF veterans will have higher rates of diagnosable post-combat mental health disorders. The Committee is concerned that only a small portion of the returning veterans enrolling in the VA system have been military transfer admissions and have had prior assessments for mental health disorders, leading to large number of walk-ins. All returning veterans from OEF/OIF are eligible for care from the VA for 2 years upon separating from the military. There is concern that areas, such as San Diego, CA, with high concentration of existing veterans will

begin to see a strain on mental health services due to large numbers of walk-ins. To alleviate this situation the Committee directs the VA to work with the San Diego, CA, Veterans Health Care System to develop a Primary Care/Post-Deployment Unit pilot program in San Diego and evaluate the need for such a program nationally. The goal of the pilot program should be to ease pressure from walk-ins and assist with the seamless transition program from the Department of Defense to the VA by establishing a unit that would provide a comprehensive mental and physical health evaluation to returning combat veterans. The Committee encourages the VA to establish a Post Traumatic Stress Disorder clinical team at each VA Medical Center; provide a certified family therapist within each Vet Center; and appoint a regional PTSD coordinator within each VISN and Readjustment Counseling Service region to evaluate programs, promote best practices and make resource recommendations.

*Rural Veterans Health Care Initiative.*—The Committee supports continuation at the current level of support for the Rural Health Care Initiative at the White River Junction, VT VAMC.

*Psychology Post-Doctoral Training Program.*—The Committee continues to support the Veterans Health Administration's effort to strengthen its Psychology Post-Doctoral Training Program. The Committee directs the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide a progress report by December 30, 2006, on the number of training slots for psychologists and their locations, as well as the progress being made in other interdisciplinary training programs.

*Medication Therapy Management Program.*—In order to promote cost savings and improved health outcomes, the Committee encourages the VA to consider conducting a demonstration project to identify effective Medication Therapy Management Program [MTMP] models for veterans with chronic illnesses. The Committee urges that this demonstration project include MTMP approaches that emphasize evidence-based prescribing, prospective medication management, technological innovation and outcomes reporting.

*National Medical Quality Improvement Program.*—The world-class care provided to veterans through the VA healthcare system sets the standard of clinical performance. One program which has contributed to the high reputation for care has been the VA National Surgical Quality Improvement Program [NSQIP]. The Committee notes and commends the Surgical Service at the San Francisco, CA VAMC for recording the best overall NSQIP performance in the country. Since the NSQIP's inception in 1994, the VA has reported consistent improvements in all surgery performance measures. Based on the accomplishments of the program, and having no comparable private sector program, the Committee understands that the American College of Surgeons has tested a program to expand the VA NSQIP to non-VA institutions. Given the success of VA NSQIP, the Committee believes the VA is well suited for the next phase of expansion toward a National Medical Quality Improvement Program [NMQIP]. With the increasing appreciation of the contribution of errors and avoidable complications to post-surgical morbidity and mortality in America, the successful execution of such a program could have an enormous impact on the cost and quality of care in this country. The Committee directs the VA to

work in coordination with the San Francisco, CA VAMC to develop preliminary guidelines and benchmarks for implementing such a program and report back to the Committee by March 29, 2006, on the feasibility, including costs, of implementing NMQIP nationally.

*National Autopsy Registry for Dementia and Other Causes of Cognitive Impairment.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of autopsy-based validation of clinical and laboratory data in order to accurately diagnose dementia and other causes of cognitive impairment. The Committee understands that the Veterans Health Administration [VHA] has recently adopted a policy to request permission from the family to perform an autopsy on patients who die at a VHA facility. Therefore, the Committee encourages the VHA, in collaboration with the West Virginia University Blanchette Rockefeller Neurosciences Institute; VHA facilities; and designated Alzheimer’s Disease Centers, to build a more substantive and proactive clinical component around this new policy and to create a central data repository for the information.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$4,667,360,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	4,517,874,000
House allowance .....	4,134,874,000
Committee recommendation .....	<sup>1</sup> 2,858,442,000

<sup>1</sup> Total does not include \$1,456,821,000 for the information technology program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The “Medical administration” account provides funds for the expenses of management, security, and administration of the VA healthcare system. This appropriation provides for costs associated with the operation of VA medical centers; other facilities; and VHA headquarters; plus the costs of Veterans Integrated Service Network [VISN] offices and facility director offices; Chief of Staff operations; quality of care oversight; legal services; billing and coding activities; and procurement.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$2,858,442,000 for medical administration. This amount is \$1,808,918,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$1,659,432,000 below the budget request.

The Committee has included bill language to make available through September 30, 2007, up to \$250,000,000 of the medical administration appropriation. This provides flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs as it continues to implement significant program changes.

The Committee recommendation does not include \$1,456,821,000 for the Department’s information technology program. This funding is provided in a new and separate account. However, personnel full time equivalent [FTE] costs will remain in the current account.

*Antimicrobial Study.*—The Committee encourages the Department of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study at the Jackson, MS Veterans Affairs Hospital to build upon existing beneficial antimicrobial properties of copper alloys, seeking to validate the effectiveness of copper to inactivate dangerous microbes in healthcare and other high-risk facilities and to reduce the incidence of infec-

tion. It is recognized that new antimicrobial resistance is a threat to healthcare facilities, it increases healthcare costs, and it increases the duration and severity of infections acquired in hospital settings and communities.

*ImPACT.*—The Committee encourages the Department of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study at the Veterans Affairs Gulf Coast, MS Regional Medical Center to build upon ImPACT, which is an existing technology used as a diagnostic tool for traumatic brain injury assessment developed by the University of Pittsburgh, PA Medical Center. With an increasing and aging veteran population, the Veterans Administration healthcare system has an urgent need to apply advanced technologies and mechanisms to assess the progress of dementia, specifically in patients with Alzheimers.

*Third-Party Collections.*—The Committee is concerned that the VA is only collecting 41 percent (unadjusted for Medicare impacts) of the billed amounts from third-party insurance companies. The VA's budget submission states the collection percentage was 41 percent for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005, and the goal for fiscal year 2006 is 41 percent. Even though the fiscal year 2005 collections are expected to total approximately \$1,018,000,000, the VA should be placing greater emphasis on collecting more of the amounts legally due the VA. Therefore, the VA shall report to the Committees on Appropriations in both Houses of Congress on the work it is doing to increase the collection rate. This report shall be delivered no later than January 1, 2006.

*Management Efficiencies.*—To offset the overall cost of the VA's increased workload and utilization, the VA anticipates resource savings associated with management efficiencies. For fiscal year 2006, the budget request estimates management savings of \$590,000,000. However, the budget justification provides no detail on how the VA will actually achieve this level of savings. The Committee is concerned that if the VA does not achieve this level of savings, it will be forced to scale back the level of service provided to veterans. Therefore, the Department is directed to report to the Committee, on a quarterly basis, the amount of savings it is realizing and the progress toward achieving \$590,000,000 in savings. This report shall be due within 30 days of the end of each fiscal quarter.

*Per Diem Payments.*—The fiscal year 2006 budget request proposed to revise the eligibility requirements for receiving per diem payments for care in State veterans' homes. This could disqualify many of the veterans who currently reside in these facilities. By adopting any proposal that restricts per diem payments, notably by instituting rules that would make only priority level one, two, three, and catastrophically disabled level four veterans eligible for per diem payments, the VA could be placing State veterans' homes in an untenable financial position. Therefore, the Committee does not support the VA proposal to alter the current structure for providing per diem payments to State veterans' homes for long-term care and directs the Secretary to maintain the existing eligibility criteria for such payments.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Appropriations, 2005 .....	.....
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	.....
House allowance .....	.....
Committee recommendation .....	\$1,456,821,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The “Information technology” account encompasses the entire information technology portfolio for the Department of Veterans Affairs. This includes all automation efforts in all administrations. It does not, however, include the VA’s personnel cost associated with any projects. This cost will remain in the accounts they are currently in.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,456,821,000 for information technology [IT]. This amount is \$1,456,821,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$1,456,821,000 above the budget request.

The Committee is impressed and supportive of the many robust IT initiatives undertaken by the VA. However, the Committee is concerned that the Department of Veterans Affairs is not putting as much attention into a Department-wide information technology program as it should for such a large budget. The Committee understands that each VA Administration will manage its own projects, but there is no one office with final budget and programmatic authority overseeing the entire Department’s IT effort. The Committee is concerned that without a single office ultimately responsible for the Department’s numerous automation efforts, the vast sums appropriated for this area might not be obligated in the most efficient manner. While all of the proposed VA’s IT projects have merit, the Committee is not certain that all of the projects are planned and organized to a maturity level to efficiently obligate the funds requested this year.

The Committee has included bill language which creates a separate account for information technology and separates it from the “Medical administration” account. This new structure will help the Department to better organize the entire IT program and more accurately display and report the Department’s IT efforts. In addition, the Committee directs the Secretary to create an office with the authority and responsibility to ensure the most effective use of appropriated funds which coordinates all IT projects, regardless of which Administration is managing the particular project. Furthermore, the Department is directed to include this account structure in future budget submissions.

The appropriation for this account shall be for all VA IT projects, to include contract and procurement costs for associated hardware and software. The VA’s FTE costs associated with the administration of the projects will remain in their current accounts.

In addition, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide the Committees on Appropriations in both Houses of Congress an overall milestone schedule for each IT project, as well as a monthly status report on all IT projects. This report should include, by project, the amount of the

appropriation received, the scheduled completion date, the planned and actual obligations, and the amount of unobligated balances.

*HealtheVet.*—The Committee lauds the VA for its strategic foresight in proposing the HealtheVet initiative. This program will greatly enhance the medical care and safety of our Nation’s veterans. It is imperative that before the VA takes on such a massive and far-reaching project, that it takes the time to adequately plan, schedule and resource this initiative. Doing this before funds are obligated will save the Government time and money in the long run. It will also deliver the services comprising the HealtheVet program in a more efficient manner. The Committee cannot emphasize enough the importance of locking in the requirements for this initiative before entering into a contractual obligation with an outside firm for project development. The Committee reminds the Department to apply lessons learned from other Government IT project failures, and to cautiously use taxpayer funds in software development and project management. The Committee is tremendously supportive of this project and looks forward to assisting the VA with this important initiative.

However, because the Department has not satisfied the Committee’s concerns regarding the use of fiscal year 2005 funds and because of the Department’s confusion over the planned use of fiscal year 2006 funds, the Committee has included language in the bill capping the HealtheVet project at \$100,000,000 in fiscal year 2006, and outlining certain requirements the Department must meet before any funds may be obligated. These restrictions are the first step in the creation of a Department-wide office responsible for the entire VA’s IT effort, and as such the Committee expects the office to submit a detailed financial plan for the use of fiscal year 2006 funds.

*CoreFLS.*—The Committee is supportive of the CoreFLS program. However, the Committee has not seen any justification for doubling the budget from the fiscal year 2005 level. Therefore, the Committee has provided \$35,000,000 for this effort and directs that the VA shall not obligate more than this level for this project in fiscal year 2006.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$3,715,040,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	3,297,669,000
House allowance .....	3,297,669,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,297,669,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The “Medical facilities” account provides funds for the operation and maintenance of the VA healthcare system’s vast capital infrastructure. This appropriation provides for costs associated with utilities, engineering, capital planning, leases, laundry and food services, groundskeeping, housekeeping, facility repair, and property disposition and acquisition.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$3,297,669,000 for medical facilities. This amount is \$417,371,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

The Committee has included bill language to make available through September 30, 2007, up to \$250,000,000 of the medical facilities appropriation. This provision provides flexibility to the Department as it continues to implement significant program changes.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$402,348,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	393,000,000
House allowance .....	393,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	412,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The “Medical and prosthetic research” account provides funds for medical, rehabilitative, and health services research. Medical research supports basic and clinical studies that advance knowledge leading to improvements in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of diseases and disabilities. Rehabilitation research focuses on rehabilitation engineering problems in the fields of prosthetics, orthotics, adaptive equipment for vehicles, sensory aids and related areas. Health services research focuses on improving the effectiveness and economy of the delivery of health services.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$412,000,000 for medical and prosthetic research. This is \$9,652,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$19,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee remains highly supportive of this program, and recognizes its importance both in improving healthcare services to veterans and recruiting and retaining high-quality medical professionals in the Veterans Health Administration.

*Gulf War Illness Research.*—The Committee is concerned that the Veterans Administration is not placing sufficient emphasis on Gulf War Illness research. The fiscal year 2006 request for medical research is more than \$9,000,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. This reduction in medical research comes at a particularly difficult time for veterans in light of the fact that so many are developing serious illnesses that have yet to be explained. Unknown illnesses are being categorized broadly as “Gulf War Illness syndrome” because the Syndrome itself is not fully understood and its connection to other illnesses. This fact alone should dictate more of an effort to understand and develop treatments, not less, as the VA has done, through the reduction of the budget. In September 2004, the Research Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans’ Illness [RAC/GWVI] issued a report entitled “Scientific Progress in Understanding Gulf War Veterans’ Illnesses.” In this report, the RAC/GWVI published its major findings as follows:

- A substantial proportion of Gulf War veterans are ill with multi-symptom conditions not explained by wartime stress or psychiatric illness.
- Treatments that improve the health of veterans with Gulf War illnesses are urgently needed.
- Important questions concerning the health of children and other family members of Gulf War veterans remain unanswered.
- Further progress in understanding and treating Gulf War veterans' illnesses require Federal research programs that are properly focused, well managed, and adequately funded.

The RAC/GWVI includes in this report a recommendation to develop a comprehensive Federal research plan to address Gulf War veterans' illnesses by adopting a strategic research program that identifies and addresses key medical questions. It goes on to recommend a minimum funding allocation by the VA of "not less than \$15,000,000 in each of the next 4 years."

Therefore, the Committee directs the Department of Veterans Affairs to follow the RAC/GWVI recommendations. To this end, the Committee directs the VA to devote at least \$15,000,000 this fiscal year, and in each of the next 4 fiscal years, solely to Gulf War Illness research and to reflect this direction in future budget submissions.

Over the last several months, the VA and the RAC/GWVI Commission have met to discuss establishing a Gulf War Illness Center dedicated solely to the research and the study of Gulf War Illnesses. It was agreed that the Center should perform several functions including: analysis of VA databases to identify potentially effective novel treatments that are being used by providers, maintain a collection of anecdotal reports about potential treatments and to conduct pilot studies furthering Gulf War Illness research. As a result of these discussions, it was decided that an expert panel of advisors would be convened to help plan the structure of this center. Unfortunately, the progress of this group has been slow.

