tomorrow, no, we can only go to conference at 2, if it's in the afternoon.

So anyone managing a bill, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut is going to have to manage this one, is faced with all kinds of conflicting demands from Members who seem to be almost unconscious about the fact that their demands, in fact, are conflicting. And all I can say as chairman of the committee is we will try to give Members the maximum time possible to review the bills, consistent with our obligation to get the work done.

So I think if anyone is concerned about a specific item in the bill, I'm sure the gentlewoman and I'm sure the gentleman from Georgia will be willing to walk them through what the committee has in mind.

But in the end, I would simply—I'm not going to vote for this motion because I can't with a straight face both promise to make these bills available for 72 hours and meet all of the other conflicting demands that Members of the House are making. We've got an obligation to try to balance those requirements, and we will do that to the best of our ability. And in the end, I think we will have reasonable bills, and we will let the public be the judge of just how reasonable they are.

I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield myself such time as may consume.

I want to say this, as my friends on the Appropriations Committee know on the other side, that this concern really is far beyond this bill. I do believe this process, particularly on the subcommittee, has been open and that Members on our side of the aisle have had plenty of time to read it.

However, I know there are Members who are not on the Appropriations Committee who are constantly criticizing our committee for doing things, and I believe that they do deserve the time to view the bill. It is a $23 billion bill in terms of the discretionary spending and I think around $80 billion for the nondiscretionary spending. So $100 billion is probably worth 3 days of scrutiny.

Yet, I think what's really more concerning is because the process of appropriations has gone through regular order—and I think the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentlewoman from Connecticut have done a great job of being open to all members of the committee and all Members of the House on it—other bills which have been significant, which have not gone through our committee, did not have the sunshine of this bill or the sunshine of some of the other bills.

And so a lot of the things that are concerning the constituents back home right now—and I think that Mr. BAIRD from Oregon has picked up on—is that people are thinking about the stimulus bill, $787 billion. And I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin had hearings in December on that, and we were appreciative of it, but a lot of the Members of the House did not have the opportunity to read that bill and scrutinize it as much as they would like to. And then the most recent one was the cap-and-trade bill, which Members were aware was getting amended at 3 a.m. and we were supposed to vote on it the next day. We convened 6 hours later at 9 a.m.

Now, we also have out there in the realm of possibilities a massive health care bill, a bill that the CBO has scored at $1.29 trillion, and our constituents are very concerned. In fact, I've never seen a petition like this before, but there's actually been a petition sent up to Members of Congress saying, Will you agree to read the bill before you vote on it? And I think that's a fair request by our constituents, the minimum bid, for Members of Congress, to read the bill.

And I think that the Appropriations Committee can lead by example on this by allowing 72 hours, but I think there are also concerns, you know, perhaps this should be regularly part of the process when we have a large spending bill. This one's $100 billion; again, the health care bill is $1.29 trillion. People deserve the opportunity to look at it.

Now, I also know, having served in the majority, how difficult it is to manage a bill in a House with 435 independent contractors and conflicting schedules, and then you go to the really hard job and that's the other body, and sometimes it's difficult to get everybody just in the room at the same time. But that's why we passed last week in the House a continuing resolution, which actually builds in some time now, that we will have—should the other body pass that this week, we will have until October 30 to pass these bills. So the 72 hours won't put in jeopardy any of the funding levels or force the government to go back on some money or scramble around. So we do have until October 30, but there certainly would be no reason to wait that long. We're just asking for 72 hours.

And we feel very strongly about this. We have done this already on the energy and water bill, and I think that we're just concerned about spending, Mr. Speaker.

That's kind of what this bill boils down to, and again, it goes well beyond the Appropriations Committee and certainly beyond this bill, but we are hearing from the folks back home, and I represent Georgia. Mr. BAIRD represents Oregon. I share his concern. We have a discharge petition on his bill trying to get it on the floor of the House right now. I don't know if it's bipartisan, but 160 Members have already signed that discharge petition expressing concern to have more time to read bills once they are out of the conference committee.

I reserve the balance of my time. We do not have any other speakers on this side, so if my colleague is ready to yield back, I would be, too.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman, and I would just, with the remaining few comments, because I think that we have had this conversation, discussion, about it, focus my attention on this particular piece of legislation, and I understand the gentleman is talking about other areas.

But I think that this is particularly and maybe unique in the sense of the kinds of efforts that have gone into making this a very open process, a process where people are knowledgeable about what they're doing and how they're doing it and what kinds of input have gone in. And again, there are not too many folks around here, whether they're from north, south, east or west, and the folks from the Northeast who care about animal and plant disease. There are folks in the west coast, east coast that care about dairy. There are people who have expressed their views who are on the committee, off the committee with regard to our settling the issue of the Chinese poultry. So I think everyone has had a very adequate amount of time to look at this and to be able to reflect on it so that they can come to a conclusion.

Let me just ask the gentleman if he does have any more speakers?

Mr. KINGSTON. No, I do not have any speakers, and I'm ready to yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. As am I.

Mr. KINGSTON. With the exception that I have been admonished that, as I was looking at the Speaker from Oregon, I was thinking Oregon. Mr. BAIRD is from Washington, and so I'm asking for forgiveness from Mr. BAIRD. And they're both great States, of course, and I just want to make sure that's a matter of record.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, on September 24, 2009, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider 11 resolutions to authorize appropriations for the General Services Administration's (GSA) FY 2010 Capital Investment and Leasing Program, including six construction resolutions (authorizing $302.6 million) and five repair and alteration resolutions (authorizing $510.4 million). The Committee adopted the resolutions by voice vote with a quorum present.

Enclosed are copies of the resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 24, 2009.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.
Chairman.

Enclosures.

ALTERATION ENERGY AND WATER RETROFIT AND CONSERVATION MEASURES PROGRAM VARIOUS BUILDINGS—PEW–2010

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to implement energy and water retrofit and conservation measures in Government-owned buildings during fiscal year 2010, at a proposed cost of $20,000,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the procurement includes minimum performance requirements requiring energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

This alteration prospectus proposes the implementation of energy and water retrofit and conservation measures in Government-owned buildings during fiscal year 2010. Projects to be accomplished in Federal buildings throughout the country are currently being identified through surveys and studies. The projects to be funded will have positive savings-to-investment ratios, will provide reasonable payback periods, and may generate rebates and savings from utility companies and incentives from grid operators. Projects will vary in size, by location, and by delivery method. This prospectus requests authority to fund energy and water retrofit work. The authority requested in this prospectus is for a diverse set of retrofit projects with engineering solutions to reduce energy or water consumption and/or costs.

JUSTIFICATION

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58) required a 2% energy usage reduction as measured in BTU/GSF per year from 2006 through 2015 over a 2003 baseline. Additionally, this act sets a mandate to install advanced meters for electricity in all buildings by 2012. Guidance issued by the Department of Energy pursuant to this requirement states that savings anticipated from advanced metering can range from 2% to 45% annually when used in combination with continuous commissioning efforts. Executive Order 13423 on Strengthening Environmental, Energy and Transportation Management was, concerning energy consumption reduction, incorporated into law as the energy independence and Security Act of 2007. The Executive Order also established a water reduction mandate of 2% per year based on a 2007 baseline as measured in gallons/gsf.

By the year 2015, all Federal agencies are directed to reduce overall energy use in federally operated buildings they operate by 30 percent from 2003 levels and reduce overall water use by 16 percent from 2007 levels. Increased energy and water efficiency in buildings and operations will require capital investment for changes and modifications to physical systems which consume energy and water.

In addition, the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 included provisions that exceed the requirements of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. One such long-term requirement is to eliminate fossil fuel-generated energy consumption in new and renovated Federal buildings by FY 2030 by achieving targeted reductions beginning with projects designed in FY 2010. Other shorter-term measures include increasing the use of solar hot water heating (to 30%); installation of advanced meters for water and gas (previously only electricity was covered); and broader application of energy efficiency in all major renovations. Approval of this FY 2010 request will enable GSA to continue to provide leadership in energy/water conservation and efficiency to both the public and private sectors.

AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED—$20,000,000

Potential projects to be accomplished in Federal buildings throughout the country are currently being identified through surveys and studies. The projects to be funded will have positive savings-to-investment ratios, will provide reasonable payback periods, and may generate rebates and savings from utility companies and incentives from grid operators. Projects will vary in size by location and by delivery method. Typical projects include the following:

Upgrading heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems with new high efficiency systems including the installation of energy management control systems.

Altering constant volume air distribution systems to variable air flow systems by the addition of variable air flow boxes, fan volume control dampers, and related climatic controls.

Installing building automation control systems, such as night setback thermostats and time clocks, to control HVAC systems.

Installing automatic occupancy light controls, lighting fixture modifications and associated wiring to reduce the electrical consumption per square foot through the use of higher efficiency lamps and use of non-uniform task lighting design.

Installing new or modifying existing temperature control systems.

Replacing electrical motors with multi-speed or variable-speed motors.

Insulating roofs, pipes, HVAC duct work, and mechanical equipment.

Installing and caulking storm windows and doors to prevent the passage of air and moisture through the building envelope.

Providing advanced metering projects which enable building managers to better monitor and optimize energy performance.

Providing and implementing water conservation projects.

Providing renewable projects including photovoltaic systems, solar hot water systems, and wind turbines.

Providing distributed generation systems.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

It has been determined that the practical solution to achieving the identified building energy and water management goals is to proceed with the energy and water retrofit work indicated above.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 11, 2009.

Recommended:— — —, Acting Commissioner, Public Building Service.

Approved: Paul F. Prouty, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

DESIGN/ALTERATION—HIGH PERFORMANCE ENERGY PROJECTS—ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT OF 2007—VARIOUS BUILDINGS—PEISA–2010

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for implementation of high performance energy projects and conservation measures in Government-owned buildings during fiscal year 2010, at a proposed cost of $20,000,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the procurement includes minimum performance requirements requiring energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

This alteration prospectus proposes the implementation of high performance energy projects and conservation measures in Government-owned buildings during fiscal year 2010. Projects, to be accomplished in Federal buildings throughout the country, are currently being identified through surveys and studies. The projects to be funded will have positive savings-to-investment ratios, will provide reasonable payback periods, and may generate rebates and savings from utility companies and incentives from grid operators. Projects will vary in size, by location, and by delivery method. This prospectus requests authority to fund geothermal and other high-performance green building retrofit work, as well as designs for new facilities that incorporate these technologies. As we formulate and develop future projects, we will incorporate these activities into our designs. As appropriate, we will use the authority in this prospectus to incorporate this requirement into previously funded and authorized activities. The authority requested in this prospectus is for a diverse set of retrofit and design projects with engineering solutions to reduce energy consumption and/or costs.

