Calendar No. 96

108TH CONGRESS *1st Session*	SENATE	REPORT 108–46

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1050]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

MAY 13, 2003.—Ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Calendar No. 96

108TH CONGRESS *1st Session*	SENATE	REPORT 108–46

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1050]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

MAY 13, 2003.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
86–990 WASHINGTON : 2003

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(108th Congress, 1st Session)

JOHN WARNER, Virginia, *Chairman*

JOHN MCCAIN, Arizona	CARL LEVIN, Michigan
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma	EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
PAT ROBERTS, Kansas	ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
WAYNE ALLARD, Colorado	JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama	JACK REED, Rhode Island
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine	DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
JOHN ENSIGN, Nevada	BILL NELSON, Florida
JAMES M. TALENT, Missouri	E. BENJAMIN NELSON, Nebraska
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia	MARK DAYTON, Minnesota
LINDSEY O. GRAHAM, South Carolina	EVAN BAYH, Indiana
ELIZABETH DOLE, North Carolina	HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York
JOHN CORNYN, Texas	MARK PRYOR, Arkansas

JUDITH A. ANSLEY, *Staff Director*
RICHARD D. DEBOBES, *Democratic Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Calendar No. 96

108TH CONGRESS *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 108–46

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAY 13, 2003.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 1050]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill (S. 1050) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2004;

(2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2004;

(3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2004;

(4) impose certain reporting requirements;

(5) impose certain limitations with regard to specific procurement and research, development, test and evaluation actions and manpower strengths; provide certain additional legislative authority, and make certain changes to existing law;

(6) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2004; and

(7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2004.

Committee overview and recommendations

As the committee deliberates on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, over 300,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coast guardsmen, active and reserve component, and countless civilians who support military, diplomatic and humanitarian operations, are serving valiantly in the Persian Gulf region to secure the peace and freedom they have won for the people of Iraq. The stunning, rapid military success in Operation Iraqi Freedom is a testament to the dedication and competence of the members of the U.S. Armed Forces. The precision and skill with which recent operations have been conducted is a tribute to American technology and ingenuity, as well as to forward-thinking officials who recognized the changing nature of warfare in the 21st Century. The American military has made the Nation, and the world, a safer place. Military strategists and historians will study this military campaign for years to come and will recognize it as a new chapter in military history. Without a doubt, the U.S. military is the most capable military force in the world, a model of excellence, and the standard by which others are measured.

The defense of the United States and the protection of the American people is the most solemn responsibility of any elected official. All Americans must be ever mindful that the defense of the homeland begins on the distant battlefields of the world. Time and again in recent years, the Armed Forces of the United States have been called upon to defend American interests and values around the world, from Iraq to Afghanistan to the Balkans, and elsewhere. Time and again, the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States military have successfully achieved the missions they have been given with professionalism, precision, and humanity. They will be called upon again, and they must be ready.

Despite recent successes, new threats and challenges will surely emerge. A most urgent duty of the Congress is to provide the authorities and resources necessary to ensure that the armed forces have the capability to effectively deter and, if necessary, defeat those who would attack America or its interests, either at home or abroad.

In order to meet the comprehensive defense needs required for the 21st Century, the U.S. Armed Forces must be technologically advanced, fully integrated forces that can rapidly and decisively reach the far corners of the world to deter, disrupt or defeat those who threaten the United States, its interests overseas, and its friends and allies. The modernization—transformation—of America's Armed Forces is achievable and necessary, if the U.S. military is to be prepared for current and future responsibilities. The President's budget request for defense for fiscal year 2004 continues the

momentum achieved in recent years of making real increases in defense spending to sustain readiness, enhance the quality of life of military personnel and their families, and modernize and transform the U.S. Armed Forces to meet current and future threats.

Since the beginning of the 108th Congress, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate has conducted 44 hearings and received numerous policy and operational briefings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 2004 and related defense issues. As a result of these deliberations, the committee identified six priorities to guide its work on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004:

(1) enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to fulfill its homeland defense responsibilities by providing the resources and authorities necessary for the Department to assist in protecting the nation against all current and anticipated forms of attack;

(2) continue the committee's commitment to improving the quality of life for the men and women of the armed forces—active, reserve, guard and retired—and their families;

(3) provide the men and women in uniform with the resources, training, technology and equipment they need to safely and successfully perform their missions, both now and in the future;

(4) sustain the readiness of the armed forces to conduct the full spectrum of military operations against all current and anticipated threats;

(5) support the Department of Defense's efforts to build the innovative capabilities necessary to continue the transformation of the armed forces to enable them to successfully confront future threats, particularly by enhancing technological advantages in areas such as unmanned systems; and

(6) improve the efficiency of Department programs and operations, and reduce the cost and time required to develop and acquire new capabilities and needed services.

In order to fund these priorities, the committee recommends $400.5 billion for defense programs for fiscal year 2004, an increase of $17.9 billion above the amount appropriated last year by the Congress for fiscal year 2003. This represents an increase of 3.2 percent in real terms for defense.

The committee's first priority was to enhance the Department of Defense's homeland defense capabilities and improve the ability of the U.S. Armed Forces to combat terrorism, both at home and abroad. In these areas, the committee authorizes an increase of $400.0 million over the budget request. Funding highlights include, $88.4 million to field 12 additional Weapons of Mass Destruction—Civil Support Teams; $147.0 million for innovative technologies to combat terrorism and defeat emerging asymmetric threats; $173.3 million for development and fielding of chemical and biological agent detection and protection technologies; and, $107.0 million for enhancing the capabilities of special operations forces. To protect America from ballistic missile threats, the committee supports the budget request of $9.1 billion for missile defense.

The committee continues its commitment to improving the quality of life of the men and women in uniform, and their families, by authorizing a 3.7 percent across-the-board pay raise for all uni-

formed service personnel, as well as a targeted pay raise of up to 6.25 percent for certain senior non-commissioned officers and mid-career personnel. The committee also adopted several key provisions to recognize the sacrifices of the members of the armed forces, including increases in the family separation allowance and hostile fire pay, designation of assignment incentive pay for those assigned to Korea, and approval of a high-tempo allowance for those service members deployed away from home for extended periods of time.

The administration requested $9.0 billion for military construction and family housing. Due to pending realignments of overseas basing, the committee recommends adjusting the program to increase investment in installations in the United States, while at the same time sustaining a reduced, but prudent investment in overseas locations that will be of long-term value to the United States. The committee recommends an overall increase of $373.4 million in military construction. Among the funding adjustments made by the committee are increases of over $220.0 million in critical unfunded projects identified by the military services, and an additional $200.0 million in quality of life projects such as barracks, family housing, and child development centers.

Over the past several years, the committee has encouraged the Department to increase procurement spending to a level that will sustain the timely recapitalization and modernization of the armed forces. This year, the committee authorizes $75.6 billion in procurement funding, a $1.1 billion increase over the budget request. This procurement funding includes: over $12.0 billion for shipbuilding and conversions; almost $1.0 billion for the Army's interim armored combat vehicle, the Stryker; $1.5 billion for Army attack and lift helicopters; over $2.0 billion for 11 additional C–17 strategic lift aircraft; and, $8.1 billion in various tactical aircraft programs for the Air Force and the Navy.

Additionally, the committee recognized the need for robust investment in future capabilities. The committee authorizes $63.2 billion for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) activities, an increase of $1.3 billion over the President's budget request. This RDT&E funding includes, over $1.0 billion for the next generation DD(X) destroyer; additional funding for the continued development of the Littoral Combat Ship; $1.7 billion for the Future Combat System, the Army's centerpiece of transformation; $5.8 billion for development of various tactical aircraft, including over $4.4 billion for the continued development of the Joint Strike Fighter, an increase of $56.0 million over the budget request; and, $10.7 billion for advanced science and technology (S&T) initiatives, an increase of over $500.0 million over the budget request. This increase in S&T brings the Department closer to the Secretary's goal of devoting three percent of all defense funds to the S&T programs that have the potential to develop transformational technologies.

Together, the investments in procurement to sustain current capabilities, and research and development to evolve to a more capable force, will give the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces the equipment they need to prevail across the full spectrum of military operations, both now and in the future.

The sustained readiness of the U.S. Armed Forces is what protects America. The success of recent military operations represents

the real return on added investments made by the Congress in recent years in training, munitions, maintenance and spare parts. As the force reconstitutes after operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, the committee will closely monitor whether additional funds are needed for those items not covered by supplemental funds to pay for these operations and to ensure the overall readiness of the armed forces. Within readiness accounts, funds were increased to address currently identified shortfalls, such as adding $283.0 million for equipment maintenance and testing, including depot maintenance, technical assistance, corrosion control, and systems testing, and $26.5 million above the budget request to support active and reserve forces to accelerate fielding and replacement of personal and field equipment.

The transformation of the Department of Defense will depend on effective management and stewardship of departmental resources. The committee recommends numerous legislative provisions to improve the management and oversight of the Department. Some of these provisions would streamline the acquisition process, provide for greater personnel flexibility to manage the acquisition workforce, and ensure that joint requirements can be more rapidly achieved. Acquisition authorities to facilitate the war on terrorism and support contingency operations were extended, and proposed new authorities will give state and local governments rapid access to anti-terrorism technologies and services available to the Department. Finally, access to military training ranges has been assured in a way that safeguards the protection of endangered species and contributes to the readiness of the armed forces.

With U.S. Armed Forces poised on distant battlefields and countless others standing watch at home, the committee is committed to providing the resources needed for the men and women of the armed forces, and their families. The committee's past support for increased defense spending has proven to be a wise investment. There is no greater evidence than the successes witnessed on the battlefields of Iraq. The committee believes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 sustains the advances made in recent years, and provides the necessary investments to prepare for the future.

Explanation of funding summary

The administration's budget request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 2004 was $399.7 billion, of which $298.5 billion was for programs that require specific funding authorization. According to the estimating procedures used by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the amount requested was $400.5 billion. The funding summary table that follows uses the budget authority as calculated by CBO.

The following table summarizes both the direct authorizations and equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2004 defense programs. The columns relating to the authorization request do not include funding for the following items: pay and benefits for military personnel; military construction authorizations provided in prior years; and other small portions of the defense budget that are not within the jurisdiction of this committee or that do not require an annual authorization.

Funding for all programs in the national defense function is reflected in the columns related to the budget authority request and the total budget authority implication of the authorizations in this bill.

The committee recommends funding for national defense programs totaling $400.5 billion in budget authority. This funding level is consistent with the budget authority level of $400.5 billion for the national defense function recommended in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004 (H. Con. Res. 95).

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization	BA Implication Request	BA Implication Senate
DIVISION A					
Title I -- PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	2,128,485	30,000	2,158,485	2,128,485	2,158,485
Missile Procurement, Army	1,459,462	94,000	1,553,462	1,459,462	1,553,462
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,640,704	17,800	1,658,504	1,640,704	1,658,504
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,309,966	53,339	1,363,305	1,309,966	1,363,305
Other Procurement, Army	4,216,854	49,173	4,266,027	4,216,854	4,266,027
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	8,788,148	208,800	8,996,948	8,788,148	8,996,948
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,991,821	55,000	2,046,821	1,991,821	2,046,821
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	922,355	2,000	924,355	922,355	924,355
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	11,438,984	269,000	11,707,984	11,438,984	11,707,984
Other Procurement, Navy	4,679,443	65,000	4,744,443	4,679,443	4,744,443
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,070,999	18,600	1,089,599	1,070,999	1,089,599
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	12,079,360	3,400	12,082,760	12,079,360	12,082,760
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	1,284,725		1,284,725	1,284,725	1,284,725
Missile Procurement, Air Force	4,393,039	1,400	4,394,439	4,393,039	4,394,439
Other Procurement, Air Force	11,583,659	47,000	11,630,659	11,583,659	11,630,659
Procurement, Defense-wide	3,665,506	218,600	3,884,106	3,665,506	3,884,106
Procurement, National Guard & Reserve Equipment					
Defense Production Act Purchases				67,516	67,516
Defense Health Program		327,826	327,826		327,826
Office of the Inspector General		2,100	2,100		2,100
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction (Transfer from Other Programs)		1,530,261	1,530,261		1,530,261
Total Procurement	**72,653,510**	**2,993,299**	**75,646,809**	**72,721,026**	**75,714,325**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization	BA Implication Request	BA Implication Senate
Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	9,122,825	-110,325	9,012,500	9,139,825	9,029,500
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	14,106,653	483,631	14,590,284	14,106,653	14,590,284
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	20,336,258	46,149	20,382,407	20,336,258	20,382,407
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	17,974,257	874,761	18,849,018	17,974,257	18,849,018
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	286,661		286,661	286,661	286,661
Defense Health Program (Transfer from Other Programs)		65,796	65,796		65,796
Office of the Inspector General (Transfer from Other Programs)		300	300		300
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	**61,826,654**	**1,360,312**	**63,186,966**	**61,843,654**	**63,203,966**
Title III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE & OTHER					
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	24,965,342	-297,339	24,668,004	24,965,342	24,668,004
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	28,287,690	-236,300	28,051,390	28,287,690	28,051,390
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	3,406,656	9,700	3,416,356	3,406,656	3,416,356
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	27,793,931	-818,700	26,975,231	27,793,931	26,975,231
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	16,570,847	-831,800	15,739,047	16,570,847	15,739,047
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,952,009		1,952,009	1,952,009	1,952,009
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,171,921	-1,500	1,170,421	1,171,921	1,170,421
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	173,952	-500	173,452	173,952	173,452
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	2,179,188	-500	2,178,688	2,179,188	2,178,688
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	4,211,331	16,000	4,227,331	4,211,331	4,227,331
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	4,402,646	3,000	4,405,646	4,402,646	4,405,646
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	10,333		10,333	10,333	10,333
Environmental Restoration, Army	396,018		396,018	396,018	396,018
Environmental Restoration, Navy	256,153		256,153	256,153	256,153

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization	BA Implication Request	BA Implication Senate
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	384,307		384,307	384,307	384,307
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	24,081		24,081	24,081	24,081
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	212,619	40,000	252,619	212,619	252,619
Cooperative Threat Reduction	450,800		450,800	450,800	450,800
Overseas Military Investment Recovery				1,331	1,331
Disposal of DoD Real Property				16,303	16,303
Lease of DoD Real Property				14,770	14,770
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	59,000		59,000	59,000	59,000
National Science Center, Army				5	5
Burdensharing				500,000	500,000
Rocky Mountain Arsenal				6,210	6,210
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	50,000	-50,000		50,000	
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities (Transfer from Other Programs)		817,371	817,371		817,371
Defense Health Program (Transfer from Other Programs)		14,862,900	14,862,900		14,862,900
Office of the Inspector General (Transfer from Other Programs)		160,049	160,049		160,049
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	**116,958,824**	**13,672,382**	**130,631,206**	**117,497,443**	**131,169,825**
Other Programs					
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense (Transfer to O&M)	817,371	-817,371		817,371	
Defense Health Program	15,270,509	-15,270,509		15,270,509	
Defense Health Program (Transfer to O&M)	14,876,887	[-14,876,887]		14,876,887	
Defense Health Program (Transfer to R&D)	65,796	[-65,796]		65,796	
Defense Health Program (Transfer to Procurement)	327,826	[-327,826]		327,826	

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization	BA Implication Request	BA Implication Senate
Office of the Inspector General	162,449	-162,449		162,449	
Office of the Inspector General (Transfer to O&M)	160,049	[-160,049]		160,049	
Office of the Inspector General (Transfer to R&D)	2,100	[-2,100]		2,100	
Office of the Inspector General (Transfer to Procurement)	300	[-300]		300	
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army	1,650,076	-1,650,076		1,650,076	
CHEM DEMIL (Transfer to R&D)	1,530,261	[-1,530,261]		1,530,261	
CHEM DEMIL (Transfer to Military Construction)	119,815	[-119,815]		119,815	
Other Programs	**17,900,405**	**-17,900,405**		**17,900,405**	
Total Operation and Maintenance & Other Programs	**134,859,229**	**-4,228,024**	**130,631,206**	**135,397,848**	**131,169,825**
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds	1,721,507	-60,200	1,661,307	2,396,507	2,336,307
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,062,762		1,062,762	1,062,762	1,062,762
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund				-99,558	-99,558
Armed Forces Retirement Home Fund	65,279		65,279		
Refined Petroleum Transfer Account proposal		-675,000	-675,000		-675,000
Total Revolving and Management Funds	**2,849,548**	**-735,200**	**2,114,348**	**3,359,711**	**2,624,511**
MILITARY PERSONNEL	**98,956,065**	**228,731**	**99,184,796**	**98,956,065**	**99,184,796**
DIVISION B					
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	1,602,060	-62,650	1,539,410	1,602,060	1,539,410
Military Construction, Navy	1,147,537	35,031	1,182,568	1,147,537	1,182,568
Military Construction, Air Force	830,671	204,867	1,035,538	830,671	1,035,538

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization	BA Implication Request	BA Implication Senate
Military Construction, Defense-wide	623,698	-9,628	614,070	695,298	685,670
Military Construction, Army National Guard	168,298	108,481	276,779	168,298	276,779
Military Construction, Air National Guard	60,430	148,100	208,530	60,430	208,530
Military Construction, Army Reserve	68,478	6,000	74,478	68,478	74,478
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	28,032	6,100	34,132	28,032	34,132
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	44,312	9,600	53,912	44,312	53,912
Military Construction, Foreign Currency Fluctuations				55,000	55,000
Base Realignment and Closure IV	370,427		370,427	370,427	370,427
NATO Security Investment Program	169,300		169,300	169,300	169,300
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction (Transfer from Other Programs)		119,815	119,815		119,815
Total Military Construction	**5,113,243**	**565,716**	**5,678,959**	**5,239,843**	**5,805,559**
FAMILY HOUSING					
Family Housing Construction, Army	409,191		409,191	409,191	409,191
Family Housing Support, Army	1,043,026	-11,173	1,031,853	1,043,026	1,031,853
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	184,193		184,193	184,193	184,193
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	852,778	-39,620	813,158	852,778	813,158
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	657,065		657,065	657,065	657,065
Family Housing Support, Air Force	834,468	-21,698	812,770	834,468	812,770
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide	350		350	350	350
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	49,440		49,440	49,440	49,440

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization	BA Implication Request	BA Implication Senate
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	300		300	300	300
Total Family Housing	**4,030,811**	**-72,491**	**3,958,320**	**4,030,811**	**3,958,320**
FY 03 Military Construction and Family Housing Recission	-153,373		-153,373	-153,373	-153,373
Total Military Contruction and Family Housing	**8,990,681**	**493,225**	**9,483,906**	**9,117,281**	**9,610,506**
OTHER DoD MILITARY					
Other Trust Funds				271,439	271,439
Other Legislation	45,000	-45,000		45,000	
Sale of Material in National Defense Stockpile				-139,573	-139,573
Receipts from travel and purchase card refunds				44,000	44,000
Offsetting Receipts and Other				-1,233,546	-1,233,546
Total Other DoD Military	**45,000**	**-45,000**		**-1,012,680**	**-1,057,680**
TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY (051)	**380,180,687**	**67,343**	**380,248,030**	**380,382,905**	**380,450,248**
DIVISION C					
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)					
Energy Supply	110,473		110,473	110,473	110,473
Weapons Activities	6,378,000	79,272	6,457,272	6,378,000	6,457,272
NNSA Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,340,195		1,340,195	1,340,195	1,340,195
Naval Reactors	768,400	20,000	788,400	768,400	788,400
Office of the Administrator	347,980		347,980	347,980	347,980
Total National Nuclear Security Administration	**8,834,575**	**99,272**	**8,933,847**	**8,834,575**	**8,933,847**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization	BA Implication Request	BA Implication Senate
Defense Site Acceleration Completion	5,814,635		5,814,635	5,814,635	5,814,635
Defense Environmental Services	995,179		995,179	995,179	995,179
Other Defense Actitivities	494,331	-29,272	465,059	494,331	465,059
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	430,000	-70,000	360,000	430,000	360,000
Total Environmental & Other Defense Activities	**7,734,145**	**-99,272**	**7,634,873**	**7,734,145**	**7,634,873**
Energy Employees Illness Compensation Fund				425,000	425,000
Energy Employees Compensation - Administration				55,000	55,000
Corps of Engineers - Civil Works				140,000	140,000
Department of Homeland Security				92,000	92,000
Cerro Grande Fire Activities Recession				-75,000	-75,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	19,559		19,559	19,559	19,559
TOTAL ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)	**16,698,752**		**16,698,752**	**17,335,752**	**17,335,752**
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)					
Department of Education				8,000	8,000
Department of Homeland Security				1,575,000	1,575,000
Department of Justice				524,000	524,000
Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund				107,000	107,000
Department of Transportation - MARAD Maritime Security Program				99,000	99,000
Intelligence Community Management Account				125,000	125,000
CIA Retirement & Disability				226,000	226,000
National Science Foundation - Antarctic research activities				68,000	68,000
Selective Service System - Salaries and Expenses				28,000	28,000
TOTAL DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)				**2,760,000**	**2,760,000**
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	**396,879,439**	**67,343**	**396,946,782**	**400,478,657**	**400,546,000**

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Explanation of tables

The following tables provide the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title I of this Act. The tables also display the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2004 budget request for procurement programs and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in the report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Chemical agents and munitions destruction, Defense (sec. 106)

The budget request included $1.7 billion for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (CAMD,D), as follows: $1,199.2 million for operations and maintenance; $251.9 million for research and development; and $79.2 million for procurement. The request also included $119.8 million for military construction described as elsewhere in this report.

The committee strongly supports the decision of the Department to request funding for the Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction program in a defense-wide account. Section 1521(f) of title 50, United States Code, requires that funds for this program shall not be included in the budget accounts for any military department. Funding the destruction program in a defense-wide account ensures that the program is subject to the appropriate level of management and oversight and ensures that the program is not subject to the internal budget priorities of one particular service. Therefore, the committee recommends $1.5 billion for CAMD, D as follows: $1.2 billion for operation and maintenance; $251.9 million for research and development; and $79.2 million for procurement.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Aircraft Procurement, Army						
	Aircraft						
	Fixed Wing						
1	UTILITY F/W (MR) AIRCRAFT						
	Rotary Wing						
2	UH-60 BLACK HAWK (MYP)	10	138,859	7	70,700	17	209,559
	Additional UH-60s			[7]	[70,700]		
3	UH-60 BLACK HAWK (MYP) (AP-CY)		28,141				28,141
4	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING						
	Modification of Aircraft						
	Modification of Aircraft						
5	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)		3,176				3,176
6	ARL MODS (TIARA)		5,707				5,707
7	AH-64 MODS		58,879				58,879
8	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS		495,525		15,000		510,525
	CH-47 helicopter induction for MH-47G				[15,000]		
9	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP) (AP-CY)		20,515				20,515
10	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		10,448				10,448
11	OH-58 MODS		477				477
12	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS		762				762
13	LONGBOW		762,464				762,464
14	LONGBOW (AP-CY)		14,204				14,204

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
15	UH-60 MODS		136,496		-100,000		36,496
	UH-60M recapitalization reduction: not ready for production				[-100,000]		
16	KIOWA WARRIOR		45,051		12,300		57,351
	GAU-19 machine gun				[12,300]		
17	AIRBORNE AVIONICS		71,206				71,206
18	GATM ROLLUP		59,104				59,104
19	AIRBORNE DIGITIZATION		1,906				1,906
	Spares and Repair Parts						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
20	SPARE PARTS (AIR)		11,299				11,299
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
	Ground Support Avionics						
21	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		14,879		7,000		21,879
	AVR-2 laser detecting set				[7,000]		
22	ASE INFRARED CM		75,713				75,713
	Other Support						
23	AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL		26,594				26,594
24	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,295		15,000		28,295
	ANVIS night vision equipment				[15,000]		
25	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		16,597				16,597
26	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		28,894		10,000		38,894
	Cockpit airbag system (CABS)				[10,000]		
27	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		59,963				59,963

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
28	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,203				1,203
29	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		2,512				2,512
30	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS		24,616				24,616
	Total - Aircraft Procurement, Army		2,128,485		30,000		2,158,485
	Missile Procurement, Army						
	Other Missiles						
	Surface-to-air Missile System						
1	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	108	561,555			108	561,555
2	STINGER SYSTEM SUMMARY		2,942				2,942
3	AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY						
4	SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY:		7,452				7,452
	Air-to-surface Missile System						
5	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY		33,061		43,000		76,061
	Additional Hellfire II missiles				[43,000]		
6	APKWS (ADVANCED PRECISION KILL WEAPON SYSTEM)						
7	APKWS (ADVANCED PRECISION KILL WEAPON SYSTEM) (AP-CY)						
	Anti-tank/Assault Missile System						
8	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	901	133,115		40,000	901	173,115
	Additional Javelin command launch units				[40,000]		
9	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY (AP-CY)		7,600				7,600

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
10	LINE OF SIGHT ANTI-TANK (LOSAT) SYSTEM SUM	76	43,232			76	43,232
11	LINE OF SIGHT ANTI-TANK (LOSAT) SYS SUM (AP-CY)						
12	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	200	10,010			200	10,010
13	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY (AP-CY)		16,366				16,366
14	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	786	107,759			786	107,759
15	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2,934	14,646			2,934	14,646
16	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS		40,155				40,155
17	HIMARS LAUNCHER	24	124,191			24	124,191
18	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	50	50,301			50	50,301
19	ATACMS BLKII SYSTEM SUMMARY						
20	ATACMS PENETRATOR						
	Modification of Missiles						
	Modifications						
21	PATRIOT MODS		212,575		11,000		223,575
	PAC-3 improvements				[11,000]		
22	STINGER MODS		973				973
23	AVENGER MODS						
24	ITAS/TOW MODS		15,707				15,707
25	MLRS MODS		19,918				19,918
26	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS: (NON AAO)		467				467
	Spares and Repair Parts						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
27	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		50,542				50,542

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
28	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,464				3,464
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)		10				10
30	MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION						
31	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		3,421				3,421
	Total - Missile Procurement Army		1,459,462		94,000		1,553,462
	Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army						
	Tracked Combat Vehicles						
	Tracked Combat Vehicles						
1	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD		6,252				6,252
2	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT		113,302				113,302
3	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT (AP-CY)						
4	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES		3,397				3,397
5	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES						
6	STRYKER	301	955,027			301	955,027
7	FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS: (FCS)						
	Modification of Tracked Combat Vehicles						
8	CARRIER, MOD						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
9	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		16,756				16,756
10	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, FIST VEHICLE		676				676
11	BFVS SERIES (MOD)		23,126				23,126
12	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		36,092				36,092
13	FAASV PIP TO FLEET		10,981				10,981
14	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)						
15	HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)						
16	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)						
17	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		268,644				268,644
18	M1A1D RETROFIT						
19	SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2						
20	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM		92,942				92,942
21	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM (AP-CY)						
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
22	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)		489				489
23	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		10,188				10,188
	Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles						
	Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles						
24	ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	1,480	16,559			1,480	16,559
25	MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)				6,900		6,900
	M249 squad automatic weapons (SAW)				[6,900]		
26	GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3						
27	MORTAR SYSTEMS	59	10,102			59	10,102

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
28	M16 RIFLE						
29	XM107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	600	8,753			600	8,753
30	5.56 CARBINE M4	8,635	8,978			8,635	8,978
31	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)		4,998		4,000		8,998
	LW-155 howitzer long lead items				[4,000]		
	Modification of Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles						
32	MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS		3,845				3,845
33	M4 CARBINE MODS		6,660		5,000		11,660
	M4 Carbine modifications for rapid fielding initiative				[5,000]		
34	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)		5,096		300		5,396
	SAW modifications for rapid fielding initiative				[300]		
35	MEDIUM MACHINE GUNS (MODS)		2,970		200		3,170
	Machine gun modifications for rapid fielding initiative				[200]		
36	HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)	13	882			13	882
37	M119 MODIFICATIONS						
38	M16 RIFLE MODS		2,369				2,369
39	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,220		700		2,920
	Lightweight shotguns for rapid fielding initiative				[700]		
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
40	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		489		700		1,189
	M145 Machine gun optics for rapid fielding initiative				[700]		
41	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		7,089				7,089
42	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		2,675				2,675

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
43	SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		1,117				1,117
44	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
45	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)		18,030				18,030
	Total - Procurement of WTCV, Army		1,640,704		17,800		1,658,504
	Procurement of Ammunition, Army						
	Ammunition						
	Small/Medium Caliber Ammunition						
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		183,731				183,731
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		65,414				65,414
3	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES		5,557				5,557
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		60,484				60,484
5	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES						
6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		8,812		10,000		18,812
	M919 Armor-piercing, fin-stabilized, w/ tracer 25mm				[10,000]		
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		12,941		1,000		13,941
	M789 high-explosive, dual purpose cartridge				[1,000]		
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		126,994				126,994
	Mortar Ammunition						
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		45,408				45,408

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		14,104				14,104
11	CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES		53,621		2,000		55,621
	M930 illumination cartridge				[2,000]		
	Tank Ammunition						
12	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES		20,607				20,607
13	120MM TANK TRAINING, ALL TYPES		134,270				134,270
14	CTG, TANK, 120MM TACTICAL, ALL TYPES		42,408				42,408
	Artillery Ammunition						
15	CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1		34				34
16	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES		30,151				30,151
17	CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES		77,781		1,000		78,781
	M485 illumination cartridge				[1,000]		
18	REMOTE AREA DENIAL ARTILLERY MUNITION (RADAM)						
19	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T		78,949				78,949
	Artillery Fuzes						
20	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES		47,400				47,400
	Mines						
21	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES						
22	MINE AT VOLCANO,: ALL TYPES				5,000		5,000
	M87A1 Volcano anti-tank mine				[5,000]		
23	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES		14,564				14,564
24	WIDE AREA MUNITIONS (WAM), ALL TYPES						
25	ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Rockets						
26	SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		13,836				13,836
27	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		21,981				21,981
	Other Ammunition						
28	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		24,959		1,000		25,959
	Modern demolition initiators				[1,000]		
29	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		27,010				27,010
30	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		8,999				8,999
31	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		9,035				9,035
	Miscellaneous						
32	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		10,529				10,529
33	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES						
34	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		4,808				4,808
35	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		7,697				7,697
36	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		7,415				7,415
37	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		11,868				11,868
38	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		98				98
	Ammunition Production Base Support						
	Production Base Support						
39	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		33,570		27,339		60,909
	Dye sets for medium caliber ammunition				[1,000]		
	Modern munitions load, assembly, and pack technology				[2,000]		
	Transfer from WCF for WP production equipment				[24,339]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
40	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		13,020				13,020
41	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		9,664				9,664
42	CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION		77,592		6,000		83,592
	Conventional ammunition demilitarization				[6,000]		
43	ARMS INITIATIVE		4,655				4,655
	Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Army		1,309,966		53,339		1,363,305
	Other Procurement, Army						
	Tactical and Support Vehicles						
	Tactical Vehicles						
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		17,977				17,977
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:		23,950		4,000		27,950
	M871A3 trailers				[4,000]		
3	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS		9,499				9,499
4	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)		137,847		23,500		161,347
	Additional HMMWVs				[23,500]		
5	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)						
6	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)		309,810				309,810
7	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN		14,968				14,968
8	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		133,130		25,000		158,130
	Movement Tracking System (MTS)				[25,000]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
9	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)						
10	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916		45,772				45,772
11	TOWING DEVICE, 5TH WHEEL						
12	TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)	5	979			5	979
13	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P	139	24,838			139	24,838
14	LINE HAUL ESP						
15	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		57,061				57,061
16	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)		245				245
17	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL	40	1,958			40	1,958
	Non-tactical Vehicles						
18	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	4	608			4	608
19	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		3,078				3,078
20	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER	85	6,260			85	6,260
	Communications and Electronics Equipment						
	Comm-Joint Communications						
21	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM						
22	WIN - TACTICAL PROGRAM		3,231				3,231
23	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		4,570				4,570
	Comm-Satellite Communications						
24	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPAC		98,272				98,272
25	SHF TERM		17,492				17,492
26	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)		5,154				5,154
27	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	14,195	44,290			14,195	44,290
28	SMART-T (SPACE)		48,585				48,585

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
29	SCAMP (SPACE)		600				600
30	SCAMP BLOCK II						
31	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS		8,859				8,859
32	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		10,668				10,668
	Comm-C3 System						
33	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		16,499				16,499
	Comm-Combat Communications						
34	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		52,384				52,384
35	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		2,937				2,937
36	SINCGARS FAMILY		39,275		15,000		54,275
	Additional SINCGARS radios				[15,000]		
37	MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATION OPERATIONS SYSTEMS	1	6,087			1	6,087
38	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS		850				850
39	ACUS MOD PROGRAM		108,391		25,000		133,391
	Shelters for Army Common User System (ACUS)				[25,000]		
40	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING		15,903		6,200		22,103
	Multiband radios for rapid fielding initiative				[6,200]		
41	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		8,025				8,025
42	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)		15,393				15,393
43	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)		6,602				6,602
	Comm-Intelligence Communications						
44	JWICS CONNECTIVITY						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
45	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,241				1,241
	Information Security						
46	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		2,702				2,702
47	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		124,419				124,419
	Comm-Long Haul Communications						
48	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		10,332				10,332
49	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		46,835				46,835
50	ARMY DISN ROUTER		6,016				6,016
51	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)		457				457
52	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		2,975				2,975
	Comm-Base Communications						
53	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		328,188				328,188
54	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		12,435				12,435
55	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)		96,475				96,475
56	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		14,424				14,424
	Elect Equip-Nat For Int Prog (NFIP)						
57	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)		1,624				1,624
58	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)		24,632				24,632
	Elect Equip-Tact Int Rel Act (TIARA)						
59	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)		36,980				36,980
60	JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)						
61	PROPHET GROUND (TIARA)		3,175				3,175
62	TUAV	8	73,764			8	73,764

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
63	ARMY COMMON GROUND STATION (CGS) (TIARA)		8,261				8,261
64	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)		13,003				13,003
65	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)						
66	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (TIARA)						
67	DCGS-A UNIT OF EMPLOYMENT (JMIP)		2,687				2,687
68	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION MODS (JTAGS)						
69	TROJAN (TIARA)		6,535				6,535
70	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)		2,619				2,619
71	CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS) (TIA		7,892				7,892
72	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TIARA)	4	4,983			4	4,983
	Elect Equip-Electronic Warfare (EW)						
73	SHORTSTOP						
74	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		2,296				2,296
	Elect Equip-Tactical Surv. (TAC SURV)						
75	FAAD GBS						
76	SENTINEL MODS		17,595				17,595
77	NIGHT VISION DEVICES		65,629		1,800		67,429
	NVDs for rapid fielding initiative				[1,800]		
78	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	110	50,125			110	50,125
79	LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)						
80	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	3,104	50,504			3,104	50,504
81	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT						
82	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP		13,594				13,594

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
83	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)		644				644
84	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MVS)		274				274
85	PROFILER	10	12,591			10	12,591
86	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)		35,169				35,169
87	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)	2,674	83,200			2,674	83,200
88	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD	45	12,302			45	12,302
89	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	158	39,517			158	39,517
90	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA		9,080				9,080
	Elect Equip-Tactical C2 Systems						
91	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS		45,613				45,613
92	ADV FA TAC DATA SYS / EFF CTRL SYS (AFATDS/EC		22,324				22,324
93	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, AFATDS		2,059				2,059
94	LIGHT WEIGHT TECH FIRE DIRECTION SYS (LWT		3,223				3,223
95	CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)		22,197				22,197
96	FAAD C2		19,474				19,474
97	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD		8,996				8,996
98	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE / LIGHTWEIGHT FED (FED/L		6,023				6,023
99	KNIGHT FAMILY		6,732				6,732
100	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		1,814				1,814
101	LOGTECH		8,774				8,774
102	TC AIMS II		17,492				17,492
103	GUN LAYING AND POS SYS (GLPS)						
104	ISYSCON EQUIPMENT		21,528				21,528

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
105	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS)		9,452				9,452
106	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER		8,321				8,321
107	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	201	37,141			201	37,141
108	STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)		46,233				46,233
109	STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM		361				361
	Elect Equip-Automation						
110	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		6,186				6,186
111	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		213,055				213,055
112	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		45,789				45,789
	Elect Equip-Audio Visual Sys (A/V)						
113	SPECIAL INFORMATION OPERATIONS (SIO) (TIARA)						
114	AFRTS		2,519				2,519
115	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)		3,879				3,879
116	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)		2,047				2,047
	Elect Equip-Support						
117	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		426				426
	Other Support Equipment						
	Chemical Defensive Equipment						
118	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)		35,252				35,252
	Bridging Equipment						
119	TACTICAL BRIDGING		42,539				42,539
120	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON		59,393				59,393

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Engineer (Non-construction) Equipment						
121	DISPENSER, MINE M139		5,231				5,231
122	TOWED VOLCANO DELIVERY SYSTEM						
123	VOLCANO LIGHT						
124	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST	69	1,766			69	1,766
125	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING	12	2,314			12	2,314
126	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS						
127	WIDE AREA MUNITIONS (REMOTE CONTROL UNIT)						
128	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)	36	8,247			36	8,247
129	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)		9,398				9,398
130	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	3	624			3	624
	Combat Service Support Equipment						
131	HEATERS AND ECU'S		13,544				13,544
132	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES		5,979				5,979
133	FLOODLIGHT SET, ELEC, TRL MTD, 3 LIGHTS						
134	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	795	4,286			795	4,286
135	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)		7,577				7,577
136	LAND WARRIOR	2,425	94,827	-2,425	-94,827		
	Program reduction			[-2,425]	[-21,327]		
	Transfer to PE 64713A (RDA 102)				[-73,500]		
137	AUTHORIZED STOCKAGE LIST MOBILITY SYSTEM (ASL		4,451				4,451
138	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		16,021				16,021
139	AIR DROP PROGRAM		4,892				4,892

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
140	CAMOUFLAGE: ULCANS						
141	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (ENG SPT EQ)		10,947				10,947
142	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CSS EQ)						
	Petroleum Equipment						
143	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
144	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		24,205				24,205
145	INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		1,182				1,182
	Water Equipment						
146	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS		15,809				15,809
	Medical Equipment						
147	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		16,555				16,555
	Maintenance Equipment						
148	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	186	12,855			186	12,855
149	WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD	112	5,873			112	5,873
150	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)		4,002				4,002
	Construction Equipment						
151	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)						
152	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING						
153	DISTR, WATER, SP MIN 2500G SEC/NON-SEC						
154	MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING		16,607				16,607
155	COMPACTOR						
156	LOADERS		8,148				8,148
157	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
158	DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS						
159	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED						
160	CRANES		4,131				4,131
161	CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH	1	1,781			1	1,781
162	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	1	1,937			1	1,937
163	ARMORED COMBAT EARTHMOVER, M9 ACE						
164	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)	15	4,842			15	4,842
165	CONST EQUIP ESP				10,200		10,200
	Construction equipment extended service program (ESP)				[10,200]		
166	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)		6,305				6,305
	Rail Float Containerization Equipment						
167	FLOATING CRANE, 100-250 TON						
168	LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)						
169	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS				25,000		25,000
	Modular causeway system (MCS)				[25,000]		
170	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		7,860				7,860
	Generators						
171	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		62,853				62,853
	Material Handling Equipment						
172	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)	72	36,237			72	36,237
173	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	142	22,422			142	22,422
174	MHE EXTENDED SERVICE PROGRAM (ESP)	6	1,329			6	1,329
175	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MHE)						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Training Equipment						
176	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS (CTC) SUPPORT		36,827				36,827
177	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		165,254		4,800		170,054
	Military Ops in Urban Terrain (MOUT) instrumentation				[4,800]		
178	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER		71,692				71,692
179	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCA		10,295				10,295
	Test Measure and Dig Equipment (TMD)						
180	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT		18,304				18,304
181	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)		27,952				27,952
182	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)		14,718				14,718
183	ARMY DIAGNOSTICS IMPROVEMENT PGM (ADIP)						
	Other Support Equipment						
184	RECONFIGURABLE SIMULATORS						
185	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		75,288				75,288
186	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT		15,026				15,026
187	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)		47,918				47,918
188	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,571				2,571
189	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		11,526				11,526
190	MA8975		2,419				2,419
191	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
	OPA2						
192	INITIAL SPARES - C&E		44,714				44,714
	OPA3						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
193	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,250				1,250
xx	WMD - Civil Support Teams				25,900		25,900
	Financial information systems				-22,400		-22,400
	Total - Other Procurement, Army		4,216,854		49,173		4,266,027

Army Aircraft

UH–60 Blackhawk

The budget request included $138.9 million for 10 UH–60L Blackhawk helicopters. The current Army requirement for Blackhawk helicopters is 1,680. When the current UH–60L Blackhawk helicopter multi year procurement contract terminates in fiscal year 2007, as planned, the Army will have 1,665 helicopters in the inventory, 15 short of the total requirement.

The committee notes that the engines of Army helicopters flying as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom frequently clogged because of exposure to sand. The committee believes that Army aviation assets could benefit from the installation of an engine inlet barrier system.

The committee recommends an increase of $70.7 million for seven additional UH–60L helicopters to be fielded in accordance with Army priorities and $800,000 for an engine inlet barrier system for the UH–60 Blackhawk helicopter, for a total authorization of $209.4 million.

CH–47 cargo helicopter modifications

The budget request included $495.5 million for CH–47 modifications. The committee understands that the Secretary of Defense approved the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) Army Special Operations Aviation (ARSOA) transformation plan to increase the number of authorized MH–47G helicopters by 24. The Army was directed to transfer 16 CH–47 aircraft to USSOCOM for conversion to MH–47G, leaving the Army with a requirement to transfer eight additional aircraft in the future. The committee notes that there are four aircraft awaiting induction at Corpus Christi Army Depot that could be used to satisfy half of the remaining USSOCOM requirement. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for the repair of four CH–47 helicopters, for a total authorization of $510.5 million for aircraft modifications.

UH–60 Blackhawk modifications

The budget request included $136.5 million for selected upgrades for the UH–60 Blackhawk helicopter. With this funding the Army intended to begin a much-needed recapitalization program for the upgrade of UH–60 helicopters into the UH–60 model M configuration, with 10 UH–60M helicopters to be produced in fiscal year 2004. The committee understands that the UH–60M contractor recently submitted an estimate-at-completion for the integration and qualification contract that indicates that the program will not be executable as currently budgeted. As a result, the Army and the contractor have restructured the program to make the program executable within the amounts requested for UH–60 Blackhawk modifications in the fiscal year 2004 request for procurement and research and development. According to the Army, the restructured program will allow the contractor to complete fiscal year 2003 work, including the completion of two prototypes. With the revised fiscal year 2004 budget request, the Army intends to procure four additional prototype aircraft to mitigate risk in the operational test. Accordingly, the Army has requested that funding be trans-

ferred from procurement accounts to research and development accounts to fund these activities. The committee recommends a transfer of $100.0 million from Aircraft Procurement, Army, to PE23744A, for a total authorization of $36.5M for selected UH–60 helicopter upgrades and $170.2 million in PE23744A for Blackhawk UH–60M recapitalization.

Kiowa Warrior

The budget request included $45.1 million for safety enhancements for the OH–58D Kiowa Warrior helicopter. The Kiowa Warrior safety enhancement program (SEP) is intended to reduce aircraft weight, resulting in increased range, maneuverability and mission performance in a helicopter which provides the Army with an armed reconnaissance capability until adequate numbers of Comanche helicopters are fielded in the 2017 time frame. The GAU–19/A is an externally mounted aircraft gun that was nominated, successfully field tested, and approved for SEP by the Army process. The GAU–19/A is safer, more reliable, requires less maintenance, and is lighter than the current OH–58D weapon, the M2 .50 caliber machine gun. The committee recommends an increase of $12.3 million for 75 GAU–19As, for a total authorization of $57.3 million for Kiowa Warrior.

Aircraft survivability equipment

The budget request included $7.0 million for the AN/AVR–2A laser detecting set. The AN/AVR–2A is a passive threat warning system which receives, processes, and displays threat information resulting from aircraft illumination by lasers. The committee notes that current funding procures AN/AVR–2s for installation on special operations helicopters but does not fully address Army requirements for integration of the AN/AVR–2A on Apache model A and D aircraft. The AN/AVR–2A provides increased crew and aircraft survivability. The committee believes that these enhancements should be fielded as soon as possible. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million for the AN/AVR–2A laser detecting set, for a total authorization of $14.0 million for AN/AVR–2A laser detecting sets.

Avionics support equipment

The budget request included $13.3 million for 1,862 Aviator Night Vision Imaging Systems (ANVIS). The ANVIS is critical to the aviator's ability to operate at night and in low-light conditions. With a total requirement of 12,000 ANVISs, a shortfall of over 7,500 systems exists after the fiscal year 2004 quantities are procured. The Army has funded the acquisition of the ANVIS in fiscal years 2005–2007 of the Future Years Defense Program. The committee believes that the safety and effectiveness of Army aviators support an acceleration of procurement of these systems. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for 2,100 additional ANVIS, a total authorization of $28.8 million.

Aircrew integrated systems

The budget request included $28.9 million for aircrew integrated systems, but no funding for the cockpit airbag system (CABS), a

crash-activated, inflatable protection system. The committee believes that CABS provides supplemental head and body restraint for helicopter aircrews which can significantly reduce fatalities and injuries in the event of helicopter crashes. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the procurement of cockpit airbag systems, for a total authorization of $38.9 million.

Army Missiles

Hellfire

The budget request included $33.1 million for the procurement of Longbow Hellfire missiles, but no funding for the Hellfire II missile. The Hellfire II air-to-ground missile provides a precision strike capability and is the primary anti-tank weapon of Army aviation helicopters. The committee understands that the Hellfire II was operationally employed in Operation Iraq Freedom and that the current inventory of 7,900 missiles is below the Army's acquisition objective of 8,578 missiles. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement of $129.2 million for the Laser Hellfire Missile (Hellfire II). The committee recommends an increase of $43.0 million for the procurement of Hellfire II missiles, for a total authorization of $76.1 million.

Javelin missiles

The budget request included $133.1 million for Javelin missile procurement. Javelin consists of a reusable command launch unit and missile and is capable of defeating all known tank armor and has residual capability against bunkers and field fortifications. The committee notes that existing funding supports the procurement of a total of 4,348 command launch units, leaving an unfunded requirement of 1,074 to outfit the Army National Guard. The committee understands that if the Army buys command launch units during fiscal year 2004, it can take advantage of a planned multi year Javelin procurement contract, enabling a better price than if these systems are purchased in smaller quantities over several years. The committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million for the procurement of Javelin command launch units, for a total authorization of $173.1 million in Javelin missile procurement.

Weapons and Track Combat Vehicles

Squad automatic weapon

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of the M249 Squad Automatic Weapon (SAW). The SAW is an individually portable machine gun which provides sustained automatic fire capability and increased range. The Army Chief of Staff has identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement of $13.9 million for the SAW. The committee recommends an increase of $6.9 million for the procurement of additional M249 SAWs, for a total authorization of $6.9 million for the SAW.

Lightweight 155mm howitzer

The budget request included $5.0 million for the procurement of long-lead items for the lightweight 155mm (M777) howitzer. The M777 towed howitzer program is a joint Army/Marine Corps program to develop and field a replacement for the M198 howitzer. The M777 howitzer incorporates innovative designs, including an M776 cannon tube, to achieve lighter weight without sacrificing capability. The program entered low rate initial production for 94 Marine Corps guns in November 2002. The committee understands that the program will enter into full rate production for the Marine Corps howitzer in fiscal year 2005. The committee believes that advanced procurement of cannons for the Marine Corps' howitzers will reduce fiscal year 2005 howitzer production costs. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for the procurement of long-lead items for howitzer cannons, for a total authorization of $9.0 million for the lightweight 155mm howitzer.

Rapid fielding initiative

As a result of lessons learned from the 2002 deployment of combat units to Afghanistan, the Army initiated a program, the Rapid Fielding Initiative (RFI), to provide soldiers and units with required items of field equipment which were not issued through normal supply procedures. The committee understands that the Army has fielded this equipment to elements of the 82nd Airborne Division and 101st Air Assault Division by reallocating funds within the Army. The committee further understands that the Army has identified an initial cost of approximately $11.0 million to equip a brigade with soldier mission essential equipment, including: specialized cold weather clothing and hydration systems; military operations on urbanized terrain (MOUT) specialized equipment sets, including assault ladders and fiber optic viewers; individual weapons optics; force mobility and mobility equipment, such as the advanced combat helmet and knee and elbow pads; and lethality improvements such as the M249 squad automatic weapons rails and multiband inter/intra team radios. The committee supports this initiative and recommends an increase of $14.9 million for this initiative. Specifically, the committee recommends an increase of $6.9 million to weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army, and $8.0 million to other procurement, Army, to be distributed in the following manner:

(In millions of dollars)

WTCV BLIN 33, GB3007, M4 Carbine Modifications	5.0
WTCV BLIN 34, GZ1290, Squad Automatic Weapons Modifications	0.3
WTCV BLIN 35, GZ1300, Medium Machine Gun Modifications	0.2
WTCV BLIN 39, GZ0925, M145 Machine Gun Optics	0.7
WTCV BLIN 40, Gl3200, Lightweight Shotgun System	0.7
OPA, BLIN 40, BA5210, Multiband Inter/Intra Team Radios	6.2
OPA, BLIN 77, KA3500, Night Vision Devices	1.8

Army Ammunition

M919 Armor-piercing fin-stabilized, discarding-sabot, with tracer 25mm cartridge

The budget request included $491,000 in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for the M919 armor-piercing fin-stabilized, dis-

carding-sabot, with tracer (APFSDS–T) 25mm cartridge. According to the Department of the Army, an unfunded requirement exists for the M919. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for the M919 APFSDS–T. This addition will address shortfalls in APFSDS–T requirements and assist the Army in achieving C–1 readiness levels.

M789 high-explosive, dual-purpose cartridge

The budget request included $958,000 in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for the M789 high-explosive, dual-purpose (HEDP) cartridge. The committee notes that the Department of the Army is proceeding with procurement of ammunition, including the M789 HEDP, necessary to implement the Department's revised training strategy. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for the M789 HEDP.

M930 illumination cartridge

The budget request included $2.0 million for the M930 illumination cartridge. The committee supports the efforts of the Army to increase the war reserve requirement for the M930, which will have been reduced to about 33 percent by the end of fiscal year 2003. The Army assess the M930 as a critical end-item. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for M930 120mm illumination cartridge.

M485 illumination cartridge

The budget request included no funding for the M485 illumination cartridge. The committee supports the Army's initiative to achieve C–1 level of readiness for the M485 illumination cartridge. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for the M485 illumination cartridge.

M87A1 Volcano anti-tank mine

The budget request included no funding for the M87A1 Volcano anti-tank mine. The committee notes that this system is a key component of the Army landmine program. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army for the M87 Volcano anti-tank mine.

Modern demolition initiators

The budget request included $25.0 million for modern demolition initiators (MDIs). MDIs are non-electric detonators that are used to initiate munitions and explosives. MDIs provide a safer, more reliable detonation system while decreasing time on target. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, to procure additional MDIs.

Dye sets for medium caliber ammunition

The budget request included $33.6 million for the provision of industrial facilities in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, including replacement of obsolete or worn production equipment. The committee notes that the only existing production dye sets for medium

caliber ammunition are nearing obsolescence. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for the replacement of production dye sets for medium caliber ammunition.

Modern munitions load, assembly, and pack technology

The budget request included $33.6 million for the provision of industrial facilities in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, including the establishment, augmentation, and improvement of ammunition production capabilities. The committee supports the plans of the Army's Armament, Research, Development and Engineering Center (ARDEC) to manage the challenges associated with the load, assembly, and pack processes of modern munitions. The committee notes that existing high volume production facilities can be equipped to support both the latest explosive formulations and component assemblies to meet these challenges. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for equipment requirements in support of modern munitions, load, assembly and pack technology.

White phosphorous production equipment

The committee understands that the Army Working Capital Fund Capital Investment Program budget request for fiscal year 2004 included $24.3 million to replace white phosphorous production equipment at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas. The Army supports this upgrade in order to "reduce health and safety hazards" for workers and to provide production flexibility in support of Army Transformation.

The committee is concerned that funding this project within the working capital fund could have an adverse impact on the rates of the smoke, incendiary, and illumination munitions produced at Pine Bluff Arsenal. Therefore, the committee recommends a transfer of $24.3 million from Army Working Capital Fund cash balances to Procurement of Ammunition, Army, to complete the necessary equipment upgrades of the white phosphorous production line.

Conventional ammunition demilitarization

The budget request included $77.6 million for the demilitarization of conventional ammunition. The committee notes that the stockpile of ammunition requiring demilitarization is increasing due to inventory aging, Army modernization, and serviceability issues caused by increased deployments. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for conventional ammunition demilitarization.

Other Army Procurement

M871A3 semi-trailer

The budget request included $7.3 million for the procurement of 158 M871A3 semi-trailers. The M871A3 semi-trailer is a 22½=ton flatbed/break bulk (FB/BB) tactical, dual purpose, bulk and container transporter. The M871A3s are the primary means of distributing containers and bulk cargo within the theater of operations.

This model trailer corrects problems of the M871A1 fielded model with load height bridge clearance and mating with the five-ton variant of the family of medium tactical vehicle (FMTV). The committee notes that with the procurement of 158 trailers, the Army will have achieved only 67 percent of its Army acquisition objective. Without this new model, containerized loads may be required to bypass supply routes, which would inhibit mission completion. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for the procurement of additional M871A3 semi-trailers, for a total authorization of $11.3 million.

High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles

The budget request included $137.8 million for high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWV). The HMMWV serves as the Army's light tactical wheeled vehicle for command and control, light cargo, and personnel transport. The committee notes that the Army's approved acquisition objective is for over 122,000 HMMWVs, but the Army has procured slightly over 100,000 to date. The fiscal year 2004 budget request funds an additional 2,114 HMMWVs, leaving the Army well short of its stated requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $23.5 million for procurement of additional HMMWVs, for a total authorization of $161.3 million.

The committee is concerned with the current condition of the Army's light tactical wheeled vehicle fleet. The average age of the light tactical wheeled vehicle fleet, mostly HMMWVs, is between 10 and 15 years old. These older HMMWV models do not possess the payload and mobility capabilities of the new model HMMWVs the Army intends to procure with this budget request. The Army's Objective Force relies extensively on the light tactical wheeled vehicle fleet as the prime mover for many systems including key command, control, communications, and computers, and intelligence systems. The committee believes that there may be an extensive investment needed in technology insertion and block changes to the light tactical wheeled vehicle fleet to meet transformation requirements.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to deliver a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 31, 2004, identifying critical technology insertions and block changes to the Army's light tactical wheeled vehicle fleet that could reduce vehicle aging, improve payload and mobility capabilities, and reduce operations and support costs. Further, the Secretary is expected to deliver a light tactical wheeled vehicle fleet modernization plan to meet these key requirements at the same time the report is delivered to the congressional defense committees.

Movement Tracking System

The budget request included $10.4 million for the procurement of the Movement Tracking System (MTS). The MTS provides critical near-real time visibility and management of mobile assets worldwide for a multitude of tactical wheeled vehicles including the palletized load system, the heavy expanded mobility tactical truck, and the family of medium tactical vehicles. The committee notes that for fiscal year 2003, the Army intends to procure 2,619 MTS

with $41.7 million, but has requested only $10.4 million for 636 MTS in fiscal year 2004. The committee is concerned that the Army has not given higher priority to the procurement and installation of this vital piece of equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for procurement of additional movement tracking systems, for a total authorization of $35.4 million.

SINCGARS radios

The budget request included $39.3 million for the procurement of the SINCGARS family of radios. The committee notes that current and programmed funding for the SINCGARS family of radios procures 245,888 radios out of a total Army requirement for 252,091 radios. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for the procurement of SINGCARS radios, for a total authorization of $54.3 million.

Area Common User System

The budget request included $108.4 million for modifications to the Area Common User System (ACUS) and its migration to the Army's war fighting information network-tactical (WIN–T) program. The ACUS modernization program supports the downsizing of ACUS legacy systems through the procurement and fielding of the single shelter switch (SSS) and the high mobility digital group multiplexer assemblage (HMDA). The committee notes that SSS and HMDA support the Army's strategic goals of increasing deployability, security, capacity, and speed of information distribution by greatly reducing airlift requirements. However, the Army does not adequately fund this equipment in the Future Years Defense Program. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for ACUS, for a total authorization of $133.4 million.

Land Warrior

The budget request included $94.8 million in other procurement, Army, for Land Warrior, and $49.2 million in PE64713A for Land Warrior development. The Land Warrior program integrates small arms with high-tech equipment and consists of several subsystems including the weapon, integrated helmet assembly, protective clothing and individual equipment, computer, squad radio, and software. With this funding the Army intends to procure 1,975 Land Warrior systems for the Rangers and Stryker systems. The committee understands that the Land Warrior initial-capability system failed developmental tests primarily due to subsystem reliability issues, but did meet functionality requirements such as situational awareness, survivability, and communications. In light of these developmental test failures, it appears that the Army has taken measures to improve Land Warrior reliability through risk mitigation assessments and demonstrations. Accordingly, the Army has requested that funding be transferred from procurement accounts to research and development accounts to fund these activities.

The budget request for Land Warrior development included no funding for the Integrated Battlefield Combat Situational Awareness System (IB–CSAS). IB–CSAS proposes to bring dismounted forces into the battlefield common operating picture for embedded live-fire training and combat using integrated technologies includ-

ing ultra wide band for improved position, location, and tracking, and small and lightweight soldier sensors for laser-based combat identification systems. The committee notes that these technologies are estimated to be at technology readiness levels three and four and require more development work.

The committee recommends a transfer of $73.5 million from Land Warrior procurement to PE64713A project 667, Land Warrior development, of which $15.0 million is for further IB–CSAS development, for a total authorization of $122.7 million in PE67413A for the Land Warrior system, and a decease of the remaining $21.3 to Other Procurement, Army.

Construction equipment extended service program

The budget request included no funding for the service life extension program of general construction equipment. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement of $10.2 million for the service life extension of various construction equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $10.2 million for the construction equipment extended service program, for a total authorization of $10.2 million.

Modular Causeway System

The budget request included no funding for the modular causeway system. The Modular Causeway System (MCS) is an assemblage of interoperable and interchangeable components which constitute the Army's primary means of augmenting existing port facilities, or conducting joint logistics over-the-shore (JLOTS) operations where no port is available due to shallow water or low-sloping beach gradients. The MCS is a critical element of LOTS/JLOTS operations. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for the procurement of MCS, for a total authorization of $25.0 million.

Military operations on urban terrain

The budget request included $165.3 million for non-system training devices, but no funding for the Military Operations on Urban Terrain (MOUT) Instrumentation System. The committee understands that this system uses a combination of cameras, sensors, simulations, and targets to provide realistic training that is captured for after-action review and analysis, which provides feedback to soldiers to improve their combat capabilities in an urban setting. The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million for the MOUT instrumentation system, for a total authorization of $170.1 million for non-system training devices.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Aircraft Procurement, Navy						
	Combat Aircraft						
	Combat Aircraft						
1	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)		12,493				12,493
2	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	42	2,946,380			42	2,946,380
3	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) (AP-CY)		84,765				84,765
4	F/A-18G (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) (AP-CY)						
5	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	9	833,109			9	833,109
6	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) (AP-CY)		39,058				39,058
7	AH-1W (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA						
8	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	9	310,799			9	310,799
9	MH-60S (MYP)	13	336,536			13	336,536
10	MH-60S (MYP) ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		94,972				94,972
11	MH-60R	6	352,057		3,500	6	355,557
	Airborne low frequency sonar (ALFS)				[3,500]		
12	MH-60R ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		46,472				46,472
13	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	2	211,097			2	211,097
14	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) (AP-CY)		17,409				17,409
	Airlift Aircraft						
	Airlift Aircraft						
15	MH-60S (MYP)						
16	UC-35	2	15,579	2	15,600	4	31,179
	Operational Support Aircraft (OSA)			[2]	[15,600]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
17	C-40A	1	63,952			1	63,952
18	C-37				55,000		55,000
	C-37 aircraft procurement acceleration				[55,000]		
	Trainer Aircraft						
	Trainer Aircraft						
19	T-39	1	22,018			1	22,018
20	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	15	339,201			15	339,201
21	JPATS		2,399	5	35,000	5	37,399
	Additional aircraft			[5]	[35,000]		
	Other Aircraft						
	Other Aircraft						
22	KC-130J		39,163				39,163
23	KC-130J (AP-CY)		40,000				40,000
24	F-5	4	1,947			4	1,947
	Modification of Aircraft						
	Modification of Aircraft						
25	EA-6 SERIES		207,146				207,146
26	AV-8 SERIES		20,866		50,000		70,866
	AV-8B avionics upgrade				[13,000]		
	AV-8B Litening pods				[37,000]		
27	F-14 SERIES						
28	ADVERSARY		2,649				2,649
29	F-18 SERIES		335,894				335,894

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
30	H-46 SERIES		81,072				81,072
31	AH-1W SERIES		5,810				5,810
32	H-53 SERIES		9,676				9,676
33	SH-60 SERIES		18,405				18,405
34	H-1 SERIES		3,492		5,500		8,992
	Navigational thermal imaging system				[5,500]		
35	H-3 SERIES						
36	EP-3 SERIES		31,506		4,800		36,306
	EP-3 service life assessment				[4,800]		
37	P-3 SERIES		94,972		39,400		134,372
	P-3 ASUW improvement program (AIP)				[39,400]		
38	S-3 SERIES		8,364				8,364
39	E-2 SERIES		43,139				43,139
40	TRAINER A/C SERIES		10,497				10,497
41	C-2A		35,318				35,318
42	C-130 SERIES		6,554				6,554
43	FEWSG		565				565
44	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		13,290				13,290
45	E-6 SERIES		48,517				48,517
46	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		26,537				26,537
47	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		49,601				49,601
48	T-45 SERIES		22,321				22,321
49	POWER PLANT CHANGES		21,564				21,564

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
50	JPATS SERIES		534				534
51	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		6,358				6,358
52	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		20,729				20,729
53	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		148,627				148,627
54	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		4,814				4,814
	Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts						
	Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts						
55	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,158,057				1,158,057
	Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities						
	Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities						
56	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (M)						
57	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (88)						
58	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJ (89)						
59	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (90)						
60	PEACEKEEPER						
61	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		460,865				460,865
62	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		15,487				15,487
63	WAR CONSUMABLES		11,247				11,247
64	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		25,790				25,790
65	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		26,785				26,785
66	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,694				1,694
67	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	Total - Aircraft Procurement, Navy		8,788,148		208,800		8,996,948

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Weapons Procurement, Navy						
	Ballistic Missiles						
	Ballistic Missiles						
1	TRIDENT II	12	675,209			12	675,209
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
	Modification of Missiles						
3	TRIDENT II MODS						
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
4	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,305				1,305
	Other Missiles						
	Strategic Missiles						
5	TOMAHAWK	267	277,588			267	277,588
6	ESSM	105	112,774			105	112,774
	Tactical Missiles						
7	AMRAAM	53	37,648			53	37,648
8	SIDEWINDER	167	35,818			167	35,818
9	JSOW	429	138,451			429	138,451
10	SLAM-ER	84	54,145			84	54,145
11	STANDARD MISSILE	75	148,308			75	148,308
12	RAM	90	48,315			90	48,315

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
13	AERIAL TARGETS		70,676		15,000		85,676
	GQM-163A Supersonic Sea Skimming Tgts (SSST)				[15,000]		
14	DRONES AND DECOYS						
15	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		10,943				10,943
	Modification of Missiles						
16	SIDEWINDER MODS						
17	HARM MODS		7,787				7,787
18	STANDARD MISSILES MODS		50,836				50,836
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
19	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		7,443		20,000		27,443
	ABL facilities restoration				[20,000]		
20	FLEET SATELLITE COMM (MYP) (SPACE)						
	Ordnance Support Equipment						
21	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,361				15,361
	Torpedoes and Related Equipment						
	Torpedoes and Related Equip.						
22	ASW TARGETS		25,532				25,532
	Mod of Torpedoes and Related Equipment						
23	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS		34,249				34,249
24	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		60,372				60,372
25	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		3,210				3,210
	Support Equipment						
26	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		24,943				24,943

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
27	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		12,811				12,811
	Destination Transportation						
28	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		2,776				2,776
	Other Weapons						
	Guns and Gun Mounts						
29	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		4,240				4,240
30	COAST GUARD WEAPONS						
31	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS						
	Modification of Guns and Gun Mounts						
32	CIWS MODS		41,448		20,000		61,448
	CIWS-1B upgrade kits				[20,000]		
33	5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS						
34	GUN MOUNT MODS		27,263				27,263
	Other						
35	PIONEER		13,622				13,622
36	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
37	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJ (89)						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
38	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		48,748				48,748
	Total - Weapons Procurement, Navy		1,991,821		55,000		2,046,821

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps						
	Proc Ammo, Navy						
	Navy Ammunition						
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		164,105				164,105
2	JDAM	12,326	277,347			12,326	277,347
3	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		28,245				28,245
4	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		17,933				17,933
5	PRACTICE BOMBS		51,417				51,417
6	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		26,374				26,374
7	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS		10,904				10,904
8	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		44,068				44,068
9	JATOS		4,627				4,627
10	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		13,248				13,248
11	EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)		3,776				3,776
12	76MM GUN AMMUNITION		1,226				1,226
13	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		16,368				16,368
14	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		17,724				17,724
15	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		10,469				10,469
16	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES						
17	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,173				2,173
18	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Proc Ammo, MC						
	Marine Corps Ammunition						
19	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES		24,618				24,618
20	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES		6,351				6,351
21	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		36,552				36,552
22	.50 CALIBER		10,218				10,218
23	40 MM, ALL TYPES		10,191				10,191
24	60 MM HE M888						
25	60MM, ALL TYPES		6,064		2,000		8,064
	60mm high explosive cartridge				[2,000]		
26	81MM, ALL TYPES		19,361				19,361
27	120MM, ALL TYPES		18,691				18,691
28	FUZE, ET, XM762						
29	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		3,859				3,859
30	9 MM ALL TYPES		2,706				2,706
31	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		7,914				7,914
32	STINGER SLEP						
33	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		15,461				15,461
34	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		49,813				49,813
35	AAAV						
36	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		3,752				3,752
37	FUZE, ALL TYPES		4,397				4,397
38	NON LETHALS		3,671				3,671
39	AMMO MODERNIZATION		7,116				7,116

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
40	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,616				1,616
	Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps		922,355		2,000		924,355
	Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy						
	Other Warships						
	Other Warships						
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM						
2	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM (AP-CY)		1,186,564				1,186,564
3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	1	1,511,935			1	1,511,935
4	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE (AP-CY)		1,016,172				1,016,172
5	SSGN CONVERSION	2	930,700			2	930,700
6	SSGN ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		236,600				236,600
7	CRUISER CONVERSION	1	194,440			1	194,440
8	CRUISER CONVERSION ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
9	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS						
10	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY)		367,832				367,832
11	SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS				248,000		248,000
	SSN refueling overhaul				[248,000]		
12	SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY)		164,372				164,372
13	DDG-51	3	3,198,311		21,000	3	3,219,311
	DDG-51 modernization program				[20,000]		
	Composite ship louvers				[1,000]		
14	DDG-51 (AP-CY)						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Amphibious Ships						
	Amphibious Ships						
15	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP		355,006				355,006
16	LPD-17	1	1,192,034			1	1,192,034
17	LPD-17 (AP-CY)						
	Auxiliaries, Craft and Prior Year Program Costs						
	Auxiliaries, Craft and Prior Year Program Costs						
18	LCU(X)						
19	OUTFITTING		344,949				344,949
20	SERVICE CRAFT		31,480				31,480
21	LCAC SLEP	3	73,087			3	73,087
22	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
23	MINE HUNTER						
24	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		635,502				635,502
	Total - Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy		11,438,984		269,000		11,707,984
	Other Procurement, Navy						
	Ships Support Equipment						
	Ship Propulsion Equipment						
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE		10,664				10,664

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		12,910				12,910
	Propellers						
3	SUBMARINE PROPELLERS						
	Navigation Equipment						
4	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		15,130				15,130
	Underway Replenishment Equipment						
5	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT		1,398				1,398
	Periscopes						
6	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIPMENT		33,391				33,391
	Other Shipboard Equipment						
7	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		22,015				22,015
8	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		4,102				4,102
9	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		50,392				50,392
10	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,830				8,830
11	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
12	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		11,471				11,471
13	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		26,660				26,660
14	DSSP EQUIPMENT		27,493				27,493
15	LCAC		10,627				10,627
16	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT		13,592				13,592
17	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		124,214		9,400		133,614
	Integrated condition assessment system (ICAS)				[9,400]		
18	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
19	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM		14,591				14,591
	Reactor Plant Equipment						
20	REACTOR POWER UNITS		333,107				333,107
21	REACTOR COMPONENTS		211,030				211,030
	Ocean Engineering						
22	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		7,258				7,258
	Small Boats						
23	STANDARD BOATS		53,913				53,913
	Training Equipment						
24	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		8,115				8,115
	Production Facilities and Equipment						
25	OPERATING FORCES IPE		5,499				5,499
	Other Ship Support						
26	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		128,441				128,441
	Drug Interdiction Support						
27	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
	Communications and Electronics Equipment						
	Ship Radars						
28	RADAR SUPPORT						
29	TISS						
	Ship Sonars						
30	SPQ-9B RADAR		9,739		9,700		19,439
	SPQ-9B solid state transmitters				[9,700]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
31	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM						
32	SSN ACOUSTICS		265,423				265,423
33	UUV PROGRAM						
34	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,758				5,758
35	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		13,644				13,644
	ASW Electronic Equipment						
36	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		24,631				24,631
37	SSTD		11,277				11,277
38	ADVANCE DEPLOYABLE SYSTEM						
39	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		46,360				46,360
40	SURTASS		15,228				15,228
41	ASW OPERATIONS CENTER		6,516				6,516
	Electronic Warfare Equipment						
42	AN/SLQ-32		19,429				19,429
43	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS		4,191				4,191
	Reconnaissance Equipment						
44	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		123,267				123,267
	Submarine Surveillance Equipment						
45	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM		71,411				71,411
	Other Ship Electronic Equipment						
46	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM						
47	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY		62,845				62,845
48	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT		52,398				52,398
49	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)		52,594				52,594

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
50	ATDLS		16,197				16,197
51	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		18,324				18,324
52	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)		15,674				15,674
53	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV		4,194				4,194
54	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		8,560				8,560
	Training Equipment						
55	OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
56	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT		50,542				50,542
	Aviation Electronic Equipment						
57	MATCALS		15,629				15,629
58	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		7,860				7,860
59	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM		17,493				17,493
60	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM		30,095				30,095
61	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,633				7,633
62	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM						
63	FACSFAC		4,337				4,337
64	ID SYSTEMS		21,829				21,829
65	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)		8,639				8,639
	Other Shore Electronic Equipment						
66	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT		46,551				46,551
67	TADIX-B						
68	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
69	DIMHRS		5,512				5,512
70	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS		60,600				60,600
71	RADIAC		8,600				8,600
72	GPETE		10,006				10,006
73	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		8,726				8,726
74	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		6,469				6,469
75	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		15,420				15,420
	Shipboard Communications						
76	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS		49,430				49,430
77	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		175,087		7,300		182,387
	Upgrade deployed shipboard switching systems				[7,300		
78	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M		25,213				25,213
	Submarine Communications						
79	SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS		16,591				16,591
80	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		104,935		11,000		115,935
	Submarine high data rate antenna				[11,000]		
	Satellite Communications						
81	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		257,388				257,388
	Shore Communications						
82	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		3,939				3,939
83	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		1,437				1,437
84	NSIPS		363				363

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
85	JEDMICS				2,500		2,500
	JEDMICS				[2,500]		
86	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		75,336				75,336
	Cryptographic Equipment						
87	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		81,938				81,938
	Cryptologic Equipment						
88	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		24,739				24,739
	Other Electronic Support						
89	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		12,582				12,582
	Drug Interdiction Support						
90	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
	Aviation Support Equipment						
	Sonobuoys						
91	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES		85,632				85,632
	Aircraft Support Equipment						
92	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		30,981				30,981
93	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		7,569				7,569
94	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		11,850				11,850
95	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		20,277				20,277
96	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		25,658				25,658
97	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		1,775				1,775
98	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		27,749				27,749
99	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		13,624				13,624
100	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		22,537				22,537

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
101	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,969				4,969
	Ordnance Support Equipment						
	Ship Gun System Equipment						
102	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT						
103	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM		4,301				4,301
104	MK98-NIGHT VISION DEVICES		12,638				12,638
	Ship Missile System Equipment						
105	NATO SEASPARROW		32,797				32,797
106	RAM GMLS		31,300				31,300
107	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM		58,089				58,089
108	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		105,227		12,000		117,227
	Integrated bridge system (IBS)				[12,000]		
109	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		63,423				63,423
110	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,786				5,786
111	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS		7,875				7,875
	FBM Support Equipment						
112	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
113	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		103,874				103,874
	ASW Support Equipment						
114	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS		68,032				68,032
115	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,951				4,951
116	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,780				4,780
117	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,275				7,275

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Other Ordnance Support Equipment						
118	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIPMENT		8,083				8,083
119	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,726				4,726
	Other Expendable Ordnance						
120	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM		44,757		11,000		55,757
	NULKA decoys				[11,000]		
121	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		7,352				7,352
122	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		25,150		5,000		30,150
	Submarine training performance support systems				[5,000]		
	Civil Engineering Support Equipment						
	Civil Engineering Support Equipment						
123	ARMORED SEDANS						
124	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,305				2,305
125	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		1,472				1,472
126	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		19,721				19,721
127	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		8,834				8,834
128	TACTICAL VEHICLES		38,745				38,745
129	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		4,251				4,251
130	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		5,007				5,007
131	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		13,608				13,608
132	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		943				943

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Supply Support Equipment						
	Supply Support Equipment						
133	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		15,053				15,053
134	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,883		8,000		21,883
	Serial number tracking system (SNTS)				[8,000]		
135	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,197				5,197
136	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		75,571				75,571
	Personnel and Command Support Equipment						
	Training Devices						
137	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,532				2,532
	Command Support Equipment						
138	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		60,688		10,000		70,688
	Man overboard indicator (MOBI) system				[10,000]		
139	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,786				7,786
140	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9,511				9,511
141	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		21,148				21,148
142	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9,219				9,219
143	MOBILE SENSOR PLATFORM		35,899				35,899
144	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,349				15,349
145	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		74,626				74,626
	Productivity Programs						
146	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Other						
147	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
148	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (88)						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
149	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		247,636				247,636
	Financial information systems				-20,900		-20,900
	Total - Other Procurement, Navy		4,679,443		65,000		4,744,443
	Procurement, Marine Corps						
	Weapons and Combat Vehicles						
	Tracked Combat Vehicles						
1	AAV7A1 PIP		11,297				**11,297**
2	AAAV		97,915				**97,915**
3	LAV PIP		13,191				**13,191**
4	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)		3,650				**3,650**
5	MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)		6,757				**6,757**
6	M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS		4,222				**4,222**

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Artillery and Other Weapons						
7	HIMARS	1	17,954			1	17,954
8	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	60	111,489			60	111,489
9	MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)		3,305				3,305
10	MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		6,898				6,898
11	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION		4,977		1,200		6,177
	Squad automatic weapon (SAW)				[1,200]		
	Weapons						
12	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM		13,712				13,712
	Other Support						
13	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR		1,349				1,349
	Guided Missiles and Equipment						
	Guided Missiles						
14	EADS MOD		1,996				1,996
15	JAVELIN						
16	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP)		817				817
17	HIMARS ROCKETS						
18	PREDATOR (SRAW)	526	36,398			526	36,398
	Other Support						
19	MODIFICATION KITS		587				587
	Communications and Electronics Equipment						
	Vehicle Mounted Radios and Equipment						
20	SMALL UNIT REMOTE SCOUTING SYSTEM		2,058				2,058
	Command and Control Systems						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
21	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		29,225				29,225
22	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		13,548				13,548
23	MULTIPLE ROLE RADAR SYSTEM		1,633				1,633
24	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS		13,919				13,919
25	TRANSITION SWITCH MODULE		23,072				23,072
26	COMPLIMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPON						
	Repair and Test Equipment						
27	AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS		20,462				20,462
28	GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIPMENT		8,369				8,369
	Radad Equipment (Non-tel)						
29	RADAR SET AN/TPS-59		18,211				18,211
	Intell/Comm Equipment (Non-tel)						
30	TACTICAL REMOTE SENSOR SYSTEM		9,476				9,476
31	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		12,476				12,476
32	MOD KITS (INTEL)		7,856				7,856
33	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (INTEL)						
	Repair and Test Equipment (Non-tel)						
34	GENERAL PURPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE		13,215				13,215
	Other Comm/Elec Equipment (Non-tel)						
35	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		24,428		5,400		29,828
	AN/PVS-14 night vision equipment				[5,400]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Other Support (Non-tel)						
36	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		463				463
37	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		61,514				61,514
38	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		9,316				9,316
39	RADIO SYSTEMS		10,633		12,000		22,633
	Lightweight multiband satellite terminals				[12,000]		
40	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		19,252				19,252
41	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		24,360				24,360
42	MOD KITS MAGTF C41		20,786				20,786
43	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		10,790				10,790
44	INTELLIGENCE C2 SYSTEMS		3,626				3,626
45	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		28,444				28,444
	Support Vehicles						
	Administrative Vehicles						
46	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	30	963			30	963
47	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		10,278				10,278
	Tactical Vehicles						
48	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	1,738	124,548			1,738	124,548
49	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT		4,611				4,611

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
50	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP		3,386				3,386
51	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS						
	Other Support						
52	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,027				4,027
	Engineer and Other Equipment						
	Engineer and Other Equipment						
53	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		2,724				2,724
54	COMBAT BREACHER VEHICLE						
55	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		15,812				15,812
56	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		5,067				5,067
57	DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS		2,041				2,041
58	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		12,982				12,982
59	FAMILY OF EOD EQUIPMENT		4,608				4,608
60	BRIDGE BOATS		10,760				10,760
	Material Handling Equipment						
61	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
62	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT		21,404				21,404
63	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		5,064				5,064
64	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP		10,742				10,742

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
65	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		27,885				27,885
66	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		8,091				8,091
	General Property						
67	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		1,975				1,975
68	TRAINING DEVICES		19,988				19,988
69	CONTAINER FAMILY		5,150				5,150
70	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		14,380				14,380
71	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)						
72	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN						
	Other Support						
73	FAMILY OF INCIDENT RESPONSE		3,447				3,447
74	MODIFICATION KITS		2,597				2,597
75	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		5,206				5,206
76	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
77	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		19,617				19,617
	Total - Procurement, Marine Corps		1,070,999		18,600		1,089,599

Multiyear procurement authority for Navy programs (sec. 121)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract for procurement of the following: (1) the F/A–18 aircraft program; (2) the E–2C aircraft program; (3) the Tactical Tomahawk cruise missile program; and, (4) the *Virginia*-class submarine program.