Therefore, the Committee directs the VA's Office of Research and Development to thoroughly evaluate the need to establish a research center exclusively devoted to Gulf War Illness research and, if warranted, move forward with this initiative. This initiative shall, at a minimum, begin with a pilot study at the University of Texas, Southwestern Medical Center, which is presently conducting extensive research on Gulf War Illness. The VA shall report to the Committee on the results of the evaluation and all proposed follow-on activities no later than 30 days following enactment of this Act, and every quarter thereafter.

*Prosthetics Research.*—The Committee stresses the importance of caring for veterans returning from the battlefield. Prosthetics research, including the development of high-tech and "smart limb" technology, can restore the quality of life and functional independence for veterans who have lost limbs. The Committee directs the VA to place a priority on prosthetics in its research agenda, and to report to the Committees on Appropriations in both Houses of Congress by December 31, 2005, on how the VA will make prosthetics research a priority for our returning service members.

*Liver Disease Research.*—The Committee is concerned with the long-term consequences of hepatitis C infection in veterans, including the development of primary liver cancer. The Committee is also concerned about the long-term consequences of hepatitis C in those with HIV infection. Given the unique capabilities of the VA system, the Committee urges the VA to consider developing multi-center trials for management of primary liver cancer and treatment of HCV/HIV co-infection.

*Nursing Research.*—The Committee is aware of the continuing need for nursing research to identify and quantify patient outcomes related to nursing care. With the ability to assess, administer, and evaluate the effectiveness of healthcare delivery from entry into the healthcare system until discharge, nurses are uniquely qualified to collect, analyze, and interpret data as it relates to safe and efficient patient care. The Committee encourages the Department to fund nursing research initiatives, specifically those aimed at eliminating barriers to care, reducing patient safety hazards, and improving efficiency in work environments.

#### MEDICAL CARE COST RECOVERY COLLECTIONS

##### MEDICAL CARE COLLECTION FUND

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$1,985,984,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	2,170,000,000
House allowance .....	2,170,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,170,000,000

##### MEDICAL CARE COLLECTION FUND—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2005 .....	-\$1,985,984,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	-2,170,000,000
House allowance .....	-2,170,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	-2,170,000,000

##### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Medical Care Collection Fund [MCCF] was established by the Balanced budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33). In fiscal year 2004, Public Law 108-199 allowed the Department of Veterans Affairs to deposit first-party and pharmacy co-payments; third-party insurance payments and enhanced use collections; long-term care co-payments; Compensated Work Therapy Program collections; and Parking Program fees into the MCCF. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs has the authority to transfer funds between the MCCF and the medical services appropriation, medical administration appropriation, and medical facilities appropriation.

##### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes the authority to retain co-payments and third-party collections, estimated to total \$2,170,000,000 in fiscal year 2006.

##### DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$2,388,109,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	2,493,485,000
House allowance .....	2,511,485,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,597,807,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation provides for the administration of nonmedical veterans benefits through the Veterans Benefits Administration [VBA], the executive direction of the Department, several top level supporting offices, the Board of Contract Appeals, and the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$2,597,807,000 for Departmental Administration. The amount is composed of \$1,418,827,000 for General operating expenses; \$156,447,000 for the National Cemetery Administration; \$70,174,000 for the Office of inspector general; \$607,100,000 for Construction, major projects; \$208,937,000 for Construction, minor projects; \$104,322,000 for Grants for construction of State extended care facilities; and \$32,000,000 for Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries.

## GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$1,314,155,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	1,418,827,000
House allowance .....	1,411,827,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,418,827,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation provides for the general operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,418,827,000 for general operating expenses. This amount is \$104,672,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and equal to the budget request. In addition to this appropriation, resources are made available for general operating expenses through reimbursements totaling \$640,266,500 for fiscal year 2006. In addition, \$9,740,000 is transferred from the Compensation and Pension account for administrative cost of implementing cost-saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, and the Veterans Benefits Act of 1992.

*Diabetes Monitoring Systems.*—The Committee is aware of the VA's proposal regarding the national standardization of home glucose monitoring systems and is concerned about the potential impacts of this initiative. Therefore, the Committee directs that the VA shall not implement this initiative. Furthermore, the Committee directs that the VA provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a report on the cost of replacing the non-standardized equipment while at the same time maintaining the existing equipment if the patient chooses to keep it.

## NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$147,734,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	156,447,000
House allowance .....	156,447,000
Committee recommendation .....	156,447,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The National Cemetery Administration was established in accordance with the National Cemeteries Act of 1973. It has a four-fold mission: to provide for the interment in any national cemetery of the remains of eligible deceased servicepersons and discharged veterans, together with their spouses and certain dependents, and permanently to maintain their graves; to mark graves of eligible persons in national and private cemeteries; to administer the grant program for aid to States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans' cemeteries; and to administer the Presidential Memorial Certificate Program.

There are a total of 158 cemeterial installations in 39 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The Committee's recommendation for the National Cemetery Administration provides funds for all of these cemeterial installations.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$156,447,000 for the National Cemetery Administration. This is an increase of \$8,713,000 over the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

## OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$69,153,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	70,174,000
House allowance .....	70,174,000
Committee recommendation .....	70,174,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Inspector General was established by the Inspector General Act of 1978 and is responsible for the audit and investigation and inspections of all Department of Veterans Affairs programs and operations.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$70,174,000 for the Inspector General. This is an increase of \$1,021,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

## CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$455,130,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	607,100,000
House allowance .....	607,100,000
Committee recommendation .....	607,100,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The "Construction, major projects" account provides for constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities (including parking projects) under the jurisdiction or for the use of the VA, including planning, architectural and engineering services, Capital Asset Realignment Enhanced Services [CARES] activities, assessment, and site acquisition where the estimated cost of a project is more than the amount set forth in 38 U.S.C. section 8104(a)(3)(A). Proceeds realized from Enhanced Use Lease activi-

ties may be deposited into the “Construction, major projects” and “Construction, minor projects” accounts.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$607,100,000 for the construction of major projects. This is \$151,970,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same level as the budget request.

The following table compares the Committee recommendation with the budget request.

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and description	2006 Request	Committee recommendation
<b>Veterans Health Administration [VHA]:</b>		
Cleveland, OH Cleveland-Brecksville Consolidation, Phase 2 .....	\$87,300	\$87,300
Pittsburgh, PA Consolidation of Campuses, Phase 2 .....	82,500	82,500
Las Vegas, NV New Medical Facility, Phase 2 .....	199,000	199,000
Gainesville, FL Correct Patient Privacy Deficiencies, Phase 2 .....	76,400	76,400
Anchorage, AK Outpatient Clinic and Regional Office, Phase 2 .....	63,510	63,510
Biloxi, MS Consolidation—Mental Health .....	17,500	17,500
Fayetteville, AR Clinical Addition .....	5,800	5,800
Subtotal, CARES .....	532,010	532,010
Advance planning fund: Various locations .....	28,290	28,290
Asbestos abatement: Various locations .....	5,000	5,000
Claims Analyses: Various locations .....	3,000	3,000
Judgment Fund: Various locations .....	2,500	2,500
Hazardous Waste: Various locations .....	2,000	2,000
Facility Security Fund: Various locations .....	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Other locations .....	55,790	55,790
Total VHA construction, major projects .....	587,800	587,800
Less Proceeds and revenues from Lakeside, IL .....	—48,000	—48,000
Total VHA .....	539,800	539,800
<b>Veterans Benefits Administration [VBA]</b> .....		
<b>National Cemetery Administration [NCA]:<sup>1</sup></b>		
Land Acquisition: Bakersfield, CA; Birmingham, AL; Columbia/Greenville, SC; Jacksonville, FL; Sarasota County, FL; South East Pennsylvania .....	41,000	41,000
Fort Rosecrans Annex at Miramar, CA Phase I Development .....	19,450	19,450
Subtotal, Construction .....	60,450	60,450
Design Fund: Various locations .....	3,850	3,850
Advance planning fund: Various locations .....	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Other various locations .....	4,850	4,850
Total NCA construction, major projects .....	65,300	65,300
Staff Offices: Advanced Planning Activities at Various locations .....	2,000	2,000
Total construction, major projects .....	607,100	607,100

<sup>1</sup> National Cemetery Administration major project requests do not include the purchase of pre-placed crypts, which are funded by the Compensation and Pensions appropriation.

*Capital Asset Realignment For Enhanced Services [CARES].—*  
The Committee recommends \$607,100,000 for major construction projects approved through the CARES program. The Committee’s

recommendation funds the Secretary’s list of prioritized projects for fiscal year 2006, as identified in the May 20, 2004 report entitled “CARES Major Construction Projects Fiscal Year 2004–2010.” The Committee applauds the VA for completing its national CARES plan as detailed in its CARES decision report, which was released on May 7, 2004, and remains strongly committed to funding the Secretary’s recommendations.

*CARES Implementation.*—The Committee is concerned that the original 2004 snapshot of the Department’s infrastructure and mission requirements for each facility has changed due to the large number of veterans returning from Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom [OEF/OIF]. The Committee understands that the VA is now seeing large concentrations of veterans in areas that were not originally anticipated to receive the increased workload. These veterans are all eligible for 2 years of full medical benefits, and many have special needs. When no VA facilities are available, and the VA has to provide for contracted services to meet the need, the VA’s contract cost has dramatically increased.

The public meetings the VA is now conducting have produced unpredictable results. The meetings are raising issues and problems that were not identified in the 2004 report. In addition, the timeline for concluding the facility review process the Secretary endorsed for the 18 locations requiring further study, is slipping further into calendar year 2006.

Therefore, as a result of these issues, it would be prudent to carefully and systematically reevaluate the 18 facilities on the Secretary’s list requiring additional study based on a more global situation now facing our Nation’s veterans and the impact of the returning OEF/OIF veterans. The Committee has included bill language prohibiting the VA from using any funds to change the current infrastructure, service or mission of the 18 facilities on this list. The Committee encourages the VA to continue studying these locations and submit its recommendations to the Congress as part of the CARES recommendation in the VA’s fiscal year 2007 capital plan.

The Committee is aware that the CARES Commission’s final report recommended new Community Based Outpatient Clinics [CBOC] in Bellingham, Washington and North Central Washington. The Committee is aware of the lack of access to VA primary care in Washington State and encourages the VA to move forward with establishing these CBOCs.

*Beckley, WV, Nursing Home.*—The Committee urges the VA to include sufficient funding in its fiscal year 2007 budget request for construction of a 120-bed nursing home care unit at the Beckley, WV VAMC, consistent with the CARES priority list as described in the VA’s February 2005 Five-Year Capital Plan 2005–2010 report.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$228,933,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	208,937,000
House allowance .....	208,937,000
Committee recommendation .....	208,937,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The “Construction, minor projects” account provides for constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities (including parking) under the jurisdiction or for the use of the VA, including planning, CARES activities, assessment of needs, architectural and engineering services, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is equal to or less than the amount set forth in 38 U.S.C. section 8104(a)(3)(4). Public Law 106–117, the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act of 1999, gave the VA the authority to make capital contributions from minor construction in enhanced-use leases. Proceeds realized from enhanced-use lease activities may be deposited into the “Construction, major projects” and “Construction, minor projects” accounts.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$208,937,000 for minor construction. This is \$19,996,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

## GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$104,322,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	.....
House allowance .....	25,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	104,322,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account is used to provide grants to assist States in acquiring or constructing State home facilities for furnishing domiciliary or nursing home care to veterans, and to expand, remodel or alter existing buildings for furnishing domiciliary, nursing home, or hospital care to veterans in State homes. The grant may not exceed 65 percent of the total cost of the project, and grants to any one State may not exceed one-third of the amount appropriated in any fiscal year. Public Law 102–585 granted permanent authority for this program, and Public Law 106–117 provided greater specificity in directing VA to prescribe regulations for the number of beds for which grant assistance may be furnished. This program has been a successful partnership between the States and the VA in meeting the long-term care needs of elderly veterans for decades.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$104,322,000 for grants for the construction of State extended care facilities. This is the same as the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$104,322,000 above the budget request. This program cost-effectively meets long-term healthcare needs of veterans.

The Committee was disappointed that the Department did not request any funding for this program, nor did it provide any explanation for the action. The Committee believes the VA decision to “suspend” this program was done solely to reduce the budget request and has no substantive merit. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes a funding level that is equal to the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. To do any less could potentially jeopardize

projects currently awaiting funding as well as the welfare of deserving veterans.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$31,744,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	32,000,000
House allowance .....	32,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	32,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Public Law 105–368, amended title 38 U.S.C. section 2408, established authority to provide aid to States for establishment, expansion, and improvement of State veterans cemeteries which are operated and permanently maintained by the States. This statutory change increased the maximum Federal share from 50 percent to 100 percent in order to fund construction costs and the initial equipment expenses when the cemetery is established. The States remain responsible for providing the land and for paying all costs related to the operation and maintenance of the State cemeteries, including the costs for subsequent equipment purchases.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$32,000,000 for grants for construction of State veterans cemeteries. This is \$256,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

*Fort Ord, CA.*—The Committee is concerned that land located at Fort Ord, CA, and set aside for a cemetery is not being used for that purpose due to established policies that may not have adequately considered situations that exist at Fort Ord. The Committee directs the Secretary and the Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs to examine the unique situation at Fort Ord and report back to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress by December 30, 2005, on what is necessary for the Department to make use of this site.

*Homelake, CO.*—Homelake is home to one of the oldest State veterans cemeteries in the country. The first veteran was buried in the Homelake Cemetery in 1891. Veterans from all wars beginning with the Civil War and Spanish American Wars through the War in Iraq have been buried at Homelake. The Committee encourages the Department of Veterans Affairs to evaluate the needs for the historic preservation of this cemetery.

## TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. The Committee includes a provision which outlines re-programming authority and responsibilities for the Veterans Benefit Administration.

SEC. 202. The Committee includes a provision which outlines re-programming authority and responsibilities for the Veterans Health Administration.

SEC. 203. The Committee includes a provision requiring the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit quarterly financial reports on the Veterans Health Administration.

SEC. 204. The Committee includes a provision which defines a change in scope for construction projects.

SEC. 205. The Committee includes a provision which requires funds to be deposited into the “Medical services” account.

SEC. 206. The Committee includes a provision which allows for the use of fiscal year 2006 funds for prior year obligations.

SEC. 207. The Committee includes a provision which allows for the use of fiscal year 2006 funds for prior year obligations resulting from the Competitive Equity Banking Act.