JUSTIFICATION

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58) required a 2% energy usage reduction as measured in BTU/gsf per year from 2006 through 2015 over a 2003 baseline. Additionally, this act sets a mandate to install advanced meters for electricity in all buildings by 2012. Guidance issued by the Department of Energy pursuant to this requirement states that savings anticipated from advanced metering can range from 2% to 45% annually when used in combination with continuous commissioning efforts. In regard to energy consumption reduction, Executive Order 13423 on Strengthening Environmental, Energy and Transportation Management was, incorporated into law as the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA). Both increased the energy reduction mandates to 3% per year, and the Executive Order also established a water reduction mandate of 2% per year based on a 2007 baseline as measured in gallons/gsf.

By the year 2015, all Federal agencies are directed to reduce overall energy use in federally operated buildings they operate by 30

percent from 2003 levels and reduce overall water use by 16 percent from 2007 levels. Increased energy and water efficiency in buildings and operations will require capital investment for changes and modifications to physical systems which consume energy and water, as well as other high performance green building initiatives and infrastructure designs and retrofits.

In addition, EISA included provisions that exceed the requirements of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. One specific long term requirement is to eliminate fossil fuel generated energy consumption in new and renovated Federal buildings by FY 2030 by achieving targeted reductions beginning with projects designed in FY 2010. High-performance green building initiatives and infrastructure designs and retrofits will assist in reaching the targeted reductions.

EISA also requires GSA to create at least two technology acceleration programs, for high-efficiency lighting and for geothermal space conditioning (ground source heat pump), as well as others that are cost effective.

The technology acceleration programs are broad in their application and potentially dramatic in their ability to improve the human and energy performance attributed to buildings. Lighting control systems, even with the lighting energy improvements of the past 30 years in Federal buildings, have the ability to improve the working performance conditions and reduce energy consumption by nearly 30%. The capital cost of these renovations is considerable, as most require the removal and replacement of ceiling systems, and the re-wiring of electrical distribution. The geothermal (ground source heat pump) program requires significant training both for GSA personnel and contractors. EPA and DoE have programs that can be adapted for GSA, and the cost of the program is reduced accordingly. The feasibility studies are considerable in number, and involve information about site conditions for existing buildings that are not readily available in our records, as well as vast changes in the direction to procurement and engineering professionals across the agency. GSA's ability to design and implement this acceleration program will have great value to the rest of the Federal inventory, as the lessons learned and programmatic guidance developed will be applicable to many other building types. The upfront capital costs of geothermal systems are typically 1.5 times conventional systems, and yield a positive return on investment typically in the 10–15 year range (dependent upon geological conditions (capital) and the cost of energy (operations)).

Approval of this fiscal year 2010 request will enable GSA to continue to provide leadership in energy/water conservation and efficiency to both the public and private sectors.

Authorization Requested—$20,000,000.

Potential projects to be accomplished in Federal buildings throughout the country are currently being identified through surveys and studies, along with potential new designs. The projects to be funded will have positive savings-to-investment ratios, will provide reasonable payback periods, and may generate rebates and savings from utility companies and incentives from grid operators.

Projects will vary in size by location and by delivery method. Typical projects include the following:

Designing new facilities to conform to EISA and to incorporate these new technologies.

Designing new facilities to incorporate other sustainable, green building technologies, such as solar power, wind power, green roofs, and photovoltaic techniques.

Drilling to install vertical and horizontal geothermal loops.

Installing heat pumps and other types of geothermal equipment.

Installing building insulation and seals to enhance equipment performance and reduce the size and energy consumption of geothermal and other energy-efficient equipment.

Installing new or modifying existing green building materials.

Installing wastewater recycling processes for use on lawns, in toilets, and for washing cars.

Insulating roofs, pipes, HVAC duct work, and mechanical equipment.

Installing other green building technologies such as hot water heat recycling, renewable heating systems, seasonal thermal storage systems, and solar air conditioning, green roofs, and cool roofs.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

It has been determined that the practical solution to achieving the identified building energy and water management goals is to proceed with the energy and water retrofit work indicated above.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 11, 2009.

Recommended:— — —Acting Commissioner, Public Building Service

Approved: Paul F. Prouty, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

ALTERATION—FIRE PROTECTION & LIFE SAFETY PROGRAM—VARIOUS BUILDINGS—PFP–2010

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for alterations to upgrade, replace, and improve life safety features and fire protection systems in Government-owned buildings during fiscal year 2010, at a proposed cost of $20,000,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the procurement includes minimum performance requirements requiring energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

This prospectus proposes alterations to upgrade, replace, and improve life safety features and fire protection systems in Government-owned buildings during Fiscal Year 2010. Projects in federal buildings throughout the country are currently being identified through surveys and studies and will vary in size, location, and delivery method. The authority requested in this prospectus is for a diverse set of retrofit projects with engineering solutions to reduce fire and life safety hazards. Typical projects include the following:

Replacing antiquated fire alarm and detection systems that are in need of repair or for which parts are no longer available.

Installing emergency voice communication systems to facilitate occupant notification and/or evacuation.

Installing and/or expanding fire sprinkler coverage to protect federal property.

Constructing additional or enclosing existing exit stair towers to ensure timely evacuation of buildings in the event of an emergency.

JUSTIFICATION

GSA conducts periodic life safety and fire protection assessments of federal buildings nationwide to assess fire risk. As a result of these assessments, a number of life safety and fire protection issues have been identified that need to be addressed in order to reduce the risk of injury, the loss of federal property, and interruption of a federal agency mission.

This prospectus will provide upgrades to a number of GSA federal buildings that do not meet current or national or GSA building fire alarm codes. These buildings contain antiquated hardwired fire alarm systems with replacement parts that are no longer available, lack voice communication capability, and a complete sprinkler system.

Authorization Requested—$20,000,000.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

It has been determined that the practical solution to achieving the identified building fire and life safety goals is to proceed with the fire and life safety work indicated above.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 11, 2009.

Recommended: — — — Acting Commissioner, Public Buildings Service.

Approved: Paul F. Prouty, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

ALTERATION—NEW EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING—WASHINGTON, DC—PDC–0105–WA10

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to the New Executive Office Building, located at 725 17th Street, NW., in Washington, D.C., at design and review costs of $394,000 (design costs of $451,000 were previously authorized), management and inspections costs of $6,257,000 {management and inspection costs of $423,000 were previously authorized), and estimated construction costs of $23,625,000 (estimated construction costs of $5,388,000 were previously authorized), at a proposed total cost of $30,276,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends the Committee resolution of July 21, 2004.

Provided, that, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, the General Services Administration (GSA) shall use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

Provided further, that within 180 days of approval of this resolution, GSA shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the U.S. Senate a report on the planned use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, for such project and if such systems are not used for the project, the specific rationale for GSA's decision.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, GSA shall, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out alteration, design, or construction projects.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, each alteration, design, or construction prospectus submitted by GSA shall include an estimate of the future energy performance of the building and specific description of the use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

PROJECT SUMMARY

The General Services Administration (GSA), proposes to amend Prospectus PDC–

0105–DC05 due to changes in scope, internal swing space requirements, material escalations, and security escort costs not originally contemplated for the New Executive Office Building located at 725 17th Street, NW in Washington, DC.

MAJOR WORK ITEMS

HVAC system upgrades, demolition and abatement, interior construction, internal swing space build out, fire protection alarm, lighting and branch wiring, communications, superstructure.

PROJECT BUDGET

Design and Review	
Design and Review (FY2005)	$451,000
Additional Design (FY2010 Request)	394,000
Design and Review Subtotal	845,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	
M&I (FY2005)	423,000
Additional M&I (FY2010 Request)	6,257,000
M&I Subtotal	6,680,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	
ECC (FY2005)	5,388,000
Additional ECC (FY2010 Request)	23,625,000
ECC Subtotal	29,013,000
Estimated Total Project Cost*	36,538,000

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Authorization Requested (Additional—Design, ECC and M&I)—$30,276,000.

PRIOR AUTHORITY AND FUNDING

The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure authorized $6,262,000 for design, construction and management and inspection on July 21, 2004.

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works authorized $6,262,000 for design, construction and management and inspection on November 17, 2004.

Through Public Law 108–447, Congress appropriated $6,262,000 for design, construction and management and inspection in FY 2005.

PRIOR PROSPECTUS-LEVEL PROJECTS IN BUILDING (PAST 10 YEARS):

None.

Schedule	Start	End
Design	FY2005	FY2009
Construction	FY2010	FY2012

BUILDING

The New Executive Office Building is a 10-story reinforced concrete building with a red brick façade. The building which is proximate to the White House Complex, a desirable feature for the building's tenants, was constructed in 1966. The building has approximately 432,131 gsf with 110 parking spaces.

MAJOR TENANT AGENCIES

Executive Office of the President—Office of Management and Budget, Defense—Office of the Secretary; Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Secret Service.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project will replace components of the existing HVAC system. The fan coil units (FCUs) on the ninth and tenth floors will be replaced, along with deteriorated black iron riser piping from the third through tenth floors.

In addition to replacing the existing perimeter riser system, asbestos-containing material (ACM) shall be abated. To avoid potential hazardous exposure from the asbestos abatement, GSA will create internal swing space for the tenant agency to temporarily relocate from the ninth and tenth floors. Costs to build out the temporary space, and tenant moves including relocation of the telecommunication equipment, and the furniture are included in this prospectus.

Funds for escort security costs during construction are requested due to the sensitive nature of the customers' operations. Access to the project site will be limited to cleared escorted personnel.

Superstructure work will cover firestopping (insulation and sealing) of the pipe penetrations on each floor.

As the ceilings are demolished, new energy efficient lights will replace the existing lighting and wiring. Project specifications include the replacement of ceiling panels with a panel product which includes approximately seventy-five percent recycled content and finished with paint composed of low volatile organic compounds (VOC).

In 2002, a project replaced the FCUs except those on the ninth and tenth floors. The FCUs on floors nine and ten were not replaced at that time because the coils are located in the ceiling plenum. The ninth floor ceiling plenum is insulated with sprayed-on fireproofing containing asbestos which needs to be abated prior to construction. The initial project revealed that the riser piping along with its branches and valves have deteriorated and should be replaced.

MAJOR WORK ITEMS

HVAC Upgrades	$16,972,000
Building Demolition and Abatement	3,317,000
Interior Construction	4,679,000
Internal Swing Space Build Out	546,000
Fire Protection Alarm	628,000
Lighting and Branch Wiring	1,704,000
Communications	980,000
Superstructure	187,000
Total ECC	$29,013,000

JUSTIFICATION

Congress previously authorized this project in fiscal year 2005; however, the project scope increased pursuant to review of the 35% design completion, which uncovered logistical difficulties in maintaining customer operations during construction as originally scoped. Initial estimates did not fully capture the complexities of construction in the occupied building. The project scope is therefore increased to include: additional upgrades for the heating, ventilating and air-conditioning components and controls; security escorts required during construction; customer move expenses; and materials escalation costs.