This would be the second consecutive multiyear procurement authorization for the F/A–18 aircraft. A separate multiyear procurement was authorized for the F/A–18 aircraft engines in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107). The committee encourages the Navy to synchronize the multiyear procurement of the F/A–18 aircraft and its engines at the earliest opportunity.

The E–2C aircraft multiyear procurement would stabilize the industrial base for low rate production during the development of the follow-on aircraft, the E–2 Advanced Hawkeye.

The Tactical Tomahawk cruise missile is currently scheduled to complete Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (IOT&E) in March, 2004. The committee recommends a limitation in the provision that would delay award of a multiyear procurement contract for the Tactical Tomahawk cruise missile until, as a result of operational testing, the missile is recommended for use in the fleet.

The first submarine of the *Virginia*-class is nearing completion, with delivery scheduled in fiscal year 2004. Its design stability is evident from the low number of engineering change orders when compared to any other submarine at this stage of construction. Substantial savings can be achieved through an award of a multiyear procurement contract.

Pilot program for flexible funding of Navy vessel conversions and overhauls (sec. 122)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a pilot program to permit flexible funding of conversions and overhauls of Navy cruisers from October 1, 2003, until September 30, 2012. The budget request for fiscal year 2004 includes funding for the first of 22 *Ticonderoga*-class cruiser conversions.

Ship conversions are currently funded from the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) procurement account. It is likely that, during the course of any ship conversions, items which were not included in the original work package would be discovered which could be corrected most efficiently while the ship is in the conversion process, rather than waiting for a subsequent shipyard availability period.

The pilot program authorized by this provision would allow the Navy to transfer appropriated funds from other appropriations and merge these transferred funds with the SCN funds available for the conversion. The other appropriations accounts that could be used for this purpose include: (1) other programs within SCN; (2) Weapons Procurement, Navy; (3) Other Procurement, Navy; and, (4) Operation and Maintenance, Navy.

The provision would only allow the Navy to transfer funds when there is either: (1) an increase in the size of the workload for conversion or overhaul to meet existing requirements for the cruiser;

or (2) a revision of the original work package resulting from a new conversion or overhaul requirement.

The provision would require that the Secretary of the Navy, 30 days before any transfer could take place, report to the congressional defense committees: (1) the purpose of the transfer; (2) the amount of the transfer; (3) the account from which the transfer is being made; (4) the program, project, or activity from which the transfer is being made; (5) the account to which the funds are being transferred; and, (6) the implications of the transfer on the total cost of the cruiser conversion program.

The provision would also require the Secretary to make a final report to the congressional defense committees no later than October 1, 2011, that evaluates the efficacy of the pilot program.

Other Navy Programs

Navy Aircraft

Airborne low frequency sonar

The budget request included $352.1 million to procure six MH–60R aircraft in fiscal year 2004 and to pay various non-recurring charges and production support items for the MH–60R helicopter program. The budget request does not include any such funding for the AN/AQS–22 Airborne Low Frequency Sonar (ALFS), a dipping sonar system that will be part of the MH–60R helicopter's equipment. The Navy competitively selected ALFS in fiscal year 1992 to outfit the MH–60R fleet.

The Navy could use additional funds in fiscal year 2004 to improve logistics support of the ALFS systems by upgrading the consolidated automated support systems, developing intermediate technical manuals, qualifying a second source for the ALFS cable, and upgrading the sonar signal generator. Such efforts could lead to significant reductions in total life cycle costs for ALFS. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million to pay for these activities to support ALFS system introduction.

Operational support aircraft

The budget request includes $15.6 million for the procurement of two UC–35 operational support aircraft for the Marine Corps. The UC–35 is certified by the Federal Aviation Administration and has begun to replace the Marine Corps' aging CT–39 operational support aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of $15.6 million for the procurement of two additional UC–35 aircraft.

C–37 aircraft

The budget request included no funds for C–37 aircraft. The C–37 is a long-range, twin engine, commercially available transport aircraft. The mission of the C–37 aircraft is to provide long range executive transport for the Chief of Naval Operations, unified commanders, and their staff. The Navy has an inventory objective of five C–37 aircraft. Four of the five aircraft currently performing this mission have exceeded, or will exceed, their fatigue life by fiscal year 2006. The committee is aware that the Future Years Defense Program includes funding for three C–37 aircraft, with the

next aircraft scheduled to be procured in fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends an increase of $55.0 million to accelerate this program by procuring a C–37 aircraft in fiscal year 2004.

Joint Primary Aircraft Training System

The budget request included $2.4 million for the procurement of certain items supporting the Joint Primary Aircraft Training System (JPATS) for the Navy, but included no funding for Navy JPATS aircraft. JPATS is a joint program between the Navy and the Air Force. The Air Force intends to procure 52 JPATS aircraft in fiscal year 2004, but the Navy plans to delay procurement of JPATS aircraft until fiscal year 2007. The committee continues to believe that the Navy should begin to procure the aircraft for the planned joint primary pilot training with the Air Force. The committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million for the procurement of five Navy JPATS aircraft.

AV–8B aircraft modifications

The budget request includes $20.9 million for modifications to the AV–8B aircraft, of which $9.9 million is for core avionics upgrades. No funding was included for Litening precision strike targeting pods.

As the AV–8B aircraft ages, the Navy is facing diminishing manufacturing sources and material shortages, resulting in problems with obsolescence of certain avionics components. Additional funding could be used to resolve known avionics deficiencies to improve readiness, availability, and safety. The committee notes that $13.0 million was included on the Marine Corps' unfunded priority list for fiscal year 2004 for this purpose. The committee recommends an increase of $13.0 million for AV–8B core avionics upgrades.

AV–8B aircraft have been using the Litening II targeting pod to provide precision targeting capability. A recent upgrade to the Litening II targeting pod has yielded the Litening advanced targeting (AT) configuration, which would increase the AV–8B's lethality and survivability by allowing standoff precision weapons delivery. The upgrade of eight Litening II targeting pods to the Litening AT configuration and the procurement of 22 Litening AT pods is included on the Marine Corps' unfunded priority list for fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends an increase of $37.0 million for Litening II targeting pod upgrades and for the procurement of Litening AT pods, for a total authorization of $70.9 million for modifications to the AV–8B aircraft.

Navigational Thermal Imaging System

The budget request included $3.5 million for H–1 series modifications, including $3.4 million for the procurement of AN/AAQ–22A/C UH–1N Navigational Thermal Imaging Systems (NTIS). The NTIS is a commercially-available thermal imaging device which provides significant safety enhancements to the legacy H–1 series of helicopters. The committee understands that the Marine Corps has an acquisition objective of 122 NTIS, but can procure only eight NTIS and some of the associated logistics with the funding requested in this budget request. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million for the procurement of addi-

tional AN/AAQ–22 NTIS, for a total authorization of $9.0 million for H–1 series upgrades.

EP–3 aircraft service life assessment

The budget request included $31.5 million for modifications to the EP–3 aircraft, but included no funding to assess the remaining service life of the aircraft. The EP–3 is a land-based, long range intelligence aircraft. EP–3s have historically been among the most heavily utilized aircraft in the military. This utilization rate has increased significantly since the beginning of the Global War on Terrorism in 2001.

There are only 12 EP–3 aircraft active in the fleet. The average service life of these aircraft is currently 29 years. Preliminary results from a recent strength test, which became available after the submission of the Navy's fiscal year 2004 budget request, indicate that more than half of the EP–3 aircraft have already exceeded their fatigue life. The fatigue test results indicate there is a potential near-term crisis in the operational availability of these scarce intelligence assets, and operational restrictions have been imposed on the speed and maneuvering envelopes of some of the EP–3 aircraft.

The committee understands that a program of inspections and modifications could assess whether or not the EP–3 fleet can remain at its current inventory level. The committee understands that this program would not remove the operational restrictions on the aircraft, but would provide better knowledge about future EP–3 aircraft availability. The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million for a program of inspections and modifications to assess the remaining service life of the EP–3 fleet of aircraft.

The committee believes that this situation merits senior-level review to ensure that the capability being provided by EP–3 aircraft is not precipitously lost. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2004. This report should include an analysis of the following: (1) how the Department of Defense will maintain the capability currently being provided by EP–3 aircraft until a suitable replacement capability is available; (2) when such a replacement capability might be available; (3) what range of options should be considered in determining that replacement capability; and (4) the operational, safety, or effectiveness issues associated with the required operational restrictions on the EP–3 aircraft, and whether it would be acceptable to continue operating with such restrictions until a replacement for the EP–3 aircraft capability is deployed.

P–3C aircraft modifications

The budget request included $95.0 million for modifications to the P–3C aircraft, which included $58.1 million for the procurement and installation of Anti-surface Warfare Improvement Program (AIP) kits. AIP greatly expands the P–3C aircraft's capabilities to operate in littoral regions with the addition of advanced technology sensors, expanded communications, upgraded weapon delivery capabilities, survivability upgrades, and improved operator

situational awareness. The Navy has a requirement for 146 AIP-equipped P–3C aircraft. Funding for 69 aircraft has been appropriated, with 56 of those aircraft delivered. The committee recommends an increase of $39.4 million for the procurement and installation of three additional P–3 AIP kits.

Aerial targets

The budget request included $70.7 million for the procurement of aerial targets. The aerial target program provides powered targets, towed targets, and associated equipment for fleet training and weapons system testing and validation. The GQM–163A supersonic sea-skimming target (SSST), when introduced in the fleet in fiscal year 2004, will provide the Navy with the only aerial target system capable of simulating the airframe size, sea-skimming range, speed, and maneuverability of potential threat aircraft or anti-ship missiles, to meet fleet testing and weapon system development requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for the procurement of additional GQM–163A SSSTs.

Navy Weapons

Weapons industrial facilities

The budget request included $7.4 million for various activities at government-owned, contractor-operated weapons industrial facilities, but included no funding for the facilities restoration at the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory (ABL). The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for the facilities restoration program at ABL.

Close-in weapons system

The budget request included $41.4 million for the Phalanx close-in weapons system (CIWS), including $15.6 million for the procurement of seven and the installation of 13 Block 1B CIWS upgrade kits (CIWS–1B). The Phalanx is a high rate-of-fire weapon that automatically acquires, tracks, and destroys aircraft and anti-ship cruise missiles that have penetrated all other ship defenses. It is the most widely distributed ship self-defense weapon in the fleet, installed on virtually all surface ships. The CIWS–1B is an upgrade that uses thermal imaging and an automatic acquisition video tracker that provides the additional capability to engage small, high speed, maneuvering surface craft and low, slow aircraft and helicopters. This upgrade is essential to provide a defense against potential terrorist and asymmetric threats as the fleet operates in the littorals. The committee is aware of the Navy's plan to accelerate the production of CIWS–1B to 39 upgrade kits in fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million to procure an additional 10 CIWS–1B upgrade kits to accelerate the program and smooth the ramp-up in production.

Navy and Marine Corps Ammunition

60mm high explosive cartridge

The budget request included no funding in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps, for the 60mm high explosive

(HE) cartridge. According to the Marine Corps, the 60mm HE cartridge is critical to conducting contingency operations in the Global War on Terrorism. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps, for procurement of the 60mm HE cartridge.

Navy Shipbuilding and Conversion

Submarine refueling overhauls

The budget request included no funding for refueling Los Angeles-class submarines. In the fiscal year 2003 budget request, the Navy included funding for refueling a single Los Angeles-class submarine, and projected that it would request funds for refueling two additional submarines in fiscal year 2004.

The 1999 "Attack Submarine Study" conducted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff concluded that the Navy needed to have a minimum of 68 attack submarines in fiscal year 2015 to meet all the requirements of the unified commanders and the national intelligence community. The 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) determined that 55 attack submarines were the minimum force necessary to present a moderate operational risk.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, one additional *Los Angeles*-class submarine refueling overhaul was added, for a total of two, so that attack submarine force levels would not decrease below the QDR-recommended level of 55 submarines. The fiscal year 2004 budget request, however, did not include the two projected refueling overhauls for fiscal year 2004, deferring one until later and forcing the decommissioning of the other attack submarine, the USS *Jacksonville* (SSN–699).

Although the committee notes that the Navy has included the refueling overhaul of the USS *Jacksonville* (SSN–699) on its unfunded priority list, the decommissioning of the USS *Jacksonville* (SSN–699) would again put the Navy below the QDR-recommended force level for attack submarines. This was exactly the situation the committee wanted to avoid by funding an additional refueling in fiscal year 2003. The committee is concerned that the Navy will continue to defer necessary refueling overhauls and accept high operational risk.

The committee is reluctant to recommend additional funding to solve a force structure problem. Nevertheless, the case for this refueling is compelling. The committee recommends an increase of $248.0 million for the refueling overhaul of the USS *Jacksonville* (SSN–699).

DDG–51 "Arleigh Burke"-class destroyer modernization program

The budget request included $3.198 billion for the procurement of three DDG–51 *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers, including $77.6 million in cost for planning. The DDG–51 destroyers are a mainstay of the fleet, and are able to operate offensively and defensively, independently or as units of carrier or expeditionary strike groups. Several initiatives are nearing fruition in the Navy that would improve the effectiveness of the DDG–51 while reducing manpower requirements for destroyers.

One such initiative would be the installation of composite ship louvers. Louvers are used on ships to cover air intake and engine exhaust areas to reduce exposure of internal equipment to the weather and to reduce radar signatures. Use of composite materials instead of steel would greatly reduce maintenance requirements. The committee believes that the Navy can achieve significant operations and support savings by accelerating incorporation of these initiatives.

The committee recommends an increase of $21.0 million for the engineering and installation planning for DDG–51 *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyer modernization and optimized manning upgrades on new construction ships, of which $1.0 million is for composite ship louvers.

Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a DDG–51 modernization plan by March 1, 2004. The plan should outline the key hull, mechanical, and electrical system upgrades, selective combat system upgrades, and potential manning reductions that could be achievable even with the additional missile defense role that may be assigned to this ship class.

Integrated Condition Assessment System

The budget request included $124.2 million for the procurement of ship equipment items of less than $5.0 million, but included no funding for the Integrated Condition Assessment System (ICAS). ICAS has been installed on various classes of surface ships and is a shipboard condition-based maintenance system. ICAS remotely monitors the operating parameters of machinery throughout the ship, analyzes the collected data, and alerts operators to potential performance problems. The committee recommends an increase of $9.4 million for the procurement and installation of ICAS in mine warfare ships, amphibious ships, and surface combatants.

Other Navy Procurement

SPQ–9B radar

The budget request included $9.7 million for the SPQ–9B radar. The SPQ–9B radar solid state transmitter is designed to provide early and reliable detection of low flying, small radar cross section targets in natural and man-made clutter, while improving its capability to perform its original missions of anti-surface gunfire support and navigation. The inventory objective for the SPQ–9B radar is 118 systems for surface ships. The committee recommends an increase of $9.7 million to accelerate procurement of the SPQ–9B radar.

Shipboard communications automation

The budget request included $175.1 million in shipboard communications automation procurement, including $8.3 million for the automated digital network system (ADNS) project. ADNS provides procurement and technology enhancements for automated routing and switching of tactical and strategic voice, video, and data communications using transmission control protocol/internet protocol (TCP/IP) networks.

Section 353 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) directed the Secretary of Defense to establish policy and procedures regarding installation and connection of telecom switches to the Defense Switch Network (DSN). The Navy is currently operating a number of shipboard switches that were installed before this language was enacted. These switches and associated software are in a number of configurations that have not been certified as secure and interoperable within DSN. Having so many disparate configurations within the fleet raises concerns about security and increased operating and support costs. The committee believes that the Navy should upgrade deployed systems to a DSN-certified configuration, and recommends an increase of $7.3 million for this purpose.

Submarine high data rate antenna

The budget request included $104.9 million in submarine communications systems procurement, including $15.5 million for submarine high data rate (HDR) antenna systems.

The submarine HDR antenna program provides submarines with antennas that have the bandwidth, gain, and flexibility to meet the stated fleet requirements for HDR communications in the super-high frequency (SHF) and extremely-high frequency (EHF) spectrums. Participating fully in the Navy's new efforts to implement network centric warfare requires that ships have higher data rate communications than are currently available on submarines.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $11.0 million to accelerate procurement of submarine HDR antenna systems.

Joint Engineering Data Management Information and Control System

The budget request included no funding for the Joint Engineering Data Management Information and Control System (JEDMICS). JEDMICS is the joint Department of Defense system for permanently storing, managing, and controlling digital engineering drawings and associated technical data. JEDMICS replaced labor intensive engineering drawing repositories with automated central repositories for all engineering and manufacturing information for weapons systems. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million for JEDMICS in Other Procurement, Navy.

Integrated bridge system

The budget request included $105.2 million for AEGIS support equipment, but included no funding for the integrated bridge system. The integrated bridge system improves situational awareness through automation of navigation and ship control systems, enhancing ship safety while reducing crew workload. Installation of this system has helped the Navy to meet its electronic chart and display information requirement. The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for the procurement and installation of integrated bridge systems on AEGIS surface combatants.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system

The budget request included $44.8 million for anti-ship missile decoy systems, including $21.9 million for procuring 86 NULKA de-

coys. Procuring additional NULKA decoys would ensure that fleet installations remain on a reasonable schedule, would keep production rates above the minimum sustaining level, and would achieve more reasonable unit production costs. The committee recommends an increase of $11.0 million to procure additional NULKA decoys.

Submarine training device modifications

The budget request included $25.2 million to procure submarine training device modifications. The Navy has critical training requirements to support submarines in the fleet and is beginning to use electronic performance support systems that would enhance training quality opportunities for deployed forces. The committee believes that the Navy could use these systems more extensively to provide on-the-job operation, maintenance and troubleshooting support normally provided by journeymen, and advanced schoolhouse training. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to expand the use of performance support systems in conducting submarine training.

Other supply support equipment

The budget request included $13.9 million in other supply support equipment, but included no funding for the Serial Number Tracking System (SNTS). The SNTS utilizes automatic identification technology (AIT) to store and retrieve specific maintenance and supply significant information concerning Navy repairable assets. AIT devices include bar code and memory buttons. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for the additional procurement of the SNTS.

Man overboard indicator system

The budget request included $60.7 million in command support equipment, but included no funding to continue buying man overboard indicator (MOBI) systems. The MOBI is a device that a sailor secures on his/her person while aboard ship. If the sailor were to fall overboard, the MOBI would activate and send a distress signal that would permit rescue forces to find the sailor. Each year, sailors' lives are lost and much time and fuel is spent by the Navy attempting to locate sailors who fall overboard. Use of this device could alleviate this situation. The committee believes that the Navy should continue the MOBI effort, and recommends an increase of $10.0 million to procure MOBI systems.

Marine Corps Procurement

Squad automatic weapon

The budget request included $3.1 million for the procurement of the M249 Squad Automatic Weapon (SAW). The SAW is an individually portable machine gun which provides sustained automatic fire capability and increased range. It is a critical weapon in the Marine Corps rifle squad. The committee understands that the Marine Corps has an inventory of 12,413 of such weapons, of which 7,642 are fielded, with the remaining weapons considered unserviceable. The fiscal year 2004 budget request funds for 2,593 to replace these unserviceable weapons. The committee notes that the

Commandant of the Marine Corps identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement of $8.1 million to procure additional SAWs. The committee recommends an increase of $1.2 million for the procurement of additional M249 SAWs, for a total authorization of $5.3 million.

Night vision equipment

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of AN/PVS–14 night vision devices. The AN/PVS–14 provides service men in Marine Corps combat infantry units with a lightweight night vision device that can be used for observation and surveillance, and a night scope. The Marine Corps completed its inventory objective of 10,152 AN/PVS–14 devices in fiscal year 2000, but has stated that 1,507 devices are broken and require replacement. The committee also notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement of $5.4 million for the AN/PVS–14. The committee recommends an increase of $5.4 million for the procurement of 1,507 night vision devices, a total authorization of $5.4 million for AN–PVS–14.

Lightweight multiband satellite terminal

The budget request included $10.6 million for the procurement of Marine Corps radio systems but no funding for the lightweight multiband satellite terminal (LMST). The LMST upgrades existing Marine Corps satellite radios to extend their useful life and to provide the Marine commander with greater access to a wide range of commercial and military satellites. The committee notes that this program was funded in fiscal year 2003 and in the Future Years Defense Program, but not in fiscal year 2004. The committee also notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement of $18.0 million for the LMST. The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for procurement of additional lightweight multiband radio system upgrades, for a total authorization of $22.6 million for LMST.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Aircraft Procurement, Air Force						
	Combat Aircraft						
	Tactical Forces						
1	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER						
2	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (AP-CY)						
3	F-22 RAPTOR	22	3,727,093	-2	-217,000	20	3,510,093
	F-22 reduction: production scheduling slip			[-2]	[-217,000]		
4	F-22 RAPTOR (AP-CY)		498,285				498,285
	Airlift Aircraft						
	Tactical Airlift						
5	C-17A (MYP)	11	2,027,572		88,000	11	2,115,572
	C-17 Multiyear procurement program - transfer rqst				[88,000]		
6	C-17A (MYP) (AP-CY)		504,100		-98,000		406,100
	C-17 Advance procurement- transfer rqst				[-98,000]		
7	C-17 ICS		927,627				927,627
	Other Airlift						
8	C-130H						
9	C-130J	5	335,991			5	335,991
10	C-130J (AP-CY)		110,000				110,000
	Trainer Aircraft						
	UPT Trainers						
11	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Operational Trainers						
12	JPATS	52	280,569			52	280,569
	Other Aircraft						
	Helicopters						
13	V-22 OSPREY	2	217,853			2	217,853
14	V-22 OSPREY (AP-CY)		15,150				15,150
	Mission Support Aircraft						
15	C-32B FEST/DEST AIRCRAFT						
16	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	27	2,540			27	2,540
	Other Aircraft						
17	TARGET DRONES		48,402				48,402
18	E-8C						
19	E-8C (AP-CY)						
20	HAEUAV	4	197,912			4	197,912
21	HAEUAV (AP-CY)		55,000				55,000
22	PREDATOR UAV	16	193,569			16	193,569
	Modification of Inservice Aircraft						
	Strategic Aircraft						
23	B-2A		76,464		24,700		101,164
	Transfer from PE 64240F (RDAF 68)				[24,700]		
24	B-1B		91,623				91,623
25	B-52		61,133				61,133
26	F-117		16,790				16,790

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Tactical Aircraft						
27	A-10		17,769		20,000		37,769
	A-10 Litening pods				[20,000]		
28	F-15		197,605		36,500		234,105
	F-15 mods - Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) equipment				[11,500]		
	F-15 engine upgrades				[25,000]		
29	F-16		300,596		58,200		358,796
	F-16 engine procurement				[48,200]		
	F-16 Litening pods				[10,000]		
30	F22 RAPTOR		8,284				8,284
31	T/AT-37		79				79
	Airlift Aircraft						
32	C-5		92,047		39,400		131,447
	C-5A Avionics Modernization Program				[39,400]		
33	C-9		978				978
34	C-17A		42,801		6,300		49,101
	C-17 aircraft modifications - transfer rqst				[6,300]		
35	C-21		1,367				1,367
36	C-32A		189				189
37	C-37A		355				355
38	C-141						
	Trainer Aircraft						
39	T6 MODIFICATIONS		4,201				4,201
40	T-38		132,196				132,196

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
41	T-41 AIRCRAFT		88				88
42	T-43		8,224				8,224
	Other Aircraft						
43	KC-10A (ATCA)		20,622				20,622
44	C-12		5,769				5,769
45	C-18						
46	C-20 MODS		444				444
47	VC-25A MOD		69,857				69,857
48	C-40		200				200
49	C-130		195,737		12,900		208,637
	C-130 APN-241 radar upgrade				[6,100]		
	KU-Band satellite integration				[6,800]		
50	C130J MODS		9,759				9,759
51	C-135		176,382		8,600		184,982
	KC-135 simulator upgrades (boom)				[8,600]		
52	C-29A MODS						
53	DARP		90,133		23,800		113,933
	Cobra Ball dual-sided SIGINT				[12,100]		
	Rivet Joint SIGINT modernization				[5,500]		
	Rivet Joint specific emitter identification				[6,200]		
54	E-3		53,467				53,467
55	E-4		58,708				58,708
56	E-8		36,017				36,017

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
57	H-1		3,367				3,367
58	H-60		44,723				44,723
59	OTHER AIRCRAFT		69,706				69,706
60	PREDATOR MODS		14,178				14,178
61	CV-22 MODS		279				279
	Other Modifications						
62	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS		16,525				16,525
	Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts						
	Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts						
63	REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		190,132				190,132
64	SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES		11,381				11,381
	Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities						
65	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		216,219				216,219
	Post Production Support						
66	B-1		8,448				8,448
67	B-2A		6,919				6,919
68	B-2A		31,556				31,556
69	C-130		8,470				8,470
70	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		7,292				7,292
71	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		13,871				13,871
	Industrial Preparedness						
72	REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		21,728				21,728

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	War Consumables						
73	WAR CONSUMABLES		25,716				25,716
	Other Production Charges						
74	REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		327,231				327,231
75	DEPOT MODERNIZATION		57,690				57,690
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
76	REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		9,449				9,449
	DARP						
77	DARP		82,933				82,933
	Cancelled Account Adjustments						
78	SUPPLY DEPOTS/OPERATIONS (NON-IF)						
	Total - Aircraft Procurement, Air Force		12,079,360		3,400		12,082,760
	Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force						
	Procurement of Ammo, Air Force						
	Rockets						
1	ROCKETS		64,494				64,494
	Cartridges						
2	CARTRIDGES		159,746				159,746
	Bombs						
3	PRACTICE BOMBS		45,909				45,909
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		167,834				167,834

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
5	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS						
6	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	294	117,841			294	117,841
7	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	20,244	427,709			20,244	427,709
8	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISP	2,516	72,411			2,516	72,411
	Flare, IR MJU-7B						
9	CAD/PAD		20,030				20,030
10	EXPLOSIVE ORDINANCE DISPOSAL		3,175				3,175
11	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		164				164
12	REPLENISHMENT SPARES		3,167				3,167
13	MODIFICATIONS <5M		189				189
14	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		336				336
	Fuzes						
15	FLARES		146,221				146,221
16	FUZES		36,466				36,466
	Weapons						
	Small Arms						
17	SMALL ARMS		19,033				19,033
	Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	23,054	1,284,725			23,054	1,284,725

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Missile Procurement, Air Force						
	Ballistic Missiles						
	Misile Replacement Equipment-Ballistic						
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		50,713				50,713
	Other Missiles						
	Tactical						
2	JASSM	250	102,534			250	102,534
3	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	325	79,981			325	79,981
4	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	386	69,072			386	69,072
5	AMRAAM	201	105,246			201	105,246
6	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	280	23,117			280	23,117
7	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB						
	Industrial Facilities						
8	REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		1,948				1,948
	Modification of Inservice Missiles						
	Class IV						
9	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		3,498				3,498
10	MM III MODIFICATIONS		606,964		-13,600		593,364
	GRP excess overhead				[-13,600]		
11	AGM-65D MAVERICK		318				318
12	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE		11,478				11,478
13	PEACEKEEPER (M-X)						
	Missile Spares and Repair Parts						
14	REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		78,449				78,449

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Other Support						
	Space Programs						
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
16	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES		34,588				34,588
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
18	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		9,145				9,145
19	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		226,622				226,622
20	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) (AP-CY)		32,230				32,230
21	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM						
22	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(S		68,026				68,026
23	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE		113,067				113,067
24	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM		12,479				12,479
25	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)		91,499		-45,000		46,499
	Excess Funds				[-45,000]		
26	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH	4	609,310		60,000	4	669,310
	Assured access				[60,000]		
27	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)		91,128				91,128
	Special Programs						
28	CANCELLED ACCOUNT						
29	DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM		292,000				292,000
30	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		1,552,081				1,552,081
31	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		127,546				127,546
	Total - Missile Procurement, Air Force		4,393,039		1,400		4,394,439

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Other Procurement, Air Force						
	Vehicular Equipment						
	Passenger Carrying Vehicles						
1	SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2						
2	STATION WAGON, 4X2						
3	BUSES						
4	AMBULANCES						
5	LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE						
6	ARMORED VEHICLE	1	243			1	243
7	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLE	269	12,031			269	12,031
	Cargo and Utility Vehicles						
8	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4		15,515				15,515
9	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4		5,374				5,374
10	TRUCK MAINT/UTILITY/DELIVERY		10,244				10,244
11	TRUCK CARRYALL		9,552				9,552
12	FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		5,687				5,687
13	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)		3,714				3,714
14	CAP VEHICLES		786				786
15	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		38,283				38,283
	Special Purpose Vehicles						
16	TRUCK TANK FUEL R-11		14,115				14,115
17	HMMWV, ARMORED		2,968				2,968

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
18	HMWWV, UP-ARMORED		5,809				5,809
19	TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-2						
20	TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-4		3,768				3,768
21	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE		6,052				6,052
22	TRUCK HYDRANT FUEL		1,397				1,397
23	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		24,028				24,028
	Fire Fighting Equipment						
24	TRUCK CRASH P-19		4,836				4,836
25	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		5,564				5,564
	Material Handling Equipment						
26	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB		8,510				8,510
27	TUNNER LOADER						
28	HALVERSEN LOADER	30	19,339			30	19,339
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		9,423				9,423
	Base Maintenance Support						
30	LOADER, SCOOP		5,656				5,656
31	TRUCK, DUMP		4,990				4,990
32	RUNWAY SNOW REMOVAL & CLEANING		16,298				16,298
33	MODIFICATIONS		564				564
34	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		12,260				12,260

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Electronics and Telecommunications						
	Comm Security Equipment (COMSEC)						
35	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		30,417				30,417
36	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)						
	Intelligence Programs						
37	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,935				2,935
38	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		1,683		12,400		14,083
	Jumbo-digital transit-cased system				[12,400]		
	Electronics Programs						
39	AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (AT		74,664				74,664
40	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		33,704				33,704
41	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPRO		29,849				29,849
42	WEATHER OBSERVE/FORECAST		32,839				32,839
43	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		43,094				43,094
44	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		20,613				20,613
45	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT		389				389
46	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM		403				403
47	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MO		48,927				48,927
	Special Comm-Electronics Projects						
48	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		119,534				119,534
49	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL S		23,457				23,457
50	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		9,247				9,247
51	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY S		34,877				34,877
52	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		23,442		5,000		28,442

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Joint Threat Emitter system procurement acceleration				[5,000]		
53	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY C						
54	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		11,634				11,634
55	GCSS-AF FOS		17,147				17,147
56	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS		50,803				50,803
57	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)		45,954				45,954
	Air Force Communications						
58	BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE		268,408		8,000		276,408
	Information transport system (ITS)				[8,000]		
59	USCENTCOM		30,335				30,335
60	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		10,555				10,555
	DISA Programs						
61	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PROG SP		95,421				95,421
62	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE		10,332				10,332
63	NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPA		10,786				10,786
64	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK		48,229				48,229
65	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE		80,635				80,635
66	MILSATCOM SPACE		42,329				42,329
67	SPACE MODS SPACE		30,747				30,747
68	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS						
	Organization and Base						
69	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		158,322				158,322
70	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATE		8,839				8,839
71	RADIO EQUIPMENT		8,750				8,750

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
72	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)		2,590				2,590
73	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		3,238				3,238
74	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		160,558				160,558
75	CAP COM & ELECT						
76	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		5,960				5,960
	Modifications						
77	COMM ELECT MODS		38,732				38,732
	Other Base Maintenance and Support Equipment						
	Test Equipment						
78	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE		13,528				13,528
79	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY		1,074				1,074
80	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		9,382				9,382
	Personal Safety and Rescue Equipment						
81	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		5,340		8,300		13,640
	Panoramic Night Vision Goggles (PNVG)				[8,300]		
82	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		7,435		11,800		19,235
	Aircraft survivable radio test equipment				[7,000]		
	Fixed Aircraft Standardized Seats				[4,800]		
	Depot Plant and Material Handling Equipment						
83	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING		13,919		12,000		25,919
	Point of Maintenance Initiative program				[12,000]		
84	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		11,702				11,702

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Electrical Equipment						
85	FLOODLIGHTS		5,616				5,616
86	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		9,570				9,570
	Base Support Equipment						
87	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		9,617				9,617
88	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT		13,889		3,000		16,889
	Expeditionary medical support packages (EMEDS)				[3,000]		
89	ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS		664				664
90	AIR BASE OPERABILITY		5,502				5,502
91	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		5,708				5,708
92	PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCING CAPITA		6,210				6,210
93	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		92,951				92,951
94	AIR CONDITIONERS		10,238				10,238
95	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		14,940				14,940
	Special Support Projects						
96	PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES		50,442				50,442
97	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ		3,998				3,998
98	DARP RC135		16,775				16,775
99	DARP, MRIGS		99,915				99,915
100	SELECTED ACTIVITIES		8,981,728				8,981,728
101	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		220,228				220,228
102	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE		14,141				14,141
103	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
104	MODIFICATIONS		201				201

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
105	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		4,980				4,980
	Spares and Repair Parts						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
106	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		36,582				36,582
	Financial information systems				-13,500		-13,500
	Total - Other Procurement, Air Force		11,583,659		47,000		11,630,659

Elimination of quantity limitations on multiyear procurement authority for C–130J aircraft (sec. 131)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the restrictions on quantity of C–130J aircraft that were included in the multiyear procurement authority granted to the Secretary of the Air Force in section 131(a) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). The Air Force negotiated its multiyear contract based on a quantity of 40 C–130J aircraft and 24 KC–130J aircraft. The committee believes these numbers do not have to be included in the multiyear authorization since series production of these aircraft will extend well beyond the multiyear contract.

Other Air Force Programs

Air Force Aircraft

F/A–22 aircraft

The budget request included $3.7 billion for the procurement of 22 F/A–22 Raptor aircraft. The F/A–22 aircraft is stealthy, capable of supersonic cruise without afterburner, and incorporates multisensor integration. The F/A–22 will provide day and night, all-weather air supremacy and precision ground attack capability against the most sophisticated integrated air defense systems.

The F/A–22 program was approved for entry into low-rate initial production in fiscal year 2002. Due to an over-run in the cost of the development program, the Department of Defense imposed a buy-to-budget approach on the program, which caused the Air Force to shift funding from the production program to the development program. This transfer, combined with increased unit cost, resulted in an Air Force decision to reduce the number of aircraft from 23 to 20 to be produced with fiscal year 2003 funding. It also resulted in a decrease in aircraft quantity for fiscal year 2004, from the projected 27 aircraft to the 22 aircraft in the budget request.

The greatest challenge in the F/A–22 development program is one of software integration, which has resulted in a software instability problem that affected both the startup of the integrated weapons system and the continuity of the system while in operation. Software stability metrics were established for both startup and run-time between unintended shutdowns. The thresholds for commencing training of operational aircrews in preparation for the start of dedicated initial operational test and evaluation (DIOT&E) were that the system startup should work 90 percent of the time, with a run-time of at least 10 hours of operation between unintended shutdowns. To demonstrate operational suitability during DIOT&E, the software must be capable of achieving 100 percent startup and 20 hours of operation between unintended shutdowns.

The first production representative F/A–22 aircraft have been delivered to Nellis Air Force Base to commence training of operational aircrews, however the software stability metrics to commence training have yet to be achieved. In fiscal year 2002, the committee was briefed that DIOT&E would commence in April 2003. Appearing before the Airland Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee in April 2003, the Assistant Secretary

of the Air Force for Acquisition testified that the schedule to start DIOT&E has now slipped to October 2003. In his approval of a revised F/A–22 acquisition strategy on April 2, 2003, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) assessed the strategy to achieve the required F/A–22 avionics capability as medium-to-high risk. In an acquisition decision memorandum of the same date, USD (AT&L) directed the Air Force to define options in the event that the F/A–22 does not improve to an acceptable level. These options must identify the cost and schedule implications of open system integration and identify the relationship to other programs, such as the F–16 aircraft and F–35 Joint Strike Fighter.

The F/A–22 production program is also experiencing difficulties. The committee was briefed in fiscal year 2002 on an aircraft delivery schedule that showed that by the end of March 2003, the Air Force would have taken delivery of 19 F/A–22s. At the end of March 2003, only 12 F/A–22s had been delivered. In February 2003, the committee was briefed on another aircraft delivery schedule that indicates that the delivery schedule will catch up to that which is on contract with the delivery of the 35th aircraft in June 2004. This aircraft will be the eighth of 13 aircraft awarded in lot two. Meanwhile, the Air Force has just awarded a contract for the third lot of 20 F/A–22 aircraft. The committee is concerned that the production processes and performance to date have not proven capable of meeting delivery schedules, yet a larger lot has been awarded, and an even larger number of 22 F/A–22s is requested in the budget request.

Once the F/A–22 enters the inventory, it will be the most technically advanced tactical aircraft in the world. There are a limited number of potential threat aircraft that can outmaneuver the tactical aircraft currently in the inventory of the U.S. military. There are also integrated air defense systems that only the stealthy F/A–22 will be able to penetrate in both day and night. Testing has already confirmed that the stealth, supersonic cruise, and maneuverability of the aircraft meets or exceeds expectations. However, due to the uncertainty of the approach being taken to the software stability problems, and the continuing inability of this program to meet production schedules, the committee believes it would not be prudent to authorize the ramp-up of procurement of F/A–22s to 22 aircraft in fiscal year 2004. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $217.0 million, for a total authorization of $3.5 billion for the procurement of 20 F/A–22 aircraft in fiscal year 2004.

C–17 aircraft funding transfers

The budget request included $2.03 billion for the continuing multiyear (MYP) procurement of 11 C–17 aircraft in fiscal year 2004, $504.1 million for the advance procurement for 14 fiscal year 2005 C–17 aircraft, and $42.8 million for C–17 aircraft modifications. After further review of the budget request material, the Air Force has requested that certain funding transfers be made in C–17 aircraft program elements to allow full execution of fiscal year 2004 funding. In accordance with the request of the Air Force, the committee recommends an increase of $88.0 million for the C–17 aircraft MYP, a decrease of $98.0 million from C–17 aircraft ad-

vance procurement, and an increase of $6.3 million for C–17 aircraft modifications.

A–10 aircraft modifications

The budget request included $17.8 million for modifications to the A–10 aircraft, but included no funds for the procurement of advanced targeting (AT) pods. The Litening AT pod would greatly improve the effectiveness and survivability of the A–10. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for the procurement of Litening AT pods for A–10 aircraft.

F–15 aircraft modifications

The budget request included $197.6 million for modifications for the F–15 aircraft, including $67.8 million for upgrading the engines to the F100–PW–220E configuration. This engine upgrade yields significant safety, performance, and support enhancements. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for additional F–15 engine upgrades to the F100–PW–220E configuration.

F–15 modifications

The budget request included $197.6 million for modifications to the F–15 aircraft, including $5.3 million to begin installing identification friend or foe (IFF) equipment on F–15 aircraft in the active force. Neither the budget request nor the Future Years Defense Program includes any funding to upgrade the IFF systems for F–15 aircraft operating in the Air National Guard.

The current IFF systems on F–15 aircraft are exhibiting high failure rates and are becoming an increasing burden on aircraft maintenance crews. The Air Force estimates that it will not be able to buy spare parts for the current systems beginning in fiscal year 2004.

The committee believes that the Air Force should provide an upgraded IFF capability to the F–15 aircraft operating in the Air National Guard, particularly in light of the contribution these aircraft have been making to continental air defense in the Global War on Terrorism.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $11.5 million in F–15 modifications to buy and install a replacement for the current F–15 IFF system for active and reserve component F–15 aircraft.

F–16 aircraft modifications

The budget request included $300.6 million for modifications to the F–16 aircraft, but included no funding for the procurement and installation of F100–PW–229 engines or for the procurement of Litening Advanced Targeting (AT) pods.

The F100–PW–229 engine provides block 42 F–16 aircraft with thrust and performance which is comparable to block 40 and block 50/52 F–16 aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of $48.2 million for F100–PW–229 engines for block 42 F–16 aircraft.

The Litening AT pod has an improved forward looking infrared sensor which provides greater performance and improved reliability. These pods enable the F–16 to deliver precision guided munitions. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for

the procurement of Litening AT pods, for a total authorization of $358.8 million for F–16 modifications.

C–5 aircraft modifications

The budget request included $92.0 million for modifications to the C–5 aircraft, including $79.9 million for the Avionics Modernization Program (AMP). The AMP modification consists of a newly designed avionics suite that will be more reliable and maintainable, while meeting the requirements of the global air traffic management (GATM) standards. The committee notes that additional funding for AMP is requested on the Air Force unfunded priority list, and recommends an increase of $39.4 million to procure an additional 12 kits and restore the C–5 AMP program to its previous schedule.

The committee has expressed concern in the past that the Air Force has scheduled the AMP upgrade for the 50 newer C–5B aircraft, while the 60 older C–5A aircraft are not scheduled for the AMP upgrade until after the period covered by the Future Years Defense Program. The committee directs that the 12 additional authorized kits are to be installed in C–5A aircraft.

C–130 modifications

The budget request included $195.7 million for modifications to C–130 aircraft, but included no funding for integrating a very high data rate communications antenna on certain C–130 aircraft for disseminating streaming video and signals intelligence data.

In various contingency operations, the Air Force needs to have the capability to deploy rapidly to a theater of operations and begin disseminating data to the war fighters. Such information could be generated from a number of sources, including the Scathe View C–130 podded imagery reconnaissance capability and the Predator unmanned aerial vehicle video. Until the Air Force can establish ground-based operations centers with full capability, there is a need to support tactical operations with a more readily deployable capability.

Regular ultra-high frequency satellite data links do not possess sufficient band width to support these capabilities. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.8 million in C–130 modifications to integrate Ku-band satellite communications capability on one of the C–130 aircraft capable of carrying the required pallet.

C–130 radar upgrade

The budget request included $195.7 million for modifications to the C–130 aircraft, which includes $2.3 million for the procurement and installation of the APN–241 radar for certain aircraft. The APN–241 is the standard radar for the Air Force C–130H3 and the new C–130J aircraft. The APN–241 radar meets safety and navigation requirements, and is certified for the adverse weather aerial delivery system. The committee recommends an increase of $6.1 million for the procurement and installation of eight APN–241 radars for C–130s.

KC–135 aircraft boom operator weapons systems trainer

The budget request included $176.4 million for C–135 aircraft modifications, but included no funds for simulator upgrades for the KC–135 aerial refueling aircraft.

Currently, KC–135 refueling boom operators are trained on part-task trainers and on actual flights. High fidelity aircraft boom operator weapons systems trainers (BOWSTs) would reduce the training time and the number of aircraft sorties necessary to train new boom operators, promoting cost efficiencies. The committee recommends an increase of $3.4 million in PE 41218F in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force for further development of the BOWST. The committee further recommends an increase of $8.6 million for the procurement of the KC–135 aircraft BOWST.

Cobra Ball dual-sided signals intelligence

The budget request included $90.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program (DARP), but included no funding for the Cobra Ball aircraft signals intelligence upgrades. The Cobra Ball aircraft is a unique national asset that provides a highly mobile capability to collect critical ballistic missile data. The information collected is used for intelligence analysis, treaty verification, and theater ballistic missile defense.

Planned measurement and signature intelligence (MASINT) upgrades to the Cobra Ball aircraft would displace high gain antennas currently used for signals intelligence collection. In order to maintain and improve this capability, and to make various on-board sensors compatible, the Cobra Ball aircraft must have newly configured antennas, as well as upgrades to receivers on-board.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for dual-sided signals intelligence modifications to the Cobra Ball aircraft.

Rivet Joint specific emitter identification

The budget request included $90.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program (DARP), but included no funding for the RC–135 Rivet Joint specific emitter identification capability. Rivet Joint is an airborne signals intelligence platform and one of the highest priority collectors for regional combatant commanders. The Rivet Joint platform is able to detect radar emissions of interest, but lacks onboard databases and communications to achieve detailed, rapid identification of individual emitters. Additional funding is required to enable Rivet Joint to correlate and disseminate time critical radar emitter location information.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for Rivet Joint specific emitter identification.

Rivet Joint signals intelligence modernization

The budget request included $90.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program (DARP), including $55.3 million for RC–135 Rivet Joint modernization. Rivet Joint is an airborne signals intelligence platform and

one of the highest priority collectors for regional combatant commanders. The Rivet Joint's onboard systems were designed to be an open architecture for upgrades, but have reached maximum capacity to absorb additional upgrades. Additional funding is required to upgrade the on-board architecture and install additional capabilities in emerging threat areas. This is one of the highest unfunded priorities for the Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for Rivet Joint signals intelligence modernization.

Air Force Missiles

Guidance replacement program

The budget request included $607.0 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force for the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile modernization, of which $217.0 million was for the Guidance Replacement Program. The committee understands that the overhead rate reported by the contractor has increased dramatically, and does not believe that this increase has been adequately justified. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of $593.4 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, a decrease of $13.6 million.

Titan

The budget request included $91.5 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force for the Titan space launch vehicle. The National Reconnaissance Office will assume management of the Titan program until Titan launches are completed, and the Air Force budget request is intended to cover close-out costs for the Air Force contract. The committee understands that the Air Force has identified $45.0 million in excess prior year funds. Therefore, the committee recommends a total authorization of $46.5 million for Titan in Missile Procurement Air Force a decrease of $45.0 million, and directs the Secretary of the Air Force to use the excess prior year funds to meet fiscal year 2004 funding requirements for Titan contract close out.

Evolved expendable launch vehicle

The budget request included $609.3 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, for the evolved expendable launch vehicle (EELV), of which $156.9 million is for assured access to space. The budget request also contained $7.0 million in PE 64853F for assured access research and development.

The EELV program acquires launch services for national security payloads from two commercial launch vendors, each of which has developed its own family of launch vehicles. The Department of Defense supported the development of these launch vehicles to preserve the benefits of competition and to hedge against technical problems in either family of vehicles.

The committee is aware that the commercial launch market, which provided the economic basis to support two launch vendors, has collapsed. The absence of such a base places in doubt the abil-

ity of either vendor to sustain launch operations over any extended period.

The Under Secretary of the Air Force, who serves as the executive agent for Department of Defense space programs, and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command have testified to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee on the significance of assuring access to space for U.S. national security space payloads and sustaining two launch vendors. The Air Force budget request included funding to support the EELV launch infrastructure to help do so. The committee recognizes that additional government support and a revised pricing structure will be required to sustain both vendors in the near term, and that budget constraints prevented the Air Force from providing the funds required to sustain the launch vendor base.

Therefore, the committee recommends $669.3 million in Missile Procurement Air Force, an increase of $60.0 million, to support assured access to space.

Other Air Force Procurement

Air National Guard jumbo digital transit-cased system

The budget request included $1.7 million for Other Procurement, Air Force, Intelligence Communications Equipment, but included no funding for Jumbo Digital Transit-cased Systems (J–DTS) for Air National Guard intelligence squadrons. J–DTS is a component of the Distributed Common Ground Station (DCGS) architecture that enables users in remote locations to receive imagery and other intelligence information from a variety of intelligence collection platforms including Global Hawk, Predator and U–2 aircraft, and in some cases, enables remote users to actually control the sensors on the intelligence platform. Fielding of J–DTS to Air National Guard intelligence squadrons would enable these units to participate in real-world intelligence operations on a daily basis, providing better training for Air National Guard intelligence specialists, and providing some relief to the high operations tempo of active duty U.S. Air Force intelligence squadrons. The committee recommends an increase of $12.4 million in Other Procurement, Air Force, Intelligence Communications Systems, to connect Air National Guard intelligence squadrons to the DCGS Wide Area Network and to procure additional Jumbo Digital Transit-cased systems.

Joint Threat Emitter

The budget request included $23.4 million for the procurement and installation of training and simulation equipment for Air Force combat training ranges. This includes $12.5 million that the Air Force intends to use to procure the Joint Threat Emitter (JTE) System. The JTE is a high power, high fidelity emitter capable of replicating more than 1,500 threat signals. The Air Force believes that the JTE system will modernize range threat simulator capabilities by emulating signals which simulate the most advanced air defense threat systems. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for accelerating procurement and installation of JTE systems.

Base information infrastructure

The budget request included $268.4 million for the procurement and installation of base information infrastructure improvements. Within this category, the Air Force provides upgrades for the Combat Information Transport System (CITS), including its subsets: (1) the Information Transport System (ITS); (2) the Network Management System/Base Information Protect; (3) the Voice Switching System; and, (4) the Telecommunications Management System.

The Air Force has determined that ITS improvements will have a direct effect on war fighting and contingency support. The Air Force has appropriately placed a high priority on providing enhancements to the ITS portion of the CITS program. This priority is based on an assessment that the current infrastructure is inadequate to support information-intensive command and control systems that support military operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for accelerating procurement and installation of fiber optic communications upgrades within the ITS upgrade effort.

Panoramic night vision goggles

The budget request included $5.3 million for the procurement of night vision goggles for the Air Force, of which $4.1 million would be for the procurement of panoramic night vision goggles (PNVGs). Production of PNVGs is scheduled to begin in fiscal year 2003. The improvement in field-of-view offered by these devices will greatly enhance aircrew situational awareness and safety. The committee recommends an increase of $8.3 million for procurement of additional PNVGs.

Personnel safety and rescue

The budget request included $7.4 million for personal safety and rescue items less than $5.0 million, including $1.0 million for the procurement of aircrew survival radio test sets, but included no funding for fixed aircraft standardized seats (FASS).

Aircrew survival radios have become increasingly complex, which, in turn, has increased the complexity of the test equipment necessary to test such radios. Insufficient test equipment can lead to maintenance backlogs. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million for current generation, self-contained, transportable, and semi-automated radio test systems fielded for use by the U.S. military.

The Air Force has begun development and testing of the FASS crew seats. A production-ready seat for C–130 and KC–135 aircraft will be ready by February 2004. The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million for the procurement of FASS, for a total authorization of $19.2 million for personal safety and rescue items.

Point of maintenance initiative

The budget request included $13.9 million for mechanized material handling, but included no funds for the point of maintenance initiative (POMX). POMX is a data collection program that increases the timeliness and accuracy of mission critical data collection and reduces the burden on flight line personnel. POMX focuses on maintenance and munitions processes for the aircraft using

hand-held computer devices, networks, and software now in widespread commercial use. The Air Force intends to start fielding POMX at certain bases in fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for the procurement and fielding of POMX in fiscal year 2004.

Expeditionary medical support packages

The budget request included $13.9 million for Air Force medical and dental equipment, but included no funding for the procurement of expeditionary medical support (EMEDS) packages. EMEDS is the primary tool of the expeditionary Air Force medical system. It is a highly mobile hospital system designed to be airlifted to forward positions to provide medical care. Recent enhancements to EMEDS have integrated chemical-biological protection into EMEDS to allow medical personnel to operate without the use of mission-oriented protective posture gear. Realizing the significant benefits of EMEDS for homeland defense or during other natural or man-made disasters, the committee notes that the Air National Guard has proposed reorganizing and training existing medical assets into EMEDS-supporting contingency configurations. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for EMEDS packages for the Air Force.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Procurement, Defense-Wide						
	Major Equipment						
	Major Equipment, OSD/WHS						
1	WHS MOTOR VEHICLES	2	70			2	70
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		37,291				37,291
3	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		21,622				21,622
	Major Equipment, NSA						
4	CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]				
5	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]				
6	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM	[ ]	[ ]				
7	DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE COUNTERDRUG PROGRAM						
	Major Equipment, DISA						
8	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		32,860				32,860
9	CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS						
10	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM		5,277				5,277
11	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS		4,743				4,743
12	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,507				2,507
13	TELEPORTS		58,160				58,160
14	GLOBAL INFORMATION GRID		380,135				380,135
15	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M		70,025				70,025
	Major Equipment, DIA						
16	INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNITCATIONS	[ ]	[ ]				
17	INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]				
18	HEADQUARTERS MANAGEMENT DIA	[ ]	[ ]				

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
19	INTEL SUPPORT TO OSD COUNTER-NARCOTICS	[ ]	[ ]				
	Major Equipment, DLA						
20	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		8,545				8,545
	Major Equipment, DCAA						
21	MAJOR EQUIPMENT/ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M		1,500				1,500
	Major Equipment, TJS						
22	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		46,114				46,114
	Missile Defense Agency						
23	PATRIOT PAC-3						
	Major Equipment, DHRA						
24	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		7,312				7,312
	National Imagery and Mapping Agency						
25	NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY	[ ]	[ ]				
	Defense Threat Reduction Agency						
26	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NIMA		200				200
27	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		37,350				37,350
	Defense Security Cooperation Agency						
28	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		209				209
	Major Equipment, AFIS						
29	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS		6,824				6,824
	Major Equipment, DODDE						
30	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT AND LOGISTICS		2,337				2,337

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Major Equipment, DCMA						
31	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		9,908				9,908
	Major Equipment, DTSA						
32	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		590				590
	Special Operations Command						
	Aviation Programs						
33	SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES		675,063		3,100		678,163
	MH-60L altitude hold				[3,100]		
34	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS		56,133				56,133
35	MC-130H COMBAT TALON II		8,838				8,838
36	CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION	2	108,790			2	108,790
37	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION		390,054				390,054
38	C-130 MODIFICATIONS		214,798		23,000		237,798
	Commando Solo				[23,000]		
39	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		295				295
	Shipbuilding						
40	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM		8,351				8,351
41	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (AP-CY)		23,573		-23,600		-27
	Adv SEAL Delivery System - adv procurement reduction				[-23,600]		
42	MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE		10,100				10,100
	Ammunition Programs						
43	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		35,746				35,746
44	CONVENTIONAL AMMO WORKING CAPITAL FUND						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
45	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		22,506				22,506
	Other Procurement Programs						
46	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS		56,225				56,225
47	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		16,522		11,700		28,222
	Joint threat warning system				[5,700]		
	Recce-Pad				[6,000]		
48	SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS		16,003		41,200		57,203
	Advanced lightweight grenade launcher				[22,200]		
	Light counter mortar radar				[6,500]		
	Night vision and laser targeting device				[12,500]		
49	JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM		18,269				18,269
50	ITV		5,206				5,206
51	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS		1,316				1,316
52	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		9,981		16,500		26,481
	Special Operations riverine craft				[16,500]		
53	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		7,995				7,995
54	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT		1,990				1,990
55	DRUG INTERDICTION						
56	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		11,207				11,207
57	SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM		292				292
58	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		235,269		25,500		260,769
59	PSYOP EQUIPMENT		18,264				18,264

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	Chemical/Biological Defense						
	CBDP						
60	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		85,018		36,500		121,518
	JSLIST				[36,000]		
	M45 army aircrew protective masks				[500]		
61	DECONTAMINATION		12,643		10,000		22,643
	M291/295 decon kits				[2,000]		
	Wide-area decontamination applicator				[8,000]		
62	JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM		71,952				71,952
63	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		17,608		2,000		19,608
	Chem-bio protective shelter				[2,000]		
64	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		318,516		80,600		399,116
	CBIFPP detection suite				[76,600]		
	JCAD				[2,000]		
	ACADA				[2,000]		
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		473,404				473,404
999a	WMD - Civil Support Teams				1,000		1,000
	Financial information systems				-8,900		-8,900
	Total - Procurement, Defense-Wide		3,665,506		218,600		3,884,106

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY RESERVE						
1	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	NAVY RESERVE						
2	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	MARINE CORPS RESERVE						
3	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	AIR FORCE RESERVE						
4	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
5	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
6	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Authorized Qty	Authorized Cost
	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES						
1	DOMESTIC RADIATION HARDENED ELECTRONICS		67,516				67,516
	TOTAL DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT		67,516				67,516
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION				1,530,261		1,530,261
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM				327,826		327,826
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL				2,100		2,100
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT		72,721,026		2,993,299		75,714,325

Defense-wide Programs

MH–60L altitude hold

The budget request included no funding for procurement, Defense-wide, Special Operations Forces Rotary Wing Upgrade, for the MH–60 altitude hold program. This system allows the aircraft to maintain a constant altitude, greatly reducing pilot workload, especially over regions with indistinguishable terrain features, such as desert, and during long night-vision goggle missions over water.

U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) has spent $10.3 million over the past two fiscal years to develop and begin to integrate this capability into 15 MH–60L aircraft. Because of competing priorities, SOCOM was unable to include this item in the President's budget request, but it is one of the highest unfunded priorities for the Commander, SOCOM.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.1 million for procurement, Defense-wide, SOF Rotary Wing Upgrades, to complete the procurement of the MH–60L altitude hold equipment.

EC–130J Commando Solo upgrades

The budget request included $214.8 million in procurement, Defense-wide for Special Operations Command Aviation Programs, C–130 Modifications account, but included no funding to complete conversion of one C–130J to the EC–130J, Commando Solo configuration. The total funding required to convert a C–130J to the EC–130J configuration is $110.0 million. A total of $87.0 million was appropriated in fiscal year 2003, leaving a $23.0 million shortfall in the program. The Department of Defense recently reprogrammed $23.0 million to fund this shortfall and avoid a break in production activity, creating a shortfall in the larger EC–130 program. Commando Solo, a flying radio and television broadcast capability, has been extensively used to perform psychological operations missions in Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

The committee recommends an increase of $23.0 million in procurement, Defense-wide for Special Operations Command Aviation Programs, C–130 Modifications, to fully fund the EC–130 aircraft modification program.

Advanced SEAL delivery system

The budget request included $23.6 million for advance procurement of long lead time items associated with the Advanced SEAL Delivery System (ASDS). The ASDS is a miniature, combatant submarine being developed for the infiltration and exfiltration of naval special operations forces. Unlike current underwater delivery systems, ASDS would transport Navy SEALs over longer distances in a dry environment, enhancing the operators' ability to accomplish their mission once ashore.

Significant technical and financial problems have plagued this program since its inception. For the past four years, the committee has expressed increasing concern about the cost of this system and the significant performance shortfalls the program continues to exhibit. At the urging of the committee, the Department of Defense has agreed to designate ASDS as an Acquisition Category I pro-

gram and will reinstate a Milestone C decision to assess affordability and effectiveness, providing substantially more oversight of this program.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 directed the General Accounting Office (GAO) to conduct a comprehensive review of the ASDS program. The recently released GAO report concludes that ASDS has only fully met three of its 16 key performance parameters (KPP). It has partially met eight additional KPPs and is making progress on another four. The boat has significant shortfalls with regard to its acoustic signature. It also has experienced recurring problems with battery cell failure rates and limited recharge cycles, raising doubts about its endurance and life cycle costs.

In August 2001, the Navy program office took "conditional" preliminary acceptance of the first boat from the prime contractor under an agreement that all contractual requirements needed for final government acceptance would be completed within one year. To date, the contractor has still not satisfactorily completed the contract requirements and the first boat is still not ready for final government acceptance. The first ASDS boat is scheduled to undergo an operational evaluation (OPEVAL), starting in April 2003, to determine the effectiveness and suitability of the boat for use in combat. The OPEVAL will be a major factor in deciding whether or not to declare an initial operating capability for ASDS, albeit at reduced performance standards. The OPEVAL will also be a major consideration in the Milestone C decision, to be made later in 2003.

The requirement for a SEAL delivery system remains critical for our special operations forces. Whether this particular ASDS design is the right one to meet the requirement will be determined by the OPEVAL and by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD, AT&L) in the Milestone C decision process.

This review process may well determine that the ASDS program needs to be restructured, that the boat needs significant additional development, or that the program is not effective and should be terminated. The committee opposes the commitment of additional advance procurement funding for ASDS until the Milestone C decision has determined the future direction of this program. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $23.6 million in procurement, Defense-wide for ASDS Advance Procurement. There have been significant changes to the ASDS design and in the industrial base since the inception of the ASDS program. The committee directs that the USD, AT&L review the ASDS sourcing strategy both at the prime and subcontractor level to maximize the benefits of competition and ensure the availability of effective production and systems integration capabilities. If a Milestone C decision determines that the ASDS program is now, or will be capable of meeting requirements, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command to conduct a full and open competition to procure additional ASDS boats.

Hand-held reconnaissance and surveillance project

The budget request included $16.5 million in procurement, Defense-wide for the Special Operations Forces (SOF) Intelligence

Systems, but included only $570,000 to continue fielding of the hand-held reconnaissance and surveillance project, commonly called Recce-Pad. Recce-Pad was developed as a component of the portable intelligence collection and relay capability (PICRC) program. Fielding of PICRC to headquarters and support elements has been completed, but fielding to tactical components is only partially complete. Additional funding is required to ensure that deployed special operations teams can have this unique capability that enhances their operational effectiveness.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, SOF Intelligence Systems for the Recce-Pad hand-held reconnaissance and surveillance project to continue fielding to tactical SOF elements.

Joint threat warning system

The budget request included $3.6 million in procurement, Defense-wide, Special Operations Forces Intelligence Systems, for procurement of the Joint Threat Warning System (JTWS). JTWS is a modular, lightweight ground signals intelligence system that can be mounted on a variety of special operations forces (SOF) delivery platforms, providing threat warning, situational awareness, and enhanced force protection for SOF elements. JTWS is an evolutionary acquisition program that builds upon previous efforts to separately acquire similar warning systems for air, ground, and maritime applications.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.65 million in procurement, Defense-wide, SOF Intelligence Systems, to procure 25 additional JTWS systems, completing the basis of issue plan for all elements of U.S. Special Operations Command.

Advanced lightweight grenade launcher

The budget request included $9.3 million in procurement, Defense-wide for the Special Operations Forces, Small Arms and Weapons procurement account for the Advanced Lightweight Grenade Launcher (ALGL) systems for the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM).

The ALGL system provides a much improved capability over the Mark 19 grenade launcher it replaces. The ALGL system provides a 40 mm grenade launcher first round hit capability on lightly armored vehicles at ranges beyond 1500 meters, is man-portable and has an advanced day/night fire control system. It has proven useful in recent military operations and is the highest priority of the Commander, SOCOM, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $22.2 million in procurement, Defense-wide for Special Operations Forces Small Arms and Weapons, to accelerate fielding of this important weapons system.

Lightweight counter mortar radar

The lightweight counter mortar radar (LCMR) is a man-portable radar system capable of detecting and determining the location of opposing force mortar fire and allowing quick, accurate response from friendly forces to neutralize the threat. U.S. Light Infantry Forces and Special Operations Forces have no fielded lightweight

system for locating enemy mortar fire. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 included $3.0 million in research and development funds to produce two prototype radars. The prototypes have proven very capable and require only minor additional developmental work. Procurement and fielding of the system to special operations forces could begin in fiscal year 2004 if sufficient funding is available.

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 included no funding for LCMR because of competing requirements within U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM), but this program is one of the highest unfunded priorities of Commander, SOCOM. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide in PE 1160404BB to complete development of LCMR, and an increase of $6.5 million in procurement, Defense-wide in Special Operations Forces Small Arms and Weapons, to begin procurement and fielding of this important system.

Night vision and laser targeting devices

The budget request included $4.7 million for special operations forces night vision and laser targeting devices. Of this amount, $2.7 million was requested for continued development of such devices in research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E), Defense-wide, PE 1160404BB, and $2.0 million was requested for procurement, Defense-wide, Special Operations Forces Small Arms and Weapons.

The value of these advanced night vision and laser targeting devices has been clear in recent military operations. Special operations forces rely on stealth and secrecy to successfully conduct their missions. These devices enable them to operate efficiently under the cover of darkness and successfully engage high value targets with much lower risk.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.5 million in procurement, Defense-wide, Special Operations Forces Small Arms and Weapons, to accelerate fielding of these advanced night vision and laser targeting devices.

Special operations craft-riverine

The budget request included no funding for Special Operations Craft-Riverine (SOC–R) procurement. The SOC–R is an air-transportable, armored craft that is capable of carrying special operations forces for insertion, extraction, and reconnaissance mission in riverine and coastal environments. SOC–R replaces less capable and unsupportable Vietnam-era craft, meets modern warfare requirements, and is the second highest priority of Commander, SOCOM, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $16.5 million in procurement, Defense-wide for Special Operations Forces Combatant Craft Systems, to accelerate fielding of the SOC–R and to complete the objective inventory of this program for SOCOM.

Joint Service Lightweight Integrated Suit Technology

The budget request included $74.2 million for procurement of the Joint Service Lightweight Integrated Suit Technology (JSLIST).

This funding level is 17 percent below the fiscal year 2003 requested level.

The JSLIST program fields a common chemical protective ensemble (suits, boots, socks, and gloves) to the military services. JSLIST promotes commonality and standardization to maximize resources and eliminate redundancy among the services.

The committee notes the efforts of the Department of Defense to meet requirement objectives for the JSLIST. From December 2002 through March 2003, JSLIST production was increased from 79,000 per month to 90,000 per month. The Fiscal Year 2003 Emergency Wartime Supplemental will fund 110,000 per month, the maximum estimated capacity of JSLIST production.

The committee supports the efforts of the Department to ensure that the men and women of the armed forces are fully protected against a chemical or biological attack. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $36.0 million for JSLIST to sustain maximum production capacity through fiscal year 2004.

M45 Army Aircrew Protective Mask

The budget request included $85.0 million in the Defense-wide procurement account for individual chemical and biological protection equipment, including funding for several types of protective masks. The request, however, included no funding for the M45 Army Aircrew Protective Mask. The M45 fulfills an interim, Army-unique requirement until the Joint Service General Purpose Mask is fielded to the services. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $500,000 to procure additional M45 Army Aircrew Protective Masks.

M291 and M295 decontamination kits

The budget request included no funding for M291 and M295 decontamination kits. The M291 and M295 decontamination kits provide efficient, proven, and safe methods to remove toxic chemical agents from skin and equipment. They are used by all military services and also by civilian personnel for responding to chemical terrorist attacks. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million for the procurement of M291 decontamination kits and $1.0 million for the procurement of M295 decontamination kits.

Wide-area decontamination

The budget request included $7.0 million in decontamination procurement for wide-area decontamination applicators and $8.6 million in PE 64384BP for wide-area decontamination technology development. The committee recommends a number of increases to the budget request for the Chemical and Biological Defense Program to further expand the wide-area decontamination capabilities of the services. Specifically, the committee recommends the following: an increase of $8.0 million in decontamination procurement for wide-area decontamination applicators; and an increase of $5.7 million in PE 64384BP for wide-area decontamination technology development, including decontamination applicators and solutions.

The committee notes that, as U.S. Armed Forces assembled in Southwest Asia for contingency operations against Iraq, the use of

chemical and biological weapons by Saddam Hussein could not be discounted. Committee members questioned representatives from the Department and the military services on the current chemical and biological defense capabilities of the armed forces during hearings on the budget request for fiscal year 2004. Of particular concern to committee members was the preparedness of military combat and supporting units in the theater to survive a biological or chemical attack and to sustain operations in a contaminated environment.

The assessments of the service chiefs on this issue were particularly noteworthy. Each service chief expressed his unequivocal conviction that the men and women of their respective services were prepared to respond to an attack with a chemical or biological agent. According to the service chiefs, soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines received the training and equipment to survive an attack and to sustain combat operations should that contingency arise.

One particular shortfall, however, noted in written testimony by both the commander, U.S. Pacific Command, and the deputy commandant of the Marine Corps for Plans, Policy and Operations was in the area of wide-area decontamination technologies and equipment.

Chemical-Biological Protective Shelter

The budget request included $17.6 million in the Defense-wide procurement account for collective protection in the Chemical-Biological Defense Program, including funding for the Chemical-Biological Protective Shelter (CBPS). Specifically, the budget request included $1.0 million for CBPS system fielding and engineering support. As noted in the report to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (S.Rpt 107–151), there is an increasing threat of chemical and biological attack on U.S. military personnel. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for procurement of additional CBPS.

Automatic Chemical Agent Detector and Alarm

The budget request included $318.5 million for the procurement of contamination avoidance equipment. The requested funding supports the procurement of chemical and biological detection, warning and reporting, and reconnaissance systems, such as the Automatic Chemical Agent Detector and Alarm (ACADA).

The committee notes that Army National Guard units that are deploying worldwide in support of military operations must possess the same level of defense against chemical agents as active duty units. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in contamination avoidance equipment procurement for ACADA.

Chemical Biological Installation Force Protection Program

The budget request included $76.6 million to deploy the Chemical Biological Installation/Force Protection Program(CBIFPP) to 15 military installations in fiscal year 2004. The CBIFPP consists of a highly effective suite of manual and automated chemical and biological detection equipment. The committee recommends an in-

crease of $76.6 million for CBIFPP to procure the CBIFPP detection suite for an additional 15 installations in fiscal year 2004.

The committee strongly supports the Department of Defense's efforts to rapidly deploy chemical and biological detection equipment to military installations. The committee has expressed concern over the years regarding the effectiveness of the Department's force protection initiatives at its installations at home and abroad.

The committee recognizes that many elements are critical to an antiterrorism force protection plan. One of the most urgent is the need for advance warning of a release of chemical or biological agents. The committee recognizes the threat of a weapons of mass destruction attack utilizing biological and/or chemical agents, that could be relatively easy to procure, produce, and weaponize. Early detection of such an attack is critical, as it enables local authorities to quickly respond and provide needed services to residents of, and military and civilian personnel on, military installations.

Joint Chemical Agent Detector

The budget request included $6.3 million for procurement of the Joint Chemical Agent Detector (JCAD). The JCAD is an automatic, lightweight, man-portable, point-sampling chemical warfare agent vapor detection/warning system. The JCAD will replace legacy chemical detection equipment, including the Chemical Agent Monitor, Improved Chemical Agent Monitor, Automatic Chemical Agent Detector and Alarm, M90s, M8A1s, and M256A1 kits. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for procurement of JCAD to accelerate replacement of legacy chemical detection equipment.

Items of Special Interest

Ammunition plant and arsenal modernization

The committee is concerned about the state of the Army's ammunition plants and arsenals. The committee notes that much of the material and equipment at these facilities is more than 60 years old. Funding levels have impacted the ability of the Army to keep pace with advances in manufacturing technologies in the commercial sector. Systems in some facilities are controlled by computer systems that were developed in the mid-1970s. In addition, management of real property maintenance requirements has impacted the productivity and effectiveness of ammunition plants and arsenals.

The committee notes that a thorough overview of the Army's ammunition production and arsenal modernization requirements is long overdue. Therefore, the committee directs the Army to develop a comprehensive modernization plan to be funded over the Future Years Defense Program beginning with its fiscal year 2005 budget submission. The committee directs the Army to place particular emphasis on modernization of key electrical control systems, production control and computer systems. In addition, the committee urges the Army to investigate the possibility of more fully incorporating real property maintenance requirements into the future-years facilities contracts. The committee directs the Army to sub-

mit the plan to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2004.

Ground systems industrial base

Section 113 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) directed the Army to review heavy tank and armored fighting vehicle upgrade programs to determine if projected program terminations would adversely impact the availability of needed armored systems industrial and technology capabilities. The Army's report, submitted February 4, 1999, concluded that current upgrades and limited new procurements were sufficient to maintain industrial and technological capabilities for the near term. The report also concluded that, for the period 2005 to 2015, after completion of the Bradley M2A3 upgrade and the Abrams M1A2 system enhancement programs, uncertainty in Army requirements would likely affect second and third tier vendors, may lead to increased costs to qualify new vendors, and may erode prime contractors' system engineering and design skills.

The committee notes that the Army's report was based on the assumption that programs such as the M1A2 system enhancement program, the M1 Wolverine heavy assault bridge, the M1 Grizzly counter obstacle vehicle, the M2A3 Bradley fighting vehicle, and the Crusader field artillery system, along with other legacy force systems, would be in various stages of production during the 2005–2015 period. Additionally, the Army research and development expenditures at that time focused on digitization and the development of Future Scout and Calvary System and Future Combat Systems (FCS) platforms.

The committee notes that since that time, the scope and nature of the Army's modernization program has changed. Over the course of the previous three fiscal years, the Army has terminated 29 programs and restructured another 20 programs to generate additional funds for Army transformation. In the fiscal year 2004 budget request, the Army cancelled 24 legacy force systems and restructured another 24 systems in order to shift funding to meet Objective and Interim Force requirements. The committee understands that the initial operational capability (IOC) for FCS will be delayed until fiscal year 2012 and that the Army intends to field two Objective Force brigades per year starting in fiscal year 2015.

The committee notes that the Army's decisions to terminate and restructure numerous legacy force systems, and to delay the FCS IOC by two years, may have an adverse impact on the industrial base for ground combat systems, including subsystems such as transmissions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to update the Armored Systems Modernization Report directed by Section 113 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) and to present to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 31, 2004, a report on the ground systems industrial base. The report shall include a description of the current capability of the industrial base, the capability expected between 2004 and 2015, the capability required during the same time period, and actions to be

taken, if any, to ensure that the industrial base retains those required capabilities.

Navy and Marine Corps Tactical Aviation Integration

The budget request included the first phase of the integration plan for the tactical aviation organizations of the Navy and the Marine Corps. Under this plan, the combined number of Navy and Marine Corps tactical aviation squadrons would decrease from 64 squadrons to 59 squadrons, and the number of new tactical aircraft necessary to be procured would decrease from 1,637 aircraft to 1,230 aircraft. The integration would increase the number of Marine Corps squadrons currently assigned to Navy airwings from four to ten, and would assign three Navy squadrons to Marine Corps airwings. The first phase, in fiscal year 2004, would result in the decommissioning of one Navy Reserve squadron and one Marine Corps reserve squadron.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an analysis of the Navy and Marine Corps tactical aviation integration plan to determine: (1) the validity of the assumptions made in formulating the plan; (2) the impact on Naval and Marine Corps Reserve force structure if the plan were to be executed; and (3) the ability of the smaller force structure to meet operational requirements. This analysis should be delivered to the congressional defense committees before December 1, 2003.

Relevancy of the Mobility Requirements Study for Fiscal Year 2005

The Mobility Requirements Study for Fiscal Year 2005 (MRS–05) was completed in fiscal year 2001. The most significant finding of this study was the identification of a significant shortfall in inter-theater airlift. The study identified an airlift requirement of 54.5 million ton-miles per day in order to meet the needs established by the unified commanders to execute the National Military Strategy, which, at the time the study was completed, was to engage in two nearly simultaneous major theater wars.

Since the Department completed this study, the United States was attacked on September 11, 2001, the National Security Strategy has been changed, and the U.S. military has been engaged in an ongoing Global War on Terrorism, including Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Additionally, the Army has recently introduced the Interim Brigade Combat Team (IBCT). The goal for an IBCT is to deploy anywhere in the world within 96 hours, which will require airlift instead of the sealift that has traditionally moved the equipment of large Army formations.

The committee is aware that steps are being taken to reduce the shortfalls in inter-theater airlift identified by MRS–05. There is currently a multiyear procurement (MYP) of C–17 aircraft, with an option for an additional 42 aircraft above the 180 aircraft that will be procured at the end of the current MYP. There are two major C–5 upgrade programs. The Civil Reserve Air Fleet has been activated when necessary to provide additional airlift.

The committee is interested in a comparison of the factual data for inter-theater airlift requirements in fiscal years 2002 and 2003

with the assumptions made in MRS–05 to verify the relevancy of the MRS–05 study. The committee directs the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, to submit a report on this comparison to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2004. The report should compare the assumptions in MRS–05, which led to a requirement for inter-theater airlift of 54.5 million ton-miles per day, with the data for fiscal years 2002 and 2003. The report should reach a conclusion regarding whether the 54.5 million ton-mile a day requirement is too low, too high, or approximately correct, given the changing force structure and operating environments of the Armed Forces.

Report on conventional ammunition industrial base

The committee is concerned that current munitions stocks and production levels may be insufficient to meet warfighter needs and to maintain a healthy industrial base. The House report to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (H. Rept. 107–436) directed the Secretary of the Army to prepare a report on the conventional ammunition industrial base requirements to fulfill the ammunition requirements for the new capabilities-based strategy of the Department of Defense and the unfunded requirements of the Army Chief of Staff. The date of submission for the report was January 15, 2003.

On February 25, 2003, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology (ASA(ALT)) notified the committee that the Army has completed its analysis of the ammunition requirements and the ability of the industrial base to satisfy these requirements, and was finalizing the industrial base strategy. ASA(ALT) also stated that the strategy would be briefed to the congressional defense committees no later than April 25, 2003.

The committee has not received either the congressionally-mandated report on the conventional ammunition industrial base or the ASA(ALT) industrial base strategy briefing. The committee is disappointed that the Army was unable to meet either congressionally-directed or self-imposed deadlines. The committee directs the Army to expedite the delivery of the ammunition requirements and industrial base report to the committee and to expedite the briefing of the Army industrial base strategy to the committee.

The committee believes that restoring ammunition stocks to necessary levels may require significant production of new rounds, and believes that additional production capacity may need to be reconstituted. For example, the Army estimates that they have single suppliers for 71 of 302 critical components needed to manufacture ammunition. The committee expects that the report on the industrial base and the Army's strategy for future ammunition production will consider secondary sources in the event of unforeseeable incidents or surge production requirements. Additionally, the committee expects the aforementioned report and briefing to specifically address the Army's current bomb production capacity and the consideration of reconstituting additional manufacturing lines at facilities such as Crane Army Ammunition Activity and McAlester Army Ammunition Plant.

Sonobuoys

The budget request included $85.6 million for building all types of sonobuoys. These funds would be sufficient to procure approximately 113,000 sonobuoys, thereby increasing the inventory of sonobuoys to the number needed to support annual peacetime training requirements. Until this year, the Navy has been faced with two poor alternatives: (1) curtailing training, with an attendant adverse effect on readiness; or (2) continuing training and accepting a reduction in war reserve assets, making the force less ready to operate at required higher rates in a conflict.

