

Report to Congress on Government-Owned Unaccompanied Housing



**Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for
Acquisition, Technology and Logistics**

February 2013

The estimated cost of this report for the Department of Defense is approximately \$30,300 in Fiscal Years 2010 - 2013. This includes \$300 in expenses and \$30,000 in DoD labor.
Cost estimate generated on November 7, 2012 RefID: A-09F968A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Congressional Request.....	1
Section 1- UH Standards.....	1
DoD Standards for UH Condition, Configuration, and Privacy	2
DoD Performance Budget Goal for UH Condition.....	4
Military Service Plans for Configuration and Privacy.....	5
Section 2 - Plans to Replace Relocatable UH and Modernize UH.....	5
Relocatable UH.....	6
Plans for Deteriorating and Outdated UH.....	6
Investment Details	8
Section 3- DoD UH Inventory	9
UH Capacity Requirements	9
Personnel Assigned to Permanent Party UH	10
Inventory and Adequacy of Permanent Party and Training UH.....	10
MilCon projects to Eliminate Inadequate Permanent party UH	12
Conclusion	12

ATTACHMENTS

1. Army standards, goals, and progress for configuration, and privacy	13
2. Navy standards, goals, and progress for configuration, and privacy	15
3. Marine Corps standards, goals, and progress for configuration, and privacy.....	16
4. Air Force standards, goals, and progress for configuration, and privacy	17
5. Army MilCon UH Projects, FY 2010 to 2013	18
6. Navy MilCon UH Projects, FY 2010 to 2013.....	20
7. Marine Corps MilCon UH Projects, FY 2010 to 2013	21
8. Air Force MilCon UH Projects, FY 2010 to 2013.....	22

TABLES

1. DoD UH Min Configuration and Privacy Standards for Assignment – Perm Party	2
2. DoD UH Construction Standards – Junior Enlisted Permanent Party	3
3. Military Services Permanent Party UH Condition at the end of each FY	4
4. Military Services Training UH Condition at the end of each FY	4
5. UH MilCon and O&M Focused Funding - Permanent Party and Training.....	5
6. Relocatable Permanent Party UH as of September 30, 2011.....	6
7. Personnel Without Dependents Required to Live in Permanent Party UH in U.S.....	9
8. Military Services Permanent Party UH Requirements each FY	10
9. Military Personnel Assigned to Permanent Party UH as of September 30, 2011.....	10
10. Military Services Permanent Party UH Inventory at the end each FY	11
11. Military Services Training UH Inventory at the end each FY.....	11

Executive Summary

In the mid-1990s, the Department of Defense (DoD) began to focus on the modernization of permanent party unaccompanied housing (UH) with a substantial increase in military construction (MilCon) funding and the introduction of new UH designs offering more privacy and amenities. From FY 1996 through FY 2012, over \$21 billion of MilCon funds were used to construct and modernize UH worldwide. Also, hundreds of millions in operation and maintenance (O&M) funds were targeted toward UH for modernization. This substantial investment has brought the UH modernization program closer to completion, and, just as important, DoD has developed new budget metrics to help ensure that the modernized UH inventory is adequately maintained over the long term.

Congressional Requests

This report responds to three separate requests by Congress for information on UH.

First, in the Explanatory Statement for H.R. 2638, the Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009, Congress asked the Department to document the extent to which UH meets its established standards, reasons why such facilities fail to meet such standards; and an estimate of funding required by fiscal year for each Military Service to bring UH into compliance with DoD standards. The responses to these questions can be found in Section 1 of this report.

Next, Senate Report 111-35 accompanying S. 1390, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2010, asked the Department to provide a strategy to replace relocatable housing with permanent facilities and the investments or replacement military construction required to provide adequate housing for Service members at installations affected by force structure initiatives. The report should also include a plan to replace, sustain, restore, or modernize deteriorating and outdated UH, and the investment details associated with that plan. The responses to these questions can be found in Section 2 of this report.

Finally, Senate Report 111-40 accompanying S. 1407, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2010, asked the Department to provide the total number of military personnel by Service and rank assigned to UH as of September 30, 2008, and the total inventory of UH spaces, including permanent party and trainee UH, by Service, as of September 30, 2008. The inventory is to specify which spaces are adequate and which are inadequate. Additionally, Congress asked for the projected UH space requirements by Service through FY 2015 and a list of individual construction projects and project costs by Service and by fiscal year required to eliminate remaining inadequate permanent party UH through FY 2015. The responses to these questions can be found in Section 3 of this report.

Section 1: Unaccompanied Housing (UH) Standards:

This section responds to the UH information requested in the Explanatory Statement for Public Law 110-329, the Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009.

DoD Standards for UH Condition, Configuration, and Privacy

In October 2010, DoD updated its Housing Management Manual (DoD 4165.63-M) to state that for UH to be considered adequate overall, it must meet minimum standards for condition, configuration, privacy, and health-safety. It should be noted that UH can be inadequate but still habitable, provided it does not have any serious health-safety issues as prescribed in various statutes, building codes, and regulations.

DoD 4165.63-M stipulates that for the condition of UH to be considered adequate, the Facility Condition Index¹ (FCI) must be at least 80 percent. This quality rating, expressed in terms of the relationship between what it would cost to replace a facility and what it would cost to repair it, allows us to identify those facilities in greatest need of investment.

For minimum permanent party UH configuration and privacy standards, DoD 4165-63-M establishes standards based on three military rank bands: E-1 to E4, E-5 to E-6, and E-7 to O-10 (inclusive of Warrant Officer grades). Further, for the first two bands, there are also standards based on whether the unit has a shared living room or not. Table 1 shows the standards for each pay band.

Table 1. DoD UH Minimum Configuration and Privacy Standards for Assignment – Permanent Party

PAY GRADES	MINIMUM ADEQUACY STANDARDS FOR PERMANENT PARTY PERSONNEL
O-1 and above, WO and above, and E-7 to E-9	Private unit with living room, bedroom, kitchen, and bathroom
E-5 to E-6	Shared unit with a living room: Private bedroom with 118 net square feet (NSF), bathroom shared with not more than one other, and a kitchen
	Shared unit without a living room: Private bedroom with 135 NSF, bathroom shared with not more than one other, and a kitchenette
E-1 to E-4	Shared unit with a living room: Shared bedroom with not more than one other and with a minimum of 72 NSF for each occupant, bathroom shared with not more than one other, and a kitchen
	Shared unit without a living room: Private bedroom with 90 NSF, bathroom shared with not more than one other, and a kitchenette
NOTES: 1. NSF minimums for units can be established by the Military Departments. 2. The minimum standards can be waived on a temporary basis (for no more than 1 year) due to military necessity. However, exceptions for longer periods of time can only be approved by the Secretary of a Military Department. This includes realigning pay grades as warranted by similarity of responsibilities.	

