

FY2022 NDAA: Military Construction Authorizations

February 2, 2022

The National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) typically authorizes funding for Department of Defense (DOD) **military construction** projects in Division B of the legislation.

In general, DOD military construction **accounts** fund military construction projects; major infrastructure improvements; land acquisition; construction and operation of military family housing; privatized housing through the Family Housing Improvement Fund and the Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund; construction and environmental cleanup projects required by the base closure and realignment commission (BRAC) process; and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program, which funds infrastructure projects and cost-sharing expenses for collective defense.

President's Budget Request

The FY2022 President's budget requested **\$9.8 billion** in military construction and related discretionary funding—\$1.3 billion (15%) more than the enacted FY2021 level. The request included \$8.4 billion in military construction accounts and \$1.4 billion in family housing accounts. Among the largest requested stand-alone projects, in terms of dollar value, were:

- **\$250 million** to build a dry dock addition at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, Maine, for maintenance and overhaul of the Navy's **Virginia-class** fast-attack submarines;
- **\$207.9 million** to construct a maintenance hangar at Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina, to support two squadrons of **F-35B Lightning II** stealth fighter aircraft scheduled to arrive at the installation in FY2024 and FY2025; and
- **\$168 million** to construct a helicopter rescue operations maintenance hangar at Kadena Air Base in Japan to support missions of U.S. Indo-Pacific Command and Pacific Air Forces.

House-passed NDAA

The House-passed NDAA (**H.R. 4350**) would have authorized **\$13.4 billion** for military construction projects and related funding—\$3.6 billion (36%) more than the request. The House legislation would

Congressional Research Service

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

IN11845

have authorized \$4.8 billion in increases to the request (i.e., funding beyond the amounts for certain projects requested in the budget or for projects not requested in the budget), according to CRS analysis of [funding tables](#) in the accompanying report (H.Rept. 117-118) and enacted legislation. Among these increases, the House bill would have authorized 21 [congressionally directed spending](#) projects, known as [Community Project Funding](#) items, totaling \$370 million. The net effect of these increases would have been offset by \$1.2 billion in decreases to the request.

Senate Armed Services Committee-reported NDAA

The Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC)-reported version of the bill ([S. 2792](#)) would have authorized [\\$12.7 billion](#) in military construction projects and related funding—\$2.9 billion (29%) more than the request. The SASC legislation would have authorized \$4.1 billion in increases to the request, according to CRS analysis of [funding tables](#) in the accompanying report (S.Rept. 117-39) and enacted legislation. The report did not reference Community Project Funding items. The net effect of these increases would have been offset by \$1.3 billion in decreases to the request.

The Biden Administration [opposed](#) provisions in the House-passed and SASC-reported bills to realign military construction funding “from priority projects to other projects.” It also argued that incrementally funding certain projects would require nearly \$1 billion in additional funding to complete them.

Enacted NDAA

The enacted NDAA ([S. 1605](#); [P.L. 117-81](#)) included Division B, the “Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022,” which authorized [\\$13.3 billion](#) in military construction projects and related funding—\$3.5 billion (36%) more than the request (see **Figure 1**), according to CRS analysis of the funding tables in the accompanying [explanatory statement](#). The statement [noted](#), in part, that “incremental funding of large and complex military construction projects enables the Department to execute additional infrastructure projects in a fiscal year, enables continuous congressional oversight, serves to reduce the significant unobligated MILCON balance, and provides opportunities to adjust the authorization of appropriations level for projects should issues arise or requirements change over the course of construction.”