SEC. 208. The Committee includes a provision which allows for payments from the National Service Life Insurance fund.

SEC. 209. The Committee includes a provision which continues the Franchise Fund program.

SEC. 210. The Committee includes a provision which outlines use of funds from enhanced-lease proceeds.

SEC. 211. The Committee includes a provision which provides for funds for the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication.

SEC. 212. The Committee includes a provision which sets a limit on new leases without congressional approval.

SEC. 213. The Committee includes a provision which requires disclosure of third-party reimbursement information.

SEC. 214. The Committee includes a provision which outlines authorized uses for “Medical services” funds.

SEC. 215. The Committee includes a provision which allows for the transfer of funds into the “Veterans Housing Benefit Program Fund Program Account”.

SEC. 216. The Committee includes a provision which allows eligible veterans in the State of Alaska to obtain medical care services.

SEC. 217. The Committee includes a provision which allows for the transfer of funds into the construction accounts.

SEC. 218. The Committee includes a provision which allows for the transfer of funds into the construction accounts from proceeds and revenues.

SEC. 219. The Committee includes a provision which allows for outreach and marketing to enroll new veterans.

SEC. 220. The Committee includes a provision which allows funds in the Medical Care Collection Fund to be transferred into the "Medical services" account.

SEC. 221. The Committee includes a provision making funds available for services authorized by 5 U.S.C.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES  
 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The American Battle Monuments Commission [ABMC] is responsible for the following: the maintenance and construction of U.S. monuments and memorials commemorating the achievements in battle of our Armed Forces since April 1917 (the date of U.S. entry into World War I); the erection of monuments and markers by U.S. citizens and organizations in foreign countries; and the design, construction, and maintenance of permanent military cemetery memorials in foreign countries. The Commission maintains 24 military memorial cemeteries and 25 monuments, memorials, and markers, in 15 countries around the world, including three memorials on U.S. soil. It is presently charged with erecting an Interpretive Center at the Normandy American Cemetery, Normandy, France.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$40,771,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	35,250,000
House allowance .....	35,750,000
Committee recommendation .....	36,250,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$36,250,000 for the Salaries and Expenses account. This amount is \$4,521,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$1,000,000 above the budget request. Within this amount, the Committee has provided the budget request of \$3,100,000 to complete the Normandy Interpretive Center.

FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCTUATIONS

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$11,904,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	15,250,000
House allowance .....	15,250,000
Committee recommendation .....	15,250,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$15,250,000 for the “Foreign Currency Fluctuation” account. This amount is \$3,346,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and equal to the budget request. The Committee has provided these funds due to unanticipated currency fluctuations between the U.S. dollar and the euro to meet the increased operating needs of its sites in Europe.

## U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims was established by the Veterans' Judicial Review Act of 1988. The Court is an independent judicial tribunal with exclusive jurisdiction to review decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals. It has the authority to decide all relevant questions of law; interpret constitutional, statutory, and regulatory provisions; and determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of an action by the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA]. It is authorized to compel action by the VA. It is authorized to hold unconstitutional or otherwise unlawful and set aside decisions, findings, conclusions, rules and regulations issued or adopted by the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$17,112,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	18,295,000
House allowance .....	18,295,000
Committee recommendation .....	18,795,000

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$18,795,000 for the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims. This amount is an increase of \$1,683,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$500,000 above the budget request.

*Electronic Case Management System.*—The Committee is impressed with the Court's plans to implement an electronic case management system. This is an area that can save the Court both time and money. The efficiencies gained by moving cases electronically through the system will also increase the quality and timeliness of the service our veterans receive. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes \$500,000 to allow the Court to immediately begin this worthwhile project. In an effort to take advantage of the technological gains the Federal Judiciary has made in this area, the Committee recommends the Court work with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to purchase and implement a version of their Case Management/Electronic Case File [CM/ECF] product. The Court is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations in both Houses of Congress on the progress of such a partnership.

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

## CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Secretary of the Army is responsible for the administration, operation and maintenance of Arlington National Cemetery and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery. In addition to its principal function as a national cemetery, Arlington is the site of approximately 3,100 nonfuneral ceremonies each year and has approximately 4,000,000 visitors annually.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$29,363,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	28,050,000
House allowance .....	29,550,000
Committee recommendation .....	28,550,000

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$28,550,000 for the “Ceremonial Expenses, Army” account. This amount is \$813,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and \$500,000 above the budget request.

## ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

Appropriations, 2005 .....	\$61,131,000
Budget estimate, 2006 .....	58,281,000
House allowance .....	58,281,000
Committee recommendation .....	58,281,000

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Armed Forces Retirement Home account provides funds to operate and maintain the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, District of Columbia, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, Mississippi. These two facilities provide long term housing and medical care for our Nation’s needy veterans.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends authority to expend \$58,281,000 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund to operate and maintain the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, DC, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, MS. This amount is \$2,850,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and equal to the budget request. Within this appropriation level, the Committee has provided \$1,248,000 for the Capital Improvement Program.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE  
STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill “which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session.”

*Title I—Department of Defense*

Military Construction, Army  
Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps  
Military Construction, Air Force  
Military Construction, Defense-wide  
Military Construction, Army National Guard  
Military Construction, Air National Guard  
Military Construction, Army Reserve  
Military Construction, Naval Reserve  
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve  
North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Security Investment Program  
Family Housing Construction, Army  
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Army  
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps  
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps  
Family Housing Construction, Air Force  
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Air Force  
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide  
Department of Defense, Family Housing Improvement Fund  
Base Realignment and Closure Account, 1990  
Base Realignment and Closure Account, 2005

*Title II—Department of Veterans Affairs*

Information Technology

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(C), RULE XXVI OF THE  
STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 21, 2005, the Committee ordered reported, en bloc S. 1446, an original bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, H.R. 2528, making appropriations for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title;

and H.R.3058, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, the Judiciary, Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, provided that the bill be subject to further amendment and the bill be consistent with its budget allocation, by a recorded vote of 28–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Cochran	
Mr. Stevens	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Craig	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. DeWine	
Mr. Brownback	
Mr. Allard	
Mr. Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson	
Ms. Landrieu	

#### COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include “(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee.”

The Committee bill as recommended contains no such provisions.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
ALABAMA					
ARMY:					
ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT: UPGRADE FOR 33 THEATER HIGH ALTITUDE AIR DEFENSE STORAGE IGLOOS .....		3,150			-3,150
FORT RUCKER: SYSTEM TEST AND INTEGRATION LAB/FLIGHT TEST SUPPORT FACILITY .....		9,700			-9,700
REDSTONE ARSENAL:					
AMMUNITION HANDLING INSTRUCTION FACILITY .....		4,700			-4,700
SYSTEMS SOFTWARE ENGINEERING ANNEX .....			20,000	+20,000	+20,000
AIR FORCE: MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE: SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND LODGING FACILITY .....	14,900	14,900	14,900		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: FORT PAYNE: ADDITIONAL/ALTERATION READINESS CENTER .....		4,145			-4,145
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: MONTGOMERY REGIONAL AIRPORT BASE: REPLACE COMPOSITE OPERATIONS AND TRAINING FACILITY .....	9,100	9,100	9,100		
NAVAL RESERVE: MOBILE: MARINE CORPS RESERVE CENTER .....	7,463	7,463	8,163	+700	+700
TOTAL, ALABAMA .....	31,463	53,158	52,163	+20,700	-995
ALASKA					
ARMY:					
FORT RICHARDSON: RAILHEAD PORT FACILITY .....			4,700	+4,700	+4,700
FORT WAINWRIGHT:					
BARRACKS COMPLEX .....	33,560	33,560	33,560		
INFORMATION SYSTEMS FACILITY .....			5,600	+5,600	+5,600
ROTARY WING LANDING PAD .....			5,500	+5,500	+5,500
AIR FORCE:					
CLEAR AIR FORCE STATION: DORMITORY (100 ROOM) .....	20,000	20,000	20,000		
EIELSON AFB: MOBILITY WAREHOUSE .....	820	820	820		
ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE:					
C-17 SURVIVAL EQUIPMENT SHOP .....			54,000		
C-17 MAINTENANCE COMPLEX (PHASE I) .....	54,000	54,000	54,000		
AIR FORCE RESERVE: ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE: C-17 CONVERT HANGAR FOR AIR FORCE RESERVE COMMAND GROUP HEAD-QUARTERS .....	3,100	3,100	3,100		
TOTAL, ALASKA .....	111,480	111,480	133,180	+21,700	+21,700

ARIZONA									
ARMY:									
	FORT HUACHUCA: EFFLUENT REUSE SYSTEM .....	5,100	8,100	8,100	5,100	8,100	8,100	8,100	-5,100
	YUMA PROVING GROUND: SPECIAL OPERATIONS FREE FALL SIMULATOR .....		3,637		3,637	3,637		+8,100	+8,100
NAVY:	YUMA: ROTARY WING FUELING APRON .....								
AIR FORCE:									
	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE: CSAR SQUADRON COMPLEX .....	8,600	8,600	8,600	8,600	8,600	8,600		
	LUKE AIR FORCE BASE: DORMITORY (144 ROOM) .....	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000		
	DEFENSE-WIDE: YUMA: ROTARY WING HYDRANT SYSTEM .....	7,300	7,300	7,300	7,300	7,300	7,300		
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: MARAMA: FIRE STATION .....		1,499		1,499	1,499			-1,499
AIR FORCE RESERVE:									
	DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE: ALTER RESCUE SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY .....	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500		
	LUKE AIR FORCE BASE: 944TH CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON FACILITY .....		5,900		5,900	5,900			-5,900
	TOTAL, ARIZONA .....	34,037	46,536	42,137	46,536	42,137	46,536	+8,100	-4,399
ARKANSAS									
AIR FORCE:									
	LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE:								
	ARMEN DINING FACILITY .....	6,400	6,400	6,400	6,400	6,400	6,400		-6,400
	PARALLEL TAXIWAY ALL AMERICAN LANDING ZONE .....	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500		
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: CAMP ROBINSON: REGIONAL INSTITUTE TRAINING COMPLEX .....					5,608	5,608	+5,608	+5,608
	TOTAL, ARKANSAS .....	2,500	8,900	8,108	8,900	8,108	8,900	+5,608	-792
CALIFORNIA									
ARMY:									
CONCORD:									
	PIER SECURITY UPGRADE .....	8,600	8,600	8,600	8,600	8,600	8,600		
	UPGRADE OUTLOAD FACILITIES .....	3,250	3,250	3,250	3,250	3,250	3,250		
FORT IRWIN:									
	LAND ACQUISITION (PHASE III) .....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000		
	MILITARY OPERATIONS URBAN TERRAIN (PHASE I) .....	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000		
	REPLACE DINING FACILITY .....		4,250		4,250	4,250			-4,250
NAVY:									
CAMP PENDLETON:									
	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE FACILITY .....	5,160	5,160	5,160	5,160	5,160	5,160		
	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS—HEADQUARTERS .....	19,620	19,620	19,620	19,620	19,620	19,620		
	FLIGHT LINE SECURITY FENCE .....	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400		
	RECLAMATION/CONVEYANCE (PHASE I) .....		25,436		25,436	25,436	25,436		

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
CHINA LAKE: ADVANCED SENSOR LAB .....	19,158	19,158	19,158		
EL CENTRO: APRON AND HANGAR RECAP (PHASE II) .....	18,666	18,666	18,666		
LEMOORE: REPLACE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWER .....	8,480	8,480	8,480		
MIRAMAR MARINE CORPS AIR STATION: PROVOST MARSHAL SCREENING FACILITY .....		5,070			-5,070
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL: GLASGOW HALL ADDITION .....		6,500			-6,500
NORTH ISLAND: BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS—SHIPBOARD ASHORE .....	13,700	13,700		-13,700	-13,700
TWENTYNINE PALMS:					
IMPROVE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY .....		3,000			-3,000
MILITARY OPERATIONS ON URBAN TERRAIN FACILITY (PHASE I) .....		21,000			-21,000
AIR FORCE:					
BEALE AIR FORCE BASE: GLOBAL HAWK TWO BAY MAINTENANCE HANGAR .....	14,200	14,200	14,200		
EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE: MAINBASE RUNWAY (PHASE I) .....	37,000	37,000	37,000		
TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE:					
AEROSPACE GROUND EQUIPMENT FACILITY (AGE) .....			10,900	+10,900	+10,900
AIR MOBILITY OPERATIONS GROUP GLOBAL REACH: DEPLOYMENT CENTER .....	19,000	19,000	19,000		
C-17 ADDITION/ALTERATION LIFE SUPPORT .....	1,300	1,300	1,300		
C-17 ADDITION COMPOSITE SHOP .....	3,200	3,200	3,200		
C-17 MAINTENANCE TRAINING FACILITY .....	8,100	8,100	8,100		
VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE: FITNESS CENTER .....	16,845	16,845	16,845		
DEFENSE-WIDE:					
BEALE AIR FORCE BASE: CLINIC ADDITION/ALTERATION .....	18,000	18,000	18,000		
CORONA:					
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES APPLIED INSTRUCTION FACILITY .....	4,000	4,000	4,000		
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES SEAL TEAM OPERATIONS/SUPPORT FACILITY .....	11,000	11,000	11,000		
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES TRAINING SUPPORT FACILITIES .....	13,350	13,350	13,350		
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT—TRACY: REPLACE GENERAL PURPOSE WAREHOUSE .....	33,635	33,635	33,635		
MIRAMAR: REPLACE STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM .....	23,000	23,000	23,000		
SAN DIEGO: PATIENT PARKING FACILITY .....	15,000	15,000	15,000		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:					
CAMP ROBERTS: URBAN COMBAT COURSE .....			1,500	+1,500	+1,500
ROSEVILLE: ADDITIONAL/ALTERATION READINESS CENTER (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	2,941	2,941	2,941		
SAN LUIS OBISPO: DINING FACILITY .....			8,599	+8,599	+8,599