For Service members in basic training, the minimum configuration and privacy housing standard is an open bay facility with a central bath and with at least 72 net square feet (NSF) for each Service member. This area includes space for a bed, locker, and circulation. Although this threshold can be reduced by the Military Services due to military necessity, reduced net living areas can create unhealthy conditions. Service members undergoing training subsequent to basic training should have housing that provides more space, privacy, and amenities, with the Secretaries of the Military

¹ Facility Condition Index (FCI) represents the ratio of the estimated maintenance and repair requirements (M&R) to Plant Replacement Value. M&R requirements consist of that work necessary to ensure that a constructed asset is restored to a condition substantially equivalent to the originally intended and designed capacity, efficiency, or capability.

Departments determining appropriate standards based on the type and length of training and the status of the trainee or student occupants.

In addition to minimum configuration and privacy standards, DoD 4165.63-M also establishes new construction standards for UH. For permanent party UH, DoD 4165.63-M has made a “market-style” unit the DoD new construction standard to reflect the trend toward private sector type housing, improvements in new university student housing, and to minimize the housing disparity between married and single members in the same pay grade. A market-style unit is a studio to four bedroom unit with a bathroom for each bedroom (or one shared by no more than two bedrooms), a living room, a full kitchen with a full-size refrigerator, sink with disposal, range (or oven and four-burner cook top), microwave oven, and a clothes washer and dryer. Consistent with section 2856 of title 10 U.S.C., the floor areas of such housing shall “not exceed the floor areas of similar housing in the private sector in that locality”. This is very similar to the benchmark that was used to size military family housing after section 2826 of title 10, U.S.C. was revised to make it similar to housing in the private sector in that locality. Therefore, the same approach was used to establish the maximum and minimum gross area limits for junior enlisted UH, shown in Table 2.

Table 2. DoD UH Construction Standards – Junior Enlisted Permanent Party

APARTMENT TYPE	CONSTRUCTION MAXIMUM (Gross Square Feet)	CONSTRUCTION MINIMUM (Gross Square Feet)
Studio	750	600
One-bedroom	1,050	750
Two-bedroom	1,290	850
Three-bedroom	1,530	1,100
Four-bedroom	1,760	1,420
NOTES:		
1. Maximum based on a market-style unit.		
2. The gross area limits above include circulation space and common areas such as lounges, fitness rooms, activity rooms, storage rooms, and building management offices.		
3. Maximum area may be increased up to 10 percent to meet the accessibility requirements for wounded, ill, or injured personnel, or other unique situations such as cold climate, chemical-biological-radiological antiterrorism features, or high-rise construction (seven or more stories).		

DoD 4165.63-M states that new UH constructed for non-commissioned officers, warrant officers, and officers (O-5 and below) who are typically allowed to receive a housing allowance and live in the community, but for military necessity are required to live on the installation should generally be one-bedroom units comparable to rental housing in the private sector in that locality. The Secretaries of the Military Departments are authorized to establish the specific standards for this type of housing, in addition to new construction standards for trainee and student UH, appropriate for the type and length of training and the status of the trainee or student occupants.

The preceding DoD standards show deference to the Military Services’ unique operational/mission needs, so DoD 4165-63-M authorizes the Secretaries of the Military Departments to approve different UH configuration and privacy standards (minimum and new construction), which are summarized on Attachments 1 through 4 for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, respectively. Also on these attachments are the unique Service policies governing what pay grades are required to live in permanent party UH.

DoD Performance Budget Goal for UH Condition

The FY 2013 President’s Budget Request includes a DoD Performance Budget Goal requiring that at least 90 percent of the Military Department’s permanent party UH have an FCI condition of at least 80 percent by the end of FY 2017, except for the Navy, whose goal was adjusted to the end of FY 2022. The Navy was given additional time because of the additional requirements from an initiative to house junior enlisted sailors while in homeport and its constrained funding. The Department tracks condition status through the Services’ annual budget submissions to the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), where they are required to report on progress toward achieving the DoD condition standard for permanent party UH. Although funding constraints, both in MilCon and O&M accounts, present a challenge toward meeting the UH condition standard, this DoD Performance Budget Goal has brought a funding focus to the permanent party UH program similar to the condition goal for Government-owned family housing, which has been in place since FY 2002. Tables 3 and 4 below depict the condition of permanent party and training UH from FY 2011 to 2017 for each Military Service. The permanent party UH condition plans show that the Services have either already met the DoD Performance Budget Goal (Army and Air Force), or are on track to meet it (Navy and Marine Corps).

Table 3. Military Services Permanent Party UH Condition at the end of each Fiscal Year

Service	FCI	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Army	≥ 80%	89.2%	91.2%	93.0%	94.7%	96.4%	98.3%	99.4%
Navy	≥ 80%	44.3%	47.7%	50.0%	51.1%	57.8%	62.9%	69.3%
Marine Corps	≥ 80%	83.8%	84.9%	86.3%	88.4%	89.4%	90.0%	90.0%
Air Force	≥ 80%	96.4%	95.8%	97.7%	97.9%	98.0%	98.0%	98.0%
DoD Wide	≥ 80%	84.0%	85.4%	87.1%	88.4%	90.1%	91.6%	92.9%

Table 4. Military Services Training UH Condition at the end of each Fiscal Year

Service	FCI	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Army	≥ 80%	71.5%	73.9%	76.8%	79.5%	81.6%	82.1%	82.4%
Navy	≥ 80%	49.9%	49.1%	47.3%	47.0%	46.4%	46.5%	44.0%
Marine Corps	≥ 80%	72.8%	74.0%	74.6%	75.9%	76.6%	77.2%	77.8%
Air Force	≥ 80%	85.2%	84.9%	86.3%	86.4%	88.6%	88.7%	88.8%
DoD Wide	≥ 80%	71.5%	74.4%	76.6%	78.0%	80.0%	80.5%	80.9%

Military Service Plans for Configuration and Privacy

Since the Military Services are authorized to establish their own configuration and privacy standards, DoD did not establish overarching timeline goals for UH configuration and privacy. Nevertheless, the Military Services are required to report on progress toward achieving their own standards for permanent party UH configuration and privacy in their annual budget submissions to OSD. The current permanent party UH inventory includes a variety of configurations that provide a range of privacy, area, and amenities that span from UH built in the 1950s with 4-person rooms with central latrines, to private sector type “market-style” apartments with private bedrooms, bathrooms shared by no more than two people, full kitchens, living/dining rooms, and clothes washers and dryers. The Services’ configuration and privacy goals and their progress toward achieving these goals are included with their standards on Attachments 1 through 4 for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, respectively.

Since the inception of the current UH modernization program in the mid-1990s, the Military Services have made substantial MilCon and focused O&M investments to construct and improve permanent party and training UH. Table 5 provides a summary of this funding from FY 2010 through the FY 2013 President’s Budget submission.