Figure I. Military Construction Authorizations in the FY2022 NDAA
(in billions of dollars)

Account	Request	House-passed H.R. 4350	SASC-reported S. 2792	Enacted P.L. 117-81	Difference (%)
Military Construction, Army	\$0.83	\$1.48	\$1.63	\$1.73	107%
Military Construction, Navy	\$2.37	\$3.54	\$3.70	\$3.90	64%
Military Construction, Air Force	\$2.10	\$3.28	\$2.33	\$2.49	18%
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	\$1.96	\$2.09	\$2.01	\$2.03	4%
NATO Security Invest. Prgm.	\$0.21	\$0.21	\$0.21	\$0.21	0%
Military Construction, Army National Guard	\$0.26	\$0.33	\$0.35	\$0.39	52%
Military Construction, Army Reserve	\$0.06	\$0.15	\$0.12	\$0.12	90%
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	\$0.07	\$0.07	\$0.07	\$0.07	0%
Military Construction, Air National Guard	\$0.20	\$0.26	\$0.36	\$0.38	93%
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	\$0.08	\$0.12	\$0.16	\$0.16	109%
Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund	<\$0.01	<\$0.01	<\$0.01	<\$0.01	0%
Base Realignment and Closure, Army	\$0.07	\$0.12	\$0.07	\$0.12	77%
Base Realignment and Closure, Navy	\$0.11	\$0.16	\$0.11	\$0.16	45%
Base Realignment and Closure, Air Force	\$0.10	\$0.15	\$0.10	\$0.10	0%
Base Realignment and Closure, Defense-Wide	<\$0.01	<\$0.01	<\$0.01	<\$0.01	0%
Military Construction, SUBTOTAL	\$8.42	\$11.95	\$11.23	\$11.86	41%
Family Housing Construction, Army	\$0.10	\$0.15	\$0.13	\$0.16	62%
Family Housing Operation and Maint., Army	\$0.39	\$0.39	\$0.39	\$0.39	0%
Family Housing Construction, Navy	\$0.08	\$0.08	\$0.08	\$0.08	0%
Family Housing Operation and Maint., Navy	\$0.36	\$0.36	\$0.36	\$0.36	0%
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	\$0.12	\$0.12	\$0.12	\$0.12	0%
Family Housing Operation and Maint., Air Force	\$0.33	\$0.33	\$0.33	\$0.33	0%
Family Housing Operation and Maint., Defense-Wide	\$0.05	\$0.05	\$0.05	\$0.05	0%
Family Housing Improvement Fund	<\$0.01	<\$0.01	<\$0.01	<\$0.01	0%
Family Housing, SUBTOTAL	\$1.42	\$1.47	\$1.45	\$1.48	4%
TOTAL	\$9.85	\$13.42	\$12.68	\$13.35	36%

Source: CRS analysis of H.Rept. 117-118, pp. 482-498; S.Rept. 117-39, pp. 516-538; and explanatory statement accompanying the FY2022 NDAA (P.L. 117-81) in the December 7, 2021, *Congressional Record*, pp. H7436-H7448.

Notes: Totals may not sum due to rounding. “Difference (%)” column is the percentage difference between the requested and enacted amounts.

The act authorized funding for the bulk, though not all, of the Administration’s projects, including the dry dock addition at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. The act authorized \$4.9 billion in increases to the request. Among these increases were the [Community Project Funding](#) items in the House bill. The net effect of these increases were offset by \$1.4 billion in decreases to the request. Among these decreases was a [\\$150 million](#) reduction to the requested level funding for the maintenance hangar at Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point and a [\\$133 million](#) reduction to the requested level of funding for the helicopter hangar at the Kadena Air Base. In recommending similar reductions in its version of the legislation, the House Armed Services Committee noted its support for the projects yet [questioned](#) the armed services’ ability to fully expend the requested funding in FY2022.

The enacted legislation [supported](#) the Administration’s request for the NATO Security Investment Program. It also [authorized](#) the Secretary of Defense to accept six military construction projects in South Korea with a combined value of \$505.2 million and two military construction projects in Poland with a combined value of \$37 million. The host governments paid for the projects pursuant to security agreements with the United States requiring in-kind contributions.

In addition, the enacted legislation [prohibited](#) DOD from conducting another BRAC round; [mandated](#) the publishing of information on Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization (FSRM) projects costing more than \$15 million; [continued](#) various military housing reforms; [required](#) the Government Accountability Office to report on the contracting processes DOD used to maintain and upgrade stateside military installations; and [extended](#) authorizations for certain military construction projects [previously identified](#) for a redirection of funding for the construction of barriers along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Author Information

Brendan W. McGarry
Analyst in U.S. Defense Budget

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.