The committee commends the Navy for taking this action. However, the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) includes a program that would procure approximately 91,000 sonobuoys per year after fiscal year 2004. Such a low level of investment would return the Navy to the situation of managing negative effects on training or war reserves.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report on the date that the President submits the budget request for fiscal year 2005 that details: (1) projections of on-hand inventory by type and model of sonobuoy for fiscal years 2004 through fiscal year 2007 based on the current FYDP; (2) projections of the remaining design shelf life of the inventory for each of those years; (3) total inventory requirements for each type and model of sonobuoy, including specific requirements for training and other readiness activities and for war reserve; and (4) a year-by-year procurement plan, including funding and quantities, that would meet these requirements for each type and model of sonobuoy.

Surface combatant shipbuilding industrial base

The budget request included funding for three DDG–51 *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers in fiscal year 2004, and projects the procurement of another three DDG–51 *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers in fiscal year 2005. Last year, Congress provided the Navy statutory authority to procure up to six DDG–51 class ships over the fiscal year 2006 and 2007 period due to concern over declining major surface combatant force levels and the critical need to sustain the dual-source surface combatant shipbuilder industrial base through the transition from DDG–51 to DD(X) destroyer programs. However, the fiscal year 2004 budget and Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) proposes to procure no additional DDG–51s after fiscal year 2005, and to procure DD(X) destroyers at a very low rate through fiscal year 2008. The FYDP projects the procurement of a total of four DD(X) destroyers in fiscal years 2006 through 2008.

In November 2000, the Navy submitted an update to the 1993 "DDG–51 Industrial Base Study" that reaffirmed that both *Arleigh Burke*-class shipyards could remain viable with the shared, annual workload of three new procurement DDG–51s, plus additional work. In testimony before the Seapower Subcommittee in March 2002, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition stated that he did "not have a current study that looks at the industrial base", but that he had "assumptions, and the earlier studies have changed the way we are doing business now."

The 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) determined that a surface combatant level of 116 vessels was necessary to meet national security requirements. Since that time, the Chief of Naval Operations has published the Navy's Sea Power 21 vision. This vision would align naval forces with 12 carrier strike groups, which require surface combatants, 12 expeditionary strike groups, which require surface combatants, and a number of surface combatants for missile defense, with that number yet to be determined. The committee believes that the demands for surface combatants are expanding to a level in excess of the level which was identified in the QDR.

The committee remains concerned about the surface combatant industrial base, particularly during the transition from *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers to the DD(X) in fiscal years 2006 through 2008. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to deliver an updated surface combatant industrial base study to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2004, which will include: (1) projection of the workload for those shipyards engaged in the construction of surface combatants from fiscal year 2005 through fiscal year 2010; (2) an assessment of the risk for the financial viability of those shipyards during the same period; and, (3) a plan on how the Navy intends to sustain the unique technical and production skills within that industrial base.

T–45 Training System

The budget request included $339.2 million for the procurement of the T–45 Training System, which includes the procurement of 15 T–45 Goshawk aircraft in addition to other elements of the system. In the Department of Defense selected acquisition reports, the inventory objective of T–45 aircraft has been increased from 183 to 211. This is reflected in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP), with additional purchases programmed in fiscal years 2005 and 2006. The committee is aware that the fully integrated T–45 Training System consists of 234 T–45 aircraft, 18 simulators, and other types of training aids and material. The committee encourages the Navy to program for additional aircraft in the FYDP to achieve the requirements for the fully integrated training system.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Explanation of tables

The following tables provide the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title II of this Act. The tables also display the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2004 budget request for research, development, test and evaluation programs and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in the report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004
(Dollars in Thousands)

Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION	Request	Change	Authorized
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	9,122,825	-110,325	9,012,500
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	14,106,653	483,631	14,590,284
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	20,336,258	46,149	20,382,407
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	17,974,257	874,761	18,849,018
Operational Test & Evaluation	286,661		286,661
Defense Health Program		65,796	65,796
Office of the Inspector General		300	300
TOTAL RDT&E	**61,826,654**	**1,360,312**	**63,186,666**

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Science and Technology

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its commitment to and robust budget submission for science and technology across the services and defense agencies. The Science and Technology Program budget request for fiscal year 2004 is $10.232 billion, or 2.69 percent of the overall Department of Defense request. Over the past two years the Department has increased its budget request for science and technology by nearly 25 percent, up from $7.8 billion in fiscal year 2002. The Department is moving towards meeting the Secretary of Defense's goal of funding the Science and Technology Program at 3 percent of the overall defense budget.

The Department of Defense faces numerous competing priorities and operational demands. However, the committee notes that without a stable long-term investment in basic research and technology development, the recent display of the armed forces' technological advantages, such as precision weaponry, unmanned systems, smart munitions and increased situational awareness, would not have been possible. These technological success stories stand on the shoulders of decades of investment in core scientific disciplines such as chemistry, physics, materials research and information technology.

The men and women of the armed forces rely upon the scientific and technological innovation funded within this bill for rapidly increasing capability on the battlefield. The transformation of the armed services depends upon enhancing our technological advantages in areas such as unmanned systems and technologies to combat terrorism and defeat weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of over $130.0 million in unmanned systems and an increase of more than $150.0 million in technologies to combat the threats of terrorism at home and abroad.

While the Department is increasing its budget request for the Science and Technology Program, the committee remains concerned that the investment in basic research has remained stagnant and is too focused on near-term demands. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million for basic research. In addition, the committee directs the Director of Defense Research and Engineering to commission a study by the National Academy of Sciences to assess the basic research portfolio of the services and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). This assessment should review the basic research portfolio in order to determine if the programs are consistent with the definitions of basic research in DoD regulation. This report is not intended to rate the worthiness of the basic research portfolio, but rather to determine whether the basic research portfolio needs to be realigned to be more consistent with the goals of traditional fundamental research activities.

The committee recommends that the Department utilize all possible means to ensure that awards of grants and contracts for research and development programs are awarded through competitive, merit-based selection procedures.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Prohibition on transfer of certain programs outside the Office of the Secretary of Defense (sec. 211)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to retain the following five devolved programs in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD): (1) Explosive Demilitarization Technology Program; (2) High Energy Laser Initiative; (3) High Energy Laser Research Program; (4) High Energy Laser Advanced Development Program; and (5) University Research Initiative. These programs have particular congressional interest due to their unique contributions to the defense science and technology program and the joint nature of their activities.

The committee remains concerned about the devolution of numerous research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) programs from OSD to the military services and defense components. These concerns were articulated in the statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003. Although OSD was directed to halt the devolution of several specific programs, the Department continued the process and in the fiscal year 2004 budget transferred fifteen RDT&E programs from OSD to the military services and defense components.

Additionally, the statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 required OSD to report to Congress prior to the devolvement of a number of RDT&E programs. The report failed to answer many basic questions and did not provide adequate justification for the devolvement of the programs. The report has done little to ease the concerns of the committee about the future adequate funding, oversight, and maintenance of these inherently joint programs. In addition, the Congress is aware of the heightened concern in the affected research communities regarding devolvement, given its possible adverse effects on program structure and funding.

The committee also notes that two previous attempts to devolve RDT&E programs from OSD have failed. In fiscal year 2003, both the Medical Free Electron Laser (MFEL) program and the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute (AFRRI) were devolved to the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Despite assurances that the programs would continue their previous activities, the budgets of both programs were zeroed and subsequently transferred back to OSD without funding. As a result, Department of Defense reprogrammed fiscal year 2003 resources to fund these valuable research programs. The programs have been impacted by discontinuity in important defense medical research activities, affecting numerous university, industry, and government research personnel.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report for each of the remaining ten RDT&E programs which were devolved, if the current year's budget request for the program is less than the fiscal year 2004 budget request in constant dollars. This reporting requirement is intended to be in effect for the next four fiscal years. This report shall be included with that year's budget request, and shall contain budget request and appropriated levels for the program dating back to fiscal year 2000 in both cur-

rent and constant dollars, and an analysis of the impact of the reduced funding on the development of military capabilities, affected contractors, technical workforce, and scientific and technological advancement.

Objective force indirect fires program (sec. 212)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to ensure that, not later than October 1, 2003, the Objective Force indirect fires program be planned, programmed, and budgeted as a distinct program element and that the funds be administered consistent with the budgetary status of the program as a distinct program element. The provision would also prohibit the Army from planning, programming, and budgeting for the Objective Force indirect fires program in one program element in combination with the Armored Systems Modernization program. The Secretary is required to certify in writing to the congressional defense committees that the Objective Force indirect fires program is being planned, programmed, and budgeted as a distinct program element.

Section 216 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), directed the Secretary to carry out a program to provide the Army, no later than fiscal year 2008, with a self-propelled Future Combat Systems (FCS) non-line-of-sight (NLOS) cannon to equip the Objective Force. Section 216(d) of P.L. 107–314 directed that of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Army for research, development, test and evaluation, $368.5 million was to be used only to develop and field the FCS NLOS cannon and a resupply vehicle. The statement of managers accompanying the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), authorized the $368.5 million in PE63854A, Armored Systems Dem/Val: F47 FCS NLOS Cannon.

In the fiscal year 2004 budget request, the Army has proposed moving the FCS NLOS cannon program line to the FCS program line PE64645A, Armored Systems Modernization, and proposed renaming the program "Objective Force Indirect Fires". The committee believes that this realignment violates the intent of the Congress: the FCS NLOS Cannon program should be carried out as a discrete program. In addition, the committee believes that the realignment jeopardizes the Army's ability to develop and field this system by fiscal year 2008, as required by law. The committee understands that the Objective Force initial operational capability, including FCS, will be delayed until fiscal year 2012. The committee is concerned that aligning the FCS NLOS cannon with FCS will significantly impact the FCS NLOS cannon program and delay development and fielding of this important program. The committee believes that the FCS NLOS cannon must be developed with the visibility provided by a discrete program element.

Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense

Fielding of ballistic missile defense capabilities (sec. 221)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Department of Defense to use research, development, test and evalua-

tion funding to develop and field an initial set of ballistic missile defense capabilities.

The committee notes that this provision would provide the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) with the necessary flexibility to manage the timely fielding of missile defense capabilities, and that the authority provided therein is consistent with section 803 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–107). The committee notes that the MDA Director testified before the Strategic Forces Subcommittee that initial fielding of missile defenses can facilitate more realistic testing, because "* * * we must have assets and infrastructure in the field if we are going to begin to test a system under operationally realistic conditions." The committee continues to believe that robust testing of ballistic missile defense systems is essential.

Repeal of requirements for certain program elements for Missile Defense Agency activities (sec. 222)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 223(a) of Title 10, which currently defines in law the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) program elements.

The committee is aware of interest in the administration in submitting an MDA budget request in fiscal year 2005 that reflects a single program element. This would have the effect of maximizing management flexibility by allowing the MDA Director to redirect funds within the one program element without any reprogramming restrictions (except for projects designated as congressional interest items). The committee is sympathetic with the need for management flexibility to achieve the challenging goal of deploying effective missile defenses as rapidly as possible, but is concerned that such an approach would significantly limit the congressional insight into MDA activities which is required for appropriate committee oversight of MDA activities.

The committee notes that MDA is currently the only organization within the Department of Defense for which program elements are defined in law. The repeal of this section would restore MDA to the same status as other DOD entities, and would enhance management flexibility by allowing MDA to restructure its program elements without requesting legislative relief. However, the committee believes that submission of future budget justification materials should be consistent with past practice, and that any submission reflecting a single MDA program element would be inappropriate.

Oversight of procurement of ballistic missile defense system elements (sec. 223)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit certain information related to ballistic missile defense system elements for which the Missile Defense Agency is engaged in planning for production and initial fielding and an estimate of funding necessary for procurement of BMD system elements in the future-years defense program.

Renewal of authority to assist local communities impacted by ballistic missile defense system test bed (sec. 224)

The committee recommends a provision that would renew for three years the authority of the Missile Defense Agency to use research, development, test, and evaluation funds for assistance to communities significantly impacted by the expanded ballistic missile defense test bed. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a description of the community assistance projects to be supported in a given fiscal year along with an estimate of the total cost of each project.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Global Research Watch Program in the Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (sec. 231)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a Global Research Watch program and increase the budget request in PE 65798S by $1.0 million for this program. The goals of the Global Research Watch program are consistent with initiatives being undertaken by the Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, the military services, and the intelligence community. The program is also consistent with the October 2002 recommendations of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST), which reported that the government should "* * * keep a closer watch on R&D developments across the globe and provide a bi-yearly assessment of the impact of those developments on our science and technology." PCAST also noted that "* * * the consequence of this evaluation would be suggestions on the allocation of funds and resources to fields that need bolstering or reductions from areas that have been more adequately funded." The committee believes that this program could provide important information to assist the Department in making research investment decisions.

The committee directs the Director of Defense Research and Engineering to establish this program in coordination with existing international cooperative activities of the military services, defense agencies, and intelligence community. The committee notes and commends the excellent work done by the various services' overseas research offices and recommends that this program link the services' overseas offices, scientific reports in order to provide information to the Department of Defense as a whole. The committee notes that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency's Militarily Critical Technologies List may provide a model for the establishment of this program, but intends this program to be focused on the promotion of international cooperation, scientific benchmarking, and technical analyses of global capabilities, and not the development of export controls or supporting technology security activities.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency Biennial Strategic Plan (sec. 232)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to strengthen its strategic planning process and prepare a biennial strategic plan to accompany the budget request submitted to the congressional

defense committees in alternating fiscal years, beginning in fiscal year 2006. The strategic plan shall include an identification of long-term goals, emerging investment opportunities and an assessment of the current research portfolio to meet these goals. The plan shall provide an assessment of technology transition to other defense entities and the agency's role in supporting service missions. In addition, the plan shall include a review of the personnel authorities and processes available to DARPA and an assessment of the utilization of these authorities.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to appoint a senior review panel to assist in the formulation, review, and approval of the strategic plan. This panel shall be chaired by the Director of Defense, Research and Engineering and shall include six additional senior officials comprised of an equal mix of government and non-governmental representatives. Each panel member shall serve two-year terms, with a rotation of one-third of the panel every two years. The government representatives shall be senior military officials appointed from the services and at least equal in rank to the Director of DARPA. The non-governmental officials shall be senior representatives from academia, industry, or other non-governmental organizations. The review panel shall not interfere with the management of DARPA programs, which remains the sole responsibility of the Director of DARPA.

The committee notes that the contributions of DARPA to the national security of the United States are significant. Throughout its history, DARPA has remained true to its original mission: to maintain the technological superiority of the U.S. Military and prevent technological surprise by sponsoring revolutionary, high-payoff research that bridges the gap between fundamental discoveries and military use.

The committee commends DARPA on the submission of its inaugural strategic plan. This plan was recommended in a 1999 Defense Science Board report and directed by the Senate report accompanying S. 2514 (S. Rept. 107–151). The DARPA strategic plan identified eight important strategic thrusts that clearly reflect the DARPA mission. According to the strategic plan, the thrust areas were formulated by outreach to senior military and government officials. While such outreach is extremely critical for receiving invaluable input and sharing information about the current research portfolio of DARPA, the committee is concerned that the process of arriving at the long-term strategic plan is still not the result of in-depth planning and review.

Enhancement of authority of Secretary of Defense to support science, mathematics, engineering and technology education (sec. 233)

The committee recommends a provision that would enable the Secretary of Defense to develop a more comprehensive and attractive array of educational programs in science, mathematics and engineering. The committee notes that educational programs in technical fields serve to help train the next generation of scientists, engineers, and technical entrepreneurs, all of whom may contribute to the future technological superiority of our military forces. The committee also notes that science, mathematics, and engineering

education is vitally important for all future warfighters as the military services embrace new technologies to drive transformation.

Department of Defense high-speed network-centric and bandwidth expansion program (sec. 234)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a comprehensive research and development program for advanced technologies to achieve high-bandwidth wireless communications for the Department of Defense. The Department is currently in the process of transformation to a network-centric force, where the rapid delivery of large amounts of data throughout the theater of operation will dramatically enhance warfighter capability and situational awareness. A major aspect of this transformation would be the "last mile" connectivity to the warfighter and military assets in the battlespace, which can only be achieved through high-bandwidth communication systems. An essential element of this communication system would be efficient utilization of bandwidth, in order to fully exploit military assets, such as unmanned systems, satellite communications, and sensors, and to disseminate critical information throughout the battlefield.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to consider a number of areas for this research and development program. The first is spectrum access for wireless and mobile systems. The Department should focus on the efficient use of spectrum, in order to enhance technologies to improve the individual user bandwidth and system level capacity. Additional research should address compression technology, interference issues, resource management, signal processing, traffic management, software defined radios, fully adaptive antenna arrays, and spread spectrum systems. The second area of research and development is highly networked systems, to include the ability to develop complex ad hoc network structures to provide for the connectivity to battlefield assets, and the development of grid computing and spectrum usage monitoring systems. Another important research area is end user devices, such as efficient receivers and transmitter devices, antenna technologies, advanced digital power management techniques, and signal processing. Finally, the program should include research on applications, including robust security, encryption, and privacy applications, as well as improved human interfaces.

In carrying out the research program, the Department shall focus on joint systems acquisition and deployment among the various services and agencies, to coordinate the research and development areas listed above. Joint experimentation will be crucial in testing systems and ensuring maximum bandwidth utilization across the military services. The provision requires the Department to work in close coordination with civilian research and development efforts to provide for the enhancement of military research and development activities on such communications. This should include identification of the most promising technologies, as well as the funding for joint experimentation activities on such technologies.

The provision would require that a report be submitted with the fiscal year 2005 budget request which describes the research and development activities carried out under the program, including current and proposed funding levels for each research area.

Additional Matters of Interest

Army

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY			
0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	24,121		24,121
0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	128,798	6,000	134,798
		Low temperature research		[2,000]	
		Desert terrain analysis		[4,000]	
0601103A	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	71,642	-71,642	
		Transfer program to PE 61103D8Z (RDDW 3)		[-71,642]	
0601104A	4	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	84,816	5,000	89,816
		Infrastructure protection research		[4,000]	
		Ferroelectric nanomaterials fabrication		[1,000]	
0601105A	5	FORCE HEALTH PROTECTION	9,847		9,847
0601114A	6	DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PGM TO STIM COMPET RESEARCH	9,730		9,730
0601228A	7	HISTORICALLY BLACK COL AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTIT	14,083		14,083
0602105A	8	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	15,186	6,000	21,186
		Advanced materials processing		[3,000]	
		Multifunctional composite materials		[3,000]	
0602120A	9	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	22,765		22,765
0602122A	10	TRACTOR HIP	5,835		5,835
0602211A	11	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	39,459		39,459
0602270A	12	EW TECHNOLOGY	17,029		17,029
0602303A	13	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	43,269	17,000	60,269
		Short range air defense radar		[8,000]	
		Maneuver air defense system		[6,500]	
		Multiple component flight test		[2,500]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0602307A	14	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	14,189		14,189
0602308A	15	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	15,941	7,500	23,441
		Advanced photonic detectors		[5,000]	
		Immersive simulation and training research		[2,500]	
0602601A	16	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	80,910	12,000	92,910
		Corrosion-resistant coatings		[1,500]	
		Rapid prototyping technologies		[2,000]	
		Unmanned vehicle control technologies		[2,500]	
		Advanced energy and manufacturing technology		[3,000]	
		Advanced electric drive		[3,000]	
0602618A	17	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	53,478		53,478
0602622A	18	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECH	3,540		3,540
0602623A	19	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,835		5,835
0602624A	20	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	39,485	3,000	42,485
		Single crystal tungsten alloy penetrators		[3,000]	
0602705A	21	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	33,694	9,000	42,694
		Flexible displays		[9,000]	
0602709A	22	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	22,233		22,233
0602712A	23	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	21,291	9,500	30,791
		Chemical vapor sensing		[2,500]	
		Synthetic aperture radar mine detection systems		[2,000]	
		Rapid and reliable countermine capabilities		[5,000]	
0602716A	24	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	16,749		16,749

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0602720A	25	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	18,252	1,000	19,252
		Environmental Response and Security Protection Program		[1,000]	
0602782A	26	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	18,728		18,728
0602783A	27	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	4,142		4,142
0602784A	28	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	45,407	3,000	48,407
		Geosciences and atmospheric research		[3,000]	
0602785A	29	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	15,548		15,548
0602786A	30	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	29,421	4,800	34,221
		Embedded optical communications		[4,800]	
0602787A	31	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	58,877	2,500	61,377
		Anthrax research		[2,500]	
0602805A	32	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY			
0603001A	33	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	63,882		63,882
0603002A	34	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	35,168	12,000	47,168
		Electronic garments		[5,000]	
		Stable hemostat		[5,000]	
		Genomics research		[2,000]	
0603003A	35	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	72,083		72,083
0603004A	36	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	47,752		47,752

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603005A	37	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECH	210,856	35,000	245,856
		21st century truck		[17,500]	
		Fuel cell technology		[5,000]	
		Advanced collaborative environments		[2,000]	
		Fastening and joining technologies		[1,500]	
		Tactical vehicle design tools		[2,000]	
		Advanced thermal management controls		[1,500]	
		Advanced composite materials		[5,500]	
0603006A	38	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECH	10,379		10,379
0603007A	39	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECH	4,931		4,931
0603008A	40	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY (H)	40,347		40,347
0603009A	41	TRACTOR HIKE	8,781		8,781
0603015A	42	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	18,649	5,500	24,149
		Immersive simulation and training research		[5,500]	
0603017A	43	TRACTOR RED			
0603020A	44	TRACTOR ROSE	2,872		2,872
0603103A	45	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	9,349	-9,349	
		Transfer program to PE 63104D8Z (RDDW 26)		[-9,349]	
0603105A	46	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	6,733		6,733
0603125A	47	COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,916		4,916
0603238A	48	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PREC STRIKE TECH DEM	12,660		12,660
0603270A	49	EW TECHNOLOGY	11,273		11,273
0603313A	50	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	111,321	6,000	117,321
		Close-in Active Protection (CIAPS) prototype		[6,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603322A	51	TRACTOR CAGE	7,592		7,592
0603606A	52	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	24,552		24,552
0603607A	53	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	6,193		6,193
0603654A	54	LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	8,847		8,847
0603710A	55	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	47,088	3,000	50,088
		Warfighter/firefighter position, location, and tracking sensor		[3,000]	
0603728A	56	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	15,776		15,776
0603734A	57	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,441		3,441
0603772A	58	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECH	20,255		20,255
0603305A	59	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION(NON SPACE)	51,547	32,400	83,947
		Mobile tactical high energy laser		[7,000]	
		Advanced laser electric power		[2,900]	
		Integrated composite missile structures		[5,000]	
		Low cost interceptor		[6,000]	
		Advanced radars and electro optical sensors		[6,500]	
		Radar power technology		[5,000]	
0603308A	60	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE)	9,632		9,632
0603327A	61	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	79,959	3,000	82,959
		AMD Architecture Analysis (A3) program		[3,000]	
0603619A	62	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	36,976		36,976
0603627A	63	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	10,262		10,262
0603639A	64	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	11,249		11,249
0603653A	65	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	61,377		61,377
0603747A	66	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	13,987		13,987

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603766A	67	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	17,068		17,068
0603774A	68	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,283		5,283
0603779A	69	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	11,514	6,500	18,014
		Managing Army Technologies for Environmental Enhancement		[4,500]	
		Manganese Health Research Program		[2,000]	
0603782A	70	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL	90,774		90,774
0603790A	71	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,779		4,779
0603801A	72	AVIATION - ADV DEV	9,968		9,968
0603802A	73	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV	31,856		31,856
0603804A	74	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	12,008	13,500	25,508
		Mobile parts hospital development		[6,000]	
		Theater support vessel development		[7,500]	
0603805A	75	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CNTRL SYS EVAL AND ANALYSIS	8,682		8,682
0603807A	76	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	11,042	5,000	16,042
		Automated detection for biodefense		[5,000]	
0603850A	77	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (JMIP/DISTP)	2,097		2,097
0603851A	78	TRACTOR CAGE			
0603854A	79	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS			
0603856A	80	SCAMP BLOCK II	28,028		28,028
0603869A	81	MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEF SYS (MEADS) CONCEPTS	276,259	-276,259	
		Program reduction		[-34,934]	
		Transfer to PE 64865C (RDDW 90)		[-241,325]	
0604201A	82	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	64,650		64,650
0604220A	83	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0604223A	84	COMANCHE	1,079,257		1,079,257
0604270A	85	EW DEVELOPMENT	33,214		33,214
0604280A	86	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	134,693		134,693
0604321A	87	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	20,168		20,168
0604328A	88	TRACTOR CAGE	16,215		16,215
0604329A	89	COMMON MISSILE	183,790		183,790
0604601A	90	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	21,637		21,637
0604604A	91	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	4,366		4,366
0604609A	92	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-SDD	12,094		12,094
0604611A	93	JAVELIN	956		956
0604619A	94	LANDMINE WARFARE			
0604622A	95	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	9,200		9,200
0604633A	96	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	2,514		2,514
0604641A	97	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)		2,800	2,800
		TUGV		[2,800]	
0604642A	98	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	15,700		15,700
0604645A	99	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-SDD	1,701,331		1,701,331
0604649A	100	ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT			
0604710A	101	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - SDD	29,022		29,022
0604713A	102	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	67,283	73,500	140,783
		Integrated battlefield combat situational awareness (IB-CSAS)		[15,000]	
		Land Warrior development (transfer from OPA 136)		[58,500]	
0604715A	103	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - SDD	71,616		71,616
0604716A	104	TERRAIN INFORMATION - SDD	6,977		6,977

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0604726A	105	INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM	3,309		3,309
0604738A	106	JSIMS CORE PROGRAM			
0604741A	107	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTEL - SDD	29,297		29,297
0604742A	108	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,994		16,994
0604746A	109	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	4,634		4,634
0604760A	110	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - SDD	26,358		26,358
0604766A	111	TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS - SDD	19,695		19,695
0604768A	112	ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM (ATACMS)	55,075	7,500	62,575
		Viper strike munitions		[7500]	
0604770A	113	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	4,705		4,705
0604778A	114	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)	1,574		1,574
0604780A	115	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	3,998		3,998
0604783A	116	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	9,437		9,437
0604801A	117	AVIATION - SDD	2,379		2,379
0604802A	118	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - SDD	129,409	20,000	149,409
		Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System (APKWS)		[20,000]	
0604804A	119	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - SDD	86,288		86,288
0604805A	120	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYS - SDD	219,088		219,088
0604807A	121	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MED BIOLOGICAL DEF EQPMT - SDD	12,202		12,202
0604808A	122	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - SDD	90,396		90,396
0604814A	123	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS	133,994		133,994
0604817A	124	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	3,541		3,541
0604818A	125	ARMY TAC CMD & CNTRL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	98,129	3,900	102,029
		Army Airborne Command and Control System (A2C2S)		[3,900]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0604819A	126	LOSAT	30,809		30,809
0604820A	127	RADAR DEVELOPMENT			
0604823A	128	FIREFINDER	27,107		27,107
0604854A	129	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS	32,629		32,629
0604865A	130	PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION	174,475	-174,475	
		Transfer to PE 64865C (RDDW 90)		[-174,475]	
0605013A	131	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	47,566		47,566
0604256A	132	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	17,751		17,751
0604258A	133	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,890		13,890
0604759A	134	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	62,135		62,135
0605103A	135	RAND ARROYO CENTER	22,804		22,804
0605301A	136	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	137,307		137,307
0605326A	137	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	26,473		26,473
0605502A	138	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605601A	139	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	174,603		174,603
0605602A	140	ARMY TECH TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	54,986		54,986
0605604A	141	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	39,138		39,138
0605605A	142	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	17,806		17,806
0605606A	143	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	3,098		3,098
0605702A	144	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	9,669		9,669
0605706A	145	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	15,832		15,832
0605709A	146	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	3,579		3,579
0605712A	147	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	67,795		67,795
0605716A	148	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	57,074		57,074

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0605718A	149	SIMULATION & MODELING FOR ACQ, RQTS, & TNG (SMART)	2,654		2,654
0605801A	150	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	71,555		71,555
0605803A	151	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	28,520		28,520
0605805A	152	MUNITIONS STANDARD, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	19,855		19,855
0605857A	153	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	4,938		4,938
0605898A	154	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (R&D)	8,995		8,995
0909999A	155	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
0603778A	156	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	84,839		84,839
0102419A	157	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	57,549		57,549
0203610A	158	DOMESTIC PREP AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTR			
0203726A	159	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	28,917		28,917
0203735A	160	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	24,486	4,700	29,186
		Abrams track improvement		[4,700]	
0203740A	161	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	39,581		39,581
0203744A	162	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PROD IMPROVEMENT PGMS	187,959	100,000	287,959
		UH-60M Blackhawk recapitalization (transfer from procurement)		[100,000]	
0203752A	163	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PGM	3,399	5,000	8,399
		Full authority digital engine control (FADEC)		[5,000]	
0203758A	164	DIGITIZATION	18,251		18,251
0203759A	165	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD, BRIG AND BELOW (FBCB2)	48,436		48,436
0203761A	166	FORCE XXI, WARFIGHTING RAPID ACQUISITION PROGRAM			
0203801A	167	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PGM	44,468	4,000	48,468
		PAC-3 antenna mast group		[4,000]	
0203802A	168	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	9,822		9,822

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0203806A	169	TRACTOR RUT	8,851		8,851
0203808A	170	TRACTOR CARD	9,255		9,255
0208010A	171	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	16,543		16,543
0208053A	172	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	9,767		9,767
0301359A	173	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	5,968		5,968
0303028A	174	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES		10,000	10,000
		Base protection and monitoring system		[8,000]	
		Portable documentation exploitation		[2,000]	
0303140A	175	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	20,728		20,728
0303141A	176	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	58,983		58,983
0303142A	177	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	87,352		87,352
0303150A	178	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	20,124		20,124
0305114A	179	TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEM	956		956
0305204A	180	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	60,493		60,493
0305206A	181	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,751		4,751
0305208A	182	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	32,292		32,292
0708045A	183	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	65,981		65,981
1001018A	184	NATO JOINT STARS	503		503
		Financial information systems		-18,200	-18,200
		Total, RDT&E Army	**9,122,825**	**-110,325**	**9,012,500**

Fundamental research for the Army Objective Force

The budget request included $128.8 million in PE 61102A for basic research leading to new concepts and technologies for the Army Objective Force. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 61102A for basic research in support of the Army Objective Force: $2.0 million for advanced research in unique low temperature performance, energy and environmental challenges facing military ground vehicles and power systems; and $4.0 million for predictive modeling and information analysis of desert terrain in support of military operations.

Infrastructure protection research

The budget request included $84.8 million in PE 61104A for University and Industry Research Centers. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 61104A for basic research on infrastructure protection of military structures and installations. The committee notes that this research has significantly accelerated the reconstruction efforts for recently damaged military facilities and supports the continuation of these research efforts.

Ferroelectric nanomaterials fabrication

The budget request included $84.8 million in PE 61104A for university and industry research centers. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 61104A for research on novel ferroelectric nanomaterials fabrication methods.

Applied materials research

The budget request included $15.2 million in PE 62105A for applied research in materials technology. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62105A for materials research that would contribute to the development of the Objective Force: $3.0 million for advanced materials processing research in polymer composites, metals, ceramics and superalloys; and $3.0 million for the development of new multifunctional composite materials and new simulation tools for use in Future Combat Systems.

Army missile research

The budget request included $43.3 million in PE 62303A for applied research in missile technology. The committee recommends an increase of $17.0 million in PE 62303A for the development of new technologies for future Army missile systems: $6.5 million for technology development to improve capabilities for defeating incoming rockets, mortars, and artillery; $2.5 million for initial demonstrations of critical component technologies for future missile systems; and $8.0 million for the development of advanced radar architectures and efficient radar power and transmission technologies.

Advanced Concepts and Simulation Research

The budget request included $15.9 million in PE 62308A for the development of advanced concepts and simulation research. The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 62308A for technology development for Future Combat Systems: $5.0 mil-

lion for advanced photonics detector research; and $2.5 million for development of highly immersive simulation technologies.

Combat vehicle and automotive technology

The budget request included $80.9 million in PE 62601A for research on combat vehicles and automotive technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million in PE 62601A for this research: $3.0 million for advanced electric drives; $1.5 million for continued research on corrosion-resistant coatings; $2.0 million for rapid prototyping technologies; $3.0 million for advancing the introduction of affordable advanced power technologies into military land warfare systems; and $2.5 million for autonomous behavior research for the unmanned systems component of the Army Future Combat Systems. In a recent report entitled "Technology Development for Army Unmanned Ground Vehicles," the National Academy of Sciences noted that advances in human-robot interaction and the development of natural user interfaces for controllers of unmanned vehicles are essential for battlefield use of these systems.

Single crystal tungsten alloy penetrators

The budget request includes $39.5 million in PE 62624A for weapons and munitions technology. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for the research, development, and testing of single crystal tungsten alloy penetrators for use as a replacement for depleted uranium armor penetrators.

Flexible displays

The budget request included $33.7 million in PE 62705A for research in electronics and electric devices. The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 62705A for flexible display technology to support the Objective Force Warrior program.

Countermine capabilities

The budget request included $21.3 million in PE 62712A for applied research on countermine systems. The committee recognizes the importance of new, innovative technologies for the detection of landmines and encourages the Army to explore all possible technological solutions for quicker, more accurate detection. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $9.5 million in PE 62712A for the further development of countermine technologies: $2.5 million for chemical vapor sensing technologies; $5.0 million for advanced technologies for rapid and reliable countermine capabilities; and $2.0 million for the continued development of the synthetic aperture radar mine detection systems.

Environmental response and security protection

The budget request included $18.3 million in PE 62720A for Environmental Quality Technology. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million to enhance ongoing research and development of a user-friendly computer software system that would allow military installation security planners and managers to evaluate health risks and impacts associated with exposure to hazardous substances as a result of terrorist attacks.

Geosciences and atmospheric research

The budget request included $45.4 million in PE 62784A for Military Engineering Technology. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62784A for research in the environmental sciences, including climatology and weather patterning, which are critical to the determination of agent dispersion and other important phenomena.

Embedded optical communications

The budget request included $29.4 million in PE 62786A for Warfighter Technology. The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million in PE 62786A for the development of communications suites that will provide embedded optical communications for the Objective Force Warrior.

Enhanced anthrax research

The budget request included $58.9 million in PE 62787A for medical defense research. The committee recognizes the need to improve the understanding of the genes and proteins produced by the anthrax bacterium and the human immune response to anthrax. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62787A for the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases to conduct enhanced anthrax research.

Genomics research

The budget request included $35.2 million in PE 63002A for Medical Advanced Technology. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63002A for genomics research to address disease outbreaks resulting from chemical and biological attacks.

Medical Advanced Technology

The budget request included $35.2 million in PE 63002A for the development of advanced medical technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63002A for improved combat casualty care system: $5.0 million for the development of electronic garments integrated with biosensors for remote casualty assessment, triage and initial treatment; and $5.0 million for research on an enhanced collagen based stable hemostat.

Combat vehicle technology development and support

The budget request included $210.9 million in PE 63005A for Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology. The committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million in PE 63005A for research and development to support advanced combat vehicle technologies: $17.5 million to accelerate state of the art information and mobility technologies in the 21st Century Truck Initiative; $2.0 million for research utilizing advanced collaborative environments; $5.0 million for the development of on-board hydrogen generation for fuel cells in military ground vehicle systems; $1.5 million for the development of advanced technologies to improve the safety, reliability and quality of mechanically fastened, joined and bonded assemblies; $2.0 million for the development of tactical vehicle design tools; $1.5 million for research on advanced thermal manage-

ment controls; and $5.5 million for research on advanced composite materials for Future Combat Systems tactical and combat vehicles.

Interactive training technologies

The budget request included $18.6 million in PE 63015A for Next Generation Training and Simulation Systems. The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 63015A for the continued development of interactive technologies to support training and mission rehearsal exercises. The committee commends the Army for its innovative approach to highly immersive training and simulation through the creation of the Institute for Creative Technologies.

Close-in Active Protection

The budget request included $111.3 million in PE63313A for missile and rocket advanced technology, but no funding for the Close-in Active Protection System (CIAPS). The committee understands that fiscal year 2003 funding for the CIAPS supports a demonstration consisting of rocket-propelled grenades and anti-tank guided missiles that are flight tested against a CIAPS prototype mounted on a testbed Light Armored Vehicle. The CIAPS was developed to address the survivability issue inherent in armored vehicles, including the Army's Future Combat System (FCS). The committee believes that the FCS platform would benefit from technologies derived from CIAPS. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for CIAPS, for a total authorization of $117.3 million in PE63313A.

Warfighter/firefighter position, location, and tracking sensor

The budget request included $47.1 million in PE63710A for the night vision advanced technology but no funding for the warfighter/firefighter position, location, and tracking sensor, which is a system that locates friendly units inside of buildings. The committee notes that the Army conducted a demonstration using fiscal year 2003 funds and believes that this system has applicability in military operations in urban terrain environments. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE63710A for the continued development of the warfighter/firefighter position, location, and tracking sensor, for a total authorization of $50.1 million.

Advanced laser electric power

The budget request included $51.5 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense integration, but no funding for advanced laser elective power.

The committee is aware that the Army is developing high energy lasers (HELs) with the potential to defeat short range rockets and missiles, artillery shells, and a variety of aerial platforms. HEL concepts under development include solid state lasers. The development of compact, high efficiency fuel cells will be important to provide a reliable power source for these lasers.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.9 million in PE 63305A for research and development to improve the robustness of proton exchange membrane and similar fuel cell systems.

Advanced radars and electro-optical sensors

The budget request included $51.5 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense integration, but no funding for advanced radars and electro-optical sensors. The committee is aware of ongoing research and development in optical communications, optical imaging, ultrahigh bandwidth data transmission, digital radar and optical overhead sensors that have the potential to develop systems with high resolution, faster data analysis and processing to users, and to reduce size and power consumption.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million in PE 63305A for advanced radars and electro-optical sensors.

Integrated composite missile structures

The budget request contained $51.5 million in PE63305A, Army Missile Defense Integration, but no funding for integrated composite missile structures.

Current missile airframes are complex multi-tiered structures consisting of a heatshield, a bondline, and a substructure that can potentially limit missile performance because of inherent limits in thermal protection, structural integrity, and electromagnetic shielding properties. The committee believes, based on prior research and development efforts, that integrated composite missile structures have the potential to reduce cost and weight while significantly enhancing missile performance, including increased range and better thermal performance. These prior efforts also suggest that manufacturing such complex composite structures is feasible. The improved performance offered by such structures could be valuable for a variety of military applications, including missile defense.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE63305A to demonstrate the feasibility of manufacturing integrated composite missile structures.

Low cost interceptor

The budget request included $51.5 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense integration, but no funding for the low cost interceptor (LCI).

The LCI project is intended to develop a low cost missile interceptor to provide a cost effective defense to low cost airborne threats including cruise missiles and unmanned aerial vehicles while maintaining substantial capabilities against more sophisticated missile threats. The program has successfully completed preliminary design review and is scheduled to complete critical design in calendar year 2003. The committee believes that a low-cost adjunct to existing air and missile defenses would be a sound approach to addressing the proliferation of low-cost threats.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million to PE 63305A for continued design, fabrication, and testing of the low cost interceptor.

Mobile tactical high energy laser

The budget request included $51.5 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense integration, including $39.1 million for the mobile tactical high energy laser (MTHEL).

The Army, in cooperation with the Israeli Ministry of Defense, has developed a tactical high energy gas laser intended to provide defense against short range rockets and artillery. The Army tested this laser with considerable success against both types of targets. This prototype laser, however, is a large stationary facility. To meet Army and Israeli military air and missile defense needs, a smaller, mobile directed energy system is needed. To that end, the Army has requested funding for a joint U.S.-Israeli development program. The committee notes that this effort has considerable merit as a pathfinder for the Army's objective of developing a solid state THEL.

To help sustain the MTHEL effort, the committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63305A.

Radar power technology

The budget request included $51.5 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense integration, but no funding for radar power technology.

The committee believes that wide bandgap electronics for radars have the potential to significantly increase system performance, reduce size and weight, and reduce logistics requirements. Prior year funding for silicon carbide wide bandgap electronics have supported research, test, experiment and demonstration of enhanced radar transmit/receive modules and amplifiers, antennas, and other radar component technology. The committee understands that additional funds could be used to support insertion and test of these technologies in current Army systems, as well as those under development.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63305A for radar power technology.

Air and missile defense architecture analysis

The budget request included $80.0 million in PE 63327A for air and missile defense systems engineering. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for air and missile defense architecture analysis.

Managing Army Technologies for Environmental Enhancement Program

The budget request included $11.5 million in PR 63779A for environmental quality technology. The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million to complete the development and validation of the Managing Army Technologies for Environmental Enhancement (MANATEE) program, a facility-wide integrated environmental monitoring, management, and control system for the Radford Army Ammunition Plant. The purpose of MANATEE is to manage facility activities to prevent hazardous waste spills and other environmental compliance problems.

Manganese Health Research Project

The budget request included $11.5 million in PE 63779A for environmental quality technology. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to initiate a Manganese Health Research Project to determine the health effects of manganese and to develop

proper worker safeguards. The military departments are significant customers of manganese. Manganese is a component of coated welding rods and various steel alloys. As a result, there can be exposure to manganese during welding or steelmaking and through the handling of batteries or petroleum products in which manganese is used as an additive. Although much is known about the toxicity of manganese, it would be useful to have additional information on human exposure assessments and identification of mechanisms for determining disposition and damage in the human body.

Logistics and engineer equipment

The budget request included $12.0 million in PE63804A for logistics and engineer equipment advanced development. This program supports the advanced component development and prototypes of new and improved technologies for combat support and combat service support equipment essential to sustaining combat operations.

Of the $12.0 million for logistics and engineer equipment advanced development, $3.8 million was requested for marine-orientated logistics equipment advanced development in support of the Army's logistics-over-the-shore (LOTS) mission. The committee understands that the Theater Support Vessel (TSV) is the primary equipment funded in this program and that the TSV is the Army's replacement for the logistics support vessel. The committee notes that the Army and the Navy have cooperatively leased a commercial fast ferry for development and testing. The committee believes that both the Army and Navy will benefit from the prototype, which is built on a composite hull design, currently under study by the Army.

Of the $12.0 million for logistics and engineer equipment advanced development, no funding was requested for the Mobile Parts Hospital (MPH). The MPH is a self-contained, self-sustaining mobile mini-manufacturing center that can produce spare parts near the point of need. The committee notes that the Army used previous year congressionally-directed funding increases to design and demonstrate an off-site capability to fabricate parts on demand. The committee believes that advanced development will enable the rapid repair and return to service of disabled equipment, and address the military priority of weapon system readiness.

The committee recommends an increase of $13.5 million for logistics and engineer equipment of which $7.5 million is for the continued development of the TSV and $6.0 million for the advanced development of the MPH, for a total authorization of $25.5 million in PE63804A for logistics and engineer equipment.

Automated technologies for biodefense

The budget request included $11.0 million in PE 63807A for advanced development of medical systems. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63807A for research leading to automated and fully networked devices for detection of biological agents.

Tactical unmanned ground vehicle

The budget request included no funding in PE64641 for the development of the tactical unmanned ground vehicle (TUGV) program. The TUGV program includes a family of products including the Man-Portable Robotic System (MPRS), the Tactical Unmanned Vehicle-Medium (TUV–M), and Viking, a large flail system mounted on a bulldozer designed for tactical employment as a mine clearing system. The committee understands that fiscal year 2002 and 2003 funding demonstrated the Viking mine clearing capability but that the system is too wide and heavy to be air delivered via C–130 aircraft. The committee believes that this transformational capability should be accelerated to develop a TUGV which is C–130 transportable. The committee recommends an increase of $2.8 million in PE64641 for the tactical unmanned ground vehicle, for a total authorization of $2.8 million.

Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System

The budget request included $35.1 million in PE64802A for the Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System (APKWS). The APKWS is a family of 2.75-inch precision rockets that will be achieved through a series of block upgrades to the existing HYDRA–70 rocket system. The committee understands that the APKWS Block I program will enter system development and demonstration in fiscal year 2003 to develop, test, and qualify a laser guided 2.75-inch munition and complete a limited-user test in fiscal year 2005. However, future planned enhancements including the development and qualification of an improved warhead and fuze, are not planned until fiscal year 2006–2007. The committee believes that the Army would benefit from an acceleration of the development of these safety enhancements. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for the development of the APKWS, for a total authorization of $55.1 million in PE64802A.

Viper strike munition

The budget request included no funding in PE64767A for the development of the Viper strike munition. Viper strike munitions, using a semi-active laser seeker to find its designated targets, provide the Army with an armed, unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) with pinpoint accuracy against an unlimited target set operating with man-in-the-loop control. The committee understands that the Army is developing Viper munitions as a derivative of the brilliant anti-tank submunition and, during a March 29 and 30, 2003, demonstration, dispensed Viper munitions from a Hunter UAV which scored seven direct hits in nine attempts against targets. The committee believes that this transformational capability should be accelerated for fielding to the combatant commanders as soon as feasible. The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million for the continued development of Viper strike munitions, for a total authorization of $7.5 million in PE64767A.

Army airborne command and control system

The budget request included $23.2 million in PE64818A for the development of a integrated suite of radios, antennas and computers aboard a UH–60L Blackhawk helicopter for airborne com-

mand and control. The committee notes that the Army has deployed two prototypes to the Iraq theater of operations even though the airborne aviation command and control system (A2C2S) has not undergone an initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E). The Army continues to conduct systems integration activities while preparing for the IOT&E scheduled for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends an increase of $3.9 million for systems integration for A2C2S, for a total authorization of $27.1 million in PE64818A.

Combat vehicle improvement program

The budget request included $24.5 million in PE23735A for the Abrams tank improvement program, but no funding for Abrams track improvement. The committee understands that the tank track is the top consumable operations and support cost driver for the Abrams tank. The Army's overall modernization strategy includes preserving the essential warfighting capabilities and readiness of current Army units through very limited modernization and recapitalization efforts. The Army expects to retain these legacy force units for over 30 years. The committee notes that the Army has not completed developmental testing. The committee recommends an increase of $4.7 million for the continued development of Abrams track, for a total authorization of $29.2 million in PE23735A.

Full authority digital engine control

The budget request included $3.4 million in PE23752 for the aircraft engine component improvement program, but no funding for the continued development of full authority digital engine control (FADEC). The FADEC would apply to all current and future Army turbine engines, significantly reducing procurement costs, improving engine capability, and increasing pilot safety by reducing pilot workload. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for the development of the FADEC, for a total authorization of $8.4 million in PE23752 for the aircraft engine component improvement program.

Base protection and monitoring system

The budget request included no funding in research, development, test and evaluation, Army, PE 33028A, for Security and Intelligence Activities. As threats to military installations become more complex, effective force protection measures require improved situational awareness and enhanced command and control capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 33028A to establish a test-bed for a state-of-the-art base protection and monitoring system operations center, preferably at a teaching installation that can leverage its ability to formulate training and doctrine for the optimal employment of such capabilities, to demonstrate an integrated warning system to protect critical infrastructure, enhance detection, and improve physical security.

Document exploitation

The budget request included no funding for PE 33028A, Security and Intelligence Activities. Portable, rugged document exploitation equipment is currently not available to military personnel operating in deployed, austere environments. The technology exists to develop lightweight equipment that can scan documents, quickly search for key words in native languages and transmit potentially valuable documents back to exploitation facilities quickly, thus providing battlefield commanders with rapid exploitation of captured information. Such equipment would have been indispensable in Afghanistan and Iraq, and will prove invaluable in the global war on terrorism. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 33028A to develop and begin fielding portable document exploitation systems.

Navy

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY			
0601103N	1	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	70,669	-70,669	
		Transfer program to PE 61103D8Z (RDDW 3)		[-70,669]	
0601152N	2	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	17,400		17,400
0601153N	3	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	368,517	9,500	378,017
		Robotic countermine technology		[3,000]	
		Neutron detection technology		[1,500]	
		Advanced power and propulsion		[5,000]	
0602114N	4	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	114,144	1,000	115,144
		Gallium nitride materials		[6,000]	
		Free electron laser		[10,000]	
		Chemical detection on UAVs		[2,000]	
		Silver Fox UAV		[8,000]	
		Transfer to PE 63114N (RDN 18), Navy accounting error		[-25,000]	
0602123N	5	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	75,909	18,300	94,209
		Advanced fusion processing		[5,000]	
		Fiber reinforced polymers		[4,000]	
		Corrosion modeling		[4,500]	
		Polymeric aircraft components		[4,800]	
0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	31,778		31,778
0602232N	7	COMMUNICATIONS, CMD AND CONTROL, INTEL, SURVEIL			
0602233N	8	HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY			
0602234N	9	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY			
0602235N	10	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	59,022		59,022

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0602236N	11	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	52,213	18,500	70,713
		Bioagent diagnostic tool		[4,000]	
		Biowarfare agent detector		[4,000]	
		Low observable materials		[6,000]	
		Carbon thermostat materials		[1,500]	
		Space tether system		[1,000]	
		Coastal mapping systems		[2,000]	
0602271N	12	RF SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	44,019	5,000	49,019
		High brightness electron sources		[3,000]	
		Advanced semiconductor research		[2,000]	
0602435N	13	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	48,785	6,000	54,785
		Ocean observing systems		[6,000]	
0602633N	14	UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY			
0602747N	15	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	62,583	2,800	65,383
		Low acoustic signature motors & propulsion		[2,800]	
0602782N	16	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	47,490		47,490
0602805N	17	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM			
0603114N	18	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	173,478	25,000	198,478
		Transfer from PE 62114N (RDN 4), Navy accounting error		[25,000]	
0603123N	19	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	55,780	18,800	74,580
		Project M - Mark V seat demonstration		[4,700]	
		HTS AC synchronous motor		[10,000]	
		Laser welding for shipbuilding		[4,100]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603235N	20	COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	69,194	10,000	79,194
		Consolidated undersea situational awareness		[4,000]	
		Shipboard automated reconstruction capability		[6,000]	
0603236N	21	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	54,794	12,500	67,294
		Automated container and cargo handling system		[6,500]	
		Emerging/critical interconnection technologies		[3,000]	
		Expeditionary logistics software development		[3,000]	
0603271N	22	RF SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	45,475	10,000	55,475
		Precision surveillance and targeting radar		[10,000]	
0603508N	23	SURFACE SHIP & SUBMARINE HM&E ADVANCED TECH			
0603640M	24	MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECH DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	56,404	12,900	69,304
		Water purification technology		[6,000]	
		CETO		[1,500]	
		Dragon Eye UAV		[3,500]	
		Expeditionary communications system		[1,900]	
0603706N	25	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT			
0603707N	26	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV			
0603712N	27	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNY			
0603727N	28	NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM	151,058		151,058
0603729N	29	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	11,435		11,435
0603747N	30	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	38,168		38,168
0603757N	31	JOINT WARFARE EXPERIMENTS	13,684	15,000	28,684
		Modeling and simulation for homeland defense		[15,000]	
0603758N	32	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	20,584		20,584

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603782N	33	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHN	31,719	7,500	39,219
		Augmented reality research		[3,500]	
		Hyperspectral mapping		[4,000]	
0603792N	34	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION			
0603207N	35	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	22,832		22,832
0603216N	36	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	6,809	8,000	14,809
		Rotorcraft external airbag protection system (REAPS)		[8,000]	
0603237N	37	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	79,449		79,449
0603254N	38	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	11,149		11,149
0603261N	39	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	7,051		7,051
0603382N	40	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	3,394	4,000	7,394
		Improved combat information center (CIC)		[4,000]	
0603502N	41	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	140,731		140,731
0603506N	42	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	48,347		48,347
0603512N	43	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	144,965	21,000	165,965
		Aviation Ship Integration Center		[14,000]	
		Advanced battle station/decision support system		[7,000]	
0603513N	44	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	20,431	3,000	23,431
		Improved surface vessel torpedo launcher		[3,000]	
0603525N	45	PILOT FISH	95,301		95,301
0603527N	46	RETRACT LARCH	74,111		74,111
0603536N	47	RETRACT JUNIPER	20,526		20,526
0603542N	48	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	1,112		1,112

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603553N	49	SURFACE ASW	2,506	2,500	5,006
		ASW risk reduction		[2,500]	
0603559N	50	SSGN CONVERSION	68,988		68,988
0603561N	51	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	52,744	36,700	89,444
		Submarine advanced payload and sensors		[25,000]	
		Rotary electromagnetic launcher		[3,000]	
		Advanced metal fiber brushes		[8,700]	
0603562N	52	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	6,027		6,027
0603563N	53	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	7,679		7,679
0603564N	54	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES			
0603570N	55	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	201,239		201,239
0603573N	56	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	1,468		1,468
0603576N	57	CHALK EAGLE	17,463		17,463
0603581N	58	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	158,071	35,000	193,071
		LCS mission module development		[35,000]	
0603582N	59	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	86,836		86,836
0603609N	60	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	42,539		42,539
0603611M	61	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	240,695		240,695
0603612M	62	MARINE CORPS MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	1,215		1,215
0603635M	63	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	19,700	12,500	32,200
		Non-lethal weapons		[12,500]	
0603654N	64	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	12,385		12,385
0603658N	65	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	72,506		72,506

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603713N	66	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	18,180	3,500	21,680
		Distress signalling system evaluation		[3,500]	
0603721N	67	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	30,127	3,000	33,127
		Integrated Marine Mammal Monitoring and Protection System		[3,000]	
0603724N	68	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	1,713		1,713
0603725N	69	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,440		1,440
0603734N	70	CHALK CORAL	61,453		61,453
0603739N	71	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	7,591		7,591
0603746N	72	RETRACT MAPLE	300,864		300,864
0603748N	73	LINK PLUMERIA	105,363		105,363
0603751N	74	RETRACT ELM	43,755		43,755
0603755N	75	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	9,733		9,733
0603764N	76	LINK EVERGREEN	95,796		95,796
0603787N	77	SPECIAL PROCESSES	53,450		53,450
0603790N	78	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	7,941		7,941
0603795N	79	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	63,434		63,434
0603851M	80	NONLETHAL WEAPONS	43,445		43,445
0603857N	81	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVAL TEAM (ASCIET)	16,765		16,765
0603860N	82	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	24,304		24,304
0603879N	83	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) SYS ENGINEER (SE)	15,053		15,053
0603889N	84	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS			
0604272N	85	TAC AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM			
0604327N	86	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYS (HDBTDS)			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0604707N	87	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCH/ENG SPT	31,369	5,000	36,369
		Advanced wireless network		[5,000]	
0603662N	88	FOREIGN COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE (FCI)	[ ]		
0603787N	89	SPECIAL PROCESSES	[ ]		
0603831N	90	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]		
0604212N	91	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	66,764	1,000	67,764
		Advanced helicopter tow cable		[1,000]	
0604214N	92	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	10,527	7,000	17,527
		AV-8B aircraft engine development		[7,000]	
0604215N	93	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	50,063		50,063
0604216N	94	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	76,998		76,998
0604217N	95	S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT			
0604218N	96	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	4,309		4,309
0604221N	97	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	7,306	12,300	19,606
		P-3 AIP phased capability upgrade		[12,300]	
0604230N	98	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,466	3,000	4,466
		Deployable autonomous distribution systems for MIUW		[3,000]	
0604231N	99	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	68,805		68,805
0604234N	100	E-2C RADAR MODERNIZATION	352,298		352,298
0604245N	101	H-1 UPGRADES	90,589		90,589
0604261N	102	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	15,831		15,831
0604262N	103	V-22A	441,142		441,142
0604264N	104	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,765		8,765
0604270N	105	EW DEVELOPMENT	256,701		256,701

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0604273N	106	VHXX EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	197,431		197,431
0604280N	107	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	87,943		87,943
0604300N	108	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	1,037,987		1,037,987
0604307N	109	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	205,733		205,733
0604311N	110	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	7,989		7,989
0604312N	111	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	25,137		25,137
0604329N	112	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)			
0604366N	113	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	76,927	46,000	122,927
		ERAM acceleration		[46,000]	
0604373N	114	AIRBORNE MCM	88,514		88,514
0604503N	115	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	80,815	5,000	85,815
		Submarine antenna technology improvements		[5,000]	
0604504N	116	AIR CONTROL	10,472		10,472
0604507N	117	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	1,006		1,006
0604512N	118	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	18,352		18,352
0604518N	119	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	21,244		21,244
0604558N	120	NEW DESIGN SSN	112,355	26,200	138,555
		Virginia class - information assurance		[8,200]	
		Virginia class - multi mission module		[10,000]	
		Virginia class - network centric architecture		[8,000]	
0604561N	121	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	13,482		13,482
0604562N	122	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	32,238	20,000	52,238
		Submarine tactical control system		[10,000]	
		Submarine weapons control system		[10,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0604567N	123	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	138,017		138,017
0604574N	124	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	2,267		2,267
0604601N	125	MINE DEVELOPMENT	1,497		1,497
0604603N	126	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	9,701		9,701
0604610N	127	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	3,442		3,442
0604618N	128	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	33,029		33,029
0604654N	129	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,136		8,136
0604703N	130	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	1,941		1,941
0604710N	131	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM		3,500	3,500
		Uninterruptible PEM fuel cell		[3,500]	
0604721N	132	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	16,942		16,942
0604727N	133	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	775		775
0604755N	134	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	40,930		40,930
0604756N	135	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	23,076		23,076
0604757N	136	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	35,508	11,000	46,508
		NULKA decoy development		[7,000]	
		Radar absorbing tiles		[4,000]	
0604771N	137	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	9,121		9,121
0604777N	138	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	45,726		45,726
0604784N	139	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	28,755		28,755
0604800N	140	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	2,171,736	56,000	2,227,736
		Interchangeable engine development		[56,000]	
0604910N	141	SMART CARD	552		552
0605013M	142	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	8,835		8,835

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0605013N	143	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	30,562	2,000	32,562
		Wireless sensor technologies		[2,000]	
0605014N	144	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MIL HUMAN RESOURCES SYS (DIMHRS)	78,724		78,724
0605015N	145	JOINT COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT GRP (JCAG)			
0605500N	146	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	76,243		76,243
0508713N	147	NAVY STANDARD INTEGRATED PERSONNEL SYSTEM (NSIPS)	4,653		4,653
0604256N	148	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	28,004		28,004
0604258N	149	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	37,638		37,638
0604759N	150	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	43,908		43,908
0605152N	151	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	4,431	1,000	5,431
		Fire retardant fibers		[1,000]	
0605154N	152	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	40,726		40,726
0605155N	153	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,006		2,006
0605502N	154	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605804N	155	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	726		726
0605853N	156	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	30,236	3,500	33,736
		Warfare analysis and education		[3,500]	
0605856N	157	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,883		3,883
0605861N	158	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	64,885		64,885
0605862N	159	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	13,554		13,554
0605863N	160	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	78,648		78,648
0605864N	161	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	258,471		258,471
0605865N	162	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	12,094		12,094
0605866N	163	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	3,187		3,187

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0605867N	164	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	12,091		12,091
0605873M	165	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	16,635		16,635
0909999N	166	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
0603660N	167	ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	[ ]		
0603661N	168	RETRACT VIOLET	[ ]		
0101221N	169	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	104,793	1,500	106,293
		Thin plate pure lead batteries		[1,500]	
0101224N	170	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	38,408		38,408
0101226N	171	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	2,955		2,955
0101402N	172	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	27,357		27,357
0203761N	173	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	14,662		14,662
0204136N	174	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	179,047		179,047
0204152N	175	E-2 SQUADRONS	9,083		9,083
0204163N	176	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	16,484		16,484
0204229N	177	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MSN PLANNING CTR (TMPC)	71,385	10,000	81,385
		Precision target aided navigation (PTAN)		[10,000]	
0204311N	178	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	14,278		14,278
0204413N	179	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	5,652		5,652
0204571N	180	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	21,719		21,719
0204574N	181	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,466		1,466
0204575N	182	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	11,927		11,927
0205601N	183	HARM IMPROVEMENT	49,381		49,381
0205604N	184	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	44,526		44,526
0205620N	185	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	12,179		12,179

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0205632N	186	MK-48 ADCAP	17,227		17,227
0205633N	187	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	60,073		60,073
0205658N	188	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	7,236		7,236
0205667N	189	F-14 UPGRADE			
0205675N	190	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	62,751		62,751
0206313M	191	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	235,722		235,722
0206623M	192	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYS	35,439		35,439
0206624M	193	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	19,723		19,723
0207161N	194	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	2,322		2,322
0207163N	195	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	9,297		9,297
0301303N	196	MARITIME INTELLIGENCE	[ ]		
0301323N	197	CPLLECTION MANAGEMENT	[ ]		
0301327N	198	TECHNICAL RECONNAISANNCE AND SURVEILLANCE	[ ]		
0303109N	199	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	379,541		379,541
0303140N	200	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	18,404		18,404
0304111N	201	SPACE ACTIVITIES	[ ]		
0305149N	202	COBRA JUDY	69,369		69,369
0305160N	203	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	4,966		4,966
0305188N	204	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	50,413		50,413
0305192N	205	JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	5,314		5,314
0305204N	206	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	56,521	46,400	102,921
		Fire Scout UAV		[46,400]	
0305205N	207	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	101,448		101,448

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0305206N	208	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,345	5,100	18,445
		Podded sensors for air recconnaissance		[5,100]	
0305207N	209	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,717		13,717
0305208N	210	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	4,421		4,421
0305927N	211	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE			
0308601N	212	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	7,044	2,000	9,044
		Verification, validation and accreditation improvements		[2,000]	
0702207N	213	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	9,073		9,073
0708011N	214	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	54,593		54,593
0708730N	215	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	10,068		10,068
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	1,028,497		1,028,497
		Financial information systems		-15,200	-15,200
		Total, RDT&E Navy	**14,106,653**	**483,631**	**14,590,284**

Naval basic research

The budget request included $368.5 million in PE 61153N for basic research to support naval applications. The committee recommends an increase of $9.5 million in PE 61153N for Defense Research Sciences: $3.0 million for autonomous robotic countermine technology in very shallow water and surf zones; $5.0 million for research in advanced power and propulsion technology systems; and $1.5 million for advanced research in neutron detection technologies.

Free electron laser

The budget request included $114.1 million in PE 62114N for Power Projection Applied Research. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62114N for acceleration of the high power free electron laser (FEL) power scaling project. The Navy has identified free electron lasers as a possible future directed energy weapon for the defense of Navy assets. The committee commends the Navy for the support of the FEL program and expects the Office of Naval Research to fully fund the ongoing program to reach the 100 kilowatt power level.

Microelectronics and materials development

The budget request included $114.1 million in PE 62114N for Power Projection Applied Research. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62114N for research in gallium nitride microelectronics to enhance radio frequency power performance on Navy radar systems.

Transformational unmanned aerial vehicles capabilities

The budget request included $114.1 million in PE 62114N for applied research in power projection. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62114N for the accelerated development of transformational UAVs: $2.0 million for the development of chemical weapon detection capabilities for small, lightweight UAVs; and $8.0 million for the continued development and testing of the Silver Fox unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). The committee commends the Navy for successfully building and testing this innovative UAV in less than two years. The committee notes that the Silver Fox UAV recently flew missions in Operation Iraqi Freedom and will continue to develop increased sensing and intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities.

Force Protection Applied Research

The budget request included $75.9 million in PE 62123N for Force Protection Applied Research. The committee recommends an increase of $18.3 million in PE 62123N for force protection research: $5.0 million for advanced fusion processing to enable the fusion of hyperspectral and panchromatic data; $4.0 million for reliability-based structural analysis and design of fiber reinforced polymers for ship structures; $4.8 million to develop rapid prototype polymeric aircraft components; and $4.5 million for the development of a corrosion modeling software tool to study discrete structural corrosion.

Advanced research for Naval systems

The budget request included $52.2 million in PE 62236N for Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research. The committee recommends an increase of $8.5 million in PE 62236N for applied research in future warfighter systems: $1.0 million for the integration of tether technology onto unmanned aerial vehicles and the demonstration of surveillance and electrodynamic propulsion capabilities; $6.0 million for the development and demonstration of high performance low observable materials for Navy stealth applications; and $1.5 million for the continued development of low cost composite forms for aerospace platforms.

Biowarfare detection and diagnosis

The budget request included $52.2 million in PE 62236N for Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62236N for biowarfare detection and diagnosis technologies: $4.0 million for the development of mass spectrometric-based instrumental diagnostic tools for rapid diagnosis of infectious disease; and $4.0 million for developing inexpensive, sensitive and reliable detectors for biowarfare agents.

Coastal mapping systems

The budget request included $52.2 million in PE 62236N for Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62236N for the development of coastal area mapping systems.

Electronics research for naval applications

The budget request included $44.0 million in PE 62271N for applied research in radio frequency systems. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62271N for applied research in materials and electronics to enable future naval capabilities: $3.0 million for research on high brightness electron sources for vacuum electronics applications; and $2.0 million for advanced semiconductor materials research for high power amplifiers.

Ocean observing program

The budget request included $48.8 million in PE 62435N for ocean warfighting environment applied research. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62435N to continue efforts to develop an information system to collect, integrate and disseminate ocean observations and predictions.

Low acoustic signature motors and propulsors

The budget request included $62.6 million in PE 62747N for applied research to support the development of undersea warfare technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $2.8 million in PE 62747N for research on high power battery systems, motors, propulsors, and power converters for torpedoes.

Office of Naval Research accounting adjustment

The budget request included $173.5 million in PE 63114N for Power Projection Advanced Technology. The committee rec-

ommends a transfer of $25.0 million into PE 63114N from PE 62114N. This transfer reflects the correction of an accounting error by the Office of Naval Research and does not reflect a reduction in any program.

High temperature superconducting alternating current synchronous motor

The budget request included $55.8 million in PE 63123N for various force protection advanced technology development activities, but included no funding to continue development of a high-temperature, superconducting (HTS), alternating current (AC), synchronous motor. The Navy is working on the electric warship program to address electrical and auxiliary system component technology to provide improvements in system energy and power density, system operating efficiency, and ability to recover from casualties.

The Navy is shifting to integrated electric propulsion approaches for the fleet, most notably in the DD(X) destroyer program. HTS AC motors and generators hold the potential to be much smaller, quieter, and less expensive than alternative systems.

The committee believes that the Navy should continue development efforts on a large scale HTS motor to determine whether such a motor could serve as a central component of a propulsion system. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $10.0 million in PE 63123N to build and begin testing a DD(X)-size HTS AC synchronous motor.

Laser welding for shipbuilding

The budget request included $55.8 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology, but did not include funding for the laser welding and cutting program. Transition and qualification of laser welding and cutting processes would significantly reduce ship construction costs while affording ship designers greater flexibility, and ultimately improve ship performance. The committee recommends an increase of $4.1 million in PE 63123N for the development and qualification of the laser welding process for naval ship construction.

Project M

The budget request included $55.8 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology, but included no funding for Project M, which would develop active control seats for use in the Mark V patrol boat. The current seats in the Mark V patrol boat offer little protection to individuals at high speed under operational conditions. As a result, injuries are common. A prototype, active controlled seat has been demonstrated in the laboratory. The committee recommends an increase of $4.7 million in PE 63123N for Project M.

Common picture technologies

The budget request included $69.2 million in PE 63235N for Common Picture Advanced Technology. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63235N for common picture research and development: $4.0 million for development

and certification of undersea situational awareness capabilities; and $6.0 million for the development of a shipboard automated reconstruction capability.

Warfighter sustainment advanced technology

The budget request included $54.8 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology. This included funding for various efforts to support expeditionary logistics, but included no funding for automated handling of cargo or containers, or for the emerging/critical interconnection technologies (E/CIT) program.

The expeditionary logistics investment is intended to develop and improve transformational Naval surface distribution/replenishment techniques, and to improve the situational awareness of readiness and operating logistics status. The committee believes that the Navy could employ software products that use decision support planning tools to process timely, accurate information on tactical equipment and weapons system on the battlefield. Sensors installed on equipment could relay diagnostic data that could be used to determine logistics and supply priorities, while achieving a much smaller support force footprint ashore. The Navy needs to continue software development to improve expeditionary logistics management. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 in PE 63236N million to continue this development effort.

An automated cargo and container handling system would provide the Navy with a capability of offloading supply ships in support of sea-based operations. The concept would use multi-point stabilization to overcome the dangerous pendulum effect that can plague existing shipboard cranes. The committee recommends an increase of $6.5 in PE 63236N million to initiate the development, fabrication, and testing of an automated container and cargo handling system which would be capable of operating in sea states up to sea state three.

The E/CIT program would strengthen the ability of both the Department of Defense and industry to support the military's unique printed circuit board requirements through an integrated program of research, education, and industrial extension. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for the E/CIT program, for a total authorization of $67.3 in PE 63236N.

Precision surveillance and targeting radar

The budget request included $45.5 million in PE 63271N for radio frequency (RF) systems advanced technology, including $9.2 million for various developments within the surface and aerospace surveillance advanced RF systems project. Under the time-critical strike (TCS) activities within this project, the Navy completed an initial design of a pod-mounted precision surveillance and targeting (PS&T) radar system based on AN/APY–6 technology for in-flight captive carry by Navy F/A–18 aircraft.

Within the past year, the Navy has decided to redirect the PS&T development effort. Due to changed program requirements, the Navy intends to reconfigure the design of the PS&T radar from the previous pod-mounted configuration to an internal carriage configuration for time-critical targeting demonstrations on board the

Navy's Global Hawk Broad Area Maritime Surveillance (BAMS) unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV).

The intent of this effort would be to demonstrate a low cost, lightweight, high resolution synthetic aperture/ground moving target indicator radar for BAMS and other platforms. The committee believes that this is a high priority effort for finding and engaging difficult targets on the battlefield. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63271N to accelerate development and demonstration of the PS&T system.

Marine Corps Warfighting Laboratory

The budget request included $56.4 million for PE 63640M for Marine Corps Advanced Technology Demonstration. The committee recommends an increase of $12.9 million in PE 63640M for technology development and transition efforts at the Marine Corps Warfighting Laboratory (MCWL): $6.0 million for development of advanced water purification technology; $1.5 million for the Center for Emerging Threats and Opportunities (CETO); $3.5 million to accelerate the Dragon Eye unmanned aerial vehicle, a low-cost, light-weight, expendable platform which recently performed in the Iraqi theater, giving the Marines vital over-the-hill situational awareness; and $1.9 million for the enhancement of the Sea Viking 2004 expeditionary tactical communications system.

The committee commends the Marine Corps Warfighting Laboratory for its technology development efforts and quick reaction capabilities. The MCWL, through the wargaming and concept of operations analysis capabilities of CETO, has provided quick situational analysis to the senior warfighting commanders, thereby preventing operational and tactical surprise, and has played a critical role in the Global War on Terrorism.

Modeling and simulation for homeland defense

The budget request includes $13.7 million PE 63757N for Joint Warfighting Experiments to conduct simulations and sustain support structures to be used by the Joint Warfighting Center, U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) to develop new joint warfighting concepts and to support efforts to develop the doctrine and concepts associated with Department of Defense (DOD) support to homeland security. The budget request did not include any funding specifically for the purpose of developing new, alternative modeling and simulations capabilities to support the homeland defense responsibilities of the DOD and the armed forces.

The committee urges the Commander, JFCOM, to aggressively seek alternative modeling and simulation concepts and proposals that have the potential for adaptation to the unique needs of the DOD, with their overarching domestic and international defense responsibilities. Investment must continue in all aspects of national security simulation to ensure that all of the components necessary to represent all aspects of the Department's national security responsibilities are being developed to ultimately interact with an overall family of simulations.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E), Navy, PE 63757N, to be used only by the Commander, JFCOM, to develop

and demonstrate models of U.S. urban areas, simulations on the employment of weapons of mass destruction in these urban areas, simulations on the capabilities of the Department's civil support capabilities, interactive capacity for live responses for local, state and national civil authorities, and the means to ultimately become part of a larger full-spectrum national security modeling and simulation architecture. Having such components and alternatives to existing simulation architectures will greatly assist the Commander, JFCOM, in evaluating available alternatives and developing the right integrating architecture to maximize their training and readiness potential.

Mine warfare technology

The budget request included $31.7 million in PE 63782N to support research in mine and expeditionary warfare technology. The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 63782N for this account: $3.5 million for augmented reality technologies which enhance maritime navigation, operational security and harbor defense; and $4.0 million for near global hyperspectral mapping of littoral regions.

Rotorcraft external airbag protection system

The budget request included $6.8 million in PE 63216N for aviation survivability developments, but included no funding for the continued evaluation of the rotorcraft external airbag protection system (REAPS). As noted in the Senate Report accompanying S.2514 (S. Rept. 107–151), the committee considers REAPS a viable option for making helicopter crashes significantly more survivable. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63216N for the continued development of REAPS.

Improved shipboard combat information center

The budget request included $3.4 million in PE 63382N for advanced combat system technology, but included no funding for an improved shipboard combat information center (CIC). A prototype of this system would demonstrate the capability of emerging technologies to further automate and improve the warfighting operations of a surface ship combatant. The improved CIC would integrate a number of technologies that are reconfigurable depending on mission requirements, with the objective of enhancing combat capabilities while reducing the required number of CIC personnel. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63382N for developing an improved CIC.

Advanced battle station/decision support system

The budget request included $145.0 million in PE 63512N for carrier systems development, but included no funding for the advanced battle station/decision support system (ABS/DSS). The ABS/DSS is a suite of information management tools that is intended to provide the war fighter with a consolidated situational awareness picture of the battle space. ABS/DSS automatically prioritizes and reconfigures the battle picture in real time, and displays information in a manner more easily understood and absorbed by combat watch standers.

The Navy believes that the ABS/DSS suite will provide a low-risk decision support capability that has great potential for multiple Navy platforms, and possible application for other services. The Navy also believes that benefits could include reductions in personnel requirements and total operating costs while improving situational awareness.

The Navy needs to continue software development of ABS/DSS, including software certification within the defense information infrastructure/common operating environment (DII/COE) context, before the suite can be considered for deployment in the fleet. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63512N for expanding production efforts on the ABS/DSS software and for conducting required DII/COE certification.

Carrier system development

The budget request included $145.0 million in PE 63512N for carrier system development, but included no funding for the Aviation Ship Integration Center. The aviation ship development activity is a Navy-unique program to address all technology areas associated with Navy and Marine Corps aircraft operations aboard ships. The Aviation Ship Integration Center is intended to avoid future costs by examining engineering and integration design changes that can be used on various ships and aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of $14.0 million in PE 63512N for the Aviation Ship Integration Center.

Surface vessel torpedo tubes

The budget request included no funding in PE 63513N for developing improved torpedo tube technology for surface ships. The Navy has been managing a Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) project to develop a modular, gas generator launch canister. This project is employing commercial, off-the-shelf (COTS), automobile-style air bags for launch energy. Employing COTS components, with such long shelf life, could greatly reduce the maintenance burden of keeping the current air flask-based torpedo tubes in operational condition. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63513N to continue development of an improved launch capability for surface vessel torpedo tubes.

Anti-submarine warfare risk reduction

The budget request included $2.5 million in PE 63553N for anti-submarine warfare (ASW) advanced development, which provides demonstration and validation of technology for potential surface sonar and combat systems applications. Efforts in this area focus on shallow water and littoral area undersea warfare (USW) and on demonstration and validation of USW concepts and technology. The committee believes that an opportunity exists, with the Navy's consolidation of multiple ASW system software baselines into a common baseline on submarines and surface combatants, to apply modern technology in fusing data from a variety of sources. These sources could include acoustic, electronic, radar, and network inputs. The committee believes that risk reduction activities in this area could significantly enhance the effectiveness of the littoral

combat ship. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63553N for ASW risk reduction.

Reducing maintenance by improving brushes on electric motors

The budget request included $1.3 million in PE 63561N to continue a program to conduct full scale, land-based testing of advanced metal fiber brushes, and to continue the testing on a submarine of a complete set of advanced metal fiber brushes in a ship service motor generator set. Metal fiber brushes have demonstrated, through a Navy-sponsored, phase II Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) program, the capability to significantly enhance performance and reduce maintenance costs on Navy motors and generators. The systematic approach for certifying the technology requires certification for varying motor and generator capacities before the brushes can be introduced more widely in the submarine fleet. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $8.7 million in PE 63561N for the following purposes: (1) to test and certify advanced metal fiber brush technology to reduce maintenance and improve reliability of motors and generators; and, (2) to accelerate transition of these brushes to the operating fleet.

Rotary electromagnetic launcher

The budget request included $52.7 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine systems development, but included no funding to develop the rotary electromagnetic launcher (REML) system.

Current submarine launchers, which are based on using energy from high pressure air sources, are configured to provide maximum launch effort for heavyweight torpedoes. These launchers are not well suited to conduct softer launches of mines or unmanned undersea vehicles (UUVs). The Navy had been considering a plan to replace the current launcher system on the Virginia-class submarine as early as fiscal year 2007. Under the current budget, the Navy will now only be ready to conduct an integrated system demonstration in fiscal year 2009 or 2010. The committee believes that it is difficult to understand the relative priority that the Navy has afforded to improving payload launch systems, particularly in view of the major initiatives the Navy intends to pursue in UUVs.

The committee believes that additional resources are needed in fiscal year 2004 to complete the demonstration that was started in fiscal year 2003, and to accelerate availability of REML technology for an integrated system demonstration sooner than the current Navy plan. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63561N for REML development.

Submarine payloads and sensors

The budget request included $52.7 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine systems development, but included no funding to develop advanced payload and sensor systems. The advanced submarine systems development program is responsible for incorporating the recommendations of the Defense Science Board that the Navy develop new capabilities for our submarine forces. It is also the mechanism for implementing congressional intent that the

Navy continue a robust technology insertion program for Virginia-class submarines during production.

The Navy has funded two industry consortia to conduct five demonstrations in the component advanced development (CAD) phase of this effort. The demonstrations were started late in fiscal year 2001 and are scheduled to be complete by fiscal year 2004. These efforts include: a flexible payload module (FPM); a stealthy affordable capsule system (SACS); processing; a small, unmanned aerial vehicle (SUAV); and, broaching universal buoyant launcher (BUBL).

Under current Navy plans, the consortia will continue an industry technology incubator effort aimed at defining new start demonstrations to be selected in fiscal year 2003 with $16.5 million available in fiscal year 2003 funding. Under the Navy's plan, with no Navy funding available in fiscal year 2004, no new starts will be possible, and existing efforts may be impacted.