Table 5. UH MilCon and O&M Focused Funding (above normal sustainment funding) Permanent Party and Training (dollars in thousands)

Service	Funds	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	Totals
Army	MilCon	\$1,305,600	\$1,212,968	\$727,500	\$721,000	\$3,967,068
	O&M	\$139,200	\$319,900	\$147,400	\$415,400	\$1,021,900
Navy	MilCon	\$15,407	\$75,342	\$136,314	\$164,884	\$391,947
	O&M	\$16,900	\$103,700	\$163,000	\$220,000	503,600
Marine Corps	MilCon	\$322,720	\$686,304	\$87,301	\$49,434	\$1,145,759
	O&M	\$16,000	\$13,900	\$21,900	11,400	\$63,200
Air Force	MilCon	\$160,000	\$150,820	\$446,697	\$42,500	\$800,017
	O&M	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$77,500	\$63,500	\$812,500
DoD Wide	MilCon	\$1,803,727	\$2,125,434	\$1,397,812	\$977,818	\$6,304,791
	O&M	\$272,100	\$537,500	\$409,800	\$710,300	\$2,401,200

Lists of individual MilCon UH projects from FY 2010 to FY 2013 are shown on Attachments 5 through 8 for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, respectively. This substantial investment has brought the Services close to meeting their UH goals as depicted in Attachments 1 through 4 for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, respectively

Section 2 – Plans to Replace Relocatable UH and Modernize UH

This section responds to the UH information requested in Senate Report 111-35 accompanying S.1390, the National Defense Authorization Act, for FY 2010.

Relocatable UH

One of the strategies the Department uses to rapidly house unaccompanied personnel during surge or manpower buildup periods is the use of relocatable, temporary facilities. These temporary facilities are generally retained for a period of 5 to 7 years. In some instance, if the facility condition warrants, the relocatables can be retained for a longer period. However, due to considerable investment by the Services, by the end of FY 2011, only the Army and Navy were using relocatable buildings for permanent party UH, and only in overseas locations. The following table depicts this data:

Table 6. - Relocatable Permanent Party UH as of September 30, 2011 (Bedrooms)

Service	Government-Owned		Leased		Totals
	U.S.	Foreign	U.S.	Foreign	
Army	4,224	0	0	0	4,224
Navy	0	2,076	0	626	2,702
Totals	0	2,110	0	626	2,736

Plans for Deteriorating and Outdated UH

The primary management tool to prevent widespread deterioration in the condition of permanent party UH is the recently created DoD Performance Budget Goal to maintain at least 90 percent of permanent party UH at a minimum FCI of 80 percent over the long term. The following sections summarize the UH modernization and sustainment plans the Military Services have developed since DoD began a focused effort to improve UH in the mid-1990s.

Army

The Army's substantial UH requirements were driven by Grow the Force, Base Realignment and Closure, global re-stationing, and Modularity (transforming from a divisional structure to brigade combat teams). Additionally, the Army faced a very large UH restoration and modernization backlog to improve or replace aging facilities and to correct configuration deficiencies, such as central latrine UH. The Army attacked these formidable challenges by developing a holistic Barracks Strategic Plan that included MilCon and focused O&M funding strategy for permanent party UH. Unlike the other Services, the Army typically programs and builds new permanent party UH as an integral part of a brigade or battalion complex with other facilities such as a consolidated administration building (for organizational elements above company level), flexible company operations buildings (for administration, storage, and operations), and dining facilities.

This Army UH strategic plan established standards to ensure Soldiers are not required to live in UH that do not meet health, life, and safety requirements. Furthermore, O&M funds were reprioritized to provide for urgently needed repairs to permanent party UH. In 2007, the Training Barracks Upgrade Plan was created to fund major projects that upgrade and extend the life of training UH. New management controls were also implemented by the Army's Installation Management Command to ensure that barracks are inspected and needed repairs are completed before another unit occupies the facility after returning from an overseas deployment. In 2012, the Army rolled out a program called First Sergeants Barracks Program 2020 which represents the next stage in the evolution of the Army's UH management. It supports the Army of the future, which will be smaller with more time spent at installations. It capitalizes on the increased presence of military leaders at

installations by transferring responsibility for day to day management of permanent party barracks from garrisons to military unit leaders. This not only reduces the civilian pay requirement for the program but also reestablishes the chain of command as the primary manager of UH. Military leaders will have a more visible role in the barracks and will be able to monitor morale, health, welfare, and discipline issues of their Soldiers more effectively, thereby getting ahead of situations that may lead to assaults and other health of the force issues.

With over \$12B of UH MilCon funding from FY 1996 to FY 2012 and a large commitment of O&M funds, the Army is nearing the end of their UH modernization programs. For permanent party UH, the primary remaining goal will be to replace central latrine UH, which currently accounts for about 14 percent of the total permanent party UH inventory. Another positive note is that the Army met the FCI condition goal for permanent party UH by the end of FY 2012 (at least 90 percent of UH at FCI of 80 percent or more). The Army is also updating their new construction standard to a variation of the DoD market-style standard by adding a living room to the 1+1 Enhanced module that already had a kitchenette. Training UH has also been a focus area as the Army has made substantial investments in initial entry training barracks to include both basic combat training and advanced individual training complexes. After funding the remaining of the initial entry training barracks, the Army will begin to direct funding towards the reserve component mobilization and annual training (Operational Readiness Training Complexes). The Army currently expects that over 80 percent of their training/mobilization barracks will be adequate by the end of FY 2016

Navy

The key component of the Navy's permanent party UH modernization program is the Homeport Ashore (HPA) initiative which was created to improve the quality of life of fleet Sailors by moving junior single Sailors off ships and into UH ashore while in homeport. The Navy plans to complete the HPA MilCon buyout by FY 2016. Because of the HPA requirement and constrained funding, the DoD Performance Budget Goal for the Navy is to have at least 90 percent of the Navy permanent party UH with an FCI of at least 80 percent by the end of FY 2022. As an interim goal, the Navy is working to have at least 50 percent of the inventory at the DoD condition standard by FY 2017 (current projection is 69 percent of the inventory). To help achieve this goal, the Navy plans to commit \$195M of focused O&M funds through FY 2020 and has provided about \$2.5B of MilCon funding from FY 1996 to FY 2012. The Navy is on track to meet the direction from the Chief of Naval Operations to replace or renovate by FY 2020 all student dormitories with an FCI below 60 percent.

While the DoD standard for single Sailor accommodations is at least 90 NSF per person, the Navy has used its waiver authority to temporarily double up room occupancy to expedite Homeport Ashore. In some UH, this requires reducing bedroom space to a minimum of 55 square feet per Sailor and having four Sailors share a bathroom. The Navy has also updated its new construction standard to a 2-bedroom, 2-bath market-style unit with a full kitchen, living room, and washer-dryer. Four E-1 to E-3s (two per bedroom) or two E-4s are assigned to such a unit.