After further investigation of the piping and FCUs, additional equipment and operating deficiencies were identified. Most of these deficiencies are related to equipment having reached the end of its useful life and some are a result of previous renovations that did not include certain adjustments to the HVAC system that might have been incorporated in larger projects.

Significant leaks due to the deterioration of the risers have resulted in extensive damage and disruption to agency operations. A major leak in August 2006 caused a day-long building shutdown and tenant productivity losses, as well as extensive damage to the tenant's space. Riser failures should be considered eminent and leaks could again cause extensive damage and interruption to the tenant's missions which are critical to the operation of the Executive Office of the President.

The upgraded HVAC work will provide increases in energy efficiency and will provide improved controls and monitoring by utilizing newer state of the art technology.

The recent implementation of HSPD–12 and the customer's need for security escorts during construction must now be accommodated.

Customer moves are required in order to abate the asbestos and install the new fan coil units and variable frequency drives located in the ceilings on the 9th and 10th floors. It is necessary to remove the ceilings in their entirety including lights, sprinklers and fire alarms, and telecommunication equipment.

Materials escalation will be necessary because construction will proceed in four phases to accommodate OMB's time sensitive operations. This lengthens the project delivery schedule and is a reason for the increase in cost.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED (30-YEAR, PRESENT VALUE COST ANALYSIS)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project.

RECOMMENDATION

Alteration.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 11, 2009.

Recommended: — — —, Acting Commissioner, Public Buildings Service.

Approved: Paul F. Prouty, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

ALTERATION—DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING—WASHINGTON, DC—PDC–0035–WA10

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Office Building located at Pennsylvania Avenue and 17th Street, NW, in Washington, D.C., at design and review costs of $1,050,000, at management and inspections costs of $1,800,000, and estimated construction costs of $12,150,000, at a proposed total cost of $15,000,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, the General Services Administration (GSA) shall use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

Provided further, that within 180 days of approval of this resolution, GSA shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the U.S. Senate a report on the planned use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, for such project and if such systems are not used for the project, the specific rational for GSA's decision.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, GSA shall, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out alteration, design, or construction projects.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, each alteration, design, or construction prospectus submitted by GSA shall include an estimate of the future energy performance of the building and specific description of the use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

PROJECT SUMMARY

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a comprehensive roof replacement to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building (EEOB) located at Pennsylvania Ave and 17th Street, NW, in Washington, DC.

MAJOR WORK ITEMS

Building roofing systems repairs and select systems replacement activities including; flat seam copper roofing replacement; skylight repairs and replacement; dormer and chimney repairs; lightning protection; flashing systems repairs and/or replacement and slate repairs and/or replacement.

PROJECT BUDGET

Design and Review	$1,050,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	12,150,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	1,800,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	$15,000,000

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Authorization Requested (Design, ECC, M&I)—$15,000,000.

PRIOR AUTHORITY AND FUNDING

None.

Schedule	Start	End
Design	FY2010	FY2010
Construction	FY2010	FY2011

BUILDING

The EEOB, constructed in 1888, is on the National Register of Historic Places. This building functions as the principal support facility for the White House operations, offering 691,783 gross square feet and 46 outside parking spaces.

TENANT AGENCIES

Executive Office of the President of the United States, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Defense and General Services Administration

PROPOSED PROJECT

The existing roof design is a complex mansard system with flat, vertical and angled surfaces; multiple peaks, valleys, changes in plane and flashing connections, dormers, chimneys, skylights, domes, and other impressive architectural details. The long term replacement tasks include repairs, replacement and/or new installation of all; skylights, flat seam copper roofing, lightning protection, cast iron dormer metals, chimney trim and flashings, other roof flashing and counter flashing components and miscellaneous sealants and appurtenances.

MAJOR WORK ITEMS

Flat Seam Copper Roofing	$6,339,000
Skylight Repair	2,641,000
Dormer and Chimney Repair	1,585,000
Lightning Protection	528,000
Flashing and Slate Replacement	1,057,000
Total ECC	$12,150,000

JUSTIFICATION

The EEOB roofing system was partially repaired and replaced under a major project completed during 1988–1994. The previous scope of work in the most recent multi phased project did not provide for or include, the installation of roof-access traffic ways, maintenance platforms, waterproof mission-critical equipment installations, a permanent and available fall protection system, gutter/downspout and rain water conductor piping. Foot traffic, to accomplish maintenance of the roofing system and other work, has exacerbated damage, resulting in hundreds of leaks throughout the building.

SUMMARY OF ENERGY COMPLIANCE

The EEOB roof replacement will implement design principles to be integrated as seamlessly as possible into all aspects of both the design and construction process, Currently we are looking at options that will achieve the goal of obtaining certification through the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System of the U.S. Green Building Council.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED (30-YEAR, PRESENT VALUE COST ANALYSIS)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project.

RECOMMENDATION

Alteration.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 11, 2009.

Recommended: — — — Acting Commissioner, Public Buildings Service.

Approved: Paul F. Prouty, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

ALTERATION—WEST AND EAST WING INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEMS REPLACEMENT—WASHINGTON, DC—PDC–0017–WA10

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to the New Executive Office Building, located at 725 17th Street, NW, in Washington, DC, at design costs of $18,687,000 (design costs of $22,179,000 were previously authorized), at management and inspections costs of $14,504,000 (management and inspection costs of $12,416,000 were previously authorized), and estimated construction costs of $164,159,000 (estimated construction costs of $144,271,000 were previously authorized), at a proposed total cost of $197,350,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends the Committee resolution of September 24, 2008.

Provided, that, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, the General Services Administration (GSA) shall use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

Provided further, that within 180 days of approval of this resolution, GSA shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the U.S. Senate a report on the planned use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, for such project and if such systems are not used for the project, the specific rational for GSA's decision.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, GSA shall, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out alteration, design, or construction projects.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, each alteration, design, or construction prospectus submitted by GSA shall include an estimate of the future energy performance of the building and specific description of the use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

PROJECT SUMMARY

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes to amend prospectus number PDC0017–WAO9 for repair and alterations to the West Wing of the White House to include the East Wing of the White House located at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC. GSA re-examined the original plan and phases to implement critical changes at the West Wing and upon that evaluation recognized that completing the West and East Wing primary system replacement together given the similarity of scope was the most cost and time efficient approach.

MAJOR WORK ITEMS

Demolition and abatement, site work, structural and finishes work, fire suppression system, mechanical systems to include HVAC and Chemical Biological Radiological (CBR), electrical systems and fire alarm, physical security and information technology systems.

PROJECT BUDGET

Design and Review	
Phase I (FY2008 Reprogramming—West Wing Ph I)	$9,689,000
Additional Phase I (FY09 Proposed Reprogramming—East Wing Ph I)	16,860,000
Phase II (future fiscal year—West Wing Ph II)	6,245,000
Phase III (future fiscal year—East Wing Ph II)	8,072,000
Design and Review Subtotal	$40,866,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	
Phase I (FY2009—West Wing PH I	$70,271,000
Additional Phase I ECC (FY2010 Request—East Wing PH I)	111,177,000
Phase II (future fiscal year—West Wing Ph II)	74,000,000
Phase III (future fiscal year—East Wing Ph II)	52,982,000
ECC Subtotal	$308,430,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	
Phase I (FY2009—West Wing Ph I)	$6,216,000
Additional Phase I M&I (FY2010 Request—East Wing Ph $)	9,823,000
Phase II (future fiscal year—West Wing Ph II)	6,200,000
Phase III (future fiscal year—East Wing Ph II)	4,681,000
M&I Subtotal	$26,920,000
Estimated Total Project Cost*	$376,216,000

* Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Additional Authorization Requested (Design, ECC, M&I)—$203,595,000.[1]

[1]This request is for the balance of authorization required for the East Wing portion of the project. The West Wing portion has been fully authorized.

FY2010 Funding Requested (Additional Phase I ECC and M&I)—$121,000,000.

PRIOR AUTHORITY AND FUNDING

The House and Senate Appropriations Committees approved a reprogramming request of $9,689,000 for design for the West Wing portion of the project in FY2008.

The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure authorized $15,934,000 for design for the West Wing portion of the project on September 24, 2008.

The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure authorized $162,932,000 for design construction and management and inspection for the West Wing portion of the project on September 24, 2008.

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works authorized $172,621,000 for design, construction and management and inspection for the West Wing portion of the project on May 21, 2008.

Through Public Law 111–8, Congress appropriated $76,487,000 for partial construction and management and inspection in FY2009.

PRIOR PROSPECTUS-LEVEL PROJECTS IN BUILDING (PAST 10 YEARS)

None.

Schedule	Start	End
Design	FY2008	FY2013
Construction	FY2010	FY2016.

BUILDING

Originally constructed in 1902, the West Wing is the part of the White House in which the Oval Office, the Cabinet Room and the Situation Room are located. It serves as the day-to-day office of the President of the United States. It is roughly 30,000 gross square feet and includes offices for senior members of the Executive Office of the President of the United States and their support staff.

The East Wing as it exists today was added to the White House in 1942 and serves as office space for the First Lady and her staff, the Department of Defense, and the United States Secret Service. The East Wing also includes the President's Theater, the visitor's entrance and the East Colonnade.

TENANT AGENCY

Executive Office of the President of the United States.

PROPOSED PROJECT

A study of the electrical and mechanical systems of the West Wing was completed and the findings identified a critical need for the immediate replacement of the aged and failing systems in order to prevent an imminent equipment failure and the resultant interruption of services. There is currently no redundant HVAC equipment for the West Wing and this has prevented shutdown for testing and maintenance of the equipment for many years. The West Wing electrical systems have also reached the end of their reliable productivity and failure would result in discontinued operations.

Similar studies have been undertaken and completed on the East Wing and indicate the condition of the utilities in the East Wing is similar to the West Wing, replacement is necessary to prevent imminent failure. In order to secure continuous reliable HVAC and electrical service to both the West and East Wing, GSA proposes replacing all primary systems and secondary distribution systems that serve the interior of the each wing.

While the projects were originally planned as separate projects, GSA is now planning to combine the replacement of the primary systems for the West and East Wing in Phase I of the project. The replacement of the secondary distribution systems for the West and East Wings will follow in Phase II and Phase III, respectively.

The proposed total project includes the construction of a new accessible, utility pathway to allow for the service and maintenance of the new systems infrastructure. As there is currently no space available in the building to accommodate any additional equipment, the project will include the construction of new mechanical and electrical rooms to support the new services. Select structural and architectural restoration of areas that are disturbed in the systems replacement will be included. Fire life safety upgrades including automatic fire suppression and fire alarm systems. Mechanical work includes HVAC systems and controls, CBR systems, plumbing storm and sewer systems. Electrical power, lighting, select emergency power and lighting and select UPS systems. Physical security system includes; access control, intrusion detection, video assessment and emergency notifications systems. Both copper and fiber optic backbones are included for the IT systems infrastructure.