AIR NATIONAL GUARD: FRESNO YOSEMITE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: AIR SOVEREIGNTY ALERT—ALERT CREW QUARTERS FACILITY .....	3,000	3,000	3,000	.....	.....	.....
ARMY RESERVE:						
FORT HUNTER LIGGETT:						
SHOOT HOUSE/AFTER ACTION REVIEW .....	1,700	1,700	1,700	.....	.....	.....
URBAN ASSAULT COURSE .....	1,500	1,500	1,500	.....	.....	.....
AIR FORCE RESERVE: TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE: C-17 WHEEL AND TIRE SHOP .....	.....	3,900	.....	.....	.....	-3,900
TOTAL, CALIFORNIA .....	367,241	410,961	374,540	+ 7,299	.....	- 36,421
COLORADO						
ARMY:						
FORT CARSON:						
ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE AIR CONTROL GROUP COMPLEX (PHASE I-B) .....	14,600	14,600	14,600	.....	.....	.....
BARRACKS COMPLEX .....	25,522	25,522	25,522	.....	.....	.....
COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY .....	28,000	28,000	28,000	.....	.....	.....
SHOOT HOUSE .....	1,250	1,250	1,250	.....	.....	.....
SHOOT HOUSE (U.S. ARMY SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND) .....	1,250	1,250	1,250	.....	.....	.....
AIR FORCE:						
BUCKLEY AIR FORCE BASE:						
ADD/ALTER COMMUNICATIONS COMPLEX .....	10,600	10,600	10,600	.....	.....	.....
CONSOLIDATED SERVICES FACILITY .....	4,000	4,000	4,000	.....	.....	.....
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT FACILITY .....	5,500	5,500	5,500	.....	.....	.....
PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE:						
76TH SPACE CONTROL FACILITY .....	.....	12,700	.....	.....	.....	- 12,700
WEST GATE FORCE PROTECTION ACCESS .....	12,800	12,800	12,800	.....	.....	.....
U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY: UPGRADE ACADEMIC FACILITY (PHASE IV-A) .....	13,000	13,000	13,000	.....	.....	.....
DEFENSE-WIDE: PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE: LIFE SKILLS SUPPORT CENTER .....	1,820	1,820	1,820	.....	.....	.....
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: GREELEY AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION: SPACE WARNING SQUADRON SUPPORT FACILITY .....	.....	6,400	6,400	+ 6,400	.....	.....
TOTAL, COLORADO .....	118,342	137,442	124,742	+ 6,400	.....	- 12,700
CONNECTICUT						
NAVY: SUBMARINE BASE NEW LONDON: CRANE MAINTENANCE FACILITY .....	.....	.....	4,610	+ 4,610	.....	+ 4,610
TOTAL, CONNECTICUT .....	.....	.....	4,610	+ 4,610	.....	+ 4,610

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
<b>DELAWARE</b>					
<b>AIR FORCE:</b>					
DOVER AIR FORCE BASE:					
C-17 ALTER FACILITIES FOR PARTS STORAGE .....	1,000	1,000	1,000		
C-17 FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY .....	5,000	5,000	5,000		
DORMITORY (144 ROOM) .....	13,000	13,000	13,000		
<b>AIR NATIONAL GUARD:</b>					
NEW CASTLE COUNTY AIRPORT ANG BASE:					
ADDITIONS TO RESERVE FORCES MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY .....	1,500		1,500	+ 1,500	+ 1,500
NEW SECURITY FORCES FACILITY .....			1,400	+ 1,400	+ 1,400
<b>TOTAL, DELAWARE .....</b>	<b>19,000</b>	<b>19,000</b>	<b>21,900</b>	<b>+ 2,900</b>	<b>+ 2,900</b>
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</b>					
<b>AIR FORCE:</b>					
BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE:					
CONSTRUCT OPERATIONS FACILITY .....	10,400	10,400	10,400		
FORCE PROTECTION MAIN GATE .....	4,500	4,500	4,500		
DEFENSE-WIDE: BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE: PEPCO FEEDER LINE .....	7,900	7,900	7,900		
<b>TOTAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA .....</b>	<b>22,800</b>	<b>22,800</b>	<b>22,800</b>		
<b>FLORIDA</b>					
<b>NAVY:</b>					
JACKSONVILLE: HELICOPTER HANGAR REPLACEMENT (PHASE I) .....	45,179	45,179	45,179		
MAYPORT:					
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS—HOMEPORT ASHORE .....	7,820	7,820	7,820		
CONSOLIDATED MAINTENANCE FACILITY .....	4,470	4,470	4,470		
EXPAND FLIGHT TRAINER .....	2,930	2,930	2,930		
PANAMA CITY: JOINT AQUATIC COMBAT DIVER TRAINING .....	9,678	9,678	9,678		
PENSACOLA: WATER TREATMENT FACILITY RECAPITALIZATION .....	8,710	8,710	8,710		
					- 4,470

WHITING FIELD NAVAL AIR STATION: CONTROL TOWER RECAPITALIZATION, SOUTH FIELD	.....	4,670	+ 4,670	+ 4,670	+ 4,670
AIR FORCE:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
CAPE CANAVERAL AIR STATION: SATELLITE PROCESSING OPERATIONS SUPPORT FACILITY	.....	6,200	+ 6,200	+ 6,200	+ 6,200
HURLBURT FIELD: WEAPONS INSTRUCTOR COURSE FACILITY	.....	2,540	.....	.....	.....
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
CENTRAL COMMAND JOINT INTELLIGENCE CENTER	.....	67,000	67,000	.....	.....
SECURITY FORCES FACILITY	.....	11,200	11,200	.....	.....
TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1ST AIR FORCE OPERATIONS CENTER (PHASE II)	.....	10,000	.....	.....	- 10,000
DORMITORY (120 ROOM)	.....	9,000	9,000	.....	.....
F/A-22 ADDITION FUELS MAINTENANCE	.....	2,500	2,500	.....	.....
DEFENSE-WIDE:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE: SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES MOBILITY/AERIAL DELIVERY: SUPPORT FACILITY	.....	12,800	12,800	.....	.....
HURLBURT FIELD: AT/FP MAIN GATE/SOUNDSE ACCESS	.....	6,500	.....	.....	- 6,500
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: CAMP BLANDING: REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE COMPLEX (PHASE II)	.....	20,049	.....	.....	- 20,049
AIR FORCE RESERVE:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
HOMESTEAD AIR RESERVE BASE: VISITING QUARTERS	.....	6,900	.....	.....	- 6,900
PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE: ALTER RESCUE SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	.....	2,090	2,090	.....	.....
TOTAL, FLORIDA	181,447	229,366	192,317	+ 10,870	- 37,049
GEORGIA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
ARMY:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
FORT BENNING:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY	20,961	20,961	20,961	.....	.....
INFANTRY PLATOON BATTLE COURSE	4,300	4,300	4,300	.....	.....
SHOOT HOUSE	1,250	1,250	1,250	.....	.....
SHOOT HOUSE (U.S. ARMY SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND)	1,700	1,700	1,700	.....	.....
SQUAD DEFENSE RANGE	.....	2,050	.....	.....	- 2,050
FORT GILLEM:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
FORENSIC LAB ADDITION	3,900	3,900	3,900	.....	.....
MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	.....	4,550	4,550	+ 4,550	+ 4,550
FORT STEWART:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
BARRACKS COMPLEX	37,566	37,566	37,566	.....	.....
SHOOT HOUSE (U.S. ARMY SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND)	1,250	1,250	1,250	.....	.....
URBAN ASSAULT COURSE	1,350	1,350	1,350	.....	.....
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	17,814	17,814	17,814	.....	.....
NAVY:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
ALBANY MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
COMBAT VEHICLE MAINTENANCE AND PRESERVATION FACILITY	.....	4,000	4,000	+ 4,000	.....





MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
<b>KANSAS</b>					
ARMY: FORT LEAVENWORTH: LEWIS AND CLARK INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITY (PHASE III) .....	42,642	42,642	42,642		
FORT RILEY:					
ALERT HOLDING AREA .....					
DEPLOYMENT FACILITY RAMP EXPANSION .....	5,500	5,500	6,300	+ 6,300	+ 6,300
DEPLOYMENT SUPPORT FACILITY .....			5,500		
DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE TRAINING RANGE .....	17,500	17,500	4,600	+ 4,600	+ 4,600
DEFENSE-WIDE: MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE: HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM .....	15,800	15,800	15,800		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: PITTSBURG: READINESS CENTER .....					
ARMY RESERVE: NEW CENTURY: ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP/AREA MAINTENANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITY/UNHEATED STORAGE (PHASE I) .....	6,376	6,376	5,683		- 5,683
TOTAL, KANSAS .....	87,818	93,501	98,718	+ 10,900	+ 5,217
<b>KENTUCKY</b>					
ARMY: FORT CAMPBELL:					
AIRFIELD SUPPORT FACILITY .....	49,575	3,600	49,575		- 3,600
BARRACKS COMPLEX—52ND ST .....	43,000	43,000	43,000		
BARRACKS COMPLEX—GLIDER RD .....	24,650	24,650	24,650		
BARRACKS COMPLEX (PHASE II) .....	10,300	10,300	10,300		
COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY (PHASE II) .....			8,300	+ 8,300	+ 8,300
MAIN GATE ACCESS CONTROL POINT (GATE 4) .....	1,700	1,700	1,700		
URBAN ASSAULT COURSE .....					
FORT KNOX:					
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY .....	21,000	21,000	8,200	+ 8,200	+ 8,200
TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX 1 (PHASE II) .....			21,000		
DEFENSE-WIDE:					
FORT CAMPBELL:					
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES COMPANY OPERATIONS AND SUPPLY FACILITY .....	7,800	7,800	7,800		

SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES GROUP OPERATIONS COMPLEX .....	30,000	30,000	30,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: W.H. FORD REGIONAL TRAINING CENTER: TRAINING COMPLEX (PHASE VI) .....	9,720	9,720	9,720	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, KENTUCKY .....	197,745	201,345	214,245	+ 16,500	+ 12,900		
LOUISIANA							
ARMY: FORT POLK: COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY .....	28,887	28,887	28,887	.....	.....	.....	.....
AIR FORCE: BARKSDALE AFB: INTEGRATED OPERATIONS CENTER .....	.....	.....	10,800	+ 10,800	+ 10,800		+ 10,800
TOTAL, LOUISIANA .....	28,887	28,887	39,687	+ 10,800	+ 10,800		+ 10,800
MAINE							
NAVY: PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD: ACOUSTIC TEST AND CALIBRATION FACILITY .....	.....	.....	8,100	+ 8,100	+ 8,100		+ 8,100
TOTAL, MAINE .....	.....	.....	8,100	+ 8,100	+ 8,100		+ 8,100
MARYLAND							
NAVY:							
ANAPOLIS: WESLEY BROWN FIELD HOUSE (PHASE I) .....	24,930	24,930	24,930	.....	.....	.....	.....
INDIAN HEAD: JOINT EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT CENTER .....	.....	13,460	.....	.....	.....	.....	- 13,460
PATUXENT RIVER:							
MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT TEST FACILITY .....	5,800	5,800	5,800	.....	.....	.....	.....
PRESIDENTIAL HELICOPTER PROGRAMS SUPPORT FACILITY (PHASE I) .....	40,700	40,700	40,700	.....	.....	.....	.....
DEFENSE-WIDE:							
BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL: ACADEMIC PROGRAM CENTER/GRADUATE SCHOOL NURSING ADDITION .....	10,350	10,350	10,350	.....	.....	.....	.....
FORT DETRICK:							
JOINT MEDICAL LOGISTICS CENTER .....	34,000	34,000	34,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
U.S. ARMY MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES STERILIZATION PLANT .....	21,200	21,200	21,200	.....	.....	.....	.....
FORT MEADE:							
CLASSIFIED MATERIAL CONVERSION .....	12,030	12,030	12,030	.....	.....	.....	.....
FRIENDSHIP ANNEX COMPLEX GENERATOR PLANT .....	12,009	12,009	12,009	.....	.....	.....	.....
SOUTH CAMPUS MAIL FACILITY .....	4,010	4,010	4,010	.....	.....	.....	.....
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: DUNDALK ARMORY: ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP .....	.....	.....	4,912	+ 4,912	+ 4,912		+ 4,912
TOTAL, MARYLAND .....	165,029	178,489	169,941	+ 4,912	- 8,548		
MASSACHUSETTS							
AIR FORCE: HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE: FOURTH CLIFF EROSION CONTROL STABILIZATION SYSTEM(PHASE I) .....	10,000	10,000	.....	- 10,000	- 10,000		- 10,000
REPLACE BCE HEAVY REPAIR AND GROUNDS FACILITY .....	.....	.....	3,900	+ 3,900	+ 3,900		+ 3,900

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:					
CAMP CURTIS GUILD (READING) ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	17,136	17,136	17,136		
CAMP EDWARDS: READINESS CENTER (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	2,542	2,542	2,542		
WESTFIELD: FIRE STATION (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	2,129	2,129	2,129		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: BARNES MUNICIPAL AIRPORT: WEAPONS MAINTENANCE/LOAD CREW TRAINING FACILITY .....	7,100	7,100	7,100		
AIR FORCE RESERVE: WESTOVER AIR RESERVE BASE: MUNITIONS STORAGE AND MAINTENANCE .....	3,000	3,000	3,000	+ 7,100	
TOTAL, MASSACHUSETTS .....	34,807	41,907	35,807	+ 1,000	- 6,100
MICHIGAN					
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:					
CAMP GRAYLING RANGE: MULTI-PURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE .....	1,901	1,901	1,901		
LANSING: USPTO/READINESS CENTER—PHASE I .....			11,800	+ 11,800	+ 11,800
AIR NATIONAL GUARD:					
ALPENA: CRTC SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY .....			9,500	+ 9,500	+ 9,500
W.K. KELLOGG AIRPORT: REPLACE CIVIL ENGINEERING COMPLEX .....		7,400			- 7,400
TOTAL, MICHIGAN .....	1,901	9,301	23,201	+ 21,300	+ 13,900
MINNESOTA					
AIR NATIONAL GUARD:					
DULUTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: FAA/AIR NATIONAL GUARD FIRE STATION FACILITY .....			6,500	+ 6,500	+ 6,500
MINNEAPOLIS-ST.PAUL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: COMPOSITE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX .....		8,800			- 8,800
AIR FORCE RESERVE: MINNEAPOLIS-ST.PAUL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: JOINT USE SMALL ARMS RANGE .....		3,000			- 3,000
TOTAL, MINNESOTA .....		11,800	6,500	+ 6,500	- 5,300
MISSISSIPPI					
NAVY: NAS MERIDIAN: JET ENGINE TEST CELL .....			10,450	+ 10,450	+ 10,450
AIR FORCE:					
COLUMBUS AFB: MISSION SUPPORT GROUP COMPLEX .....			10,000	+ 10,000	+ 10,000

KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE:						
STUDENT DORMITORY (300 ROOM)	30,100	30,100	30,100	30,100	30,100	
TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	17,400	17,400	17,400	17,400	17,400	
DEFENSE-WIDE: KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE: SURGERY SUITE ADDITION/ALTERATION	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:						
CAMP SHELBY:						
COMBINED ARMS AREA WETLANDS CROSSINGS (PHASE I)	5,263	5,263	5,263	5,263	5,263	
MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: GULFPORT: REPLACE MUNITIONS TRAINING AND STORAGE COMPLEX						+ 1,500
TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI	69,763	72,763	94,713	+24,950	+21,950	
MISSOURI						
ARMY: FORT LEONARD WOOD: COUNTERMINE TRAINING COMPLEX (PHASE II)	8,100	8,100	8,100	8,100	8,100	
AIR FORCE: WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE: B-2 CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS STORAGE		5,721				- 5,721
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:						
FORT LEONARD WOOD: MK 19 RANGE	1,878	1,878	1,878	1,878	1,878	
SPRINGFIELD: AVIATION CLASSIFICATION AND REPAIR ACTIVITY DEPOT (PHASE I)		8,234				- 8,234
TOTAL, MISSOURI	9,978	23,933	9,978			- 13,955
MONTANA						
AIR FORCE: MALMSTROM AFB: PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER			13,500	+ 13,500	+ 13,500	
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:						
HELENA:						
ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY (PHASE II)	5,942	5,942	5,942	5,942	5,942	
ADDITION/ALTERATION READINESS CENTER (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY)	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324	
TOWNSEND: QUALIFICATION TRAINING RANGE		2,558				- 2,558
TOTAL, MONTANA	7,266	9,824	20,766	+ 13,500	+ 10,942	
NEBRASKA						
AIR FORCE:						
OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE:						
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER			12,800	+ 12,800	+ 12,800	
CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE WEATHER AGENCY	30,410	30,410	30,410	30,410	30,410	
REPAIR RUNWAY	19,870	19,870	19,870	19,870	19,870	
TOTAL, NEBRASKA	50,280	50,280	63,080	+ 12,800	+ 12,800	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
NEVADA					
AIR FORCE:					
INDIAN SPRINGS:					
PREDATOR MAINTENANCE AND LOGISTICS COMPLEX .....	19,260	19,260	19,260		
PREDATOR MUNITIONS COMPLEX .....	9,330	9,330	9,330		
PREDATOR OPERATIONS FACILITIES .....	23,314	23,314	23,314		
PREDATOR TRAINING FACILITIES .....	8,820	8,820	8,820		
NELNIS AIR FORCE BASE:					
AIRFIELD RESCUE STATIONS (PHASE I) .....		3,741	4,800	+ 4,800	+ 1,059
F/A-22 ADD/ALTER LOW OBSERVABLE COMPOSITE FACILITY .....	9,330	9,330	9,330		
F/A-22 ADD/ALTER WEAPONS SCHOOL .....	10,240	10,240	10,240		
DEFENSE-WIDE: NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE: BIO ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING FACILITY REPLACEMENT .....	1,700	1,700	1,700		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: RENO-TAHOE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: INTELLIGENCE EXPLOITATION FACILITY .....			16,800	+ 16,800	+ 16,800
TOTAL, NEVADA .....	81,994	85,735	103,594	+ 21,600	+ 17,859
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
NAVY: PORTSMOUTH: ACOUSTIC TEST AND CALIBRATION FACILITY .....		8,100			- 8,100
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: NH NATIONAL GUARD STATE MILITARY RESERVATION: NH NATIONAL GUARD JOINT FORCE HEADQUARTERS .....			10,498	+ 10,498	+ 10,498
TOTAL, NEW HAMPSHIRE .....		8,100	10,498	+ 10,498	+ 2,398
NEW JERSEY					
ARMY: PICATINNY ARSENAL: FIRE STATION .....		4,450	4,450	+ 4,450	
NAVY: EARLE PIER COMPLEX REPLACEMENT (PHASE III) .....	54,432	54,432	54,432		
AIR FORCE: MCGUIRE AIR FORCE BASE: ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM .....	13,185	13,185	13,185		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: LAKEHURST: CONSOLIDATED LOGISTICS AND TRAINING FACILITIES .....	26,685	26,685	26,685		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: ATLANTIC CITY: ARM AND DISARM APRON—END OF RUNWAY 13 .....		1,500			- 1,500

ARMY RESERVE:								
FORT DIX:								
COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY .....	12,271	12,271						- 12,271
SHOOT HOUSE/AFTER ACTION REVIEW/BREACH FACILITY .....	1,569	1,569			1,569			
TOTAL, NEW JERSEY .....	95,871	114,092	100,321				+ 4,450	- 13,771
NEW MEXICO								
AIR FORCE:								
HOLLOWAN AIR FORCE BASE: FIRE STATION .....			15,000				+ 15,000	+ 15,000
KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE: HC-130P SIMULATOR FACILITY .....	6,600	6,600	6,600					
DEFENSE-WIDE: CANNON AIR FORCE BASE: REPLACE FUEL STORAGE AND LOADING FACILITY .....	13,200	13,200	13,200					
TOTAL, NEW MEXICO .....	19,800	19,800	34,800				+ 15,000	+ 15,000
NEW YORK								
ARMY:								
FORT DRUM:								
AIRFIELD VEHICLE SUPPORT FACILITY .....		9,700	9,700				+ 9,700	
AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT PALLET PROCESSING FACILITY .....	1,850	1,850	1,850					
BARRACKS COMPLEX 10300 BLOCK (PHASE I) .....	38,500	38,500	38,500					
PHYSICAL FITNESS FACILITY .....	6,800	6,800	6,800					
U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY:								
LIBRARY AND LEARNING CENTER (PHASE II) .....	25,470	25,470	25,470					
MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE .....	4,000	4,000	4,000					
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:								
KINGSTON: ADDITION/ALTERATION READINESS CENTER (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	6,039	6,039	6,039					
LATHAM: READINESS CENTER (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	5,580	5,580	5,580					
LEEDS: ADDITION/ALTERATION READINESS CENTER (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	3,065	3,065	3,065					
ROCHESTER: ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY (AVIATION TRANSFORMATION) .....	19,944	19,944	19,944					
AIR NATIONAL GUARD:								
HANGCOCK FIELD: UPGRADE SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY .....		5,600						- 5,600
STEWART INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: REPLACE FIRE CRASH/RESCUE STATION .....	10,200	10,200	10,200					
NAVY RESERVE: ALBANY: JOINT RESERVE CENTER .....	19,970	19,970	19,970					
AIR FORCE RESERVE: NIAGARA FALLS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: VISITING QUARTERS .....	9,200	9,200	9,200					
TOTAL, NEW YORK .....	150,618	165,918	160,318				+ 9,700	- 5,600

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
<b>ARMY:</b>					
<b>FORT BRAGG:</b>					
BARRACKS COMPLEX—ADDITION TO 3RD BRIGADE .....	32,000	11,400	32,000	.....	.....
BARRACKS COMPLEX 2ND BRIGADE (PHASE I) .....	30,611	30,611	30,611	.....	-11,400
BARRACKS COMPLEX (PHASE II) .....	50,000	50,000	50,000	.....	.....
BARRACKS COMPLEX—3RD BRIGADE (PHASE I) .....	35,600	35,600	35,600	.....	.....
BARRACKS COMPLEX—DIVISION ARTILLERY (PHASE I) .....	7,300	7,300	7,300	.....	.....
COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITY .....	4,450	4,450	4,450	.....	.....
COURTHOUSE .....	2,100	2,100	2,100	.....	.....
URBAN ASSAULT COURSE .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>					
<b>ARMY:</b>					
<b>FORT BRAGG:</b>					
BARRACKS COMPLEX—ADDITION TO 3RD BRIGADE .....	32,000	11,400	32,000	.....	-11,400
BARRACKS COMPLEX 2ND BRIGADE (PHASE I) .....	30,611	30,611	30,611	.....	.....
BARRACKS COMPLEX (PHASE II) .....	50,000	50,000	50,000	.....	.....
BARRACKS COMPLEX—3RD BRIGADE (PHASE I) .....	35,600	35,600	35,600	.....	.....
BARRACKS COMPLEX—DIVISION ARTILLERY (PHASE I) .....	7,300	7,300	7,300	.....	.....
COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITY .....	4,450	4,450	4,450	.....	.....
COURTHOUSE .....	2,100	2,100	2,100	.....	.....
URBAN ASSAULT COURSE .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>NAVY:</b>					
<b>CAMP LEJEUNE:</b>					
ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE FACILITY .....	4,040	4,040	4,040	.....	.....
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS—CAMP JOHNSON .....	20,340	20,340	20,340	.....	.....
MESS HALL—COURTHOUSE BAY .....	11,840	11,840	11,840	.....	.....
MULTI-PURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE .....	5,370	5,370	5,370	.....	.....
CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
AIR INSTALLATIONS COMPATIBLE USE ZONES LAND ACQUISITION .....	1,890	1,890	1,890	.....	.....
HIGH EXPLOSIVE MAGAZINES .....	5,107	5,107	5,107	.....	.....
ORDNANCE FIELD MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS BUILDING .....	2,000	2,000	2,000	.....	.....
V22 GEARBOX REPAIR/TEST FACILITY .....	15,390	15,390	15,390	.....	-2,000
V22 ROTOR BLADE REPAIR FACILITY .....	4,760	4,760	4,760	.....	.....
NEW RIVER .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
AIRCRAFT FIRE AND RESCUE FACILITY .....	.....	4,310	4,310	+ 4,310	.....
MAIN GATE SECURITY UPGRADES .....	2,530	2,530	2,530	.....	.....
<b>DEFENSE-WIDE:</b>					
<b>FORT BRAGG:</b>					
NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION .....	18,075	18,075	18,075	.....	.....
RESISTANCE TRAINING COMPLEX (JOINT SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND) .....	2,569	2,569	2,569	.....	.....
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES HEADQUARTERS BUILDING .....	3,700	3,700	3,700	.....	.....

SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES TRAINING FACILITY .....	8,500	8,500	8,500	8,500	.....	.....	.....	.....	
SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE: REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM .....	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	.....	.....	.....	.....	
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:									
LENOIR: FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP .....	.....	.....	5,858	5,858	.....	.....	+ 5,858	.....	
TARBORO: ADDITIONAL/ALTERATION READINESS CENTER (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	1,154	1,154	1,154	1,154	.....	.....	.....	.....	
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: CHARLOTTE/DOUGLAS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX .....	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	.....	.....	.....	.....	
TOTAL, NORTH CAROLINA .....	289,226	312,794	299,394	299,394	.....	.....	+ 10,168	- 13,400	
NORTH DAKOTA									
AIR FORCE: MINOT AIR FORCE BASE: SECURITY FORCES VEHICLE ALERT FACILITY .....	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	.....	.....	.....	.....	
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:									
CAMP GRAFTON: UPGRADE/HARDEN PERIMETER .....	.....	870	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	- 870	
FRAMINGHAM BARRACKS: BISMARCK WMD CIVIL SUPPORT TEAM FACILITY .....	.....	.....	3,737	3,737	.....	.....	+ 3,737	+ 3,737	
MINOT AIR FORCE BASE: FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP .....	10,950	10,950	10,950	10,950	.....	.....	.....	.....	
TOTAL, NORTH DAKOTA .....	19,650	20,520	23,387	23,387	.....	.....	+ 3,737	+ 2,867	
OHIO									
ARMY: LIMA ARMY MODIFICATION CENTER: JOINT SYSTEMS MANUFACTURING CENTER INTEGRATED OFFICE BUILDING .....	.....	11,600	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	- 11,600	
AIR FORCE:									
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE:									
ADD/ALTER INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION COMPLEX .....	19,670	19,670	19,670	19,670	.....	.....	.....	.....	
NEW ACADEMIC BUILDING .....	.....	12,950	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	- 12,950	
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:									
MANSFIELD LAHM AIRPORT: FIRE STATION (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	1,293	1,293	1,293	1,293	.....	.....	.....	.....	
NORTH CANTON: ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY (AVIATION TRANSFORMATION) .....	7,923	7,923	7,923	7,923	.....	.....	.....	.....	
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: CAMP PERRY ANG STATION: REPLACE TROOP TRAINING QUARTERS .....	.....	.....	4,700	4,700	.....	.....	+ 4,700	+ 4,700	
AIR FORCE RESERVE:									
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE:									
C-5 AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS (PHASE II) .....	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400	.....	.....	.....	.....	
C-5 ALTER FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY .....	800	800	800	800	.....	.....	.....	.....	
C-5 ALTER FUEL HYDRANT SYSTEM .....	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	.....	.....	.....	.....	
C-5 ALTER MAINTENANCE SHOPS .....	800	800	800	800	.....	.....	.....	.....	
C-5 FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE HANGAR .....	10,500	10,500	10,500	10,500	.....	.....	.....	.....	
C-5 SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE HANGAR .....	15,300	15,300	15,300	15,300	.....	.....	.....	.....	
C-5 SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY .....	5,750	5,750	5,750	5,750	.....	.....	.....	.....	
YOUNGSTOWN AIR RESERVE STATION: JOINT SERVICE LODGING FACILITY (PHASE I) .....	.....	7,500	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	- 7,500	
TOTAL, OHIO .....	68,036	100,086	72,736	72,736	.....	.....	+ 4,700	- 27,350	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
OKLAHOMA					
ARMY:					
FORT SILL:					
FIRE STATION .....	.....	3,150	.....	.....	-3,150
RAILROAD EQUIPMENT FACILITY .....	2,700	2,700	2,700	.....	.....
MCALESTER:					
AMMUNITION CONTAINER FACILITY .....	5,400	5,400	5,400	.....	.....
HIGH EXPLOSIVE MAGAZINE INSTALLATION .....	.....	1,100	.....	.....	-1,100
AIR FORCE:					
TINKER AIR FORCE BASE:					
31ST COMBAT COMMUNICATION SQUADRON OPERATIONS COMPLEX .....	11,960	11,960	11,960	.....	.....
UPGRADE BUILDING 3001 INFRASTRUCTURE (PHASE II) .....	20,000	20,000	20,000	.....	.....
TOTAL, OKLAHOMA .....	40,060	44,310	40,060	.....	-4,250
OREGON					
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: SALEM: WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—CIVIL SUPPORT TEAM READY BUILDING .....	.....	2,735	.....	.....	-2,735
NAVAL RESERVE: EUGENE: ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER .....	6,132	6,132	6,132	.....	.....
TOTAL, OREGON .....	6,132	8,867	6,132	.....	-2,735
PENNSYLVANIA					
ARMY: LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT: AMMUNITION SHIPPING FACILITY .....	.....	6,300	6,300	+ 6,300	.....
NAVY: PHILADELPHIA: MACHINERY NETWORKS DEVELOPMENT AND INTEGRATION FACILITY .....	.....	4,780	.....	.....	-4,780
DEFENSE-WIDE: DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND: REPLACE PHYSICAL FITNESS FACILITY .....	6,500	6,500	6,500	.....	.....
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:					
ERIE:					
FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP (STRYKER BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM) .....	5,136	5,136	5,136	.....	.....
READINESS CENTER (STRYKER BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM) .....	11,008	11,008	11,008	.....	.....
FORT INDIANTOWN GAP:					
BATTALION TRAINING FACILITY (PHASE I) (STRYKER BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM) .....	22,190	22,190	22,190	.....	.....



MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
TOTAL, SOUTH CAROLINA .....	69,261	77,161	79,559	+ 10,298	+ 2,398
SOUTH DAKOTA					
AIR FORCE: ELSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE: MAINTENANCE GROUP HEADQUARTERS FACILITY .....				+ 8,400	+ 8,400
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: JOE FOSS FIELD: SECURITY FORCES FACILITY AND COMMUNICATIONS UPGRADE .....		5,500			- 5,500
TENNESSEE					
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: TENNESSEE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD HEADQUARTERS: READINESS CENTER, PHASE II .....			23,193	+ 23,193	+ 23,193
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: MEMPHIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: C-5 FUEL CELL MAINTENANCE HANGAR AND SHOP .....	23,000	23,000	23,000		
C-5 MAINTENANCE HANGAR AND SHOPS .....	39,000	39,000	39,000		
TOTAL, TENNESSEE .....	62,000	62,000	85,193	+ 23,193	+ 23,193
TEXAS					
ARMY: FORT BLISS: VEHICLE BRIDGE .....		5,000			- 5,000
FORT HOOD: BATTALION COMMAND AND CONTROL FACILITIES .....	6,600	6,600	6,600		
FIRE STATION .....	4,100	4,100	4,100		
FIRE STATION (NORTH FORT HOOD) .....		4,650			- 4,650
MULTIPURPOSE SQUAD QUALIFICATION COURSE—SCOUT COMPLEX .....	8,000	8,000	8,000		
PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER .....		6,800			- 6,800
QUALIFICATION TRAINING RANGE .....	6,093	6,093	6,093		
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP .....	21,645	21,645	21,645		
FORT SAM HOUSTON: RENOVATE BARRACKS WINGS AND BATTALION COMMAND AREA .....			7,000	+ 7,000	+ 7,000
NAVY: KINGSVILLE: AIRFIELD LIGHTING (NAVY AUXILIARY LANDING FIELD ORANGE GROVE) .....					
T-10 JET ENGINE TEST CELL .....	6,010	6,010	6,010		
		10,030			- 10,030

AIR FORCE:								
GOODFELLOW AIR FORCE BASE: CHAPEL CENTER .....		4,300						- 4,300
LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE: AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE COMPLEX .....		7,900						- 7,900
SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE:								
STUDENT DORMITORY (300 ROOM) .....	33,000	33,000		33,000				
T-6 CONTRACTOR OPERATED MAINTENANCE AND BASE SUPPLY WAREHOUSE .....	3,000	3,000		3,000				
DEFENSE-WIDE: LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE: MILITARY WORKING DOG MEDICAL FACILITY REPLACEMENT .....	11,000	11,000		11,000				
ARMY RESERVE:								
ELLINGTON FIELD: ARMED FORCES RESERVE AND BATTLE PROJECTION CENTER .....				15,000		+ 15,000		+ 15,000
GRAND PRAIRIE: ARMY RESERVE CENTER (PHASE II) .....	5,685	5,685		5,685				
AIR FORCE RESERVE: FORT WORTH: AIRCRAFT GENERATION FACILITY .....		1,750						- 1,750
TOTAL, TEXAS .....	105,133	145,563		127,133		+ 22,000		- 18,430
UTAH								
ARMY: DUGWAY PROVING GROUND: MICHAEL ARMY AIRFIELD RUNWAY (PHASE II) .....	25,000	25,000		25,000				
AIR FORCE:								
HILL AIR FORCE BASE:								
ADD TO SOFTWARE SUPPORT FACILITY .....	19,500	19,500		19,500				
CONSOLIDATE MISSILE STORAGE FACILITIES .....				9,800		+ 9,800		+ 9,800
F/A-22 AIRCRAFT BATTLE DAMAGE REPAIR TRAINING .....	4,600	4,600		4,600				
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: CAMP WILLIAMS: ADDITIONAL/ALTERATION READINESS CENTER (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	3,279	3,279		3,279				
TOTAL, UTAH .....	52,379	52,379		62,179		+ 9,800		+ 9,800
VERMONT								
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:								
CAMP JOHNSON: INFORMATION SYSTEMS FACILITY .....				5,617		+ 5,617		+ 5,617
ETHAN ALLEN: MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE .....	3,000	3,000		3,000				
TOTAL, VERMONT .....	3,000	3,000		8,617		+ 5,617		+ 5,617
VIRGINIA								
ARMY:								
FORT A.P. HILL: MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE .....	2,700	2,700		2,700				
FORT BELVOIR: DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD (PHASE I) .....	5,000	5,000		5,000				
FORT EUSTIS: DEPLOYMENT STAGING AREA .....				3,100		+ 3,100		+ 3,100
FORT LEE: 49TH QUARTERMASTER GROUP OPERATIONS STORAGE .....		3,900						- 3,900
FORT MYER: CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER .....	15,200	15,200		15,200				

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
NAVY:					
LITTLE CREEK: REPLACE PIERS AND QUAYWALL	36,034	36,034	36,034		
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER: ELECTROMAGNETIC RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING FACILITY			9,960	+ 9,960	+ 9,960
NORFOLK:					
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR (MH-60S CV)	21,565	21,565	21,565		
H60 TRAINER BUILDING	10,680	10,680	10,680		
PIER 11 REPLACEMENT (PHASE III)	40,200	40,200	40,200		
SHIP REPAIR PIER 3 REPLACEMENT (PHASE I)	47,729	47,729	47,729		
OCEANA NAVAL AIR STATION: F/A-18 FACILITY UPGRADES	11,680	11,680	11,680		
QUANTICO:					
AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON—WHITE SIDE	8,031	8,031	8,031		
AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON—GREEN SIDE	11,667	11,667	11,667		
HOCKMOUTH HALL ADDITION	2,600		4,000	+ 1,400	+ 4,000
RELIGIOUS AND FAMILY SERVICES CENTER					- 4,270
WHITE SIDE COMPLEX	34,730	34,730	34,730		
AIR FORCE:					
LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE:					
F/A-22 MUNITIONS STORAGE COMPLEX	20,925	20,925	20,925		
REPAIR PRIMARY PARKING APRON/TAXIWAY	17,740	17,740	17,740		
REPAIR WEST PARKING APRON/TAXIWAY		5,700			- 5,700
DEFENSE-WIDE:					
FORT BELVOIR:					
ALTER AIR INTAKES	4,500	4,500	4,500		
HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT (PHASE II)	57,000	57,000	57,000		
NORFOLK: REPLACE OIL TANKS	6,700	6,700	6,700		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:					
FORT BELVOIR: TOTAL ARMY SCHOOL SYSTEM COMPLEX (PHASE I)	13,596	13,596	13,596		
FORT PICKETT: MILITARY OPERATIONS ON URBAN TERRAIN (MOUT) SHOOT HOUSE	1,552	1,552	1,552		
WINGHESTER: READINESS CENTER		7,619	7,619	+ 7,619	
NAVAL RESERVE: OCEANA NAVAL AIR STATION: C-40 HANGAR	2,259	2,259	2,259		
TOTAL, VIRGINIA	372,088	390,977	394,167	+ 22,079	+ 3,190

WASHINGTON								
ARMY:								
FORT LEWIS:								
BARRACKS COMPLEX .....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000				
BARRACKS COMPLEX—NORTH FORT .....	49,949	49,949	49,949	49,949				
NAVY:								
BANGOR:								
ENCLOSE MOTOR TRANSFER FACILITY .....	2,860	2,860	2,860	2,860				
LIMITED AREA PRODUCTION AND STORAGE COMPLEX (PHASE II) .....	47,095	47,095	47,095	47,095				
MISSION SUPPORT FACILITY .....	15,780	15,780	15,780	15,780				
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER—CARDEROCK DIVISION DETACHMENT CONSOLIDATION (PHASE II) .....	9,430	9,430	9,430	9,430				-9,430
WATERFRONT SECURITY ENCLAVE .....	41,520	41,520	41,520	41,520				
EVERETT: BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS HOMEPORT ASHORE (PHASE I) .....	49,950	49,950	49,950	49,950				
WHIDBEY ISLAND: HIGH PERFORMANCE MAGAZINES .....	4,010	4,010	4,010	4,010				
AIR FORCE: FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE: RESISTANCE TRAINING FACILITY .....			8,200	8,200				+8,200
DEFENSE-WIDE:								
FORT LEWIS:								
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES AVIATION BATTALION COMPLEX .....	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000				
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES EXPAND COMPOUND .....	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500				
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES TRAINING FACILITY (SPECIAL WARFARE CENTER AND SCHOOL) .....	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800				
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: CAMP MURRAY: HOMELAND SECURITY MULTI-FUNCTIONAL EDUCATION CENTER .....	1,424	1,424	1,424	1,424				-1,424
TOTAL, WASHINGTON .....	310,454	325,318	318,654	318,654				-6,664
WEST VIRGINIA								
AIR NATIONAL GUARD:								
EASTERN WEST VIRGINIA REGIONAL AIRPORT—SHEPHERD FIELD, MARTINSBURG:								
C-5 CORROSION CONTROL HANGAR .....	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000				
C-5 JET FUEL STORAGE/HYDRANT SYSTEM/PARKING APRON .....	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000				
UPGRADE AND EXTEND RUNWAY .....			17,000	17,000				+17,000
YEAGER AIRBASE ANG: BRIDGE/GATE HOUSE/FORCE PROTECTION ENTRY .....			6,500	6,500				+6,500
TOTAL, WEST VIRGINIA .....	43,000	43,000	66,500	66,500				+23,500
WISCONSIN								
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: CAMP WILLIAMS: READINESS CENTER .....	5,357	5,357	5,357	5,357				
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: GENERAL MITCHELL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT: UPGRADE COMPOSITE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT COMPLEX .....			7,000	7,000				+7,000
ARMY RESERVE:								
FORT MCGOY:								
MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE .....	3,038	3,038	3,038	3,038				

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER ACADEMY (PHASE I) .....	15,405	15,405	15,405		
PUBLIC SAFETY CENTER .....	5,365	5,365	5,365		
SHOOT HOUSE/AFTER ACTION REVIEW/BREACH FACILITY .....	1,700	1,700	1,700		
WAUSAU:					
ARMY RESERVE CENTER/ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP/UNHEATED STORAGE .....	11,098	11,098	11,098		
TOTAL, WISCONSIN .....	41,963	41,963	48,963	+ 7,000	+ 7,000
WYOMING					
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: CASPER: READINESS CENTER (ARMY DIVISION REDESIGN STUDY) .....	2,802	2,802	2,802		
AIR NATIONAL GUARD: CHEYENNE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT: COMPOSITE AIRLIFT SUPPORT COMPLEX .....	7,000	7,000	7,000		
TOTAL, WYOMING .....	9,802	9,802	9,802		
BAHRAIN ISLAND					
DEFENSE-WIDE: BAHRAIN: MEDICAL CLINIC ADDITION/ALTERATION .....	4,750	4,750	4,750		
TOTAL, BAHRAIN ISLAND .....	4,750	4,750	4,750		
GERMANY					
ARMY:					
GRAFENWOEHR:					
BARRACKS COMPLEX .....	40,000	40,000	40,000		
BRIGADE COMPLEX—FORWARD SUPPORT .....	40,681	40,681	40,681		
SHOOT HOUSE .....	1,800	1,800	1,800		
URBAN ASSAULT COURSE .....	1,600	1,600	1,600		
VILSECK: BARRACKS COMPLEX (PHASE II) .....	13,600	13,600	13,600		
AIR FORCE:					
RAMSTEIN AIR BASE:					
AIRFIELD MAINTENANCE COMPOUND .....	8,600	8,600	8,600		
MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY .....	3,050	3,050	3,050		