The Navy is the only Service with privatized UH intended solely for junior enlisted personnel. With special legislation in the FY 2003 NDAA, the Navy awarded two pilot UH privatization projects at San Diego, California, and Hampton Roads, Virginia, in 2006 and 2007, respectively. Although both of these projects have provided quality housing at a lower life-cycle cost than comparable Government-owned UH, the Navy has no additional privatized UH projects because of the expiration of the pilot FY 2003 authority.

Marine Corps

Permanent party UH has been the Marine Corps' top facility priority since the Commandant of the Marine Corps approved the Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (BEQ) Campaign Plan in 2006. From FY 1996 to FY 2012, the Marine Corps spent about \$3.5B of MilCon funding and about \$0.5B of focused O&M funds to replace and renovate UH. The goals of this strategic plan are to eliminate existing space deficiencies and inadequate UH, support force modernization initiatives, and complete funding the 2+0 UH standard by FY 2014 (one 180 SF room with a bathroom and two closets, occupied by two E-1 to E-3s or one E-4 to E-5). The Marine Corps is on track to meet the DoD Performance Budget Goal of having at least 90 percent of their permanent party BEQs with an FCI of at least 80 percent by the end of FY 2017. Similar to the other Services, the funding priority for training UH will increase after the permanent party UH buyout is complete. About 75 percent of the training UH inventory is currently at an FCI of at least 80 percent.

Air Force

With a MilCon investment of almost \$3B from FY 1996 to FY 2012, the Air Force has already achieved three important permanent party UH goals: (1) taken all UH with central latrines out of the permanent party inventory; (2) implemented a policy since 1996 whereby each unaccompanied Airmen in permanent party UH is assigned to a private bedroom; and (3) exceeded the DoD Performance Budget Goal of at least 90 percent of permanent party UH at a minimum 80 percent FCI (96 percent in 2012). Furthermore, the Air Force construction standard for new permanent party UH is a market-style "Dorms-4-Airmen" module which has four private bedrooms, each with a private bathroom. Each module also has a kitchen, living room, and clothes washer-dryer.

The driver behind the Air Force UH modernization strategy is their centrally-managed Dorm Master Plan (DMP). This comprehensive review is accomplished every 4 years and was last updated in 2012. It provides for each installation: requirements, priorities, and investment strategies. The DMP also includes a detailed field assessment of the existing inventory and supporting infrastructure, which is developed by a team of experienced engineers and architects. The DMP initially only focused on permanent party UH, but it has now been broadened to include training UH and unaccompanied officer UH. The training UH is in good condition as the 2012 DMP update shows that about 85 percent of the inventory has an FCI of at least 80 percent.

To ensure the DMP recommendations are executed, the Air Force has now centralized all of its UH MilCon funding and manages an O&M Dorm Focus Fund to renovate UH that is most in need. To determine funding priority, the DMP develops a composite adequacy rating for every UH building that considers condition (FCI), configuration, infrastructure, and energy/environment.

Investment Details:

Since FY 1996, the Military Services have spent over \$20 billion in MilCon funds towards UH modernization, with more than \$6 billion in FY 2010 through FY 2013. Table 5 provides a summary of the FY 2010 to FY 2013 MilCon and focused O&M funding. Details on the individual MilCon projects for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, are listed in Attachments 5 to 8, respectively.

Section 3 – DoD Unaccompanied Housing Inventory

This section responds to the UH information requested in Senate Report 111-40 accompanying S.1407, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2010.

UH Capacity Requirements:

Pursuant to section 403 of title 10, U.S.C., military members without dependents in pay grade E-7 or above are generally allowed to receive a housing allowance and live in community housing. Below this pay grade, the Secretary of a Military Department determines the pay grade of enlisted members who are generally required to live in UH and not be authorized a housing allowance. One statutory exception is that E-6s may elect to receive a housing allowance if they are assigned to UH that does not meet DoD minimum adequacy standards. Furthermore, installation commanders have authority to designate as key and essential permanent party unaccompanied personnel of any pay grade. Members of all pay grades are usually required to live in UH during training and mobilization. Factors that impact what permanent party pay grades are required to live in UH include militarization and/or mentoring, team building, operational and/or mission requirements, location (if outside the United States), availability of Government-controlled housing, and quality of life. Based on these factors, the Military Departments have established the pay grade thresholds shown in Table 7 for permanent party enlisted personnel in the United States. At locations outside the United States, the thresholds can be at a higher pay grade due to security concerns and other factors.

Table 7. – Personnel Without Dependents Required to Live in Permanent Party UH in the United States

Service	Pay Grades
Army	E-1 to E-5
Navy	E-1 to E-3, and E-4 with less than 4 years of service. However, depending on availability of UH on an installation, E-4s with more than 4 years of service may also be required to live in UH.
Marine Corps	E-1 to E-5
Air Force	E-1 to E-3, and E-4 with less than three years of service

In the past, the pay grade thresholds in Table 7 used to be higher, but they have been reduced by all the Services to improve quality of life. The last threshold change came in 2005 when the Army authorized E-6s without dependents to receive a housing allowance and live in the community when stationed at installations in the U.S. By 2000, the Navy and Marine Corps generally no longer required E-5s and E-6s to live in UH. In 1997, the Air Force started to allow E-5s without dependents to receive a housing allowance.

Based on the Military Services UH assignment standards, authorized end-strength, and marriage rates, the Military Services calculate permanent party UH requirements, which are shown on Table 8 projected through FY 2017. The large Navy increase in FY 2012 is due to Homeport Ashore.

Table 8. Military Services Permanent Party UH Requirements each Fiscal Year (personnel)

Service	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Army	135,953	131,094	130,017	130,450	129,836	129,744	129,614
Navy	44,402	78,445	75,499	72,554	69,608	66,662	66,662
Marine Corps	94,247	94,247	90,103	90,103	90,103	90,103	90,103
Air Force	60,896	60,896	62,053	62,053	62,053	62,053	62,053
DoD Wide	230,200	303,786	295,619	293,107	289,547	286,509	286,379

Personnel Assigned to Permanent Party UH:

The actual number of personnel living in permanent party UH at any given time will be less than the projected requirement primarily because of several reason such as personnel either deployed, on temporary duty (TDY) at another installation for training, or on TDY while undergoing a permanent change of station. Other reasons include major renovation projects, routine M&R projects, pending demolition or conversion, and deficits. As requested in Senate Report 111-40, the number of personnel living in permanent party UH at the end of the latest reporting period is shown on Table 9.