The committee believes that the Navy should continue these efforts to support transforming current submarine capabilities. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 63561N to continue advanced payload and sensor development.

Littoral Combat Ship

The budget request included $158.1 million in PE 63581N for the development of the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS). The LCS is intended to be a fast, agile, and stealthy surface combatant capable of operating in support of anti-access missions against asymmetric threats in the littorals. The primary, focused missions for LCS include prosecution of small boats, mine countermeasures, and littoral anti-submarine warfare. The secondary missions for LCS include intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, homeland defense, support for special operations forces, and logistic support. The basic LCS seaframe will be equipped with core capabilities, and focused mission modules will enable LCS to perform one of its focused missions. The concept of operations envisions the LCS as operating independently, in groups, or in support of a larger force.

After receiving six design concept studies in fiscal year 2003, the Navy released a request for proposals to industry. The fiscal year 2004 budget request, if authorized and appropriated, would allow the Navy to select three of the industry proposals to advance the seaframe design in fiscal year 2004, with a plan to start building the first ship with research, development, test and evaluation funds in fiscal year 2005.

The committee is concerned that the analysis underpinning the LCS requirement is not sufficient. Section 218 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) required the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report on LCS which addressed in detail the analytical process to examine alternatives, and establish relative priorities to meet valid requirements. The committee believes that the report, which was delivered pursuant to last year's requirement, did not provide the necessary analysis.

The Navy believes that this ship would offer a way to achieve a fleet size of 375 ships, a number that the Chief of Naval Operations

has said is required to support the Sea Power 21 vision. The committee is concerned that the larger surface combatant force will decline to a number even below that which is projected in the near term as a result of the acquisition of LCS. While the cost of the LCS seaframe has been estimated, and is included in the preliminary design interim requirements document, there is no firm estimate of what LCS will cost with its focused mission modules. Overall Navy affordability constraints may well lead to a fleet with the number of Navy ships close to the number now in commission, only of lesser capability.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report to the committee by March 1, 2005, that: (1) details the Navy's progress in further defining the concept of operations for the LCS; (2) assesses the analytical basis for the establishment of LCS requirements; (3) assesses the technical maturity of the focused mission modules for flight zero ships, and, to the extent possible, for flight one ships; and, (4) estimates the recurring LCS weapons system cost, to include seaframe and focused mission modules, at a production rate similar to that in the Navy plan.

The committee believes that the Navy will have to conduct significant experimentation to determine the utility of the LCS concept. The focused mission modules are required to enable that experimentation, yet the Navy failed to fully fund focused mission modules in the budget request. The committee believes that before committing to production of more than a few ships, the Navy should have determined, through analysis and experimentation, that this ship will deliver the Navy's expected capabilities. To accelerate this process, the committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million in PE 63581N for LCS modules.

Non-lethal weapons

The budget request included $19.7 million in PE63635M for Marine Corps ground combat/supporting arms systems but no funding for non-lethal weapons development. Non-lethal weapons development includes weaponization of technology, reactive nanoparticles (RNP) for facility clearing, and the urban operations laboratory.

The weaponization of technology program explores the Marine Corps' ability to neutralize facilities and the threats and personnel associated with these facilities. The committee understands that this program has the potential to reduce collateral damage to personnel and property over current man-power-intensive and destructive operations in urban environments. The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement of $3.4 million for weaponization of technology.

The RNP for facility clearing program establishes an urban operations program that is focused on, but not limited to, the clearing of facilities with nanoparticles and other non-lethal weapon technologies. The committee understands that this program is working extensively on mapping the capabilities of nanoparticles and other technologies to the unique considerations within an urban environment and will develop strategic and implementation plans for recommendation to the Marine Corps. The committee notes that the

Commandant of the Marine Corps identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement of $3.6 million for RNP.

The urban operations laboratory provides the Marine Corps with the assessment, analysis, and remediation capabilities to ensure acceptable risk and collateral damage effects on the use of lethal and nonlethal weapons within the urban environment. The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement of $5.5 million for the continued operations and expansion of the urban operations laboratory.

The committee recommends increases in PE63635M of $3.4 million for weaponization of technology, $3.6 million for RNP for facility clearing, and $5.5 million for the urban operations laboratory, for a total authorization of $32.2 million.

Distress signaling systems

The budget request included $18.2 million in PE 63713N for ocean engineering technology development, but included no funding for distress signaling systems. This program element funds development efforts to overcome deficiencies that constrain underwater operations in the areas of search, location, rescue, recovery, salvage, construction, and protection of offshore assets. The program also develops medical technology, diver life support equipment, and the vehicles, systems, tools, and procedures to permit manned underwater operations.

The committee understands that survivors in the sea have a much greater chance for rescue when they can improve their visibility to rescuers. Some methods for this improved visibility include streamers, dye markers, and infrared markers. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63713N for the Navy to evaluate distress signaling systems available on the commercial market.

Marine mammal monitoring and protection system

The budget request included $48.8 million in PE 63721N for Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for development and transition of an active integrated marine mammal monitoring and protection system.

Advanced wireless networks

The budget request included $31.4 million in PE 64707N for space and electronic warfare architecture research and development, but no funds for the Navy collaborative integrated information technology initiative (NAVCIITI).

The committee is aware that past NAVCIITI research has contributed to high pay-off networking and communications technologies, including software-reconfigurable radios, smart antennas, and ultra-wideband systems. The committee understands that additional funds are required to continue development of advanced wireless networks. Such wireless network technology could support warfighters by providing robust voice and data communications in hostile environments without a fixed local infrastructure.

The committee recommends $36.4 million in PE 64707N, an increase of $5.0 million for NAVCIITI to develop advanced wireless networks.

Advanced cable design

The budget request included $66.8 million in PE 64212N for other helicopter development, but included no funding for an advanced cable design for the MH–60S helicopter, an effort which began in fiscal year 2003. Present tow cable systems used in mine and undersea warfare sensing and countermeasure devices use steel-reinforced cables to meet the mechanical strength requirements. These cables are extremely heavy when deployed. Current technology would allow the use of synthetic fiber in a polymer sheath to replace the current cables. This would significantly reduce the weight and hydrodynamic drag, increasing on-station time for the helicopter. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 64212N to continue the design and development of an advanced tow cable.

AV–8B aircraft engine development

The budget request included $10.5 million in PE 64214N for development efforts for the AV–8B aircraft, including $2.3 million for the engine life monitoring program (ELMP). Additional funds in the ELMP could improve the F402 engine's safety, reliability, and increase the mean time between engine removal from 275 hours to 800 hours. These additional funds are noted in the Navy unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 64214N for the AV–8B aircraft ELMP.

P–3 modernization program

The budget request included $7.3 million in PE 64221N for modernization programs for the P–3 aircraft, primarily to fund improved sensor integration and readiness improvements. The P–3 Anti-surface Warfare Improvement Program (AIP) was initiated in 1994 to improve the P–3's capability. The P–3 AIP phased capability upgrade (PCU) program has allowed the aircraft to systematically add capability to meet new and emerging operational requirements. Some of the enhancements that could be realized by the P–3 AIP–PCU include: (1) incorporation of an integrated tactical picture; (2) link 16; (3) tactical common data link; and, (4) electro-optic geo-location. The committee recommends an increase of $12.3 million to fund integration, first kit installation, and testing of the P–3 AIP–PCU.

Warfare support system

The budget request included $1.5 million in PE 64230N for development of warfare support systems, but included no funding for development of deployable autonomous distributed systems (DADS) for mobile inshore undersea warfare (MIUW). The coastal warfare units are the primary undersea surveillance resource for the coastal warfare force. The MIUW units require leading edge technology to combat mini-submarines, swimmer delivery vehicles, and swimmer infiltration. Updating MIUW units with DADS will provide these units with needed technology. The committee recommends an

increase of $3.0 million in PE 64230N to develop DADS for incorporation into MIUW units.

Extended range active missile

The budget request included $76.9 million in PE 64366N for standard missile improvements, including $34.2 million for the development of the extended range active missile (ERAM). The ERAM will provide capability against manned fixed and rotary wing aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles, and land attack and antiship cruise missiles. ERAM will use the technology developed in the seeker of the Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) and combine it with the standard missile to achieve required capabilities. Additional funding in fiscal year 2004 could be used for wind tunnel testing, self-test and reliability improvements, and production cost-reduction efforts. The Navy identified additional funding for ERAM on its unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $46.0 million in PE 64366N to reduce risk and accelerate ERAM initial operational capability.

Submarine antenna technology improvements

The budget request included $80.8 million in submarine systems development, including $9.1 million for various submarine integrated antenna systems developments.

In order to participate fully in the Navy's network centric warfare efforts, ships must have higher data rate communications than are currently available on submarines, and the Navy must develop the capability to permit submarines to communicate without restricting operations to slow speed at periscope depth.

One near-term solution could involve using an expendable two-way satellite communications buoy operating in the ultra high frequency (UHF) portion of the electromagnetic spectrum. An approach that would employ fiber optic links between the submarine and a communications buoy could be compatible with existing buoy launcher systems.

A longer-term approach would require extending communications capability to other portions of the electromagnetic spectrum. A tethered platform could provide connectivity and could be used to achieve better situational awareness by employing such sensor technologies as photonics, electronic support measures, and acoustics. Such a tethered platform could also take advantage of existing towed buoy handling mechanisms already installed on submarines.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64503N to pursue these developments to provide higher data rate communications, including: (1) $2.0 million to develop an expendable two-way satellite communications buoy; and, (2) $3.0 million to develop a tethered communications and sensor platform.

"Virginia"-class submarine design development

The budget request included $112.4 million in PE 64558N for *Virginia*-class submarine design development. This includes the technology, prototype components, and systems engineering needed to design and construct the submarine and build its command, control, communications, and intelligence system. The budget request included no funding for information assurance. Submarine combat

systems are required to be interoperable with joint forces and other battle group participants while maintaining a high level of information security. The committee recommends an increase of $8.2 million in PE 64558N for submarine information assurance.

The budget request included no funding to develop the multi-mission module concept for the *Virginia*-class submarine. A payload modular force could bring new capabilities to the fleet, while increasing payload capacity and flexibility. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64558N for the development of the multi-mission module concept for the *Virginia*-class submarine.

The budget request included no funding to develop a network centric sustainment architecture for the *Virginia*-class submarine. This architecture would enable system upgrades, problem correction, training, and other information related sustainment activities to be conducted by the crew while a submarine is deployed and on-station. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63558N for the development of a network centric sustainment architecture for the *Virginia*-class submarine, for a total authorization of $138.6 million in PE 64558N.

Submarine tactical warfare system

The budget request included $32.2 million in PE 64562N for the submarine tactical warfare system. Submarine command and control systems for earlier classes of submarines were originally designed using a closed architecture concept that severely limited the flexibility needed for adding new or improved functional capabilities. Beginning with the *Virginia*-class submarine, the command, control, communications, and intelligence system incorporated an open system architecture to facilitate the use of commercial-off-the-shelf hardware and software in the subsystems that provide mission essential functions. The Navy has implemented the submarine warfare system (SWS) modernization effort to evolve the combat control system of earlier classes of submarines into the tactical control system (TCS) and the weapon control system (WCS). The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the TCS and an increase of $10.0 million for the WCS to enable future capability improvements for the SWS on all submarine classes, a total authorization of $52.2 million in PE 64562N for the submarine tactical warfare system.

Uninterruptible fuel cell

The budget request included no funding in PE 64710N for the Navy energy program. The Navy is tri-service lead for the implementation of renewable/alternative energy systems for the Department of Defense.

Reliable electric power is important for providing continuing operations at key operating facilities. Microprocessor operations are particularly sensitive to short interruptions. A potential way of dealing with the problem on a facility-wide basis, rather than piecemeal, would be to supply loads through uninterruptible substations that could respond within a few milliseconds to outages.

The committee understands that such a substation with appropriate response times could be feasible by developing proton exchange membrane (PEM) fuel cell designs.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 64710N to demonstrate the technical and economic viability of a set of PEM fuel cells and control unit in daily operation of a reliable, uninterruptible distributed generator.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system development

The budget request included $35.5 million for ship self-defense soft-kill systems development in PE 64757N, including $2.3 million to develop various product improvements for the NULKA system.

The Navy has identified a series of development activities associated with the NULKA system that are required to understand and deal with emerging threats:

(1) an improved payload that would provide radio frequency coverage of more than one band of the spectrum to deal with anti-ship missiles;

(2) an expanded anti-tampering program effort;

(3) an improved guidance and propulsion system to allow more precise positioning of the decoy during operations;

(4) an effort to design an infrared payload to enable NULKA to deal with newer anti-ship missile homing technologies; and

(5) design agent support and development of a systems integration facility.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 64757N for the NULKA development program to continue these efforts.

Radar absorbing tiles for ship self defense

The budget request included $35.5 million in PE 64757N for ship self defense, but included no funding for the development or testing of radar absorbing tiles to reduce surface ship radar signatures. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64757N to develop and test advanced radar absorbing tiles for Navy ships.

Joint Strike Fighter

The budget request included $2.2 billion in PE 64800N and $2.2 billion in PE 64800F for the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) development program. The total request for the JSF program included $100.0 million to continue development of the second source, interchangeable engine for the JSF, designated as the F136 engine. The fiscal year 2003 F136 program was funded at $174.7 million.

The committee believes that the interchangeable engine should be made available for competitive procurement as early as possible. The result of a reduction to this program would be to delay the interchangeable engine by at least two years.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $56.0 million in PE 64800N to continue the F136 interchangeable engine development on its original schedule. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should make the financial adjustments to the Future Years Defense Program that are necessary to restore the original interchangeable engine schedule.

Wireless sensor technology

The budget request included $30.6 million in PE 65013N for Information Technology Development. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for the development of an open architecture wireless sensor network to reduce naval asset life-cycle costs.

Fire retardant fibers

The budget request included $4.4 million in PE 65152N for Naval studies and analysis. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 65152N for the assessment of upgraded fire retardant fibers that provide increased flame protection and durability.

Warfare analysis and education

The budget request included $30.2 million in PE 65853N for support of wargames and research analysis. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 65853N for warfare analysis and education, particularly aimed at current national security threats and global terrorism.

Thin plate pure lead battery technology

The budget request included $104.8 million in PE 11221N for strategic submarine and weapons system support, but no funding for thin plate pure lead (TPPL) battery technology.

The committee is aware of ongoing research to apply well-understood TPPL technology to submarine batteries. This technology has the potential to increase submarine battery energy density, reduce corrosion and associated maintenance costs, and improve life span, performance, reliability, output, and recovery from deep discharges.

Therefore, the committee recommends $106.3 million in PE 11221N, an increase of $1.5 million for research and development for thin plate pure lead battery technology.

Precision terrain aided navigation

The budget request included $71.4 million in PE 24229N for continued development of the Tomahawk cruise missile weapons system, but included no funding for precision terrain aided navigation (PTAN). PTAN would offer an alternative guidance system for Tomahawk that could be used if the global positioning system (GPS) currently used was degraded by jamming or by other means. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 24229N for development of the PTAN system for the Tomahawk cruise missile.

Fire Scout RQ–84

The budget request included $56.5 million in PE 35204N for Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of $46.4 million for the continuation of the Fire Scout RQ–8A program. Although the Navy has recently expressed renewed interest in the Fire Scout program as a key unmanned component for the Littoral Combat Ship, the committee is concerned by last year's cancellation by the Navy of this important vertical tactical unmanned platform. The committee expects the Navy to restore full funding for this platform in fiscal year 2005.

Airborne reconnaissance systems

The budget request included $13.3 million in PE 35206N for the development of airborne reconnaissance systems. The committee is aware that the technologies developed in this program help satisfy the requirements of the objective architecture established in the Integrated Airborne Reconnaissance Strategy and are identified in the Airborne Reconnaissance Technology Program Plan. Transition of many of these technologies to podded sensor platforms has been successful. The committee recommends an increase of $5.1 million in PE 35206N for continued development of podded sensors.

Verification, validation and accreditation improvements

The budget request included $7.0 million in PE 38601N for Modeling and Simulation Support. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 38601N for verification, validation, and accreditation improvements for risk reduction and reduced lifecycle costs.

Air Force

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE			
0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	204,754	5,500	210,254
		Quantum information technology		[1,500]	
		Adaptive optics research		[4,000]	
		Reduce biological research		[-5,000]	
		Increase propulsion research		[5,000]	
0601103F	2	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	105,224	-105,224	
		Transfer program to PE 61103D8Z (RDDW 3)		[-105,224]	
0601108F	3	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	12,063	-12,063	
		Transfer program to PE 61108D8Z (RDDW 5)		[-12,063]	
0602102F	4	MATERIALS	68,657	17,500	86,157
		Composites for UAVs		[4,000]	
		Fabrication of microelectronic components		[6,000]	
		Closed cell foam materials		[2,000]	
		Nanotechnology research		[4,500]	
		Airbase materials technologies		[1,000]	
0602201F	5	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	65,662		65,662
0602202F	6	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	66,795		66,795
0602203F	7	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	101,575		101,575
0602204F	8	AEROSPACE SENSORS	75,577		75,577
0602500F	9	MULTI-DISCIPLINARY SPACE TECHNOLOGY	90,526		90,526

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0602601F	10	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	83,240	14,500	97,740
		Elastic memory composites		[4,000]	
		Thin film solar cells		[3,500]	
		Parallel datacom network		[4,000]	
		Microsatellite cluster technology		[3,000]	
0602602F	11	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	46,455		46,455
0602605F	12	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	35,359		35,359
0602702F	13	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	71,674	7,000	78,674
		MASINT warfighter visualization tools		[7,000]	
0602805F	14	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,586		10,586
0602890F	15	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	41,854	-41,854	
		Transfer program to PE 62890D8Z (RDDW 22)		[-41,854]	
0603112F	16	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	33,079	7,000	40,079
		Metals affordability initiative		[7,000]	
0603203F	17	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	36,550		36,550
0603205F	18	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY			
0603211F	19	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	73,416	11,500	84,916
		Advanced aluminum aerostructures		[6,500]	
		Life-cycle extension assessment		[2,000]	
		Fly-by-light photonic technology		[3,000]	
0603216F	20	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	114,726	13,000	127,726
		Fuels, lubrication and turbine engine technologies		[7,000]	
		Advanced turbine gas engine		[6,000]	
0603231F	21	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	34,487		34,487

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603270F	22	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	28,496		28,496
0603311F	23	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY			
0603333F	24	UNMANNED AIR VEHICLE DEV/DEMO			
0603401F	25	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	72,114	13,800	85,914
		Satellite hardening technologies		[6,800]	
		Thin film amorphous silicon solar arrays		[7,000]	
0603436F	26	TRANSFORMATIONAL WIDEBAND MILSATCOM			
0603444F	27	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	6,323	10,000	16,323
		High accuracy network determination sytem		[10,000]	
0603500F	28	MULTI-DISCIPLINARY ADV DEVELOPMENT SPACE TECH	62,610		62,610
0603601F	29	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	30,516		30,516
0603605F	30	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	27,024		27,024
0603723F	31	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY			
0603755F	32	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	185,282		185,282
0603789F	33	C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	31,538		31,538
0603801F	34	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	369,483		369,483
0603850F	35	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	8,537		8,537
0603924F	36	HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,910	-10,910	
		Transfer program to PE 63924D8Z (RDDW 56)		[-10,910]	
0207423F	37	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	12,053		12,053
0401840F	38	AMC COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	6,046		6,046
0804757F	39	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	2,940		2,940
0603260F	40	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,513		4,513
0603287F	41	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	24,483		24,483

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603421F	42	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III		80,000	80,000
		Program acceleration		[80,000]	
0603430F	43	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	778,078	60,000	838,078
		AEHF spare parts		[60,000]	
0603432F	44	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	5,580		5,580
0603434F	45	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPER ENVIRON SATELLITE SYS	267,716		267,716
0603438F	46	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	14,714	4,000	18,714
		Space control / ASAT technology		[4,000]	
0603742F	47	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	16,575		16,575
0603790F	48	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	3,888		3,888
0603791F	49	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	545		545
0603845F	50	ADVANCED WIDEBAND SYSTEM (AWS)	439,277	-50,000	389,277
		AWS program risk		[-50,000]	
0603850F	51	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	16,466		16,466
0603851F	52	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	67,632		67,632
0603854F	53	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SYSTEM RDT&E (SPACE)	36,686		36,686
0603856F	54	AIR FORCE/NATIONAL PROGRAM COOPERATION (AFNPC)			
0603858F	55	SPACE-BASED RADAR	274,104		274,104
0603859F	56	POLLUTION PREVENTION	2,318		2,318
0603860F	57	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	13,847		13,847
0604327F	58	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYS (HDBTDS)	12,633		12,633
0604731F	59	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV)	161,269		161,269
0604855F	60	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE LAUNCH	24,440		24,440
0604856F	61	COMMON AERO VEHICLE (CAV)	12,220		12,220

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603840F	62	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	38,147		38,147
0604012F	63	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	843		843
0604222F	64	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	13,396		13,396
0604226F	65	B-1B	88,703		88,703
0604233F	66	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	3,267		3,267
0604239F	67	F-22	620,740		620,740
0604240F	68	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	152,084	-24,700	127,384
		Transfer to B-2 procurement (APAF 23)		[-24,700]	
0604251F	69	SPACE-BASED RADAR			
0604270F	70	EW DEVELOPMENT	74,034	19,800	93,834
		Precision location and identification (PLAID)		[13,800]	
		Loitering electronic warfare killer (LEWK)		[6,000]	
0604280F	71	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	48,814		48,814
0604287F	72	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	7,261		7,261
0604329F	73	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	126,447		126,447
0604421F	74	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	82,565		82,565
0604435F	75	INTERIM POLAR	13,740		13,740
0604441F	76	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	617,229		617,229
0604479F	77	MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	1,383		1,383
0604600F	78	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	15,849		15,849
0604602F	79	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,419	5,000	13,419
		Passive attack weapon		[5,000]	
0604604F	80	SUBMUNITIONS	4,717		4,717
0604617F	81	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	5,574		5,574

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0604618F	82	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	34,061		34,061
0604706F	83	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	269		269
0604731F	84	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV)	14,675		14,675
0604735F	85	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	20,383		20,383
0604740F	86	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	239		239
0604750F	87	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,320		1,320
0604754F	88	TACTICAL DATA LINK INFRASTRUCTURE	14,675		14,675
0604762F	89	COMMON LOW OBSERV VERIF SYS (CLOVERS)	7,000		7,000
0604779F	90	TACTICAL DATA LINK INTEROPERABILITY			
0604800F	91	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	2,194,087		2,194,087
0604851F	92	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	184,193		184,193
0604853F	93	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)	8,000		8,000
0605011F	94	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	24,063		24,063
0207249F	95	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT			
0207256F	96	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE	4,892		4,892
0207434F	97	LINK-16 SUPPORT AND SUSTAINMENT	58,783		58,783
0207701F	98	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	6,946		6,946
0305176F	99	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	14,684		14,684
0401318F	100	CV-22	65,703		65,703
0604256F	101	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	36,595		36,595
0604759F	102	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	50,215		50,215
0605101F	103	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	24,586		24,586
0605306F	104	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	4,692		4,692
0605502F	105	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0605712F	106	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	34,646		34,646
0605807F	107	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	336,720		336,720
0605860F	108	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	9,673	15,500	25,173
		Ballistic missile range safety technology		[15,500]	
0605864F	109	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	42,909	-3,300	39,609
		STP		[-3,300]	
0605976F	110	FACILITIES REST AND MOD - TEST AND EVAL SPT	33,940		33,940
0605978F	111	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT - TEST AND EVALUATION SPT	15,770		15,770
0804731F	112	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	318		318
0909900F	113	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
0909980F	114	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT	36,434		36,434
1001004F	115	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,867		3,867
0604240F	116	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	24,691		24,691
0605024F	117	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	7,855		7,855
0101113F	118	B-52 SQUADRONS	28,649		28,649
0101120F	119	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	13,364		13,364
0101122F	120	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	29,804		29,804
0101313F	121	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM	1,748		1,748
0101815F	122	ADVANCED STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	6,100		6,100
0102326F	123	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION	22,573		22,573
0203761F	124	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRAN			
0207028F	125	JOINT EXPEDITIONARY FORCE EXPERIMENT	51,367		51,367
0207131F	126	A-10 SQUADRONS	29,729		29,729
0207133F	127	F-16 SQUADRONS	87,478		87,478

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0207134F	128	F-15E SQUADRONS	112,085	16,500	128,585
		F-15C/D radar upgrade		[16,500]	
0207136F	129	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	20,633		20,633
0207138F	130	F-22 SQUADRONS	315,784		315,784
0207141F	131	F-117A SQUADRONS	14,752		14,752
0207161F	132	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	375		375
0207163F	133	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	32,429		32,429
0207224F	134	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY			
0207247F	135	AF TENCAP	10,479	5,500	15,979
		GPS jammer detection and location system		[3,000]	
		Space control test bed		[2,500]	
0207248F	136	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	164,239		164,239
0207253F	137	COMPASS CALL	3,790		3,790
0207268F	138	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	180,112		180,112
0207277F	139	CSAF INNOVATION PROGRAM	1,880	8,000	9,880
		Eagle Vision commercial imagery program		[8,000]	
0207325F	140	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	31,216	17,000	48,216
		Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM) extended range		[17,000]	
0207410F	141	AEROSPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	27,887		27,887
0207412F	142	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	16,083		16,083
0207417F	143	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	270,397		270,397
0207423F	144	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	12,312		12,312
0207424F	145	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM			
0207433F	146	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	263,392		263,392

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0207438F	147	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	31,647		31,647
0207445F	148	FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK	42,877		42,877
0207446F	149	BOMBER TACTICAL DATA LINK	12,959		12,959
0207448F	150	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	26,927		26,927
0207449F	151	MC2C (MULTI-SENSOR C2 CONSTELLATION)	363,630		363,630
0207581F	152	JOINT SURVEIL AND TGT ATTACK RADAR SYS (JOINT STARS)	58,431		58,431
0207590F	153	SEEK EAGLE	19,587		19,587
0207591F	154	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	425,486		425,486
0207601F	155	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	8,483		8,483
0207605F	156	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	6,262		6,262
0208006F	157	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	62,348		62,348
0208021F	158	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	12,091		12,091
0208160F	159	TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM			
0208161F	160	SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM			
0301310F	161	NATIONAL AIR INTELLIGENCE CENTER	[ ]		
0301314F	162	COBRA BALL	[ ]		
0301315F	163	MISSILE AND SPACE TECHNICAL COLLECTION	[ ]		
0301324F	164	FOREST GREEN	[ ]		
0301398F	165	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS GDIP	[ ]		
0302015F	166	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	44,377		44,377
0303110F	167	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)			
0303112F	168	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS (AIRCOM)			
0303131F	169	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM NETWORK (MEECN)	10,716		10,716

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0303140F	170	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	37,667	2,000	39,667
		Cybersecurity research		[2,000]	
0303141F	171	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	17,473		17,473
0303150F	172	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,547		3,547
0303401F	173	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)			
0303601F	174	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	173,831		173,831
0304111F	175	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]		
0304311F	176	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	107,800		107,800
0305099F	177	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	7,164		7,164
0305110F	178	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	18,603	5,000	23,603
		Civil Reserve Space Service		[5,000]	
0305111F	179	WEATHER SERVICE	16,317		16,317
0305114F	180	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APP, AND LANDING SYS (ATCALS)	10,622		10,622
0305128F	181	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	474		474
0305142F	182	APPLIED TECHNOLOGY AND INTEGRATION	[ ]		
0305144F	183	TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)			
0305148F	184	AIR FORCE TAC MEASUREMENT AND SIG INTEL (MASINT) SYS	7,510		7,510
0305159F	185	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	232,287	-103,800	128,487
		Classified reduction		[-103,800]	
0305160F	186	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	918		918
0305164F	187	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYS (USER EQUIPMENT)	100,589		100,589
0305165F	188	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYS (SPACE AND CONTROL)	146,468		146,468
0305172F	189	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS	[ ]		
0305174F	190	SPACE WARFARE CENTER	404		404

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0305182F	191	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	63,210		63,210
0305202F	192	DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	52,518	41,000	93,518
		U-2 SYERS 2 focal planes		[8,000]	
		U-2 SIGINT risk mitigation		[33,000]	
0305205F	193	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	398,631	3,500	402,131
		Global Hawk lithium battery demonstration		[3,500]	
0305206F	194	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	77,823		77,823
0305207F	195	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	14,726		14,726
0305208F	196	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	27,107	20,000	47,107
		Distributed common ground / surface system (DCGS) block 20		[20,000]	
0305906F	197	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	57,933		57,933
0305910F	198	SPACETRACK (SPACE)	118,234		118,234
0305911F	199	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)			
0305913F	200	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	35,834		35,834
0305917F	201	SPACE ARCHITECT	12,589		12,589
0308601F	202	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT			
0308699F	203	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	3,254		3,254
0401115F	204	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	105,381		105,381
0401119F	205	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	356,570		356,570
0401130F	206	C-17 AIRCRAFT	184,089		184,089
0401132F	207	C-130J PROGRAM	13,551		13,551
0401134F	208	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	45,946		45,946
0401218F	209	KC-135S	1,473	3,400	4,873
		KC-135 simulator upgrades (boom)		[3,400]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0401219F	210	KC-10S	2,306		2,306
0401839F	211	AIR MOBILITY TACTICAL DATA LINK			
0702207F	212	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,406		1,406
0708011F	213	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	39,396		39,396
0708012F	214	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
0708026F	215	PRODUCTIVITY, REL, AVAIL, MAINTAIN. PROG OFC (PRAMPO)			
0708611F	216	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	54,034	3,500	57,534
		Aging aircraft		[3,500]	
0708612F	217	COMPUTER RESOURCES SPT IMPROVEMENT PGM (CRSIP)			
0901212F	218	SERVICE-WIDE SUPPORT (NOT OTHERWISE ACCOUNTED FOR)	4,392		4,392
0901218F	219	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	7,130		7,130
0901538F	220	FIN MGT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,464		13,464
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	5,245,898		5,245,898
		Financial information systems		-11,500	-11,500
		Total, RDT&E Air Force	**20,336,258**	**46,149**	**20,382,407**

Air Force propulsion research

The budget request included $204.8 million in PE 61102F for Defense Research Sciences. The committee recommends a transfer of $5.0 million from PE 61102F, Biological Sciences research programs to PE 61102F, Propulsion research programs, and an increase of $5.5 million in PE 61102F for basic research in critical technologies necessary for the next generation of Air Force systems. Of the $5.5 million increase, $4.0 million would be used for research on adaptive optics technologies; and $1.5 million for basic research in quantum information processing and technologies.

The committee notes that the Air Force requested more funding for basic research in Biological Sciences than in Propulsion in its core basic research program. The Air Force made this request despite the fact that the Department of Defense is proposing a National Aerospace Initiative that will depend upon scientific advances in propulsion technologies made by university research. The committee believes that the Air Force should make funding basic research in propulsion science and technology a high priority, given the tradition of Air Force support of these scientific disciplines, and their clear connection to current and future Air Force missions. The committee notes that in fiscal year 2004 the Air Force reduced its request in PE 61102F by $23.8 million, as compared to the fiscal year 2003 budget request. The Air Force indicates that this reduction will result in the suspension or non-initiation of approximately 130 grants that would have otherwise supported approximately 390 graduate and post-graduate students. The committee urges the Air Force to increase and sustain its support of university research and the training of future scientists and engineers.

Aerospace materials research

The budget request included $68.7 million in PE 62102F for advanced materials research. The committee recognizes the critical role that materials research and materials processing technology play in extending the life of aging equipment. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $17.5 million in PE 62102F for advanced materials research: $4.0 million for developing low-cost composite airframes, particularly for platforms which require high performance and light weight such as unmanned aerial vehicles; $6.0 million for the development and application of a high power, tunable, ultra-violet laser processing tool for the fabrication of micro-engineered components; $4.5 million for research in nanotechnology in support of aerospace materials; $1.0 million for materials research to support the development of fire protection systems, directed energy technologies, and technologies for crash and rescue operations; and $2.0 million for the development of fire retardant polymer materials.

Space technologies

The budget request included $83.2 million in PE 62601F for research in space technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $14.5 million in PE 62601F for novel materials and computing for space technologies: $3.5 million to develop high-temperature rigid silicone thin films for solar cells; $4.0 million for furthering technological readiness levels of elastic memory composite

materials; $3.0 million for continued development of microsatellite cluster technology; and $4.0 million for developing an all-optical, seamless data communication network for satellite communication.

MASINT warfighter visualization tools

The budget request included $71.7 million in PE 62702F for command, control, and communications research. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 62702F for the development of user-friendly measurement and signature intelligence visualization tools.

Advanced materials for weapons systems

The budget request included $33.1 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials research for weapons systems. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63112F for technology development to support affordable defense and aerospace systems and manufacturing of specialty aerospace metals.

Aerospace technologies and demonstrations

The budget request included $73.4 million in PE 63211F for aerospace technology development and demonstration. The committee recommends an increase of $11.5 million in PE 63211F for applied research to support improved aerospace structures and technology demonstrations: $6.5 million for research on the use of aluminum aerostructures for aerospace components; $3.0 million for the demonstration of fly-by-light photonic technology; and $2.0 million for an assessment of possible upgrade options and life-cycle extension alternatives for the current fleet of tactical aircraft. While making its assessment of upgrade options and life-cycle extension alternatives, the Air Force should avail itself of the expertise of the original aircraft manufacturers.

Fuels, lubrication and turbine engine technology

The budget request included $114.7 million in PE 63216F for research in aerospace propulsion and power technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63216F for the Integrated High Performance Turbine Engine Technology (IHPTET) and Versatile Affordable Advanced Turbine Engine (VAATE) programs: $7.0 million for research dedicated to fuels, lubrication and turbine engine technology; and $6.0 million for the advanced turbine engine gas generator program.

B–2 bomber

The budget request included $176.8 million in PE 64240F for research and development for the B–2 bomber and $76.5 million in Aircraft Procurement for post production support for the B–2 bomber. The Department of the Air Force has informed the committee that funds were misaligned in these two accounts. Consistent with the request by the Air Force, the committee recommends $152.1 million in PE 64240F, a decrease of $24.7 million, and $101.2 million in Aircraft Procurement for post production support for the B–2 bomber, a corresponding increase of $24.7 million.

Advanced spacecraft technology

The budget request included $72.1 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, of which $2.2 million is for development and evaluation of space conventional power generation technologies, such as advanced thin film solar cells.

The committee is aware of ongoing research on high specific power thin film multi-junction amorphous silicon arrays on flexible substrates for space applications. A recent Air Force report indicated that this technology has the potential to produce solar arrays that are five times greater in specific power, five to ten times cheaper, three to five times lighter, require five times less stowed volume, and offer improved radiation resistance compared to current solar arrays. The report also notes that this advanced technology is more mature than others currently under investigation.

In light of the promise of this technology, the committee recognizes that the requested funding is insufficient. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63401F for continued development of thin film multi-junction amorphous silicon arrays on flexible substrates for space applications.

Satellite protection technology

The budget request included $72.1 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but no funding for hardening technologies for satellite protection (HTSP).

The committee continues to be concerned about the potential vulnerability of U.S. commercial and military satellites, particularly in light of the increasing reliance of the military on space assets and foreign efforts to develop the means to disrupt U.S. exploitation of those assets. The Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency confirmed in testimony before the committee that several countries have programs that could result in kinetic energy, directed energy, or electronic counter-space capabilities.

The committee is aware that protecting satellites from space control threats adds to acquisition costs, and that both commercial and military program managers who must live within constrained budgets have limited incentive to incorporate expensive design features to defeat those threats. The committee notes that high level attention and policy direction related to space system vulnerability (addressed elsewhere in this report) is a key first step to providing proper incentives. Providing lower cost, standardized tools to satellite designers that will minimize cost and design impact will also allow measures to reduce vulnerability to be designed in, rather than added on, to satellites. An effort to develop an integrated module to the standard Satellite Tool Kit for low cost laser and radio frequency hardening techniques was initiated in fiscal year 2001.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.8 million in PE 63401F to continue research and develop on hardening technologies for satellite protection.

High accuracy network determination system

The budget request included $6.3 million in PE 63444F for the Maui Space Surveillance program, but no funding for the high accuracy network determination system (HANDS).

HANDS is intended to develop a network of relatively low resolution optical sensor systems linked through a central high performance computing system to improve space situational awareness. The committee believes that improved space situational awareness will be important in reducing the vulnerability of U.S. space assets, and understands that additional funds for the HANDS project could be used to operate the network; design and build upgraded optical sensors; and tie the sensors to the high performance computing system.

The committee recommends $16.3 million in PE 63444F, an increase of $10.0 million to continue HANDS research and development.

Global Positioning System III

The budget request included no funding for the Global Positioning System (GPS) III in PE 63421F.

GPS provides signals that allow users to determine precise geolocation, a capability critical to a range of military and civilian applications. The committee notes that current generation GPS satellites use very low power signals and are vulnerable to jamming. While the Air Force is incorporating improvements to unlaunched current generation GPS block II satellites to provide enhanced anti-jam capabilities, the Department of Defense has determined that these improvements will not be sufficient to satisfy future requirements.

GPS also faces the potential for significant international competition from the European Galileo program. The committee continues to believe that GPS should be the international standard for radionavigation and that the GPS III effort is integral to achieving that end.

To address these needs, the Air Force initiated the GPS III program. Although $60.2 million was appropriated for this effort in fiscal year 2003, the fiscal year 2004 budget request does not sustain this effort. The committee understands that the Air Force will request additional funds for GPS III in fiscal year 2005. The committee notes that such a delay will disrupt ongoing concept definition work and could result in delays to the planned first launch of GPS III.

In light of these considerations, the committee recommends $80.0 million in PE 63421F, an increase of $80.0 million, for continued development of the GPS III satellite. The committee recognizes that this amount, using a spiral development approach, could support a first launch of GPS III in 2010. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to study options for accelerating the GPS III program, and to report the results of that study to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2004.

Advanced extremely high frequency system

The budget request included $778.1 million in PE 63430F for development of the advanced extremely high frequency (AEHF) satellite communications system.

Advanced EHF satellites will provide secure, survivable, jam resistant communications at much higher data rates than is currently available. At least three AEHF satellites will be required to

support critical military communications, and as many as five could be needed, depending on progress in the research and development of next-generation transformational communications satellites.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2004 budget request includes no procurement funding for the third AEHF satellite and that the Air Force does not intend to request this funding until fiscal year 2005. This represents a significant change from the budget projection for AEHF in fiscal year 2003, when the Air Force planned to request $95.0 million in advanced procurement for the third AEHF satellite in fiscal year 2004. The committee recognizes that this delay will result in a significant production gap that will require a costly requalification of suppliers, a significant increase in technical risks, and a possible delay in the AEHF schedule.

To address these risks, and to lower the risk to the first two satellites, the committee recommends $838.1 million in PE 63430F, an increase of $60.0 million, for additional spare parts for AEHF. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to study options for restoring the AEHF program schedule, and to report the results of that study to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2004.

Space control technology

The budget request included $14.7 million in PE 63438F for space control technology, but no funding for the kinetic energy antisatellite program (KEASAT).

U.S. national security space policy includes a requirement to develop, operate, and maintain space control capabilities to ensure freedom of action in space and to deny freedom of action in space to adversaries. The committee notes that the Department of Defense focus on space control technology has increased as a result of the proliferation of satellite technology and the potential for foreign space assets to pose serious threats to U.S. military forces.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense invested about $350.0 million in KEASAT technology throughout the 1990s and substantial progress was made in the development of KEASAT hardware and software. The committee is also aware that a number of other space control technologies may enhance the KEASAT kill vehicle capabilities.

The committee recommends $18.7 million in PE 63438F, an increase of $4.0 million, to assess and evaluate KEASAT technologies as part of a space control architecture, and to continue development of space control technologies that leverage KEASAT kill vehicle capabilities and the substantial investments made in the KEASAT project.

Advanced wideband system/transformational communications architecture

The budget request included $439.3 million in PE 63845F for the advanced wideband satellite communications system (AWS) and transformational communications architecture (TCA).

The committee supports the goal of the advanced wideband system to provide dramatic increases in communications bandwidth. As information dominance becomes more central to success in war-

fare, such increases will be required to support the voice, data and imagery needs of the U.S. military. To achieve these advances, AWS/TCA will develop a new, very complex communications architecture involving laser communications; internet packet switching; integration of space, air, and ground networks; new ground terminals; new security protocols; and multiple users, including the military services, the intelligence community, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The committee is concerned that the technical, cost, and schedule risks for the AWS/TCA program appear to be very high. The committee is concerned that: (1) key AWS/TCA technologies, including multiple access laser communications terminals and information assurance, are immature; (2) the system engineering to provide the basis for a successful architecture has not yet been adequately addressed; (3) the coordination among multiple agencies and schedules and the technical maturity of many elements of the AWS/TCA system-of-systems and will be difficult; (4) the size and weight of the spacecraft have not been determined, but may exceed the capacity of current launch vehicles; (5) the budget request would nearly quadruple AWS/TCA funding, a level that may be difficult to execute; and (6) the scheduled first launch in 2009 may leave insufficient time to address these challenges.

The committee believes that AWS/TCA should proceed at an aggressive but more measured pace that recognizes these challenges and manages risk in a prudent manner. Consequently, the committee recommends $389.3 million in PE 63845F for the advanced wideband satellite communications system and transformational communications architecture, a decrease of $50.0 million.

Electronic warfare development

The budget request included $74.0 million in PE 64270F for electronic warfare development programs in the Air Force, but included no funding for either the continued development of the Precision Location and Identification (PLAID) Program or the Loitering Electronic Warfare Killer (LEWK).

PLAID is entering production as the ALR–69 radar warning receiver. It will improve survivability of Air Force aircraft by increasing aircrew situational awareness, providing accurate ground emitter location and unambiguous identification. Its installation in F–16 and C–130 aircraft will rectify the effectiveness and suitability shortfalls of the current radar warning receivers. Continued development of PLAID is included on the Air Force unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $13.8 million in PE 64270F for the continued development of PLAID.

LEWK was approved as a joint service advance concept technology demonstration in fiscal year 2001. LEWK is an unmanned combat air vehicle, which, when it detects a threat radar, will itself attack the radar, contributing to the suppression of enemy air defenses. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for LEWK, for a total authorization of $93.8 million in PE 64270F.

Passive Attack Weapon

The budget request included $8.4 million in PE 64602F for armament and ordnance development, but included no funding for the Passive Attack Weapon.

The Passive Attack Weapon is a kinetic energy weapon system designed to defeat targets of special interest, particularly chemical and biological storage facilities. The weapon dispenses non-explosive penetrators to destroy the target while limiting collateral damage and environmental impact. The committee believes that the Passive Attack Weapon could provide an important capability in the effort to hold critical targets at risk.

The committee understands that additional funds are required to complete engineering and manufacturing development and to initiate low rate initial production of the passive attack weapon. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64602F for continued development of the Passive Attack Weapon.

Space test program

The budget request included $42.9 million in PE 65864F for the space test program. This program supports the development and launch of space experiments. The committee notes that many of these experiments may be delayed because they are launched on the space shuttle, which has been grounded for an indeterminate period of time as a result of the Columbia accident. Consequently, the committee recommends $39.6 million in PE 65864F, a decrease of $3.3 million.

F–15C/D aircraft radar upgrade

The budget request included $112.1 million in PE 27134F for the operational system development of the F–15 series of aircraft. The request included no funding for non-recurring development of a radar to replace the current F–15C/D aircraft radar, the mechanically-scanned APG–63 (V)1. There are 18 F–15 aircraft with an advanced electronically scanned array (AESA) radar, which provides capability against cruise missiles. The F–15C/D aircraft are scheduled to remain in the inventory in considerable numbers beyond fiscal year 2020, and cruise missile defense is a likely mission the aircraft will have to perform for homeland defense. Additionally, an AESA radar would provide significant reliability and maintainability enhancements to the F–15 C/D aircraft. The committee is aware that there is ongoing development work in the private sector for an F–15C/D AESA radar upgrade, and recommends an increase of $16.5 million in PE 27134F to continue development of an F–15C/D AESA radar.

Patriot advanced capability–3 spiral development

The budget request included $174.5 million in PE 64865A for continued development of the Patriot Advanced Capability–3 (PAC–3) air and missile defense interceptor system, $44.5 million in PE 23801A for PAC–3 modifications, and $276.3 million in PE 63869A for development of the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS). The budget request also included $212.6 million in Missile Procurement, Army, for Patriot modifications.

The PAC–3 system is intended to provide effective defenses for forward deployed forces and small areas against hostile aircraft, cruise missiles, and short and medium range ballistic missiles. PAC–3 is currently being deployed and, consistent with Administration policy, funding for and execution of PAC–3 procurement is being transferred from the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to the Army. The administration also proposed to transfer follow-on PAC–3 development from MDA to the Army.

The MEADS program is an international effort of the United States, Germany, and Italy. MEADS is also intended to provide effective defenses for forward deployed forces and small areas against hostile aircraft, cruise missiles, and short and medium range ballistic missiles. MEADS is intended to be lighter and more mobile than PAC–3 to meet the need for a mobile air and missile defense system capable of defending maneuver forces, while providing 360 degree radar coverage and a thoroughly integrated command and control system. MEADS is scheduled to replace PAC–3 starting in fiscal year 2012. The committee strongly supports international cooperative efforts to develop effective missile defenses, including the MEADS program.

At the same time, the committee is aware that PAC–3 and MEADS share the same mission and that efforts continue to improve the PAC–3 system. PAC–3 development and modifications are also intended to extend its capabilities, and make the system lighter, more mobile, and more deployable. These efforts appear to parallel key aspects of the MEADS program. The committee is concerned that the parallel pursuit of PAC–3 spiral development and the MEADS development program does not represent a coherent approach to the further development of terminal phase ballistic missile defense.

For example, the committee notes that the Army fiscal year 2004 budget request included three separate launcher efforts, one for PAC–3, one capable of launching both the PAC–3 missile and the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) missile, and a MEADS launcher that will only launch the PAC–3 missile. The MEADS program also funded a "certified missile round" for $17.2 million in fiscal year 2003. However, MEADS uses the PAC–3 missile. The committee notes that these redundancies offer ample evidence that efficiencies can be achieved by better coordinating the two programs.

The committee has concluded that greater terminal missile defense capability can be introduced into the field faster by developing a plan to use technologies developed by the MEADS program in successive PAC–3 spiral improvements. This approach would obviate the need to replace PAC–3 with MEADS. PAC–3 would take advantage of sequential MEADS developments in PAC–3 spirals and would eventually evolve into a system with all the attributes the MEADS program is intended to field.

This approach is particularly important given the shortfalls in PAC–3 development identified by the Army. The Army unfunded priority list includes $55.5 million for evolutionary PAC–3 development and another $4.0 million to reduce the size and weight of the PAC–3 antenna mast, and the Army identifies about another

$100.0 million in needed improvements for PAC–3 for which funding was not requested in fiscal year 2004.

Consequently, the committee supports a restructuring of the MEADS and PAC–3 development programs, integrating the two efforts to support PAC–3 spiral development. The committee believes that a restructured program should remain an international cooperative effort. While such restructuring would likely cause some disruption to currently planned MEADS technology development efforts, the committee concludes that the prospective benefits of such a restructuring outweigh the potential disadvantages.

The committee also concludes that this spiral development effort would be best managed by the Missile Defense Agency. MDA's goal of developing a single integrated missile defense system, with a seamless tool kit of missile interceptors, sensors, and battle management systems will require extensive integration of all elements of the system. The committee notes that such coordination is best managed centrally, and that devolution of continuing research and development on deployed systems to the services will undermine that goal. The committee also notes that the effective management of the restructured PAC–3 spiral development program will require continuity in program leadership and oversight.

The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary to restructure the PAC–3 development program and the MEADS program into a coordinated PAC–3 spiral development program and to engage the MEADS international partners in this restructuring. To support this goal, the committee recommends the following:

(1) no funding for PE 64865A, a decrease of $174.5 million;

(2) no funding for PE 63869A, a decrease of $276.3 million;

(3) $415.8 million in PE 64865C, an increase of $415.8 million; and

(4) $48.5 million in PE 23801A, an increase of $4.0 million for the light antenna mast group; and

(5) $223.6 million in Missile Procurement Army, an increase of $11.0 million to meet unfunded PAC–3 requirements identified by the Army.

The committee directs that of the amount authorized for appropriation in PE 64865C, $20.0 million shall be available to meet high priority unfunded PAC–3 evolutionary development efforts identified by the Army. The committee recommends $221.3 million to support MEADS legacy program efforts, which the committee expects would be tailored to support PAC–3 spiral development. The committee notes that this MEADS funding level would represent a $45.1 million increase compared to fiscal year 2003.

Global positioning system jammer detection and location system

The budget request included $10.5 million in PE 27247F for Air Force tactical exploitation of national capabilities, but no funding for the Global Positioning System Jammer Detection and Location System (JLOC).

The Global Positioning System (GPS) is a navigational satellite system that is increasingly central to U.S. warfighting capabilities. GPS provides signals for accurate navigation and provides the technical basis for many of the precision guided weapons in the U.S.

inventory. GPS satellites, however, transmit very low power signals that are susceptible to jamming. The Department of Defense recognizes the high priority need to protect GPS signals from jamming.

The JLOC effort is developing a sensor, database, and predictive tool that will enhance the ability to detect, locate, identify, and track jamming threats to GPS, and thus enhance situational awareness, mission tasking and mission planning. Early assessments have proven the feasibility of the JLOC system and prior year funding will produce an end-to-end demonstration. The committee is aware that additional funds are required to improve the prototype sensor, integrate the sensor on additional platforms, modify and enhance the JLOC master station and database, conduct additional testing, and begin transitioning the system for operational use.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 27247F for JLOC.

Space control test bed

The budget request included $10.5 million in PE 27247F for Air Force tactical exploitation of national capabilities, but no funding for the space control test bed.

U.S. national security space policy includes a requirement to develop, operate, and maintain space control capabilities to ensure freedom of action in space and to deny freedom of action in space to adversaries. One element important to achieving this goal is the ability to assess and integrate new space control systems, concepts, technologies, methods and training in operationally realistic environments. The committee notes that a viable space control test bed could help provide such operationally realistic environments by linking test and operational facilities, collecting and analyzing test and training data, improving system assessment tools and simulations, and developing warfighting exercises.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 27247F for the development of a space control test bed.

Eagle Vision

The budget request included $1.9 million in PE 27277F for research and development of the Air Force Chief of Staff (CSAF) Innovation Program and $3.6 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, line 44, for intelligence command and control. A key component of the CSAF Innovation Program is Eagle Vision, a family of systems that provide commercial imagery to operational commanders. Eagle Vision has been deployed to the Persian Gulf in support of forces engaged in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The committee notes that the President is preparing a national policy supporting government use of commercial remote sensing capabilities and that the Director of Central Intelligence has strongly endorsed the expanded use of commercial imagery to meet U.S. military and intelligence needs. In response, the National Imagery and Mapping Agency is requesting funding to acquire commercial imagery and is supporting the development of next generation commercial imagery satellites. The committee believes that enhancing the warfighters' tools to use this imagery in a timely and effective manner is important to maximize its military utility.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 27277F to provide improved capability to collect and process new high resolution commercial imagery, to sustain and maintain current Eagle Vision systems, and for operational fielding of Eagle Vision improvements near completion.

Joint air-to-surface standoff missile

The budget request included $31.2 million in PE 27325F for the continued development of the Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM). JASSM is a long range, conventional, autonomous, air-to-surface, precision guided cruise missile. The JASSM is currently going through testing and is in low rate initial production. An extended range (ER) variant of the JASSM, known as JASSM-ER, is in development. The JASSM–ER will provide greater standoff for the launch aircraft. This standoff is important, especially for the B–1 bomber aircraft: the B–1 defensive systems upgrade program was cancelled in fiscal year 2003. The committee recommends an increase of $17.0 million in PE 27325F to accelerate the development of JASSM–ER.

Cybersecurity Research

The budget request included $37.7 million in PE 33140F for the Information Systems Security Program. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for research on computer system vulnerabilities and cyberthreats, including the transition of technologies for operational use.

Civil reserve space service

The budget request included $18.6 million in PE 35110F for research and development related to the Air Force Satellite Control Network (AFSCN), but no funding for the civil reserve space service (CRSS).

The AFSCN provides tracking, telemetry, and control for U.S. military satellites. The committee notes that by fiscal year 2006, AFSCN will operate at 96 percent capacity in the eastern hemisphere, a level that will start to jeopardize the ability of the Air Force to meet both routine and contingency requirements. The CRSS effort is intended to demonstrate the feasibility of augmenting AFSCN capabilities with commercial satellite control antennas. The committee is aware that the early experiments have shown that commercial antennas, while not yet able to meet a full range of military satellite control requirements, could free AFSCN capacity to help meet critical warfighter needs. The National Security Space Architect has recommended investigation of commercial services as a means to reduce future AFSCN support and modernization costs.

Therefore, the committee recommends $23.6 million in PE 35110F, an increase of $5.0 million, to continue research into the technical feasibility of CRSS.

Ballistic missile range safety technology

The budget request included $9.7 million in PE 65860F for the rocket systems launch program, but no funding for ballistic missile range safety technology (BMRST).

The committee recognizes that new ballistic missile range safety technology (BMRST) holds significant promise to improve down range reentry support, increase launch support capability, lower range support costs, and improve range safety. BMRST is based on Global Positioning System signals and an inertial navigation system to track space launch vehicles. Because it is mobile, the system can be used to support launches from the Eastern and Western launch ranges (located at Cape Canaveral and Vandenberg Air Force Base, respectively), as well as others with varying trajectories, such as missile defense launches. The significance of this effort is highlighted by the Air Force termination of several other launch range modernization initiatives, including flight safety, centralized control and automation, communications, weather systems, and range surveillance systems in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

Three BMRST units have been developed and one is undergoing certification testing. The committee recommends $25.2 million in PE 65860F, an increase of $15.5 million for BMRST, to expand system capability, support mid-course tracking and range certification, and conduct additional testing requirements to address issues raised in early certification testing.

U–2 aircraft SENIOR YEAR electro-optical reconnaissance system focal planes

The budget request included $52.5 million in PE 35202F, for the Dragon U–2 program, but included no funding for repair or replacement of SENIOR YEAR electro-optical reconnaissance system (SYERS–2) focal planes. The SYERS–2 sensor is a very capable intelligence collection sensor that provides regional combatant commanders with much of their imagery collection needs. When the sensor was developed, it was funded with several spares to replace the focal planes of the sensor, as age and operational tempo caused deteriorations in performance. The number of spares has dwindled and new investment in this long-lead time requirement is critical to maintaining the SYERS–2 capability. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 35202F, to establish the capability to produce, test, and deliver SYERS–2 focal plane assemblies.

U–2 signals intelligence risk mitigation

The budget request included $52.5 million in PE 35202F for the Dragon U–2 program, but included no funding for developmental work to integrate existing sensors onto upgraded U–2 aircraft platforms. Planned upgrades to U–2 airframes have created compatibility and integration issues with regard to current generation sensors. Developmental work is required to make current sensors forward compatible with Block 10 U–2 aircraft. This program is a high priority unfunded requirement of the Secretary of the Air Force.

The committee recommends an increase of $33.0 million in PE 35202F to reduce the risk associated with integrating various sensors onto Block 10 U–2 aircraft.

Global Hawk lithium battery demonstration

The budget request included $398.6 million in PE 35205F for Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million for qualification of a light weight lithium-ion aviation battery for the Global Hawk platform.

Distributed common ground systems

The budget request included $27.1 million in PE 35208F, for distributed common ground systems, but included no funding for Distributed Common Ground/Surface System (DCGS) Block 20, the next generation system to integrate collection from multiple intelligence platforms into a single system for deployed forces.

The Air Force has been pursuing a spiral development approach for DCGS. The so-called "Increment 1" for the program built on legacy, proprietary systems to add capabilities and begin the migration to a system based on an open architecture. The Air Force's goal for DCGS Block 10 is to field a common exploitation infrastructure with an open architecture. The Air Force plan for DCGS Block 20 includes further enhancements providing: (1) collaborative support over broad geographic areas; (2) fusion and exploitation of multiple types of intelligence products; and (3) connectivity with additional intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) platforms, including national assets.

The services and the intelligence community have been plagued for many years by individually developed systems that have hampered overall ISR integration. The committee understands that the senior leadership of the Army, Navy, and Air Force have agreed that the services should consolidate their efforts behind the current Air Force competition for the latest iteration of the DCGS program, called "DCGS Block 10.2." The committee believes that this represents a positive step in solving a long standing problem and directs the Department of Defense to ensure that the services' efforts are focused on a migration path to the open architecture and capabilities prescribed for DCGS Block 20.

Because DCGS Block 20 appears to offer genuine progress in the integrating and expanding use of service and national ISR capabilities, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 35208F, to accelerate development and fielding of DCGS Block 20.

Aging aircraft

The budget request included $54.0 million in PE 78611F for Support Systems Development. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 78611F for technologies to address issues related to aging aircraft.

Defense-Wide

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE			
0601101D8Z	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH			
0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	151,029	21,000	172,029
		Nano- and microelectronics		[5,000]	
		Neural engineering research		[4,000]	
		Government industry cosponsorship of university research program		[10,000]	
		Nanophotonic systems fabrication		[2,000]	
0601103D8Z	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES		264,035	264,035
		Transfer program from PE 61103A (RDA 3)		[71,642]	
		Transfer program from PE 61103N (RDN 1)		[70,669]	
		Transfer program from PE 61103F (RDAF 2)		[105,224]	
		Photonics research		[3,500]	
		Advanced remote sensing software		[5,000]	
		Bioterrorism response analysis		[2,000]	
		Carbon nanotechnology research		[6,000]	
0601105D8Z	4	FORCE HEALTH PROTECTION			
0601108D8Z	5	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES		12,063	12,063
		Transfer program from PE 61108F (RDAF 3)		[12,063]	
0601111D8Z	6	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESE			
0601114D8Z	7	DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PGM TO STIM COMPETITIVE RESEARCH			
0601384BP	8	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	35,831	3,500	39,331
		Bacteriophage amplification		[1,500]	
		Cell and tissue culture and bacterial growth core research		[2,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0602227D8Z	9	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	9,494	9,000	18,494
		Medical free electron laser		[9,000]	
0602228D8Z	10	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCI			
0602234D8Z	11	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	27,231		27,231
0602301E	12	COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	404,859	-20,000	384,859
		Computer research projects		[-20,000]	
0602302E	13	EMBEDDED SOFTWARE AND PERVASIVE COMPUTING	13,318		13,318
0602383E	14	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	137,254		137,254
0602384BP	15	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	106,451	21,000	127,451
		Acoustic wave sensor technology		[2,000]	
		Water quality sensors		[3,500]	
		Mustard gas antidote		[3,000]	
		Bioinformatics		[6,500]	
		Sensor technologies		[2,000]	
		Food security technologies		[3,000]	
		Nerve agent decontamination technology		[1,000]	
0602702E	16	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	250,558	-11,000	239,558
		Tactical technology		[-11,000]	
0602712E	17	MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	465,544	-20,000	445,544
		Biology research		[-20,000]	
0602715BR	18	NUCLEAR SUSTAINMENT & COUNTERPROLIFERATION TECHNOLC			
0602716BR	19	WMD DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY	183,178		183,178
0602717BR	20	STRATEGIC DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES	116,049		116,049

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0602787D8Z	21	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	9,213	2,500	11,713
		AFRRI		[2,500]	
0602890D8Z	22	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH		41,854	41,854
		Transfer program from PE 62890F (RDAF 15)		[41,854]	
1160401BB	23	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	9,715		9,715
1160407BB	24	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,961		1,961
0603002D8Z	25	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	5,028		5,028
0603104D8Z	26	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY		18,849	18,849
		Transfer program from PE 63103A (RDA 45)		[9,349]	
		Actodemil		[2,500]	
		Prototype production capability		[4,000]	
		Photocatalytic decommissioning process		[3,000]	
0603121D8Z	27	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	31,300		31,300
0603122D8Z	28	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	60,526	7,500	68,026
		Blast mitigation		[7,500]	
0603160BR	29	COUNTERPROLIFERATION ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT TECHNOL(	76,277	10,000	86,277
		Portable radiation search tool		[10,000]	
0603175C	30	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	240,820		240,820
0603225D8Z	31	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	25,011		25,011
0603232D8Z	32	AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION			
0603285E	33	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	323,730	-20,000	303,730
		Space technology		[-20,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603384BP	34	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED D	103,725	6,000	109,725
		SensorNet		[5,000]	
		Topically applied vector vaccine		[1,000]	
0603704D8Z	35	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	11,693		11,693
0603711BR	36	ARMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	4,807		4,807
0603712S	37	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	22,359	23,000	45,359
		Manufacturing extension partnership		[9,000]	
		Diminishing manufacturing sources (DMS) database		[7,000]	
		Vehicle fuel cells		[7,000]	
0603716D8Z	38	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	47,068		47,068
0603727D8Z	39	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	9,685		9,685
0603728D8Z	40	AGILE PORT DEMONSTRATION			
0603739E	41	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	174,150		174,150
0603750D8Z	42	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	213,361	10,000	223,361
		High altitude airship		[10,000]	
0603752D8Z	43	COMMERCIAL TECHNOLOGY INSERTION PROGRAM			
0603755D8Z	44	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM			
0603760E	45	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	242,738	3,000	245,738
		All optical switching system		[3,000]	
0603762E	46	SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	342,914	-25,000	317,914
		Sensor technologies		[-25,000]	
0603763E	47	MARINE TECHNOLOGY	13,898		13,898
0603764E	48	LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	82,387	7,500	89,887
		Organic micro air vehicle		[7,500]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603765E	49	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	210,532		210,532
0603766E	50	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	95,654		95,654
0603769D8Z	51	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPME			
0603781D8Z	52	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	22,652		22,652
0603805S	53	DUAL USE APPLICATION PROGRAMS			
0603826D8Z	54	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	74,385		74,385
0603832D8Z	55	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	44,887		44,887
0603924D8Z	56	HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM		10,910	10,910
		Transfer program from PE 63924F (RDAF 36)		[10,910]	
0603942D8Z	57	TECHNOLOGY LINK	2,000		2,000
0603943D8Z	58	AIR-TO-AIR TECHNOLOGY	2,000		2,000
0605160D8Z	59	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	1,882		1,882
0605803SE	60	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATI(	13,757		13,757
1160402BB	61	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	67,017		67,017
0603228D8Z	62	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT			
0603709D8Z	63	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	11,515	3,000	14,515
		Semi-autonomous UGV		[3,000]	
0603714D8Z	64	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	16,718	10,000	26,718
		Classified programs		[10,000]	
0603736D8Z	65	CALS INITIATIVE	4,000		4,000
0603851D8Z	66	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGR	35,594		35,594
0603869C	67	MEADS CONCEPTS			
0603879C	68	ADVANCED CONCEPTS, EVALUATIONS AND SYSTEMS	151,696		151,696
0603880C	69	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SEGMENT			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603881C	70	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	810,440	10,000	820,440
		Arrow		[10,000]	
0603882C	71	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	3,613,266	88,300	3,701,566
		Ground-based midcourse		[100,000]	
		Aegis program management		[-11,700]	
0603883C	72	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT	626,264		626,264
0603884BP	73	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	162,142	6,000	168,142
		Anthrax and plague oral vaccine development		[6,000]	
0603884C	74	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	438,242	3,250	441,492
		Airborne infrared system		[10,000]	
		X-band radar		[5,000]	
		E-2 infrared search and track (IRST)		[3,750]	
		STSS program management		[-15,500]	
0603886C	75	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM INTERCEPTOR	301,052	-70,000	231,052
		BMDS inteceptors		[-70,000]	
0603888C	76	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS	611,522		611,522
0603889C	77	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PRODUCTS	343,644		343,644
0603890C	78	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS CORE	483,996	-3,000	480,996
		Corporate lethality testing		[-5,000]	
		Advanced Research Center (ARC)		[2,000]	
0603910D8Z	79	STRATEGIC CAPABILITY MODERNIZATION			
0603920D8Z	80	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	13,299		13,299
0603923D8Z	81	COALITION WARFARE	5,906		5,906
0604722D8Z	82	JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPM			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0303191D8Z	83	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	6,362		6,362
0604384BP	84	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	148,017	5,700	153,717
		Wide area decontamination solutions and applicators		[5,700]	
0604618D8Z	85	MANPADS DEFENSE PROGRAM	25,000		25,000
0604709D8Z	86	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	13,597	2,000	15,597
		Counter-terrorism UGVs		[2,000]	
0604764K	87	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	18,910		18,910
0604771D8Z	88	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	10,633		10,633
0604861C	89	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD			
0604865C	90	PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION		415,800	415,800
		PAC-3 spiral development transfer from PE 63869A (RDA 81)		[241,325]	
		PAC-3 spiral development transfer from PE 23801A (RDA 130)		[174,475]	
		Patriot evolutionary development program ($20,000 non-add)			
0604867C	91	NAVY AREA THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE			
0605013BL	92	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	10,539		10,539
0605013D8Z	93	PROTOTYPE ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS			
0605015BL	94	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT-STANDARD PROC S	5,195		5,195
0605016D8Z	95	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	84,688		84,688
0303129K	96	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	10,170		10,170
0303140K	97	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	5,987		5,987
0303141K	98	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	17,259		17,259
0305840K	99	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE	6,028		6,028
0305840S	100	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE	2,360		2,360
0603757D8Z	101	TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (T2)	2,951		2,951

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0603858D8Z	102	UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE			
0604774D8Z	103	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	18,575		18,575
0604943D8Z	104	THERMAL VICAR	7,157		7,157
0605104D8Z	105	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	30,204		30,204
0605110BR	106	CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	1,858		1,858
0605114D8Z	107	BLACK LIGHT	19,675		19,675
0605114E	108	BLACK LIGHT			
0605116D8Z	109	GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	24,638	3,000	27,638
		See and avoid UAV technologies		[3,000]	
0605117D8Z	110	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	33,916		33,916
0605123D8Z	111	INTERAGENCY EXPORT LICENSE AUTOMATION	8,837		8,837
0605124D8Z	112	DEFENSE TRAVEL SYSTEM	31,806		31,806
0605126J	113	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	87,250		87,250
0605128D8Z	114	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)			
0605130D8Z	115	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	34,873		34,873
0605384BP	116	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	39,345		39,345
0605502C	117	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - MDA			
0605502E	118	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605710D8Z	119	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	20,556		20,556
0605790D8Z	120	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH/CHALLENGE ADMINIS	2,026		2,026
0605798S	121	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	5,209	1,000	6,209
		Global research watch		[1,000]	
0605799D8Z	122	FORCE TRANSFORMATION DIRECTORATE	19,675		19,675
0605801K	123	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIC)	44,162		44,162

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0605803SE	124	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATI(	8,858		8,858
0605804D8Z	125	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	8,938		8,938
0605898E	126	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	45,002		45,002
0901585C	127	PENTAGON RESERVATION	14,481		14,481
0901598C	128	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS - MDA	93,441		93,441
0901598D8W	129	IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES	8,605		8,605
0909999E	130	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
0604805D8Z	131	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE			
0605127T	132	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SY	1,934		1,934
0605601D8Z	133	RDT&E TRANSFORMATIONAL PROGRAMS			
0607384BP	134	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYS DEV)	3,442		3,442
0208043J	135	ISLAND SUN	1,469		1,469
0208045K	136	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	42,415		42,415
0208052J	137	JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	7,254		7,254
0300205R	138	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS	550		550
0301011G	139	CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[ ]		
0301301L	140	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[ ]		
0301398L	141	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS GDIP, DIA	[ ]		
0302016K	142	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	1,133		1,133
0302019K	143	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATI(	2,460		2,460
0303126K	144	LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	1,401		1,401
0303127K	145	SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM			
0303131K	146	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORI	7,198		7,198
0303140D8Z	147	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	14,790		14,790

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0303140G	148	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	476,657	2,000	478,657
		Info systems security research		[2,000]	
0303149J	149	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	4,199		4,199
0303149K	150	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	37,100		37,100
0303150K	151	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	49,991		49,991
0303153K	152	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	18,850		18,850
0303165K	153	DEFENSE COLLABORATION TOOL SUITE (DCTS)	14,915		14,915
0303170K	154	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	40,830		40,830
0303610K	155	TELEPORT PROGRAM	10,462		10,462
0304210BB	156	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	24,587		24,587
0304345BQ	157	NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY	[ ]		
0305102BQ	158	DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	161,873	18,000	179,873
		NIMA TPED for FIA development		[14,000]	
		BRITE		[4,000]	
0305125D8Z	159	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	2,051		2,051
0305127BZ	160	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	[ ]		
0305127V	161	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES			
0305146BZ	162	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (JMIP)	82,266		82,266
0305146D8Z	163	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (JMIP)	30,757		30,757
0305190D8Z	164	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	132,094		132,094
0305191D8Z	165	TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	249,152		249,152
0305193L	166	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS	[ ]		
0305202G	167	DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	2,747		2,747
0305206G	168	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	12,184		12,184

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
0305207G	169	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,424		4,424
0305208BQ	170	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	[ ]		
0305208G	171	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	2,460		2,460
0305208L	172	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	979		979
0305883L	173	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET INTEL SUPPORT	[ ]		
0305884L	174	INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES	[ ]		
0305885G	175	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	112,691		112,691
0305889G	176	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT			
0305917D8Z	177	NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE ARCHITECT (NSSA)			
0708011S	178	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	16,163	3,000	19,163
		Laser additive manufacturing technology		[3,000]	
0708012S	179	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	35,781		35,781
0902298J	180	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)	18,943		18,943
1001018D8Z	181	NATO JOINT STARS	24,721		24,721
1160279BB	182	SMALL BUS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANS PII			
1160401BB	183	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
1160402BB	184	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
1160404BB	185	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	255,981	11,500	267,481
		Light counter mortar radar		[1,500]	
		Multiband multimission radios		[10,000]	
1160405BB	186	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,726		16,726
1160407BB	187	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
1160408BB	188	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	64,430		64,430

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	2,892,190		2,892,190
		Financial information systems		-10,500	-10,500
		Total, RDT&E Defense-Wide	**17,974,257**	**874,761**	**18,849,018**
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE			
0603941D8Z	1	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	12,804		12,804
0604940D8Z	2	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (	123,215		123,215
0605118D8Z	3	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	37,323		37,323
0605131D8Z	4	LIVE FIRE TESTING	10,074		10,074
0605804D8Z	5	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	103,245		103,245
		Total, Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	**286,661**		**286,661**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**61,826,654**	**1,294,216**	**63,120,870**

Defense Research Sciences

The budget request included $151.0 million in PE 61101E for Defense Research Sciences. The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 61101E for university based basic research in this account: $5.0 million for nano- and micro-electromechanical systems; and $4.0 million for neural engineering research for autonomous control.

Nanophotonic systems fabrication

The budget request included $151.0 million in PE 61101E for Defense Research Sciences. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 61101E for research on the fabrication of novel nanophotonic systems.

Semiconductor research programs

The budget request included $151.0 million in PE 61101E for basic research at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 61101E to continue the Government Industry Cosponsorship of University Research (GICUR) program. Of this amount, the committee recommends that $1.0 million be used to support the GICUR Undergraduate Research Assistantship Program, and directs that this funding be targeted towards increasing the participation of U.S. citizens in semiconductor research programs.

The committee notes that the budget request included no funding for the GICUR program. This program has successfully partnered industry with DOD in investing in basic research to develop the next generation of semiconductor microelectronics technologies. These technologies advance the capabilities of nearly every defense weapon system, including radars, missile seekers, and information and communications networks. The program also supported several university-based microelectronics research centers that helped maintain the United States' global advantage in semiconductor technology and train the next generation of electronics engineers.

The committee is concerned about the serious national security implications of the decline of the domestic high-end semiconductor chip manufacturing sector, and the potential subsequent loss of domestic semiconductor research and design capabilities. The migration of these capabilities overseas could potentially hamper the ability of the Department of Defense to obtain high-end semiconductor integrated circuits from domestic sources.

The committee directs the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology to submit a report detailing Department of Defense plans to ensure the retention of domestic semiconductor chip manufacturing capabilities, as well as research and design capability. This report should be submitted by September 30, 2004. The committee notes that it may be possible to address some of these issues by increasing funds for research and development, supporting cooperative government-industry research programs, adjusting U.S. trade policies, and developing joint production agreements and other innovative partnership arrangements with the semiconductor industry.

University Research Initiative

The budget request included no funding for PE 61103D8Z, University Research Initiative. In the fiscal year 2004 budget request, this program was devolved to the military services, however, the committee has reconstituted the program, as referred to elsewhere in this committee report. The committee recommends an increase of $16.5 million in PE 61103D8Z: $6.0 million for university based research in advanced carbon nanotechnology to support the warfighter; $3.5 million for basic research in photonics and microsystems technology; $5.0 million for development and testing of advanced remote sensing software; and $2.0 million to develop integrated systems analysis capabilities for bioterrorism response exercises.

Cell and tissue culture and bacterial growth core research

The budget request included $6.3 million in PE 61384BP for chemical and biological defense basic research, including research in the life sciences in support of new and improved detection technologies for biological agents and toxins. The committee recognizes the importance of core research in the areas of cell and tissue culture and bacterial growth. Recognized follow-on application of this research includes vaccine development, biosensor production and biological pharmaceuticals development. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for cell and tissue culture and bacterial growth core research in PE 61384BP.

Bacteriophage amplification

The budget request included $35.8 million in PE 61384BP for chemical and biological defense basic research, including efforts to expand knowledge in the relevant fields for chemical and biological defense. The committee recognizes the importance of improving the sensitivity, portability, and effectiveness of current biological agent detectors, including those technologies that will analyze for bacteria in food, water, body fluids and soil. To advance this research, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million for bacteriophage amplification to improve the analysis of whole cell bacteria in PE 61384BP.

Medical Free Electron Laser

The budget request included $9.5 million in PE 62227D8Z for the medical free electron laser program. The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 62227D8Z. The committee notes elsewhere in this committee report that the Department of Defense's devolvement of this program to the National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 2003 produced disastrous results. While the program was returned to the Department in fiscal year 2004, the budget request was decreased by approximately 50 percent. The committee expects the Department to fully fund the medical free electron laser program in future years at levels that existed prior to devolvement.

Computer research projects

The budget request included $404.9 million in PE 62301E for Computing Systems and Communications Technology. The committee recommends a decrease of $20.0 million in PE 62301E.

Acoustic wave sensor technology

The budget request included no funding in PE 62384BP for acoustic wave sensor technology. The committee supports efforts of the Defense Department to leverage advances in surface acoustic wave technology for biological agent detector applications. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to PE 62384BP for such purposes.

Bioinformatics

The budget request included $106.5 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense program applied research, including efforts to improve chemical and biological defense equipment and material. The committee continues to support Defense Department research in the field of bioinformatics. Molecular-level biological data such as pathogen deoxyribonucleic acid is essential to combat bioweapons and infectious diseases. The committee understands that the requirement to process extremely large life science data sets, to conduct bio-system and genomic information analysis, and to provide advanced information on descriptive capabilities of pathogens to end-users in the military present significant challenges. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million in PE 62384BP for bioinformatics research.

Food security technologies

The budget request included $106.5 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense program applied research, including efforts to conduct real-time sensing and immediate biological countermeasures, but no funding for food security technologies. The committee notes that the food supply of armed forces can be a vulnerability unless adequate protective measures are established. The committee supports initiatives to address this vulnerability, including the equipping of research facilities with necessary hardware and instrumentation. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62384BP for research and development of food security technologies to defend against chemical and biological contamination.

Mustard gas antidote

The budget request included $17.9 million in PE 62384BP for applied research related to the development and application of pharmaceuticals for prevention and treatment of the toxic effects of nerve, blister, respiratory, and blood agents. The committee is aware of research being conducted by the Department of Defense for a mustard gas antidote using signal transduction inhibition antioxidant liposomes (STIMAL). The committee notes that STIMAL research has demonstrated the ability to substantially reduce or eliminate the affects of a range of chemical and biological weapons. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62384BP for mustard gas antidote research.

Nerve agent decontamination technology

The budget request included $65.9 million in PE 62384BP for applied research in chemical-biological defense technologies, including decontamination technologies. The committee supports the work of the Department of Defense to develop decontamination agents that are less toxic and increasingly "environmentally friendly," such as photo-catalytic decontamination solutions. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62384BP to develop a rapid decontamination system utilizing photo-catalytic technology.

Sensor technologies

The budget request included $106.5 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense program applied research, including conduct of applied research in the area of real-time sensor networks. The committee supports efforts by the Department of Defense to enhance real-time detector sensors and related technologies. The committee notes that of the many challenges of sensor technologies, those related to deployment of sensors over a large geographic area are particularly difficult. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62384BP to develop a prototype sensor network that can be deployed over a large geographic region.

Water quality sensors

The budget request included no funding in PE 62384BP for water quality sensors. The committee notes the military utility of the real-time monitoring of water quality, including biological and pollutant agents in drinking water. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 62384BP for the development of a hand-held water quality sensing device for such purposes.

Tactical technology

The budget request included $250.6 million in PE 62702E for applied research on tactical technology. The committee recommends a decrease of $11.0 million in PE 62702E for mission specific processing, water rocket technology and the Varuna program.

Biology research at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency

The budget request included $465.5 million in PE 62712E for Materials and Electronics Technology. The committee recommends a decrease of $20.0 million in PE 62712E for research on biological materials and systems.

Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute

The budget request includes $9.2 million in PE 62787D8Z for applied research in medical technologies at the Armed Forces Radiobiology Institute (AFRRI). The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62787D8Z to support the radiation biology research activities of AFRRI.

The committee commends the efforts of AFRRI to conduct world class research in radiation biology to support Department of Defense (DOD) operational missions and homeland defense activities. The committee notes that AFRRI research is directed towards re-

sponding to nuclear accidents or terrorist incidents, by developing the medical practices and technologies used in radiation casualty management. The committee notes that a terrorist nuclear incident in a major metropolitan center could result in millions of casualties and would overwhelm the ability of the government and medical infrastructure to respond. Despite this threat and the world-class research and training performed by AFRRI for DOD since 1961, this program was transferred to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in fiscal year 2003, where the program's budget was zeroed.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report at the time of submission of the fiscal year 2005 budget request detailing plans for the role of AFRRI in responding to a terrorist nuclear incident. The report should analyze the adequacy of AFRRI's staff, resources, and facilities to handle the inevitable surge in research and medical support activities following such an event, the organizational structures that link AFRRI's expertise with the homeland defense activities of DOD, research and technology development goals of DOD and AFRRI that will improve national response capabilities for such an event, and the impact of the lack of funding for the AFRRI program in fiscal year 2003 budget request. The report should also consider any lessons learned by the surge in activities at the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases following the recent terrorist anthrax attacks.