All utility services will be rerouted to allow the GSA necessary access to operate, maintain, and repair infrastructure, services and equipment as required.

MAJOR WORK ITEMS

Site Work	$41,298,000
Structural and Finishes Work	68,356,000
Fire Suppression System	16,062,000
Mechanical Systems	87,479,000
Electrical System & Fire Alarm, Physical Security and IT Systems	78,560,000
Demolition/Abatement	16,675,000
Total ECC	$308,430,000

JUSTIFICATION

GSA completed a systems evaluation and technical study of the physical plant, infrastructure and facilities serving each wing as well as select systems and equipment resulting in sequential projects. While the projects were originally planned as separate projects, GSA and the Administration have determined that combining the West and East Wing primary systems replacement projects together would be more cost effective by eliminating duplicate costs for mobilization, demobilization, remobilization, management, inspections and reduced construction time and cost. In addition, the combined projects create less disruption to mission critical operations given the connection, continuation and extension of similar utilities and infrastructure scope of work connecting West Wing services with the East Wing. A provision will be made in the design of West Wing Phase I for the replacement of the secondary distribution systems for the West and East Wings that will follow in Phase II and Phase III, respectively.

SUMMARY OF ENERGY COMPLIANCE

The West and East Wing Infrastructure Project will integrate and implement sustainable design principles and energy efficiency effort as seamlessly as possible into all aspects of both the design and construction process. The goal is to obtain certification through the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System of the U.S. Green Building Council.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED (30-YEAR, PRESENT VALUE COST ANALYSIS)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project.

RECOMMENDATION

Alteration.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 11, 2009.

Recommended: — — — Acting Commissioner, Public Buildings Service.

Approved: Paul F. Prouty, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

AMENDED PROSPECTUS—CONSTRUCTION—UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE ANNEX—SAN DIEGO, CA—PCA–CTC–SD09

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, additional appropriations in the amount of $78,000,000 are authorized for management and inspection and construction of the United States Courthouse Annex, San Diego, California, not to exceed 466,886 gross square feet. This resolution amends the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee resolution dated July 19, 2006;

Provided, that the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the San Diego, California Courthouse Complex contains no more than 22 courtrooms;

Provided further, that the Administrator of General Services shall not construct more than six courtrooms or 12 chambers in the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex under the authority of this resolution;

Provided further, that the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that a sharing plan approved by the Judicial Conference on September 15, 2009, for courtrooms for magistrate judges is adopted within 30 days of this resolution and is implemented in the design of the San Diego Courthouse Complex;

Provided further, that the Administrator of General Services shall require that any excess space not allocated to courtroom or other court-related use in the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex shall be used to provide office space to Executive Branch agencies that are not ancillary or related to the Federal judiciary;

Provided further, that the Administrator of General Services shall submit a prospectus for any additional expansion space, after completion of construction and occupancy of the San Diego Courthouse Annex, for court or other court-related use requested in the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex;

Provided further, that, prior to acceptance of the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP), the Administrator of General Services shall advise the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the number of courtrooms, chambers, court space, court related space, and other agency space to be provided in the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex;

Provided further, that no additional funds, beyond the GMP, in effect on the date of this resolution, for the procurement for the construction of the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex, as of the date of adoption of this resolution, shall be authorized or obligated for the project,

Provided further, that, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, the General Services Administration (GSA) shall use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project,

Provided further, that, within 180 days of adoption of this resolution, GSA shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the U.S. Senate a report on the planned use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, for the project and if such systems are not used for the project, the specific rationale for GSA's decision.

DESCRIPTION

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes the construction of a 466,886 gross square foot U.S. Courthouse Annex (CT Annex), including 105 inside parking spaces,

in San Diego, CA. The CT Annex will meet the 30-year space needs of the courts and court-related agencies in conjunction with the existing Edward J. Schwartz Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse (FBCT). San Diego was one of the four emergency projects on the Judiciary's Revised Five-Year Courthouse Project Plan—FY2005–2009, approved by the Judicial Conference on March 26, 2004.

PROJECT SUMMARY

Site Information	
Site acquired	2.27 acres
Building Area	
Gross square feet (excluding inside parking)	419,636
Gross square feet (including inside parking)	466,886
Project Budget	
Site (FY1999, 2002, 2003, 2005)	$31,916,000
Design (FY2003, 2006)	13,711,000
Management and Inspection (M&I) (FY2006)	7,740,000
Additional M&I	2,260,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC) (FY2006)	$248,816,000
Additional ECC	108,102,000
Total ECC ($760/gsf including inside parking [1])	356,918,000
Estimated Total Project Cost*	$412,545,000

[1]The ECC/gsf does not include $2.3 million for repair and alteration work to the Edward J. Schwartz Federal Building & U.S. Courthouse to re-orient the public entrance to face the proposed annex which is included in the Total ECC.

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by GSA.

Authorization Requested (Additional ECC & M&I)—$110,362,000.

FY2009 Funding Requested—$110,362,000.

PRIOR AUTHORITY AND FUNDING

The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee authorized $302,183,000:

$15,400,000 for site on July 23, 1998; $3,100,000 for site and $11,237,000 for design, or $14,337,000, for a 583,746 gsf Courthouse Annex, including 46 inside parking spaces, on July 8, 2001; $9,360,000 for additional site and $204,000 for additional design for a 583,746 gsf Courthouse Annex, including 46 inside parking spaces, on July 24, 2002; $2,516,000 for additional site and $552,000 for additional design, or $3,068,000, for a 614,394 gsf Courthouse Annex, including 105 inside parking spaces, on July 21, 2004; and $1,540,000 for additional site, $1,718,000 for additional design, $248,816,000 for construction, and $7,740,000 for management and inspection for a 466,886 gsf Courthouse Annex, including 105 inside parking spaces, on July 19, 2006.

The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee authorized $302,183,000: $15,400,000 for site on September 23, 1998; $3,100,000 for site and $11,237,000 for design, or $14,337,000, for a 583,746 gsf Courthouse Annex, including 46 inside parking spaces, on September 25, 2001; $9,360,000 for additional site and $204,000 for additional design for a 583,746 gsf Courthouse Annex, including 46 inside parking spaces, on September 26, 2002; $2,516,000 for additional site and $552,000 for additional design, or $3,068,000, for a 614,394 gsf Courthouse Annex, including 105 inside parking spaces, on November 17, 2004; $1,540,000 for additional site, $1,718,000 for additional design, $221,345,000 for construction, and $7,740,000 for management and inspection for a 619,644 gsf Courthouse Annex, including 105 inside parking spaces, on July 20, 2005; and $27,471,000 for additional construction for a 466,886 gsf Courthouse Annex, including 105 inside parking spaces, on May 23, 2006.

Funding is $302,183,000:

Congress appropriated $273,172,000: $15,400,000 for FY 1999 (Public Law 105–277), $23,901,000 for FY 2003 (Public Law 108–7); $3,068,000 for FY 2005 (Public Law 108–447); and $230,803,000 for FY 2006 (Public Law 109–115).

GSA reprogrammed $29,011,000: $1,540,000 to the project in FY 2002 and $27,471,000 to the project in FY 2006.

SCHEDULE

FY 1998—Site.
FY 2003—Design.
FY 2009—Construction.
FY 2013—Occupancy.

OVERVIEW OF PROJECT

In fiscal year 2006, GSA submitted a prospectus for a CT Annex providing 619,644 gross square feet of space (PCA-CTC-SD06). Due to increased construction materials costs, GSA and the District Court agreed to reduce the scope of this project. GSA submitted an amended prospectus with a revised plan (PCA-CTC-SD07). Under this revised plan, GSA eliminated six proposed floors of the building. The number of proposed district courtrooms, but not chambers, was reduced from 18 to 14 and the number of appellate chambers was reduced from 3 to 2 in the 10-year program. The proposed expansion district courtrooms, but not chambers, were reduced from 5 to 0 in the 30-year program. The new CT Annex will provide 466,886 gross square feet, 152,758 gross square feet less than the original construction prospectus for this project. After submitting the revised plan, GSA encountered additional difficulty and was unable to award the reduced project. Due to continuing materials escalation, limited bidding, market conditions, and further delays in award, GSA is seeking additional funding and authorization.

The CT Annex will provide 14 district courtrooms and 18 chambers, two Court of Appeals judges' chambers, a visiting district chamber, District Clerk's office, Pretrial Services and the U.S. Marshals Service. Pretrial Services will occupy space within the building until that space is needed for conversion to six additional district judge's chambers. The project will include modification of the entrance to the existing FB-CT. Currently, the lobby of this building is accessed from Front Street. The new access will be from the courtyard between the new CT Annex and the existing FB-CT. Also, construction will include a tunnel linking the existing FB-CT to the new CT Annex and an extension connecting the existing prisoner tunnel to the new CT Annex.

After completion of the CT Annex, the existing FB-CT will be retained to provide space for the magistrate, senior district, and two Court of Appeals judges. The U.S. Bankruptcy Court will continue to occupy the Jacob Weinberger Courthouse.

One Court of Appeals Judge, Pretrial Services and a portion of the U.S. Attorney's office are in leased locations in the downtown area. These leases will be extended or terminated to coincide with the occupancy of the new CT Annex.

TENANT AGENCIES

The CT Annex will house the District Judges, District Clerk, two Court of Appeals Judges, Pretrial Services, and the U.S. Marshals Service.

DELINEATED AREA

The CT Annex will be constructed in the Central Business District on a site adjacent to the existing FB-CT. This site has been acquired except for closing of Union and E Streets.

JUSTIFICATION

The District Court currently occupies space in the existing FB-CT. This building cannot accommodate the Courts' total space requirements and was not designed to accommodate needed expansion on the site. Some of the modifications to FB-CT resulted in less than adequate sized courtrooms that have been used for 13 years.

Federal construction of a new CT Annex in conjunction with continued use of the existing FB-CT is the most desirable housing strategy to meet the projected space needs of the Southern District Courts and court-related agencies in San Diego. The new CT Annex will improve the flow of prisoners, adequately house the district judges, and significantly increase security. Completion of the CT Annex will permit one Court of Appeals judge and Pretrial Services to vacate leased space.

The Judicial Conference, in September 2003, declared a space emergency at San Diego in order to recognize the effect of aggressive border enforcement initiatives on the court's facilities and the serious security and operational problems at this location.

The additional funds requested in this prospectus are due to increased construction material costs. During the past two years, the construction industry has experienced a significant increase in costs, primarily due to the increased demand for raw materials from construction in international markets and coastal communities in the United States affected by hurricanes. For example, construction material costs in the Southern California area have escalated by approximately 11 percent per year. Much of the raised access flooring in the building and metric measurement were eliminated in further efforts to reduce costs.