Table 9. – Military Personnel Assigned to Permanent Party UH as of September 30, 2011

Pay Grade	Army	Navy	USMC	Air Force	Totals
E-1	95,830	6,971	13,902	1,888	223,974
E-2		9,139	15,859	3,569	
E-3		15,751	10,309	26,160	
E-4		6,858	14,140	3,598	
E-5	11,116	2,317	4,445	1,999	23,128
E6		1,584	962	705	
E-7 to E-9	1,326	1,481	937	403	4,147
Total Enlisted	108,272	44,101	60,554	38,322	251,249
WO-1 to O-10	Not Available	978	Not Available	1,272	Not Available
Total Officer & Enlisted	Not Available	45,079	Not Available	39,594 ²	Not Available

Inventory and Adequacy of Permanent Party and Training UH:

Because of the huge number of UH units spread around the world, it has been a continuing challenge for the Military Services to obtain current, accurate information about their UH real property inventory and the personnel assigned to UH. But with a new web-based, enterprise military housing system (eMH) that the Services have started to use, the scope, accuracy, and timely availability of inventory and occupant data for permanent party UH will improve significantly in the coming years. Furthermore, this data will be available at all organizational levels. The eMH system

² Does not include 4,538 members from other Services, for which pay grade breakdown is not available.

will eventually replace different legacy housing management systems maintained by each of the Services for day-to-day housing management functions such as checking in/out of individual members to specific UH units, assigning and tracking furnishings, recording the physical attributes of every UH unit (size and amenities), monitoring occupancy, tracking maintenance and repair issues, and capturing the FCI for every UH building.

One example of the benefits of eMH can be seen in Table 9, where the Army could not easily determine the number of personnel assigned to UH in every pay grade. The Army claims that when eMH is fully deployed at all their installations worldwide, this breakdown will be available accurately and on a real-time basis.

Another benefit that eMH will provide is a more accurate accounting of the various units used to measure UH inventory and requirements – person, bedroom, and space. For family housing dwellings, this is not a problem because only one family is assigned to every unit, but in UH, depending on pay grade, the Services will assign from one to four permanent party members per bedroom, except for the Air Force where every Airmen is assigned to a private bedroom regardless of pay grade. For example, if inventory is limited, two E-1 to E-4 Soldiers can be assigned to a single room, but only if each Soldier has at least 90 NSF of living space. An E-5 Soldier could only be assigned to a bedroom if it has at least 135 NSF. So for the Army, a bedroom greater than or equal to 180 SF would have two spaces. The new eMH system will finally make it easy to know the capacity of any UH building depending on the pay grade of the intended occupants.

As requested in Senate Report 111-40, the past and projected permanent party UH inventory, by Service, is provided on Table 10; and for training UH on Table 11. The percentage of this inventory that has an adequate condition (FCI \geq 80 percent), by Service, is shown on Tables 3 and 4 for permanent party and training UH, respectively.

Table 10. – Military Services Permanent Party UH Inventory at the end of each Fiscal Year (bedrooms)

Service	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Army	149,036	150,590	150,657	147,456	140,573	137,183	135,262
Navy	40,231	40,467	41,203	41,623	42,187	42,537	42,537
Marine Corps	62,278	64,878	68,614	68,931	69,189	69,571	70,128
Air Force	68,800	67,562	66,428	66,428	66,428	66,428	66,428
DoD Wide	320,345	323,497	326,902	324,438	318,377	315,719	314,355

Table 11. – Military Services Training UH Inventory at the end of each Fiscal Year (spaces)

Service	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Army	224,101	222,752	223,837	223,546	227,036	231,345	231,817
Navy	37,899	37,899	38,149	38,193	38,193	38,297	38,297
Marine Corps	35,256	36,963	37,801	39,923	41,342	42,500	43,800
Air Force	38,182	37,552	37,000	37,000	36,166	36,166	36,166
DoD Wide	308,274	335,166	336,787	338,662	342,737	348,308	350,080

MilCon Projects to Eliminate Inadequate Permanent Party UH:

Attachments 5 to 8 include a list of all the UH MilCon projects by Service (permanent party and training) that were appropriated in FY 2010 to FY 2012, and in the FY 2013 President's Budget Request. The projects beyond FY 2013 are still under development.

Conclusion:

The Department remains committed to maintaining and improving housing for junior enlisted personnel without dependents. Although this goal will be increasingly difficult in the future budgetary landscape, a Service member's living environment is an important factor to preserve and enhance the All-Volunteer Force. As substantial improvements have been made to family housing, continued investment in UH will ensure parity with their married counterparts.

Army Standards, Goals, and Progress for Unaccompanied Housing Configuration & Privacy

1. **Who is Required to Live in Permanent Party UH:** The assignment policy in the U.S. is E-1 to E-5s without dependents. In foreign countries, higher pay grades are sometimes required to live in UH. See Army Regulation 420-1, Army Facilities Management, pages 96-97, section 3-82.a.(2)(a): http://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/pdf/r420_1.pdf
2. **Minimum Standards for Assignment to Permanent Party and Training UH:** Because the Army is still using UH with central latrines for permanent party personnel, the minimum assignment standard is a four-person room (each with at least 90 SF) with a central latrine. For more detail on permanent party and training UH standards, see Army Regulation 420-1, Army Facilities Management, pages 49-50, section 3-23.b.
3. **Construction Standard for Permanent Party UH:** The Army's current construction standard through FY 2014 is a "1+1 Enhanced" module which has two 140 SF bedrooms, one bathroom, and a kitchenette. The module is shared by two E-1 to E-4s, and E-5s may be assigned the entire module with one of the bedrooms furnished as a living room. The Army's new construction standard beginning in FY 2015 is a "2/1 Market Style" module which adds a living room to the 1+1 Enhanced module. For details see the Army Corps of Engineers Fort Worth District UEPH Center of Standardization website: <http://mrsi.usace.army.mil/fdt/Army%20Standards/UEPH%20PP%20Barracks%20Army%20Standard.pdf>
4. **Construction Standards for Training UH:** See Army Corps of Engineers Fort Worth District Center of Standardization website for standards regarding Basic & One Station Unit Training; and Advanced Individual Training: http://www.swf.usace.army.mil/pubdata/ec/cos/BT/Docs/12-BT_OSUT_Army_Standard-18Jan08.pdf
http://www.swf.usace.army.mil/pubdata/ec/cos/AIT/Docs/09-AIT_Army_Standard-18Jan08.pdf
5. **Configuration and Privacy Goals:** After the permanent party UH buyout is complete, all permanent party UH will meet the following adequacy standards: (a) no central latrines, (b) no four-person rooms but two E-1 to E-4s may share a room with at least 180 SF, and (c) all E-5s have their own bedroom with at least 135 SF and share a bath with not more than one other. Once the training UH buyout is complete, training UH will: (a) provide at least 72 SF for Basic Training and 90 SF for Advanced Individual Training, (b) be in good quality, and (c) meet all training mission requirements.

