



# FY2024 NDAA: Military Construction and Housing Authorizations

August 23, 2023

On March 13, 2023, the Biden Administration delivered the annual President's Budget Request seeking \$16.675 billion for the Department of Defense (DOD) Military Construction (MILCON) account for Fiscal Year 2024. The MILCON account request includes funding for MILCON programs and Military Family Housing programs. The request marks a 14.4% percent decrease from the amount enacted in the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2023 (P.L. 117-263), which authorized \$19.486 billion for MILCON accounts.

On June 30, the House Armed Services Committee reported a draft of a FY2024 NDAA. The bill, H.R. 2670, and its accompanying report, H.Rept. 118-125, included \$17.475 billion for DOD's MILCON authorizations under Division B, about \$800 million above the amount requested, a 4.8% proposed increase. H.R. 2670 includes 26 Community Project Funding items totaling \$480 million. The House passed the bill on July 14, 2023.

On July 11, 2023 the Senate Armed Services Committee reported a draft of a FY2024 NDAA. The bill, S. 2226, and its accompanying report, S.Rept. 118-58, included \$16.675 million for DOD's MILCON programs, an amount equal to the Administration's request. On July 27, the Senate passed S. 2226. There were no Congressionally Directed Spending items in the Senate-passed bill.

Table I. Comparison of MILCON Funding Authorizations in House and Senate NDAAs for FY2024

Account	FY2024 Request	House Change	House Bill (H.R. 2670)	Senate Change	Senate Bill (S. 2226)
Military Construction, Army	1,470,555	332,610	1,803,165	180,824	1,651,379
Military Construction, Navy	6,022,187	-678,673	5,343,514	-1,353,700	4,668,487
Military Construction, Air Force	2,605,314	440,000	3,045,314	466,500	3,071,814

**Congressional Research Service** 

https://crsreports.congress.gov

IN12229

**CRS INSIGHT** 

Prepared for Members and

Committees of Congress

Military Construction, Defense-wide	2,984,682	-59,535	2,925,147	21,425	3,006,107
Military Construction, Army National Guard	340,186	250,756	590,942	310,381	650,567
Military Construction, Army Reserve	107,076	118,000	225,076	63,000	170,076
Military Construction, Navy and Marine Reserve	51,291	15,000	66,291	0	51,291
Military Construction, Air National Guard	178,722	152,342	331,064	143,570	322,292
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	291,572	52,500	344,072	18,000	309,572
NATO Security Investment Program	293,434	0	293,434	0	293,434
INDOPACIFIC Combatant Command	0	0	0	150,000	150,000
Family Housing	1,933,644	27,000	1,960,644	0	1,933,644
Family Housing Improvement Fund (FHIF)	6,611	0	6,611	0	6,611
Unaccompanied Housing Improv. Fund (UHIF)	496	0	496	0	496
Base Realignment and Closure	389,174	150,000	539,174	0	389,174
Total Division B, Military Construction	16,674,944	800,000	17,474,944	0	16,674,944

Source: Funding Tables in Report No. 118-125, Sec. 4601; and S.Rept. 118-58, Sec. 4601.

**Notes**: Family Housing here includes the sum of the following accounts, Army Family Housing Construction, Army Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Navy Family Housing Construction, Navy Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Family Housing Construction, Air Force Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Defense-wide Family Housing Operation & Maintenance. To facilitate the comparison of the House and Senate bills, CRS has broken out the Family Housing Improvement Fund (FHIF), Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund (UHIF) and INDOPACOM Construction as separate line items for this table.

# **Selected Policy Issues**

The House and Senate versions of an NDAA include policy provisions that could impact military construction and military housing programs. Both bills include provisions that would increase congressional oversight of unaccompanied housing and family housing on military installations.

**Table 2** provides a comparison of selected policy provisions from the two NDAA bills.

Table 2. Selected NDAA Military Construction and Housing Issues

House-passed	(H.R.	2670)	
	(		

Senate-passed (S. 2226)

#### Military Construction

Section 2801 would amend Title 10, Sec. 2391 of the *U.S. Code* to make the Defense Community Infrastructure Pilot (DCIP) program permanent.

No similar provision

Section 2814 would amend Title 10, Section 2391, of the U.S. Code to include Coast Guard installations in the Defense Community Infrastructure Pilot (DCIP) Program.

Section 2801 would provide expanded authority for the commander of U.S. Indo-Pacific Command (INDOPACOM) to authorize or carry out MILCON projects in the INDOPACOM area of responsibility or to authorize the Secretary of a military department to carry out such a project.

Section 1636 would authorize the use of cost-plus-incentivefee contracting for military construction projects associated with the Sentinel Intercontinental Ballistic Missile program. No similar provision

#### House-passed (H.R. 2670)

# Senate-passed (S. 2226)

Section 2866 would limit the use of all funds for construction related to the headquarters of the U.S. Space Force pending an Air Force report to congressional defense committees about the justification for the selection process for the headquarters.

No similar provision

#### Unaccompanied Housing

Section 2825 would require the service secretaries to approve certain waivers relating to configuration and privacy standards for military unaccompanied housing.

No similar provision

Section 2826 would require the Secretary of Defense to update minimum standards relating to the health, safety, and condition of unaccompanied housing. The provision would also require any waivers for such standards to be approved by the appropriate secretary of the military department.

Section 2824 would expand the existing Uniform Code of Basic Standards for military housing to include unaccompanied housing. The code currently applies only to family housing.

No similar provision

Section 2821 would require DOD to issue a uniform facility condition index for military unaccompanied housing.

No similar provision

Section 2822 would require the Secretary of Defense to provide annual certification to the congressional defense committees regarding the habitability of unaccompanied housing facilities.

No similar provision

Section 2823 would require DOD to create regulations for effective and timely maintenance work order management for the maintenance and repair of unaccompanied housing facilities.

No similar provision

Section 2825 would require the assignment of a civilian employee at housing offices at each military installation to oversee matters relating to unaccompanied housing.

No similar provision

Section 2829 would require that, within three years, all military unaccompanied housing facilities are retrofitted with security cameras in all common areas and entry points.

No similar provision

Sec. 2830 would require the Secretary of Defense to submit annual reports about unaccompanied housing, including estimated repair costs for each facility.

### Privatized Military Housing

Section 2822 would create a DOD Military Housing Readiness Council

Section 2851 would create a DOD Military Housing Readiness Council

Section 2824 would establishing additional requirements for a military housing complaint database

No similar provision

No similar provision

Section 2841 would impose limitations on payments to privatized military housing companies that do not comply with the military "tenant bill of rights."

No similar provision

Section 2842 would require DOD to implement recommendations contained in the April 2023 GAO report regarding privatized military housing.

No similar provision

Section 2843 would restrict privatized military housing companies from asking tenants to sign non-disclosure

agreements.

#### **Transient Housing**

Section 2821 would transfer the "jurisdiction for the administration of military transient lodging to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment. (ASD(El&E))." Oversight of transient housing is currently the purview of the individual services.

No similar provision

Source: CRS analysis of H.R. 2670, H.Rept. 118-125, S. 2226, and S.Rept. 118-58.

# **Author Information**

Andrew Tilghman Analyst in U.S. Defense Infrastructure Policy

# Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.