EXPLANATION OF CHANGES

The gross square footage of the project is the same as currently authorized. However, to provide one courtroom for every two senior judges, two senior district courtrooms in the existing building were reassigned for magistrate judge use. Also, the projected number of magistrate judges was reduced from 18 to 14. The reassignment and reduction means that there are now five unassigned courtrooms that will be used for ADR Suites and attorney conference rooms.

The Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC) of the proposed project reflects an increase of $110,362,000 from the ETPC of the project currently authorized by the House and Senate Committees (which is the result of construction escalation and change in the projected start of construction from 2006 to 2009.)

DEPARTURES

2nd Special Proceedings Courtroom—This departure was identified in a previous prospectus signed on March 28, 2002 and approved by the House and Senate Committees on July 24, 2002 and September 26, 2002, respectively, and in subsequent resolutions. Approximate cost $1,000,000.

With eight courtrooms for four senior district judges, the project does comply with the July 19, 2006, resolution of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which authorized the proposed project, requiring (via amendment to the U.S. Courts Design Guide) that each U.S. Courthouse construction project provide one courtroom for every two senior judges.

SPACE REQUIREMENTS OF THE U.S. COURTS

	Current		Request		
	Courtrooms	Judges	Courtrooms Existing Buildings	Courtrooms New Building	Judges
District					
Active	13	13	0	14	18
Senior	3	5	4	0	8
Visiting	0	2	0	0	1
Magistrate	*8	9	**19	0	14
Circuit	0	****3	0	0	4
Total:	24	32	***23	14	45

*These courtrooms do not meet minimum USCDG standards.
**Seven of these courtrooms do not meet minimum USCDG standards. The five unassigned courtrooms and chambers will be used as ADR Suites and attorney conference rooms.
***One magistrate courtroom will be converted to a new lobby facing the new CT Annex.
****One judge is in leased space.

SUMMARY OF ENERGY COMPLIANCE

This project is designed to meet the requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED (30-YEAR, PRESENT VALUE COSTS)

New Construction: $340,927,000
Lease: $540,465,000

RECOMMENDATION—CONSTRUCTION

The 30-year, present value cost of construction is $199,538,000 less than the cost of leasing, an equivalent annual cost advantage of $13,129,000.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on February 26, 2008.

Recommended: — — —, Commissioner, Public Buildings Service.

Approved: — — —, Administrator, General Services Administration.

January 2008

Housing Plan
Courthouse Annex

SAN DIEGO, CA
PCA-CTC-SD09

Locations	Current							Proposed						
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)				RSF	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)				RSF
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Total
Schwartz Courthouse														
District Court	245	245	66,163	150	95,949	162,262	217,133	80	80	26,709	-	91,379	118,088	158,022
Court of Appeals	10	10	4,920	134	7,913	12,967	17,352	10	10	4,920	134	7,913	12,967	17,352
U.S. Marshals Service	65	65	15,511	423	19,942	35,876	48,008	66	66	18,083	810	20,945	39,838	53,310
US Attorney	310	310	85,040	3,284	12,147	100,471	134,447	410	410	107,881	6,104	10,661	124,646	166,798
U. S. Bankruptcy Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	1,000	-	4,200	5,200	6,958
Tax Court	11	11	128	-	434	562	751	11	11	675	-	1,050	1,725	2,308
DHS- Immig ; Customs	164	164	61,831	-	-	61,831	82,741	260	260	69,521	2,314	3,817	75,652	101,235
Exec Office of Immigr Review	6	6	2,811	-	155	2,966	3,969	6	6	2,811	-	155	2,966	3,969
IRS	202	202	46,578	387	3,180	50,145	67,103	210	210	55,600	2,035	2,099	59,734	79,933
Treasury Inspector General	3	3	445	-	-	445	595	3	3	417	18	19	454	608
Fed Bur of Investigations	1	1	153	-	-	153	205	1	1	127	-	-	127	170
GSA Public Bldgs Service	16	16	6,715	533	-	7,248	9,699	16	16	6,715	533	-	7,248	9,699
Federal Protective Service	6	6	2,062	-	-	2,062	2,759	10	10	2,294	100	-	2,394	3,204
Federal Technology Service	-	-	562	-	-	562	752	-	-	220	-	353	573	767
Joint Use	-	-	-	-	22,304	22,304	29,847	-	-	-	-	16,450	16,450	22,013
Vacant	-	-	8,208	-	-	8,208	10,984	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	1,039	1,039	301,127	4,911	162,024	468,062	626,345	1,089	1,089	296,973	12,048	159,041	468,062	626,345
Leased Space														
Court of Appeals	6	6	4,136	-	-	4,136	4,758	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pretrial Services	41	41	9,530	-	-	9,530	10,839	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
US Attorney	16	16	7,361	-	182	7,543	8,614	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	63	63	21,027	-	182	21,209	24,209	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Courthouse Annex														
District Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	281	281	71,486	9,599	114,911	195,996	264,595
Court of Appeals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	21	727	-	5,427	6,154	8,308
U.S. Marshals Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	145	145	33,483	6,010	16,305	55,778	75,300
Pretrial Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76	76	15,301	515	2,183	17,999	24,299
GSA Public Bldgs Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	529	-	-	529	714
Federal Technology Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400	400	540
Joint Use/Building Support	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	1,950	850	1,500	4,300	5,805
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529	529	123,456	16,974	140,726	281,156	379,561
Total	1,102	1,102	322,154	4,911	162,206	489,271	650,554	1,618	1,618	420,429	29,022	299,767	749,218	1,005,906

Usable square footage means the portion of the building available for use by tenants' personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building (e.g. auditorium, health units and snack bars). Usable square footage does not include space devoted to building operations and maintenance (e.g. craft shops, gear rooms, building supply rooms, rest rooms and lobbies).

Special Space	USF
Laboratory	200
Holding Cells	13,648
Private Toilets	11,567
Physical Fitness	5,750
Conference	42,475
ADP	1,475
Courtroom	38,177
Judicial Hearing	1,446
Judicial Chambers	23,476
Food Service	2,512
TOTAL	140,726

ACQUISITION—COLUMBIA PLAZA BUILDING—WASHINGTON, DC—PDC–0000–WA10

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for acquisition, through a purchase option, of the Columbia Plaza Building located at 2401 E Street, NW, Washington, D.C., at a proposed cost of $100,000,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

DESCRIPTION

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes to acquire, through a purchase option, the Columbia Plaza Building located at 2401 E St., NW, Washington, DC. The government has an option to purchase the building at the set price of $100,000,000 at the end of the current lease term in 2012, provided 365 days notice has been given to the lessor.

BUILDING

The Columbia Plaza Building was constructed in the mid 1960s. Prior to the Department of State's (DOS) initial occupancy in 1992 the building underwent a major renovation converting the space from residential use to office use. GSA currently leases 511,500 rentable square feet and 361 parking spaces at Columbia Plaza for the DOS under a 20–year lease agreement that expires in April 2012.

PROJECT BUDGET

Building and Site Acquisition—$100,000,000.

Authorization Requested (Acquisition)—$100,000,000.

JUSTIFICATION

DOS and GSA signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 1987 committing both agencies to consolidate DOS space and personnel in the Foggy Bottom area of the District of Columbia and Rosslyn, VA. The Columbia Plaza Building, located northwest of the Harry S Truman (Main State) Building, has been occupied for more than 20 years as a leased location. The Columbia Plaza Building's location in Foggy Bottom is directly adjacent to Main State and supports the goals of DOS as identified in the 1987 MOU. The building's proximity to both Main State and the approximately 3.5 million square feet DOS occupies in the Foggy Bottom area provides many operational benefits ranging from human resources, mobility in and around the State's Foggy Bottom locations, and efficiencies in facility operations through information technology linkages and security. Given all of these factors, DOS continues to have a long-term need for the space in the Columbia Plaza Building.

Alterations for $30,600,000 were completed in 1992 and the government currently operates virtually all aspects of the facility. GSA recently performed a Building Engineering Report (BER) for the Columbia Plaza Building which reported that the building is in fair overall condition. As part of the $30M investment in 1992, GSA was directed by Congressional resolution that ''GSA will attempt to include a purchase option in the lease contract''. GSA successfully negotiated a purchase option as part of the terms of the 20-year lease. The terms of the purchase option and price were set when the lease transaction was signed in 1992. The government's option to purchase the building is currently established at $100,000,000 or approximately $151 per gross square foot. This price is well below the current market rates for buildings of comparable size in Washington, DC, especially a building with long-term government occupancy. In 2006, GSA completed a fair market value (FMV) appraisal which indicated the FMV of Columbia Plaza Building to be approximately $190,000,000, well above the established option price to the government.

TENANT AGENCIES

Department of State.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED (30-YEAR, PRESENT VALUE COST ANALYSIS)

Purchase—$317,305,000.

Lease—$513,447,000.

The 30-year, present value cost of purchase is $196,142,000 less than the cost of leasing, an equivalent annual cost advantage of $12,614,000.

RECOMMENDATION

Acquisition.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 11, 2009.

Recommended: — — —, Acting Commissioner, Public Buildings Service.

Approved: Paul F. Prouter, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

DESIGN/BUILD—FEDERAL BUILDING–FBI DISTRICT OFFICE—MIAMI/MIRAMAR, FL—PFL–FBC–MI10

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for a new Federal Building in the Miami/Miramar, Florida area for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, currently located in twelve separate locations spread across the Miami, Miramar, and Dade County, Florida area, at site costs of $9,000,000, design and review costs of $11,924,000, management and inspection costs of $8,401,000 and estimated construction costs of $161,350,000, for a combined cost of $190,675,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, the General Services Administration (GSA) shall use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

Provided further, that within 180 days of approval of this resolution, GSA shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the U.S. Senate a report on the planned use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, for such project and if such systems are not used for the project, the specific rational for GSA's decision.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, GSA shall, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out alteration, design, or construction projects.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, each alteration, design, or construction prospectus submitted by GSA shall include an estimate of the future energy performance of the building and specific description of the use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

DESCRIPTION

The US General Services Administration proposes building a new Federal Building in the Miami/Miramar, Florida area for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). This facility will serve to meet the FBI's current and future space needs as their new District Office in South Florida, and will consolidate their current space spread across the Miami, Miramar, and Dade County, Florida area in twelve separate locations.

PROJECT SUMMARY

Site Information	
To be acquired acreage	9.0
Building Area	
Building without Parking (gsf)	474,801
Building with Parking (gsf)	474,801
Number of outside parking spaces	30
Structured Parking Spaces	535
PROJECT BUDGET	
Site	$9,000,000
Design and Review Subtotal	11,924,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC) ($452/gsf incl. inside parking)	161,350,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	8,401,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	$190,675,000

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Authorization Requested (Design, ECC, and M&I)—$190,675,000.