6. Progress Toward Goals: The table below shows permanent party UH data as of Sep 30, 2011:

Configuration	Inven- tory %	Privacy	Personnel
Market-Style (incl living room & kitchen)	1%	Share bedroom with 72 SF or more per occupant in a Market Style unit	0
2 Bedrooms (each < 180 SF), 1 Bath (1+1)	55%		
2 Bedrooms (each ≥ 180 SF), 1 Bath (2+2)	9%	Share bedroom with 90 SF or more per occupant in a non-Market Style unit	41,827
1 Bedroom, 1 Bath (Interim)	19%		
Central Latrine	14%	Share bedroom with less than 90 SF per occupant in a non-Market Style unit	0
Relocatable & Temporary	~0%		
Other Junior Enlisted	1%		
Senior Enlisted & Officers	1%		

Navy Standards, Goals, and Progress for Unaccompanied Housing Configuration & Privacy

1. Who is Required to Live in Permanent Party UH: The assignment policy is for unaccompanied E-1 to E-3s, and E-4s with less than four years of service. Also, based on local UH availability, house the maximum number of E-4s with four or more years of service. See NAVADMIN 072/12: <http://www.public.navy.mil/bupers-npc/reference/messages/Documents/NAVADMINS/NAV2012/NAV12072.txt>
2. Minimum Standards for Assignment to Permanent Party and Training UH: Based on NAVADMIN 072/12, the minimum assignment standards are as follows:
 - a. Permanent Party UH. Two E-1 to E-3s share a bedroom with each having at least 72 SF in a market-style unit, and at least 90 SF in a non-market-style unit; no more than two E-1 to E-3s shall share a bath. E-4s get a private bedroom and no more than two share a bath.
 - b. Training UH. Trainees share a bedroom with each having at least 90 SF; no more than four per bath. Every attempt shall be made to assign no more than two per bath.
3. Construction Standard for Permanent Party UH: The Navy has adopted the DoD market-style construction standard having two 144 SF bedrooms (each with two closets), two bathrooms, a living/dining room, full kitchen, and clothes washer & dryer adequate for four E-1 to E-3s per unit or two E-4s. For additional details, see FC 4-721-10, Navy & Marine Corps Unaccompanied Housing, section 4-1: http://www.wbdg.org/ccb/DOD/UFC/fc_4_721_10n.pdf
4. Construction Standards for Training UH: Per CNIC Instruction 11103.5, Enclosure 4, the training construction standard depends on the type and length of training. For all types of Navy training UH construction standards (including recruits), see FC 4-721-10, Navy & Marine Corps Unaccompanied Housing, chapters 4 and 6.
5. Configuration and Privacy Goals: By FY 2016, house all single shipboard Sailors in pay grades E-1 to E-3, and E-4 with less than four years of service, in homeport Navy UH. By FY 2022, complete the last permanent party UH project so all E-1 to E-4s are housed in adequate facilities.
6. Progress Toward Goals: See below for permanent party UH data as of September 30, 2011:

Configuration	% of Inventory	Privacy	Number of Personnel
Market-Style (incl living room & kitchen)	3%	Share bedroom with 72 SF or more per occupant in a Market Style unit	2,256
2 Bedrooms (each < 180 SF), 1 Bath (1+1)	48%		
2 Bedrooms (each ≥ 180 SF), 1 Bath (2+2)	6%	Share bedroom with 90 SF or more per occupant in a non-Market Style unit	21,968
1 Bedroom, 1 Bath (2+0)	31%		
Central Latrine	1%	Share bedroom with less than 90 SF per occupant in a non-Market Style unit	4,907
Relocatable & Temporary	5%		
Other Junior Enlisted	5%		
Senior Enlisted & Officers	1%		

Marine Corps Standards, Goals, and Progress for Unaccompanied Housing Configuration & Privacy

1. Who is Required to Live in Permanent Party UH: The assignment policy is for all bona fide bachelors E-1 to E-5, based on page 2 of the USMC Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (BEQ) Campaign Plan. This document can be accessed by the public at:
<http://www.militarytimes.com/static/projects/pages/barracks.pdf>

2. Minimum Standards for Assignment to Permanent Party and Training UH: The minimum adequacy standard for permanent party is two E-1 to E-3s per bedroom, each with at least 90 SF, and a bath shared by not more than four. E-4 to E-5s get a private bedroom at least 180 SF and a bath shared by not more than two. See page 3, Table 1-1 in the Campaign Plan. At locations with a UH inventory deficit, up to three E-1 to E-3s can share a bedroom, each with at least 90 SF; and two E-4s can share a bedroom, each with at least 135 SF, and a bath shared by no more than two. See page 4, Table 1-2 in the Campaign Plan. For training standards, see Marine Corps Order (MCO) P11000.22, pages 2-13 to 2-14a, section 2106:
<http://www.marines.mil/Portals/59/Publications/MCO%20P11000.22%20W%20CH%201-6.pdf>

3. Construction Standard for Permanent Party UH: The USMC has a Navy Secretariat approved waiver for the USMC BEQ Campaign Plan to use the “2+0” module as the USMC UH construction standard. This module has a 180 SF bedroom, two closets, and a bathroom. For construction details, see UFC 4-721-10, Navy & Marine Corps Bachelor Housing, pages 51-56, section 4-4:
http://www.wbdg.org/ccb/DOD/UFC/ufc_4_721_10.pdf

4. Construction Standards for Training UH: Per MCO P11000.22, section 2106, the construction standard depends on the type and length of training. For all types of training UH construction standards, see UFC 4-721-10, Navy & Marine Corps Bachelor Housing, 43-63, Chapter 4.

5. Configuration and Privacy Goals: By FY 2014, fund the last 2+0 permanent party UH project so all E-1 to E-5s are housed to at least the minimum configuration and privacy standards without any waivers (e.g., three E-1 to E-3s sharing a bedroom, or two E-4s sharing a bedroom).

6. Progress Toward Goals: See below for permanent party UH data as of September 30, 2011:

Configuration	% of Inventory	Privacy	Number of Personnel
Market-Style (incl living room & kitchen)	0%	Share bedroom with 72 SF or more per occupant in a Market Style unit	0
2 Bedrooms (each < 180 SF), 1 Bath (1+1)	6%		
2 Bedrooms (each ≥ 180 SF), 1 Bath (2+2)	14%	Share bedroom with 90 SF or more per occupant in a non-Market Style unit	38,758
1 Bedroom, 1 Bath (2+0)	61%		
Central Latrine	1%	Share bedroom with less than 90 SF per occupant in a non-Market Style unit	3,211
Relocatable & Temporary	0%		
Other Junior Enlisted	17%		
Senior Enlisted & Officers	1%		

Air Force Standards, Goals, and Progress for Unaccompanied Housing Configuration & Privacy