SPANGDAHLEM AIR BASE:						
CONTROL TOWER .....	7,100	7,100	7,100	7,100		
LARGE VEHICLE INSPECTION STATION .....	5,374	5,374	5,374	5,374		
DEFENSE-WIDE:						
LANDSTUHL: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL/MIDDLE SCHOOL CLASSROOM ADDITION .....	5,572	5,572	5,572	5,572		
VILSECK: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION AND RENOVATION .....	2,323	2,323	2,323	2,323		
TOTAL, GERMANY .....	129,700	129,700	129,700	129,700		
GREECE						
DEFENSE-WIDE: SOUDA BAY: REPLACE FUEL PIPELINE .....	7,089	7,089	7,089	7,089		
TOTAL, GREECE .....	7,089	7,089	7,089	7,089		
GUAM						
NAVY: ALPHA/BRAVO WHARVES IMPROVEMENTS (PHASE I) .....	25,584	25,584	25,584	25,584		
AIR FORCE:						
ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE:						
AIR EXPEDITIONARY FORCE FORWARD OPERATING LOCATION MUNITIONS STORAGE IGLOOS .....	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000		
REPLACE MILITARY WORKING DOG FACILITY .....	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500		
DEFENSE-WIDE: AGANA NAVAL AIR STATION: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL/MIDDLE SCHOOL REPLACEMENT .....	40,578	40,578	40,578	40,578		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: BARRIGADA: WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—CIVIL SUPPORT TEAM READY BUILDING .....	4,852	4,852	4,852	4,852		
TOTAL, GUAM .....	84,662	89,514	84,662	84,662		-4,852
ITALY						
ARMY: PISA: AMMUNITION STORAGE FACILITY .....	5,254	5,254	5,254	5,254		
AIR FORCE:						
AVIANO AIR BASE:						
AIR CONTROL SQUAD WAREHOUSE .....	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800		
CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT CENTER FACILITY .....	10,850	10,850	10,850	10,850		
FAMILY SUPPORT CENTER .....	4,010	4,010	4,010	4,010		
TOTAL, ITALY .....	27,914	27,914	27,914	27,914		
KOREA						
ARMY:						
CAMP HUMPHREYS:						
BARRACKS COMPLEX .....	28,000	28,000	25,000	25,000		-3,000
BARRACKS COMPLEX .....	45,637	45,637	38,637	38,637		-7,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
BARRACKS COMPLEX .....	40,525	40,525	35,525	- 5,000	- 5,000
YONGPYONG: URBAN ASSAULT COURSE .....	1,450	1,450	1,450		
AIR FORCE:					
KUNSAN AIR BASE:					
CONSOLIDATED PERSONNEL PROCESSING THEATER FACILITY .....	6,800	6,800	6,800		
DORMITORY (382 ROOM) .....	44,100	44,100	37,388	- 6,712	- 6,712
OSAN AIR BASE:					
ADD/ALTER SQUADRON OPERATIONS/APPLIED METEOROLOGY UNIT FACILITY .....	18,969	18,969	18,969		
DORMITORY (156 ROOM) .....	21,750	21,750	20,750	- 1,000	- 1,000
DEFENSE-WIDE: TAEGU AIR BASE: ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL REPLACEMENT/ADDITION .....	8,231	8,231	8,231		
TOTAL, KOREA .....	215,462	215,462	192,750	- 22,712	- 22,712
KWAJALEIN					
DEFENSE-WIDE: KWAJALEIN ATOLL: EMERGENCY SERVICES FACILITY, MECK ISLAND .....	4,901	4,901	4,901		
TOTAL, KWAJALEIN .....	4,901	4,901	4,901		
PORTUGAL					
AIR FORCE: LAJES FIELD: FIRE/GRASH RESCUE STATION .....	12,000	12,000	12,000		
TOTAL, PORTUGAL .....	12,000	12,000	12,000		
PUERTO RICO					
ARMY RESERVE: CAMP SANTIAGO: MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE .....	2,000	2,000	2,000		
TOTAL, PUERTO RICO .....	2,000	2,000	2,000		
SPAIN					
DEFENSE-WIDE: ROTA: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND HIGH SCHOOL MULTIPURPOSE BUILDING .....	7,963	7,963	7,963		
TOTAL, SPAIN .....	7,963	7,963	7,963		

TURKEY					
AIR FORCE: INCIRLIK AIR BASE: CONSOLIDATED COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY .....	5,780	5,780	5,780	5,780	.....
TOTAL, TURKEY .....	5,780	5,780	5,780	5,780	.....
UNITED KINGDOM					
AIR FORCE:					
ROYAL AIR FORCE MILDENHALL: BASE ENGINEER COMPLEX .....	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	.....
ROYAL AIR FORCE LAKENHEATH:					
SMALL DIAMETER BOMB MAINTENANCE FACILITY .....	2,625	2,625	2,625	2,625	.....
SMALL DIAMETER BOMB STORAGE IGLOO AND ADDITION .....	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	.....
SMALL DIAMETER BOMB STORAGE IGLOO AND ADDITION .....	41,697	44,997	44,997	41,697	.....
DEFENSE-WIDE: MENWITH HILL STATION: OPERATIONS/TECH BUILDING .....					- 3,300
TOTAL, UNITED KINGDOM .....	60,322	63,622	60,322	60,322	- 3,300
NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (NATO)					
NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM (NSIP) .....	206,858	206,858	206,858	206,858	.....
TOTAL, NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (NATO) .....	206,858	206,858	206,858	206,858	.....
WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED					
ARMY:					
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS:					
PLANNING AND DESIGN .....	161,393	168,804	191,393	191,393	+ 22,589
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION .....	20,000	20,000	35,000	35,000	+ 15,000
OVERHEAD COVER SYSTEMS .....	.....	50,000	.....	.....	- 50,000
NAVY:					
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS:					
PLANNING AND DESIGN .....	29,512	36,029	32,524	32,524	- 3,505
WHARF UPGRADE .....	39,019	.....	.....	.....	- 39,019
RESCISSON .....	.....	.....	- 92,354	- 92,354	- 92,354
AIR FORCE:					
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS:					
PLANNING AND DESIGN .....	79,047	91,733	103,347	103,347	+ 11,614
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION .....	15,000	15,000	20,000	20,000	+ 5,000
DEFENSE-WIDE:					
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS:					
NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY .....	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	.....
CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION .....	10,000	5,000	10,000	10,000	+ 5,000
ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....	60,000	50,000	60,000	60,000	+ 10,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
PLANNING AND DESIGN:					
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	15,575	16,175	20,575	+ 5,000	+ 4,400
PLANNING AND DESIGN	26,110	26,110	41,110	+ 15,000	+ 15,000
TRICARE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY	65,000	65,000	71,435	+ 6,435	+ 6,435
SUBTOTAL, PLANNING AND DESIGN	106,685	107,285	133,120	+ 26,435	+ 25,835
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	2,000	2,000	3,000	+ 1,000	+ 1,000
TRICARE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY	3,193	3,193	4,193	+ 1,000	+ 1,000
UNDISTRIBUTED	3,000	3,000	3,000		
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENT EDUCATION	1,096	1,096	2,096	+ 1,000	+ 1,000
NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY	3,300	3,300	3,300		
THE JOINT STAFF	7,543	7,543	7,543		
SUBTOTAL, UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	20,132	20,132	23,132	+ 3,000	+ 3,000
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:					
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS:					
PLANNING AND DESIGN	46,148	54,319	67,128	+ 20,980	+ 12,809
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,646	7,646	17,646	+ 10,000	+ 10,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD:					
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS:					
PLANNING AND DESIGN	12,856	23,027	32,856	+ 20,000	+ 9,829
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,000	5,000	10,000	+ 5,000	+ 5,000
ARMY RESERVE:					
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS:					
PLANNING AND DESIGN	14,416	16,713	29,416	+ 15,000	+ 12,703
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	2,979	2,979	2,979		
NAVAL RESERVE:					
UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS:					
PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,978	1,746	2,978		+ 1,232
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION		1,232	750	+ 750	- 482

AIR FORCE RESERVE:								
VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS:								
PLANNING AND DESIGN .....	3,770	6,407	13,770	+10,000			+7,363	
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION .....	4,000	4,000	4,000					
TOTAL, WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED .....	664,581	711,052	721,685	+57,104			+10,633	
FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY								
ALASKA:								
FORT RICHARDSON (117 UNITS) .....	49,000	49,000	49,000					
FORT WAINWRIGHT (96 UNITS) .....	49,000	49,000	49,000					
FORT WAINWRIGHT (84 UNITS) .....	42,000	42,000	42,000					
ARIZONA:								
FORT HUACHUCA (131 UNITS) .....	31,000	31,000	31,000					
YUMA (35 UNITS) .....	11,200	11,200	11,200					
OKLAHOMA: FORT SILL (129 UNITS) .....	24,000	24,000	24,000					
VIRGINIA:								
FORT LEE (96 UNITS) .....	19,500	19,500	19,500					
FORT MONROE (21 UNITS) .....	6,000	6,000	6,000					
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	300,400	300,400	300,400					
PLANNING AND DESIGN .....	17,536	17,536	17,536					
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	549,636	549,636	549,636					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:								
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	131,860	131,860	131,860					
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	28,718	28,718	28,718					
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	68,188	68,188	68,188					
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT .....	1,345	1,345	1,345					
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	39,465	39,465	39,465					
LEASING .....	213,990	213,990	213,990					
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	309,123	309,123	309,123					
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	20,304	20,304	20,304					+9,000
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	812,993	803,993	812,993				+9,000	
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY .....	1,362,629	1,353,629	1,362,629				+9,000	
FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS								
GUAM: GUAM (126 UNITS) .....	40,298	40,298	40,298					

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS .....	178,644	178,644	178,644	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	218,942	218,942	218,942	.....	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:					
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	97,841	97,841	97,841	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	20,189	20,189	20,189	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	81,924	76,924	81,924	.....	+ 5,000
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	45,421	45,421	45,421	.....	.....
LEASING .....	143,790	143,790	143,790	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	186,511	186,511	186,511	.....	.....
MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUM .....	56	56	56	.....	.....
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	17,928	17,928	17,928	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	593,660	588,660	593,660	.....	+ 5,000
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS .....	812,602	807,602	812,602	.....	+ 5,000
FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE					
ALASKA:					
EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE (92 UNITS) .....	37,650	37,650	37,650	.....	.....
EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE (300 UNITS) .....	18,144	18,144	18,144	.....	.....
CALIFORNIA: EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE (226 UNITS) .....	59,699	59,699	59,699	.....	.....
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE (159 UNITS) .....	48,711	48,711	48,711	.....	-48,711
FLORIDA: WACDILL AIR FORCE BASE (PHASE VII) (109 UNITS) .....	40,982	40,982	40,982	.....	.....
IDAHO: MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE (PHASE VII) (194 UNITS) .....	56,467	56,467	56,467	.....	.....
MISSOURI: WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE (111 UNITS) .....	26,917	26,917	26,917	.....	.....
MONTANA: Malmstrom Air Force Base (296 UNITS) .....	68,971	68,971	68,971	.....	.....
NORTH CAROLINA: SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE (PHASE IX) (255 UNITS) .....	48,868	48,868	48,868	.....	.....
NORTH DAKOTA:					
GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE (PHASE J) (300 UNITS) .....	86,706	86,706	86,706	.....	.....
MINOT AIR FORCE BASE (PHASE XII) (223 UNITS) .....	44,548	44,548	44,548	.....	.....

SOUTH CAROLINA: CHARLESTON AIR FORCE BASE (10 UNITS) .....	15,935	15,935	15,935	15,935	.....	.....	.....
SOUTH DAKOTA: ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE (60 UNITS) .....	14,383	14,383	14,383	14,383	.....	.....	.....
TEXAS: DYESS AIR FORCE BASE (PHASE VI) (190 UNITS) .....	43,016	43,016	43,016	43,016	.....	.....	.....
GERMANY:							
RAMSTEIN AIR BASE (101 UNITS) .....	62,952	62,952	62,952	62,952	.....	.....	.....
SPANGDAHL AIR BASE (79 UNITS) .....	45,385	45,385	45,385	45,385	.....	.....	.....
TURKEY, INCIRLIK AIR BASE (100 UNITS) .....	22,730	22,730	22,730	22,730	.....	.....	.....
UNITED KINGDOM: ROYAL AIR FORCE LAKENHEATH (107 UNITS) .....	48,437	48,437	48,437	48,437	.....	.....	.....
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS .....	420,203	409,103	409,113	409,113	.....	.....	.....
PLANNING AND DESIGN .....	40,404	37,104	37,104	37,104	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	1,251,108	1,236,220	1,142,622	1,142,622	.....	.....	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:							
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	116,946	116,946	116,946	116,946	.....	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	78,090	66,470	78,090	78,090	.....	.....	.....
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	25,740	25,740	25,740	25,740	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	41,932	41,932	41,932	41,932	.....	.....	.....
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT .....	2,407	2,407	2,407	2,407	.....	.....	.....
LEASING .....	154,907	154,907	154,907	154,907	.....	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	310,479	310,479	310,479	310,479	.....	.....	.....
DEBT ACCOUNT .....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	36,437	36,437	36,437	36,437	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	766,939	755,319	766,939	766,939	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE .....	2,018,047	1,991,539	1,909,561	1,909,561	.....	.....	.....
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE							
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:							
UTILITIES ACCOUNT (NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY) .....	7	7	7	7	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT (NSA) .....	25	25	25	25	.....	.....	.....
LEASING (NSA) .....	9,814	9,814	9,814	9,814	.....	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (NSA) .....	1,134	1,134	1,134	1,134	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT (DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY) .....	4,031	4,031	4,031	4,031	.....	.....	.....
LEASING (DIA) .....	30,130	30,130	30,130	30,130	.....	.....	.....
UTILITIES ACCOUNT (DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY) .....	427	427	427	427	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT (DLA) .....	40	40	40	40	.....	.....	.....
SERVICES ACCOUNT (DLA) .....	80	80	80	80	.....	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT (DLA) .....	299	299	299	299	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	766,939	755,319	766,939	766,939	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE .....	2,018,047	1,991,539	1,909,561	1,909,561	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	1,251,108	1,236,220	1,142,622	1,142,622	.....	.....	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:							
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	116,946	116,946	116,946	116,946	.....	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	78,090	66,470	78,090	78,090	.....	.....	.....
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	25,740	25,740	25,740	25,740	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	41,932	41,932	41,932	41,932	.....	.....	.....
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT .....	2,407	2,407	2,407	2,407	.....	.....	.....
LEASING .....	154,907	154,907	154,907	154,907	.....	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	310,479	310,479	310,479	310,479	.....	.....	.....
DEBT ACCOUNT .....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	36,437	36,437	36,437	36,437	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	766,939	755,319	766,939	766,939	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE .....	2,018,047	1,991,539	1,909,561	1,909,561	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	1,251,108	1,236,220	1,142,622	1,142,622	.....	.....	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:							
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	116,946	116,946	116,946	116,946	.....	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	78,090	66,470	78,090	78,090	.....	.....	.....
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	25,740	25,740	25,740	25,740	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	41,932	41,932	41,932	41,932	.....	.....	.....
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT .....	2,407	2,407	2,407	2,407	.....	.....	.....
LEASING .....	154,907	154,907	154,907	154,907	.....	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	310,479	310,479	310,479	310,479	.....	.....	.....
DEBT ACCOUNT .....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	36,437	36,437	36,437	36,437	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	766,939	755,319	766,939	766,939	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE .....	2,018,047	1,991,539	1,909,561	1,909,561	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	1,251,108	1,236,220	1,142,622	1,142,622	.....	.....	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:							
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	116,946	116,946	116,946	116,946	.....	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	78,090	66,470	78,090	78,090	.....	.....	.....
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	25,740	25,740	25,740	25,740	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	41,932	41,932	41,932	41,932	.....	.....	.....
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT .....	2,407	2,407	2,407	2,407	.....	.....	.....
LEASING .....	154,907	154,907	154,907	154,907	.....	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	310,479	310,479	310,479	310,479	.....	.....	.....
DEBT ACCOUNT .....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	36,437	36,437	36,437	36,437	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	766,939	755,319	766,939	766,939	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE .....	2,018,047	1,991,539	1,909,561	1,909,561	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	1,251,108	1,236,220	1,142,622	1,142,622	.....	.....	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:							
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	116,946	116,946	116,946	116,946	.....	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	78,090	66,470	78,090	78,090	.....	.....	.....
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	25,740	25,740	25,740	25,740	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	41,932	41,932	41,932	41,932	.....	.....	.....
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT .....	2,407	2,407	2,407	2,407	.....	.....	.....
LEASING .....	154,907	154,907	154,907	154,907	.....	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	310,479	310,479	310,479	310,479	.....	.....	.....
DEBT ACCOUNT .....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	36,437	36,437	36,437	36,437	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	766,939	755,319	766,939	766,939	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE .....	2,018,047	1,991,539	1,909,561	1,909,561	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	1,251,108	1,236,220	1,142,622	1,142,622	.....	.....	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:							
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	116,946	116,946	116,946	116,946	.....	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	78,090	66,470	78,090	78,090	.....	.....	.....
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	25,740	25,740	25,740	25,740	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	41,932	41,932	41,932	41,932	.....	.....	.....
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT .....	2,407	2,407	2,407	2,407	.....	.....	.....
LEASING .....	154,907	154,907	154,907	154,907	.....	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	310,479	310,479	310,479	310,479	.....	.....	.....
DEBT ACCOUNT .....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	36,437	36,437	36,437	36,437	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	766,939	755,319	766,939	766,939	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE .....	2,018,047	1,991,539	1,909,561	1,909,561	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	1,251,108	1,236,220	1,142,622	1,142,622	.....	.....	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:							
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	116,946	116,946	116,946	116,946	.....	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	78,090	66,470	78,090	78,090	.....	.....	.....
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	25,740	25,740	25,740	25,740	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	41,932	41,932	41,932	41,932	.....	.....	.....
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT .....	2,407	2,407	2,407	2,407	.....	.....	.....
LEASING .....	154,907	154,907	154,907	154,907	.....	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	310,479	310,479	310,479	310,479	.....	.....	.....
DEBT ACCOUNT .....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	36,437	36,437	36,437	36,437	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	766,939	755,319	766,939	766,939	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE .....	2,018,047	1,991,539	1,909,561	1,909,561	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	1,251,108	1,236,220	1,142,622	1,142,622	.....	.....	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:							
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	116,946	116,946	116,946	116,946	.....	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	78,090	66,470	78,090	78,090	.....	.....	.....
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	25,740	25,740	25,740	25,740	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	41,932	41,932	41,932	41,932	.....	.....	.....
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT .....	2,407	2,407	2,407	2,407	.....	.....	.....
LEASING .....	154,907	154,907	154,907	154,907	.....	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	310,479	310,479	310,479	310,479	.....	.....	.....
DEBT ACCOUNT .....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	36,437	36,437	36,437	36,437	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	766,939	755,319	766,939	766,939	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE .....	2,018,047	1,991,539	1,909,561	1,909,561	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	1,251,108	1,236,220	1,142,622	1,142,622	.....	.....	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:							
UTILITIES ACCOUNT .....	116,946	116,946	116,946	116,946	.....	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT .....	78,090	66,470	78,090	78,090	.....	.....	.....
SERVICES ACCOUNT .....	25,740	25,740	25,740	25,740	.....	.....	.....
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT .....	41,932	41,932	41,932	41,932	.....	.....	.....
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT .....	2,407	2,407	2,407	2,407	.....	.....	.....
LEASING .....	154,907	154,907	154,907	154,907	.....	.....	.....
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY .....	310,479	310,479	310,479	310,479	.....	.....	.....
DEBT ACCOUNT .....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....
PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS .....	36,437	36,437	36,437	36,437	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MA							