FY 2010 Funding Request—$190,675,000.

Schedule	Start	End
Design	FY2010	FY2012
Construction	FY2011	FY2014

OVERVIEW OF PROJECT

The new Miami FBI District Office will provide for the space requirements and security needs for the FBI in the South Florida area. 535 secured structured parking spaces will be incorporated into the construction of the FBI District Office facility and made available to the FBI, primarily for the use of Government-owned vehicles and other official Government purposes. Surface parking spaces will also be provided.

TENANT AGENCIES

Department of Justice—Federal Bureau of Investigation

JUSTIFICATION

An important component of the priorities of the FBI is the availability of efficient and cost effective facilities, with state-of-the-art infrastructure in which to carry out the FBI's mission. FBI requires a facility that meets the Level 4 Interagency Security Committee (ISC) criteria, with sufficient space for the current and projected workforce. In addition, the expansion of the secure work environment is essential to foster synergy among FBI elements for greater coordination and productivity internally and with partner organizations. The existing, disparate FBI facilities are incapable of providing the increased square footage necessary to support new functions and cannot meet enhanced IT infrastructure and security requirements. A new, consolidated location will provide the FBI with sufficient space to meet its current requirements and allow for full compliance with the ISC guidelines.

The requirement for FBI's consolidated Miami Field Division office was originally to be included in the larger Miami/Miramar, FL DOJ lease consolidation, along with the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF), as requested under PFL–01–MI06, and originally authorized by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on February 16,

2006, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on November 17, 2005. In 2007, it was determined by DOJ that the original consolidated campus strategy was no longer logistically or financially feasible. Therefore, GSA requested authority to procure DEA's requirements separately (Prospectus No. PFL–02–MI08), which were authorized by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 24, 2008, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on September 17, 2008. The ATF's requirements were delivered below the prospectus threshold. Given the size, complexity, long term nature, and other aspects of the FBI's requirements, GSA determined that a Federally owned facility would better serve the mission and operations of the Government.

SUMMARY OF ENERGY COMPLIANCE

This project will be designed to conform with the requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and to earn LEED certification. It will also meet Congressionally-required energy efficiency and performance requirements in effect during design. GSA will encourage exploration of opportunities to gain increased energy efficiency above the measures achieved in the design.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED (30-YEAR, PRESENT VALUE COST ANALYSIS)

New Construction—$352,712,000.

Lease—$520,093,000.

The 30 year, present value cost of new construction is $167,380,000 less than the cost of lease, an equivalent annual cost advantage of $10,764,000.

RECOMMENDATION

Construction.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 11, 2009.

Recommended: — — —, —Acting Commissioner, Public Buildings Service.

Approved: Paul F. Prouty, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

Housing Plan PF -MI10
Federal Bur Investigation
M.. ..4 FL

Locations	Current							Proposed						
	Personnel		*Usable Square Feet (USF)*				*RSF*	*Personnel*		*Usable Square Feet (USF)*				*RSF*
	Office	**Total**	**Office**	**Storage**	**Special**	**Total**	**Total**	**Office**	**Total**	**Office**	**Storage**	**Special**	**Total**	**Total**
GSA Leases														
16320 NW 2nd Ave Bldg - Miami, FL	604	604	91,704	2,000	26,104	**119,808**	**137,779**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Lincoln Square Bldg - Miami, FL	24	24	21,973	0	0	**21,973**	**25,269**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Flamingo Park of Commerce - Miramar, FL	13	13	29,800	0	0	**29,800**	**34,270**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
FBI Leases		0							0					
Miramar Self Storage - Miramar, FL	0	0	0	600	0	**600**	**690**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
16400 NW 2nd Ave Bldg - Miramar, FL	0	0	0	3,933	0	**3,933**	**4,523**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
8245 NW 53rd Street - Miramar, FL	19	19	3,896	0	0	**3,896**	**4,480**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Southwest 6th Street - Plantation, FL	41	41	3,944	0	0	**3,944**	**4,536**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
16320 NW 2nd Ave - Miami, FL	0	0	0	1,760	0	**1,760**	**2,024**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Tech Storage - Miami, FL	0	0	0	6,000	0	**6,000**	**6,900**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Health Care Warehouse - Miami,FL	0	0	0	5,355	0	**5,355**	**6,158**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Shared Space with Local Police Departments														
9105 25th Street NW - Miramar, FL	19	19	1,900	0	0	**1,900**	**2,185**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
100 Southwest 3rd - Pompano Beach	13	13	2,000	0	0	**2,000**	**2,300**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
NEW FBI DISTRICT OFFICE (FEDERALLY-OWNED)	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**	890	890	195,738	85,150	74,300	**355,188**	**437,926**
Total:	**733**	**733**	**155,217**	**19,648**	**26,104**	**200,969**	**231,114**	**890**	**890**	**195,738**	**85,150**	**74,300**	**355,188**	**437,926**

	Current	Proposed
	Utilization	
Rate	165	172

Current UR excludes 34,148 USF of office support space
Proposed UR excludes 43,062 USF of office support space

Special Space	
Laboratory	1,000
Private Restrooms	750
Food Service	2,600
ADP	27,225
Conference/Training	11,200
Physical Fitness	4,500
Vehicle Bay/Maintenance	15,675
Boat Bay	4,000
Emergency Generator	300
Weapons/Ammo Vaults	700
Processing Rooms	3,350
Inside Parking/Garage	3,000
Total:	**74,300**

CONSTRUCTION—U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY—MADAWASKA, ME—PME–BSD–MW10

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. § 3307, appropriations are authorized for the construction of a new land port of entry at Madawaska, ME to replace the existing Port of Entry, at management and inspection costs of $3,827,000 and estimated construction costs of $46,300,000, for a combined cost of $50,127,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, the General Services Administration (GSA) shall use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

Provided further, that within 180 days of approval of this resolution, GSA shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the U.S. Senate a report on the planned use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, for such project and if such systems are not used for the project, the specific rational for GSA's decision.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, GSA shall, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out alteration, design, or construction projects.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, each alteration, design, or construction prospectus submitted by GSA shall include an estimate of the future energy performance of the building and specific description of the use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

DESCRIPTION

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes the construction of a new land port of entry (POE) at Madawaska, ME to replace the existing POE, expand inspection lanes, and operational functions. The proposed project will replace the undersized main administration building at 2 Bridge Street, while addressing current safety, security, circulation, and efficiency issues.

Project Summary	
Site Information	
Government-owned	.87 acres
To be acquired	12.45 acres
Building Area	
Building (including canopies)	39,211 gsf
Building (excluding canopies)	28,756 gsf
Number of inside parking spaces	5[1]
Number of outside parking spaces	48[2]
Cost Information	
Site Development Cost[3]	$17,181,000
Building Costs (includes inspection canopies) ($743/gsf)	$29,119,000
Project Budget	
Site Acquisition (FY 2005 & FY 2008)	$14,406,000
Design and Review (FY 2005 & FY 2008)	4,514,000
Additional Design and Review (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) 2009)	750,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	3,827,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	46,300,000
Estimated Total Project Cost*	$69,797,000

[1]The existing facility does not have any inside parking spaces.

[2]Parking spaces include 5 spaces for visitor parking, 30 for employees, 6 for referral and service, and 7 for truck inspection. Currently, there are 6 outside parking spaces at the facility.

[3]Site Development includes site clearing, demolition, roadways and utilities.

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for emerging technologies and alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Authorization Requested (ECC and M&1)—$50,127,000.*

*GSA has worked closely with DHS program offices responsible for developing and implementing security technology at the Land Ports of Entry (LPOE's). These programs include United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US–VISIT), Radiation Portal Monitors (RPM's) and Advanced Spectroscopic Portal (ASPs) monitors, Western Hemisphere Travel initiative (WHTI) and Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII). This prospectus contains the funding of infrastructure requirements for each program known at the time of prospectus development since these programs are at various stages of development and implementation. Additional funding by a Reimbursable Work Authorization (RWA) may be required to provide for as yet unidentified elements of each of these programs to be implemented at this port.

PRIOR AUTHORITY AND FUNDING

The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure authorized $1,760,000 for site acquisition and design on July 21, 2004.

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works authorized $1,760,000 for site acquisition and design on November 17, 2004.

The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure authorized $17,600,000 for additional site acquisition and additional design on September 20, 2006.

The Senate Committee for Environment and Public Works authorized additional site acquisition and additional design on September 27, 2006.

Through Public Law 108–447, Congress appropriated $1,760,000 for site acquisition and design in FY 05 on December 8, 2004.

Through Public Law 110–161, Congress appropriated $17,160,000 for additional site acquisition and design on December 26, 2007.

Through Public Law 111–5, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, GSA's Spending Plan included $750,000 for additional design.

Schedule	Start	End
Design	FY2008	FY2010
Construction	FY2010	FY2012

OVERVIEW OF PROJECT

This project will provide for the improvement and expansion to this POE on approximately 13.32 acres of land. GSA owns approximately .87 acres and will purchase an additional 12.45 acres. The scope of the project includes a total replacement of the existing original 6,000 gsf building built in 1959 with a new, multiple building facility totaling 28,756 gsf. The planned expansion includes: a 10,423 gsf main administration building; 1,275 gsf for 2 non-commercial inspection lanes and an enclosed secondary inspection bay; a 146 gsf outbound inspection booth; 12,753 gsf of commercial inspection offices, dock, cargo facility, inspection booth, a non-intrusive inspection (NII) facility; a 1,894 pedestrian processing facility; and 2,265 gsf of indoor parking.

TENANT AGENCIES

Department of Homeland Security (DHS)—Customs and Border Protection (CBP), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)—Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and GSA.

LOCATION

The Madawaska land POE is located in northern Maine in Aroostook County, at 2 Bridge Street, at the international border between the United States and Canada separating the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick, and adjacent to the Canadian town of Edmundston.

JUSTIFICATION

The existing site at Madawaska is very small, situated on less than one acre of land and is geographically constrained by the St. Johns River, Nexfor Fraser Papers and the Montreal Maine & Atlantic Railroad. The planned addition of radiation portal monitors and other on-site inspection equipment will only exacerbate the situation as the existing site lacks sufficient staging and queuing areas. In addition, site parking and vehicle maneuvering areas are inadequate, the commercial truck traffic pattern, and visitor and employee parking are not clear and well defined, Existing site constraints imposed by the railroad and paper company, require that an elevated roadway be constructed to allow for a full inspection operation by CBP.

Madawaska is New England's third busiest port in automobile traffic and sixth busiest in truck traffic. On-site staffing has increased substantially since September 11, 2001, resulting in the need for additional space. The existing facility lacks sufficient office and storage space, as well as a secure area to perform standard interview and search procedures. There is no commercial secondary inspection area to perform a proper secondary inspection, which at times involves unloading a typical tractor-trailer. As a result, secondary truck inspections are done at roadside. This effort often causes traffic congestion that backs up onto the bridge.