Explosive demilitarization technology

The budget request included no funding in PE 63104D8Z for explosive demilitarization technology programs. The budget request included $16.3 million in PE 63103A for explosive demilitarization technology programs. The budget request reflects the decision by the Department of Defense to devolve explosive demilitarization technology programs to the military services in fiscal year 2004.

As discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee disagrees with the recommendation of the Department to devolve certain research and development programs, such as explosive demilitarization technology programs, to the services. Therefore, the committee recommends that explosive demilitarization technology programs be reconstituted as the Explosive Demilitarization Technology program, PE 63104D8Z, and that $16.3 million in PE 63104A be transferred to PE 63104D8Z.

In addition, the committee recommends an increase of $9.5 million in PE 63104D8Z for explosive demilitarization technology programs. Of this amount, $4.0 million would be used for demilitarization technology, to include a prototype production capability that will eliminate the usage of open-burn/open-detonation for disposing of tactical missiles; $3.0 million to provide technical support and research in the photocatalytic decommissioning process; and, $2.5 million to enhance and expand the application of the actodemil process.

Blast mitigation program

The budget request included $60.5 million in PE 0603122D8Z for Combating Terrorism Technical Support. The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 0603122D8Z for the blast mitigation program to pursue research and development of

technologies to validate and enhance existing and new analytical tools that will be available to the armed services, homeland defense officials, state and local preparedness groups, and the structural engineering community. The committee recognizes the importance of understanding the response of buildings, structures, and housing to explosives and other weapons of mass destruction to improve the protection of our nation's infrastructure.

Portable radiation search tool

The budget request included $76.3 million in PE 63160BR for counterproliferation advanced development technologies, including efforts to demonstrate integrated nuclear warfare protection system technologies. The committee notes that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency included testing of a portable radiation search tool (PRST) in the congressionally-directed Unconventional Nuclear Warfare Defense pilot program. The PRST, a gamma ray and neutron detector based on fiber optic technology, demonstrated the capability to detect radiological weapons of mass destruction. In addition, the PRST was certified by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for exceeding requirements during IAEA's Illicit Trafficking Radiation Assessment Program. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63160BR for continued development of the PRST.

Advanced Aerospace Systems

The budget request included $323.7 million in PE 63285E for technology development of advanced aerospace systems. The committee recommends a decrease of $20.0 million in PE 63285E. This reduction reflects a concern over a lack of coordination among the Department of Defense's space research programs.

Anthrax and plague oral vaccine research and development

The budget request included $49.9 million for preclinical development of safe and effective prophylaxes and therapies for pre- and post-exposure to biological threat agents, including development of oral vaccines. The committee supports efforts to exploit advanced vaccine technology to develop a single-dose oral vaccine that can protect against multiple biological warfare agents, such as anthrax and plague. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for continuing development of an oral vaccine in PE 63384BP.

SensorNet

The budget request included $103.7 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense program advanced technology development. The committee is aware of the Department of Defense initiative, SensorNet, to utilize public cell phone infrastructure for real-time detection and assessment of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear threats. The committee notes that a pilot program to test an integrated and interoperable system involving a military installation and a surrounding civilian community would provide the data necessary for program evaluation. The committee recommends $5.0 million in PE 63384BP for a SensorNet pilot program.

Topically applied vectored vaccines

The budget request included $49.9 million in PE 63384BP for preclinical development of safe and effective prophylaxes and therapies for pre- and post-exposure to biological threat agents, but included no funding for topically applied vector vaccines. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 63384BP to continue efforts initiated by the Navy on topically applied vectored vaccines.

Logistics technology demonstrations

The budget request included $22.4 million in PE 63712S for logistical research and development technical demonstrations. The committee notes the importance of this research and development in providing possible solutions for the readiness and sustainment issues facing the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $16.0 million in PE 63712S for logistics technology demonstrations: $9.0 million to develop a multi-state manufacturing extension partnership to assist the Department in the identification of requirements for product delivery times; and $7.0 million to develop and maintain a centralized repository for diminishing manufacturing source information.

Vehicle fuel cell program

The budget request included $22.4 million in PE 63712S for Generic Logistics Research and Development Technology Demonstrations. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63712S to continue the vehicle fuel cell program, including research and development on reforming technologies that will allow use of JP–8 fuel in emerging fuel cell propulsion technologies.

High Altitude Airship

The budget request included $213.4 million in PE 63750D8Z for Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations (ACTD). The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63750D8Z for the acceleration of the High Altitude Airship ACTD program. The High Altitude Airship will provide long duration capability, wide area surveillance, large payload capacity and communication relay functions. The committee commends the Department of Defense for its investment in innovative platforms, such as the High Altitude Airship, that offer transformational capabilities.

All optical transparent switching systems

The budget request included $242.7 million in PE 63760E for applied research in command, control, and communications research. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63760E for research in all optical transparent switching systems. The committee recommends DARPA more fully interact with other services and defense agencies, particularly defense intelligence agencies, to leverage the research and technology development opportunities in high-speed, high-data rate, encrypted networks.

Sensor and guidance technology

The budget request included $342.9 million in PE 63762E for Sensor and Guidance Technology. The committee recommends a de-

crease of $25.0 million in PE 63762E for sensor and guidance technology. Of this amount, $10.0 million would be reduced from the Lightfoot radar project and advanced exploitation system technologies.

Organic micro unmanned aerial vehicles

The budget request included $82.4 million in PE 63764E for Land Warfare Technology. The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 63764E for the acceleration of the organic air vehicle (OAV) family of vehicles. This scalable platform offers autonomous operations, long endurance on station, and hover or perching capabilities. The OAV is a critical component of the unmanned systems within Future Combat System.

Tactical unmanned ground vehicles

The budget request included $11.5 million in PE 63709D8Z for the Joint Robotics Program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63709D8Z for the development and demonstration of semi-autonomous capabilities of unmanned ground systems. The committee notes that the autonomous nature of unmanned ground vehicles is a particularly challenging aspect of the platform and supports increased research in this important technology development area.

Arrow

The budget request included $64.8 million in PE 63881C for the continued research and development of the U.S.-Israel Arrow ballistic missile defense program, but no funding for procurement of the Arrow system for deployment in Israel.

The committee continues to support Israeli efforts to defend itself from ballistic missile threats posed by its regional adversaries and recognizes that those threats will continue to evolve over time. The Arrow system is a key component of Israel's missile defense efforts. The committee notes that the importance of missile defense interoperability was highlighted during the recent conflict in Iraq when the Patriot air and missile defense system was deployed to Israel to supplement the Arrow system. To support improved Arrow system performance, more robust testing, and enhanced interoperability with U.S. missile defense systems, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63881C, for a total authorization of $74.8 million.

The committee also supports U.S. co-production of the Arrow, which will allow Israel to deploy this system in a more timely manner. The committee notes that the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003, recently approved by Congress includes $9.0 billion in loan guarantees and $1.0 billion in foreign military financing to assist Israel in meeting the cost of defending itself from regional threats. The committee believes that these sources of funding, in addition to the foreign assistance provided to Israel annually by the United States, should allow Israel the flexibility to meet more effectively the full range of its defense needs, including defense against ballistic missile attack.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense provided two thirds of the funding for the development of the Arrow system

and continues to provide funding for Arrow production, and that the Arrow system embodies U.S. developed technologies. The committee notes that any sale of the Arrow ballistic missile defense system to third parties should take place only after approval by the U.S. Government, pursuant to the requirements of existing law.

Aegis ballistic missile defense

The budget request contained $3.6 billion in PE 63882C for midcourse ballistic missile defense, of which $726.2 million was for Aegis ballistic missile defense. The committee notes that the request within this program element for Aegis ballistic missile defense program management has more than tripled since fiscal year 2002, and has increased by $11.7 million as compared to fiscal year 2003, although program management personnel levels remained stable. The committee recommends $714.5 million in PE 63882C for Aegis ballistic missile defense, a decrease of $11.7 million.

Ground-based midcourse defense

The budget request included $3.6 billion in PE 63882C for the ballistic missile defense (BMD) midcourse defense segment, of which $2.8 billion is for ground-based midcourse defense.

The committee supports the President's decision to field an initial set of missile defense capabilities, including a total of twenty interceptors at Fort Greely and Vandenberg Air Force Base by the end of fiscal year 2005. The committee recognizes that this is an ambitious schedule, which is driven by the immediacy of missile threats to the United States that were confirmed by the Director of Central Intelligence, who testified to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that North Korea has both nuclear devices and the current capability of reaching the United States with a ballistic missile.

Although the director of the Missile Defense Agency has testified that the funding requested for ground-based midcourse defense is adequate to develop and field the system on schedule, the committee notes that MDA assesses the technical and schedule risk as medium and the cost risk of the program as high. The committee notes that an additional intercept test, an integrated ground test, a second in-flight interceptor communication system data terminal, and a second mission computer for the sea-based X-band radar would be useful to reduce risk and enhance operational availability and capability.

Therefore, the committee recommends $3.7 billion in PE 63882C, an increase of $100.0 million for an additional intercept test in fiscal year 2004 and other activities to reduce technical, schedule, and cost risk and enhance the test and operational capabilities of the ground-based midcourse defense system. The committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives by November 1, 2003, on the ground-based midcourse defense test plan. The report should identify changes to the plan submitted with the fiscal year 2003 budget, the rationale for those changes, an explanation of the test planning process, and the goals of each GMD flight test as of the date of the report.

Airborne infrared system

The budget request included $438.2 million in PE 63884C for ballistic missile defense sensors, but no funding for the airborne infrared system (AIRS).

AIRS is a system of six infrared and visible sensors, a surveillance radar, and adjunct data processing and storage. Early versions of the system are mounted on aircraft (the High Altitude Observatory, or HALO, and HALO II), but with incremental and evolutionary development, could be deployed on a variety of platforms, including the Global Hawk unmanned aerial vehicle and potentially, the High Altitude Airship being developed by the Missile Defense Agency (MDA). HALO and HALO II have already provided valuable data on infrared signatures of ballistic missiles. The committee believes that an improved system, if and when deployed, could meet important operational and technical intelligence capabilities in support of ballistic missile defense requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63884C for AIRS research and development. This funding will allow MDA to proceed with engineering and concept studies for a full scale operational prototype sensor suite suitable for installation on either a manned or unmanned aerial platform.

E–2 infrared search and track

The budget request included $438.2 million in PE 63884C for ballistic missile defense sensors, but no funding for infrared search and track technology for the Navy's E–2 tactical warning and command and control aircraft.

The Navy has conducted testing of a turreted infrared search and track (IRST) system on the Navy's E–2's tactical warning and command and control aircraft that successfully demonstrated the potential for such a system to receive cues, and then detect and track short and medium range ballistic missiles. A more capable system, that includes fixed infrared arrays and a turret, shows high potential for a robust capability to detect and track these missile threats early in flight through mid-course trajectory and to provide accurate impact point prediction. The committee notes that this project is best funded through the BMD sensors program element.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.75 million in PE 63884C for flight testing and continued development of the E–2 IRST project. The committee directs the Director of MDA to assess this sensor technology as a component of the BMD sensor architecture.

Family of radars

The budget request included $438.2 million in PE 63884C for ballistic missile defense (BMD) sensors.

The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has initiated an effort to validate the concepts of forward based radars, sensor layering and netting, and the use of such radars to observe ballistic missiles early in flight to provide precise track information for use by other elements of the BMD system. The committee is aware that MDA considered several alternatives for the first generation of radars to be forward based. These included several variants of the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) radar and the High Power Dis-

criminator, a smaller X-band radar suitable for deployment on Aegis cruisers. MDA concluded that a modified THAAD radar is the alternative that provides maximum capability in the most cost effective and timely manner. MDA awarded a $350.0 million contract for modified and marinized THAAD radars, the first being available for test in 2005 and operationally available in 2006.

The committee understands the potential advantages of land-basing forward based radars, including routine availability. However, the committee is concerned that the U.S. military will not always know with good fidelity where missile threats will develop, nor whether basing rights in foreign nations would be available. Sea basing for these radars could provide significant flexibility to meet the missile defense requirements against threat missiles of all ranges and in multiple theaters. The committee notes that sea-basing of forward based sensors is particularly significant in light of the President's decision in December 2002, to field an initial set of missile defense capabilities. That decision includes deployment of up to 20 Standard Missile III interceptors on Aegis cruisers by 2005.

The committee understands that the marinized THAAD radar variant could be deployed on a variety of sea-borne platforms. In part because MDA has not selected a basing mode, the current contract does not include any activities to integrate this radar on a ship. The committee understands that early design activities to achieve such an integration could begin in fiscal year 2004, and integration and deployment on a ship could be achieved by 2006. Selection of a sea-based platform and the start of this design work in fiscal year 2004 would be important to achieving this schedule and supporting early sea-based missile defense capabilities.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63884C to initiate design efforts to integrate the marinized THAAD radar with a sea-based platform by 2006. The committee urges MDA and the Navy to commit to such a platform in a timely manner. The committee directs the Director of MDA, in consultation with the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, to develop an appropriate deployment plan and concept of operations to ensure that sea-based forward based radars can achieve maximum capability to support both theater and long-range missile defense missions, and to report to the congressional defense committees on the plan and concept of operations no later than February 15, 2004.

Russian American observation satellite program

The budget request included $438.2 million in PE 63884C for ballistic missile defense sensors, of which $29.6 million was for the Russian American Observation Satellite (RAMOS) program. Of the amount requested for RAMOS, $11.4 million is intended to fund hardware development in the Russian Federation.

The committee continues to support cooperative missile defense efforts with the Russian Federation. However, the committee notes that no formal government-to-government agreement on the RAMOS program yet exists despite years of negotiation. In the absence of such an agreement, the Russian Federation hardware development was supported at a level of $6.0 million in fiscal year 2003.

The committee recommends $29.6 million in PE 63884C for the RAMOS program, the requested amount. The committee directs that, of that amount, no more than $24.6 million may be available for obligation or expenditure until a government-to-government agreement on the RAMOS program is concluded. The committee intends this restriction to provide an appropriate incentive to the Russian Federation to reach an agreement.

Space tracking and surveillance system

The budget request included $300.2 million in PE 63884C for the space tracking and surveillance system (STSS), of which $65.7 million was for program management. The committee remains strongly supportive of the STSS effort, which is intended to develop space-based infrared sensors capable of detecting, tracking, and potentially discriminating ballistic missile warheads in flight. However, the committee notes an unjustified growth in program management cost since fiscal year 2003. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $15.5 million in PE 63884C for STSS.

Ballistic missile defense system interceptors

The budget request included $301.1 million in PE 63886C for ballistic missile defense system (BMDS) interceptors research and development. The program is intended to develop an interceptor missile for boost phase or mid-course intercept of ballistic missiles that can be ground- or sea-based. It will also develop boost phase kinetic energy interceptor kill vehicles for land-, sea-, and space-based systems. The program is structured to mature ground-based technologies first, and evolve those technologies over time for sea- and space-basing.

The committee believes that boost phase defenses will be important in the overall ballistic missile defense architecture and supports continuing efforts in this area. Further efforts to develop a common multi-use interceptor could also result in efficiencies across a number of systems. However, the committee is aware that the operational concepts for kinetic energy boost phase intercept systems from land and sea are extraordinarily challenging in some key respects and that the architecture of a space based boost system is unclear. The committee also notes that: (1) the budget request represents a six-fold increase in funding for the interceptor missile; (2) no path to migrate the technology to sea-basing has been established; and (3) political factors related to land-based siting and budget implications of new sea-based platforms are not clearly understood.

Consequently, the committee recommends $231.1 million in PE 63886C for BMDS interceptors, a decrease of $70.0 million. The committee notes that the funding recommended will be sufficient to proceed with a robust program.

Advanced Research Center

The budget request contained $484.0 million in PE 63890C for ballistic missile defense system core activities. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for the Advanced Research Center.

Ballistic missile defense lethality testing

The budget request included a total of $484.0 million in PE 63890C for ballistic missile defense system core activities, which provides resources to define and integrate the BMD system. Of this amount, $21.2 million was requested for lethality testing and analysis, an amount more than triple the amount authorized for this purpose in fiscal year 2003. The committee notes that this increase is excessive, and recommends a decrease of $5.0 million for the corporate lethality program.

Joint robotics

The budget request included $13.6 million in PE 64709D8Z for the Joint Robotics program. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 64709D8Z for the development of small unmanned ground vehicles to perform counter-intelligence and counter-terrorist operations.

See and avoid technologies

The budget request included $24.6 million in PE 65116D8Z for support to command, control, communications and intelligence. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 65116D8Z for development of see and avoid technologies, specifically as applicable to unmanned aerial vehicles.

Information systems security research

The budget request included $476.7 million in PE 33140G for the Information Systems Security Program. The committee notes that the Nation's military and commercial information systems continue to be extremely vulnerable to attack. While funding for defense information systems security has increased in recent years, the threat to defense information systems from other nations, terrorist groups, and private individuals continues to grow. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 33140G, to facilitate research and collaboration between industry, government, and academia to share lessons learned and improve cooperation to solve common defense information systems security challenges.

Broadcast-Request Imagery Technology Experiment

The budget request included $161.9 million in PE 35102BQ for the Defense Imagery and Mapping Program, but did not include funding for the Broadcast-Request Imagery Technology Experiment (BRITE). BRITE is a unique capability to disseminate timely, tailored imagery products, including frames of streaming video from unmanned reconnaissance systems, to forward deployed tactical military forces via existing communications architectures. BRITE was developed by the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) at the request of U.S. Special Operations Command, and then transitioned to the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) for sustainment. BRITE has been used extensively by special operations forces and others in both Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

The clear utility of this program led the committee to add additional funding in each of the past two fiscal years to ensure BRITE remains available to tactical users. Despite the urging of the Con-

gress, NIMA failed to include funding for BRITE in its fiscal year 2004 budget request. The committee understands that NIMA has many funding challenges and that priorities must be established, but is disappointed that NIMA does not recognize the need to sustain this important program.

The committee continues its strong support for the BRITE program and recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 35102BQ to continue development of this unique capability and to sustain the modest infrastructure and functionality that enables isolated, tactical users to benefit from the BRITE program. The committee expects NIMA to fund this system in future budget submissions.

Tasking, processing, exploitation and dissemination for the future imagery architecture

The budget request included $161.9 million in PE 35102BQ, but included limited funding for development of the tasking, processing, exploitation and dissemination (TPED) system to support the next generation of national imagery assets, the Future Imagery Architecture (FIA). Although the Department has been developing FIA for several years, the committee continues to have concerns about whether the community has devoted sufficient investment in the TPED architecture that must be developed to take full advantage of FIA capabilities. Since its creation in 1997, the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) has had many competing priorities in modernizing its capabilities and preparing for the future. These competing priorities have led NIMA to defer a significant portion of the planned funding for FIA TPED. The committee believes that NIMA should apply additional funding to ensure that development of the TPED architecture, especially the portion that will support regional combatant commanders and tactical users, will keep pace with the overall development and fielding of FIA.

The committee recommends an increase of $14.0 million in RDT&E, Defense-wide, PE 35102BQ, to accelerate development of the FIA TPED components that will support tactical and operational users.

Laser additive manufacturing initiatives

The budget request included $16.2 million in PE 78011S for manufacturing technology programs. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 78011S to develop laser additive manufacturing technologies to produce high performance military components.

Multiband multimission radios

The budget request included no funding for Special Operations Communications Advanced Development for upgrading the multiband multimission radio. The committee has supported accelerated fielding of this lightweight communications system that has proven indispensable in the global war on terrorism and in Operation Iraqi Freedom. U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) was only recently alerted to a communications security obsolescence requirement, requiring replacement of communications security chips on all fielded radios. Development and replacement of these chips is important to ensure deployed special operations forces have secure,

lightweight, versatile communications in the field, and is one of the highest unfunded priorities for Commander, SOCOM. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for PE 1160404BB for Special Operations Communications Advanced Development, Project S700.

Items of Special Interest

Apache Longbow

The committee strongly supports the Army's decision to include the Apache Longbow as a fully interoperable part of the Objective Force within the unit of employment (UE). In the case of the 10-year-old Apache Longbow system, which is planned for another quarter century of use, the proposed block III multiyear procurement is an appropriate spiral development to restore needed power margins, lower operations and support costs and, most important, incorporate an open architecture-based digital backbone with the external interfaces for connecting with the Army's network-centric structure for massing effects and fires. The committee notes that the block III concept was endorsed in an acquisition decision memorandum approved by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

Once the Army makes a decision regarding the scope and nature of an Apache Block III program, the committee encourages the Army to submit a reprogramming request if any non-recurring engineering is needed in fiscal year 2004, to ensure that the block III upgrades start production in fiscal year 2006. The committee understands that a fiscal year 2006 start will maximize program savings and meet the Objective Force unit of employment first unit equipped date.

Ballistic protective garments

The committee is aware that in the recently concluded Iraq conflict, countless lives were saved by the use of protective fiber outer garments, to include ballistic protective vests. From the weight and flexibility perspectives, the vests used by our soldiers in Iraq were a vast improvement over the body armor used in the 1991 Gulf War. Current research holds the promise to further enhance ballistic protection using lightweight materials that will reduce the soldier's load. The committee understands the value of the ballistic-resistant materials research being done at universities, small businesses, and defense labs all over the nation to support this military need. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue supporting this type of research in universities, industry, and defense labs to continue this critical technology development so as to field novel ballistic resistant clothing in the next five years.

Chemical and biological test facilities

The committee understands that the development of chemical and biological defense equipment and medical countermeasures requires adequate test and evaluation (T&E) facilities. The committee is interested in the degree to which these facilities support the chemical and biological defense program. Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nu-

clear, Chemical and Biological Defense Programs (ATSD(NCB)) and the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) to report on the status of the test and evaluation facilities for chemical and biological defense programs. The report should include the following: an analysis of the capacity and versatility of the T&E infrastructure to meet the requirements of current and planned chemical and biological defense research and development programs, including facilities for testing equipment with live agents and simulants and for animal testing; and, an identification of any actions needed to meet testing requirements. The report should be completed jointly by ATSD(NCB) and DOT&E and shall be included in the "Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense Program: Annual Report to Congress" submitted for 2004.

Counterproliferation Support Program

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) established the Counterproliferation Support Program (CPSP) in August 1994 to address shortfalls in counterproliferation operational capabilities. These shortfalls were identified in the congressionally-mandated "Report on Nonproliferation and Counterproliferation Activities and Programs." Specifically, the CPSP leverages DOD acquisition programs to meet the counterproliferation priorities of the combatant commanders.

The President's budget request for fiscal year 2000, submitted in February 1999, requested that funding for the CPSP be transferred from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA). The budget request included the funding transfer in order to align CPSP funding with the CPSP management responsibilities that DOD assigned to DTRA on October 1, 1998. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) authorized the transfer of CPSP funding from OSD to DTRA.

The committee understands that the DOD is reviewing the CPSP and is considering options to further enhance counterproliferation efforts. The committee supports the DOD review of the CPSP and directs the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense to provide the committee with periodic updates on the status of the review.

Cruise missile defense

The committee is aware of increasing concern about threats from cruise missiles to U.S. land and sea forces and the U.S. coast line. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than February 15, 2004, on the U.S. military's ability to address current cruise missile threats and plans to address future cruise missile threats.

DD(X) destroyer

The DD(X) will be a multi-mission surface combatant tailored for land attack and maritime dominance. The DD(X) program will also provide a baseline for spiral development of technology and engineering to support a range of future surface ships such as the future cruiser, CG(X), and the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS). The Future Years Defense Program includes funding to build the first

DD(X) using research, development, test, and evaluation funding in fiscal years 2005 and 2006. The preliminary design review for DD(X) is currently scheduled in January, 2004.

The DD(X) program evolved from the DD–21 program, which was cancelled by the Navy. The committee is aware of debate within the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy concerning the size of the DD(X), and that all of the key performance parameters in the requirements documentation for the ship are under review. Key performance parameters that would directly affect the size of the ship would include the number and type of guns, the volume of the weapons magazines, and the number of missile cells. At a hearing of the Seapower Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee in April, 2003, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition testified that it was important to take the time necessary to ensure that the requirement was right.

The committee concurs that it is important to ensure that the requirement for the next family of surface combatants is based on sound analysis. The committee has supported the Marine Corps' requirement for the rate, volume, and precision of fires provided by naval gunfire support, and directs the Navy to ensure that Marine Corps' requirements are taken into account in its re-evaluation of DD(X) requirements.

Infrared search and track

The Navy has been developing infrared search and track (IRST) technology for shipboard application for more than a decade. Horizon search, for which an IRST system would be optimized, is an area of relative weakness for active radar.

Shipboard tests of such an IRST system have demonstrated high potential for improving a ship's ability to detect anti-ship cruise missiles in the presence of environmental and geographical conditions that degrade radar system performance.

In prior years, the committee had expressed concern that the Navy schedule and funding for the IRST development effort would fail to field any capability in the fleet for the foreseeable future.

Earlier this year, the Navy cancelled the IRST program that was being developed within the Ship Self-Defense Program. The Navy still believes that the surface fleet needs the additional capability that could be provided by sensors operating in parts of the electromagnetic spectrum other than that used by radars. In particular, Navy officials indicated a preference for continuing science and technology development of other infrared staring sensors that have the potential of providing acceptable performance without incurring the drawbacks of the extra topside weight associated with rotating infrared sensor systems.

The committee believes that the Navy should focus its efforts on technologies and systems engineering efforts that are more likely to yield near-term results for the fleet.

The Navy should fully evaluate hardware solutions that rely on technologies that could have wider applications within the military services or commercially before launching another hardware development effort. For example, the sensors developed for the Joint Strike Fighter program may have some potential application for

shipboard systems. New developments may ultimately be required, but an affordable solution with sufficient capability within a total systems context is far preferable to a solution that may ultimately prove unaffordable.

The Navy should take steps to ensure that follow-on IRST development efforts take full advantage of the activities that were funded under the recently canceled program, and reflect whatever lessons that may have been learned from that experience.

The Navy should employ available sensors to continue working on signal processing software algorithm development. In particular, the Navy still needs to complete a significant effort in improving the ability of an IRST system to reject false alarms. The Navy can and should continue to make progress on the software development activities that will support any sensor suite while sorting through the hardware issues.

The committee expects the Navy to keep the congressional defense committees fully informed of its plans for maturing and fielding IRST technologies.

National Aerospace Initiative

The committee agrees with the National Aerospace Initiative (NAI) goals and the three supporting pillars of this program: high speed hypersonics; access to space; and space technology. The committee is concerned, however, that the NAI program is based on an artificial schedule rather than realistic assessments of the technological developments and capabilities necessary to achieve the goals of the program. The success of NAI appears to rely upon the successful technology demonstrations within current and future programs rather than the supporting revolutionary scientific and technological discoveries that will be necessary to meet the ambitious goals of the Initiative. The committee remains concerned about whether there are adequate investments in the basic and applied research, which are necessary for the technologies needed to reach the goals of NAI. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E) to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2003, outlining the technology roadmap and capability requirements, including basic research activities, necessary to achieve the NAI goals. The report should include current and future investments in the enabling technologies necessary to reach the goals of NAI.

Networking technologies

The committee notes the increasing importance of commercial and military networks for all military operations. Networking technologies and architectures developed and used by the Department of Defense (DOD) must be high bandwidth, robust, and secure in order to support future mission applications and requirements. To that end, the committee notes that the DOD should invest in a robust portfolio of technologies to provide maximum flexibility in the development of future information systems. The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense of Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence to provide an assessment of the relative merits of asynchronous transfer mode (ATM), Internet protocol (IP), and other networking architectures in terms of DOD mission

needs, quality of service, cost, encryption capabilities, and compatibility with commercial systems. The assessment should report on DOD current and planned investments in research and technology development for future networking architectures.

Patriot advanced capability–3 testing

The committee notes that the Patriot Advanced Capability–3 (PAC–3) missile defense system has never been tested against a Scud missile even though such missiles are currently available in the United States for such testing. The committee also understands that there are no plans to conduct a test of the PAC–3 against a Scud target. The committee believes that realistic live-fire testing against actual threats, when practical, is important to ensure the effectiveness of weapon systems. Therefore, the committee directs the Missile Defense Agency and the Army to plan and budget for a test of the PAC–3 system against a Scud target before the end of fiscal year 2005. The committee encourages the Missile Defense Agency to incorporate this test into the current plans for PAC–3 testing.

Potential use of hydrogen fuel

The committee directs the Defense Logistics Agency to examine and report to the committee no later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act on the potential use of hydrogen as a defense logistics fuel. The report should include an examination of potential applications of hydrogen by the military as a transportation fuel and for power generation; potential sources of hydrogen fuel for military use domestically and overseas; potential reductions in the cost and footprint of deployment for military operations that use hydrogen fuel and fuel cell technology; and potential reductions in air emissions from military operations that use hydrogen fuel and fuel cell technology.

Space based radar and missile defense

The committee is aware of studies done within the Department of Defense that suggest that Space Based Radar (SBR) may have some inherent capability to detect, track, and discriminate ballistic missile warheads in flight. The committee understands that the primary missions of SBR are moving target indication and synthetic aperture imaging, but, in light of the high priority of ballistic missile defense, believes that an assessment of the potential contributions of SBR to missile defense is appropriate. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense, through the Defense Science Board and in consultation with the Missile Defense Agency, to provide such an assessment to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives no later than February 15, 2004. The committee would expect such a review to include: (1) an assessment of the impact of adding a missile defense mission on the ability of SBR satellites to conduct their primary missions; (2) how different SBR architectures and technical approaches might affect the ability of the satellites to achieve their primary missions and to contribute to missile defense; (3) an assessment of the value of potential SBR capabilities in the context of the family of sensors being developed by the Missile Defense

Agency; and (4) a recommendation concerning any future actions that might be desirable related to SBR contributions to missile defense.

Space Based Radar architecture

The budget request included $274.1 million in PE 63858F for the Space Based Radar (SBR) program. This program is designed to transform surveillance by providing persistent, all-weather detection, tracking, and imagery of time-critical targets.

The committee supports this effort and is aware that the Air Force is conducting an analysis of alternatives to identify an architecture for the SBR program. The committee understands that there are different proposals for an SBR architecture, including satellite constellations having Low-Earth Orbits (LEO), Medium-Earth Orbits (MEO), and mixed constellations having satellites with LEO and MEO orbits. The committee supports continued review of a wide variety of SBR architectures. The committee also notes that a spiral development approach to the SBR architecture, where the mix of satellite types and orbits change over time as technology matures, may be the appropriate approach.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2004, and a follow-on report by March 20, 2005, on the various options for the SBR architecture and spiral developments. These reports should include, when available, a description of the initial architecture planned for SBR, the rationale for choosing the initial architecture and spiral development planned for the system, and an assessment of the cost effectiveness of alternative architecture and spiral alternatives that were evaluated.

Space based infrared system

The committee supports the continuing effort to develop the Space Based Infrared System, which will replace the Defense Satellite Program and provide significantly improved early warning, missile defense, battlespace characterization, and technical intelligence capabilities. The committee is aware of the significant efforts taken by the contractor and the Secretary of the Air Force to restructure the program in the wake of serious technical problems, schedule delays, and cost increases. This restructure was approved by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition Technology and Logistics and the committee understands that the program was sound.

Consequently, the committee is deeply concerned that, in the wake of an apparently successful effort to restructure the program, the fiscal year 2004 budget request reflects another Air Force restructuring of the program. This latest restructure will delay the acquisition of the third, fourth and fifth geosynchronous satellites by two years and leave a three year gap between the launch of the second and third of these satellites. The committee is concerned that this restructure is unwise on multiple grounds: (1) it will increase cost because production lines will have to close and reopen, and subcontractors will have to be requalified; (2) technical risk will increase because of the loss of key personnel and the subcontractor base; and (3) operational risk will increase because of the

age of the current satellite constellation and the risk of launch failure in the early replacement satellites.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a plan to reduce the production gap in the SBIRS program from two years to one year. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than December 15, 2003, that describes this plan; compares the program technical, schedule, and cost risk associated with this plan to the risks of a two year delay; compares the operational risk of a one year delay compared to a two year delay; describes steps to mitigate the impact of a one year production gap; and, if the fiscal year 2005 budget request does not include full funding for the plan, provides a detailed rationale for that decision.

Space system vulnerability

The committee notes that the 2001 report of the Commission to Assess U.S. National Security Space Management and Organization emphasized the growing reliance of the U.S. civil economy and the U.S. military on space systems that are potentially very vulnerable. According to the commission, U.S. space systems are vulnerable to disruption or attack from a variety of existing and emerging threats, including attack on ground stations, denial and deception, jamming, small anti-satellites, and nuclear detonations in space. Testimony by the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency to the committee indicates that the United States is aware that some nations are planning and developing the means to attack U.S. space capabilities.

The commission report also notes that the U.S. ability to determine if a satellite anomaly is due to an attack, a hardware failure, or other causes is limited. Further, the report stated that indicators of threats to U.S. space systems "* * * have been neither sufficiently persuasive nor gripping to energize the United States to take appropriate defensive action." The commander of U.S. Strategic Command confirmed in testimony to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee that vulnerability of U.S. space systems remains a serious concern.

The committee is encouraged that the issue of the vulnerability of space systems is starting to receive high level attention. Nascent efforts are underway to address the need for collection and distribution of intelligence on threats to space systems, to establish a coordinated approach to protect satellites and space systems from those threats, and the need for continuity of operations in the event of an attack. The committee strongly approves of these efforts and encourages the Department of Defense, in conjunction with the intelligence community when appropriate, to develop a coherent path forward. The Under Secretary of the Air Force can address system needs in this context as the executive agent for Department of Defense space programs. However, the committee notes that no one in the Department of Defense has overarching responsibility for developing space policy. Such policy will be important to guide these efforts.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, to provide a report, in

classified and unclassified form, to the congressional defense committees no later than February 15, 2004, on system level, operational, and intelligence efforts to address vulnerabilities in space systems and to make any relevant recommendations.

Spacelift range system

The Air Force maintains the spacelift range system (SLRS), that consists of east and west coast ranges. The Eastern Range includes Patrick Air Force Base, Cape Canaveral, and downrange sites. The Western Range includes Vandenberg Air Force Base and downrange sites. The SLRS provides tracking, telemetry, communications, flight analysis, surveillance, and other support functions to national security, civil, and commercial space launches, ballistic missile test and evaluation, aeronautical and guided weapons tests, and space surveillance.

In the early 1990s, the Air Force established five range modernization requirements to ensure the ranges would remain safe and viable: (1) preserve and enhance range safety; (2) provide more reliable and responsive operations; (3) standardize and automate ranges; (4) reduce life cycle costs by 20 percent; and (5) normalize sustainment and logistics. Phase I of the modernization effort was started in 1993 and was completed in 1998. Phase IIA was started in 1995 and was to have been completed in 2006. That effort, however, was delayed several years, and the fiscal year 2004 budget request would terminate these range modernization efforts in fiscal year 2005. Phase IIB was to have started in 2000 but was replaced with the Space Lift Range System (SLRS) contract. The SLRS contract was awarded in fiscal year 2000 and was to continue modernization activities and support proactive recapitalization projects to sustain the range systems.

In the fiscal year 2004 budget request, the Air Force requested a reduction of $342.3 million from fiscal years 2004–2007 the budgets for launch range research and development and procurement. These reductions would lead to the cancellation of many of the modernization projects and result in a sustainment and recapitalization only approach.

The committee is concerned that this approach will be very detrimental to U.S. space capabilities in the long run. As the United States continues to increase its reliance on space assets, failure to modernize the ranges from which these assets are launched could significantly reduce the ability of the United States to exploit space based assets in the future. Moreover, many operational and technical problems at the ranges are likely to continue or worsen.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the current conditions of the spacelift ranges and the modernization requirements to meet all projected national security launch requirements. This study should include all aspects of the spacelift range infrastructure, including downrange sites, to meet anticipated launch requirements for the next 15 years. The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the study and include all recommendations for modernization that will be needed to meet the demands of our transformed forces, as well as other national security space requirements. The

committee directs the Secretary to submit the report no later than February 15, 2004.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Explanation of tables

The following tables provide the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title III of this Act. The tables also display the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2004 budget request for operation and maintenance programs and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in the report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
Operation and Maintenance, Army				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
LAND FORCES				
010	DIVISIONS	1,506,922	7,500	1,514,422
	Extended cold weather clothing system		[5,000]	
	Field battery charging technology		[2,500]	
020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	478,563		478,563
030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	383,755		383,755
040	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	467,026		467,026
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,078,757		1,078,757
LAND FORCES READINESS				
060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,568,900		1,568,900
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	488,918		488,918
080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,007,481		1,007,481
	Tank transmission upgrades ($15,000 non-add)			
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT				
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,651,539		2,651,539
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,094,309		1,094,309
110	MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	243,033		243,033

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	85,115		85,115
130	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	1,562,793		1,562,793
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**12,617,111**	**7,500**	**12,624,611**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
MOBILITY OPERATIONS				
140	STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	378,432	4,000	382,432
	Quadruple shipping containers		[4,000]	
150	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	145,728		145,728
160	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	7,753		7,753
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	6,933		6,933
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION		**538,846**	**4,000**	**542,846**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING				
180	OFFICER ACQUISITION	89,853		89,853
190	RECRUIT TRAINING	22,977		22,977

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
200	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	39,106		39,106
210	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	214,264		214,264
220	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	80,110		80,110
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	61,096		61,096
BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING				
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	306,272	2,000	308,272
	Satellite communications language training (SCOLA)		[2,000]	
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	499,040	15,000	514,040
	Flight School XXI		[15,000]	
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	142,038		142,038
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	478,903		478,903
280	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	819,604		819,604
290	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	392,550		392,550
RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING				
300	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	468,035	-13,000	455,035
	Recruiting and advertising costs		[-13,000]	
310	EXAMINING	83,269		83,269
320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	226,011		226,011
330	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	92,536		92,536
340	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	129,978		129,978

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
350	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	238,993		238,993
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**4,384,635**	**4,000**	**4,388,635**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SECURITY PROGRAMS				
360	SECURITY PROGRAMS	591,622		591,622
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS				
370	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	661,551		661,551
380	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	491,835		491,835
390	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	1,058,760	8,000	1,066,760
	Corrosion prevention and control		[8,000]	
400	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	330,129		330,129
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
410	ADMINISTRATION	664,135		664,135
420	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	623,102		623,102
430	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	210,202		210,202
440	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	198,716		198,716
450	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	707,558		707,558

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
460	ARMY CLAIMS	116,691		116,691
470	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	50,173		50,173
480	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,194,134		1,194,134
490	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	260,288		260,288
500	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS			
SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS				
510	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	207,125		207,125
520	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	58,729		58,729
530	EXPANSION OF NATO			
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**7,424,750**	**8,000**	**7,432,750**
999a	WMD - Civil Support Teams		23,300	23,300
	Operations in Southwest Asia		-200,400	-200,400
	WCF excess cash balances		-107,000	-107,000
	Transfer from WCF for WP production equipment (PAA 39)		-24,339	-24,339
	Civilian under-execution		-12,400	-12,400
Total Operation and Maintenance, Army		**24,965,342**	**-297,339**	**24,668,004**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
Operation and Maintenance, Navy				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	3,262,507		3,262,507
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,025,326		1,025,326
030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	73,961		73,961
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	105,559		105,559
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	980,136		980,136
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	50,725		50,725
SHIP OPERATIONS				
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	2,485,605	6,500	2,492,105
	Condition-based maintenance photonic sensors		[6,500]	
080	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	614,525		614,525
090	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE /1			
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE /1	3,567,545		3,567,545
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,087,587		1,087,587

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT				
120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	377,493		377,493
130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	15,574		15,574
140	SPACE SYSTEMS & SURVEILLANCE	125,107		125,107
150	WARFARE TACTICS	235,237		235,237
160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY & OCEANOGRAPHY	257,475		257,475
170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	892,241		892,241
180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	166,033	3,000	169,033
	Lead paint removal		[3,000]	
190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,733		2,733
WEAPONS SUPPORT				
200	CRUISE MISSILE	151,456		151,456
210	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	806,058		806,058
220	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	44,092		44,092
230	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	466,425		466,425
WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT				
240	NWCF SUPPORT /2	-447,755	-43,500	-491,255
	Navy excess carryover		[-43,500]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
BASE SUPPORT				
250	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,079,723		1,079,723
260	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,609,334	-29,000	2,580,334
	Naval Station Roosevelt Roads		[-29,000]	
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**20,034,702**	**-63,000**	**19,971,702**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES				
270	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	506,690		506,690
ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS				
280	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	8,217		8,217
290	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	167,127		167,127
MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS				
300	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	25,361		25,361
310	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,702		1,702
320	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	18,137		18,137
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION		**727,234**		**727,234**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING				
330	OFFICER ACQUISITION	116,022		116,022
340	RECRUIT TRAINING	8,693		8,693
350	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	91,788		91,788
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
360	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	363,006		363,006
370	FLIGHT TRAINING	441,982		441,982
380	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	113,134		113,134
390	TRAINING SUPPORT	300,843		300,843
RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION				
400	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	251,507	-5,000	246,507
	Recruiting and advertising costs		[-5,000]	
410	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	98,885		98,885
420	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	70,628		70,628
430	JUNIOR ROTC	40,333		40,333

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
BASE SUPPORT				
440	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	201,993		201,993
450	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	373,377		373,377
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**2,472,191**	**-5,000**	**2,467,191**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
460	ADMINISTRATION	698,422		698,422
470	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	4,026		4,026
480	CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	104,963		104,963
490	MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	221,170		221,170
500	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	212,060		212,060
510	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	632,682		632,682
520	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES			
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT				
530	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	193,045		193,045
540	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS			
550	PLANNING, ENGINEERING & DESIGN	301,365		301,365
560	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	905,432		905,432

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
570	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	447,639		447,639
580	HULL, MECHANICAL & ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	62,927		62,927
590	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	40,093		40,093
600	SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	66,236		66,236
610	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS			
SECURITY PROGRAMS				
620	SECURITY PROGRAMS	801,509		801,509
SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS				
630	INTERNATIONAL HDQTRS & AGENCIES	10,542		10,542
BASE SUPPORT				
640	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	98,108		98,108
650	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	253,344		253,344

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
CANCELLED ACCOUNTS				
660	CANCELLED ACCOUNT			
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**5,053,563**		**5,053,563**
	Operations in Southwest Asia		**-75,800**	**-75,800**
	WCF excess cash balances		-92,500	-92,500
Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy		**28,287,690**	**-236,300**	**28,051,390**
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
EXPEDITIONARY FORCES				
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	588,653	5,000	593,653
	Initial issue		[5,000]	
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	320,108	5,000	325,108
	Corrosion prevention and control		[5,000]	
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	101,439		101,439
040	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	912,934		912,934
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	498,007		498,007

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
999a	Chemical-Biological Incident Response Force Family of Incident Response Systems		2,000	2,000
USMC PREPOSITIONING				
060	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	76,996		76,996
070	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	4,035		4,035
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**2,502,172**	**12,000**	**2,514,172**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING				
080	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,242		10,242
090	OFFICER ACQUISITION	348		348
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT			
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION			
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
120	SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	41,514		41,514
130	FLIGHT TRAINING	171		171
140	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	8,863		8,863
150	TRAINING SUPPORT	123,007		123,007
160	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION			
RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION				
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	115,167	-2,000	113,167
	Recruiting and advertising costs		[-2,000]	
190	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	35,606		35,606
200	JUNIOR ROTC	13,200		13,200
210	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT			
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION			
BASE SUPPORT				
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	78,073		78,073
240	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	151,071		151,071
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**577,262**	**-2,000**	**575,262**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
250	SPECIAL SUPPORT	229,485		229,485
260	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	35,733		35,733
270	ADMINISTRATION	39,377		39,377

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
280	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	18,991		18,991
290	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	3,636		3,636
300	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS			
CANCELLED ACCOUNT				
310	CANCELLED ACCOUNT			
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**327,222**		**327,222**
	Operations in Southwest Asia		-300	-300
Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps		**3,406,656**	**9,700**	**3,416,356**
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,496,496		3,496,496
020	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	331,972		331,972
030	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	332,062		332,062

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
040	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	1,243,900		1,243,900
050	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,817,063	129,900	1,946,963
	Depot maintenance		[125,000]	
	Missile maintenance		[4,900]	
060	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,350,589		1,350,589
070	BASE SUPPORT	2,260,913		2,260,913
080	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	936,519		936,519
COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS				
090	GLOBAL C3I & EARLY WARNING	976,608		976,608
100	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	187,202		187,202
110	OTHER COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	597,331		597,331
120	JCS EXERCISES	35,543		35,543
130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	213,088		213,088
140	TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE AND SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	223,946		223,946
SPACE OPERATIONS				
150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	321,829		321,829
160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	67,232		67,232
170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	242,294		242,294
180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	57,046		57,046
190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	243,778		243,778

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
200	BASE SUPPORT	566,936		566,936
210	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	148,408		148,408
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**15,650,755**	**129,900**	**15,780,655**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
MOBILITY OPERATIONS				
220	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,167,958		2,167,958
230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	36,758		36,758
240	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	172,134		172,134
250	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	361,521	125,000	486,521
	Depot maintenance		[125,000]	
260	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA			
270	BASE SUPPORT	514,123		514,123
280	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	200,836		200,836
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION		**3,453,330**	**125,000**	**3,578,330**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
ACCESSION TRAINING				
290	OFFICER ACQUISITION	67,763		67,763
300	RECRUIT TRAINING	6,112		6,112
310	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	82,586		82,586
320	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	68,682		68,682
330	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION (ACADI	75,337		75,337
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
340	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	324,067		324,067
350	FLIGHT TRAINING	675,173		675,173
360	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	154,978		154,978
370	TRAINING SUPPORT	92,652		92,652
380	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	8,461		8,461
390	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	529,663		529,663
400	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION	167,050		167,050
RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION				
410	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	150,744	-5,000	145,744
	Recruiting and advertising costs		[-5,000]	
420	EXAMINING	3,103		3,103
430	OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	114,240		114,240
440	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	133,706		133,706

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
450	JUNIOR ROTC	43,413		43,413
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**2,697,730**	**-5,000**	**2,692,730**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS				
460	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	965,075	3,000	968,075
	Manufacturing technical assistance and production program		[3,000]	
470	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	409,392		409,392
480	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	240,064		240,064
490	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	130,930		130,930
500	BASE SUPPORT	1,082,612		1,082,612
510	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	241,207		241,207
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
520	ADMINISTRATION	234,370		234,370
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	347,528		347,528
540	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	213,901		213,901
550	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	121,063		121,063
560	ARMS CONTROL	33,640		33,640
570	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	679,177		679,177

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
580	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	34,655		34,655
590	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	21,432		21,432
600	BASE SUPPORT	299,750		299,750
610	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	11,011		11,011
620	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS SUPPORT			
SECURITY PROGRAMS				
630	SECURITY PROGRAMS	907,694		907,694
SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS				
640	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	18,615		18,615
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**5,992,116**	**3,000**	**5,995,116**
	Operations in Southwest Asia		-707,600	-707,600
	Supply Management Activity Group, Air Force WCF		-250,000	-250,000
	WCF excess cash balances		-114,000	-114,000
Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force		**27,793,931**	**-818,700**	**26,975,231**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	420,036	10,000	430,036
	Combatant Commander Initiative Fund		[10,000]	
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,851,533		1,851,533
030	PROBLEM DISBURSEMENTS			
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:		**2,271,569**	**10,000**	**2,281,569**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
050	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	49,991		49,991
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:		**49,991**		**49,991**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
060	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	14,005		14,005
070	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,058		3,058
080	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	101,695		101,695
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	5,517		5,517
100	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE			0
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	35,262		35,262

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
120	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	7,173		7,173
130	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	4,796		4,796
140	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	92,646		92,646
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:		**264,152**		**264,152**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
150	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	105,261		105,261
160	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	99,030		99,030
170	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,788,178		6,788,178
180	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	359,011		359,011
190	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,008,908		1,008,908
200	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	1,659		1,659
210	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	276,802		276,802
220	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,129,876		1,129,876
230	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	259,713		259,713
240	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	17,757		17,757
250	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,698,075		1,698,075
260	DEFENSE POW /MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	15,800		15,800
270	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	284,767	-200,000	84,767
	Counter-terrorism train and equip program		[-200,000]	0
280	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	200,054		200,054

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
290	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	291,246		291,246
300	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	14,105		14,105
310	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	712,567	3,000	715,567
	Information Assurance Scholarship Program		[3,000]	
320	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	61,932		61,932
330	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES			
340	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	234,498		234,498
350	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	405,500		405,500
360	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	20,396		20,396
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:		**13,985,135**	**-197,000**	**13,788,135**
	Impact aid		30,000	30,000
	Impact aid for children with disabilities		5,000	5,000
	American Red Cross emergency communication services		5,000	5,000
	Operations in Southwest Asia		-80,100	-80,100
	Transportation WCF		-600,000	-600,000
	Financial information systems		-4,700	-4,700
Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide		**16,570,847**	**-831,800**	**15,739,047**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
LAND FORCES				
010	DIVISION FORCES	14,791	7,000	21,791
	Extended cold weather clothing system		[7,000]	
020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	35,798		35,798
030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	309,462		309,462
040	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	135,342		135,342
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	467,097	1,000	468,097
	Equipment storage site initial operations		[1,000]	
LAND FORCES READINESS				
060	FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	122,020		122,020
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	59,846		59,846
080	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	62,947		62,947
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT				
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	323,592		323,592
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	182,079		182,079
110	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,672		3,672

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**1,716,646**	**8,000**	**1,724,646**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
120	ADMINISTRATION	47,714		47,714
130	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	37,862		37,862
140	PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	47,092		47,092
150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	102,695	-8,000	94,695
	Recruiting and advertising costs		[-8,000]	
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**235,363**	**-8,000**	**227,363**
Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve		**1,952,009**		**1,952,009**
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve				

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS				
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	417,743		417,743
030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	16,464		16,464
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	2,166		2,166
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	138,135		138,135
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	362		362
RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS				
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	67,211		67,211
080	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	537		537
090	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE			0
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	83,577		83,577
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,440		3,440
RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT				
120	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	65,347		65,347
RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT				
130	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,544		5,544

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
BASE SUPPORT				
140	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	61,929		61,929
150	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	131,109		131,109
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**993,564**		**993,564**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
160	ADMINISTRATION	12,560		12,560
170	CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	2,269		2,269
180	MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	36,276	-1,500	34,776
	Recruiting and advertising costs		[-1,500]	
190	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	120,733		120,733
200	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,665		5,665
210	OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	854		854
CANCELLED ACCOUNTS				
220	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS			
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**178,357**	**-1,500**	**176,857**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve		**1,171,921**	**-1,500**	**1,170,421**
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
MISSION FORCES				
010	OPERATING FORCES	61,261		61,261
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	10,231		10,231
030	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	33,621		33,621
040	TRAINING SUPPORT	25,953		25,953
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	8,770		8,770
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**139,836**		**139,836**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
060	SPECIAL SUPPORT	8,956		8,956
070	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	578		578
080	ADMINISTRATION	9,721		9,721

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	6,701		6,701
100	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,160	-500	7,660
	Recruiting and advertising costs		[-500]	
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**34,116**	**-500**	**33,616**
Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve		**173,952**	**-500**	**173,452**
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,351,819		1,351,819
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	69,058		69,058
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	319,109		319,109
040	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	61,783		61,783
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	272,603		272,603
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**2,074,372**		**2,074,372**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
060	ADMINISTRATION	59,138		59,138
070	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	24,253		24,253
080	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	14,162	-500	13,662
	Recruiting and advertising costs		[-500]	
090	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,642		6,642
100	AUDIOVISUAL	621		621
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**104,816**	**-500**	**104,316**
Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve		**2,179,188**	**-500**	**2,178,688**
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
LAND FORCES				
010	DIVISIONS	669,748	5,000	674,748
	Extended cold weather clothing system		[5,000]	
020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	651,273		651,273
030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	343,180		343,180

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
040	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	563,199		563,199
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	21,913		21,913
LAND FORCES READINESS				
060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	128,036	2,000	130,036
	Cannon bore cleaning		[2,000]	
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	106,760		106,760
080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	194,149		194,149
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT				
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	448,167		448,167
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	380,226		380,226
110	MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	398,017		398,017
120	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	42,175		42,175
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**3,946,843**	**7,000**	**3,953,843**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
130	STAFF MANAGEMENT	102,752		102,752
140	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	13,529		13,529
150	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	51,667		51,667
160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	96,540	-7,000	89,540
	Recruiting and advertising costs		[-7,000]	
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**264,488**	**-7,000**	**257,488**
999a	WMD - Civil Support Teams		16,000	16,000
Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard		**4,211,331**	**16,000**	**4,227,331**
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	2,842,931	1,500	2,844,431
	Test support program		[1,500]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	336,979	2,000	338,979
	Extended cold weather clothing system		[2,000]	
030	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	410,627		410,627
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	154,798		154,798
050	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	621,060		621,060
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**4,366,395**	**3,500**	**4,369,895**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
060	ADMINISTRATION	26,547		26,547
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,704	-500	9,204
	Recruiting and advertising costs		[-500]	
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**36,251**	**-500**	**35,751**
Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard		**4,402,646**	**3,000**	**4,405,646**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
TRANSFER ACCOUNTS				
010	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	396,018		396,018
020	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	256,153		256,153
030	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	384,307		384,307
040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	24,081		24,081
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	212,619	40,000	252,619
070	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES	50,000	-50,000	
TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS		**1,323,178**	**-10,000**	**1,313,178**
MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS				
080	U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	10,333		10,333
090	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS			
100	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	59,000		59,000
110	PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND			
120	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE			
130	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	450,800		450,800
140	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS			
150	OPPLAN 34A-35 P.O.W.			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	Request	Change	Authorized
160	COUNTER-TERRORISM/WMD DEFENSE			
	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES		817,371	817,371
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		160,049	160,049
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		14,876,900	14,876,900
	Financial information systems		-14,000	-14,000
	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		14,862,900	14,862,900
TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS		**520,133**	**15,840,320**	**16,360,453**
	Financial information systems - WCF		-60,200	-60,200
	Refined Petroleum Transfer Account proposal		-675,000	-675,000
TOTAL, OTHER			**-735,200**	**-735,200**
TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:		**116,958,824**	**12,937,182**	**129,896,006**

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 303)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $65.3 million from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for fiscal year 2004.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Armed Forces Emergency Services (sec. 311)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.0 million for the American Red Cross to support its Armed Forces Emergency Services program. The committee recognizes that the emergency communications services provided by the American Red Cross have provided an important link between the men and women of the armed forces and their families in times of personal emergency. However, the committee notes that in 1994, the Department of Defense and the American Red Cross agreed upon a goal of ending direct financial assistance to the Red Cross from the Department. Substantial "bridge funding" was authorized in 1995, 1996, and 1997 to facilitate achievement of this goal. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the President of the American Red Cross, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2004, delineating the reasons why the agreement of 1994 between their organizations, as reflected in section 383 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, has not achieved its stated goal.

Commercial imagery industrial base (sec. 312)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that: (1) at least ninety percent of the funds authorized for commercial imagery be available for the acquisition of commercial space imagery or to support the development of next generation commercial imagery satellites; and (2) the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2004, on how the Secretary will implement the President's policy on commercial remote sensing.

The committee remains strongly supportive of the acquisition of commercial imagery to help meet the low and medium resolution imagery and geospatial intelligence needs of the Department of Defense and the intelligence community. The committee notes that directing funds for commercial imagery in fiscal year 2004 budget request to acquisition of commercial space imagery will help sustain the required commercial imagery industrial base, and will encourage the development of second generation commercial imagery satellites key to meeting future needs.

Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions

General definitions applicable to facilities and operations (sec. 321)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 101 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the definitions of military munitions, operational range, range, and range activities in relation to Department of Defense (DOD) facilities and operations. Currently, these terms are narrowly defined in relation to the Secretary of Defense inventory of unexploded ordnance under section 311 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107). This proposal would ensure broader application of these definitions to the overall management of DOD facilities and operations.

Military readiness and conservation of protected species (sec. 322)

The committee recommends a provision that would preclude designation of critical habitat on Department of Defense lands that are subject to an Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP) prepared under section 101 of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a) if the Secretary of Interior determines that such a plan addresses special management considerations or protection of endangered or threatened species. The provision would allow for a balance between military training requirements and protection of endangered or threatened species as pertains to pending or future critical habitat designations. The provision does not retroactively eliminate or change critical habitat designations that are already in place, as of the date of enactment of this provision.

Consistent with current practice, the committee would expect the Secretary of Interior to use established criteria to determine if an INRMP provides special management considerations or protection, such as: (1) a current, complete plan that provides sufficient conservation benefit to the species; (2) a plan that provides assurances that the conservation management strategies will be implemented; and (3) a plan that provides assurances that the conservation management strategies will be effective.

In recent hearings before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, testimony provided by the Vice Chiefs of the military services and an official of the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) highlighted the fact that the use of INRMPs is preferred over existing statutory exclusions or exemptions because the plans better protect endangered species; application of an exclusion or exemption increases the risk of species survival. This provision would codify determinations rendered by both the Bush and Clinton Administrations that there is no need to designate critical habitat on a military installation where an INRMP safeguards endangered species and habitats.

This provision would give the FWS and the military departments management flexibility in addressing about 150 military installations or sites that are susceptible to critical habitat designation. In some instances, critical habitat designations are pending (Guam) or have been approved (Pacific Missile Range Facility, in Kauai, Hawaii) even though the species are not currently present on the mili-

tary lands. A critical habitat designation on military land poses a problem because it shifts the core mission focus away from training and readiness to the protection of endangered species and their habitats.

Recent court decisions make it necessary to provide congressional direction that ensures management flexibility on military lands. At Marine Corps Air Station Miramar and Camp Pendleton, the FWS excluded both military installations from substantial critical habitat designations based on a determination that habitat concerns may be addressed through completed INRMPs, among other factors. The Federal District Court disagreed with this approach. As a result, the FWS is now in the process of revisiting the proposed critical habitat designations at these installations. The DOD remains concerned that absent legislative relief, environmental litigation may result in the designation of substantial areas of these installations as critical habitat.

The need for flexibility was emphasized in the hearing on March 13, 2003, before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. General William L. Nyland, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, testified that: "The initial results of the Camp Pendleton Quantification Study [of Encroachment Impacts] were surprising. The three combat arms elements [artillery battery, light armored reconnaissance platoon, and the mortar man] were able to accomplish only 69 percent of established standards for non-firing field training. The combat engineer[s] * * * were able to accomplish 77 percent of established standards for non-firing field training. In the study, endangered species was the largest contributing encroachment factor. Endangered species and their habitat, for example, significantly constrain individual Marines and Marine units from digging fighting positions, gun emplacements, vehicle defilade, and for combat engineers earthmoving and vehicle recovery." In the same hearing, General John M. Keane, Vice Chief of the Army testified that: "Designations of critical habitat on Army installations adds management costs and reduces the availability of land on which to train." According to General Keane, "Maneuver land and live-fire ranges are an essential element of [the] training process—without them, our Soldiers cannot develop the confidence and the skill demonstrated during Operation ANACONDA. We must retain those resources that allow our forces to maintain the level of readiness the American people have come to expect, and deserve."

Absent the proposed legislative clarification, critical habitat could be designated on thousands of acres of valuable military training lands. Such designations would further erode the quality of military training, resulting in a direct impact on readiness.

Arctic and Western Pacific Environmental Technology Cooperation Program (sec. 323)

The Committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct a cooperative environmental technology program with countries in the Arctic and Western Pacific regions. The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may provide cooperative assistance on activities that contribute to the demonstration of environmental technology in the

Arctic and Pacific regions, with certain limitations and exceptions. The primary focus of the program would be technology projects and activities related to radiological contamination. Consistent with this focus, the provision limits the availability of program funds to no more than 10 percent for non-radiological matters. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit an annual report on the program that would include a discussion of the activities, the funding, the life-cycle costs of any projects, the participants, and any contributions from other agencies or countries.

Participation in wetland mitigation banks in connection with military construction projects (sec. 324)

The committee recommends a provision that would give the secretaries of the military departments the authority under chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, to participate in wetland mitigation banking programs or consolidated user sites ("in-lieu-fee" programs). The military departments would participate under the same terms and conditions as other participants in the mitigation bank program. Currently, there is no authority for the military departments to participate in these programs.

Typically, mitigation banks are large areas of constructed, restored, or preserved off-site wetlands that have been set aside for the express purpose of providing compensatory mitigation for adverse impacts to on-site wetlands. The owner of a mitigation bank is authorized to sell the wetland values or credits to landowners who need to substitute such wetlands for those lost to development when avoidance or on-site mitigation is not feasible. The provision would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to purchase credits from an approved mitigation banking program or consolidated user site.

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) requires mitigation to replace aquatic resource functions and values of wetlands adversely impacted by activities, such as construction. The wetland mitigation banking programs have been described under the 1990 Memorandum of Agreement between the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency, and the 1995 Federal Guidance on the Establishment, Use, and Operation of Mitigation Banks. In November 2000, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) also issued final policy guidance on "in-lieu-fee" arrangements used to provide compensation for adverse impacts to wetlands. The Army Corps of Engineers, EPA, FWS, and NMFS all support the use of and recognize the need for alternatives to on-site mitigation.

Extension of authority to use Environmental Restoration Account funds for relocation of a contaminated facility (sec. 325)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for another three years the authority of the Secretary of Defense or secretaries of the military departments to use funds available in the environmental restoration accounts, pursuant to section 2703 of title 10, United States Code, to permanently relocate facilities. The au-

thorization remains contingent upon a secretary's written determination that such permanent relocation would be part of a response action that: (1) has the support of the affected community; (2) has the approval of relevant regulatory agencies; and (3) is the most cost effective response action available. The committee maintains the expectation that this authority would be exercised judiciously and that funds would only be used for legitimate environmental restoration priorities.

Applicability of certain procedural and administrative requirements to restoration advisory boards (sec. 326)

The committee recommends a provision that would exempt the Department of Defense Restoration Advisory Boards (RABs) from the Federal Register notice requirements of section 10(a)(2), title 5, United States Code, the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). The provision would also eliminate any restrictions on the number of RABs operating at any one time. All other provisions of FACA would continue to apply. Given the large number and the purpose of RABs, the Secretary of Defense determined that strict compliance with these requirements of FACA is unduly burdensome and costly. In effect, the provision would facilitate the Secretary's full and efficient utilization of about 330 Restoration Advisory Boards as a means of integrating community and regulatory input on environmental cleanup activities at military installations throughout the United States.

Expansion of authorities on use of vessels stricken from Naval Vessel Register for experimental purposes (sec. 327)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 7306a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to retain proceeds from the sale of material and equipment stripped from vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register. Specifically, contractors or designated sales agents approved by the Secretary of the Navy would be allowed to sell the material stripped from these vessels. The excess funds would be used to pay for environmental remediation of Navy vessels designated as targets for fleet training exercises (SINKEX). Absent such authority, stripped materials and equipment would be removed, stored, and transported to the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service for possible sale, a potentially less cost effective result. The use of on-site contractors for sale of stripped materials and equipment allows the Secretary of the Navy to capitalize on the efficiencies of an integrated stripping and remediation process. Finally, this provision would clarify that experimental use of vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register includes SINKEX activities.

Transfer of vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register for use as artificial reefs (sec. 328)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register to a state, commonwealth, possession of the United States, municipal corporation, or political subdivision for use as an

artificial reef. Existing authority specifically excludes battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, frigates, and submarines from the definition of property subject to disposal (40 U.S.C. 102(9)(B)). This provision would allow the Secretary of the Navy to take advantage of the full spectrum of ship disposal options for all vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register, consistent with the Senate report accompanying S. 1416 (S. Rept. 107–62).

This provision would give the Navy authority similar to that provided to the Maritime Administration (MARAD) under section 3504 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). The Navy and MARAD are already working together to develop an integrated process for use of vessels for artificial reefs in compliance with section 2102 of title 33, United States Code. This provision would encourage these efforts. Coastal communities can benefit from these efforts because sunken vessels build reefs that prevent beach erosion and support marine life, commercial and sport fishing, and recreational diving.

Salvage facilities (sec. 329)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities and to assert claims for salvage services related to environmental response activities. The provision would amend sections 7361 and 7363 of title 10, United States Code, for this purpose.

The Salvage Facilities Act was enacted fifty years ago to allow for the preservation and recovery of stricken vessels. At that time, environmental response and pollution prevention were not considered legitimate elements of salvage activities. Marine salvage evolved over the years to embrace these issues of concern. Article 14 of the 1989 International Convention on Salvage reflects this change. This provision would align sections 7361 and 7363 of title 10, United States Code, with international law.

Task force on resolution of conflict between military training and endangered species protection at Barry M. Goldwater Range, Arizona (sec. 330)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a task force to assess various means of enabling full use of the live ordnance delivery areas at Barry M. Goldwater Range while also protecting endangered species that are present at the Range. The task force would be composed of the following: (1) the Air Force range officer (chair); (2) the range officer for Goldwater Range; Commander of Luke AFB, Arizona; (3) the Commander of Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona; (4) the Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; (5) the Manager of the Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge, Arizona; (6) a representative of Department of Game and Fish of the State of Arizona; (7) a representative of a wildlife interest group of the State of Arizona; and (8) a representative of an environmental interest group in the State of Arizona. The task force would be required to determine or assess the following: (1) the effects of the presence of endangered species on military training activities in the live ordnance delivery areas at Goldwater Range and in any other areas of the range that are adversely effected by the presence of endan-

gered species; (2) the various means of addressing any significant adverse impacts on military training activities on Goldwater Range that are identified by the task force; and (3) the benefits and costs associated with the implementation of each possible solution identified by the task force. The provision would also require the task force to report to Congress not later than February 28, 2005.

In recent hearings before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, testimony provided by the Vice Chiefs of the military services highlighted the fact that the presence of threatened and endangered species on military installations presents a testing and training challenge for the Department of Defense. There are about 190 military installations or sites that are impacted by the presence of endangered or threatened species. Once an endangered or threatened species has been listed, the Secretary of Interior must provide for the conservation of such species. (16 U.S.C. 1533). Such statutory requirements result in restrictions on military testing and training activities that may eventually serve to erode readiness.

The Goldwater Range is one of several ranges within the DOD where the ability to test and train has been impacted by the presence of endangered species. At the same time the number of Sonoran Pronghorn Antelope population has dropped to a critical level at the Range. As a result, the committee has concluded that it is appropriate to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a task force to assess the problem.

Public health assessment of exposure to perchlorate (sec. 331)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide for an independent study of the epidemiological and review of the endocrinological effects of perchlorate. The independent perchlorate study and review would be conducted through the Centers for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, or another federal entity with experience in environmental toxicology.

Ammonium perchlorate is manufactured for use as the oxidizer in the solid propellants for rockets, missiles, and fireworks. Perchlorates are also used in commercial applications such as automobile airbags and road flares. Perchlorate has been found in ground and surface water in about 18 states and is especially pervasive in the western United States.

Proposed perchlorate standards may expose the U.S. Government, federal contractors, and other producers and users of perchlorate to hundreds of millions of dollars in cleanup costs. Given the health concerns and the potential Department of Defense liability, the committee believes an independent, peer-reviewed study and review to be appropriate and necessary. To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure expeditious completion of the required study and review.

Subtitle D—Reimbursement Authorities

Reimbursement of reserve component military personnel accounts for personnel costs of special operations reserve component personnel engaged in landmines clearance (sec. 341)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 401(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of designated operations and maintenance funds to reimburse pay and allowances of reserve components members of Special Operations Command who are called to active duty to participate in humanitarian landmine clearance operations. This provision limits the Department of Defense to the expenditure of $5.0 million annually for this purpose.

Reimbursement of reserve component accounts for costs of intelligence activities support provided by reserve component personnel (sec. 342)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Chapter 1003 of title 10, United States Code by adding a new section to authorize the use of operations and maintenance funds of military departments, combatant commands, and defense agencies to reimburse pay, allowances and other expenses when National Guard or Reserve intelligence personnel are called to active duty to provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to such military departments, commands or agencies.

Reimbursement rate for airlift services provided to the Department of State (sec. 343)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to charge the Department of State the same reimbursement rate for airlift services as charged to other Department of Defense components. These airlift services would only be for the transport of armored vehicles necessary to provide a safe environment for the Secretary of State when traveling and only when such vehicles are not available in the foreign country to which the Secretary of State is traveling.

Subtitle E—Defense Dependents Education

Assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 351)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $30.0 million for continuation of the Department of Defense (DOD) assistance program to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of service members and DOD civilian employees.

Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 352)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.0 million for continuation of the Department of Defense assistance program to local educational agencies that benefit dependents with severe disabilities.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Sale of Defense Information Systems Agency services to contractors performing the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet contract (sec. 361)

The committee recommends a provision that would enable the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) to sell working-capital funded services to contractors that are working on the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) contract. This would allow NMCI contractors to directly reimburse DISA for use of Defense Information Systems Network (DISN) wide area network services. The committee believes that this arrangement will improve the efficiency of and provide cost savings to the NMCI program.

Use of the Defense Modernization Account for life cycle cost reduction initiatives (sec. 362)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization for the Defense Modernization Account (DMA) and amend the existing authority to allow the Department to program funds into this account to provide start-up funds for projects to improve the life cycle cost of new or existing systems. The savings resulting from such initiatives would then be used, in part, to reimburse the DMA.

The term "life cycle cost" represents the total cost of a system, including development, procurement, and testing, as well as subsequent operations, maintenance, and disposal costs. Existing Department of Defense directives require that the acquisition of major systems be managed to minimize life cycle costs. The committee fully expects this requirement to be retained in the revision of these regulations that is currently under way. This provision would complement that requirement by facilitating targeted investments to reduce the life cycle costs of new and existing systems.

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations governing the use of the DMA for life cycle cost reduction initiatives. These regulations would address procedures for the submission of proposals for life cycle cost reduction initiatives, the competitive evaluation of such proposals, and the reimbursement of the DMA out of savings from such proposals.

Exemption of certain firefighting service contracts from prohibition on contracts for performance of firefighting functions (sec. 363)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Department of Defense to enter into contracts for up to one year for the performance of firefighting functions to fill positions vacated by deployed military firefighters.

Technical amendment relating to termination of Sacramento Army Depot, Sacramento, California (sec. 364)

The Committee recommends a technical amendment to repeal an obsolete provision of law related to a closed military facility.

Exception to competition requirement for workloads previously performed by depot-level activities (sec. 365)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2469 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that section 2469 does not apply to current depot-level maintenance and repair workload performed under a public-private partnership pursuant to section 2474(b). While section 2474 authorizes the establishment of public-private partnerships to perform work, section 2469, by requiring a public-private competition, would essentially limit the performance of current workloads that exceed $3.0 million to either a depot or a contractor. This provision would amend section 2469 to enable effective consideration of partnerships for current workload above $3.0 million.

Support for transfers of decommissioned vessels and shipboard equipment (sec. 366)

The committee recommends a provision that would enable the Navy to provide assistance to certain foreign, state, and municipal governments, organizations, and other entities in support of certain ship and shipboard equipment transfers. The provision would only apply to transfers made in accordance with sections 2572, 7306, 7307, or 7545 of title 10, United States Code. The provision would also authorize the Navy to be reimbursed for such assistance.

The Navy maintains decommissioned naval vessels at government facilities operated by a part of the Navy Inactive Ships Management Office (NISMO). Periodically, the Navy is asked to provide services incidental to the transfer of inactive ships or of material from inactive ships by donation or by other authority. This provision would allow reimbursement for these services to be received and retained in Navy accounts.

Aircraft for performance of aerial refueling mission (sec. 367)

The budget request and the Future Years Defense Program include plans for the Air Force to retire 68 KC–135E aerial refueling aircraft. The rationale presented for retiring these aircraft is that the cost to continue maintaining them is increasing. What this rationale does not address is the overall requirement for aerial refueling, nor does it address the approach that the Air Force will take to meet this requirement, should the remaining tanker fleet be unable to meet requirements.

The committee is aware that the Air Force established a set of criteria for deciding which KC–135E's were proposed for retirement: (1) mission design series and year group; (2) proximity to programmed depot maintenance; (3) incorporation status of structural modifications; (4) incorporation of other modifications; (5) number of flight hours; (6) type of environment where aircraft had been stationed; and (7) condition of remaining fuel tank topcoat.

The committee understands that the number of aircraft the Air Force wants to retire is based on input from the Air Mobility Command and the lowering of the numbers of KC–135 aircraft at Air National Guard squadrons from 12 to eight. The committee realizes that a limited number of these aircraft may be too difficult to maintain, but does not believe the Air Force should retire 68 aircraft

until an overall approach to the modernization and recapitalization of the aerial refueling fleet is better understood.

The committee recommends a provision that would restrict the Air Force from retiring more than 12 KC–135Es in fiscal year 2004. The provision also would require an independent analysis of alternatives for meeting aerial refueling requirements to be conducted by an independent entity, such as a federally funded research and development center. The provision directs the analysis to be delivered to Congress by March 1, 2004. This analysis of alternatives should consider all possible alternatives for modernization and/or recapitalization of the aerial refueling fleet, to include, at a minimum, those recommended in the tanker requirements study for fiscal year 2005: (1) re-engining of the KC–135Es; (2) extending aircraft service life; (3) acquiring commercial-off-the-shelf aircraft; (4) developing a new tanker; (5) relying on multi-mission aircraft; (6) operating a high-low mix of aircraft; (7) pursuing a phased approach; (8) pursuing full replacement; (9) leasing; and (10) considering future requirements. Air Force briefings had indicated this analysis of alternatives would start in fiscal year 2001, but in testimony before the Airland Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee in April 2003, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition testified that there was no plan to conduct a formal analysis of alternatives. The committee believes it would be unwise to retire so many aerial refueling aircraft without a re-evaluation of the requirement and an analysis of alternatives to meet that requirement.

Stability of certain existing military troop dining facilities contracts (sec. 368)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the continuation and completion of existing contracts (including any options) awarded to the blind and severely disabled for the operation of military troop dining facilities, military mess halls, and other similar military dining facilities. The provision recommended by the committee would not address either: (1) laws applicable to any follow-on or successor contracts to these existing contracts; or (2) laws applicable to contracts for the operation of military dining facilities not currently operated by the blind and severely disabled.

Repeal of calendar year limitations on use of commissary stores by certain Reserves and others (sec. 369)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the annual limitation on use of commissary stores by certain reservists.

Budget Items

Extended Cold Weather Clothing System

The budget request included no funding for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing System (ECWCS) for the Army, active or reserve components, or the Air National Guard. The committee supports initiatives by the services to increase the survivability and comfort of military personnel in all weather conditions. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase for ECWCS in the following operation and maintenance accounts: $5.0 million for the Army; $7.0

million for the Army Reserve; $5.0 million for the Army National Guard; and $2.0 million for the Air National Guard.

Field battery charging technology

The budget request included $12.6 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army for operating forces, but included no funding for field battery charging equipment. The committee notes a continuing increase in the Army requirement to support field electronics such as global positioning systems, man-portable computers, and communications equipment. Without adequate battery support, the electronic equipment which serves as a force multiplier for deployed forces can restrict operations and limit mobility. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, for field battery charging technology, including photovoltaic arrays using copper indium gallium deselenide technology.

Quadruple shipping containers

The budget request included no funding for quadruple shipping containers in Operation and Maintenance, Army. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, for quadruple shipping containers. Quadruple shipping container technology leverages a unique construction design to maximize shipping flexibility. The mobilization for Operation Iraqi Freedom demonstrated the utility of quadruple containers to meet equipment lift requirements.

Department of Defense foreign language training

The budget request included $600,000 for the Defense Language Institute in Operation and Maintenance, Army, Budget Authority (BA) 03, specifically for Satellite Communications Language training activities (SCOLA). SCOLA is a unique satellite-based language training activity that provides television programming in a variety of languages from around the world. Language students and seasoned linguists have found this augmentation to their normal language training to be helpful. SCOLA is developing an internet-based streaming video capability which will greatly increase the availability of this training medium to military linguists, virtually anywhere they can obtain an internet connection. In addition, SCOLA plans to develop a digital archive that will allow users anywhere to review and sort language training information, on demand.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, BA 03 for SCOLA, to be used by all military service language training activities, including those of U.S. Special Operations Command.

Recruiting and advertising costs

The budget request included over $1.10 billion for recruiting and advertising. Testimony received from service personnel chiefs and Reserve chiefs indicated that retention levels are at historic highs and that recruiting efforts have been very successful. The committee believes that service recruiting goals can be achieved at less expense in the areas of advertising and support costs than the

services have requested. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $43.0 million in operations and maintenance funding for recruiting and advertising costs, divided as follows:

Army—$13.0 million;
Army Reserve—$8.0 million;
Army National Guard—$7.0 million;
Navy—$5.0 million;
Navy Reserve—$1.5 million;
Marine Corps—$2.0 million;
Marine Corps Reserve—$0.5 million;
Air Force—$5.0 million;
Air Force Reserve—$0.5 million;
Air National Guard—$0.5 million.

Flight School XXI

The budget request included $499.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, for the Army's Flight School XXI program. The committee strongly supports the Army's plan to create a more strategically responsive, agile, and versatile aviation force. In addition, the committee recognizes that Flight School XXI is an integral component of the Army's overarching transformation plan. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for the Flight School XXI program.

Corrosion prevention and control

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Army, for corrosion prevention and control. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, in support of the Army's Corrosion Prevention and Control Program. The committee recognizes advancements in Army corrosion prevention efforts and supports the Army's initiatives to address continuing challenges.

M1A1 Abrams tank transmission upgrade

Of the amount authorized for land systems depot maintenance, the committee authorizes up to $15.0 million of Operation and Maintenance, Army, for M1A1 tank transmission upgrades, and directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than February 3, 2004, on future plans to sustain the operational readiness of tank transmissions for the remaining fleet.

Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams

The budget request included no funding for the establishment of Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams (WMD–CSTs). The committee authorizes $88.4 million to establish 12 teams in fiscal year 2004. The committee directs that the $88.4 million be allocated as follows: National Guard Personnel Army, $18.3 million; National Guard Personnel Air Force, $3.9 million; Operation and Maintenance Army National Guard, $16.0; Procurement Army, $25.9 million; Operations and Maintenance Army, $23.3; Chemical Biological Defense Program, $1.0 million.

Currently, 32 teams are certified and operational. Section 1403 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal

year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) directed the Secretary of Defense to establish 23 additional WMD–CSTs for a total of 55 teams, and to ensure that there is at least one team established in each State and Territory. This additional funding will result in a total of 44 WMD–CSTs by the end of fiscal year 2004. The committee understands that the Department of Defense is capable of standing up only 12 teams in fiscal year 2004. The committee expects the Department to include funding for the remaining 11 teams in its fiscal year 2005 budget request.

Operations in Southwest Asia

The budget request included $1.4 billion in the operation and maintenance (O&M) and military personnel (MILPERS) accounts of the services and Defense agencies to cover the incremental costs of conducting Operation Northern Watch (ONW) and Operation Southern Watch (OSW) to enforce no fly zones over Northern and Southern Iraq, and Operation Desert Spring (ODS) to assist in the defense of Kuwait.

These operations have continued uninterrupted for over a decade. For the last two years, the Department has requested funding for the costs of these operations in the O&M and MILPERS accounts of the military services. These operations were funded through these accounts, instead of through a contingency fund or supplemental appropriations, because of their long-term nature.

The committee notes that on April 15, 2003, the Department of Defense announced changes to its operations in Southwest Asia. According to the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ONW ended as of April 15, 2003, and military units involved in ONW were being redeployed to other locations. They also announced that military units were no longer conducting "no fly zone" operations over Southern Iraq. Units that had previously been conducting operations in Southwest Asia were now participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF).

The Department has stated that the incremental costs of OIF would be funded through supplemental appropriations. The committee, therefore, recommends a decrease of $1.4 billion in the O&M and MILPERS accounts of the services and Defense agencies for the costs of ONW, OSW, and ODS, since these funds are no longer needed for the purposes for which they were requested. The O&M and MILPERS accounts of the services and Defense agencies shall be reduced by the following amounts:

	O&M	MILPERS
Army	−$200.4	−$74.2
Navy	−75.8	−1.2
Navy Reserve	0.0	−0.8
Marine Corps	−0.3	−0.5
Air Force	−707.6	−235.4
Defense-wide	−80.1	0.0

Working Capital Funds

The budget request included $1.7 billion in discretionary spending for defense working capital funds. To ensure proper management of the funds, the committee recommends reducing excess cash balances within the services accounts by $313.5 million, as follows:

Army, $107.0 million; Navy, $92.5 million; and Air Force, $114.0 million.

While the Navy's fiscal year 2004 budget request will not result in excess cash balances in fiscal year 2004, the Navy does plan to use working capital fund balances to buy out the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard (PSNSY) from operating under a working capital fund. However, when the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard pilot program was initiated, direct appropriations were used to remove those facilities from operating under a working capital fund. The committee is troubled both by the planned transition of the PSNSY out of the Navy's working capital fund and by the funding mechanism that is proposed for this purpose.

The transfer of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard out of the Working Capital Fund, to direct, or mission, funding has not been adequately studied. The Navy has not updated its report of the Pearl Harbor experiment in two years. The committee is concerned that removing the PSNSY will put an undue burden on the remaining shipyards funded through the working capital fund. Before changing the funding source for the PSNSY, the committee directs that the Navy conduct a study on the lessons learned and the costs and benefits of mission funding the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard. The report should also discuss the possible effects on the remaining public shipyards if these shipyards remain inside the working capital fund or are taken out of the Working Capital Fund. The committee recommends a decrease of $92.5 million in the Navy Working Capital Fund, the amount of the working capital fund buy-out costs for the PSNSY contained in the budget request.

Civilian personnel pay in excess of requirements

Analysis performed by the Government Accounting Office based on the services' end strength data for civilian personnel as of January 31, 2003, projects that the Army's civilian personnel costs are overstated for fiscal year 2004. Therefore, the committee recommends reducing the Army operation and maintenance account by $12.4 million.

Condition-based maintenance photonic sensors

The budget request included $7.8 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Navy, for ship operations, including organizational level maintenance on gas turbine engines. The committee supports the development of technology that supports the Navy's condition-based maintenance program for marine gas turbine engines. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy, for the development of photonic sensor systems for gas turbine engines.

Lead paint removal

The budget request included $5.0 million in the Operation and Maintenance, Navy, account for the removal of lead-contaminated paint from 26 very low frequency (VLF) radio towers at the Naval Computer and Telecommunications Area Master Station, Atlantic Detachment. This project, which began in fiscal year 1997, is 50 percent complete. The Navy has programmed funding to finish the remainder of the project by fiscal year 2007.

The committee strongly supports the Navy's continuing project to remove contaminated paint from the radio towers. The committee is concerned, however, with the Navy's current level of progress on this project. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy, to expedite the removal of contaminated paint from VLF radio towers.

Navy excess carryover

The committee is aware that several Navy Working Capital Fund activities currently exceed the carryover ceiling as determined under current methodologies established by the Department. The budget request includes $43.5 million in these activities that exceed the carryover ceilings as set by the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $43.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy, to reflect the funds in the Navy Working Capital Fund activities that cannot be expended during fiscal year 2004.

Naval Station Roosevelt Roads

The budget request included $3.7 billion for Navy base operations support, including the costs of base operations at Naval Station Roosevelt Roads (NSRR). The committee notes that NSRR has an annual operating budget of $58.0 million. The committee recommends a decrease of $29.0 million for NSRR due to downsizing of the base.

On April 10, 2003, the Department of the Navy announced significant changes to NSRR as a result of the end of training at Vieques. According to the Navy, Vieques-based training functions have been relocated to continental United States (CONUS)-based training areas. As a result, the overhead structure at NSRR is "* * * significantly oversized for the remaining missions and must be reduced." The Navy, therefore, is implementing a plan to disestablish or reassign military administrative and operational units currently located at NSRR that were previously connected with training at Vieques.

The committee strongly supports the Navy's plan to conform assigned units at NSRR with mission requirements of the base. The Navy plan will reduce the number of military operational and administrative units at NSRR by 60 percent and decrease the number of personnel assigned to NSRR by 65 percent over an eighteen month period. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $29.0 million, a 50 percent reduction to the annual budget, for base operations support at NSRR.

Chemical-Biological Incident Response Force Family of Incident Response Systems

The budget request included no funds in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, for the Chemical-Biological Incident Response Force (CBIRF) Family of Incident Response Systems (FIRS). The committee notes that FIRS provides CBIRF with the technologies needed to conduct reconnaissance, decontamination, force protection, medical, command-control-communication-computers-intelligence, urban search and rescue, and general support missions.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, for CBIRF FIRS.

Initial issue

The budget request included $588.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, for operational forces, including initial issue of personal clothing and equipment. The request, however, included no funding for the All Purpose Environmental Clothing System (APECS). According to the Marine Corps, APECS is of high military value as it provides Marines with the proper modernized clothing protection to perform and survive in various environments at maximum efficiency. The Marine Corps unfunded programs list identified a shortfall of $51.3 million for initial issue items. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, for initial issue, to include the APECS.

Corrosion prevention and control

The budget request included $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, for corrosion prevention and control. The committee notes that Marine Corps equipment is subjected to extreme conditions due to the operating locations of the Marine forces. The result is an increase in the degree of rust and corrosion than would otherwise normally be expected. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, for the Marine Corps to continue a robust and comprehensive Corrosion Prevention and Control Program.

Missile maintenance

The budget request included $27.8 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, but included no funding to support the AIM–9X missile. The committee notes that lack of funding will result in erosion of the availability rate of the AIM–9X. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, to support maintenance requirements of the AIM–9X.

Manufacturing Technical Assistance and Production Program

The budget request included $3.1 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, for logistics operations, but included no funding for the Manufacturing Technical Assistance and Production Program. The committee recognizes the challenges that small and disadvantaged businesses must overcome when conducting business with the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, for the Manufacturing Technical Assistance and Production Program (MTAPP) to further develop productive relationships between the small business community and the Department of Defense.

Air Force Supply Management Activity Group Working Capital Fund and Depot Maintenance

The committee is concerned with the current trend in the Air Force Supply Management Activity Group Working Capital Fund (SMAG WCF) of building excess balances. Working capital funds should be managed towards achieving a zero operating balance. However, the fiscal year 2004 budget request reflects accumulated operating balances that continue to grow through fiscal year 2005 ($404.7 million in fiscal year 2003, $668.7 million in fiscal year 2004, and $856.6 million in fiscal year 2005). Therefore, the committee recommends reducing excess balances in the SMAG WCF by $250.0 million.

The committee is also concerned that the Air Force reports a backlog of $516.0 million in fiscal year 2004 for depot maintenance. At the level of funding in the budget request, the Air Force reports that backlogs in depot maintenance for critical weapon systems (such as the KC–135, F–15, and B–52) will grow. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $250.0 million for Air Force depot maintenance activities.

Train and equip program

The budget request for the Defense Security and Cooperation Agency (DSCA) included $200.0 million for a program that would allow the Department of Defense to provide military assistance or support to unspecified foreign nations assisting U.S. military operations or other activities to combat global terrorism. Such assistance could include the provision of equipment, supplies, services, and funding. Use of these funds would require the concurrence of the Secretary of State. The committee recommends a decrease of $200.0 million in DSCA for this purpose. The committee notes that assistance of the type requested here should more appropriately be provided through the regular foreign assistance accounts. The committee notes that, for emergent requirements to support cooperative activities with foreign nations in combating global terrorism, the Department has existing authorities that it can utilize, such as sections 2341 and 2342 of title 10, United States Code, which were used recently to provide assistance to Pakistan.

Information assurance scholarship program

The budget request included $7.0 million in PE 33140D8Z, Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide for the information assurance scholarship program. This program was established by section 922 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

The committee strongly supports this program and is encouraged that the Department has established a strong foundation of participating schools and is receiving significant interest from prospective students. The need to develop and sustain a strong, professional corps of information assurance professionals within the Department of Defense remains an essential goal.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 33140D8Z, Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide for the information assurance scholarship program, to increase the number

of scholarships and grants that the Department will be able to award in fiscal year 2004.

Transportation Working Capital Fund

The U.S. Transportation Command charges the military services for transporting goods and personnel through a working capital fund arrangement where customers are billed for services to cover costs. Customer rates are adjusted a year in advance—including surcharges for administration and overhead costs—with the goal of breaking even.

Since September 11, 2001, the Global War on Terrorism has placed high demands on the Department's transportation system, resulting in large positive operating balances in the Transportation Working Capital Fund (TWCF). In fiscal year 2002, the excess balances were $680.0 million. Ongoing operations in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom will again result in large positive operating balances in the TWCF for fiscal year 2003, with revenues expected to surpass those in fiscal year 2002. Therefore, the committee recommends reducing excess balances in the TWCF by $600.0 million.

Equipment Storage Site initial operations

The budget request included $1.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve, for operating forces, but included no funding for the Equipment Storage Site program. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve, to support initial operations of Army Reserve Equipment Storage Sites. The committee notes the equipment storage requirements of the Army Reserve and the Equipment Storage Site program which is intended to address those requirements. The committee supports leveraging existing Army Reserve Strategic Storage Site facilities that provide a minimum of 1.3 million square feet of controlled humidity protection for the Equipment Storage Site program.

Cannon bore cleaning

The budget request included $1.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, for operating forces, including funds to purchase cleaning solvents for cannon bores. The committee notes the challenges of the Army National Guard related to artillery, tank, and mortar tube maintenance. The committee strongly supports Army National Guard cannon bore cleaning initiatives that will reduce maintenance requirements, while extending cannon bore life and preserving weapon accuracy. The committee also notes efforts by the Army National Guard to minimize the environmental impact that may result from cannon bore cleaning. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard for cannon bore cleaning systems using water and environmentally "friendly" detergents.

Test support program

The budget request included $2.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (ANG), for test support. The committee supports the contributions of the Air National Guard to de-

fense system testing. The committee notes that the Air National Guard has performed this function for over thirty years. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard, to support the evaluation of defense systems.

The committee also directs the Director of the Air National Guard and the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) to report jointly to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2004, on the role of the ANG in supporting defense systems testing and the plan to provide long-term core sustainment funds for defense systems test support.

Funding for Formerly Used Defense Sites

The budget request included $213.0 million for cleanup of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS). The committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million for FUDS cleanup.

The Army is the executive agent for cleanup of FUDS; the Army Corps of Engineers manages and executes actual remediation activities. The committee notes that there are over 9,000 properties identified for inclusion in the FUDS program, hundreds of which could be categorized as former ranges. Historically, the FUDS program has experienced significant funding shortfalls, making it difficult to execute much needed remediation projects at these sites. In an effort to address this problem, Congress included additional funds for FUDS remediation in every fiscal year since 2000. These funding increases merely helped to address a portion of the funding shortfalls. Once again, the fiscal year 2004 budget request failed to address this funding problem.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army to address the lack of funding support for FUDS within the DOD and the Army. This is particularly important given Congress' ongoing review of environmental encroachment issues related to the management and cleanup of operational ranges.

Specifically, the committee is aware that the Avtex Fibers Facility in Virginia, requires $10.0 million to complete environmental cleanup and demolition of buildings over the next two years. The committee recognizes the importance of this work and expects the Army Corps of Engineers to provide adequate funding to complete cleanup requirements at the Avtex site and other FUDS sites in a timely manner.

Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund

The committee has fully funded the administration request for support of ongoing DoD operations in Bosnia and Kosovo. These operations are no longer contingency events, and such contingency lines are funded in the regular appropriations accounts, as requested by the administration. Contingency operations that arose in the past year are covered in emergency supplemental requests, and are not funded through the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund (OCOTF) account. As ongoing operations are accounted for in both the normal budget process and the emergency supplemental, a contingency operations transfer fund is not needed and the committee recommends a reduction of $50.0 million from the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund.

Other Legislation

The budget request included $45.0 million for a legislative provision that the Department of Defense did not send to the Congress. Therefore, the committee recommends reducing the budget request by that amount.

Items of Special Interest

Arlington National Cemetery information and planning system

Arlington National Cemetery is the nation's principal national shrine where public honor and recognition are accorded those men and women who served in the U.S. Armed Forces. The committee notes that families, friends, and individuals from around the world travel to Arlington National Cemetery to honor their loved ones and their comrades-in-arms. The cemetery annually conducts more than 6,000 funeral services and approximately 3,000 non-funeral services, which honor all veterans and their families. Because the cemetery currently uses antiquated, labor-intensive management tools to manage myriad activities, the caretakers are presented with numerous challenges.

The committee understands that the budget request for the Department of Veterans' Affairs for fiscal year 2004 includes $500,000 to develop an information and planning system that will optimize visitors' experience at the cemetery and improve employee productivity. The committee notes that an additional $5.0 million will be necessary to install and operate this system. Therefore, the committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs to fully fund the Arlington National Cemetery information and planning system.

Chemical depot airspace security

After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the Department of Defense requested, and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) established, temporary flight restrictions above the chemical weapons stockpile depots, including Newport, Indiana. The committee has learned that a number of airspace violations have occurred in the restricted airspace above some of the depots. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to work with the FAA to enhance airspace security above the chemical depots. The committee also encourages the Department to consider any additional steps needed to avert airspace violations, possibly including enhanced surveillance or more stringent airspace restrictions.

Comprehensive management of Department of Defense ranges

The Department of Defense (DOD) manages large areas of the land, air, and sea for weapons system testing and for military training. Demand for military range space is increasing due to weapon system capabilities, technology-enabled dispersion of forces and non-contiguous operations, increasing focus on joint operations, and the adverse impacts of environmental encroachment issues. These demands present numerous challenges for the DOD.

The committee is aware of the challenges associated with the use of military test and training ranges, and the need to optimize the use of existing assets.

The committee commends the efforts of the DOD and local range commanders to overcome testing and training range challenges. On January 10, 2003, the DOD issued Directive 3200.15, which articulates DOD policy to promote the sustainment of test and training ranges. The Defense Test and Training Steering Group continues to expand cooperation among the testing and training communities. Range commanders have forged alliances and informal relationships to leverage range funding and range utilization.

The committee is interested in the results of the DOD initiatives to overcome testing and training range challenges. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of the optimal use of test and training ranges DOD-wide. The study should be submitted to the congressional defense committees no later than November 1, 2004, and should include an evaluation of the following: (1) the current and projected requirement for the land, air, and sea space in support of testing and training requirements; (2) the funding and organizational management structures that support range use, including their advantages and disadvantages; (3) alternative management structures; and (4) recommendations for specific regulatory and legislative changes to optimize range capability and use.

Depot, arsenal and ammunition workforce revitalization

The committee has long been concerned with issues of workforce revitalization in key areas of national defense, particularly in the production and maintenance of key military weapon systems and munitions. The House report to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (H. Rept. 106–616) directed the Army to establish a program to hire and train new workers at its depots. The committee strongly supports these efforts and recommends that they be expanded to include other critical aspects of defense production, such as Army arsenals and ammunition plants. The committee directs the Army to include arsenal and ammunition plants in its apprenticeship programs in order to address the need to revitalize the highly-skilled arsenal and munitions workforce.

Environmental cleanup for former Navy property on Vieques

The committee is aware that the Secretary of the Navy has now terminated Navy training activities and transferred property on Vieques Island, Puerto Rico, to the Department of Interior (DOI) and the Municipality of Vieques. The former Naval Ammunition Support Detachment (NASD) on the western side of Vieques was transferred or conveyed to the Secretary of Interior, the Municipality of Vieques, and the Puerto Rican Conservation Trust in April 2001 (Public Law 106–398). As required by Congress, the cleanup of those portions of NASD conveyed to the Municipality of Vieques and the Puerto Rican Conservation Trust are subject to environmental cleanup requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the pro-

cedures outlined in the National Contingency Plan (NCP) (Public Law 106–398).

The committee notes that cleanup designs are developed through the CERCLA process based upon relative risk to human health and the environment and future land use. The committee expects that the CERCLA process at Vieques will involve the DOI, EPA, Puerto Rico, and the public. The committee is aware that the function of the existing CERCLA process is to assess contamination, to design remedies, and to implement remedies in a transparent, orderly fashion. The committee expects that, as part of the CERCLA process, EPA and the Navy, with the assistance of DOI, will produce a Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) that will determine how the NCP will be implemented on Vieques. The committee is aware that implementation and funding of cleanups are prioritized by relative risk, with the highest priority based on risk to human health. Consistent with this practice, the committee expects that Vieques will be subject to the same prioritization methodology.

Former Navy lands transferred on the eastern side of Vieques must be managed by DOI as part of the National Wildlife Refuge System, pursuant to section 1049 of the Nation Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107). In addition, the former live impact area must be managed as a wilderness area and the public must be excluded. (Public Law 106–398; Public Law 107–107). Over the next few years, DOI will develop Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Vieques National Wildlife Refuge, as is done with all other refuges, that will outline its concept for managing the refuge. The committee recognizes that until that process is complete, it will be difficult to reach final decisions on cleanup. Although some baseline surveys have been completed, it is the committee's expectation that the Navy would carry out additional study of potential contamination of some areas.

Vieques Island has been subject to much congressional focus over the last several years and this committee intends to remain focused on the progress of cleanup and future use of the former Navy lands on Vieques. As a result, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees on the status of cleanup related actions for Vieques Island, to include agreements, remedies, priorities, and milestones, as these actions are completed. That report may be provided through the Annual Report to Congress on the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (10 U.S.C. 2706). The committee expects that such actions would be developed through a process that involves, as appropriate, DOI, EPA, and Puerto Rico. The committee notes that there may be annual updates that would be provided as each aspect of the CERCLA process unfolds. The committee further expects the Secretary of the Navy to expeditiously complete all environmental cleanup actions on Vieques Island, based on available funds, overall priorities, and applicable laws.

Guaranteed fixed price remediation contracts

The committee is aware that the Army has awarded a total of nine Guaranteed Fixed Price Remediation (GFPR) contracts in the amount of $80.0 million, seven contracts at Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) installations for $40.5 million and two contracts at

active installations for $39.8 million. The Army estimates that these nine GFPR contracts yielded a savings of about $13.0 million, as compared to other contracting methodologies. GFPR contracts include a statement of objectives with a performance-based end result of regulatory site closure for one fixed price. This approach aligns contractor incentives with achieving fast and efficient environmental remediation, avoids cost escalation and over-runs, and mobilizes innovative approaches and technologies.

The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of the Army to continue exploring appropriate uses of GFPR contracts for contaminated sites, particularly at Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) where environmental cleanup efforts have been underfunded. The Army is the executive agent for the FUDS Program, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers manages and executes environmental cleanup activities at these sites.

Specifically, the committee is aware of the important ongoing environmental cleanup activities at the former Lowry Bombing and Gunnery Range in Arapahoe County, Colorado, and that it is necessary to complete these actions to ensure protection of public health and safety. The committee encourages the Army to utilize the full spectrum of environmental cleanup methodologies at Lowry Bombing and Gunnery Range, to include cost effective GFPR contracts. Moreover, the committee expects the Department of Defense, the Army, and the Army Corps of Engineers to provide sufficient resources and funding to support cost effective and expeditious cleanup activities at the Lowry Bombing and Gunnery Range and other FUDS sites.

Mail delivery to troops stationed in the Middle East

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the delivery of mail to troops in the Middle East. Specifically, the study should: (1) determine delivery times, reliability, and losses for mail and parcels to and from troops stationed in the Middle East; (2) identify and analyze mail and parcel delivery service efficiency issues during Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm, compared to such services which occurred during Operation Iraqi Freedom; and (3) identify cost efficiencies and benefits of alternative delivery systems or modifications to existing delivery systems to improve the delivery times of mail and parcels.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the General Accounting Office's findings and recommendations.

Sea Swap

"Sea Swap" is a concept of operations for deploying Navy surface combatants, where the surface combatant is deployed from homeport for a period of time in excess of the historical six-month deployment period. Several different crews to operate the combatant are rotated from homeport to the deployed location of the combatant during the Sea Swap deployment. According to the Navy, Sea Swap is intended to maximize the on-station time of the surface combatant.

The United States Ship *Fletcher* (DDG 992) is the test ship for the Sea Swap deployment concept. The United States Ship *Fletcher* deployed in August 2002, from Naval Station Pearl Harbor. The crew of the United States Ship *Fletcher* rotated in Western Australia in January 2003. The United States Ship *Fletcher* is scheduled to return to San Diego on December 23, 2003, after completing 508 days on deployment.

According to the testimony of the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO), the Navy intends "* * * to continue to examine pilot programs in optimal manning and rotational crewing," such as Sea Swap. The return of the United States Ship *Fletcher* to homeport in December 2003 will allow the Navy the opportunity to fully analyze all data from the deployment and develop lessons learned from the experience.

The committee is interested in the lessons learned from the United States Ship *Fletcher* deployment and the CNO's continuing examination of the Sea Swap deployment concept. The committee directs the CNO to provide periodic updates to the congressional defense committees on the status of Sea Swap, including the lessons learned from the deployment of the United States Ship *Fletcher*.

Summer training for cadets and midshipmen

The committee understands that there are numerous requirements for professional training placed on cadets and midshipmen assigned to the United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy. The committee believes that such training, to include any training procured by contract, should be fully consistent with the missions and curricula of these institutions, after careful consideration of the value added by this training to the necessary development of commissioned officers and its merit in assuring accomplishment of the service academies' mission. The committee believes that any course of instruction procured by contract should be done so competitively and in full compliance with federal acquisition regulations.

Support for the Joint National Training Capability

The committee strongly supports the Department of Defense's (DOD) efforts to quickly develop and demonstrate a Joint National Training Capability (JNTC) to enhance joint warfighting preparedness. One of the foundations of the JNTC concept is connectivity between numerous existing training sites, a requirement that is being pursued by Joint Forces Command (JFCOM). At the same time, the military services are improving connectivity between training sites to support service-specific training, such as the Air Force's Distributed Mission Training and the Navy's Training Resource Strategy. The committee commends both JFCOM and the military services for their efforts to improve training, and encourages the military services to rely, to the greatest degree possible, on JNTC infrastructure to support their training needs.

The committee understands that, as Joint Forces Command seeks to meet bandwidth needs, they are working with the Defense Information Services Agency (DISA) as the preferred provider. DISA is pursuing additional bandwidth for numerous purposes be-

yond training, to include intelligence sharing and improved support for research and engineering efforts. The committee directs DISA to leverage ongoing efforts to the greatest degree possible in order to provide necessary support to the JNTC.

The committee also understands that the Department has been developing joint simulation systems in a large, joint research and development program to meet service and joint training requirements. This program has been suspended pending an analysis of alternatives that should inform decisions on a technology development plan that supports JNTC needs, as well as larger joint and service training requirements.

The committee recognizes that a functional joint simulation system is essential to fully realize the goals and potential of the JNTC program. The committee urges the Department to ensure that the simulation systems development programs are structured to meet current and future joint training and experimentation requirements. These programs should also be managed and funded in a manner that is consistent with the technical challenges, development and deployment schedule, and joint military needs associated with them.

Accordingly, the committee directs that the Department report on the results of the analysis of alternatives and provide a joint program and funding plan for establishment of a new development and acquisition program within 90 days of the conclusion of the ongoing analysis of alternatives.

Visual language translators

The committee commends the Department of Defense for utilizing visual language translators for military field operations. The committee notes that visual language translators enable service members to greatly improve communications by eliminating language barriers. These devices are currently being used by service personnel in Operation Iraqi Freedom. The committee supports the use of visual language translators and urges the Department of Defense to expand the use of this important tool.

War reserve stocks of Meals Ready to Eat

The committee understands that recent operations have greatly reduced the Department of Defense's stocks of Meals Ready to Eat (MRE). The committee directs the Defense Logistics Agency to review the adequacy of current and planned inventory levels to meet war plan requirements, and to recommend any necessary funding adjustments to the Undersecretary of Defense (Comptroller) (USD(C)).

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active duty end strengths for fiscal year 2004, as shown below:

	Fiscal year—		
	2003 authorization	2004 request	2004 recommendation
Army	480,000	480,000	480,000
Navy	375,700	373,800	373,800
Marine Corps	175,000	175,000	175,000
Air Force	359,000	359,300	359,300

Increased maximum percentage of general and flag officers on active duty authorized to be serving in grades above brigadier general and rear admiral (lower half) (sec. 402)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 525 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 50 percent to 55 percent the number of active-duty general and flag officers who may serve in grades above O–7.

Extension of certain authorities relating to management of numbers of general and flag officers in certain grades (sec. 403)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend: (1) authority for the process by which the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff fill vacant senior joint four-star general and flag officer positions; (2) the exemption of the senior joint four-star general and flag officers appointed by that process from the general and flag officer limits that apply to the military services; and (3) the process by which the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff designates and fills 12 general and flag officer positions on the joint staff and 10 reserve component general and flag positions on the staff of the commanders of the unified and specified combatant commands.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2004, as shown below:

	Fiscal year—		
	2003 authorization	2004 request	2004 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	350,000	350,000	350,000
The Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000
The Naval Reserve	87,800	85,900	85,900
The Marine Corps Reserve	39,558	39,600	39,600
The Air National Guard of the United States	106,600	107,000	107,000
The Air Force Reserve	75,600	75,800	75,800
The Coast Guard Reserve	9,000	10,000	10,000

End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the full-time support end strengths for fiscal year 2004, as shown below:

	Fiscal year—		
	2003 authorization	2004 request	2004 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	24,562	25,386	25,599
The Army Reserve	14,070	14,374	14,374
The Naval Reserve	14,572	14,384	14,384
The Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261
The Air National Guard of the United States	11,727	12,140	12,191
The Air Force Reserve	1,498	1,660	1,660

The committee recommends an increase of 213 in the Army National Guard and 51 in the Air National Guard to support the activation of 12 additional Weapons of Mass Destruction—Civil Support Teams during fiscal year 2004.

End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the minimum level of dual status technician end strengths for fiscal year 2004, as shown below:

	Fiscal year—		
	2003 authorization	2004 request	2004 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	24,102	24,589	24,589
The Army Reserve	6,599	6,699	6,699
The Air National Guard of the United States	22,495	22,806	22,806
The Air Force Reserve	9,911	9,991	9,991

Fiscal year 2004 limitations on non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish numerical limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2004, as shown below:

	Fiscal year—		
	2003 authorization	2004 request	2004 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	1,600	1,600	1,600
The Army Reserve	995	895	895
The Air National Guard of the United States	350	350	350
The Air Force Reserve	90	90	90

Subtitle C—Other Matters Relating to Personnel Strengths

Revision of personnel strength authorization and accounting process (sec. 421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a change to the method used by the Department of Defense to measure the strength for active duty and reserve component personnel from strength at the end of the fiscal year to average strength throughout the year.

Exclusion of recalled retired members from certain strength limitations during period of war or national emergency (sec. 422)

The committee recommends a provision that would exclude retirees recalled to active duty from annual personnel end strength and grade strength limitations during a period of war or national emergency in which members of a reserve component are serving on active duty pursuant to an order to active duty under sections 12301 or 12302 of title 10, United States Code.

Subtitle D—Authorization of Appropriations

Authorization of appropriations for military personnel (sec. 431)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $99.2 billion for military personnel, an increase of $286.0 million over the budget request. This includes $428.0 million for increases in the family separation allowance and special pay for duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger, $38.0 million for a minimum 3.7 percent pay raise for all eligible personnel, $45.0 million for assignment incentive pay for duty in Korea, $11.0 million for an increase in the death benefit, and $22.0 million for increases in Army and Air National Guard full-time support personnel to implement additional weapons of mass destruction-civil support teams. The provision would also authorize reductions of $46.0 million from the services' personnel accounts for selective reenlistment bonuses and $312.0 million for personnel costs related to Operation Northern Watch and Operation Southern Watch.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

Retention of health professions officers to fulfill active duty service obligations following failure of selection for promotion (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would require officers serving in the health professions who are not selected for promotion, but who have not completed their obligated active duty service, to complete their active duty service obligation unless the secretary of the military department concerned determines that completion of that service obligation would not be in the best interest of the military department.

Eligibility for appointment as Chief of Army Veterinary Corps (sec. 502)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 3084 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Chief of the Veterinary Corps of the Army be appointed from among officers of the Veterinary Corps of the Army.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Personnel Policy

Expanded authority for use of Ready Reserve in response to terrorism (sec. 511)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the language of section 12304(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of reserves for all terrorist attacks or threatened terrorist attacks in the United States that result, or could result, in loss of life or property.

Streamlined process for continuing officers on the reserve active-status list (sec. 512)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the requirement for selection boards under sections 14101 and 14701 of title 10, United States Code, to continue reserve component officers on the reserve active-status list.

National Guard officers on active duty in command of National Guard units (sec. 513)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 325 of title 32, United States Code, to allow officers of the Army or Air National Guard, called to active duty for the purpose of commanding a unit composed of both active duty and reserve component personnel, to retain and exercise their Army or Air National Guard state commissions if authorized by the President and the governor. Such National Guard officers would have the author-

ity to command subordinate active duty personnel by virtue of their own active duty status and also retain the authority to command National Guard personnel in a nonfederal status.

Subtitle C—Revision of Retirement Authorities

Permanent authority to reduce three-year time-in-grade requirement for retirement in grade for officers in grades above major and lieutenant commander (sec. 521)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 1370 of title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority to reduce the three-year time-in-grade requirement for retirement in grade for officers in grades above major and lieutenant commander.

Subtitle D—Education and Training

Increased flexibility for management of senior level education and post-education assignments (sec. 531)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 663 of title 10, United States Code, by repealing the requirement that the principal course of instruction offered at the Joint Forces Staff College as Phase II joint professional military education must be at least three months in duration. Additionally, the provision would repeal requirements related to mandatory assignment to joint duty of officers completing joint professional military education. Although greater flexibility for officer assignments would result from this provision, the committee expects that a significant number of graduates from joint professional military education schools would be assigned to joint duty upon graduation.

Expanded educational assistance authority for cadets and midshipmen receiving ROTC scholarships (sec. 532)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretaries of the military departments additional flexibility to use Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) scholarship funds to pay for room, board, and other expenses required by cadets and midshipmen for classes. This provision would ensure that Senior ROTC scholarship funds are more responsive to students' individual financial needs by allowing an alternative use of these funds when tuition costs are covered in whole or in part by other sources.

Eligibility and cost reimbursement requirements for personnel to receive instruction at the Naval Postgraduate School (sec. 533)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit assignment of enlisted members of the armed forces, who have completed undergraduate studies and been awarded a baccalaureate degree, to the Naval Postgraduate School for the purpose of full-time instruction in the field of information assurance. Additionally, this provision would authorize senior enlisted members of the armed forces to attend certain executive level seminars conducted at the Naval Postgraduate School.

Actions to address sexual misconduct at the service academies (sec. 534)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the service secretaries, under guidance provided by the Department of Defense, to direct the superintendents of their respective service academies to prescribe a policy on sexual misconduct applicable to the personnel of their academy. Additionally, the provision would direct the Secretary of Defense, through the service secretaries and service academy superintendents, to conduct annual assessments, including surveys of academy personnel, to determine the effectiveness of academy policies, training, and procedures on sexual misconduct. The Secretary of Defense would be directed to submit annual reports to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives for five years on sexual misconduct involving academy personnel.

Subtitle E—Decorations, Awards, and Commendations

Subtitle F—Military Justice

Extended limitation period for prosecution of child abuse cases in courts-martial (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 43 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) (10 U.S.C. 843) to apply a modified version of the federal criminal statute of limitations found in section 3283 of title 18, United States Code, which applies to offenses involving the sexual or physical abuse of a child under 18, to trial by a court-martial of a person for such offenses under the UCMJ. The modification would limit the application of the extended limitation period to cases involving children under the age of 16 years, the limit for such offenses under the substantive criminal provisions of the UCMJ. The extended limitation period would permit trial by court-martial if sworn charges and specifications were received before the child reached the age of 25 years. This would replace the present five-year statute of limitations for this category of offenses.

Clarification of blood alcohol content limit for the offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice of drunken operation of a vehicle, aircraft, or vessel (sec. 552)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the blood alcohol content limit for the offense of drunken operation of a vehicle, aircraft, or vessel under Article 111 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (10 U.S.C. 911). The provision would make explicit that a blood alcohol content equal to the applicable state limit, or the 0.10 limit set out in Article 111, whichever is applicable, would constitute an offense under Article 111.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

High-tempo personnel management and allowance (sec. 561)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 991 of title 10, United States Code, and section 436 of title 37, United States Code, with respect to management of deployments of

members and payment of a high-tempo allowance. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, the Congress initially required high deployment tracking systems and additional compensation for eligible members. The Department of Defense submitted a report, pursuant to congressional direction, and has recommended legislative changes that are consistent with the goals of tracking deployments of individual service members and compensating those individuals who experience unusually high deployment tempo. This provision would require payment of up to $1000 each month during which a member has been: (1) deployed for at least 401 days out of the preceding 730 days; (2) deployed continuously for more than 191 days; or (3) in the case of a Reservist, called or ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days, if such period begins within one year after the date on which the member was released from previous service on active duty for a period of more than 30 days under a call or order to active duty. The committee urges the Department to promptly implement this high-tempo allowance upon enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

Alternate initial military service obligation for persons accessed under direct entry program (sec. 562)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to establish a direct entry program for persons with critical military skills. The requirements of section 651(a) of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to the duration of initial military service obligation, would not apply to persons who enter the armed forces for an initial period of active duty under this program. Upon implementing this program, the Secretary of Defense must report to the congressional defense committees on the critical military skills designated for inclusion under this program. This program would commence on October 1, 2003, and end on September 30, 2005.

Policy on concurrent deployment to combat zones of both military spouses of military families with minor children (sec. 563)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe the policy of the Department of Defense on concurrent deployment to a combat zone of both spouses of a dual-military family with one or more minor children within 180 days of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

Enhancement of voting rights of members of the uniformed services (sec. 564)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 1973ff–1 of title 42, United States Code, by prescribing standards to be used by state officials in validating ballots submitted in elections for federal office by absent uniformed services voters. Additionally, the provision would establish procedures to facilitate voting by recently separated military members.

Items of Special Interest

Assisting non-citizen service members

The committee recognizes the contribution to national security of the many non-citizen service members in the armed forces and particularly the ultimate sacrifice made by those non-citizen service members who lost their lives during Operation Iraqi Freedom and the global war on terrorism. The committee strongly supports the decision by the President, retroactive to September 11, 2001, to exempt military members from the requirement to have served three years on active duty before applying for citizenship during the period of the war against terrorists. The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military services to review its policies to determine if any additional measures can be taken to assist and expedite the naturalization of qualified service members and their families. Specifically, the Department of Defense is directed to examine the feasibility of allowing military personnel to receive official orders and utilize government transportation and lodging in order to carry out naturalization requirements.

Computer-based assistance for survivors of military decedents

The committee strongly supports the efforts of the military services in continuing to improve casualty assistance services for the families of military members who die while in the military service of their nation. One aspect of casualty assistance that requires further emphasis and innovative leadership by the Department of Defense is providing a means to assure prompt, accurate, and detailed information specific to individual decedents about survivor benefits and how those benefits may change over time. The committee urges the Department to consider contracting for or rapidly developing a reliable computer-based service of this nature, including calculators and links to helpful web sites. This service should be available on line to survivors, the casualty assistance officers who are assigned to advise them, leaders in the chain of command, and, ideally, to all military members to assist them in understanding how benefits, such as Serviceman's Group Life Insurance, Dependency and Indemnity Compensation, and the Survivor Benefit Plan, among others, operate.

Education for service members in preventing identity theft

The committee is pleased at the ongoing efforts by the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services to provide training for military members in financial responsibility. The committee is aware that service members can be particularly vulnerable to identity theft and recommends that the DOD and military services include instruction on this problem in their financial responsibility courses. Additionally, the committee urges the Department to review its policy of using social security numbers as individual members' service numbers in view of the potential for abuse.

Family surveys

The operational demands on the men and women of the armed forces and their families, and the extraordinary value of the service

they render require the Department of Defense and the military services to employ various means to identify potential sources of dissatisfaction that might adversely affect retention in both the active and reserve components. The committee believes that surveys of military members and their spouses have particular value in this regard and looks forward to receiving the results of surveys being conducted by the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, the Air Force Community Assessment, and the Marine Corps' quality of life assessment conducted in 2002. The committee urges the military services to continue their efforts in this regard aimed at improving the attractiveness of military careers for active duty, reserve, and Guard military families.

Impact of reserve mobilization on state and local first responder units

The committee is aware that the heavy reliance on reservists and National Guardsmen during Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Noble Eagle, and Operation Iraqi Freedom has had a significant impact on individual members and their employers across the country. The committee expresses its gratitude and admiration for those employers who have supported their reserve component employees. The unique demands of the global war on terrorism for reserve component personnel with expertise in physical security, force protection, and law enforcement have resulted in the mobilization of many Reservists and Guardsmen who are employed as first responders. Concerns have been expressed that mobilization of such Reservists and Guardsmen could have an adverse impact on the state and local communities that rely upon them.

In testimony responding to these concerns, representatives of the Department of Defense have noted that administrative procedures do exist in the Department for employers to request exemption from mobilization for key employees based on the public safety requirements of individual communities. The committee urges the Department to use the valuable services of the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve and other means to disseminate information about the availability of this procedure.

The committee understands that the Department does not currently have sufficient information in its possession to determine the extent of this problem. In part this is due to the fact that many state and local first responders, particularly firefighters, are volunteers. The committee is pleased that the Department has undertaken a comprehensive survey in order to determine the occupations of those who serve in the Reserves and their volunteer activities, insofar as they are related to first responder status. The committee urges the Department to identify concentrations of reservists and National Guardsmen who serve in first responder roles and to determine the effects of mobilization on the communities served by these first responders.

Increased reliance on warrant officers

The committee expects the military services to make increased and better use of warrant officers. The committee notes that the Army has long depended on the use of warrant officers, but the

Navy's use of such officers is limited, and the Air Force does not have a cadre of warrant officers.

The Congressional Budget Office submitted a paper in February 2002 entitled, "The Warrant Officer Ranks: Adding Flexibility to Military Personnel Management." This study underscored the potential for increasing the number of warrant officers, who currently account for just over one percent of active duty personnel, to alleviate concerns about the ability of the enlisted force to recruit well-qualified individuals, to ensure the best performers in the enlisted force have career opportunities commensurate with their abilities, and to retain personnel in technical occupations for active duty careers that may extend past 30 years of total service. The committee urges the Navy to increase its use of warrant officers and the Air Force to consider creating a cadre of warrant officers to address the foregoing concerns and to assist in meeting the demand for highly skilled technical area expertise, including pilots for unmanned aerial vehicles.

Joint training of Department of Defense personnel in the Code of Conduct

The experience of the men and women of the armed forces in the recent conflict in Iraq and the realities of the global war on terrorism increasingly underscore the danger of U.S. service members being held as prisoners of war, as detainees by hostile governments, or as hostages.

The committee is aware that the military services train their personnel in the Code of Conduct for Members of the United States Armed Forces and that through this training the services strive to prepare every soldier, sailor, airman, and Marine for the possibility of being taken prisoner by hostile forces. The committee also understands that Commander, Joint Forces Command, is responsible for setting training standards for military personnel who may confront captivity.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by March 1, 2004 on the training standards required for Department of Defense personnel who are assigned duties in their areas of operational responsibility and how the training to meet those standards is provided by the military services and the Joint Forces Command. The committee requests that the report also include information about the percentage of forces currently meeting the training standards and a discussion of how the Department of Defense plans to enhance the ability of U.S. service members to fulfill their duties under the Code of Conduct.

Panel to review sexual misconduct allegations at the United States Air Force Academy

Section 501 of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003, established a panel of civilian experts to review sexual misconduct allegations at the United States Air Force Academy. The panel is required to study the policies, management and organizational practices, and cultural elements of the United States Air Force Academy that were conducive to allowing sexual misconduct (including sexual assaults and rape) at the United States Air Force Academy. The panel is required to submit a report on the

study to the Secretary of Defense and to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The committee encourages the panel to include in its report an assessment of responsibility and accountability for the policies, management and organizational practices, and cultural elements of the Air Force Academy that were conducive to allowing sexual misconduct at the Academy.

Pre-enlistment screening of applicants for military service

The committee is aware that the services have experimented with different screening programs to predict potential success of candidates for enlistment. Because historical data show that about one-third of enlistees for military service fail to complete their initial term of service, the committee is interested in ensuring that successful pre-screening programs are shared with all the services and are used to reduce first-term attrition wherever feasible.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report by January 31, 2004, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the screening programs that have been tested by the military services. The report should include an evaluation of whether each program test provided meaningful information about recruits' propensity to complete their basic training and initial terms of enlistment.

Report on implementation of recommendations of the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence

The Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence has submitted its final report to the Secretary of Defense. In its three annual reports, the Task Force made nearly 200 recommendations to improve prevention of and response to domestic violence in the military. The Department of Defense has agreed with the majority of the Task Force's recommendations included in two interim reports. The Secretary of Defense is required to submit to the committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives an evaluation of the final report within 90 days of receipt. The committee looks forward to receiving this evaluation.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to implement appropriate recommendations of the Task Force as soon as practicable. The Secretary of Defense is directed to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the implementation of the Task Force recommendations. This report should be submitted no later than one year after the Secretary submits the Department of Defense evaluation on the final report of the Task Force. The report shall include a description of the recommendations that were implemented and a description of the recommendations that were not implemented, including a statement of the reason for not implementing the recommendation.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

Increase in basic pay for fiscal year 2004 (sec. 601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an across the board military pay raise of 3.7 percent, consistent with the standard set forth in section 602 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2000 (Public Law 106–65), which requires that pay increases through fiscal year 2006 for all members equate to the Employment Cost Index plus 0.5 percent. The provision would authorize an additional targeted pay raise for certain experienced mid-career personnel that would have the effect of raising the average pay raise to 4.15 percent.

Revised annual pay adjustment process (sec. 602)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, to require an annual adjustment of basic pay for members of the uniformed services that would provide all eligible members with an increase in the monthly basic pay that is the equivalent percentage (rounded to the nearest one-tenth of one percent) of the annual increase in the Employment Cost Index (ECI). The provision would maintain the existing requirement in law that annual pay raises in fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006 equal the annual increase in ECI plus 0.5 percent.

Computation of basic pay rate for commissioned officers with prior enlisted or warrant officer service (sec. 603)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 203 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize commissioned officers who have accrued at least 1,460 points for reserve service as a warrant officer, an enlisted member, or as a warrant officer and an enlisted member, to receive basic pay at the same rate as commissioned officers credited with over four years of active-duty service as an enlisted member.

Pilot program of monthly subsistence allowance for non-scholarship Senior ROTC members committing to continue ROTC participation as sophomores (sec. 604)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize non-scholarship cadets and midshipmen in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program, who have completed the first year of the senior ROTC program, to voluntarily contract to serve for the period required by the program and, commencing in the second year of training, receive a monthly subsistence allowance at the same level as scholarship cadets and midshipmen.

Basic allowance for housing for each member married to another member without dependents when both spouses are on sea duty (sec. 605)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow two members of the uniformed services in a pay grade below E–6 who are married to each other, have no other dependent, and are simultaneously assigned to sea duty to each receive a basic allowance for housing.

Increased rate of family separation allowance (sec. 606)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the family separation allowance under section 427 of title 37, United States Code, from $100 per month to $250 per month.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 31, 2004, the authority to pay the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation bonus, the special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high priority units in the Selected Reserve, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, and the prior service enlistment bonus.

One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for certain health care professionals (sec. 612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for one year the authority to pay the nurse officer candidate accession bonus, the accession bonus for registered nurses, incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, and to repay education loans for certain Selected Reserve health professionals.

One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 31, 2004, the authority to pay the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending their period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

One-year extension of other bonus and special pay authorities (sec. 614)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 31, 2004, the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus for active members, the retention bonus for members with critical military skills, and the accession bonus for new officers in critical military skills.

Special pay for reserve officers holding positions of unusual responsibility and of critical nature (sec. 615)

The committee recommends a provision that would make reserve component officers eligible for special pay under section 306 of title 37, United States Code.

Assignment incentive pay for service in Korea (sec. 616)

The committee recommends a provision that would require payment of assignment incentive pay in the amount of $100 per month to all military members stationed in the Republic of South Korea. The committee continues to be concerned about substandard living and working conditions in Korea and recognizes a need for additional incentives for military members ordered to duty in Korea. The committee notes the Army's failure to use the existing authority for assignment incentive pay to respond to congressional expectations expressed in the Senate report accompanying S. 2514 (S. Rept. 107–151) and the recommendations by the Commander, United States Forces Korea, for improvements in the compensation for soldiers stationed in Korea.

Increased maximum amount of reenlistment bonus for active members (sec. 617)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an increase in the reenlistment bonus. The bonus payable under this provision would not exceed $70,000.

Payment of Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus to members of Selected Reserve who are mobilized (sec. 618)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that members entitled to a bonus under section 308b of title 37, United States Code, who are called or ordered to active duty, may be paid any amount of such bonus that is payable during the period of active duty without regard to the fact that the member is serving on active duty pursuant to such call or order to active duty.

Increased rate of hostile fire and imminent danger special pay (sec. 619)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the rate of special pay for duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger under section 310 of title 37, United States Code, from $150 per month to $225 per month.

Availability of hostile fire and imminent danger special pay for reserve component members on inactive duty (sec. 620)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment of hostile fire and imminent danger pay under section 310 of title 37, United States Code, to reserve component members performing inactive-duty training under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The provision would be effective as of September 11, 2001.

Expansion of overseas tour extension incentive program to officers (sec. 621)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend benefit eligibility under section 314 of title 37, United States Code, and section 705 of title 10, United States Code, to all service members, including officers, who extend duty at designated overseas locations.

Eligibility of warrant officers for accession bonus for new officers in critical skills (sec. 622)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 324 of title 37, United States Code, to allow members appointed in the grade of warrant officer (W1) to receive the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills.

Incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage (sec. 623)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the service secretaries to offer a lump sum bonus of up to $4000 to eligible enlisted members, in pay grade E–6 with less than 10 years of service or pay grade E–5 and below, regardless of years of service, who successfully convert from ratings or occupational specialties designated by the secretary concerned as adequately manned or overmanned to one in which there is a designated shortage of trained and qualified personnel. Members would have to agree to incur a minimum obligated service of four years in the new specialty to be eligible to receive this bonus.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

Shipment of privately owned motor vehicle within continental United States (sec. 631)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow service members to contract personally for the transportation of a motor vehicle in permanent change of station moves within the continental United States instead of relying exclusively on the government to arrange such transport. The amount of the allowance for such transportation would not be more than the amount that would have been paid if the member or a dependent had driven the vehicle between duty stations.

Payment or reimbursement of student baggage storage costs for dependent children of members stationed overseas (sec. 632)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 430 of title 37, United States Code, to allow military dependents who are students to store baggage one time per fiscal year at government expense at or in the vicinity of their school during their annual trip between school and their sponsors' duty station or during a different period in the same fiscal year.

Contracts for full replacement value for loss or damage to personal property transported at Government expense (sec. 633)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to require by contract that household goods carriers pay the full replacement value for loss or damage to the property of members of the armed forces moved under such a contract. Additionally, in the event a carrier does not settle a claim for loss or damage within a reasonable period of time, this provision would authorize deduction of an amount equal to the full replacement value from the amount owed by the United States to the carrier under the contract, and remission of the amount so deducted to the claimant.

Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits

Special rule for computation of retired pay base for commanders of combatant commands (sec. 641)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the rate of retired pay for combatant commanders to correspond with that of the chiefs of service.

Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for surviving spouses of Reserves not eligible for retirement who die from a cause incurred or aggravated while on inactive-duty training (sec. 642)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend benefits under the Survivor Benefit Plan to surviving spouses of reservists not eligible for retirement who die from an injury or illness incurred or aggravated in the line of duty during inactive-duty training. This provision would be effective as of September 10, 2001.

Increase in death gratuity payable with respect to deceased members of the Armed Forces (sec. 643)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the death gratuity from $6000 to $12,000, effective as of September 11, 2001.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Retention of accumulated leave (sec. 651)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to permit eligible military members to retain up to 120 days of accumulated leave under prescribed conditions. Leave in excess of 60 days accumulated would be lost unless it is used by the member before the end of the third fiscal year following the end of the qualifying service.

Other Programs

Selective reenlistment bonuses

The budget request included over $2.4 billion in funding for special and incentive pays, including increases for selective reenlist-

ment bonuses. The committee is concerned about such increases at a time when rates of retention are robust and benefits of service increasing overall. The committee believes that service retention goals can be achieved with less reliance on the selective reenlistment bonus. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $46.0 million in fiscal year 2004 divided as follows:

Army: $14.5 million;
Navy: $14.5 million;
Marine Corps: $2.5 million;
Air Force: $14.5 million.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE

Medical and dental screening for members of Selected Reserve units alerted for mobilization (sec. 701)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide medical and dental screening and care for members of the Selected Reserve who are assigned to a unit that has been alerted or notified that members of the unit will be mobilized for active duty in support of an operational mission or contingency operation during a national emergency or time of war. The committee is aware that under current law there is often inadequate time to ensure necessary medical and dental evaluation and care can be provided until members are actually on active duty.

TRICARE beneficiary counseling and assistance coordinators for reserve component beneficiaries (sec. 702)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish TRICARE beneficiary counseling and assistance coordinators for reserve and National Guard service members and their families.

The Department of Defense relies heavily on the million plus men and women of the reserve and National Guard to expand the capabilities of our active duty forces. Recent world events have required greater reliance on our Guard and reserve forces. A recent General Accounting Office study determined that nearly 80 percent of reservists have health care coverage when not on active duty, but transitioning from private sector plans to TRICARE, and back, is often disruptive and confusing. Further, reserve and National Guard members have less experience with, and knowledge of, the TRICARE program than active duty personnel. Reserve and Guard beneficiaries need help working through the complex TRICARE system.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 directed the Department of Defense to establish TRICARE beneficiary counseling and assistance coordinators that have proven to be extremely beneficial to service members, retirees, and family members. Coordinators trained in the unique challenges of moving into and out of the TRICARE system and specific reserve and National Guard benefit issues would be extremely helpful to reserve members and their families. The committee believes that a parallel system of beneficiary counseling and assistance coordinators, exclusively for reserve and Guard members and their families, with comprehensive knowledge of reserve issues could greatly improve access to health care for these service members and their families.

Extension of authority to enter into personal services contracts for health care services to be performed at locations outside medical treatment facilities (sec. 703)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for five years the authority of the Secretary of Defense to enter into personal services contracts to carry out health care responsibilities, such as the provision of medical examinations at Military Entrance Processing Stations, at locations outside medical treatment facilities. This provision would allow the U.S. Military Entrance Processing Command to continue to hire Fee-Basis practitioners to meet surge requirements.

Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund valuations and contributions (sec. 704)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish actuarially appropriate cost contributions to the Department of Defense Medicare eligible retiree health care fund for each or any of the uniformed services participating separately from the other participating uniformed services if the Secretary determines that a more accurate and appropriate actuarial valuation would be achieved by doing so.

Surveys on continued viability of TRICARE standard (sec. 705)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to survey and determine health care provider acceptance of the TRICARE Standard benefit by market area, and to designate a senior official to take the actions necessary to achieve and maintain adequate levels of provider participation in the TRICARE Standard program. The provision would direct the Comptroller General to review the processes, procedures, analyses, and actions taken by the Department of Defense to ensure ready access to the TRICARE Standard program. The committee is aware of increasing concerns from military health care system beneficiaries about access to the TRICARE Standard benefit. Lack of information about benefits and reimbursement rates are causing confusion for both beneficiaries and providers. Further, the committee is concerned that there is no responsible party within the Department of Defense charged with ensuring that there are health care providers willing to accept TRICARE Standard beneficiaries. If the Department continues to offer a "triple option" health care plan, three viable options must be available.

Elimination of limitation on covered beneficiaries eligible to receive health care services from former public health service treatment facilities (sec. 706)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the current legislative restriction on "designated providers" enrolling otherwise eligible beneficiaries who have other health insurance in U.S. Family Health Plans. Other TRICARE health plan options administered through managed care support contracts do not have the same restrictions. The committee notes that it is important that equity exist through the TRICARE program.

Modification of structure and duties of Department of Veterans Affairs—Department of Defense Health Executive Committee (sec. 707)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 8111(c) of Title 38, United States Code, which provides for establishment of a Department of Defense—Veteran's Administration Health Executive Committee. The provision would: (1) expand the scope of the committee to include review of health and other benefit issues; (2) eliminate the requirement that the chair of the committee alternate annually between the Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Under Secretary of Defense; (3) eliminate the requirement that the two departments share equally the costs of personnel and administrative support and services; and (4) eliminate the direction to the committee chairman to require the Inspector General of either or both departments to assist in the review of the implementation of activities designed to promote the coordination and sharing of health care resources between the departments.

Items of Special Interest

Children's hospitals

The committee has been concerned with reports from health care providers and institutions of insufficient reimbursement rates by the TRICARE program. This issue is exacerbated when children's hospitals provide care to TRICARE beneficiaries with high-cost, complex medical needs where TRICARE reimbursement rates do not cover the cost of care provided.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to review and consider alignment of the TRICARE payment schedule with Medicare's "disproportionate share" payment adjustment to these hospitals.

Chiropractic health care

The committee is concerned about effective implementation of the chiropractic health care program in the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee understands that the Chiropractic Oversight Advisory Committee, which was created to provide advice to the Secretary of Defense on the development and implementation of this program, has not met in over a year. The committee encourages the DOD to continue to seek the advice and expertise of the Chiropractic Oversight Advisory Committee as implementation of the chiropractic health care program continues throughout the military health care system.

The committee encourages the Department to accelerate the number of military treatment facilities that provide chiropractic care to active duty service members. Accordingly, the committee directs that the Department provide the chiropractic benefit at no fewer than 45 sites by the end of fiscal year 2004. The Department should make information readily available to members of the military departments concerning access to chiropractic services.

Further, every effort should be made by the Department to recognize chiropractors as the health care professionals that they are. The committee recommends that chiropractors, given their exten-

sive medical training, should report to a physician rather than a physician's assistant or other specialty practitioner.

Force health protection

Experience with illnesses among veterans of the 1991 Persian Gulf War highlighted deficiencies in the Department of Defense's (DOD) force health protection capabilities. Thousands of military personnel returned from serving their country in the Persian Gulf and reported a variety of symptoms for which no cause has been determined. Many of their symptoms are similar to those of patients in the general population suffering from chronic fatigue syndrome, fibromyalgia, and multiple chemical sensitivity. Although environmental exposures cannot be ruled out as a cause, many believe that deployment stress and its affect on the central nervous system is a likely factor in triggering or intensifying at least some of the Gulf War illnesses.

The committee is pleased with changes the Department has made in force health protection based on lessons learned from the first Gulf War. These include an assessment of the medical condition of members of the armed forces prior to deployment, better records of health care services and events that may affect the health of deployed service members, and procedures for follow-up medical care based on individual health assessments and review of deployment health records.

The committee encourages the DOD to continue to support programs that lead to early identification of military personnel who may be suffering from undiagnosed illnesses and that quickly provide appropriate and supportive intervention. The committee urges the Department to continue on-going research into post-deployment illnesses and to support promising research into pharmaceutical remedies that may help prevent or address this spectrum of illnesses.

Population based medical research

The committee recognizes the need that has existed over the past decade for a combined Departments of Defense (DOD) and Veterans Affairs (VA) patient population study. Much progress has been made in data sharing and joint planning, but a full population research capability does not yet exist. The committee urges the DOD to collaborate with the VA to demonstrate a joint DOD–VA population health research capability.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management

Temporary emergency procurement authority to facilitate the defense against or recovery from terrorism or nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological attack (sec. 801)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by two years temporary emergency procurement authority to assist the Department of Defense in facilitating the defense against terrorist biological or chemical attack. This provision would also expand the scope of this authority to include recovery from terrorism and the defense against nuclear or radiological attack.

Special temporary contract close-out authority (sec. 802)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to settle the financial accounts for contracts executed prior to September 30, 1996, that have unreconciled balances of less than $100,000. This section would give the Secretary of Defense three fiscal years to execute this authority.

Settlement of contracts with unreconciled balances often is necessary where a contractor has been overpaid, but neither the contractor nor the Government has any evidence of under or overpayment aside from the fact that the accounts do not reconcile. In many circumstances, the time and effort required to determine the cause of the out-of-balance condition may be disproportionate to the amount of the discrepancy.

This provision would allow DOD to terminate further reconciliation efforts or collection efforts if, after analysis, the cost of the effort is disproportionate to the amount of the discrepancy.

Defense acquisition program management for use of radio frequency spectrum (sec. 803)

The committee recommends a provision to require the Secretary of Defense to revise the acquisition policies relating to the management and use of the radio frequency spectrum and ensure that planning for spectrum usage is conducted as early as practicable in a program's development. In order to prevent the significant costs associated with redesign and delays due to insufficient spectrum planning, acquisition programs would be required to evaluate radio frequency usage prior to moving forward in the acquisition process.

At the request of the committee, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed the Department of Defense's (DOD) spectrum management process. The GAO found that during the early phases of acquisition, DOD program managers often failed to obtain, consider, or act on concerns related to the availability of adequate

spectrum to support planned weapon systems. According to GAO, a majority of program managers try to address this issue at the later stages of a program, after key system development decisions have been made. As a result, GAO found that some programs experienced significant delays, reduced operational capabilities, or the need for expensive redesign. GAO also found that the DOD policy directive (DOD Directive 4650.1) relating to the management and use of the radio frequency spectrum has not been updated since 1987, despite significant changes to the Department's acquisition process and regulations.

National Security Agency modernization program (sec. 804)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish formal acquisition management oversight by the Secretary of Defense over the National Security Agency's acquisition process. As the National Security Agency (NSA) began to fully appreciate the rapidly changing information and telecommunications environment within which it must effectively operate, the need to fundamentally modernize and transform the collection, collection management, and processing capabilities of NSA became apparent. While the requirement has been clear, progress toward achieving this fundamental reorganization has been slow.

In its first 50 years as one of the most important, productive elements of the United States intelligence community, NSA found that an internal, decentralized development and acquisition process served it well, both because of security considerations and because few commercial businesses had any expertise or enduring interest in the area of signals intelligence until recent years. As the manner in which the world communicates and shares information has changed over the past decade, however, the advantage of buying many new capabilities from commercial experts in telecommunications and information management and quickly upgrading as technology evolves, compared to making new capabilities internally, has become obvious.

Over the past three years, the committee has expressed increasing concern about the acquisition processes NSA is using to guide its massive modernization challenge. Concerned that significant funding was being consumed by a myriad of programs and projects that did not appear to be clearly linked to an overall modernization and acquisition strategy, the committee has regularly urged NSA to adopt the more disciplined acquisition management processes required within the Department of Defense for major programs. By any measure, NSA modernization efforts such as Groundbreaker and Trailblazer are major programs.

Concurrently, the committee has regularly urged the Secretary of Defense to apply more acquisition oversight to NSA. Troubled that insufficient progress was being made in enforcing discipline on the acquisition process, the Congress informed the Secretary of Defense and the Director, NSA, in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 that NSA's modernization effort would be designated a major defense acquisition program (MDAP) with milestone decision authority residing with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics

(USD (AT&L)) unless significant progress was made in several specific areas by December 1, 2002.

In a report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees on February 28, 2003, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (ASD (C3I)) and the Deputy Director for Central Intelligence for Community Management (DDCI (CM)) stated, "Although NSA has made progress in establishing structures and defining processes to enable sound acquisition practices, significant refinement and practice are needed before results become mature and repeatable." In nine categories requiring improvement, five were rated as ineffective and four were rated as immature and inconsistent in application and effectiveness.

Given the importance of NSA's mission to the overall national security of the United States, the enormity of the modernization effort NSA faces, and the resources being expended, disciplined management practices must be rapidly enacted and matured. However, three years into the effort to modernize business practices and transform NSA, insufficient progress has been made.

The committee is convinced that NSA's senior acquisition executive (SAE) has the experience and ability to substantially improve NSA's business practices. He must be empowered to do that job. Currently, major NSA program managers do not report directly to the SAE, thus undermining his ability to exercise authority and enforce discipline over the entire acquisition enterprise. The program managers are subordinate to their operational lines of authority, who are responsible for developing and prioritizing the operational requirements. This is contrary to standard acquisition practices in the Department of Defense (DOD). This situation creates a conflict of interest on funding management between operations and acquisition, prevents the SAE from controlling the necessary resources to execute his acquisition authority, and results in uncoordinated and potentially unstable program baselines.

Establishment of USD (AT&L) milestone decision authority over NSA's modernization program will require NSA to establish direct lines of acquisition authority and acquisition funding control from the SAE to the program managers. Further, it will reinforce the requirement to conform to standard DOD acquisition practices. The committee recommends that this milestone decision authority be assigned to the USD (AT&L) for a minimum of two years, and may not be reassigned to the Director, NSA, before October 1, 2006. At the discretion of the USD (AT&L), in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and the DDCI (CM), milestone decision authority may only be reassigned to the Director, NSA when, in the judgment of the USD (AT&L), NSA has implemented acquisition structures and management practices that are sufficiently mature to ensure a sound, efficient acquisition enterprise. The USD (AT&L) shall provide prior notification to the congressional defense and intelligence committees, with full justification, before exercising this discretionary authority.

Quality control in procurement of aviation critical safety items and related services (sec. 805)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the establishment of a policy for quality control in the procurement of critical aircraft spare parts. Aviation critical safety items are those parts for which the risk of failure is unacceptable because of the potential catastrophic results.

Within the Department of the Navy, approximately two percent of aviation spare and repair parts are aviation critical safety items. Because of the extreme consequences of failure, rigorous evaluations are conducted on both the item design and potential suppliers' manufacturing processes to ensure safe and reliable flight safety parts can be repeatedly produced. Aviation critical safety items are typically evaluated during the development of a system to determine the specific circumstances that would cause a failure and the effects of such a failure on safety and performance. These evaluations help establish design and manufacturing requirements and life and operational limits. The process of validating the design and manufacturing details of aviation critical safety items, and subsequently confirming the manufacturing capability and controls of potential sources, is essential to ensure operational safety and effectiveness. The process is comparable to requirements established by the Federal Aviation Administration prior to issuing production certification or parts manufacturer approval for civil aircraft parts.

The Department of Defense's (DOD) logistics management practices centralize management and acquisition of spare and repair parts. As a result, aviation critical safety items are often purchased by a DOD organization other than the organization that understands the item's design intent, criticality, limitations, and manufacturing characteristics. DOD logistics management practices result in the procurement of flight safety critical aircraft parts from other than qualified sources, and without the knowledge or approval of the cognizant design control activity. The DOD Inspector General has reported that the Department lacks adequate staff to perform the audits and certifications required to properly maintain Qualified Manufacturer's Lists and Qualified Products Lists. As a result, almost half of the vendor manufacturing lines needing certification have not been properly audited, and some of the certifications were as much as 8 years overdue. The Inspector General also reported that inadequate staffing of the Department's quality control programs has resulted in as many as 1.4 million potentially nonconforming items in the inventory for the Navy alone.

The provision recommended by the committee would require the Department to ensure that parts essential for flight safety are procured only from sources approved by the design activity and in accordance with technical requirements established by the design activity.

Subtitle B—Procurement of Services

Expansion and extension of incentive for use of performance-based contracts in procurements of services (sec. 811)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the incentive for the Department of Defense to adopt performance-based contracting techniques. The provision would also increase (to $10.0 million) the threshold for those performance-based contracts for services that can be treated as contracts for a commercial item under this authority.

Public-private competitions for the performance of Department of Defense functions (sec. 812)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a pilot program to allow the Department of Defense (DOD) to base its competitive sourcing decisions for information technology services on best value criteria. The ability for agencies to base contract awards on a best value cost/technical tradeoff was a recommendation of the Commercial Activities Panel established by section 832 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001. The pilot program would allow DOD to test best value approaches for public-private competitions that consider quality, as well as cost, as a selection factor. It would also allow DOD to take advantage of the newly revised Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A–76 when it is finalized, which, for example, would allow for best value cost-technical tradeoff source selections for information technology functions.

The committee understands the Department will comply with the requirements of section 2305(a)(2) and (3) of title 10 to the maximum extent practicable in any public-private competition conducted pursuant to this pilot program. These provisions require the Department to include in a solicitation basic information about the significant factors and subfactors to be considered in evaluating proposals and the relative weights that will be assigned to these factors and subfactors. In addition, the committee expects the Department to take reasonable steps to ensure that both public sector and private sector competitors are included in the competitive range and are provided reasonable opportunities to revise their bids to offer cost-technical trade-offs in the "final round" of a public-private competition under the pilot program. These reasonable efforts, however, should not be used to excuse late submissions of proposals.

The provision would also ensure that schedules for the completion of public-private competitions within DOD are based on DOD analysis of the availability of sufficient personnel, training, and technical resources to conduct such competitions. The Comptroller General in his comments on proposed revisions to OMB Circular A–76 recommended that the administration set more realistic timelines for the length of time it takes to conduct an A–76 cost comparison and ensure that agencies provided sufficient resources to comply with new A–76 requirements. This provision would ensure that DOD can provide this assurance. The committee expects that, if resources are insufficient to adequately conduct A–76 cost

comparisons, DOD will obtain these resources and use the flexible acquisition workforce authority provided elsewhere in this bill to realign the acquisition workforce.

Authority to enter into personal services contracts (sec. 813)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize elements of the Department of Defense within the Intelligence Community and the U.S. Special Operations Command to enter into contracts for personal services if an appropriate official determines in writing that the services to be procured are unique and that it would not be practicable to obtain such services by other means. The committee recognizes the unique circumstances faced by the intelligence community and the Special Operations Command, and the difficulty these DOD elements may occasionally have in obtaining needed support through more conventional contracting mechanisms.

Subtitle C—Major Defense Acquisition Programs

Certain weapons-related prototype projects (sec. 821)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for three years the other transaction prototype authority under section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994. This provision would also include a clarification that other transaction prototype authority can be used for prototype projects related to fielded systems. This would allow non-traditional contractors greater opportunities to participate in modernizing fielded systems with new technologies that improve capability and reduce operating and support costs.

Finally, this provision would enable the Department of Defense to capitalize on successful prototype projects by bringing the prototypes into production under standard procurement contracts. The provision would establish a three-year pilot program to ease the transition of nontraditional defense contractors from prototype transactions to standard procurement contracts. Under the pilot program, the Department would be authorized to enter into contracts of $50.0 million or less that would treat items or processes developed by nontraditional defense contractors under prototype transactions: (1) as commercial items subject to the streamlined contracting procedures established in Part 12 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation; and (2) as items or processes that are developed with mixed funds for the purpose of negotiating rights in technical data under section 2320 of title 10, United States Code.

Applicability of Clinger-Cohen Act policies and requirements to equipment integral to a weapon or weapon system (sec. 822)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify responsibility within the Department of Defense for applying the requirements of the Clinger-Cohen Act (as codified in chapter 113 of title 40, United States Code) to equipment determined by the Secretary of Defense to be an integral part of a weapon or weapon system. This provision would provide the senior acquisition officials in the Department of Defense the flexibility to establish effective in-

formation technology management policies and to alter these policies as necessary to take advantage of rapidly changing information technologies in weapons and weapon systems.

Under this provision, Clinger-Cohen Act requirements for capital planning, investment control, and performance and results-based management processes and requirements would continue to apply to weapons and weapon systems. However, these requirements would be administered by a board of senior acquisition officials instead of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) of the Department of Defense. The Board would be chaired by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and would include the three service acquisition executives and the CIO.

The provision would recognize that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the service acquisition executives with overall responsibility for the acquisition of weapons and weapon systems, are best able to develop and implement information technology policies for such weapons and weapon systems. The CIO would be included on the Board to ensure that the policies implemented by the Board are consistent with the Department's overall approach to information technology issues. In addition to implementing responsibilities under the Clinger-Cohen Act, the Board would be responsible for ensuring effective spectrum availability, interoperability, information security, evolutionary and spiral development, and implementation of software development policies and practices for information technology integral to weapon systems.

The General Accounting Office recently informed the committee that despite having a long-standing spectrum certification process, DOD has failed to follow this process, leading to problems in weapon systems development and operations. The committee expects the Board established by this provision to be instrumental in updating and revamping the guidance and process for spectrum supportability in light of recent changes to relevant DOD acquisition directives. In addition, the Board should ensure that spectrum supportability is adequately considered during weapon systems development.

Applicability of requirement for reports on maturity of technology at initiation of major defense acquisition programs (sec. 823)

The committee recommends a provision that would make a technical change to a reporting requirement, to conform to changes made in the Department of Defense's acquisition regulations and instructions.

Subtitle D—Domestic Source Requirements

Exceptions to Berry Amendment for contingency operations and other urgent situations (sec. 831)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the requirements of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, to facilitate timely purchases of products needed to support contingency operations and for other circumstances of unusual and compelling

urgency when the use of procedures other than competitive procedures have been approved.

Inapplicability of Berry Amendment to procurements of waste and byproducts of cotton and wool fiber for use in the production of propellants and explosives (sec. 832)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate domestic source restrictions for gun cotton lintners used in the production of propellants and explosives.

Waiver authority for domestic source or content requirements (sec. 833)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the application of statutory domestic source requirements and domestic content requirements, provided that: (1) the application of the requirements would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under a Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and another country; and (2) the other country does not discriminate against items produced in the United States to a greater degree than the United States discriminates against items produced in that country. This proposed standard is consistent with the standard previously adopted by the committee for products covered by the domestic content restrictions in section 2534 of title 10, United States Code.

Buy American exception for ball bearings and roller bearings used in foreign products (sec. 834)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2534(a)(5) of title 10, United States Code, which places limitations on the procurement of ball bearings and roller bearings other than those produced in the national technology and industrial base, by creating an exemption for ball bearings and roller bearings used in an end product or component of non-domestic origin.

For most non-domestic end products or components, the only acceptable source for ball bearings and roller bearings, and replacement ball bearings and roller bearings is the non-domestic original equipment manufacturer or its non-domestic supplier. When this occurs, DOD must process waivers to allow procurement of the necessary ball bearings and roller bearings. This provision would relieve DOD of this requirement. At the same time, this provision would be consistent with the purpose of the domestic source restriction in that it does not seek to replace the domestic ball bearings and roller bearings that are normally found in domestic end products or components with non-domestic ball bearings and roller bearings.

Subtitle E—Defense Acquisition and Support Workforce

Flexibility for management of the defense acquisition and support workforce (sec. 841)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) to give

the Secretary of Defense greater flexibility in managing the acquisition and support workforce. Specifically, the provision would give the Secretary the flexibility to establish different experience, educational, and tenure requirements for acquisition positions; require the establishment of a single acquisition corps; and streamline obsolete and outdated provisions of DAWIA.

Limitation and reinvestment authority relating to reduction of the defense acquisition and support workforce (sec. 842)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a moratorium on further cuts in the acquisition workforce for three years. The Secretary of Defense would be given the flexibility under this provision to realign positions in the acquisition workforce to reinvest in higher priority acquisition positions.

More than a decade of downsizing has left the Department of Defense (DOD) with a smaller workforce that is rapidly approaching retirement. Workload has increased with the acquisition workforce today managing contracts valued over $1.7 million per person in total acquisition dollars, a 40 percent increase from 1998. The Undersecretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) testified before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support that: "* * * we believe that our workforce is where it should be today to manage our workload."

Additional workforce reductions would increase the risk identified in a February 2000 report by the DOD Inspector General (DOD Acquisition Workforce Reductions: Trends and Impacts), which noted the following impacts from acquisition workforce reductions: (1) increased backlog in closing out contracts; (2) increased program costs due to contracted vice in-house technical support; (3) insufficient personnel to fill-in for employees on deployment; (4) insufficient staff to manage requirements; (5) reduced scrutiny and timeliness in reviewing acquisition actions; (6) difficulty in retaining personnel; (7) skill imbalances; and (8) lost opportunities to develop cost saving initiatives. In addition, the DOD Inspector General, in the second Semiannual Report to the Congress for Fiscal Year 2002, states that reductions in personnel and funds are adversely affecting the Department's quality assurance programs.

The Department is implementing a human resource strategic planning effort to address acquisition workforce issues. The committee notes that no further cuts should be made until the Department comprehensively addresses critical skills shortfalls in the workforce.

Clarification and revision of authority for demonstration project relating to certain acquisition personnel management policies and procedures (sec. 843)

The committee recommends a provision that would strengthen the acquisition workforce pilot program established in section 4308 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. In particular, the provision would: (1) relax the existing requirement that the entire workforce of a participating organization consist of members of the acquisition workforce and supporting personnel as-

signed to work directly with the acquisition workforce; (2) increase the total number of civilian personnel permitted to participate in the pilot program; and (3) ensure that an organization that is properly designated to participate in the pilot program would continue to do so, notwithstanding any reorganization, restructuring, realignment, consolidation, or other organizational change.

Subtitle F—Federal Support for Procurement of Anti-Terrorism Technologies and Services by State and Local Governments

Federal support for procurement of anti-terrorism technologies and services by state and local governments (secs. 851, 852, 853)

The committee recommends a series of provisions that would require the establishment of a program where state and local governments could buy anti-terrorism technology solutions from Federal Government contracts. The executive branch would be authorized to apply to these contracts discretionary indemnification authority (50 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.; Public Law 85–804) on a case-by-case basis, if it is determined necessary. The committee expects that the litigation risk for many of these technologies would be managed under authorities of subtitle G of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296). Contractors could be indemnified under procedures determined by the President only when necessary to ensure that critical technologies developed for the Department of Defense and other agencies could be rapidly purchased by state and local governments.

Subtitle G—General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations, and Other Matters

Limited acquisition authority for commander of United States Joint Forces Command (sec. 861)

The committee recommends a provision that would give the Commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), the authority to acquire systems with research, development, test and evaluation expenditure levels up to $10.0 million or procurement expenditure levels up to $50.0 million for the purpose of facilitating joint operations or enhancing interoperability. The successful use of the Special Operations Command acquisition authority below the acquisition category (ACAT) 1 level illustrates the transformation benefits of having a joint buyer, close to the user, maintain a streamlined acquisition process to deliver low dollar threshold systems rapidly to the warfighter.

The committee is concerned that urgent joint warfighting requirements are not always conceived, developed, and fielded in the most expeditious manner. Such long-standing requirements include: a joint, comprehensive blue force tracking capability; a joint, interoperable air, sea, and ground combat identification system; and a joint simulations and modeling capability essential for evaluating joint warfighting concepts development. Recent military operations have further demonstrated the high risk of fratricide on the modern battlefield and re-emphasized the need for comprehensive,

interoperable combat identification and blue force tracking architectures. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense, through the Commander, JFCOM, to use this limited acquisition authority to address such joint warfighting challenges. As the command responsible for joint experimentation and joint concepts development, JFCOM, through this authority, would have the ability to rapidly respond to the joint warfighting needs JFCOM identifies, as well as to satisfy the requirements of the regional combatant commanders for solutions that otherwise may not be provided by the individual services.

Operational test and evaluation (sec. 862)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify certain provisions regarding operational test and evaluation in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003. First, the provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to appoint a civilian, rather than a commissioned officer, as Director of the new Defense Test Resource Management Center (DTRMC). Second, the provision would clarify that the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) would remain independent of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, as provided in section 139 of title 10, United States Code, and that for this reason the DOT&E budget is not subject to review by the DTRMC. Third, the provision would clarify that DOT&E access to records and data would include relevant operational records and data for systems that are deployed prior to the completion of the operational test and evaluation. Access to such records and data, however, would be provided only in a time and manner provided by the Secretary of Defense and in accordance with operational security and other relevant operational requirements.

Multiyear task and delivery order contracts (sec. 863)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2304a of title 10, United States Code, to limit to five years the period of time for which task and delivery order contracts may be awarded. The provision also includes a conforming change to repeal section 2306c(g) of title 10, United States Code.