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (DLA) .....	404	404	404		
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	46,391	46,391	46,391		
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND .....	2,500	2,500	2,500		
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT, 1990 .....	377,827	377,827	377,827		
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT, 2005 .....	1,880,466	1,570,466	1,504,466	- 376,000	- 66,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT .....	2,258,293	1,948,293	1,882,293	- 376,000	- 66,000
GENERAL PROVISION (SEC. 122) .....	65,000	65,000		- 65,000	- 65,000
GRAND TOTAL .....	12,116,611	12,262,392	12,116,611		- 145,781
RECAPITULATION					
ARMY .....	1,479,841	1,652,552	1,640,641	+ 160,800	- 11,911
RESCISSION .....					
NAVY AND MARINE CORPS .....	1,029,249	1,109,177	1,045,882	+ 16,633	- 63,295
RESCISSION .....					
AIR FORCE .....	1,069,640	1,171,338	1,209,128	- 92,354	- 92,354
RESCISSION .....					
DEFENSE-WIDE .....	1,042,730	976,664	1,072,165	+ 139,488	+ 37,790
RESCISSION .....					
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD .....	327,012	410,624	467,146	+ 29,435	+ 95,501
AIR NATIONAL GUARD .....	165,256	225,727	279,156	+ 140,134	+ 56,522
RESCISSION .....					
ARMY RESERVE .....	106,077	138,425	136,077	+ 113,900	+ 53,429
				+ 30,000	- 2,348

NAVAL RESERVE .....	45,226	45,226	46,676	+ 1,450	+ 1,450
AIR FORCE RESERVE .....	79,260	110,847	89,260	+ 10,000	- 21,587
TOTAL, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....	5,344,291	5,840,580	5,893,777	+ 549,486	+ 53,197
NATO INFRASTRUCTURE .....	206,858	206,858	206,858		
RESCISSION .....					
FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY .....	1,362,629	1,353,629	1,362,629		+ 9,000
(CONSTRUCTION) .....	(949,636)	(949,636)	(949,636)		
(RESCISSION) .....					
(OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE) .....	(812,993)	(803,993)	(812,993)		(+ 9,000)
FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS .....	812,602	807,602	812,602		+ 5,000
(CONSTRUCTION) .....	(218,942)	(218,942)	(218,942)		
(RESCISSION) .....					
(OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE) .....	(593,660)	(588,660)	(593,660)		(+ 5,000)
FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE .....	2,018,047	1,991,539	1,909,561	- 108,486	- 81,978
(CONSTRUCTION) .....	(1,251,108)	(1,236,220)	(1,142,622)	(- 108,486)	(- 93,598)
(RESCISSION) .....					
(OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE) .....	(766,939)	(755,319)	(766,939)		(+ 11,620)
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	46,391	46,391	46,391		
(CONSTRUCTION) .....					
(OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE) .....	(46,391)	(46,391)	(46,391)		
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND .....	2,500	2,500	2,500		
RESCISSIONS .....					
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT .....	2,258,293	1,948,293	1,882,293	- 376,000	- 66,000
CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE .....					
GENERAL PROVISION (SEC. 122) .....	65,000	65,000		- 65,000	- 65,000
GRAND TOTAL .....	12,116,611	12,262,392	12,116,611		- 145,781

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
<b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</b>							
Military construction, Army	1,981,084	1,479,841	1,652,552	1,640,641	-340,443	+160,800	-11,911
Rescissions	-18,976				+18,976		
Total	1,962,108	1,479,841	1,652,552	1,640,641	-321,467	+160,800	-11,911
Military construction, Navy and Marine Corps	1,069,947	1,029,249	1,109,177	1,045,882	-24,065	+16,633	-63,295
Rescissions	-24,000			-92,354	-68,354	-92,354	-92,354
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 108-324)	138,800				-138,800		
Additional appropriations (Div. J) (Public Law 108-447)	-4,350				+4,350		
Total	1,180,397	1,029,249	1,109,177	953,528	-226,869	-75,721	-155,649
Military construction, Air Force	866,331	1,069,640	1,171,338	1,209,128	+342,797	+139,488	+37,790
Rescission	-21,800				+21,800		
Total	844,531	1,069,640	1,171,338	1,209,128	+364,597	+139,488	+37,790
Military construction, Defense-wide	686,055	1,042,730	976,664	1,072,165	+386,110	+29,435	+95,501
Rescission	-22,737				+22,737		
Total	663,318	1,042,730	976,664	1,072,165	+408,847	+29,435	+95,501
Total, Active components	4,650,354	4,621,460	4,909,731	4,875,462	+225,108	+254,002	-34,269
Military construction, Army National Guard	446,748	327,012	410,624	467,146	+20,398	+140,134	+56,522
Military construction, Air National Guard	243,043	165,256	225,727	279,156	+36,113	+113,900	+53,429
Rescission	-5,000				+5,000		
Total	238,043	165,256	225,727	279,156	+41,113	+113,900	+53,429
Military construction, Army Reserve	92,377	106,077	138,425	136,077	+43,700	+30,000	-2,348



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued  
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Rescission .....	-45,171	.....	.....	.....	+45,171	.....	.....
Total .....	801,788	1,251,108	1,236,220	1,142,622	+340,834	-108,486	-93,598
Family housing operation and maintenance, Air Force .....	853,384	766,939	755,319	766,939	-86,445	.....	+11,620
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 108-324) .....	11,400	.....	.....	.....	-11,400	.....	.....
Total .....	864,784	766,939	755,319	766,939	-97,845	.....	+11,620
Family housing construction, Defense-wide .....	49	.....	.....	.....	-49	.....	.....
Family housing operation and maintenance, Defense-wide .....	49,575	46,391	46,391	46,391	-3,184	.....	.....
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund .....	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	.....	.....	.....
Rescission .....	-19,109	.....	.....	.....	+19,109	.....	.....
Total .....	-16,609	2,500	2,500	2,500	+19,109	.....	.....
Total, Family housing .....	4,074,603	4,242,169	4,201,661	4,133,683	+59,080	-108,486	-67,978
Appropriations .....	(4,150,484)	(4,242,169)	(4,201,661)	(4,133,683)	(-16,801)	(-108,486)	(-67,978)
Emergency appropriations .....	(21,700)	.....	.....	.....	(-21,700)	.....	.....
Rescissions .....	(-97,581)	.....	.....	.....	(+97,581)	.....	.....
Chemical demilitarization construction, Defense-wide .....	81,886	.....	.....	.....	-81,886	.....	.....
Department of Defense base closure:							
Department of Defense base closure account, 1990 .....	246,116	377,827	377,827	377,827	+131,711	.....	.....
Department of Defense base closure account, 2005 .....	.....	1,880,466	1,570,466	1,504,466	+1,504,466	-376,000	-66,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 108-324) .....	50	.....	.....	.....	-50	.....	.....
Total, Department of Defense base closure .....	246,166	2,258,293	1,948,293	1,882,293	+1,636,127	-376,000	-66,000
General provision (sec. 128) .....	.....	65,000	65,000	.....	.....	-65,000	-65,000



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate
Appropriations (indefinite)	1,985,984	2,170,000	2,170,000	2,170,000	+ 184,016	.....
Total, Veterans Health Administration	28,188,875	30,180,684	28,820,684	31,332,943	+ 3,144,068	+ 2,512,259
Offsetting collections	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total available to VHA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Departmental Administration	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
General operating expenses	1,314,155	1,418,827	1,411,827	1,418,827	+ 104,672	+ 7,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 108-324)	545	.....	.....	.....	- 545	.....
National Cemetery Administration	147,734	156,447	156,447	156,447	+ 8,713	.....
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 108-324)	50	.....	.....	.....	- 50	.....
Office of Inspector General	69,153	70,174	70,174	70,174	+ 1,021	.....
Construction, major projects	455,130	607,100	607,100	607,100	+ 151,970	.....
Construction, minor projects	228,933	208,937	208,937	208,937	- 19,996	.....
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 108-324)	36,343	.....	.....	.....	- 36,343	.....
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities	104,322	.....	25,000	104,322	.....	+ 79,322
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries	31,744	32,000	32,000	32,000	+ 256	.....
Total, Departmental Administration	2,388,109	2,493,485	2,511,485	2,597,807	+ 209,698	+ 86,322
Total, title II:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New budget (obligational) authority	65,838,832	69,454,300	68,112,300	70,710,881	+ 4,872,049	+ 2,598,581
Appropriations	(65,714,762)	(69,454,300)	(68,112,300)	(68,733,881)	(+ 3,019,119)	(+ 621,581)
Rescissions	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Emergency appropriations	(124,070)	.....	.....	(1,977,000)	(+ 1,852,930)	(+ 1,977,000)
Offsetting collections	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(54,608)	(34,742)	(34,742)	(34,742)	(- 19,866)	.....
Discretionary	30,730,748	32,828,682	31,486,682	34,085,263	+ 3,354,515	+ 2,598,581

Mandatory .....	35,108,084	36,625,618	36,625,618	36,625,618	+ 1,517,534	.....	.....
Mandatory .....	(35,108,084)	(36,625,618)	(36,625,618)	(36,625,618)	(+ 1,517,534)	.....	.....
Net discretionary .....	(30,730,748)	(32,828,682)	(31,486,682)	(34,085,263)	(+ 3,354,515)	(+ 1,256,581)	(+ 2,598,581)
Medical care collection fund .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES							
American Battle Monuments Commission							
Salaries and expenses .....	40,771	35,250	35,750	36,250	- 4,521	+ 1,000	+ 500
Foreign currency fluctuations .....	11,904	15,250	15,250	15,250	+ 3,346	.....	.....
Total, American Battle Monuments Commission .....	52,675	50,500	51,000	51,500	- 1,175	+ 1,000	+ 500
U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims							
Salaries and expenses .....	17,112	18,295	18,295	18,795	+ 1,683	+ 500	+ 500
Department of Defense—Civil							
Cemeterial Expenses, Army							
Salaries and expenses .....	29,363	28,050	29,550	28,550	- 813	+ 500	- 1,000
Armed Forces Retirement Home							
Operation and maintenance .....	57,163	57,033	57,033	57,033	- 130	.....	.....
Capital program .....	3,968	1,248	1,248	1,248	- 2,720	.....	.....
Total, Armed Forces Retirement Home .....	61,131	58,281	58,281	58,281	- 2,850	.....	.....
Total, title III:	160,281	155,126	157,126	157,126	- 3,155	+ 2,000	.....
New budget (obligational) authority .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Grand total, all titles:							
New budget (obligational) authority .....	76,171,363	81,726,037	80,531,818	82,984,618	+ 6,813,255	+ 1,258,581	+ 2,452,800
Appropriations .....	(76,073,137)	(81,726,037)	(80,531,818)	(81,099,972)	(+ 5,026,835)	(- 626,065)	(+ 568,154)
Emergency appropriations .....	(293,320)	.....	.....	(1,977,000)	(+ 1,683,680)	(+ 1,977,000)	(+ 1,977,000)
Rescissions .....	(- 195,094)	.....	.....	(- 92,354)	(+ 102,740)	(- 92,354)	(- 92,354)