1. Who is Required to Live in Permanent Party UH: The assignment policy is unaccompanied E-1 to E-3s, and E-4s with less than three years of service. See Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-6005, Unaccompanied Housing Management, page 6, section 1.2.3.4.: <http://www.e-publishing.af.mil/shared/media/epubs/AFI32-6005.pdf>
2. Minimum Standards for Assignment to Permanent Party and Training UH: The minimum standard for a permanent party E-1 to E-4 is a private bedroom with at least 90 SF, and a bath shared by not more than two. See AFI 32-6005, pages 20-24, Chapter 3. This chapter also has minimum standards for training UH.
3. Construction Standard for Permanent Party UH: The construction standard is the Dorms-4-Airmen module, which is a variation of the DoD market-style standard with four bedrooms, four bathrooms, a living room, full kitchen, and clothes washer & dryer. Design details can be found in the Air Force UH Design Guide posted on the Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment website: <http://www.afcee.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-070919-082.pdf>
4. Construction Standards for Training UH: The Air Force UH Design Guide includes construction standards for training UH, which vary depending on the type and length of training.
5. Configuration and Privacy Goals: By FY 2017, the Air Force plans to fund the improvement or replacement of all permanent party dorms with an inadequate Air Force “Tier” rating, which will result in over 90% of all dorms having an FCI rating of at least 80%. For training dorms, the Air Force has programmed MilCon projects through FY 2017 to replace the aging Basic Military Training facilities at Joint Base San Antonio (formerly Lackland AFB). For Pipeline Dormitories (for technical/specialty skills training), the Air Force is programming O&M funds to stabilize the FCI ratings, and to bring them up to Air Force standards where economically feasible.
6. Progress Toward Goals: See below for permanent party UH data as of September 30, 2011:

Configuration	% of Inventory	Privacy	Number of Personnel
Market-Style (incl living room & kitchen)	8%	Share bedroom with 72 SF or more per occupant in a Market Style unit	0
2 Bedrooms (each < 180 SF), 1 Bath (1+1)	27%		
2 Bedrooms (each ≥ 180 SF), 1 Bath (2+2)	57%	Share bedroom with 90 SF or more per occupant in a non-Market Style unit (temporary situation while new dorms are under construction)	647
1 Bedroom, 1 Bath (Interim)	0%		
Central Latrine	1%		
Relocatable & Temporary	0%		
Other Junior Enlisted	4%	Share bedroom with less than 90 SF per occupant in a non-Market Style unit	0
Senior Enlisted & Officers	3%		

Army MilCon UH Projects FY 2010 to 2013

State/Country	Project Location	Project Title	Project Number	Dollars in Thousands
FY 2010				
Alaska	Fort Wainwright	Aviation Task Force Complex, Ph 1	65076	95,000
Florida	Eglin AFB	Operations Complex, Phase 3	64990	80,000
Georgia	Fort Stewart	Barracks & Dining, Grow the Force	73675	80,000
Georgia	Fort Benning	Trainee Barracks Complex, Ph 1	72322	74,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Brigade Complex	65133	49,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Battalion Complex	65135	59,000
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	Transient Advanced Trainee Barracks, Ph 1	72523	54,000
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	Trainee Barracks Complex 3 Incr 1	51857	50,000
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	Trainee Barracks Complex 6 Incr 2	62158	61,000
New York	Fort Drum	Barracks	64522	57,000
Oklahoma	Fort Sill	Barracks	69330	65,000
Oklahoma	Fort Sill	Trainee Barracks Complex	58531	61,000
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	Trainee Barracks Complex 2 Incr 1	48169	59,000
Texas	Fort Sam Houston	Enlisted UPH (PP)	64191	7,900
Virginia	Fort Lee	CSS Center of Excellence Phase 2, Incr 3	67522	137,000
Virginia	Fort Eustis	Transient UPH, Advanced Individual Train	66714	54,000
Virginia	Fort Lee	AIT Barracks Complex Ph 6	36113	65,000
Washington	Fort Carson	Brigade Complex	65362	44,000
Washington	Fort Lewis	Brigade Complex, Inc 4	65935	102,000
Germany	Ansbach	Barracks	63394	17,500
Germany	Ansbach	Barracks	69616	14,200
Germany	Kaiserslautern	Barracks	66596	20,000
FY 2010 Subtotal				1,305,600
FY 2011				
Alaska	Fort Wainwright	Aviation Task Force Complex, Ph 1 Incr 2	76573	27,000
Alaska	JB Elmendorf-Richardson	Brigade Complex Ph 1	55695	67,038
California	Presidio of Monterey	Advanced Individual Training Barracks	53789	63,000
Georgia	Fort Benning	Trainee Barracks Ph 2	72324	51,000
Hawaii	Schofield Barracks	Barracks	52269	90,000
Hawaii	Schofield Barracks	Battalion Complex	52267	98,000
Hawaii	Tripler Army Medical Center	Barracks	67258	28,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Battalion Complex	65714	31,000
Kentucky	Fort Campbell	Barracks Complex	58511	67,000
Louisiana	Fort Polk	Barracks	60130	29,000
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	Barracks	57194	29,000
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	Advanced Individual Training Barracks, Ph 2	68721	29,000
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	Company Trainee Barracks	69267	19,000
New Mexico	White Sands Missile Range	Barracks	72110	29,000
New York	Fort Drum	Engineer Battalion Complex, Ph 2	67045	61,000
New York	Fort Drum	Maneuver Enhancement Brigade, Ph 1	71472	55,000
New York	Fort Drum	Transient Training Barracks	57712	55,000
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	Student Barracks	73930	18,000
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	Basic Training Complex	73299	28,000
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	AIT Complex, Phase 1	53794	46,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Transient Training Barracks	65941	31,000
Virginia	Fort Eustis	Warrior in Transition Complex	71539	18,000
Washington	JB Lewis-McChord	Brigade Complex	55198	40,000
Washington	JB Lewis-McChord	Battalion Complex	64457	47,000
Germany	Grafenwoehr	Barracks	68606	19,000
Germany	Grafenwoehr	Barracks	69612	20,000
Germany	Grafenwoehr	Barracks	67968	17,500
Germany	Kaiserslautern	Barracks Complex	66595	35,000