SUMMARY OF ENERGY COMPLIANCE

This project is designed to conform with the requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and to earn Leadership in Energy and Environment Design (LEED) certification. It will also meet Congressionally-required energy efficiency and performance requirements in effect during design. GSA will encourage exploration of opportunities to gain increased energy efficiency above the measures achieved in the design.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

GSA owns and maintains the existing facilities at this port of entry; thus no alternative other than Federal construction was considered.

RECOMMENDATION

Construction.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 11, 2009.

Recommended:— — — Acting Commissioner, Public Buildings Service.

Approved: Paul F. Prouty, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

Locations	Current							Proposed						
	Personnel		*Usable Square Feet (USF)*				*RSF*	*Personnel*		*Usable Square Feet (USF)*				*RSF*
	Office	**Total**	**Office**	**Storage**	**Special**	**Total**	**Total**	**Office**	**Total**	**Office**	**Storage**	**Special**	**Total**	**Total**
Madawaska LPOE														
DHS - Customs and Border Protection	9	9	4,144	1,082	0	5,226	7,348	29	29	20,309	3,791	2,447	26,547	26,547
GSA - PBS	1	1	165	505	0	670	942	1	1	519	453	0	972	972
HHS - Food and Drug Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	64	453	720	1,237	1,237
Total:	**10**	**10**	**4,309**	**1,587**	**0**	**5,896**	**8,290**	**31**	**31**	**20,892**	**4,697**	**3,167**	**28,756**	**28,756**

Special Space	
Laboratory	720
Holding Cell	469
Restroom	361
Physical Fitness	768
Conference	599
Food Service	250
Total:	**3,167**

CONSTRUCTION—U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY—TORNILLO–GUADALUPE—EL PASO COUNTY, TX—PTX–BSC–TG10

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for the construction of a new port of entry at Fabens-Casita in El Paso County, TX, at additional design costs of $3,800,000, management and inspections costs of $6,381,000 and estimated construction costs of $81,384,000, for a combined cost of $91,565,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, the General Services Administration (GSA) shall use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

Provided further, that within 180 days of approval of this resolution, GSA shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the U.S. Senate a report on the planned use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, for such project and if such systems are not used for the project, the specific rational for GSA's decision.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, GSA shall, to the maximum extent practicable and considering life-cycle costs appropriate for the geographic area, use energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out alteration, design, or construction projects.

Provided further, that beginning on the date of approval of this resolution, each alteration, design, or construction prospectus submitted by GSA shall include an estimate of the future energy performance of the building and specific description of the use of energy efficient and renewable energy systems, including photovoltaic systems, in carrying out the project.

DESCRIPTION

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes the construction of new port of entry (POE) facilities to replace the existing POE at Fabens-Casita in El Paso County, TX. The proposed facility will be known as the Tornillo-Guadalupe POE.

PROJECT SUMMARY

Site Information:	
Government-owned	6.3 acres
To be acquired	[1]109 acres
Building Area:	
Building (including canopies)	86,596 gsf
Building (excluding canopies)	74,596 gsf
Number of outside parking spaces:	160
Cost Information	
Site Development Cost[2]	$63,512,000
Building Costs (includes inspection canopies) ($206/gsf)	$17,872,000

[1]Acreage is to be donated to GSA by El Paso County, TX.

[2]Site development costs include grading, utilities, paving and traffic control, drainage ponds and culverts (including piping and structures), lighting, and fencing.

PROJECT BUDGET

Design and Review (FY 2008)	$4,290,000
Additional Design	3,800,000
Management & Inspection (M&I)	6,381,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	81,384,000
Estimated Total Project Cost	$95,855,000

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for emerging technologies and alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Authorization Requested (Additional Design, ECC, M&I) $91,565,000.*

GSA has worked closely with DHS program offices responsible for developing and implementing security technology at the Land Ports of Entry (LPOE's), These programs include United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT), Radiation Portal Monitors (RPM's) and Advanced Spectroscoptic Portal (ASPs) monitors, Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI) and Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII). This prospectus contains the funding of infrastructure requirements for each program known at the time of prospectus development since these programs are at various stages of development and implementation. Additional funding by a Reimbursable Work Authorization (RWA) may be required to provide for as yet unidentified elements of each of these programs to be implemented at this port.

PRIOR AUTHORITY AND FUNDING

The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure authorized $4,290,000 for design on May 23, 2007.

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works authorized $4,290,000 for design on September 20, 2007.

Through Public Law 110–161, Congress appropriated $4,290,000 for design on December 26, 2007.

Schedule	Start	End
Design	FY2008	FY2010
Construction	FY2010	FY2013

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The GSA proposes construction of the Tornillo-Guadalupe POE to support a new international bridge crossing for which the County of El Paso, TX, obtained a Presidential Permit on March 31, 2005. The County of El Paso will construct the bridge structure, while GSA proposes to construct the POE facilities. The proposed POE will include sufficient infrastructure and facilities to support present and future demand by privately owned vehicles (POV), pedestrian and commercial traffic, both northbound and southbound. Facilities to process POV, bus, and pedestrian traffic and inspections are to include: main administration building, headhouse, four primary POV and eight secondary inspection stations, a screened ''hard secondary'' area, bus disembark and reload areas, parking for staff, service and visitors, secondary inspection canopy, POV return lanes to Mexico, requisite Non-Invasive Inspection (NII) systems (VACIS II, radiation portal monitors (RPM) and license plate readers (LPR), etc.), seizure vehicle parking area, a booth for outlease to the Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission, and a pedestrian parkway.

Facilities to support commercial traffic and inspections include: a commercial building, ten covered commercial docks, two primary inspection booths with a canopy and bypass lane, NII systems, hazardous materials containment area, exit booth, bulk cargo bin, Agriculture Quarantine Inspection (AQI), and narcotics storage. The facility will also provide an incinerator, kennel facilities, heliport, and communication tower. Additionally, inspection facilities for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) will be provided. The site will be fully secured by perimeter fencing and electronic surveillance. The existing Fabens POE will be demolished and the property will be integrated into the new proposed site at the location of the new bridge. Per the Presidential Permit, the County of El Paso will be responsible for demolition of the existing Fabens-Caseta bridge once the new bridge and POE facilities are complete.

The gross square footage requirement has increased by 8,451 square feet from the 78,145 square feet authorized for design in Prospectus PTX-BSD-TG08. The scope increase and need for additional design funding have resulted from additional requirements identified for NII systems, bird holding, security requirements, energy efficiency, and additional paving.

TENANT AGENCIES

Department of Homeland Security (DHS)-Customs and Border Protection (CBP), Department of Transportation (DOT)-Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission (TABC), and GSA.

LOCATION

The proposed location is approximately one-third mile northwest of the existing Fabens POE in El Paso County, TX.

JUSTIFICATION

The County of El Paso and its counterpart in Mexico are attempting to provide border residents with economic development opportunities and relief from the traffic backups at the congested POEs in downtown El Paso. A new facility has been determined to be needed in this area, primarily due to the processing constraints at the Fabens POE and the structural issues of the existing bridge. The proposed POE at Tornillo-Guadalupe will replace the existing port, which subsequently, will be demolished.

The existing Fabens-Caseta Bridge was constructed in 1938 and is not structurally sound enough to allow commercial vehicle crossings. The bridge is only 16 feet wide with a maximum permissible load level of 12 tons, cannot accommodate today's standard 15 to 20 tons, thereby limiting the Fabens port to processing only pedestrian and POV traffic. The existing facility is comprised of modular buildings which have reached full capacity and are unable to adequately support the needs of CBP. The Fabens modular buildings' lack of adequate space has hindered the ability of CBP to process, interview, segregate, and detain visitors to the U.S. Inefficiencies of the current facility include a domestic water system which requires water to be hauled from the nearby community. Water is only used for restrooms and hose bibs and bottled water is provided for employees to drink. Furthermore, the water system is not sufficient to provide fire-fighting capability even though the buildings have fire sprinklers. The existing septic system is not designed for the number of employees at the facility. Also, the main building does not have a public restroom.

The existing site has little utility infrastructure beyond single phase electrical power and copper telecommunications lines. The new facilities will require water, wastewater services, upgraded power, fiber optics, and natural gas. El Paso County, as part of the Presidential Permit application, has made the commitment to bring all necessary utility service to the edge of the property.

SUMMARY OF ENERGY COMPLIANCE

This project is designed to conform with the requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and to earn Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification. It will also meet Congressionally-required energy efficiency and performance requirements in effect during design. GSA will encourage exploration

of opportunities to gain increased energy efficiency above the measures achieved in the design.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

GSA owns and maintains the existing facilities at this port of entry; thus no alternative other than Federal construction was considered.

RECOMMENDATION

Additional design and construction.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 11, 2009.

Recommended — — —, Acting Commissioner, Public Buildings Service.

Approved Paul F. Prouty, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

Locations	Current*							Proposed						
	Personnel		*Usable Square Feet (USF)*				*RSF*	*Personnel*		*Usable Square Feet (USF)*				*RSF*
	Office	**Total**	**Office**	**Storage**	**Special**	**Total**	**Total**	**Office**	**Total**	**Office**	**Storage**	**Special**	**Total**	**Total**
New LPOE - Tornillo-Guadalupe														
DHS - CBP	24	24	2,750	0	8,024	**10,774**	**10,774**	122	122	9,613	303	54,178	**64,094**	**67,237**
DOT - Federal Motor Carrier Safety	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**	4	4	1,366	0	6,616	**7,982**	**8,219**
GSA - PBS	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**	1	1	100	0	900	**1,000**	**1,150**
Outlease - TABC	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**	2	2	0	0	1,520	**1,520**	**1,550**
Total	**24**	**24**	**2,750**	**0**	**8,024**	**10,774**	**10,774**	**129**	**129**	**11,079**	**303**	**63,214**	**74,596**	**78,156**

* Current section depicts space at existing Fabens-Casita POE. The new Tornillo-Guadalupe facility will replace the facilities at Fabens Casita.

Special Space	
Laboratory	420
Holding Cell	790
Restroom	2,250
Physical Fitness	560
Conference	200
ADP	810
Food Service	578
Bird Holding	125
Vaults	315
Processing Area	1,000
Lockers	780
Secured Storage	300
Control Booth	704
Kennels	1,678
Dock	10,080
Inspection Canopy	40,784
Secured Room	900
Mail Rooms	40
GSA Shop	900
Total:	**63,214**

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 905, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 16, by the yeas and nays;

Motion to Instruct on H.R. 2997, by the yeas and nays.

