

01

RELEASED

JUL 5 1973

B-169926

The Honorable J. Glenn Beall, Jr. United States Senate

Dear Senator Beall:

This is in reply to your May 16, 1973, inquiry on the status of a temporary lodging project proposed for Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland You mentioned that a contract for the design and construction of 444 family housing units was awarded in April 1973, although it was your understanding that construction of a proposed temporary lodging facility was still under consideration.

As agreed with your office, we are providing the following information on the difference between the two projects and on the status of the temporary lodging facility at Andrews.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO PROJECTS

The 444-unit family housing project was authorized under Public Law 92-145 for use by married permanent personnel and their families and is financed from appropriated funds. temporary lodging facility would provide military families with 60 units equipped with kitchenettes. Temporary lodging projects are primarily for use by personnel on permanent change-of-station moves while they are awaiting permanent quarters. They are financed from nonappropriated funds and normally are not subject to congressional review. However, mounting congressional concern over the proliferation of construction of this nature resulted in a requirement, starting 4 on July 1, 1970, that the Department of Defense furnish the Congress a semiannual list of construction projects in excess of \$25,000 financed from nonappropriated funds. Projects in excess of \$300,000 have to be reported to the Congress before contract award.

MOTEL OPERATOR'S PROPOSAL AND STATUS OF PROPOSED TEMPORARY LODGING FACILITY AT ANDREWS

In your March 8, 1973, request you transmitted a proposal from Mr. William A. Sansing, general manager of the State Inn Motel in Washington, D.C. Mr. Sansing offered to lease 50 units at \$8 a night and to provide special menus in the motel

restaurant at prices which he believed would minimize the importance of kitchenettes.

Other proposals and matters also came to our attention during the review. As a result, we informally advised Department of the Air Force and Department of Defense officials of the availability of commercial facilities for temporary lodging which appeared adequate to meet Air Force needs.

After these discussions, the Air Force entered into guaranteed-rate agreements with two motels. However, an Air Force official recently advised us that Mr. Sansing's proposal was rejected principally because kitchenettes were not provided in his units. We were told on June 7, 1973, that Mr. Sansing had not been notified of the rejection but that he would be so advised shortly thereafter.

In view of the availability of commercial units, we suggested that the Air Force reconsider its plan to construct a 60-unit temporary lodging facility at Andrews. However, Air Force officials believe that it is still needed and on June 4, 1973, they awarded a construction contract for projects at several air bases, including the one at Andrews.

We still question the need for the project at Andrews and expect to comment on this matter in the report we are preparing for issue to the Select Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in Smaller Towns and Urban Areas, House Committee on Small Business. As discussed with your office earlier, the Subcommittee has agreed with our request to send you a copy of that report.

We trust that this responds to your inquiry and appreciate your interest in this review.

Sincerely yours,

Comptroller General of the United States

. - 2 -