Army MilCon UH Projects FY 2010 to 2013

State/Country	Project Location	Project Title	Project Number	Dollars in Thousands
Germany	Vilseck	Barracks Complex	69613	19,000
Honduras	Soto Cano	Barracks	61383	20,400
Italy	Vicenza	Brigade Complex, Inc 4	70829	26,000
			FY 2011 Subtotal	1,212,938
FY 2012				
Colorado	Fort Carson	Barracks	77264	67,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	Barracks	77265	46,000
Georgia	Fort Benning	Trainee Barracks Complex Ph 3	69745	23,000
Kentucky	Fort Campbell	Barracks Complex	72684	65,000
Kentucky	Fort Campbell	Barracks	73541	23,000
Kentucky	Fort Knox	Battalion Complex	65293	48,000
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	Trainee Barracks Complex, Ph 2	62955	59,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Barracks Complex	73686	13,000
Texas	Fort Hood	Operational Readiness Training Complex	65374	51,000
Washington	JB Lewis-McChord	Brigade Complex, Ph 2	53637	56,000
Washington	JB Lewis-McChord	Battalion Complex	64014	59,000
Washington	JB Lewis-McChord	Aviation Unit Complex	76767	34,000
Washington	JB Lewis-McChord	ORTC Complex, Ph 1	58046	28,000
Afghanistan	Bagram Air Base	Barracks, Ph 5	74084	29,000
Germany	Grafenwoehr	Barracks	69614	17,500
Germany	Vilseck	Barracks	69615	20,000
Korea	Camp Carroll	Barracks	72650	41,000
Korea	Camp Henry	Barracks Complex	76235	48,000
			FY 2012 Subtotal	727,500
FY 2013				
Hawaii	Schofield Barracks	Barracks	76586	41,000
Hawaii	Schofield Barracks	Barracks	76587	55,000
Hawaii	Schofield Barracks (Wheeler)	Combat Aviation Brigade Barracks	76903	85,000
Kentucky	Fort Campbell	Battalion Headquarters Complex	61810	55,000
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	Trainee Barracks Complex 3, Ph 2	54489	58,000
New York	US Military Academy	Cadet Barracks	79933	192,000
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	Trainee Barracks Complex 2, Ph 2	58970	24,000
Texas	JB San Antonio	Barracks	68530	21,000
Virginia	Fort Lee	Adv Individual Training Barracks Cplx, Ph	33771	81,000
Washington	JB Lewis-McChord	Battalion Complex	64456	73,000
Italy	Camp Ederle	Barracks	71911	36,000
			FY 2013 Subtotal	721,000
			FY 2010 to 2013 Total	3,967,038

Navy MilCon UH Projects FY 2010 to 2013

State/Country	Project Location	Project Title	Project Number	Dollars in Thousands
FY 2010				
California	San Clemente Island	Combined Bachelor Quarters,	P-741	15,407
FY 2010 Subtotal				15,407
FY 2011				
California	NAVSTA San Diego	BQ (HPA-IAP)	P-405	75,342
FY 2011 Subtotal				75,342
FY 2012				
Virginia	NAVSTA Norfolk	BQ (HPA-IAP)	P-123	81,304
Bahrain	NSA Bahrain	BQ	P-937	55,010
FY 2012 Subtotal				136,314
FY 2013				
California	NAVBASE Coronado (NASNI)	BQ (HPA-IAP)	P-730	76,063
Virginia	NAS Oceana- Dan Neck	Training Barracks	P-513	39,086
Bahrain	NSA Bahrain	BQ	P-935	41,529
Okinawa / Japan	Camp Shields NMCB	Bachelor Quarters	P-353	8,206
FY 2013 Subtotal				164,884
FY 2010 to 2013 Total				391,947

Marine Corps MilCon UH Projects FY 2010 to 2013

State/Country	Project Location	Project Title	Project Number	Dollars in Thousands
FY 2010				
California	Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	P-1067	39,610
California	29 Palms	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	P-116	37,290
California	29 Palms	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	P-170	37,290
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Wallace Creek	P-1194	43,480
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Wallace Creek	P-1195	44,390
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Wallace Creek	P-1196	44,390
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Wallace Creek	P-1197	42,110
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Wallace Creek	P-1247	34,160
FY 2010 Subtotal				322,720
FY 2011				
California	Camp Pendleton	BEQ - Las Flores	P-1109	37,020
California	Camp Pendleton	BEQ - 13 Area	P-1113	42,864
California	29 Palms	BEQ and Parking Structure	P-163	53,158
Hawaii	Kaneohe Bay	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	P-858	90,530
North Carolina	Cherry Point	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	P-136	42,500
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Wallace Creek	P-1249	46,290
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Courthouse Bay	P-1251	42,330
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Courthouse Bay	P-1254	40,780
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Rifle Range	P-1286	55,350
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - French Creek	P-1317	43,640
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Camp Johnson	P-1319	46,550
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Wallace Creek	P-1322	51,660
Virginia	Quantico	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	P-599	37,810
Virginia	Quantico	The Basic School Student Quarters - Phase 5	P-566	55,822
FY 2011 Subtotal				686,304
FY 2012				
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	BEQ - Hadnot Point	P-138	27,439
Virginia	Quantico	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	P-611	31,374
Virginia	Quantico	The Basic School Student Quarters - Phase 6	P-567	28,488
FY 2012 Subtotal				87,301
FY 2013				
Virginia	Quantico	The Basic School Student Quarters - Phase 7	P-562	31,012
Virginia	Yorktown	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	P-985	18,422
FY 2013 Subtotal				49,434
FY 2010 to 2013 Total				1,145,759

Air Force MilCon UH Projects FY 2010 to 2013

State/Country	Project Location	Project Title	Project Number	Dollars in Thousands
FY 2010				
Arizona	Davis-Monthan	Dormitory	FBNV073004	20,000
Florida	Eglin	Dormitory	FTFA053025	11,000
Florida	MacDill	Dormitory	NVZR063708	16,000
North Dakota	Minot	Dormitory	QJVF082003	22,000
Texas	Goodfellow	Student Dormitory	JCGU083001	14,000
Texas	Lackland	Basic Military Training Dormitory	MPLS083737R2	77,000
FY 2010 Subtotal				160,000
FY 2011				
New Jersey	McGuire	Dormitory	PTFL083003	18,440
New Mexico	Cannon	Dormitory	CZQZ073005	14,000
Texas	Lackland	Basic Military Training Dorm	MPLS083737R3	67,980
Germany	Kapaun	Dormitory	TYFU083507R2	19,600
Guam	Andersen	Student Dormitory	SAKW123001	11,800
Italy	Aviano	Dormitory	ASHE123000	19,000
FY 2011 Subtotal				150,820
FY 2012				
Alaska	Eielson	Dormitory	FTQW083005	45,000
Alaska	Elmendorf-Ft Richardson	Brigade Combat Team Complex	FXSB061561	97,000
California	Travis	Dormitory	XDAT083003	22,000
New Mexico	Cannon	Dormitory	CZQZ123001	15,000
North Dakota	Minot	Dormitory	QJVF092001	22,000
Texas	Lackland	Basic Military Training Dormitory	MPLS083737R4	64,000
Texas	Ft Sam Houston	Adv. Indiv. Training Barracks	MPLS11473JB	46,000
Virginia	Langley-Eustis	Adv. Indiv. Training Barracks	WACC120007	50,000
Germany	Ramstein	Dormitory	TYFR063017	34,697
Greenland	Thule	Dormitory	WWCX103033	28,000
Korea	Osan	Dormitory	SMYU123002	23,000
FY 2012 Subtotal				446,697
FY 2013				
Texas	JB San Antonio	Dormitory (144 RM)	MPLS083008	18,000
Greenland	Thule	Dormitory (48 PN)	WWCX103032	24,500
FY 2013 Subtotal				42,500
FY 2010 to 2013 Total				800,017