Repeal of requirement for contractor assurances regarding the completeness, accuracy, and contractual sufficiency of technical data provided by the contractor (sec. 864)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the requirement for contractors providing technical data to the government to furnish written assurances that the technical data is complete, accurate, and satisfies the requirements of the contract.

The committee understands that the elimination of this requirement will only reduce paperwork and will not in any way diminish either the contractor's obligation to provide technical data that meets contract requirements or the government's ability to enforce this requirement. The committee expects that the Defense Contract Management Agency will continue to monitor contractor technical data programs in order to protect government data rights and to ensure the government receives timely and accurate information

regarding contractor processes, practice, and controls for developing technical data.

Reestablishment of authority for short-term leases of real or personal property across fiscal years (sec. 865)

The committee recommends a provision that would restore the authority of the Department of Defense (DOD) to enter into 12–month leases at any time during a fiscal year. Since 1997, DOD has not been permitted to enter leases for real and personal property that begin in one fiscal year and end in another. Consequently, all DOD leases have been written to expire on the last day of a fiscal year, subject to renewal on the first day of the subsequent fiscal year. By addressing this problem, the provision would reduce the administrative burden on lease administration and reduce the risk of Anti-deficiency Act violations.

Items of Special Interest

Applicability of the Trade Agreements Act to commercially available off-the-shelf items

The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) of 1994 (Public Law 103–155) and the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (divisions D and E of Public Law 104–106) included significant reforms to make it easier for the government to acquire commercial items.

FASA created a new system for the acquisition of commercial items and authorized the waiver of certain statutes identified as barriers to government utilization of the efficiencies of the commercial marketplace. Section 4203 of the Clinger-Cohen Act granted the Office of Federal Procurement Policy additional authority to waive statutes for items specifically defined as "commercial-off-the-shelf items" (COTS), a subset of commercial items. The intent of this provision was to enable federal agencies to purchase COTS products that might not be available in the absence of such waivers. No statutes have been waived for COTS products under this authority.

The committee has been made aware that certain government unique requirements under the Trade Agreements Act (Public Law 96–39) have created additional burdens on information technology companies selling COTS products to the government. These requirements may have reduced the number of sources and products available to the Department of Defense (DOD) and may have driven up information technology costs.

In the interest of further streamlining the procurement process, the committee requests that the DOD and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy review whether the Trade Agreements Act should be waived under the authority provided in the Clinger-Cohen Act, and report to Congress by February 1, 2004, on the results of this review.

Contracting for overseas logistics support

U.S. forces deployed overseas for peacekeeping or combat missions require a wide range of logistics support. Such support includes the construction and maintenance of temporary housing and other facilities, engineering services, transportation, and equipment

maintenance. The demand for logistics support has increased in recent years together with the pace of deployments.

The Department of Defense (DOD) has relied on active units, reserve units, and private contractors to provide support to deployed combat units. Contractors played a particularly important role in supporting U.S. forces in the Balkans, and contractors could play an even greater role in the future as DOD seeks to limit the number of military personnel engaged in functions that could be performed by civilians.

To better understand the advantages and disadvantages of increasing reliance on contractor support, the committee directs the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to examine alternative approaches to providing logistics support to deployed forces and report to the committee by March 1, 2004, on the results of this analysis. The alternatives to be examined should include the use of active logistics units, reserve units, civilian employees, and contractors, as well as the potential use of contractors whose personnel are required to retain a reserve affiliation. The CBO analysis should consider both budgetary and non-budgetary factors. CBO shall coordinate its efforts with the ongoing review by the General Accounting Office that seeks to identify the kinds of logistics tasks that contractors now perform.

Department of Defense anti-tamper program

Critical U.S. technologies may be exposed to the threat of exploitation if they are developed with or sold to foreign governments or fall into enemy hands. Exploitation through reverse engineering or countermeasure development can result in unintended transfer of technological advances, which can degrade U.S. combat effectiveness. In 1999, the Department of Defense established the anti-tamper program to protect selected weapon systems that contain critical program information. The anti-tamper program is intended to delay or deter exploitation attempts if the system falls into enemy hands.

The committee directs the General Accounting Office to review the Department's anti-tamper program and determine: (1) the process and status of the Department's anti-tamper program; (2) how the acquisition community implements the anti-tamper program; and (3) the challenges, if any, the acquisition community faces when implementing the anti-tamper program and the process for addressing these challenges.

National Industrial Security Program

The Defense Department's National Industrial Security Program oversees government contractors that administer security programs to protect classified information in their possession. Through this program, over 11,000 contractor facilities have been deemed eligible to receive classified information, with an estimated 11 million classified documents in their possession. The program is also responsible for monitoring security agreements when there is foreign involvement at a contractor facility. As the defense industry becomes increasingly globalized, it is no longer uncommon for U.S. defense contractors to have partnerships and joint ventures with

foreign companies or for foreign companies to acquire or establish facilities in the United States.

The committee directs the General Accounting Office (GAO) to review the National Industrial Security Program and the Department of Defense's oversight of contractors' programs to protect sensitive information and technology. This review should include an assessment of the department's process for: (1) approving industrial security programs for cleared facilities; and (2) monitoring compliance with industrial security requirements.

The committee also directs the GAO to review the measures the department takes to protect sensitive information and technology when a contractor is foreign-owned or has foreign business relationships. This review should include an assessment of how the Defense Department determines which type of protective agreement is appropriate when foreign involvement exists at a contractor facility and the mechanisms used to assure compliance with such agreements.

Evolutionary acquisition strategies

In testimony to the committee over the last several years, Department of Defense witnesses stated that the Department is seeking to reduce weapon systems acquisition cycle time by using incremental acquisition strategies. The committee shares the Department's view that better cost, schedule, and performance outcomes can be achieved by using a properly managed evolutionary or phased approach in developing weapon systems. At the request of this committee, the General Accounting Office (GAO) has developed a model for evolutionary acquisition that includes measures for success, which are defined for critical junctures of the product development process. These measures provide decision makers with the knowledge they need about technology, design, and production before they commit to additional time or money investments.

The committee supports the Department's efforts to build more flexibility into its acquisition process and the policies they have developed to do so. At the same time, the committee recognizes that ensuring a consistent and disciplined application of policies and regulations will be key to achieving the outcomes desired by the Department and the committee. Therefore, the committee directs the GAO to assess current acquisition policies and regulations and to determine whether: (1) the policies support knowledge-based, evolutionary acquisitions; (2) the regulations enforcing these policies provide the necessary controls to ensure the Department's intent is followed; and (3) the policies are responsive to concerns expressed by the committee in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003.

Improvement of software acquisition processes

Existing major defense acquisition programs are heavily reliant on computer software. In many cases, poor management of software development is the cause of substantial cost overruns and delayed schedules. Section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 requires the secretary of each military department and the head of each defense agency that manages a major defense acquisition program with a substantial software

component to establish a program to improve its software acquisition processes.

In a review requested by this committee, the General Accounting Office (GAO) recommended that the Department of Defense (DOD) institute software process improvement programs. To ensure that the DOD and the services are establishing processes that will result in better and more affordable software for major weapon systems, the committee directs the GAO to establish a set of knowledge-based metrics from best software development practices, to apply those metrics in evaluating the success of software development improvements on the Department's major weapon system acquisitions, and to report its findings to the committee by March 1, 2004.

Performance contracts

The General Accounting Office (GAO) reported to the committee in December 2002, on the Department of Defense's (DOD) business transformation initiatives. This GAO report identified the Department's use of performance contracts as a means of improving the oversight and operations of defense agencies that provide numerous products and services to the military services and other defense agencies. Performance contracts are formal agreements entered into by a defense agency which delineates improvement goals related to cost, productivity, quality, and responsiveness to customers. According to GAO, the Department's intent is to strengthen performance management and outcomes through the use of performance contracts. The committee directs the GAO to assess the effectiveness of performance contracts as management tools, from the time of introduction in November 1997, to the present. In particular, GAO should: (1) identify the specific defense agencies that use performance contracts; (2) consider whether contract requirements include clearly defined performance objectives and metrics; (3) review any changes made over time and lessons learned; and (4) evaluate the potential for wider application of such contracts in the Department. The committee is also interested in the relationship between the Department's efforts to implement performance contracts and its broader effort to develop Defense-wide performance goals, measures, and outcomes.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Subtitle A—Department Offices and Agencies

Clarification of responsibility of military departments to support combatant commanders (sec. 901)

The committee proposes a provision that would clarify the responsibility of the secretaries of the military departments to fulfill the current and future operational requirements of the combatant commands, subject to the authority, direction and control of the Secretary of Defense. Existing law requires the secretaries of the military departments to provide such support "to the maximum extent practicable." Elimination of this phrase would clarify the responsibility of all elements of the Department of Defense to support the war fighting function of the combatant commanders.

Redesignation of National Imagery and Mapping Agency as National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (sec. 902)

The committee recommends a provision that would change the name of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) to the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA), and introduce, as a matter of law, the term "geospatial intelligence." When NIMA was formed in 1997 it combined several components of national and military service-related imagery interpretation organizations with the Defense Mapping Agency. The name, "National Imagery and Mapping Agency," was a natural outgrowth of this process.

The traditional role of mapping has evolved into a much more sophisticated and highly technical discipline, including collection and analysis of sophisticated geodetic data and statistical data. This activity provides insight into not only where things are on the earth, but what that location means. This has given rise to the term "geospatial information."

The introduction of the term "geospatial intelligence," which encompasses the analysis and visual representation of characteristics of the earth and activity on its surface, will better describe and represent the unified activities of the NGA.

Standards of conduct for members of the Defense Policy Board and the Defense Science Board (sec. 903)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to promulgate standards of conduct for the members of the Defense Policy Board and the Defense Science Board. These standards are to be promulgated not later than 30 days after the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, and are to be reported to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon promulgation.

Subtitle B—Space Activities

Coordination of space science and technology activities of the Department of Defense (sec. 911)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Under Secretary of the Air Force appropriate oversight of space science and technology (S&T) projects. The provision would require the Under Secretary, in consultation with the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, to develop a space S&T strategy, and allow the Department S&T entities to proceed with space S&T projects only with the concurrence of the Under Secretary of the Air Force. The provision would also require the Under Secretary to submit a report on the strategy to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 15, 2004, and a review of the strategy and coordination by the Comptroller General.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is justified in increasing its investment in space science and technology, but is concerned that these efforts are not adequately coordinated. The committee notes that, according to the Air Force, a half dozen processes are currently used to coordinate space related S&T projects. According to testimony by the Under Secretary of the Air Force to the Strategic Forces subcommittee, "We must improve our S&T planning to ensure we: (1) encourage an operational pull that conveys to the S&T community a clear vision of the capabilities we need for the future; (2) address the full spectrum of future needs in a balanced and well-thought out manner; and (3) determine ways to demonstrate and spin-off promising technologies to programs." The committee notes that the Under Secretary of the Air Force is the official responsible for coordinating all Department of Defense space programs, and consequently has the proper perspective to ensure the effective coordination of S&T efforts that support future space system requirements.

Space personnel cadre (sec. 912)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a human capital resources strategy for personnel of the Department of Defense with space expertise that would ensure that the space career fields for the military services are integrated to the maximum extent possible. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on the strategy, an assessment of the progress in integrating the space career fields of the military services, and an assessment of the adequacy of the Air Force space career field. Finally, the provision would require a review and assessment by the General Accounting Office.

The 2001 report of Commission to Assess U.S. National Security Space Management and Organization expressed concern about "a lack of focused career development in the space community" and contended that "[t]he Department of Defense is not yet on course to develop the space cadre the nation needs." Consequently, Congress approved section 912 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) requiring the Air

Force to establish a space career field that included development of space systems; concepts of operations and doctrine; and space operations.

However, in a February 2003, review of the Department of Defense implementation of the Commission's recommendations, the U.S. Comptroller General was critical of the military services' lack of progress in establishing space cadre plans. The Comptroller General noted that the Department of Defense lacks a strategic approach to the task of building and maintaining a cadre of space professionals. While the Air Force, Army, and Navy are developing space cadre plans, the committee believes an integrated, strategic approach will improve coordination between the services, and thereby help provide a common expertise, eliminate redundancies or overlaps in training and education, and minimize any critical gaps that may exist in those areas.

The committee is aware that the Air Force has developed a space career field plan pursuant to section 912 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107). The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide of copy of this plan to Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than July 15, 2003.

Policy regarding assured access to space for United States national security payloads (sec. 913)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish as the policy of the United States that the President undertake actions appropriate to ensure that United States has the capacity to launch national security payloads when such payloads are needed in space. These steps would include resources and policy guidance to sustain two launch vehicles or families of launch vehicles capable of delivering national security payloads to space and a robust space launch infrastructure.

The committee continues to believe that assuring access to space for national security payloads is a vital national security interest, and that maintaining the necessary infrastructure and industrial base to do so must be a high priority of the Department of Defense. This view was strongly endorsed in testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces by the Under Secretary of the Air Force and the Commander of Strategic Command.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense sought, through the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program, to sustain two launch providers for the Department. The EELV program led to the development of two new families of space launch vehicles, capable of launching a full range of national security payloads. Sustaining two vendors provides the Department with the benefits of competition and a hedge against significant technical problems in either of the EELV variants. The committee notes that the rationale for sustaining two vendors remains compelling.

The committee is aware, however, that the commercial launch market, the health of which served as the economic basis for sustaining two launch vendors, has collapsed. The contraction of the commercial market impacts the Department's ability to assure access to space for national security payloads. In light of this cir-

cumstance, the committee believes that establishing a policy that supports assured access is a necessary first step to sustaining the required industrial base and launch infrastructure.

Pilot program to provide space surveillance network services to entities outside the United States government (sec. 914)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a three year pilot program to establish procedures for the Department of Defense to provide satellite tracking services to commercial entities, state and local governments, and foreign governments, and to be reimbursed for those services by commercial entities and foreign governments. Analysis of satellite data could be included in such transactions if the Secretary determined that to be in the national security interests of the United States.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense receives requests from non-federal entities for space surveillance information, including space track and object identification. This provision would provide authority to establish regular procedures to satisfy these requests and for commercial and foreign government entities to reimburse the Department of Defense for services, information, and analysis provided.

Content of biennial global positioning system report (sec. 915)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify an existing reporting requirement on the operational status and effectiveness of the Global Positioning System (GPS).

The committee remains convinced of the significance of GPS to the U.S. military and U.S. economy and of ensuring that GPS services remain available and effective. The committee also remains strongly supportive of GPS as the international standard for radionavigation. However, GPS faces several challenges in the near- to mid-term. These include potential disruption from jamming, competition for spectrum, and the potential for competition from the European Galileo system. In view of these challenges, the committee acknowledges that regular reporting to Congress on GPS remains timely and important.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Combatant Commander Initiative Fund (sec. 921)

The primary purpose of the combatant commander initiative fund (CCIF) is to support unforeseen contingency requirements critical to the combatant commanders' joint warfighting readiness and national security interests. In two of the last three years, the $7.0 million ceiling on funds used for procurement items with unit costs in excess of $15,000 was reached. Additionally, the $2.0 million ceiling on authority to provide military education and training was reached.

The committee believes that the environment in which today's combatant commander operates is vastly different from that which existed when these statutory limitations were established. In order

to enable the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, to meet unforeseen contingency requirements of the combatant commanders, the committee recommends a provision that amends section 166(a) of title 10, United States Code, by establishing an additional category of joint warfighting capabilities to the list of authorized activities for which these funds can be expended. Additionally, the provision amends the limitations contained in title 10: allowing up to $15.0 million for procurement of items with a unit cost in excess of $15,000; allowing up to $10.0 million to pay for expenses of foreign countries participating in joint exercises; and, allowing up to $10.0 million to provide military training and education to military and related civilians of foreign countries.

The budget request included $25.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for the CCIF. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the CCIF, to be used only by Commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command to rapidly develop and acquire inherently joint capabilities that have the potential to significantly improve the joint warfighting capabilities of combatant commanders.

Authority for the Marine Corps University to award the degree of master of operational studies (sec. 922)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 7102 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President of the Marine Corps University to confer the degree of master of operational studies upon graduates of the School of Advanced Warfighting of the Command and Staff College.

Report on changing roles of United States Special Operations Command (sec. 923)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to prepare a report on implementation of direction by the Secretary to the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) to assume an expanded role in the global war on terrorism, and to restructure SOCOM so it will be able to function as a supported combatant commander for planning and executing operations, as well as its current role as a supporting combatant commander.

In January 2003, the Secretary of Defense directed SOCOM to assume greater responsibility for conducting the global war on terrorism. The Secretary directed the SOCOM Commander to develop a counterterrorism plan, to restructure the SOCOM staff to include a fully capable contingency planning staff, and to augment SOCOM component commands at the headquarters of geographic combatant commanders. The department requested $6.7 billion for fiscal year 2004 for SOCOM, an increase of approximately thirty-four percent. This would fund a personnel increase of 1,890 individuals in fiscal year 2004, including headquarters planning staff positions, two SEAL teams, a special operations helicopter aviation battalion, and additional Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations elements. Most of the $1.1 billion in procurement would be used to replace aircraft lost in the global war on terrorism and to acquire MH–47 helicopters for the new battalion.

Special Operations Forces (SOF) are uniquely qualified to conduct counterterrorism missions, and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 that established the command provided authority for the command to function as a supporting, and supported command. Until now, the "supported command" authority has only rarely been used. The committee supports the Secretary's decision to expand SOCOM's role in the global war on terrorism, to expand SOCOM's role as a supported command, and to request additional funding for the command to develop the required capabilities to do so.

However, the committee needs additional information on how this new responsibility will impact upon SOCOM's nine statutory missions, in particular the traditional mission of foreign internal defense, and training foreign militaries in general, which provide SOF with critical training, and access to countries of interest. In addition, the committee is concerned that implementation of this new authority occur within the parameters of existing international and U.S. law, with full civilian executive and legislative oversight.

The committee directs the Secretary to provide the congressional defense committees with a report that includes information on the following: (1) the military strategy to employ SOCOM to fight the global war on terrorism and how that contributes to the overall national security strategy with regard to the global war on terrorism; (2) the scope of the authority granted to SOCOM to act as a supported command and to prosecute the global war on terrorism; (3) the operational and legal parameters within which SOCOM will exercise its authority in foreign countries when taking action against foreign and U.S. citizens engaged in terrorist activities; (4) the decision making mechanisms, to include any consultations with the Congress involved in authorizing, planning, and conducting individual missions; (5) the mechanism SOCOM will use to coordinate with other combatant commands, especially geographic commands; (6) future organization plans and resource requirements for conducting the global counterterrorism mission; and, (7) the impact on other SOF missions, including foreign internal defense, psychological operations, civil affairs, unconventional warfare, counterdrug activities, and humanitarian activities.

The report, in classified and unclassified versions, shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act.

Integration of Defense intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities (sec. 924)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD (I)) to establish an Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Council, composed of the senior intelligence officers of the military services, the directors of the Defense intelligence agencies, and the Director for Operations, J3, the Joint Staff, to provide a permanent forum for the discussion and arbitration of issues relating to the development and integration of Defense-wide ISR capabilities. The provision also would require the USD (I) to develop a comprehensive plan to guide the development, fielding, and integration of Department of Defense (DOD) ISR capabilities over the next 15 years.

The committee has no doubt that the DOD and the larger intelligence community have the most capable ISR system in the world. This system has been assembled and evolved, over time, at great effort and at great expense. As good as this system is, however, it is often plagued by gaps, competition for assets, unavailability at the required level, and parallel systems (so-called "stovepipes") that do not fully complement one another. Because of the mechanism by which requirements have been generated from multiple sources to meet a specific need, the Department has continued to develop some capabilities without regard to their place within an overarching ISR architecture. Collection managers and intelligence users have done a commendable job of formulating ways to make systems work together and complement one another, but little has been done, in a comprehensive, Defense-wide enterprise manner, to require that new intelligence capabilities being developed by the military services and the Defense intelligence agencies are conceived as part of a larger system of systems.

The Congress established the position of USD (I) in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003. A clear intent of this action was that the USD (I) would exercise comprehensive oversight of the Defense intelligence enterprise and guide the development of new intelligence capabilities, particularly within the military services, so as to maximize capability and minimize duplication of effort. The increased urgency of homeland security has made this concept even more important, as the DOD seeks the means to enhance its capabilities to fulfill its responsibilities in supporting homeland security efforts.

Traditionally, much effort has been expended on conceiving and developing intelligence collection platforms, but development of the means to process, analyze, and disseminate the resulting intelligence information has sometimes lagged behind. Providing the needed information to the battlefield commander—"the last tactical mile"—in an austere communications environment has been especially challenging. Ensuring that capabilities in all intelligence disciplines are fully integrated with interoperable communications and processing systems is absolutely essential.

The committee has confidence that the USD (I) will confront these challenges and bring needed discipline to well-intended efforts across the entire Department. The committee intends to review very carefully any recommendations of the USD (I) on how best to structure intelligence funding for the various levels of the Department. The report shall be delivered to the congressional defense and intelligence committees no later than September 30, 2004.

Establishment of the National Guard of the Northern Mariana Islands (sec. 925)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to cooperate with the Governor of the Northern Mariana Islands to establish the National Guard of the Northern Mariana Islands and integrate into the Army National Guard and Air National Guard of the United States the members of the National Guard of the Northern Mariana Islands who are granted federal recognition under title 32, United States Code.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

Transfer authority (sec. 1001)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the transfer of funds authorized in Division A of this act to unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures. Additionally, in recognizing the need to provide the Secretary of Defense with the necessary flexibility to manage the Department of Defense, the committee includes a provision to increase the transfer authority limitation to $3.0 billion.

United States contribution to NATO common-funded budgets (sec. 1002)

The resolution of ratification for the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic contained a provision (section 3(2)(C)(ii)) that requires a specific authorization for U.S. payments to the common-funded budgets of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for each fiscal year, beginning in fiscal year 1999, in which U.S. payments exceed the fiscal year 1998 total. The committee recommends a provision to authorize the U.S. contribution to NATO common-funded budgets for fiscal year 2004, including the use of unexpended balances from prior years.

Authorization of supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2003 (sec. 1003)

This provision would authorize the supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2003 enacted in the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–11).

Subtitle B—Improvement of Travel Card Management

Mandatory disbursement of travel allowances directly to travel care creditors (sec. 1011)

The committee recommends a provision that would make mandatory the requirements of section 2784a(a) of title 10, United States Code, that require direct payment to the issuer of a Department of Defense (DOD) travel card for official travel or transportation expenses charged on the travel card by a DOD employee or member. The committee is disappointed in the progress made by the Department in fully implementing this provision which is designed to provide better accountability over the use of the travel card.

Determinations of creditworthiness for issuance of Defense travel card (sec. 1012)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a program for evaluating the creditworthiness of individuals prior to the issuance of a Department of Defense travel card. The provision would prohibit the issuance of a travel card to an individual determined not credit worthy under this program.

Disciplinary actions and assessing penalties for misuse of Defense travel cards (sec. 1013)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe guidelines and procedures for making determinations regarding the taking of disciplinary action, including the assessment of penalties, against Department of Defense personnel for improper, fraudulent, or abusive use of defense travel cards by such personnel.

Subtitle C—Reports

Elimination and revision of various reporting requirements applicable to the Department of Defense (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal or modify a number of obsolete or superceded reporting requirements presently imposed by statute upon the Department of Defense.

Global strike plan (sec. 1022)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a global strike plan that would be updated annually, and to provide an annual report on the roadmap through fiscal year 2006 to the congressional defense committees.

The 2001 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), recognizing that the international security environment had changed dramatically over the past decade, recommended a reduction of deployed strategic nuclear forces from the current level of approximately 6,000 warheads to 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed warheads by 2012. The NPR also determined that, rather than relying exclusively on strategic nuclear forces for deterrence, the nation should rely on a new "triad" consisting of offensive weapons, defensive systems, and a robust infrastructure to support a full range of defense needs.

The committee notes that much of the debate concerning the NPR has focused on nuclear weapons. However, the committee also notes that the NPR sought to devise a strategic construct that would reduce reliance on nuclear weapons by providing a broader array of military tools to national command authorities and military commanders. These tools are to include advanced conventional weapons capable of striking a wider array of targets, active defenses capable of defeating attacks after they have been launched, and passive defenses capable of minimizing the effects of attacks.

The Commander of U.S. Strategic Command repeatedly emphasized in his testimony to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee the importance of this broad array of tools to the ability of Strategic Command to conduct missions in support of national command authorities. In this context, he stated his intent "* * * to provide a wide

range of advanced options to the President in responding to time-critical, high threat, global challenges and, thereby, raise even higher the nuclear threshold." He also noted the need to explore new conventional and nuclear technologies and cited several ongoing studies by the Department of Defense to examine future systems to meet strategic needs.

The committee concurs that further analysis of future systems needs is required and that integrating this broader array of capabilities will require significant coordination within the Department. The committee believes that a comprehensive effort to link planning and programs for advanced conventional munitions, nuclear concepts, and advanced strike platforms in a coordinated global strike roadmap would be important to achieving a coherent force structure in the future. Such a roadmap would help fulfill the NPR goals of providing a full range of military alternatives to military and political leaders and further reduce reliance on nuclear weapons.

Report on the conduct of Operation Iraqi Freedom (sec. 1023)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a comprehensive report on the conduct of Operation Iraqi Freedom not later than March 31, 2004. The provision would require the Secretary to emphasize the accomplishments and the shortcomings noted during preparations, conduct, and in the aftermath of military operations and to highlight any lessons learned.

Report on mobilization of the Reserves (sec. 1024)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the mobilization of reserve component forces during fiscal years 2002 and 2003. The report would include numbers and specialties of Reserves mobilized, the known effects on the reserve components, and any changes in the armed forces envisioned as a result of these effects.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Blue forces tracking initiative (sec. 1031)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to coordinate developmental activities aimed at fielding a capability to maintain information on the location of U.S. and allied forces, sometimes called "blue forces tracking." The provision would further direct the Commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), to conduct a blue forces tracking joint experiment in fiscal year 2004. The goal of the experiment would be to demonstrate and evaluate available technologies, and to recommend an achievable solution for Defense-wide fielding. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the results of the blue forces tracking experiment with a plan for how the Department would proceed with the development, acquisition and fielding

of a functional, near real time blue forces tracking system. The committee urges the Commander, JFCOM, to combine this experiment with the ongoing advanced concept technology demonstration called "Joint Blue Forces Situational Awareness (JBFSA)."

The committee is concerned that, despite significant lessons learned in military operations over the past 13 years and despite the availability of relevant technologies, the Department has made insufficient progress in developing a military service-wide, near real-time, blue forces monitoring or tracking capability. Different groups within the Department are using a variety of interim and ad hoc solutions, but these solutions employ technologies that create interoperability problems, suffer from limited coverage, and, in some cases, consume considerable space-based communications bandwidth.

With casualties attributable to friendly fire continuing to be a significant portion of overall casualties in recent conflicts, the urgency of developing and fielding a comprehensive, joint system for all military services is clear. Although the Department has designated the U.S. Army as the lead service for developing a blue forces tracking capability, the committee is concerned that the effort lacks urgency and is not fully endorsed by the other services, or the U.S. Special Operations Command. The Department has been spending resources in a fragmented manner on a series of advanced concept technology demonstrations, service-preferred systems, and special operations systems. Without better coordination of the ongoing developmental activities, the committee is concerned that the Department will not achieve a solution to the problem of friendly fire incidents.

The committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to ensure all funding for blue forces tracking development within the Department of Defense is scrutinized by the Commander, JFCOM, until such time as a Defense-wide standard and strategy for acquisition of blue forces tracking capability is determined.

Loan, donation, or exchange of obsolete or surplus property (sec. 1032)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize, for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, the Secretaries of the military departments to exchange obsolete or surplus property with an individual, organization, institution, agency, or nation if the exchange would directly benefit the historical collection of the armed forces.

Acceptance of gifts and donations for Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies (sec. 1033)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the authority of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies to accept gifts from domestic sources as well as foreign sources.

Provision of living quarters for certain students working at National Security Agency Laboratory (sec. 1034)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the National Security Agency (NSA) to provide, and if necessary, subsidize, living quarters for cooperative education (co-op) program and summer intern program students working in NSA research

laboratories. There is a shortage of affordable, short-term housing in the Fort Meade, Maryland area. The availability of affordable, short-term housing will ensure that NSA continues to attract the most qualified students for its co-op and intern programs.

Over the years, NSA has been able to eventually hire and retain over 80 percent of the graduates that have participated in its student programs. Competition for these highly skilled, highly qualified students is significant. NSA needs to be able to continue to attract students of this level of competence. Such students should not be deterred from seeking a valuable and mutually beneficial student-employee opportunity with NSA because of the unavailability of affordable, short-term housing.

Protection of operational files of the National Security Agency (sec. 1035)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to withhold from public disclosure the operational files of the National Security Agency. This provision would authorize the protection of such files from public disclosure, under the Freedom of Information Act or otherwise, to the same extent as provided for the operational files of the Central Intelligence Agency under section 701 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 431).

Transfer of administration of National Security Education Program to Director of Central Intelligence (sec. 1036)

The committee recommends a provision that would transfer responsibility for the National Security Education Program (NSEP), a scholarship, fellowship, and grant program established in 1991, from the Department of Defense to the Director of Central Intelligence. The Director of Central Intelligence administers similar student fellowship and grant programs and has expressed interest in administering this program. The committee believes the transfer of this program to the Director of Central Intelligence will enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the NSEP.

Report on use of unmanned aerial vehicles for support of homeland security missions (sec. 1037)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to provide a report no later than April 1, 2004, on the potential use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) for homeland security. The report would be produced in consultation with all relevant federal agencies.

The committee has long supported the expanded use of UAVs by the U.S. military and notes reports from soldiers in the field regarding the usefulness of UAVs as "eyes in the skies" in the global war on terrorism. The committee notes that UAVs have potential application in the area of homeland security. Long-endurance, land-based UAVs could be used to monitor remote areas along our northern and southern borders; to assist the Coast Guard in its efforts to patrol our country's 95,000 miles of waterways and aid in its drug interdiction mission; to support NORTHCOM's mission to defend our national battlespace; to monitor the safety and integrity of critical infrastructure within the United States; and to track

transportation of hazardous cargo. In addition, the report should evaluate the ability of UAV manufacturers to produce at higher rates, if necessary, to meet any increased demands for UAVs for homeland security and homeland defense missions.

The committee recognizes that there are important issues of safety, privacy and civil liberties, as well as overlapping jurisdictional issues that must be carefully considered prior to operating UAVs over U.S. territory in support of homeland security missions, and therefore the provision would require that the report include a discussion of these issues.

Conveyance of surplus T–37 aircraft to Air Force Aviation Heritage Foundation, Incorporated (sec. 1038)

The committee recommends a provision to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey a surplus T–37 aircraft to the Air Force Aviation Heritage Foundation of Georgia. This authority is discretionary and the conveyance of an aircraft authorized by this provision would be made at no cost to the United States.

Budget Items

Information technology investments to support effective financial management

The committee recommends a general reduction of $200.0 million in information technology development modernization for functional area applications in:

Other Procurement, Army—$22.4 million;
Other Procurement, Navy—$20.9 million;
Other Procurement, Air Force—$13.5 million;
Other Procurement, Defense-Wide—$8.9 million;
Research and Development, Army—$18.2 million;
Research and Development, Navy—$15.2 million;
Research and Development, Air Force—$11.5 million;
Research and Development, Defense-Wide—$10.5 million;
Defense Health Programs—$14.0 million;
Defense Working Capital Fund Operations—$60.2 million;
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide—$4.7 million.

This reduction is based on the delay in developing the Department of Defense's financial systems architecture and the lack of progress in provided adequate justification for new business information systems investments, and was calculated in the same manner as the reduction taken in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003.

The committee expects the Department to achieve these reductions by: (1) implementing the requirements of section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003; (2) restricting the development of Department of Defense business systems until the Department has completed its proposed architecture and transition plan and is in a position to ensure that business system expenditures will be consistent with that architecture and plan; and (3) restricting spending on those programs that do not meet the capital planning and investment control criteria of the Clinger-Cohen Act (40 U.S.C. 1412 and 1422).

Two years ago, the Department of Defense (DOD) initiated an ambitious effort to address shortcomings in the Department's financial management systems, operations, and controls. The Department planned to develop a comprehensive enterprise architecture and a transition plan for implementing the proposed architecture by April 2003. The proposed architecture would then be implemented over a period of four years or more. The committee continues to strongly support the Department's efforts to address shortcomings in its financial systems on a comprehensive basis.

Unfortunately, the General Accounting Office recently reported to the committee that DOD "* * * had yet to provide a clear definition of the intended purpose of the April 30, 2003, architecture * * *" and determined that "* * * the architecture will not fully satisfy the requirements contained within Section 1004 of Public Law 107–314."

The inability of the Department to develop a comprehensive architecture calls into question the need for proposed levels of expenditures for new investment in business information systems. Until the proposed architecture has been fully developed, increased spending on such systems could be wasteful. Last year, the Comptroller General of the United States testified before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support that the Department should limit the additional business systems development that the Department undertakes until a new enterprise architecture has been approved. The DOD Comptroller agreed with the Comptroller General's recommendation.

Section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 was designed to help enforce spending limitations by requiring that any defense financial information system improvement expenditure over $1.0 million be approved in advance by the DOD Comptroller. The GAO has indicated that DOD has done very little in limiting spending on business systems development until the proposed architecture and transition plan have been completed. In a February 2003 report to the committee, GAO stated:

> DOD has yet to establish the necessary departmental investment governance structure and process controls needed to adequately align ongoing investments with its architectural goals and direction. Instead, DOD continues to allow its component organizations to make their own parochial investment decisions, following different approaches and criteria. This stovepiped decision-making process has contributed to the department's current complex, error-prone environment of over 1,700 systems. In particular, DOD has not established and applied common investment criteria to its ongoing IT system projects using a hierarchy of investment review and funding decision-making bodies, each composed of representatives from across the department. DOD also has not yet conducted a comprehensive review of its ongoing IT investments to ensure that they are consistent with its architecture development efforts. Until it takes these steps, DOD will likely continue to lack effective control over the billions of dollars it is currently spending on IT projects.

The Associate Director for E-Government and Information Technology at the Office of Management and Budget recently testified before the House Government Reform Committee that about 771 projects included in the FY04 budget request with a total cost of $20.9 billion are "at risk" and will not be allowed to move forward by OMB until agencies present a successful business case. The committee is concerned that a number of DOD systems may not have an effective business justification and urges the Secretary of Defense to ensure that sufficient economic justification is provided prior to investing in business systems at DOD.

DOD's budget request included more than $5.2 billion for business systems development and modernization. This is in addition to the over $18.0 billion spent to operate and maintain the existing business information systems infrastructure. The amount planned to be spent on systems development and modernization includes funding for a large number of programs that may require fundamental restructuring depending on the outcome of the Department's current financial management review and the system architecture that the Department develops.

Refined Petroleum Products, Marginal Expense Transfer Account

The administration requested the establishment of a Refined Petroleum Products Marginal Expense Transfer Account to cover the difference between the funds the Department of Defense budgets for the purchase of refined petroleum products and the actual market prices the Department pays for fuel (i.e. the additional marginal expense). Under this proposal, an indefinite appropriation would be available for the Department to cover those additional marginal expenses. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that this transfer account would cost $675.0 million in fiscal year 2004. That amount has been included in the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution for this purpose.

The committee does not support the establishment of a Refined Petroleum Products Marginal Expense Transfer Account. A marginal expense transfer account may have unintended consequences. The committee believes that fuel costs should continue to be funded through the Defense Working Capital Fund.

Items of Special Interest

Terrorist threat integration center

The committee is concerned that the information developed by the various components of the intelligence community and the information developed by the disparate elements of the local, state, and federal law enforcement community is not quickly and efficiently shared in order to respond to significant terrorist threats to the United States. The President has directed the establishment of a terrorist threat integration center (TTIC) to correct this problem, but exactly how this organization will operate remains unclear. Because of the large responsibilities of the Department of Defense (DOD) within the intelligence community and the Department's important role in homeland defense, the Department will be involved in the organization and operation of the TTIC.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)), in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, to provide a report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees that details: the mission of the TTIC; the DOD commitment to the TTIC in terms of personnel, equipment, infrastructure and related support; the funding that will be required to meet DOD's responsibilities to the TTIC; and the relationship of the TTIC to U.S. Northern Command. In addition, the committee requests the assessment of the USD(I) as to the impact of this commitment to the TTIC on the overall defense intelligence mission, and a review of any issues associated with foreign intelligence activities supporting domestic law enforcement, as well as any issues associated with active duty military personnel supporting civil law enforcement activities. This report shall be delivered to the congressional defense and intelligence committees no later than December 1, 2003.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL POLICY

Authority to employ civilian faculty members at the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1595 of title 10, United States Code, to add the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC) as a covered institution of the Department of Defense at which the Secretary of Defense may employ civilians as professors, instructors, and lecturers, and may prescribe their compensation. The action is taken pursuant to a recommendation of the congressionally established Board of Visitors for WHINSEC.

Pay authority for critical positions (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would give the Department of Defense (DOD) critical pay authority for up to 40 administrative, technical, or professional positions. This authority would be identical to the authority given the Internal Revenue Service in 1998 to attract critical personnel to manage and support the modernization of IRS computer systems. DOD has embarked on a similar endeavor to reform its financial management computer systems. The committee anticipates that DOD will use this authority to attract an experienced program manager to run the Department's financial systems modernization, as well as for attracting people for other critical programs that require individuals with an extremely high level of managerial and technical experience.

Extension, expansion, and revision of authority for experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend and expand the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) Experimental Personnel Program. The committee recognizes the successful utilization of the experimental personnel program by DARPA and recommends extending the program for that reason. In addition, the provision would increase by ten the positions available to DARPA under this authority.

The committee supports the agility and flexibility of DARPA management and personnel policies. In addition, the committee notes the effectiveness of the Director of DARPA in recruiting scientists and technologists from cutting edge disciplines who are motivated to make a contribution to the nation by working on "DARPA-hard" problems. These individuals provide a valuable contribution to the national security and economic vitality of the United States.

Transfer of personnel investigative functions and related personnel of the Department of Defense (sec. 1104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the consent of the Director of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), to transfer the personnel security investigations functions that are performed by the Defense Security Service of the Department of Defense to the OPM.

The committee notes that this change would make OPM the central provider of these services for the Federal Government. The committee also recommends that those personnel security investigation activities currently performed by the Defense Security Service be acquired from OPM on a reimbursable basis. The proposed transfer of personnel assets would ensure that skilled investigators currently performing these functions would be available to address the critical need for these services in a centrally managed and administered entity.

Items of Special Interest

Laboratory Personnel Demonstration Projects

The committee has strongly supported the Department of Defense's efforts to provide flexibility to the defense laboratories in order to allow these laboratories to attract and retain the finest technical talent. The committee urges the Department to continue to work to ensure that the defense laboratories are of the highest quality and can continue to support and accelerate the transformation of our armed forces.

The committee commends the recent efforts undertaken by the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD, AT&L) to revitalize the innovation and functions of the defense laboratories. In particular, the committee recognizes the commitment and dedication of the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Laboratories and Basic Sciences (DUSD(LABS)) in engaging and communicating with laboratory directors on personnel issues that impact the defense laboratory system. The committee further notes that the Office of the USD, AT&L has initiated the Laboratory Quality Improvement Program, allowing for an extensive review of the defense laboratories and the various issues facing them. The committee also notes that two recent reports, the DUSD(LABS)'s "DOD Laboratory Scientist and Engineer Workforce: Framework of Human Resource Features for the Alternative Personnel System" and the Naval Research Advisory Council's "Science and Technology Community in Crisis" provide an excellent overview and interesting recommendations on laboratory issues.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

Authority to use funds for payment of costs of attendance of foreign visitors under regional defense counterterrorism fellowship program (sec. 1201)

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent the Regional Defense Counterterrorism Fellowship (RDCTF) Program established under section 8125 of the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002. Under current law, the program will expire upon expenditure of the $17.9 million originally appropriated to establish the program.

The Secretary of Defense has determined that the RDCTF program has been useful in increasing cooperation with partner nations in the global war on terrorism. Moreover, the program has provided valuable training to enable coalition partners in the global war on terrorism to improve their training programs in counterterrorism tactics, techniques, and procedures. Institutionalizing the RDCTF program will enable the Department to offer this training opportunity to a broader audience of counterterrorism officials and enable the Department to engage in long-term planning for the educational assistance of friendly nations and allies in the global war on terrorism. The provision limits the annual expenditure of funds for this purpose to no more than $20.0 million.

The committee expects the Department to ensure that the program conforms to the spirit of statutory guidelines governing the administration of related programs. The provision requires the Secretary to formulate formal guidelines within appropriate Department regulations for administration of the RDCTF program, not later than December 1, 2003, and notify the congressional defense committees when the formal guidelines are promulgated. Additionally, the provision requires the Secretary to submit an annual report to the congressional defense committees that summarizes counterterrorism training activities conducted under the auspices of the RDCTF program, as well as an assessment of the effectiveness of the program in increasing cooperation with other nations in the global war on terrorism. This report will be submitted not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, beginning with the conclusion of fiscal year 2004.

Availability of funds to recognize superior noncombat achievements or performance of members of friendly foreign forces and other foreign nationals (sec. 1202)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, to expressly authorize the Department of Defense to expend operations and maintenance funds to recognize superior noncombat achievements or performance by members of foreign forces and other foreign nationals that

significantly enhance or support the national security strategy of the United States.

Currently, the Department's authority to expend appropriated funds to recognize superior achievements for foreign nationals is limited. Military decorations may be awarded to certain foreign military officials and representational gifts may be given to certain foreign dignitaries. However, the Secretary and subordinate military commanders are inhibited in their ability to provide meaningful recognition to foreign nationals, military and civilian, who provide valuable service to the United States. This authority will provide the Secretary a valuable tool in establishing goodwill that may improve security relationships with many friendly nations in the future.

Check cashing and exchange transactions for foreign personnel in alliance or coalition forces (sec. 1203)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a disbursing official of the U.S. Government to allow military personnel from allied nations to cash checks and certain negotiable instruments and exchange foreign currency, provided these individuals are participating in military training activities with U.S. Military Forces. This authority would be subject to the approval of the senior U.S. military commander assigned to the joint operation or mission and would only be exercised when the government of the foreign nation has guaranteed payment for any deficiency resulting from the use of this authority.

Clarification and extension of authority to provide assistance for international nonproliferation activities (sec. 1204)

The committee recommends a provision that would recognize the U.N. Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) as the successor organization of the U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM), and extend the authority of the Department of Defense to continue to provide support for critical weapons inspections and monitoring in Iraq for an additional year. Even though the regime of Saddam Hussein has been removed from Iraq, the United States and its coalition partners will continue to conduct extensive inspection of suspected weapons development and storage sites and conducting verification and monitoring activities for many months. The expertise and experience of UNMOVIC may be useful in these activities. Extension of this authority for one year is a prudent step to give the Secretary of Defense and the Commander, U.S. Central Command access to all relevant bodies of experience and information with regard to weapons of mass destruction activities in Iraq.

Reimbursement costs relating to national security controls on satellite export licensing (sec. 1205)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1514 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 to clarify that only costs directly related to monitoring the launch of a satellite in a foreign country shall be reimbursed by contractors to the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee is

concerned that the Department may currently be requiring reimbursement by contractors for items and overhead that are only tangentially related to monitoring specific launches. These costs may be more suitably funded through direct appropriations. This provision would require the General Accounting Office (GAO) to conduct a study of the Department's costs for monitoring launches of satellites in a foreign country and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 1, 2004, on findings and recommendations of the GAO.

Annual report on the NATO Prague capabilities commitment and the NATO response force (sec. 1206)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit a report on implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Prague Capabilities Commitment and development of the NATO Response Force. The report would be submitted no later than January 31 of each year. The committee notes its recommendation to repeal the requirement of the Department of Defense to report annually on the NATO Defense Capabilities Initiative.

Expansion and extension of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities (sec. 1207)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority contained in Section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–84), for support to Columbia, and would renew authority for support to Peru that expired at the end of fiscal year 2002, starting in fiscal year 2003 through the end of fiscal year 2006. Additionally, the provision would authorize the same support, through the end of fiscal year 2006, for seven additional countries, including: Afghanistan; Bolivia; Ecuador; Pakistan; Tajikistan; Turkmenistan; and Uzbekistan. Because of the expanded number of nations being supported, the provision would increase the amount of funding that could be utilized for support of these nine nations to $40.0 million in any fiscal year.

Section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as amended, authorized the Department of Defense to provide specific types of counter-drug support, not to exceed $20.0 million during fiscal years 1999 through 2002, to the Government of Peru, and to the Government of Colombia during fiscal years 1999 through 2006. This program has proven valuable and effective in disrupting illegal drug trafficking in Colombia and Peru. While Colombia continues to receive counter-drug support through this and other authorities, the original authority to provide this non-lethal support to Peru expired at the end of fiscal year 2002.

The establishment of a friendly government in Afghanistan, committed to reducing drug trafficking, is an encouraging development. Opium cultivation in Afghanistan represents a large portion of the world's opiates production, and Afghanistan has long been a haven to smugglers and drug traffickers. Recent United States military cooperation with nations in the area surrounding Afghanistan and

their desire for improved relations with the United States offers a unique opportunity to further disrupt drug trafficking in the South Asia and Middle Eastern region.

The committee supports these efforts to make progress in disrupting the flow of illegal drugs. However, the committee wants to ensure that the funds authorized to be expended for these purposes are used prudently. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a comprehensive report on how these counterdrug funds are expended in each of these nine countries, not later than 60 days following the conclusion of each fiscal year for which this program is authorized.

Use of funds for unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1208)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, for two additional years, the expanded authority to use Department of Defense counterdrug funds to support a unified campaign against narcotics cultivation and trafficking, and against terrorist organizations in Colombia.

Section 8145 of the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–248) gave the Department of Defense expanded authority for the use of counterdrug funds to conduct unified counterdrug and counterterrorism activities in Colombia in fiscal year 2003. This expanded authority will expire on September 30, 2003, in the absence of an extension of authority by the Congress.

The committee is encouraged by reports from the U.S. Ambassador to Colombia, the Secretary of Defense, and the Commander, U.S. Southern Command about progress being made in eradicating drug cultivation and in combating the narco-terrorist groups that have terrorized much of rural Colombia for years, financed largely by money from drug trafficking. The Colombian government and the Colombian military appear to have reacted positively to the financial and military assistance provided by the United States and are making tangible progress in lowering drug production and in re-establishing control over large portions of the country. The leadership of President Uribe appears to have produced positive momentum in this long, unfortunate struggle. Much remains to be done, however, and the three major terrorist groups remain clear and present dangers to peace and security. The effort must be sustained until the terrorists have been defeated.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301)

The committee recommends a provision that would define the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs, define the funds as those authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act, and authorize the CTR funds to be available for obligation for three fiscal years.

Funding allocations (sec. 1302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $450.0 million, the amount included in the budget request, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. This provision would also authorize specific amounts for each CTR program element, require notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2004 funds, and provide limited authority to vary individual amounts of specific CTR program elements.

Annual certifications on use of facilities being constructed for Cooperative Threat Reduction Program projects or activities (sec. 1303)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with an annual certification that all Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program construction projects and activities will be used for their intended purpose by the country of concern and that the country has demonstrated a commitment to do so. The period of time covered by the certification would be the previous fiscal year. The provision would apply to construction projects and activities that are ongoing, as well as any that begin after the date of enactment of this Act. The first certification would be due on the first Monday in February 2004, and would cover fiscal year 2003. The certification should be submitted with the CTR annual report.

The committee is concerned that the CTR program management and oversight of CTR funded construction projects is weak, leading to construction expenditures in Russia that provide no national security benefit. Specifically, as described in the Department of Defense Inspectors General's report, Cooperative Threat Reduction: Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Liquid Propellant Diposition Project, dated September 20, 2002, one CTR construction project involved the expenditure of over $100.0 million for a new operational facility to neutralize liquid fuel taken from CTR funded dismantled Russian missiles. After the facility was completed and ready to begin neutralizing fuel, the Russian Government informed the U.S. Government that the facility would not be

needed because the fuel that had been intended to be neutralized had, since 1996, been diverted to and used by the Russian commercial space launch program. Because this facility used unique technology and had a single purpose, the CTR Program could not use the facility or its components for any other purpose.

The committee is troubled by the failure of the Russian Government to inform CTR management that the facility was no longer needed. Further, the failure of CTR management to engage the Russian Government on a regular basis to obtain assurances that the project was still required exacerbated the situation. It is the committee's expectation that this provision will help to avoid such a situation in the future.

Authority to use Cooperative Threat Reduction funds outside the Former Soviet Union (sec. 1304)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the President to obligate and expend Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) funds for a fiscal year and any CTR funds that remain available for obligation from any previous fiscal year for projects in countries beyond the states of the Former Soviet Union (FSU). These funds would be available only for proliferation threat reduction projects and activities that would assist the United States in the resolution of critical emerging proliferation threats or permit the United States to take advantage of available opportunities to achieve long-standing nonproliferation goals. Not more than $50.0 million may be obligated in any fiscal year for these projects or activities. All requirements for prior notification and limitations applicable to the obligation and expenditure of existing CTR funds apply to the CTR projects and activities permitted by this new authority.

If this provision is exercised, the committee expects the Department of Defense to undertake projects and activities that are consistent with ongoing projects and activities in the CTR program. This provision would not permit the Department to provide cash directly to any CTR recipient country for any CTR project or activity.

One-year extension of inapplicability of certain conditions on use of funds for chemical weapons destruction (sec. 1305)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by one year the President's authority to waive certain conditions with respect to the chemical weapons destruction facility at Shchuch'ye, Russia.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Explanation of funding tables

Division B of this Act authorizes funding for military construction projects of the Department of Defense. It includes funding authorizations for the construction and operation of military family housing and military construction for the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment program. It also provides authorization for the base closure account that funds environmental cleanup and other activities associated with the implementation of previous base closure rounds.

The following tables provide the project-level authorizations for the military construction funding authorized in Division B of this Act and summarize that funding by account. The tables also note as "Budget Amend" the projects contained in a fiscal year 2004 amended budget request submitted by the administration on May 1, 2003 to realign certain military construction and family housing projects.

The administration originally requested authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling $8,965,181,000. The committee transferred $119,815,000 in authorization requested by the administration in the Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction program Defense-wide account to the Military Construction, Defense-wide account.

The administration's budget amendment proposed a transfer of $25,500,000 from the Procurement, Defense-wide, Special Operations Command account into the military construction, Defense-wide account. The committee did not make this transfer.

The amended budget request included the use of $153,373,000 in fiscal year 2003 military construction authorization for rescinded projects. A list of these projects are located in a budget item entitled "Military Construction at Overseas Locations" located elsewhere in this division. The committee acknowledges this authorization as a separate entry at the end of the table.

The amended administration's request for authorization of appropriations for military construction and family housing construction is $8,990,681,000.

Summary of FY04 Military Construction Authorization for Appropriations
(Dollars in Thousands)

Military Construction	Presidents Budget	President's Amend	Senate Change	Senate Authorize
Military Construction, Army	1,536,010	1,602,060	-62,650	1,539,410
Military Construction, Navy	1,132,858	1,147,537	35,031	1,182,568
Military Construction, Air Force	772,767	830,671	204,867	1,035,538
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	597,201	623,698	-9,628	614,070
Military Construction, Army National Guard	168,298	168,298	108,481	276,779
Military Construction, Air National Guard	60,430	60,430	148,100	208,530
Military Construction, Army Reserve	68,478	68,478	6,000	74,478
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	28,032	28,032	6,100	34,132
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	44,312	44,312	9,600	53,912
Base Realignment & Closure	370,427	370,427	0	370,427
NATO Security Investment Program	169,300	169,300	0	169,300
Transfer from Chemical Ammunition Demilitarization Account				119,815
Total Military Construction	4,948,113	5,113,243	565,716	5,678,959
Family Housing Construction, Army	356,891	409,191		409,191
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Army	1,043,026	1,043,026	-11,173	1,031,853
Fam Housing Construction, Navy/MC	184,193	184,193		184,193
Fam Housing Ops & Debt, Navy/MC	852,778	852,778	-39,620	813,158
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	695,622	657,065		657,065
Family Housing Operations & Debt, AF	834,468	834,468	-21,698	812,770
Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide	350	350		350
Fam Housing Operations & Debt, Defense-Wide	49,440	49,440		49,440
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	300	300		300
Total Family Housing	4,017,068	4,030,811	-72,491	3,958,320
Subtotal:		**9,144,054**	**493,225**	**9,637,279**
FY 03 Military Construction Housing Authorization Recision:		-153,373		-153,373
Total Military Construction and Family Housing:	**8,965,181**	**8,990,681**	**493,225**	**9,483,906**

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	SOS Dormitory, Phase 3	13,400		13,400
Alabama	Air National Guard	Dannelly Field	Composite Operations And Training Facility		11,400	11,400
Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Vibration Dynamic Test Facility	5,500		5,500
Alabama	Army National Guard	Fort McClellan	Fire Station (ADRS)	1,873		1,873
Alabama	Army National Guard	Fort Payne	Add/Alter Readiness Center, (ADRS)	3,648		3,648
Alabama	Army National Guard	Mobile	Armed Forces Reserve Center (ADRS), Phase II	2,943		2,943
Alabama	Army National Guard	Springville	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	3,365		3,365
Alabama	Army National Guard	Vincent	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	3,353		3,353
Alabama	Army Reserve	Birmingham	Land Acquisition For Reserve Center		2,900	2,900
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Dormitory (96 Room)	13,914		13,914
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Repair/Expand En-route Ramp	19,060		19,060
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Joint Security Forces Complex		15,800	15,800
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Maintenance Facility	2,000		2,000
Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Vehicle Maintenance Shop		2,500	2,500
Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Barracks		8,200	8,200
Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Barracks Complex - D Street Phase 3	33,000		33,000
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Ammunition Supply Point Upgrade	10,600		10,600
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Military Operations On Urban Terrain	11,200		11,200
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Pallet Processing Facility	16,500		16,500
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Barracks - Luzon Avenue	21,500		21,500
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Alert Holding Area Facility	32,000		32,000
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Multi-Purpose Training Range Complex	47,000		47,000
Alaska	Army National Guard	Juneau	Organization Maintenance Shop		3,100	3,100
Alaska	DLA	Eielson AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	17,000		17,000
Alaska	TRICARE	Fort Wainwright	Hospital Replacement, Phase V	0		0
Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Mission Ready Supply Parts Warehouse	1,906		1,906
Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	C-130 Apron/Shoulder (CSAR)	1,954		1,954

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	HH-60 Squadron Ops/ AMU (CSAR)	6,004		6,004
Arizona	Air Force	Luke AFB	Modification To FY 2003 Land Acquisition		14,300	14,300
Arizona	Navy	Yuma	Station Ordnance Area	7,980		7,980
Arizona	Navy	Yuma	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	14,250		14,250
Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Add/Alter Hangar 280 (C-130J)	1,144		1,144
Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Operations Training Facility (C-130)	2,478		2,478
Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Child Development Center		3,750	3,750
Arkansas	Army National Guard	Warren, AR	Readiness Center		3,610	3,610
California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Upgrade Docks (Global Hawk)	8,958		8,958
California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Dormitory (96 Room) (Global Hawk)	13,342		13,342
California	Air Force	Edwards Air Force Base	Add/Renovate ISF Complex Phase I	19,060		19,060
California	Air Force	Los Angeles AFB	Area B Main Gate Complex		5,000	5,000
California	Air Force (Budget Amend)	Vandenberg Air Force Base	Consolidated Fitness Center	16,500		16,500
California	Army National Guard	Bakersfield	Readiness Center (ADRS)	5,495		5,495
California	Army National Guard	Los Alamitos	Replace Utilities Infrastructure, Phase I		21,000	21,000
California	Naval Reserve	North Island	C-40 Hangar	15,973		15,973
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, San Mateo	22,930		22,930
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	Tertiary Sewage Treatment (INCI)	24,960		24,960
California	Navy	China Lake	Upgrade Airfield Pavement	12,890		12,890
California	Navy	Lemoore	Operational Trainer	9,900		9,900
California	Navy	Lemoore	Maintenance Hangar-Overhead Space	24,610		24,610
California	Navy	Miramar	Aircraft Fire/Rescue Station	4,740		4,740
California	Navy	Monterey	Bachelor Officer Quarters	35,550		35,550
California	Navy	North Island	Taxiway/Tower	13,650		13,650
California	Navy	North Island	Squadron Operations Facility	35,590		35,590
California	Navy	Point Mugu	Aircraft Test Stand		3,000	3,000
California	Navy	Sam Nicolas Island	Transient Quarters (SNI)	6,150		6,150

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
California	Navy	San Clemente	Operational Access - Shoba	18,940		18,940
California	Navy	San Diego	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Homeport Ashore	42,710		42,710
California	Navy	Twenty-Nine Palms	Explosive Ordnance Operations Facility	2,290		2,290
California	Navy	Twenty-Nine Palms	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	26,100		26,100
Colorado	Air Force	Buckley Air Force Base	Upgrade Base Infrastructure, Phase III	6,957		6,957
Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Add/Alter Mission Support Facility		10,200	10,200
Colorado	Air National Guard	Buckley ANGB	Civil Engineer Complex	6,900		6,900
Colorado	Army National Guard	Fort Carson	Centennial Training Site, Phase II, III (Design)		4,500	4,500
Colorado	Defense Demilitarization	Pueblo Depot Activity	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Phase V		88,388	88,388
	(Transfer from Chemical and Ammunition Demilitarization Account Request)					
Colorado	TRICARE	U.S. Air Force Academy	Hospital Addition/Alteration	21,500		21,500
Connecticut	Army National Guard	Newtown Military Reservation	Working Animal Building (ADRS)	2,167		2,167
Connecticut	Army National Guard	Stones Ranch Reservation	Fire Station (ADRS)	2,422		2,422
Connecticut	Navy	New London	Tomahawk Missile Magazine		3,000	3,000
Connecticut	TRICARE	New London	Dental Clinic Replacement	6,400		6,400
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower		8,500	8,500
District Of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	AF Central Adjudication Facility	9,300		9,300
District Of Columbia	Navy	Anacostia	Motor Transport Facility Addition	1,550		1,550
District Of Columbia	TRICARE	Anacostia	Convert/Renovate Medical/Dental Clinic	15,714		15,714
District Of Columbia	TRICARE	Walter Reed AMC	Add to Alter Hospital Energy Plant	9,000		9,000
Florida	Air Force	Hurlburt Field	Special Tactics Advance Skills Training Facility	7,800		7,800
Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Security Forces Operations Facility		8,800	8,800
Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Parking Apron/Runway Extension (F-22)	6,195		6,195
Florida	Air Force (Budget Amend)	Hurlburt Field	Command And Control School Complex	19,400		19,400
Florida	DLA	Eglin AFB	Replace Jet Fuel Storage Complex	4,800		4,800
Florida	DLA	Hurlburt Field	Replace Fuel Pier	3,500		3,500
Florida	Navy	Jacksonville	Airfield Perimeter Security	3,190		3,190

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Florida	Navy	Jacksonville	Land Acquisition	115,711		115,711
Florida	Navy	Panama City	Littoral Warfare Research Complex	9,550		9,550
Florida	Navy	Whiting Field	Land Acquisition (OLF Barin Clear Zone)	4,830		4,830
Florida	SOCOM	Hurlburt Field	Squadron Operations/AMU (AC-130)	6,000		6,000
Florida	SOCOM (Budget Amend)	MacDill Air Force Base	Add/Alter Building 501A	25,500		25,500
Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	C-130 Maintenance Hangar		7,600	7,600
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	J-Stars Flight Simulator Facility	2,954		2,954
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Corrosion Control Paint Facility	25,731		25,731
Georgia	Army	Fort Gordon	Training Support Center		4,350	4,350
Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Multi-Purpose Training Range Complex	30,000		30,000
Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Physical Fitness Training Center	15,500		15,500
Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Barracks Complex - Perimeter Road	49,000		49,000
Georgia	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Stewart	Command And Control Facility	25,050		25,050
Georgia	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Stewart	Barracks, Phase I	17,000		17,000
Georgia	Army Reserve	Fort Gillem	OMS/DS/Parts Warehouse/Storage	7,620		7,620
Georgia	Navy	Kings Bay	SFF Addition & HMMWV Garage	3,340		3,340
Georgia	Navy	Kings Bay	Rifle Range	8,170		8,170
Georgia	SOCOM	Fort Benning	Physical Evaluation Center	2,100		2,100
Guam	TRICARE	Andersen AFB	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	24,900		24,900
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Kuntz Gate & Road (C-17)	3,050		3,050
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Support Utilities, Phase I (C-17)	4,098		4,098
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Flight Simulator (C-17)	5,623		5,623
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Consolidated Maintenance Complex (C-17)	7,529		7,529
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Expand Strategic Airlift Ramp	10,102		10,102
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Squadron Operations (C-17)	10,674		10,674
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Corrosion Control/ Maintenance Facility (C-17)	30,400		30,400
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Electrical Distribution System, Phase 1		6,800	6,800

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Hawaii	Army	Kunia	Land Easement	1,400		1,400
Hawaii	Army	Kunia	Land Acquisition	19,400		19,400
Hawaii	Army	Pohakuloa Training Area	Saddle Road Access, Phase III		17,000	17,000
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Information Systems Facility	18,000		18,000
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Mission Support Training Facility	33,000		33,000
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Barracks Complex - Capron Road Phase II	49,000		49,000
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Barracks Complex - Quad E	49,000		49,000
Hawaii	DLA	Hickam AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	14,100		14,100
Hawaii	Navy	Lualualei	Ordnance Holding Areas	6,320		6,320
Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor	Perimeter/Security Lighting	7,010		7,010
Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor	Waterfront Improvements	32,180		32,180
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Fitness Center-Addition	5,337		5,337
Idaho	Air Force	Mt Home	726nd Squadron Air Control Complex		9,800	9,800
Illinois	Air Force	Scott AFB	Shiloh Gate (AT/FP)	1,900		1,900
Illinois	Army National Guard	Galesburg Armory	Readiness Center		3,750	3,750
Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes	Battle Station Training Facility-Increment 1	13,200		13,200
Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes	Recruit Barracks	31,600		31,600
Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes	Recruit Barracks	34,130		34,130
Indiana	Army National Guard	Camp Atterbury	Add/Alter Readiness Center, (ADRS)	2,849		2,849
Indiana	Army National Guard	Elkhart	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,770		1,770
Indiana	Army National Guard	Gary	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,417		1,417
Indiana	Army National Guard	Gary	Limited Aviation Support Facility		15,581	15,581
Indiana	Army National Guard	South Bend	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,496		1,496
Indiana	Defense Demilitarization	Newport AAP	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Phase VI		15,207	15,207
	(Transfer from Chemical and Ammunition Demilitarization Account Request)					
Iowa	Air National Guard	Sioux City	Upgrade Runway/Taxiways, Phase II		2,000	2,000
Iowa	Air National Guard	Sioux Gateway Airport	KC-135 Fire Crash/Rescue Station	6,091		6,091

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility, Ph II		13,600	13,600
Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Barracks Complex - Graves Street	40,000		40,000
Kansas	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Leavenworth	Lewis And Clark Instructional Facility, Phase 1	28,000		28,000
Kansas	Army National Guard	Kansas City	Add/Alter Readiness Center, (ADRS)	2,982		2,982
Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Dining Facility		10,000	10,000
Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Modified Record Fire Range	3,500		3,500
Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Barracks Complex - Range Road Phase II	49,000		49,000
Kentucky	Army National Guard	Greenville	Fire Station (ADRS)	2,238		2,238
Kentucky	Army National Guard	Maysville	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	4,997		4,997
Kentucky	Army National Guard	Richmond	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	756		756
Kentucky	Defense Demilitarization	Bluegrass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Phase IV		16,220	16,220
	(Transfer from Chemical and Ammunition Demilitarization Account Request)					
Kentucky	SOCOM	Fort Campbell	Flight Simulator Facility	7,800		7,800
Louisiana	Air National Guard	NAS/JR New Orleans	Vehicle Maintenance Support Equipment Facility		6,300	6,300
Louisiana	Army	Fort Polk	Shoot House	1,250		1,250
Louisiana	Army	Fort Polk	Arms Storage Facility	1,350		1,350
Louisiana	Army	Fort Polk	Alert Holding Area Facility	8,400		8,400
Louisiana	Army	Fort Polk	Mission Training Support Facility	27,000		27,000
Louisiana	Army	Fort Polk	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	34,000		34,000
Louisiana	Army National Guard	Pineville	Consolidated Maintenance Facility Phase I	18,579		18,579
Maine	Army National Guard	Bangor	Aviation Support Facility, Phase II		14,900	14,900
Maryland	Air Force Reserve	Andrews AFB	Upgrade Airfield Pavements	835		835
Maryland	Air Force Reserve	Andrews AFB	Alter Aircraft Maintenance Shop	2,900		2,900
Maryland	Air Force Reserve	Andrews AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	7,375		7,375
Maryland	Army	Aberdeen	Chem/Bio Sample Reception Facility		13,000	13,000
Maryland	Army	Fort Meade	Dining Facility	9,600		9,600
Maryland	Army Reserve	Fort Meade	AR Center/OMS/Warehouse Phase I	19,710		19,710

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Maryland	Navy	Indian Head	Water System Improvements	14,850		14,850
Maryland	Navy	Patuxent River	JSF Test Facility	24,370		24,370
Maryland	NSA	Fort Meade	Critical Utility Control, Phase II-B	1,842		1,842
Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Otis (Falmouth)	Fire Crash/Rescue Station		11,000	11,000
Michigan	Air National Guard	Selfridge ANG Base	Pass And ID/Visitors Complex		4,000	4,000
Michigan	Air National Guard	Selfridge ANG Base	Joint Medical Training Facility		9,600	9,600
Michigan	Air National Guard	Alpena	Dining Facility		8,500	8,500
Michigan	Army National Guard	Calumet	Single Unit NG Readiness Center		3,370	3,370
Michigan	Army National Guard	Jackson	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	5,591		5,591
Minnesota	Air National Guard	Duluth	Aircraft Maintenance Facility Modernization		9,000	9,000
Mississippi	Air Force	Columbus AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower		5,500	5,500
Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Child Development Center		2,900	2,900
Mississippi	Air Force Reserve	Keesler AFB	Fuel Cell Maintenance Hangar	6,650		6,650
Mississippi	Air National Guard	Camp Shelby	Assault Runway (C-17)	7,409		7,409
Mississippi	Army National Guard	Camp Shelby	Regional Military Educational Center, Ph III	7,733		7,733
Mississippi	Army National Guard	Gulfport	Organizational Maintenance Shops		4,650	4,650
Mississippi	Navy	Meridian	Fire & Rescue Station	4,570		4,570
Mississippi	Navy Reserve	Pascagoula	Littoral Surveillance Systems Facility		6,100	6,100
Missouri	Air National Guard	Rosecrans Field	Air Traffic Control Training Complex		8,000	8,000
Missouri	Army National Guard	Kansas City	Readiness Center (ADRS)	4,947		4,947
Montana	Army National Guard	Billings	Add/Alt Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS)	1,209		1,209
Montana	Army National Guard	Kalispell	Add/Alt Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS)	706		706
Montana	Army National Guard	Kalispell	Armed Forces Reserve Center		9,020	9,020
Nebraska	Army National Guard	Columbus	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	618		618
Nebraska	Army National Guard	Norfolk	Fire Station (ADRS)	1,068		1,068
Nebraska	Army National Guard	Omaha	Readiness Center (ADRS)	5,804		5,804
Nebraska	Army National Guard	York	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	758		758

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Nebraska	Army National Guard	Camp Ashland	Construct Frontage Levee Segment		3,000	3,000
Nebraska	Army Reserve	Omaha	Land Acquisition For Army Reserve Center		3,100	3,100
Nebraska	DLA	Offutt AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	13,400		13,400
Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Vehicle Maintenance Complex		11,800	11,800
Nevada	Air National Guard	Reno	Replace Communication & Security Forces Facility		9,000	9,000
Nevada	DLA	Nellis AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	12,800		12,800
Nevada	Navy	NAS Fallon	Construct High Explosive Magazines		4,700	4,700
New Hampshire	Air National Guard	Pease ANG Base	Fire Station		6,100	6,100
New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Roads & Utilities (C-17)	4,765		4,765
New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Maintenance Training Device Facility (C-17)	6,862		6,862
New Jersey	Navy	Earle	General Purpose/Berthing Pier	26,740		26,740
New Jersey	Navy	Lakehurst	EMALS Facility	20,681		20,681
New Mexico	Air Force	Cannon AFB	Aerospace Ground Equipment Complex		7,700	7,700
New Mexico	Air Force	Cannon AFB	Install Approach Lights, Runway 13		1,300	1,300
New Mexico	Air Force	Holloman AFB	Upgrade Radar Test Facility	3,600		3,600
New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Arsenic Treatment Plant	6,957		6,957
New Mexico	Army National Guard	Albuquerque	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	2,533		2,533
New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara ARS	Visiting Airmen's Quarters		9,600	9,600
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Barracks - 10200 Area	22,500		22,500
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Barracks Complex - Wheeler Sack AAF Phase 1	49,000		49,000
New York	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Drum	Mountain Ramp Expansion	11,000		11,000
New York	Army National Guard	Rochester	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	4,332		4,332
New York	Army National Guard	Utica	Add/Alt Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS)	3,261		3,261
North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Ramp Upgrade (C-130J/30)	1,239		1,239
North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Upgrade Hanger 6 (C-130J)	2,716		2,716
North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Technical Training Facility (C-130J/30)	4,431		4,431
North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	2-Bay Hanger (C-130J)	15,629		15,629

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Boundary Fence	1,500		1,500
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Dormitory (144 Room)	9,530		9,530
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Fire Crash/Rescue Station		11,400	11,400
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks-D Area, Phase IV	17,000		17,000
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex - Butner Road Phase IV	38,000		38,000
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex - Bastogne Drive Phase I	47,000		47,000
North Carolina	Army National Guard	Asheville	Readiness Center (ADRS)	6,251		6,251
North Carolina	Army National Guard	Lenoir	Readiness Center	5,184		5,184
North Carolina	Army National Guard	Morrisville	Fire Station (ADRS)	1,306		1,306
North Carolina	Army National Guard	Salisbury	Fire Station (ADRS)	926		926
North Carolina	DODEA	Camp Lejeune	Replace Existing Mainside Primary School	15,259		15,259
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	JMTC HQ & Academic Instruction Facility	6,300		6,300
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Consolidated Armory	10,270		10,270
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	JMTC Operations & Training Facility	12,880		12,880
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	Land Acquisition (AICUZ)		1,270	1,270
North Carolina	Navy	New River	Water Treatment Facility	6,240		6,240
North Carolina	SOCOM	Fort Bragg	Company Operations Facility Addition	1,500		1,500
North Carolina	SOCOM	Fort Bragg	Maze & Façade Training Range	2,400		2,400
North Carolina	SOCOM	Fort Bragg	Battalion & Company Headquarters	4,200		4,200
North Carolina	SOCOM	Fort Bragg	Training Complex (SWCS)	8,500		8,500
North Carolina	SOCOM	Fort Bragg	Joint Operations Complex	19,700		19,700
North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Add/Alter Missile Maintenance Vehicle Facility	3,050		3,050
North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Fitness Center		9,500	9,500
North Dakota	Army National Guard	Bismarck	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,873		1,873
Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Construct Dormitory (144 Room)	10,500		10,500
Ohio	Army National Guard	Chillicothe	Readiness Center		5,560	5,560
Ohio	Army Reserve	Cleveland	AR Center/OMS/AMSA/Storage	21,595		21,595

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Oklahoma	Air Force	Altus AFB	Modify Simulator Base (C-17)	1,144		1,144
Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Building 3001 Revitalization, Phase I	19,060		19,060
Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Consolidated Integration Support Facility		7,500	7,500
Oklahoma	Air Force	Vance AFB	Consolidated Logistics Complex		15,000	15,000
Oklahoma	Army	Fort Sill	Modified Record Fire Range	3,500		3,500
Oklahoma	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Sill	Consolidated Maintenance Complex, Phase II	13,000		13,000
Oregon	Air Force Reserve	Portland IAP	Alter Flightline Facilities	2,900		2,900
Oregon	Air Force Reserve	Portland IAP	Hydrant Refueling System, Phase II	3,050		3,050
Oregon	Air Force Reserve	Portland IAP	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	4,300		4,300
Pennsylvania	DLA	Depot New Cumberland	Replace General Purpose Warehouse at #3 & 4	27,000		27,000
Pennsylvania	Navy	Philadelphia Foundry	Upgrade Large Propeller Shop (Bldg 546)		10,200	10,200
Pennsylvania	SOCOM	Harrisburg IAP	Equipment Maintenance Facility (C-130J)	3,000		3,000
Rhode Island	Air National Guard	Quonset State Airport	Replace Composite Aircraft Maintenance Complex	18,500		18,500
Rhode Island	Navy	Newport	Underwater Weapon System (LRAF)	10,890		10,890
Rhode Island	Navy	Newport	Replace Base Enlisted Quarters (NAPS)	16,140		16,140
Rhode Island	Navy	Newport	Improve Gate 1 Security		2,550	2,550
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Dormitory (144 Room)	8,863		8,863
South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Deployment Processing Center		8,500	8,500
South Dakota	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	B-1 Weapons System Trainer Facility		9,300	9,300
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Nashville	Composite Aircraft Maintenance Complex, Ph II		11,000	11,000
Tennessee	Army National Guard	Nashville	Readiness Center, Phase I		8,100	8,100
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis	Convert Hangar to Maintenance Shops		5,000	5,000
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Tyson-McGhee	Fire Station/Security Forces Facility		6,000	6,000
Tennessee	Army Reserve	Nashville	Reserve Center/OMS/UNH Storage	8,955		8,955
Texas	Air Force	Goodfellow AFB	Fire Training Classroom Facility	1,863		1,863
Texas	Air Force	Goodfellow AFB	Student Dormitory (200 Room)	18,107		18,107
Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Student Dormitory (200 Room)	20,966		20,966

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Student Dormitory (300 Room)	35,260		35,260
Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Child Development Center, Phase II		8,700	8,700
Texas	Air Force	Randolph AFB	Fitness Center		13,600	13,600
Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Student Dormitory (300 Room)	28,590		28,590
Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Barracks Complex - 67th St & Battalion Ave	47,000		47,000
Texas	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Hood	Urban Assault Course	2,800		2,800
Texas	DLA	Laughlin AFB	Replace Truck Fuel Loading Facility	4,688		4,688
Texas	Navy	NS Ingleside	Headquarters, Mine Warfare Command		7,070	7,070
Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Munitions Maintenance Facility	1,000		1,000
Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Small Diameter Bomb Storage Igloos	1,811		1,811
Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Replace Munitions Storage Igloos	13,000		13,000
Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	AEF Deployment Center		5,900	5,900
Vermont	Air National Guard	Burlington	Air Mobilization Facility		5,400	5,400
Vermont	Army National Guard	South Burlington	Army Aviation Support Facility	23,827		23,827
Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Clear Water Rinse Pad (F-22)	2,383		2,383
Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Vertical Wing Tank Storage (F-22)	2,573		2,573
Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Squadron Operations/AMU/Hangar (F-22)	20,013		20,013
Virginia	Air National Guard	Camp Pendleton	Troop Training Quarters (RED HORSE)		2,500	2,500
Virginia	Army	Fort Myer	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	9,000		9,000
Virginia	Defense (WHS)	Arlington	Pentagon Athletic Center Restoration	38,086		38,086
Virginia	DLA	Langley AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	13,000		13,000
Virginia	DTRA	Fort Belvoir	Headquarters Relocation	25,700		25,700
Virginia	Naval Reserve	Quantico	Reserve Center	9,497		9,497
Virginia	Navy	Arlington	Physical Fitness Center	1,970		1,970
Virginia	Navy	Dahlgren	Space Surveillance Operations Center	20,520		20,520
Virginia	Navy	Dahlgren	Weapon Dynamic Test Facility		3,500	3,500
Virginia	Navy	Little Creek	Gate 1 Improvements	3,810		3,810

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Virginia	Navy	Norfolk	Crane/Weight Handling Equipment Shop	17,770		17,770
Virginia	Navy	Norfolk	Pier 11 Replacement, Increment I	27,610		27,610
Virginia	Navy	Norfolk	A/C Maintenance Hangars	36,460		36,460
Virginia	Navy	Norfolk	Base Enlisted Quarters, Shipboard Ashore (Ph II)	46,730		46,730
Virginia	Navy	Quantico	Weapons Training Battalion Load & Test Facility	3,700		3,700
Virginia	Navy	Quantico	Network Operations Center		14,420	14,420
Virginia	SOCOM	Dam Neck	Mission Support Facility (CDA-N)	5,600		5,600
Virginia	SOCOM	Dam Neck	Small Arms Range	9,681		9,681
Virginia	SOCOM	Little Creek	Operations Center		9,000	9,000
Washington	Air Force (Budget Amend)	McChord AFB	Upgrade Mission Support Complex, Phase II	19,000		19,000
Washington	Air National Guard	Camp Murray	RED HORSE Medical Training Complex		7,500	7,500
Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Shoot House	1,250		1,250
Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Deployment Staging Facility	2,650		2,650
Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Barracks Complex - 17th & B St Phase III	48,000		48,000
Washington	DLA	McChord AFB	Bulk Fuel Storage Tanks	8,100		8,100
Washington	Navy	Bangor	Waterfront Security Force Facility	6,530		6,530
Washington	Navy	Bangor	Upgrade Service Pier	33,820		33,820
Washington	Navy	Port Hadlock	Ordnance Transfer Facility	2,240		2,240
West Virginia	Air National Guard	Martinsburg	Air Traffic Control Tower		5,800	5,800
West Virginia	Air National Guard	Martinsburg	C-5 Apron, Jet Fuel Storage, Hydrant System		20,000	20,000
West Virginia	Army National Guard	Eleanor	Modify FY01 Project for Road Security/Force Protection		4,000	4,000
Wisconsin	Army National Guard	Ft McCoy	Battle Simulation Center		4,340	4,340
Wyoming	Air Force	FE Warren AFB	Construct Stormwater Drainage System, Phase 1		10,000	10,000
Bahrain	Navy	SW Asia	Operations Control Center	18,030		18,030
Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Fitness Center Annex	15,903		15,903
Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Consolidated 1st Combat Comm Squadron, Ph II	19,713		19,713