Votes on H.R. 2442, H.R. 1771, and H.R. 1053 will be taken later this week.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

THUNDER BAY NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY AND UNDERWATER PRESERVE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 905, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 905, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 286, nays 107, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 740]

YEAS—286

Ackerman	Chandler	Farr
Aderholt	Childers	Fattah
Adler (NJ)	Chu	Filner
Andrews	Clarke	Forbes
Arcuri	Clay	Fortenberry
Austria	Cleaver	Foster
Bachus	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Baird	Cohen	Frelinghuysen
Baldwin	Connolly (VA)	Fudge
Barrow	Cooper	Giffords
Bean	Costa	Gonzalez
Becerra	Costello	Gordon (TN)
Berkley	Courtney	Granger
Berman	Crenshaw	Green, Al
Berry	Crowley	Green, Gene
Biggert	Cuellar	Griffith
Bilirakis	Cummings	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Dahlkemper	Guthrie
Bishop (NY)	Davis (AL)	Gutierrez
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Hall (NY)
Boccieri	Davis (TN)	Halvorson
Bono Mack	DeFazio	Hare
Boren	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Boswell	Delahunt	Heinrich
Boucher	DeLauro	Herseth Sandlin
Boyd	Dent	Higgins
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hill
Braley (IA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Himes
Brown, Corrine	Dicks	Hinchey
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Dingell	Hinojosa
Buchanan	Doggett	Hirono
Camp	Donnelly (IN)	Hodes
Cao	Doyle	Hoekstra
Capito	Driehaus	Holden
Capps	Edwards (MD)	Holt
Cardoza	Edwards (TX)	Honda
Carnahan	Ehlers	Hoyer
Carney	Ellison	Inglis
Carson (IN)	Ellsworth	Inslee
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
	Etheridge	Jenkins
	Farr	Johnson (GA)
	Fattah	Johnson (IL)
	Filner	Johnson, E. B.
	Forbes	Jones
	Fortenberry	Kagen
	Foster	Kanjorski
	Frank (MA)	Kaptur
	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy
	Fudge	Kildee
	Giffords	Kilpatrick (MI)
	Gonzalez	Kilroy
	Gordon (TN)	Kind
	Granger	Kirk
	Green, Al	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
	Green, Gene	Kissell
	Griffith	Klein (FL)
	Grijalva	Kline (MN)
	Guthrie	Kosmas
	Gutierrez	Kratovil
	Hall (NY)	Kucinich
	Halvorson	Lance
	Hare	Langevin
	Hastings (FL)	Larsen (WA)
	Heinrich	Larson (CT)
	Herseth Sandlin	LaTourette
	Higgins	Lee (CA)
	Hill	Levin
	Himes	Lewis (GA)
	Hinchey	Lipinski
	Hinojosa	LoBiondo
	Hirono	Loebsack
	Hodes	Lofgren, Zoe
	Hoekstra	Lowey
	Holden	Luján
	Holt	Lynch
	Honda	Maffei
	Hoyer	Markey (CO)
	Inglis	Markey (MA)
	Inslee	Marshall
	Jackson (IL)	Massa
	Jenkins	Matheson
	Johnson (GA)	Matsui
	Johnson (IL)	McCarthy (NY)
	Johnson, E. B.	McCaul
	Jones	McCotter
	Kagen	McDermott
	Kanjorski	McGovern
	Kaptur	McIntyre
	Kennedy	McMahon
	Kildee	McNerney
	Kilpatrick (MI)	Meek (FL)
	Kilroy	Meeks (NY)
	Kind	Melancon
	Kirk	Mica
	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Michaud
	Kissell	Miller (MI)
	Klein (FL)	Miller (NC)
	Kline (MN)	Minnick
	Kosmas	Mitchell
	Kratovil	Mollohan
	Kucinich	Moore (KS)
	Lance	Moore (WI)
	Langevin	Murphy (CT)
	Larsen (WA)	Murphy (NY)
	Larson (CT)	Murphy, Patrick
	LaTourette	Murphy, Tim
	Lee (CA)	Murtha
	Levin	Nadler (NY)
	Lewis (GA)	Napolitano
	Lipinski	Neal (MA)
	LoBiondo	Nye
	Loebsack	Oberstar
	Lofgren, Zoe	Obey
	Lowey	Olson
	Luján	Olver
	Lynch	Pallone
	Maffei	Pascrell
	Markey (CO)	Pastor (AZ)
	Markey (MA)	Paulsen
	Marshall	Payne
	Massa	Perlmutter
	Matheson	Perriello
	Matsui	Peters
	McCarthy (NY)	Peterson
	McCaul	Petri
	McCotter	Pingree (ME)
	McDermott	Platts
	McGovern	Polis (CO)
	McIntyre	Pomeroy
	McMahon	Price (GA)
	McNerney	Price (NC)
	Meek (FL)	Putnam
	Meeks (NY)	Quigley
	Melancon	Rahall
	Mica	Rangel
	Michaud	Reichert
	Miller (MI)	Reyes
	Miller (NC)	Rodriguez
	Minnick	Rogers (KY)
	Mitchell	Rogers (MI)
	Mollohan	Rooney
	Moore (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
	Moore (WI)	Ross
	Murphy (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
	Murphy (NY)	Roybal-Allard
	Murphy, Patrick	Ruppersberger
	Murphy, Tim	Rush
	Murtha	Ryan (OH)
	Nadler (NY)	Ryan (WI)
	Napolitano	Salazar
	Neal (MA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
	Nye	Sanchez, Loretta
	Oberstar	Schakowsky
	Obey	Schauer
	Olson	Schiff
	Olver	Schrader
	Pallone	Schwartz
	Pascrell	Scott (GA)
	Pastor (AZ)	Scott (VA)
	Paulsen	Sensenbrenner
	Payne	Serrano
	Perlmutter	Sessions
	Perriello	Shea-Porter
	Peters	Sherman
	Peterson	Shuler
	Petri	Shuster
	Pingree (ME)	Skelton
	Platts	Slaughter
	Polis (CO)	Smith (NJ)
	Pomeroy	Smith (TX)
	Price (GA)	Snyder
	Price (NC)	Souder
	Putnam	Space
	Quigley	Speier
	Rahall	Spratt
	Rangel	Stark
	Reichert	Stupak
	Reyes	Tanner
	Rodriguez	Taylor
	Rogers (KY)	Terry
	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (CA)
	Rooney	Thompson (MS)
	Ros-Lehtinen	Tierney
	Ross	Titus
	Rothman (NJ)	Tonko
	Roybal-Allard	Towns
	Ruppersberger	Tsongas
	Rush	Turner
	Ryan (OH)	Upton
	Ryan (WI)	Van Hollen
	Salazar	Velázquez
	Sánchez, Linda T.	Visclosky
	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz
	Schakowsky	Waters
	Schauer	Watson
	Schiff	Watt
	Schrader	Waxman
	Schwartz	Weiner
	Scott (GA)	Welch
	Scott (VA)	Wilson (OH)
	Sensenbrenner	Wittman
	Serrano	Woolsey
	Sessions	Wu
	Shea-Porter	Yarmuth
	Sherman	
	Shuler	
	Shuster	
	Skelton	
	Slaughter	
	Smith (NJ)	
	Smith (TX)	
	Snyder	
	Souder	
	Space	
	Speier	
	Spratt	
	Stark	
	Stupak	
	Tanner	
	Taylor	
	Terry	
	Thompson (CA)	
	Thompson (MS)	
	Tierney	
	Titus	
	Tonko	
	Towns	
	Tsongas	
	Turner	
	Upton	
	Van Hollen	
	Velázquez	
	Visclosky	
	Walz	
	Waters	
	Watson	
	Watt	
	Waxman	
	Weiner	
	Welch	
	Wilson (OH)	
	Wittman	
	Woolsey	
	Wu	
	Yarmuth	

NAYS—107

Akin	Fallin	McCarthy (CA)
Alexander	Flake	McClintock
Altmire	Fleming	McHenry
Bachmann	Foxx	McKeon
Bartlett	Franks (AZ)	McMorris Rodgers
Barton (TX)	Gallegly	Miller (FL)
Bilbray	Garrett (NJ)	Miller, Gary
Bishop (UT)	Gingrey (GA)	Moran (KS)
Blackburn	Goodlatte	Myrick
Blunt	Graves	Nunes
Bonner	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Boozman	Harper	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Brady (TX)	Heller	Rehberg
Bright	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Herger	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Hunter	Roskam
Burgess	Issa	Scalise
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Schmidt
Buyer	Jordan (OH)	Schock
Calvert	King (IA)	Shadegg
Campbell	King (NY)	Shimkus
Cantor	Kingston	Simpson
Carter	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Cassidy	Latham	Stearns
Castle	Latta	Sullivan
Chaffetz	Lee (NY)	Thompson (PA)
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Thornberry
Coffman (CO)	Linder	Tiahrt
Cole	Lucas	Walden
Conaway	Luetkemeyer	Westmoreland
Culberson	Lummis	Wilson (SC)
Davis (KY)	Lungren, Daniel E.	Wolf
Deal (GA)	Mack	Young (AK)
Dreier	Manzullo	
Duncan	Marchant	
Emerson		

NOT VOTING—39

Abercrombie	Boehner	Conyers
Baca	Butterfield	Davis (IL)
Barrett (SC)	Capuano	Engel
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Smith (WA)
Gohmert	Ortiz	Sutton
Grayson	Paul	Teague
Harman	Pence	Tiberi
Israel	Radanovich	Wamp
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Richardson	Wasserman Schultz
Maloney	Rohrabacher	Wexler
McCollum	Royce	Whitfield
Miller, George	Sarbanes	Young (FL)
Moran (VA)	Sestak	
	Sires	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1855

Mrs. EMERSON and Messrs. REHBERG, CULBERSON, MACK, STEARNS and MCKEON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. BONO MACK and Mr. INGLIS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 740, H.R. 905, I missed this vote because of a delayed flight, and heavy traffic on the 14th Street Bridge. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Stated against:

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 740 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 16, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 16.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 741]

YEAS—394

Ackerman	Berman	Boustany
Aderholt	Berry	Boyd
Adler (NJ)	Biggert	Brady (PA)
Akin	Bilbray	Brady (TX)
Alexander	Bilirakis	Braley (IA)
Altmire	Bishop (GA)	Bright
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Broun (GA)
Arcuri	Bishop (UT)	Brown (SC)
Austria	Blackburn	Brown, Corrine
Bachmann	Blumenauer	Brown-Waite, Ginny
Bachus	Blunt	Buchanan
Baird	Boccieri	Burgess
Baldwin	Boehner	Burton (IN)
Barrow	Bonner	Buyer
Bartlett	Bono Mack	Calvert
Barton (TX)	Boozman	Camp
Bean	Boren	Campbell
Becerra	Boswell	Cao
Berkley	Boucher	