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Passenger Terminal	1,546		1,546
Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Fire Station Annex & Training Facility	3,865		3,865
Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Fitness Center	17,117		
Germany	Air Force (Budget Amend)	Spangdahlem AB	Fitness Center	-17,117		
Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	South Gate	2,800		
Germany	Air Force (Budget Amend)	Spangdahlem AB	South Gate	-2,800		
Germany	Air Force (Budget Amend)	Ramstein AB	Civil Engineering Midfield Complex	6,250	-6,250	0
Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Brigade Complex - Barracks/Maintenance Support	30,000	-30,000	0
Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Brigade Complex - Troop Support Facilities	46,000	-46,000	0
Germany	Army	Heidelberg	Barracks - Heidelberg Hospital	17,000	-17,000	0
Germany	Army	Hohenfels	Physical Fitness Training Center	13,200	-13,200	0
Germany	Army	Bamberg	Barracks - Warner 7083	8,000		
Germany	Army (Budget Amend)	Bamberg	Barracks - Warner 7083	-8,000		
Germany	Army	Bamberg	Barracks - Warner 7004	9,900		
Germany	Army (Budget Amend)	Bamberg	Barracks - Warner 7004	-9,900		
Germany	Army	Darmstadt	Barracks - Cambrai Fritsch 4029	7,700		
Germany	Army (Budget Amend)	Darmstadt	Barracks - Cambrai Fritsch 4029	-7,700		
Germany	Army	Mannheim	Barracks - Sullivan 205	4,300		
Germany	Army (Budget Amend)	Mannheim	Barracks - Sullivan 205	-4,300		
Germany	Army	Schweinfurt	Modified Record Fire Range	7,500		
Germany	Army (Budget Amend)	Schweinfurt	Modified Record Fire Range	-7,500		
Germany	Army (Budget Amend)	Vilseck	Barracks Complex, Phase 1	12,100	-12,100	0
Germany	Army	Wuerzburg	Barracks - Leighton	18,500		
Germany	Army (Budget Amend)	Wuerzburg	Barracks - Leighton	-18,500		
Germany	DODEA	Grafenwoehr	Grafenwoehr Elementary/Middle School, Phase 1	36,247	-17,631	18,616
Germany	DODEA	Heidelberg	Mark Twain Elem School Multi-Purpose Room	3,086		3,086
Germany	DODEA	Vilseck	Elementary School Renovation/Addition	1,773		1,773

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Germany	SOCOM	Stuttgart	Forward Station Complex (FSOAR)	11,400		11,400
Germany	TRICARE	Grafenwoehr	Add/Alter Dispensary/Dental Clinic	12,585		12,585
Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Zulu Arm/De-Arm Pad	994		994
Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Munitions Administration Facility	5,301		5,301
Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Remove Airfield Obstructions-South Ramp	7,730		7,730
Italy	Army	Aviano AB	Joint Deployment Facility	15,500		15,500
Italy	Army (Budget Amend)	Aviano AB	Joint Deployment Facility, Phase II	13,000	-13,000	0
Italy	Army	Livorno	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	22,000		22,000
Italy	DODEA	Sigonella	Renovate/Construct Sigonella Elem/High School	13,969		13,969
Italy	DODEA	Vicenza	Renovate/Construct Vicenza Elem/High School	16,374		16,374
Italy	Navy	La Madalena	Consolidated Santo Stefano Facilities	39,020		39,020
Italy	Navy	Sigonella	Base Operations Support Facility, Phase I	34,070		34,070
Italy	Navy (Budget Amend)	Sigonella	Base Operations Support Facility, Phase II	14,679	-14,679	0
Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Upgrade Hardened Aircraft Shelters	7,059		7,059
Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Dormitory (156 Room)	16,638		16,638
Korea	Army	Camp Casey	Barracks Complex - Ace Boulevard	35,000		35,000
Korea	Army (Budget Amend)	Camp Casey	Barracks Complex - Ace Boulevard	-35,000		-35,000
Korea	Army	Camp Casey	Barracks Complex - Engineer Drive	41,000		41,000
Korea	Army (Budget Amend)	Camp Casey	Barracks Complex - Engineer Drive	-41,000		-41,000
Korea	Army	Camp Hovey	Barracks Complex - Hovey	29,000		29,000
Korea	Army (Budget Amend)	Camp Hovey	Barracks Complex - Hovey	-29,000		-29,000
Korea	Army (Budget Amend)	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	35,000		35,000
Korea	Army (Budget Amend)	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	41,000		41,000
Korea	Army (Budget Amend)	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	29,000		29,000
Kwajalein	Army	Kwajalein Atoll	Vehicle Paint & Prep Facility	9,400		9,400
Portugal	Air Force	Lajes Field	Add/Alter Fitness Center	4,086		4,086
Turkey	Air Force	Incirlik AB	Consolidated Communications Facility	3,262	-3,262	0

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	Vehicle Maintenance Complex	3,320		3,320
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	Post Office	3,592		3,592
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	Child Development Center Annex	3,646		3,646
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Add/Alter Crash Fire Station	2,667		2,667
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Family Support Center	5,878		5,878
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Communications Facility	8,436		8,436
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Dormitory (120 Room)	13,606		13,606
United Kingdom	Air Force (Budget Amend)	RAF Lakenheath	Mobility Cargo Processing Center	11,900		11,900
United Kingdom	Navy	St Mawgan	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	7,070		7,070
Wake Island	Air Force	Wake Island	Island-wide Infrastructure, Phase I	10,000		10,000
Wake Island	Air Force	Wake Island	Repair Airfield, Phase III	14,000		14,000
Classified	Air Force	Classified Location	Classified Project	3,250		3,250
Classified	Air Force	Classified Location	Predator B-Squadron Ops/AMU & Hangar	25,731		25,731
Classified	Army	Classified Location	Classified Project	178,700		178,700
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	12,000		12,000
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	74,345		74,345
Worldwide	Air Force (Budget Amend)	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	4,771	-4,771	0
Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Various Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,160		5,160
Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Various Locations	Planning And Design	11,142		11,142
Worldwide	Air National Guard	Unspecified Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,500		5,500
Worldwide	Air National Guard	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	16,030		16,030
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	20,000		20,000
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Host Nation Support	22,000		22,000
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	100,710		100,710
Worldwide	Army National Guard	Unspecified Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,451		1,451
Worldwide	Army National Guard	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	26,570		26,570

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Worldwide	Army Reserve	Unspecified Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,886		2,886
Worldwide	Army Reserve	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	7,712		7,712
Worldwide	Base Closure IV	BRAC IV	Base Realignment and Closure	370,427		370,427
Worldwide	DFAS	Unspecified Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,500		1,500
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	20,000		20,000
Worldwide	DODEA	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	6,500		6,500
Worldwide	Energy Conservation	Unspecified Locations	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	69,500		69,500
Worldwide	JCS	Unspecified Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,330		6,330
Worldwide	MDA	Unspecified Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,600		2,600
Worldwide	NSIP	NATO Security Investment	NATO Security Investment Program	169,300		169,300
Worldwide	Naval Reserve	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	2,562		2,562
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Location	Unspecified Minor Construction	12,334		12,334
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Location	Planning And Design	65,612		65,612
Worldwide	Navy	Various Worldwide Locations	Outlying Landing Fields (Increment I)	27,610		27,610
Worldwide	OSD Contingency	Unspecified Locations	Contingency Construction	8,960		8,960
Worldwide	OSD Minor Construction	Unspecified Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000		3,000
Worldwide	SOCOM	Unspecified Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,723		2,723
Worldwide	SOCOM	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	14,768		14,768
Worldwide	SOCOM (Budget Amend)	Unspecified Locations	Planning And Design	997	-997	0
Worldwide	TRICARE	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	18,616		18,616
			Total Military Construction:	**5,113,243**	**565,716**	**5,678,959**
Alaska	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Wainwright	Replace Family Housing (100 Units)	20,000		20,000
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Construct Family Housing (100 Units)	44,000		44,000
Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Replace Family Housing (160 Units)	27,000		27,000

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Arizona	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Huachuca	Replace Family Housing (60 Units)	14,000		14,000
Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase V (93 Units)	19,357		19,357
California	Navy	Lemoore	Replace Lemoore Lexington Park (187 Units)	41,585		41,585
California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase IV (56 Units)	12,723		12,723
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase III (112 Units)	19,601		19,601
Florida	Navy	Pensacola	Replace Family Housing (25 Units)	3,197		3,197
Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase III (279 Units)	32,166		32,166
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase V (186 Units)	37,126		37,126
Kansas	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Riley	Replace Family Housing (36 Units)	8,300		8,300
Kansas	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Riley	Replace Family Housing (36 Units)	8,400		8,400
Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Replace Family Housing (178 Units)	41,000		41,000
Maryland	Air Force	Andrews AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase II (50 Units)	20,233		20,233
Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	Replace Family Housing (100 Units)	18,221		18,221
Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Replace Family Housing (94 Units)	19,368		19,368
New Mexico	Army	White Sands	Replace Family Housing (58 Units)	14,600		14,600
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Midway Park, Phase I (161 Units)	21,537		21,537
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Replace Tarawa Terrace, Phase III (358 Units)	46,244		46,244
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	Replace Slocum Village, Phase II (339 Units)	42,803		42,803
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase VII (138 Units)	18,336		18,336
North Dakota	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase-G (144 Units)	29,550		29,550
North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase X (200 Units)	41,117		41,117
Oklahoma	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Sill	Replace Family Housing (70 Units)	15,373		15,373
Oklahoma	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Sill	Replace Family Housing (50 Units)	10,000		10,000
South Dakota	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase III (75 Units)	16,240		16,240
Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase IV (116 Units)	19,973		19,973
Texas	Air Force	Randolph AFB	Replace Family Housing (96 Units)	13,754		13,754
Virginia	Army (Budget Amend)	Fort Lee	Replace Family Housing (90 Units)	18,000		18,000

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Construct Family Housing Phase II (111 Units)	44,765		44,765
Portugal	Air Force	Lajes Field	Replace Family Housing Phase III (42 Units)	13,428		13,428
Turkey	Air Force	Incirlik AB	Replace Family Housing (100 Units)	17,538		
Turkey	Air Force (Budget Amend)	Incirlik AB	Replace Family Housing (100 Units)	-17,538		
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Replace Family Housing (89 Units)	23,640		23,640
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Housing Planning And Design	32,488		32,488
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Housing Construction Improvements	197,803		197,803
Worldwide	Army (Budget Amend)	Unspecified Locations	Housing Construction Improvements	-41,773		-41,773
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Utilities Account	167,332		167,332
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Miscellaneous Account	1,311		1,311
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Furnishings Account	44,658		44,658
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Services Account	46,735	-3,291	43,444
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Management Account	86,326	-7,882	78,444
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Leasing	234,471		234,471
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Maintenance Of Real Property	432,605		432,605
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Mortgage Insurance Premium	1		1
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Locations	Privatization Support Costs	29,587		29,587
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Housing Planning And Design	33,488		33,488
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Housing Construction Improvements	244,998		244,998
Worldwide	Air Force (Budget Amend)	Unspecified Locations	Housing Construction Improvements	-21,019		-21,019
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Utilities Account	132,651	-13,976	118,675
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Miscellaneous Account	2,527		2,527
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Services Account	26,070		26,070
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Furnishings Account	43,006		43,006
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Management Account	70,083	-7,722	62,361
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Leasing	119,908		119,908
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Maintenance Of Real Property	395,650		395,650

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Mortgage Insurance Premium	37		37
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Locations	Privatization Support Costs	44,536		44,536
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Housing Construction Improvements	20,446		20,446
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Housing Planning And Design	8,381		8,381
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Utilities Account	164,556	-9,973	154,583
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Miscellaneous Account	807		807
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Furnishings Account	25,462		25,462
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Services Account	62,730	-4,458	58,272
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Management Account	78,325	-7,741	70,584
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Leasing	132,433		132,433
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Mortgage Insurance Premium	64		64
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Maintenance Of Real Property	377,792	-17,448	360,344
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Locations	Privatization Support Costs	10,609		10,609
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Locations	Housing Planning And Design	300		300
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Locations	Utilities Account	412		412
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Locations	Furnishings Account	32		32
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Locations	Services Account	72		72
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Locations	Management Account	289		289
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Locations	Maintenance Of Real Property	2,057		2,057
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Locations	Housing Construction Improvements	50		50
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Locations	Utilities Account	413		413
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Locations	Management Account	13		13
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Locations	Miscellaneous Account	51		51
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Locations	Furnishings Account	112		112
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Locations	Services Account	405		405
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Locations	Leasing	11,987		11,987
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Locations	Maintenance Of Real Property	2,528		2,528

FY 2004 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction
(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY04 Auth Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Worldwide	DIA	Unspecified Locations	Furnishings Account	3,844		3,844
Worldwide	DIA	Unspecified Locations	Leasing	27,225		27,225
Worldwide	Housing Improvement Fund	Unspecified Locations	Family Housing Improvement Fund	300		300
			Total Family Housing	4,030,811	-72,491	3,958,320
			Subtotal	9,144,054	493,225	9,637,279
			Authority From Prior Year Recisions (Budget Amendment)	-153,373		-153,373
			Total Military Construction/Family Housing	**8,990,681**	**493,225**	**9,483,906**

Military construction at overseas locations

On May 1, 2003, the Department of Defense submitted an amendment to the fiscal year 2004 budget request that would implement the first stage of adjustments to the global positioning of U.S. forces and their supporting infrastructure. The amended budget request includes changes to the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 by realigning project authorizations within the Republic of Korea to new locations without changes to the authorization of appropriations. The amended budget request would also rescind the fiscal year 2003 authorizations for projects in Germany, Iceland, and Korea and reduced the authorization of appropriations for world-wide unspecified housing improvement accounts as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Authorization	Location	Amount
Recisions:		
Child Development Center	Bamberg, Germany	7,000.0
Barracks Complex	Bamberg, Germany	10,200.0
Upgrade Access Control	Coleman Barracks, Germany	1,350.0
Modified Record Fire Range	Darmstadt, Germany	3,500.0
Barracks Complex	Mannheim, Germany	42,000.0
Central Wash Facility	Schweinfurt, Germany	2,000.0
Elementary School Addition	Spangdahlem, Germany	997.0
Combined Dining Facility	Keflavik, Iceland	14,679.0
Replace Family Housing	Yongsan, Korea	3,100.0
Reductions:		
Army Housing Construction Improvements.	World-wide Unspecified	49,200.0
Air Force Housing Construction Improvements.	World-wide Unspecified	19,347.0
Total		153,373.0

The amended budget request would also withdraw requests for fiscal year 2004 project authorizations for numerous projects in Germany and proposed realignment of locations for project requests in Korea. The amended budget request included new projects both inside and outside the United States, as well as increased world-wide unspecified housing construction improvement accounts.

This committee reviewed the budget amendment with the understanding that the Department is currently reevaluating current plans and developing a comprehensive and integrated presence and basing strategy for overseas locations in response to numerous congressional requests. The committee recommends the acceptance of line items in the amended budget request that would authorize additional projects in the United States from savings that result from withdrawn overseas project authorization requests. All additional projects that are the result of realignments are noted in the budget table.

In light of the uncertainty of the Department's future overseas force structure and basing strategy, the committee recommends that additional project authorizations totaling $173.1 million in Germany, Italy, and Turkey be withheld for fiscal year 2004.

TITLE XXI—ARMY

Summary

The Army requested authorization of appropriations of $1,536.0 million for military construction and $1,399.9 million for family housing for fiscal year 2004. This request was amended on May 1, 2003 by the administration due to revised overseas requirements. The Army's amended budget request included $1,602.1 million for FY04 military construction and $1,452.2 million for FY04 family housing.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for $1,539.4 million for military construction and $1,441.0 million for family housing for fiscal year 2004. Within this total, the committee recommends decreases to housing operations accounts as a result of savings from housing privatization. The budget amendment resulted in a net decrease to the world-wide unspecified housing construction improvement account as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Project	Amount
Reductions by Project to Housing Improvement Account		
Ansbach, Germany	Family Housing Improvement	18,973.0
Mannheim, Germany	Family Housing Improvement	16,500.0
Weibaden, Germany	Family Housing Improvement	14,400.0
Decrease		49,873.0
Additions by Project to Housing Improvement Account		
Dugway Proving Grounds, Utah	Family Housing Replacement	8,100.0
Increase		8,100.0
Decrease total		41,773.0

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

This provision contains the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2004. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

This provision would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2004. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support fam-

ily housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2103)

This provision would authorize improvements to existing Army family housing units for fiscal year 2004.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)

This provision would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's military construction and family housing budget for fiscal year 2004. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

Termination of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2003 projects (sec. 2105)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2101 and 2104 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314) to rescind project authority from five installations in Germany and one in Korea, resulting in a total decrease of $118.4 million.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2003 projects (sec. 2106)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2101 and 2104 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314) to transfer project authority from three separate installations in Korea to Camp Humphreys, Korea, to increase the total authorization for Camp Humphreys, Korea, to $107.8 million.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2002 projects (sec. 2107)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2101 and 2104 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107) as further amended by section 2105 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314) to increase the funding authorization for barracks projects at Fort Richardson, Alaska by a total of $2.0 million.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2001 projects (sec. 2108)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2101 and 2104 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (division B of Pub. L. 106–1398) as further amended by section 2105 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Pub. L. 107–107) to increase the funding authorization for a project to construct a saddle road at the Pohakoula Training Facility, Hawaii by a total of $10.0 million.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

Summary

The Navy requested authorization of appropriations of $1,132.9 million for military construction and $1,037.0 million for family housing for fiscal year 2004. The administration submitted an amended budget request on May 1, 2003 due to revised overseas requirements. The Navy requested an amended authorization of appropriations for $1,147.5 million for FY04 military construction. The Navy's request for family housing did not change.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1,182.6 million for military construction and $997.4 million for family housing for fiscal year 2004.

The authorization for family housing includes decreases to operations accounts as a result of savings from housing privatization.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

This section contains the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2004. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2202)

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2004. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)

This section would authorize improvements to existing Navy and Marine Corps family housing units for fiscal year 2004.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Navy's military construction and family housing budget for fiscal year 2004. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

Termination of authority to carry out a certain fiscal year 2003 project (sec. 2205)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2201 and 2204 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314) to rescind a project authorization of $14.7 million for a dining facility at Keflavik, Iceland.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

Summary

The Air Force requested authorization of appropriations of $772.8 million for military construction and $1,530.1 million for family housing for fiscal year 2004. This request was amended on May 1, 2003 by the administration due to revised overseas requirements. The Air Force's amended budget request included $830.7 million for FY04 military construction and $1,491.5 million for FY04 family housing.

The committee recommends authorization of $1,035.5 million for military construction and $1,469.8 million for family housing for fiscal year 2004.

The authorization for family housing includes decreases to operations accounts as a result of savings from housing privatization and a decrease to the housing construction improvement account based on the Department of Defense's amended budget request, which deleted a project to improve family housing at Spangdahlem, Germany for $21.1 million.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

This section contains the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2004. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2302)

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2004. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)

This section would authorize improvements to existing Air Force family housing units for fiscal year 2004.

Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Air Force's budget for fiscal year 2004. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

Modification of fiscal year 2003 authority relating to improvement of military family housing units (sec. 2305)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2301 and 2304 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314) to decrease authorization for the family housing construction world-wide unspecified account by $19.3 million for a housing improvement project at Spangdahlem, Germany.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

Summary

The defense agencies requested authorization of appropriations of $597.2 million for military construction and $49.8 million for family housing for fiscal year 2004. This request was amended on May 1, 2003 by the administration due to revised overseas requirements. The defense agencies amended budget request included $623.7 million for FY04 military construction. The defense agencies budget request for FY04 family housing did not change.

The committee recommends authorization of $733.9 million for military construction and $49.8 million for family housing in fiscal year 2004.

The committee supports the decision of the Department to request funding for the Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction program in a defense-wide account. However, military construction projects supporting the demilitarization program have in past years been authorized in Division B to maintain consistent oversight of construction activities. Therefore, the committee recommends a transfer of $119.8 million from the Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction Program in Title III to Title XXIV and the authorization of appropriations necessary to continue chemical agent and munitions destruction program military construction projects at three locations.

Authorized defense agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

This section contains the list of authorized defense agency construction projects for fiscal year 2004. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2402)

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2004. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2403)

This provision would authorize improvements to existing defense agency family housing units for fiscal year 2004.

Energy conservation projects (sec. 2404)

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Authorization of appropriations, defense agencies (sec. 2405)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each defense agency military construction program for fiscal year 2004. This provision also would provide an overall limit on the amount that may be spent on such military construction projects.

Termination of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2003 projects (sec. 2406)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2401 and 2404 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314) to rescind project authority from one installation in Germany, resulting in a total decrease of $997,000.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2003 projects (sec. 2407)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2101 and 2104 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314) to transfer project authority for a Department of Defense Dependents Schools from Seoul, Korea, to Camp Humphreys, Korea.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriation of $169.3 million for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends an authorization of appropriations of $169.3 million for fiscal year 2004.

Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

This provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)

This provision would authorize appropriations of $169.3 million for the United States' contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2004.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested a military construction authorization of appropriation of $369.5 million for fiscal year 2004 for National Guard and Reserve facilities. The committee recommends authorizations of appropriations for fiscal year 2004 of 657.6 million to be distributed as follows:

	Millions
Army National Guard	$276.8
Air National Guard	208.5
Army Reserve	74.5
Air Force Reserve	53.9
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	34.1
Total	647.8

Authorized Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

This provision would authorize appropriations for military construction for the National Guard and Reserve by service components for fiscal year 2004. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2701)

This provision would provide that authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and National Guard and Reserve military construction projects would expire on October 1, 2006, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2007, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for projects for which appropriated funds have been obligated before the later of October 1, 2006, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funding for military construction for fiscal year 2007.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2001 projects (sec. 2702)

This section would extend the authorizations for certain fiscal year 2001 military construction projects until October 1, 2004, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2005, whichever is later.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2000 projects (sec. 2703)

This provision would extend the authorizations for certain fiscal year 2000 military construction projects until October 1, 2004, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2005, whichever is later.

Effective date (sec. 2704)

This provision would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, and XXVI of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2003, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

Modification of general definitions relating to military construction (sec. 2801)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2801 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify definitions for military construction and military installations. Under this provision, military construction would include any temporary or permanent construction, development, conversion, or extension of any kind carried out with respect to a military installation. The scope and duration of the operational requirement necessitating military construction does not affect the definition. This provision would also clarify the definition of military installations.

The committee believes that these clarifications are necessary to respond to interpretations by the Department of Defense that current statutes allow military construction projects over $750,000 to be funded from operations and maintenance accounts without specific authorization or notification to Congress if:

(1) the military construction project meets an urgent military operational requirement of a temporary nature;

(2) the construction will not be carried out at a military installation as previously defined under section 2801 of title 10, United States Code, or at a location where the United States is reasonably expected to have a long-term interest or presence;

(3) the United States has no intent to use the construction after the operational requirement has been satisfied; and

(4) the nature of the construction is the minimum necessary to meet the temporary operational need.

The committee is aware of, and fully supports, operational flexibility and the ability of commanders to satisfy urgent requirements in support of contingency operations. Existing authorizations exist specifically to facilitate these activities without prior notification to Congress. If these authorizations do not provide the necessary flexibility, the Department should seek to amend existing law.

For military construction carried out in fiscal years 2002 and 2003 under the Department's interpretation to support contingency operations, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a report by December 30, 2003 to the congressional defense committees with detailed information on each project executed under the aforementioned interpretations. The report shall include the country, project title, amount, date awarded, fund source, and a brief justification of the requirement.

Increase in number of family housing units in Italy authorized for lease by the Navy (sec. 2802)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2828(e) of title 10, United States Code, to increase, from 2,000 to 2,800, the number of family housing units the Secretary of the Navy may lease in Italy for which the maximum annual lease cost per unit is $25,000.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, as executive agent for housing in Italy, to coordinate with the Commander, United States European Command, to ensure that total housing requirements meet the Department's force protection guidelines and support overseas force structure and basing plans.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Increase in threshold for reports to Congress on real property transactions (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, by raising from $500,000 to $750,000 the threshold in real property transactions which requires notification to the congressional defense committees.

Acceptance of in-kind consideration for easements (sec. 2812)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2668 and section 2669 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the secretaries of the military departments to accept in-kind payments in connection with modification of existing and the granting of new easements for rights-of-way and utilities. This provision would implement the same processes for the acceptance of in-kind considerations, as directed in section 2667, subsection (c) of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to the lease of property.

Expansion to military unaccompanied housing of authority to transfer property at military installations to be closed in exchange for military housing (sec. 2813)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2905 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–501; section 2687 of title 10, United States Code) to expand the authority to allow for the transfer of property in exchange for unaccompanied housing. Current law authorizes the secretaries of the military departments to transfer property at a military installation, closed or pending closure, in exchange for military family housing at other installations not closed or pending closure.

This provision would grant the same authority to military unaccompanied housing thereby accelerating initiatives to improve the conditions and to correct the shortage of unaccompanied housing units.

Exemption from screening and use requirements under McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act for Department of Defense property in emergency support of homeland security (sec. 2814)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 11411 of title 42, United States Code, to provide an exemption for Department of Defense property from the requirement to screen excess or surplus property for other uses when the Secretary of Defense determines that such DOD property should be made available for use by a State or local government or private entity on a temporary basis to support homeland security. Private entities are limited to non-profit relief organizations and other entities that make a commitment to use the property exclusively for homeland security purposes.

While the committee recognizes the value and benefits of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, this provision is intended to facilitate expedient and effective contingency responses for homeland security activities on a temporary basis. The property should return to its previous legal status when the Secretary of Defense determines the property is no longer needed for homeland security.

Subtitle C—Land Conveyances

Transfer of land at Fort Campbell, Kentucky and Tennessee (sec. 2821)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the State of Tennessee a parcel of real property (right-of-way) for the purpose of realigning and upgrading United States Highway 79 running through Fort Campbell from two lanes to four lanes. In exchange, the Secretary would receive approximately 200 acres of replacement land, resulting in no net loss of real estate or training capability at Fort Campbell. The provision would also authorize the reimbursement by the State of all administration, survey, and other costs incurred by the Secretary into the account from which they originated.

Land conveyance, Fort Knox, Kentucky (sec. 2822)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 93 acres at Fort Knox to the Department of Veterans Affairs of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The purpose of the conveyance would be to establish a state-run cemetery for veterans of the armed forces.

This provision would also direct the Department of Veterans Affairs to reimburse the Army for administrative costs related to the conveyance.

Land conveyance, Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, Georgia (sec. 2823)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey through negotiated sale a parcel of property consisting of approximately 11 acres to the Preferred

Development Group Corporation. The purpose of the conveyance would be for economic development.

This provision would also authorize the Secretary of the Navy to receive reimbursement for costs incurred by surveys, administration and other activities to be deposited into base closure accounts for use in accordance with section 2905 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990.

Land conveyance, Army and Air Force Exchange Service property, Dallas, Texas (sec. 2824)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) to sell property at 1515 Roundtable Drive, Dallas, Texas and to retain the funds within AAFES-controlled accounts. This property was purchased with nonappropriated funds derived from AAFES operations. AAFES funds are generated from sales of goods and services to military members and expended to support the morale, welfare, and recreation of military members. Proceeds from the sale of the property should continue to benefit military members. This provision would also exempt this land disposal from the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.

Subtitle D—Review of Overseas Military Facility and Range Structure

Review of overseas military facility structure (secs. 2841–2848)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a commission to conduct a thorough study of matters related to U.S. military facility structure overseas. The Commission on the Review of the Overseas Military Structure of the United States would consist of nine members, one of whom would be appointed by the Secretary of Defense and eight of whom would be appointed by the congressional leadership. The Commission would be authorized to hold hearings and receive information from federal agencies in order to assess whether the current U.S. overseas basing structure is adequate to execute current missions, and to assess the feasibility of closures, realignments, or establishment of new installations overseas to meet emerging defense requirements. The Commission would not take the place of or preclude in any way the ongoing efforts by the Department of Defense to conduct its own review and to develop a comprehensive and integrated global presence and basing strategy.

The Commission would submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, as well as the Subcommittees on Military Construction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives on August 30, 2004, containing findings, conclusions, and recommendations for legislation and administrative actions, as well as a proposal for an overseas basing strategy to meet current and future requirements.

This provision would also authorize up to $3.0 million from the Department of Defense operations and maintenance account to be

available to the Commission to carry out its specified responsibilities.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)			
Energy Programs			
Energy supply	110,473		110,473
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities	6,378,000	79,272	6,457,272
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,340,195		1,340,195
Naval reactors	768,400	20,000	788,400
Office of the administrator	347,980		347,980
Total, National nuclear security administration	**8,834,575**	**99,272**	**8,933,847**
Environmental and other defense activities:			
Defense environmental restoration & waste management			
Defense site acceleration completion	5,814,635		5,814,635
Defense environmental services	995,179		995,179
Other defense activities	494,331	-29,272	465,059
Defense nuclear waste disposal	430,000	-70,000	360,000
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	**7,734,145**	**-99,272**	**7,634,873**
Defense nuclear facilities safety board	19,559		19,559
Subtotal Department of Energy	**16,698,752**		**16,698,752**
Cerro Grande fire activities (Use of prior years balances)	-75,000		-75,000
Total Department of Energy	**16,623,752**		**16,623,752**

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Energy Supply			
Nuclear Energy			
Infrastructure			
Idaho facilities management			
INEEL infrastructure			
INEEL infrastructure O&M (050)	21,415		21,415
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security (050)	56,654		56,654
Total, Infrastructure	**78,069**		**78,069**
Program direction (050)	35,407		35,407
Subtotal Nuclear Energy	**113,476**		**113,476**
Less security charge for reimbursable work (NE) (050)	-3,003		-3,003
Total, Energy Supply	**110,473**		**110,473**
National Nuclear Security Administration			
Weapons Activities			
Directed stockpile work			
Stockpile research and development	433,150		433,150
Stockpile maintenance	405,746		405,746
Stockpile evaluation	202,885		202,885
Dismantlement/disposal	37,722		37,722
Production support	278,113		278,113
Field engineering, training and manuals	7,170		7,170
Total, Directed stockpile work	**1,364,786**		**1,364,786**

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Campaigns			
Science campaigns			
Primary certification	65,849		65,849
Dynamic materials properties	82,251		82,251
Advanced radiography			
Operations and maintenance	65,985		65,985
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins	55,463		55,463
Total, Science campaigns	**269,548**		**269,548**
Engineering campaigns			
Enhanced surety	37,974		37,974
Weapons system engineering certification	28,238		28,238
Nuclear survivability	23,977		23,977
Enhanced surveillance	94,781		94,781
Advanced design and production technologies	79,917		79,917
Engineering campaigns construction activities			
Operations and maintenance	4,500		4,500
Construction:			
01-D-108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	61,800		61,800
Total, Engineering campaigns constr activities	**66,300**		**66,300**
Total, Engineering campaigns	**331,187**		**331,187**

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign campaign			
Operations and maintenance	316,769		316,769
Construction:			
96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF), LLNL, Livermore, CA	150,000		150,000
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**466,769**		**466,769**
Advanced simulation and computing campaign			
Operations and maintenance	713,326		713,326
Construction:			
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	12,300		12,300
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	25,000		25,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM			
Total, Construction	**37,300**		**37,300**
Total, Advanced simulation and computing campaign	**750,626**		**750,626**
Pit manufacturing and certification campaign	320,228		320,228

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Readiness campaigns			
Stockpile readiness	55,158		55,158
High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness	29,649		29,649
Non-nuclear readiness	37,397		37,397
Materials readiness			
Tritium readiness			
Operations and maintenance	59,893		59,893
Construction:			
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	75,000		75,000
98-D-126 Accelerator production of tritium (APT), various locations			
Total, Construction	**75,000**		**75,000**
Total, Tritium readiness	**134,893**		**134,893**
Total, Readiness campaigns	**257,097**		**257,097**
Total, Campaigns	**2,395,455**		**2,395,455**
Readiness in technical base and facilities			
Operations of facilities	972,773	79,272	1,052,045
Program readiness	131,093		131,093
Special projects	42,975		42,975
Material recycle and recovery	76,189		76,189
Containers	16,006		16,006
Storage	11,365		11,365

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Nuclear weapons incident response	89,694		89,694
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,340,095**	**79,272**	**1,419,367**
Construction:			
04-D-101 Test capabilities revitalization, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	36,450		36,450
04-D-102 Exterior communications infrastructure modernization, Sandia National Laboratories Albuquerque, NM	20,000		20,000
04-D-103 Project engineering and design, (PED) various locations	2,000		2,000
04-D-104 National security sciences building Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	50,000	-50,000	
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	20,500		20,500
04-D-126 Building 12-44 production cells upgrade, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	8,780		8,780

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
04-D-127 Cleaning and loading modifications Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	2,750		2,750
04-D-128 TA-18 Mission relocation project Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	8,820		8,820
03-D-101 Sandia underground reactor facility Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM			
03-D-102 SM-43 Replacement, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Albuquerque, NM		50,000	50,000
03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	10,570		10,570
03-D-121 Gas transfer capacity expansion, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO	15,300		15,300
03-D-122 Purification facility, Y-12 plant Oak Ridge, TN			
03-D-123 Special nuclear materials component requalification facility, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	7,628		7,628

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
02-D-103 Project engineering and design, various locations	10,950		10,950
02-D-105 Engineering technology complex upgrade (ETCU), LLNL, Livermore, CA	9,776		9,776
02-D-107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, Nevada Test Site	2,887		2,887
01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	1,600		1,600
01-D-107 Atlas relocation and operations Nevada Test Site, NV			
01-D-108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM			
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	45,000		45,000
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	2,838		2,838

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL, CA			
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA			
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	3,500		3,500
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM			
99-D-125 Replace boilers & controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO			
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	12,475		12,475
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX			

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River site, SC			
98-D-124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y-12 plant Oak Ridge, TN			
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO			
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	1,552		1,552
90-D-124 High explosive synthesis facility, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX			
88-D-125 HE machining facility, PX			
Total, Construction	**273,376**		**273,376**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,613,471**	**79,272**	**1,692,743**
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program			
Operation and maintenance	261,404		261,404

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Construction			
04-D-203 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering design (PED), various locations	3,719		3,719
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	**265,123**		**265,123**
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	123,605		123,605
Program direction	58,795		58,795
Total, Secure transportation asset	**182,400**		**182,400**
Safeguards and security			
Operations and maintenance	582,067		582,067
Construction:			
99-D-132 Nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	3,683		3,683
Total, Safeguards and security	**585,750**		**585,750**
Subtotal, Weapons Activities	**6,406,985**	**79,272**	**6,486,257**

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Adjustments			
Use of prior year balances			
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-28,985		-28,985
Total, Adjustments	**-28,985**		**-28,985**
Total, Weapons Activities	**6,378,000**	**79,272**	**6,457,272**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operation and maintenance	203,873		203,873
Construction:			
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL			
Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D	**203,873**		**203,873**
Nonproliferation and international security	101,734		101,734
Nonproliferation programs with Russia			
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	226,000		226,000
Russian transition initiatives	40,000		40,000
HEU transparency implementation	18,000		18,000
International nuclear safety and cooperation	14,083		14,083
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	50,000		50,000
Accelerated materials disposition	30,000		30,000
Fissile materials disposition			
U S surplus materials disposition	193,805		193,805

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Russian surplus materials disposition	47,100		47,100
Construction:			
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC			
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	13,600		13,600
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	402,000		402,000
Total, Construction	**415,600**		**415,600**
Program direction			
Total, Fissile materials disposition	**656,505**		**656,505**
Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia	**1,034,588**		**1,034,588**
Return of domestic sealed sources			
Program direction			
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,340,195**		**1,340,195**
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances			
International renewable energy program			
Total, Adjustments			
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,340,195**		**1,340,195**

Naval Reactors

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance	724,600	20,000	744,600
Construction:			
03-D-201 Cleanroom technology facility	300		300
01-D-200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY			
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	18,300		18,300
Total, Construction	**18,600**		**18,600**
Total, Naval reactors development	**743,200**	**20,000**	**763,200**
Program direction	25,200		25,200
Total, Naval Reactors	**768,400**	**20,000**	**788,400**
Office Of The Administrator			
Office of the administrator	347,980		347,980
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	**8,834,575**	**99,272**	**8,933,847**

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management			
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance.....			
Construction:			
03-D-414 Preliminary project engineering and design various locations.....			
02-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID.....			
02-D-420 Plutonium packaging and stabilization, Savannah River, SC.....			
01-D-414 Preliminary project, engineering and design (PE&D), various locations.....			
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC.....			

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEL, ID			
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA			
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC			
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC			
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA			
Total, Construction			
Total, Site/project completion			
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance			
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution			
Construction:			
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC			

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Office of river protection			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction:			
03-D-403 Immobilized high-level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA			
01-D-416 Tank waste remediation system, RL			
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA			
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA			
Total, Construction			
Total, Office of river protection			
Total, Post 2006 completion			
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution			
Science and technology			
Excess facilities			
Multi-Site activities			
Safeguards and security			
Program direction			

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Subtotal, Defense environmental restoration and waste management			
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances			
Less security charge for reimbursable work			
Total, Adjustments			
Total, Defense Environmental Restoration And Waste Management			
Defense Site Acceleration Completion *(was Defense Facilities Closure Projects)*			
2006 Accelerated completions	1,245,171		1,245,171
2012 Accelerated Completions			
Operation and maintenance	1,512,554		1,512,554
Construction:			
04-D-414 Project engineering and design, various locations	23,500		23,500
04-D-423 3013 container surveillance capability in 235-F, SR	1,134		1,134
02-D-402 Cathodic protection system expansion, ID	1,126		1,126

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant, RL	690,000		690,000
Total, Construction	**715,760**		**715,760**
Total, 2012 Accelerated Completions	**2,228,314**		**2,228,314**
2035 Accelerated Completions			
Operation and maintenance	1,892,884		1,892,884
Construction:			
04-D-408 Glass waste storage building #2, SR	20,259		20,259
03-D-403 Immobilized HLW interim storage facility, RL	13,954		13,954
03-D-414 Project engineering and design, various locations	51,500		51,500
Total, Construction	**85,713**		**85,713**
Total, 2035 Accelerated Completions	**1,978,597**		**1,978,597**
Safeguards and security	299,977		299,977
Technology development and deployment	63,920		63,920
Site closure			
Safeguards and security			
Subtotal, Defense Site Acceleration Completion	**5,815,979**		**5,815,979**
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-1,344		-1,344

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Total, Defense Site Acceleration Completion	**5,814,635**		**5,814,635**
Defense Environmental Services			
(was Defense Environmental Management Privatization)			
Community and regulatory support	61,337		61,337
Federal contribution to the uranium enrichment	452,000		452,000
Non-closure environmental activities			
Operation and maintenance	189,698		189,698
Program direction	292,144		292,144
Privatization initiatives, various locations			
Subtotal, Defense Environmental Services	**995,179**		**995,179**
Use of prior year balances			
Total, Defense Environmental Services	**995,179**		**995,179**
Total, Defense Environmental Rest & Waste Mgt	**6,809,814**		**6,809,814**
Other Defense Activities			
Energy security and assurance			
Energy security			
Program direction	4,272	-4,272	
Total, Energy security and assurance	**4,272**	**-4,272**	
Office of Security			
Nuclear safeguards and security	104,713		104,713

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Security investigations	54,554		54,554
Program direction	52,490		52,490
Chief information officer			
Corporate management information program			
Total, Office of Security	**211,757**		**211,757**
Intelligence	39,823		39,823
Counterintelligence	45,955		45,955
Advanced accelerator applications			
Independent oversight and performance assurance	22,575		22,575
Environment, safety & health			
Environment, safety and health (defense)	87,276		87,276
Program direction	20,410		20,410
Total, Environment, safety and health	**107,686**		**107,686**
Worker and community transition			
Worker and community transition	12,321		12,321
Program direction	2,679		2,679
Total, Worker and community transition	**15,000**		**15,000**

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Authorized
Office of Legacy Management			
Office of Legacy Management (050)	19,178		19,178
National security programs administrative support	25,000	-25,000	
Office of hearings and appeals	3,797		3,797
Subtotal, Other defense activities	**495,043**	**-29,272**	**465,771**
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances			
Less security charge for reimbursable work (SO)	-712		-712
Total, Adjustments	**-712**		**-712**
Total, Other Defense Activities	**494,331**	**-29,272**	**465,059**
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	430,000	-70,000	360,000
Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	**7,734,145**	**-99,272**	**7,634,873**
Defense nuclear facilities safety board	19,559		19,559
SUBTOTAL ATOMIC ENERGY	**16,698,752**		**16,698,752**
Cerro Grande Fire Activities			
Use of prior year balances	-75,000		-75,000
TOTAL ATOMIC ENERGY	**16,623,752**		**16,623,752**

National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $8.9 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) in fiscal year 2004 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to carry out programs necessary to national security.

Weapons activities

The committee recommends $6.5 billion for weapons activities, a $79.3 million increase above the amount requested for fiscal year 2004. The committee authorized the following activities: $1.4 billion for directed stockpile work; $2.4 billion for campaigns; $1.7 billion for readiness in the technical base, an increase of $79.3 million; $182.4 million for secure transportation assets; $585.8 million for safeguards and security; and $265.1 million for facilities and infrastructure.

Directed stockpile work

The committee recommends $1.4 billion for directed stockpile work, the amount of the budget request. The directed stockpile account supports work directly related to weapons in the stockpile, including day-to-day maintenance as well as research, development, engineering, and certification activities to support planned life extension programs. It also includes fabrication and assembly of weapons components, advanced concepts, weapons dismantlement and disposal, training, and support equipment. This amount includes $21.0 million for advanced concepts of which $15.0 million is authorized to continue the feasibility study on the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator.

Campaigns

The committee recommends $2.4 billion for campaigns, the amount of the budget request. The campaigns focus on science and engineering efforts involving the three weapons laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, and the weapons plants. Each campaign is focused on a specific activity to support and maintain the stockpile without underground nuclear weapons testing. These efforts maintain and enhance the safety, security, and reliability of the existing stockpile. The campaigns are divided into three major categories: science campaigns, readiness campaigns, and engineering campaigns.

The advances in science tools, which make the stockpile stewardship program possible, were discussed in the 2003 Report, Expectations for the U.S. Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship Program, by the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the United States Nuclear Stockpile, also known as the Foster Panel. While the Panel did offer constructive criticism of how the NNSA can make improvements in several areas of the nuclear weapons program, the Panel offered a more favorable view of how development in computational and experimental tools is advancing. The Panel was "* * * encouraged to find that the laboratories are doing a much better job in defining the contributions that these tools can make to directed stockpile work and ongoing warhead refurbishments." Specifically, the Panel found that the laboratories "* * * have made considerable progress in developing more formalized

and systematic methodologies for estimating warhead performance margins."

Readiness in the technical base

The committee recommends $1.7 billion in readiness in the technical base and facilities (RTBF), a $79.3 million increase above the budget request. This account funds facilities and infrastructure in the weapons complex to ensure the operational readiness of the complex and includes construction funding for new facilities.

The $79.3 million increase in RTBF is directed to the Office of Operations of Facilities to limit any additional deferred maintenance. The committee is concerned that RTBF's responsibility to meet current and future maintenance requirements is not receiving the priority and resources required to avoid expanding the enormous maintenance backlogs which developed throughout the decade of the 1990s. There is additional legislation in this Act to address the committee's concerns with the RTBF program.

Secure transportation asset

The committee recommends $182.4 million for the secure transportation asset, the amount of the budget request. The secure transportation asset is responsible for transportation of nuclear weapons, weapons materials and components, and other materials requiring safe and secure transport.

The committee is aware that the demand for secure transportation assets will increase to meet both expanding work within the stockpile life extension program and the accelerated cleanup work in the environmental management program. This places increased demand on existing assets, and highlights the need for additional assets, and the need to hire, train, and deploy additional security personnel. This latter activity takes at least 18 months. At a recent hearing before the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, Dr. Everet Beckner, Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs at the NNSA, testified that NNSA has a plan to deal with these increased demands.

Safeguards and security

The committee recommends $585.8 million for weapons safeguards and security, the amount of the budget request. The weapons safeguards and security account provides funding for all safeguards and security at all the NNSA complex sites.

Facilities and infrastructure

The committee recommends $265.1 million for the facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), the amount of the budget request. The committee has been impressed with the management of FIRP and encourages NNSA to continue to maintain this high level of organization and discipline to revitalize the nation's nuclear weapons complex. There are additional comments on FIRP in this Act as they are related to proposed legislation on RTBF.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program

The committee recommends $1.3 billion for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program, the amount of the budget request. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has management and oversight responsibilities for the nonproliferation programs of the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program. The committee authorized these programs, as follows: $203.8 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development; $101.7 million for nonproliferation and international security; $226.0 million for international nuclear materials protection and cooperation; $40.0 million for Russian transition initiatives; $18.0 million for highly-enriched uranium transparency implementation; $14.0 million for international nuclear safety and cooperation; $50.0 million for elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production; $30.0 million for accelerated materials disposition; and $656.5 million for fissile materials disposition.

The committee notes that the nonproliferation mission of the NNSA is important to U.S. National Security. For this reason, the committee believes it is important that the NNSA improve its management focus to expend its budget in a timely and efficient manner to ensure that the United States receives the promised national security benefit from these programs. In this regard, the committee encourages the NNSA to utilize all capabilities available to facilitate more effective management of these programs, in particular by developing robust information technology systems that can enable the program to better track accomplishments and expenditures.

Naval Reactors

The committee recommends $788.4 million for Naval Reactors, an increase of $20.0 million above the budget request. The $20.0 million increase is for the Naval Reactors Facilities and Operations budget to be used to decommission older facilities.

As the committee looks across the atomic energy activities at the Department of Energy, the one program that consistently performs to a level of excellence is the Naval Reactors program. Naval Reactors has not created a legacy that needs to be cleaned up by Environmental Management. Naval Reactors has not deferred maintenance for decades at a time thereby avoiding enormous maintenance backlogs and emergency recapitalization projects. The Naval Reactors program has always made it a priority to include in their original design and budget planning for a facility plans as to how they will eventually decommission that facility when it is beyond its useful life.

However, the committee is concerned that Naval Reactors has not received adequate consideration in the budget process. When Naval Reactors program sought to accelerate the decommissioning of some facilities, which would have created substantial cost savings, the project did not receive FIRP funding from DOE.

The committee would urge NNSA, including the Office of Operations and Facilities, to study the management and maintenance performance at Naval Reactors. The committee would urge NNSA to raise the bar for maintenance and recapitalization expectations across NNSA to the standard set by Naval Reactors.

Office of Administrator

The committee recommends $348.0 million for program direction for the National Nuclear Security Administration, the amount of the budget request. This account includes program direction funding for all elements of the National Nuclear Security Administration with the exception of the Naval Reactors Program and the Secure Transportation Asset.

Defense environmental management (sec. 3102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $6.8 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) in fiscal year 2004 for environmental management (EM) activities, the amount of the budget request.

Defense site acceleration completion

The budget request included funding for the following activities: $1.2 billion for 2006 accelerated completions; $2.2 billion for 2012 accelerated completions; $2.0 billion for 2035 accelerated completions; $300.0 million for safeguards and security; and $64.0 million for technology development and deployment. The committee recommends $5.8 billion for Defense site acceleration completion, the amount of the budget request.

The committee supports the new budget format for the EM program. When the EM program first began, and for most of its existence, its efforts have been primarily focused on compliance milestones, not cleanup milestones. Under the accelerated cleanup plan, in the same manner as was achieved at Rocky Flats, Mound, and Fernald, EM is reducing risk to the environment, workers and the community, shortening cleanup schedules, and saving tens of billions of dollars across the EM complex. Now all EM sites have a closure date with the last of the cleanup to be completed no later than 2035. This schedule reduces the original time lines for closure by half or more. Many of these gains have been through innovations and new technologies which were developed by EM. However, most of the gains were reached by adding flexibility and incentives into the cleanup contracts. The committee encourages EM to continue looking for ways to advance and accelerate cleanup of our former defense nuclear facilities.

Defense environmental services

The budget request included funding for the following activities: $189.7 million for non-closure environmental activities; $61.3 million for community and regulatory support; $452.0 million for the federal contribution to the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund; and $292.1 million for program direction. The committee recommends $995.2 million for Defense environmental services, the amount of the budget request.

The committee encourages EM to continue to look for ways to reduce as much funding as is possible and practical on defense environmental services so that these resources can, instead, be focused on the defense site accelerated completion activities.

Accelerate completion of 2012 and 2035 closure sites

The committee encourages DOE to use any EM funding, which becomes available due to the closure of Rocky Flats, Fernald, Mound or any other 2006 closure sites, to help accelerate closure of the remaining EM sites. The committee is concerned that there are some officials at DOE who are no longer supporting a policy to roll over savings realized as EM sites are closed, as was originally proposed in 1996 when the first three closure sites were chosen to be closed by 2006. The four remaining, major EM sites—Hanford Site, Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory, Oak Ridge Reservation and Savannah River Site—were ensured that if they stood by while the first three 2006 closures were completed, then the remaining sites could use those savings to accelerate their own closure. By closing Rocky Flats, Fernald, and Mound, there is approximately a combined $1.0 billion per year freed up to accelerate completion of the remaining EM sites.

The budget model used to accelerate closure at Rocky Flats, Mound, and Fernald was to use an increase of funding at the beginning to focus on reducing high risk cleanup tasks first. This model greatly reduced the overhead costs needed to monitor and guard the high risk areas, providing a windfall of funds to accelerate cleanup, and substantially reduce life cycle costs. With an additional $1.0 billion per year available by 2007, following the closure of the first three closure sites, this should provide the momentum needed to substantially accelerate closure of the remaining EM sites.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $465.1 million for the Department of Energy (DOE) other defense activities, $29.3 million below the budget request, as explained below.

Energy Security and Assistance

The budget request included $4.3 million for Energy Security and Assistance. The committee recommends no funds for these activities. These funds are requested for program direction costs for an operational component of this office that was transferred to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in fiscal year 2003. The committee notes that funding for this component should be included in the DHS budget.

Office of Security

The committee recommends $211.8 million for the Office of Security, the amount of the budget request. The committee notes a $27.5 million, or 15 percent, increase for this account compared to the level of funding in fiscal year 2003. However, the committee also notes that the request is still $42.2 million, or 20 percent, below the level of funding in fiscal year 2002.

Intelligence

The committee recommends $39.8 million for intelligence, the amount of the budget request.

Counterintelligence

The committee recommends $46.0 million for counterintelligence, the amount of the budget request. The committee encourages the Office of Counterintelligence to continue to focus on the current and emerging challenges in cyber-security.

Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance

The committee recommends $22.6 million for the Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance, the amount of the budget request.

Environment safety and health

The committee recommends $107.7 million for environment, safety and health, the amount of the budget request.

Worker and community transition

The committee recommends $15.0 million for worker and community transition, the amount of the budget request.

National nuclear security administrative support

The budget request included $25.0 million for national security programs administrative support. The committee recommends no funds for this purpose. The committee notes that the NNSA program direction adequately supports NNSA.

Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $360.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, $70.0 million below the budget request, but $47.0 million above the fiscal year 2003 appropriated level. The committee is concerned about whether the defense nuclear waste disposal program could absorb the entire budget request level of $430.0 million in fiscal year 2004, which is a $112.0 million increase over the fiscal year 2003 appropriated level. However, there is no intention by this reduction to delay or otherwise impact the opening of Yucca Mountain.

Defense energy supply (sec. 3105)

The committee recommends $110.5 million, the amount of the fiscal year 2004 request, for defense energy supply.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Repeal of prohibition on research and development of low-yield nuclear weapons (sec. 3131)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 3136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 and thereby end the prohibition on research and development of low-yield nuclear weapons. This provision would also state that nothing in the provision should be construed as authorizing the testing, acquisition or deployment of a low-yield nuclear weapon.

The committee notes the recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces by Ambassador Linton Brooks, the Acting-Administrator of the NNSA, in which he discussed the rea-

sons for the administration's request to repeal the ban on low-yield nuclear weapon research. According to Ambassador Brooks, "Repeal of the restriction simply removes the chilling effect on scientific inquiry that could hamper our ability to maintain and exercise our intellectual capabilities and to respond to needs that one day might be articulated by the President." Ambassador Brooks further testified, "We are, in examining these concepts, seeking to free ourselves from intellectual prohibitions against exploring the full range of technical options to meet potential future needs just because some options might imply a hypothetical weapon with a yield below an arbitrary value." Ambassador Brooks clarified that the repeal of low-yield research restrictions "* * * falls far short of committing the United States to developing, producing, or deploying new, low-yield warheads." Finally, Ambassador Brooks stressed that "* * * such warhead concepts could not proceed to full-scale development, much less production and deployment, unless Congress authorizes and appropriates the funds required to do this."

The committee also refers to a recently released report, Expectations for the U.S. Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship Program, by the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the United States Nuclear Stockpile, also known as the Foster Panel. In this report, the Panel found the "* * * proscription on [research and development] casts doubt on the permissibility of important areas of research, and perpetuates troubling gaps in our knowledge. The Executive Branch and Congress should continue to discharge their responsibilities by exercising control over Phase III (and Phase 6.3) decisions for commencing full-scale development, and at subsequent decision points. This permits necessary oversight and control without hamstringing the laboratories' ability to perform needed intellectual work in the interests of national security."

The committee encourages the NNSA to challenge their scientists and engineers to think, explore, discover, and innovate. By removing the prohibition on research and development of low-yield nuclear weapons, our experts will expand their own understanding and capabilities, without artificial restrictions. Broader U.S. defense capabilities increase the credibility of deterrence.

Readiness posture for resumption by the United States of underground nuclear weapons tests (sec. 3132)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to achieve, and thereafter maintain, a readiness posture of 18 months for resumption by the United States of underground nuclear tests. The Secretary of Energy should achieve this readiness posture by October 1, 2006. If through the review conducted to comply with section 3142(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, the Secretary determines that a different readiness posture is feasible and advisable, then the Secretary should achieve, and thereafter maintain, that optimal test readiness posture.

The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report if the Secretary determines a different readiness posture is feasible and advisable. Included in this report, the Secretary shall state the new readiness posture and explain reasons for the Secretary's determination.

Nothing in this provision shall affect the reporting requirements included in section 3142(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003.

In the 2003 report entitled Expectations for the U.S. Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship Program by the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the United States Nuclear Stockpile (more commonly known as the Foster Panel), the Panel reflected back to the 2001 report which "* * * emphasized the need for significant improvements in test readiness." The Panel recommended a readiness posture of "three months to a year." In the 2003 report, the Panel "expressed concern that the "NNSA's planning assumptions for test readiness are overly conservative, and consequently exceptionally long preparation times become a self-fulfilling prophecy." To shorten their test readiness posture, "[t]he Panel recommends that the NNSA and DOD coordinate through the Nuclear Weapons Council on a few specific steps to create a useful test-readiness posture." The Panel provided several specific steps, including identifying the tests that are most likely to be needed, preparing the appropriate test articles and instrumentation, and deploying long-lead items to the Nevada Test Site (NTS). The Panel also focused on the benefits for test readiness served by sub-critical experiments in a vertical hole at the NTS. The Panel asserted, "[t]o sustain high confidence in test readiness, it is important to have a regularly scheduled series of high fidelity sub-critical tests." The committee would encourage the NNSA to embrace these views and recommendations offered by the Foster Panel.

Technical base and facilities maintenance and recapitalization activities (sec. 3133)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to add discipline and criteria to the operations and facilities program within the readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF) program. The committee is concerned that the maintenance and repair backlogs, which have plagued the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) complex for over a decade and that led to the need to establish the facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), have not yet been corrected.

Since the creation of FIRP in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, funding to eliminate the backlog of deferred maintenance across the NNSA complex has totaled $437.0 million for the last two years, and $265.0 million is requested for fiscal year 2004. However, the budget requests for the operations of facilities program, which is responsible for current and future maintenance needs, are barely keeping pace with inflation, and the fiscal year 2004 budget request is almost $50.0 million below the fiscal year 2003 appropriation. This funding level will only continue to add to the amount of deferred maintenance, which will result in FIRP never reaching its primary mission, the elimination of the maintenance backlog in ten years.

Although the committee is concerned that NNSA is not requesting adequate funding for operations and facilities within RTBF to stem the tide of deferred maintenance, it is also the committee's view that other systemic problems need to be addressed. This pro-

vision would require the Administrator of NNSA to complete the selection of FIRP projects by September 30, 2004. No additional projects could be added to FIRP after that time.

The FIRP program was originally envisioned and introduced to Congress as a ten-year program with a narrow and specific goal of eliminating the enormous maintenance backlog, which had accumulated over many years. Accordingly, this provision would sunset the FIRP program on September 30, 2011, at the end of the FIRP's tenth year. By including this provision, the committee intends to send a clear signal to NNSA that FIRP is only a temporary fix to the maintenance backlogs and NNSA must plan to meet current and future maintenance requirements in the ordinary course of business.

The committee is concerned that the current facilities and operations program is so intertwined in the larger RTBF program that it does not receive the priority or oversight it requires. The committee believes NNSA should set up a program similar to FIRP to address current and future maintenance needs. This provision would include several requirements to ensure NNSA moves toward this type of disciplined structure.

This provision would require the Administrator to set up the operations and facilities program as a separate program, independent of the RTBF. The operations and facilities program would be managed by the Associate Administrator for Facilities and Operations or another official within NNSA in a manner similar to the way FIRP is set up and managed.

Additionally, the provision would require the Administrator to submit a report to the congressional defense committees setting forth guidelines on how NNSA's current and future maintenance needs shall be met, including the types of criteria to be used. The goal of the guidelines included in the report should be to ensure NNSA avoids maintenance backlogs.

The committee was apprehensive about authorizing such large increases to NNSA when the FIRP program began. The concerns were that at the end of the ten year period, NNSA would have spent billions of dollars without revitalizing their infrastructure. It was clear to the committee then and remains clear today that the only way to ensure the infrastructure will be revitalized and the maintenance backlog eliminated is with dedication and discipline.

Continuation of processing, treatment, and disposition of legacy nuclear materials (sec. 3134)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 to prohibit the Department of Energy (DOE), from beginning to decommission the F Canyon facility at the Savannah River Site (SRS) until the Secretary of Energy and the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB) jointly submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth an assessment whether or not all materials present in the F Canyon are safely stabilized and future needs for fissile materials disposition can be met through H Canyon. Section 3137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year

2001 is amended by deleting the requirement that F Canyon be maintained in a high state of readiness.

The committee believes there is no compelling future mission for F Canyon. All material remaining in the F Canyon facility has been or soon will be safely stabilized. All additional fissile materials that must be processed through a canyon for stabilization or disposition purposes can be processed in the newer and more flexible H Canyon facility at SRS. Furthermore, maintaining F Canyon in a high state of readiness would require the expenditure of significant funds for surveillance and maintenance, which, in the absence of any need for F Canyon, could better be applied to other important risk reduction and cleanup activities.

The Department and the DNFSB both agree the H Canyon can safely process all the material that remains in the F Canyon or that the materials can be safely disposed of in another manner. The Department and the DNFSB also both agree that there is no programmatic requirement for maintaining the F Canyon.

The provision would eliminate the DNFSB certification requirement, and would require the DOE to submit a report to the congressional defense committees and the DNFSB before commencing the decommissioning of F Canyon. The provision would retain the requirement that H Canyon be maintained in a high state of readiness. This change would ensure the availability of H Canyon for any future canyon processing needs.

Subtitle C—Proliferation Matters

Expansion of International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting Program (sec. 3141)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Energy to conduct nuclear nonproliferation threat reduction activities and projects outside the states of the former Soviet Union for the International Materials, Protection, Control, and Accounting Program. The Secretary of Energy would be required to notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives 15 days prior to obligating funds for activities in or with respect to countries outside the Former Soviet Union. The notification would include the amount to be obligated, specific details of the project, and any other federal agencies or private sector entities that may be involved.

While the committee supports the expansion of the geographic scope of this Program and expects that all expansion projects and activities will be detailed in the annual report, the committee believes that the original intent behind the creation of the Program must remain intact. Because the original mission of the International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting Program is far from complete, the committee urges the Department to undertake any geographic expansion judiciously to avoid diverting the necessary funds and program focus away from completing the Program's original mission of securing and accounting for weapons usable nuclear materials in the Former Soviet Union.

Semi-annual financial reports on Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program (sec. 3142)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide semi-annual financial reports to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives for the Department of Energy (DOE) Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program. The reports are due to the committees 30 calendar days after the end of each half of the fiscal year, beginning in fiscal year 2004. The first report would be due April 30, 2004, and would cover the first six months of fiscal year 2004.

The committee believes that the DOE Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program should provide greater transparency regarding the financial management of the Program to improve congressional oversight. Because of the committee's concern over uncosted, or unexpended, balances for this important nonproliferation program, the committee believes semi-annual financial reporting will assist the committee with tracking program expenditures to ensure that the national security benefit proposed by this nonproliferation program can be realized. This information facilitates committee monitoring of the expenditure of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program funds. Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide semi-annual financial reports detailing the total obligation authority per program, the amounts obligated, unobligated, committed to contracts, and disbursed.

Report on reduction of excessive uncosted balances for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities (sec. 3143)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives with a plan to reduce the amount of uncosted, or unexpended, balances for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program if, at the end of fiscal year 2004, the Program's uncosted balances exceed 20 percent. This plan would be due not later than November 30, 2004. The purpose of the plan would be to provide the committees with the Department of Energy's (DOE) strategic approach to addressing the low expenditures of defense nuclear nonproliferation funds from current and previous fiscal years.

The committee believes the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program should strive to attain the DOE-wide average of 15 percent uncosted, or unspent levels, per fiscal year. Currently, the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program is averaging uncosted balances of nearly 50 percent of the Program's total appropriated budget. In some instances, such as the Russian Transition Initiatives Program, these balances exceed 70 percent. According to the Department, these levels are higher than the Program's historical average of 30 percent due to the additional funds the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program received in the fiscal year 2002 emergency supplemental, and the Program's inability to absorb these additional funds in a timely manner. The committee believes these circumstances will be replicated again, as a result of the fiscal year 2003 emergency supplemental, and the Program will have the same uncosted balances situation in the current fiscal year.

The committee believes the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program must address these expenditure challenges immediately. Therefore, the committee directs program management to adopt a more aggressive, focused approach to expending these funds without sacrificing accountability, management, and oversight. The committee urges the Department to consider innovative methods in developing and implementing such an approach and to take action immediately.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Modification of authorities on Department of Energy personnel security investigations (sec. 3151)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 145 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide the Secretary of Energy the authority to refer security investigations to either the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) or the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). Current law requires the FBI to investigate all initial personnel security investigations and all reinvestigations for DOE federal and contractor employees assigned to a DOE Special Access Program (SAP) or a Personnel Security and Assurance Program.

Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, the DOE increased its security needs at the same time the FBI faced significantly increased demands on its resources. The result has been significant delays in completing security investigations needed by DOE to accomplish its mission in a timely fashion.

This provision would allow the Secretary of Energy to chose either the FBI or the OPM to conduct the investigations. The committee notes that the FBI and the OPM both use contractor personnel to perform their security investigations, and often they use the same contractors. They both conduct their investigations in a similar manner and scope.

The committee recommends that the Secretary, in exercising his discretion, choose those personnel with access to highly classified materials to be investigated by the FBI for their initial security clearances or, if those personnel already have their security clearance, any subsequent five-year or periodic re-investigations. The committee recommends the Secretary set forth a policy clearly identifying which investigations should be conducted by the FBI.

The committee is also concerned that some security breaches could have been prevented if there had been more coordination between the FBI and other security agencies, including the Central Intelligence Agency. The committee encourages the Department to look for more ways to cross check their security information against other agencies as an added security tool, where appropriate.

Responsibilities of Environmental Management program and National Nuclear Security Administration of Department of Energy for environmental cleanup, decontamination and decommissioning, and waste management (sec. 3152)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to establish a policy to clarify the shared or

overlapping responsibilities between the environmental management (EM) program and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The types of roles and responsibilities that need clarification include environmental cleanup, decontamination and decommissioning, and waste management. In each of these cleanup categories policy questions remain whether EM will retain these tasks permanently, or whether EM will only complete cleanup work they are currently assigned and then whether EM—as a Department of Energy program—would thereafter cease to exist. In this latter approach, NNSA would then be assigned these responsibilities as part of their operations and budget decisions.

When asked about the advantages of making NNSA responsible for its own cleanup, Jessie Roberson, the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, recently compared the benefits to those found by industry. Before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, Ms. Roberson testified, "In industry the view is normally that if a generator has to make cost-benefit decisions, then they are likely to generate less to be more aggressive about pollution prevention. In the past, EM and NNSA have been very intertwined at these sites, but I believe that there is a benefit to tying pollution prevention principles to the generation of materials directly." While Ms. Roberson's view is compelling, an alternative view may be that the EM program already has the cleanup expertise and should continue to conduct the cleanup activities for the NNSA complex.

The committee is concerned that there is confusion about DOE's policy, now and for the future. Clarification is needed. Accordingly, this provision would require the Secretary to include a report declaring DOE's policy on these matters. The report should be submitted with the administration's budget request for fiscal year 2005.

The provision would also require the Secretary of Energy, to prepare a plan to implement the new policy, including any recommendations for legislation to help delineate responsibilities between EM and NNSA. The plan would be presented with the administration's budget request for fiscal year 2006.

Update of report on stockpile stewardship criteria (sec. 3153)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 1, 2005, on clear and specific criteria for judging whether the science-based tools being used by the Department of Energy for determining the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile are performing in a manner that will provide an adequate degree of certainty that the stockpile is safe and reliable. This is an update of the report required in section 3158 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

The report required by this provision was recommended in the 2003 report by the Foster Panel—the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the United States Nuclear Stockpile—entitled Expectations for the U.S. Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship Program. The Panel also recommended that the report include a list of new tools to be deployed within the production facilities.

Additionally, the Panel recommended that for each tool, the "* * * report should identify critical contributions for stockpile stewardship and how the tool is to be validated." All of these Panel recommendations have been included in this provision.

Progress reports on energy employees occupational illness compensation program (sec. 3154)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Government Affairs, and the Committee on Health Education, Labor and Pensions in the Senate, and the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Education and the Workforce in the House of Representatives, on the ability of NIOSH to obtain, in a timely, accurate, and complete manner, information necessary for the purpose of carrying out radiation dose reconstructions under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA). The report should be submitted within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

Subtitle E—Consolidation of General Provisions on Department of Energy National Security Programs

Consolidation and assembly of recurring and general provisions on Department of Energy national security programs (sec. 3161)

The committee recommends a provision that would combine recurring and general provisions on Department of Energy (DOE) national security programs with a goal of consolidating and organizing these provisions into a single Act intended to comprise the principal Act of the recurring and general provisions on these programs. The committee has taken great care to ensure that this effort would not make any substantive changes to the existing laws. The provision includes technical and conforming amendments of a non-substantive nature.

Budget Items

Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development Program

The budget request included $203.8 million for the Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development Program. The committee supports the vital technologies developed by this Program to detect and deter weapons of mass destruction proliferation and to monitor nuclear explosions world-wide. The committee believes that one of the key missions of this Program should be to identify new technologies that can support the Department of Energy's ongoing nonproliferation programs and the Department of Defense's Cooperative Threat Reduction Program activities. In this regard, the committee encourages the Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development Program to use up to $2.0 million of the funds available to accelerate a technology that will identify the isotopic and chemical signatures of concealed materials located inside containers or storage sites.

Items of Special Interest

Academic evaluation of environmental management accelerated cleanup technologies

The committee notes that the environmental management program technology development and deployment program provides technical solutions and alternative technologies to assist with the accelerated cleanup of the Department of Energy (DOE) complex. Key to this success is moving the technologies that have been developed into the field where they can be fully utilized to accelerate cleanup. DOE also seeks to adapt existing technologies for application in DOE cleanup plans. DOE is constantly looking at alternative cleanup options to reduce costs and to accelerate cleanup. In carrying out these technology transfer activities DOE has successfully relied on the academic community to help develop fundamental data needed to evaluate new remediation and treatment technologies. The academic community has provided unbiased recognized technical experts to assist DOE in evaluating new technologies, resolving technical issues and working with regulators and stakeholders to ensure that the new technologies are accepted and incorporated into the cleanup plans as quickly as possible. The committee urges the Secretary of Energy to continue these beneficial relations with the academic community.

Consolidation of the Office of Worker and Community Transition and the Office of Legacy Management

The committee supports the establishment of the Office of Legacy Management as proposed by the Department of Energy's (DOE) budget request for fiscal year 2004. The Office of Legacy Management (LM) will be responsible for assuming long-term environmental stewardship responsibilities after the cleanup work by Environmental Management (EM) is complete. Additionally, LM will be responsible for ensuring the EM workforce has quick and easy access to their records, and to their pension and medical benefits.

The committee recommends that the Secretary merge the Office of Worker and Community Transition, and its responsibilities as set out in Section 3161 of the Defense Authorization Act of 1993, into the Office of Legacy Management. The functions of the Office of Worker and Community Transition include, but are not limited to, mitigating the impacts of changing conditions on the workers and communities affected by departmental mission changes.

The end of the Cold War brought fundamental changes to the DOE's mission. The Department has shifted from nuclear weapons production to other missions, such as environmental management and the eventual cleanup and closure of sites. The committee notes that by consolidating the workforce and community functions of the Office of Worker and Community Transition in the Office of Legacy Management, one dedicated office, the Department will achieve significant efficiencies and protect the workforce.

Mr. Mike Owens, Director of the Office of Worker and Community Transition, and designated to become the Director of the Office of Legacy Management, testified before the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. Mr. Owens said, "[c]learly many of the things that the Worker and Community Transition Office is doing is a very natural

glove fit to have it run by the same Office of Legacy Management. They are out there dealing with local communities, which will be a big responsibility of Legacy Management. They take the worker up to that last split second when he goes off the payroll and Legacy Management picks him up and carries him on through retirement. So it seems very logical that the two offices be merged together."

Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program

The facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP) was originally created in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 to address a backlog of deferred maintenance across the facilities and infrastructure which supports the Defense Programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The original provision required NNSA to create firm criteria against which projects would be judged and priorities established. The chosen projects were to place a high priority on worker and community health and safety, compliance with environmental requirements, safeguards and security requirements, and ensure the mission of defense programs is maintained on a timely basis. The original provision also included a mechanism for sites to have their priorities integrated into a complex wide priority projects list. The priority projects were to be based on their individual merits, not any requirement for an equitable distribution of the funds by site. Finally, the committee expressed their support for NNSA efforts to address the maintenance backlog at NNSA sites, and directed NNSA to plan and budget adequately in the future for maintenance. NNSA was to ensure that maintenance costs were included in their five year budget plan for new construction, and that all new construction was planned to include funds to tear down the facilities they are replacing.

The committee believes that the NNSA successfully set up the FIRP program as envisioned in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002. The FIRP program has adopted criteria with discipline and a vision for eliminating the deferred maintenance backlog. The management of the FIRP program has received some criticism from NNSA facilities that FIRP imposes too much discipline and a lack of flexibility. The committee asserts that it was a lack of discipline and too much flexibility which created the maintenance backlog in the first place. The committee encourages NNSA and the facilities to work to ensure that the current and future maintenance in the readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF) program receive as much priority and discipline as FIRP. RTBF is still deferring maintenance, adding scope to the FIRP program, and placing success of the FIRP program at risk.

Need for an enhanced schedule for the modern pit facility

The committee urges that the Department of Energy (DOE) to evaluate options for the acceleration of modern pit facility (MPF) design and construction. Considerations for a modern pit facility should include consolidation of design and environmental review activities, the effect of different MPF designs on construction schedules, and the potential compression of proposed construction schedules. The Department should also evaluate the loss of technical expertise in pit production due to the closure of Rocky Flats, and as-

sess options to ensure that the Nation's experience in this area is not further degraded until the MPF becomes operational. Finally, the Department should indicate how their plan for keeping the production program agile and how their engineering design will create a flexible facility to meet ever changing military requirements in a world fraught with emerging threats.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report detailing its findings, and the steps it is taking to accelerate the MPF and protect its institutional knowledge of production processes, to the congressional defense committees together with the fiscal year 2005 budget request. The report should also include a schedule to establish a requirement by pit type by year, and any other requirements. The DOE must have a requirement established to ensure that the MPF is appropriately sized.

The Department's current schedule does not envision operations at the proposed MPF until the year 2020. While the Department expects to conduct limited pit production at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in the interim, the expected production levels at this laboratory will be of limited value in maintaining the Nation's strategic arsenal. As the Department has not had a viable pit production facility since the closure of Rocky Flats in 1989, the committee is concerned with a proposed 2020 operations starting date for the new MPF.

Recruiting and retaining critical skills in the nuclear weapons complex

The committee has received several expressions of concern about the continued ability of the national laboratories and nuclear weapons plants to attract and retain a workforce meeting the Manhattan Project standard of "the best and the brightest." In response, the committee directs the General Accounting Office (GAO) to conduct a study of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and its contractor's efforts to attract and retain new scientific and engineering talent.

A key factor to maintaining a safe and reliable nuclear weapons stockpile is attracting and retaining our nation's best scientists, engineers and technicians. Since the late 1990s, numerous groups have recognized that recruiting and retention is becoming a critical problem for the nuclear weapons complex. Specifically, in February 1999, the Commission on Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise—often called the Chiles Commission—found that while the problems of an aging nuclear weapons workforce were well recognized, there were "few initiatives to change in any basic way" the manner in which the design labs and production plants approached recruitment, career management, or retention. The Commission recommended that DOE and its contractors develop on a priority basis a detailed and long-term complex-wide plan for replenishing the essential scientific, engineering, and technical nuclear weapons workforce. More recently, in fiscal year 2001, as part of an effort to improve the critical skills at the Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) required the two labs—through a contract mechanism known as Appendix O—to develop

a consolidated plan for recruiting, training and retaining employees with critical skills.

While planning is important, the committee notes that given the vital nature of this long-recognized problem, the national laboratories and nuclear weapons plants should go beyond the planning stage and should be heavily involved in implementing programs to attract and retain our nation's best scientific, engineering and technical minds. The committee is concerned that while recent initiatives have been started by the NNSA and the individual facilities, it appears that their efforts and coordination remain fragmented.

In an effort to quantify the various educational grants and outreach programs and establish a recruitment program baseline, the committee directs the GAO to include in the study, the following:

(1) an overview of the NNSA programs and initiatives to attract and retain scientific, engineering and technical skills;

(2) an inventory and description of the programs developed by the national weapons labs and nuclear weapons plants to attract and retain scientific, engineering and technical skills, including education grants and scholarship programs;

(3) an assessment of how well these programs are functioning individually and as part of the larger program;

(4) an identification and assessment of "best practices" in other high tech industries that could be used by NNSA and its contractors; and

(5) an identification and assessment of any other alternative approaches, such as the forgiveness of educational expenses, that could be used to attract and retain new scientific and engineering talent.

GAO should complete this study within six months of the date of enactment of this act and report its findings to the congressional defense committees.

Treatment of construction projects for the environmental management program

The committee supports the Department's proposed treatment of environmental management (EM) program line item projects with the expectation that the same level of project management and oversight will occur, and that this accommodation will further accelerate the cleanup of legacy waste from the EM sites.

The committee notes that the EM Program has been very successful in accelerating site closure plans by reducing risk to the environment, workers and communities, which in turn shorten cleanup schedules, and will potentially save tens of billions of dollars upon completion.

In order to introduce additional flexibility and efficiencies, the EM budget request for fiscal year 2004 included a proposal that would change the way the Department would treat line item construction projects within the EM program. In lieu of requesting all projects for authorization and subsequent base table control, in some cases the Department proposed treating construction projects as subprojects to a larger project and funded as a normal operating funded item. In making the EM program itself a project, any line item construction project at a particular site becomes a part or portion of a larger project. This arrangement would provide the project

manager with the latitude and discretion to make real time cost and schedule tradeoff decisions regarding how best to utilize the total dollar and worker resources of that project to optimize both cost and schedule.

The ability to make timely decisions regarding available resources and assets are vitally critical to the EM accelerated clean-up initiative. The committee notes the obvious success of a similar arrangement at Rocky Flats some years earlier. Likewise, the committee notes the Department remains committed to providing a similar level of detail—in both the President's budget and in project execution—that would be provided if the construction activity were a traditional line item construction project.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends $19.6 million, the amount of the fiscal year 2004 budget request, for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB).

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

By letter dated March 3, 2003, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 1428 to the Committee on Armed Services on March 3, 2003. Executive Communication 1428 is available for review at the committee. Senators Warner and Levin introduced this legislative proposal as S. 747, by request, on March 31, 2003.

Committee Action

The committee ordered reported a comprehensive original bill and a series of original bills for Department of Defense, military construction and Department of Energy authorizations by voice vote.

The roll call votes on amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the markup have been made public and are available at the committee.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during floor debate on the legislation.

Regulatory Impact

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2004.

Changes in Existing Law

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATORS CHAMBLISS, CORNYN, GRAHAM OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AND INHOFE

While the Committee has produced a good bill that will provide a much needed pay raise for the men and women who serve in our military, increased benefits for our military families, and critical resources to give our military the tools which they need to protect and defend our nation, we strongly disagree with the Committee's decision to reduce the production of the F/A–22 aircraft by 2 aircraft and decrease the fiscal year 2004 funding for the F/A–22 by $217 million.

The F/A–22 is our next generation tactical fighter aircraft to replace the aging aircraft currently in our inventory. With its stealth design, capability for supersonic cruise without afterburners, exceptional maneuverability, and advanced integrated avionics, the F/A–22 will give our military the ability to provide 24 hour all weather air superiority. The F/A–22's ability to give our pilots first-look, first-shot, first-kill capability will guarantee U.S. air dominance well into the 21st century. Further, the F/A–22 will require less maintenance support and lower deployment support requirements than our current fighters. In the face of sophisticated air defense systems, increased advanced fighter aircraft being developed and sold around the world, and enhanced air to air and surface to air missile threats, the F/A–22 will be one of our most critical military assets in the future.

In the fiscal year 2004 budget request for the Department of Defense, the President recommended $3.727 billion for the procurement of 22 F/A–22 Raptor aircraft. In fiscal year 2003, the Air Force plans to purchase 21 F/A–22 aircraft. Reducing the President's fiscal year 2004 budget request will only serve to raise questions about our commitment to the program, unsettle the confidence of the subcontractors and suppliers, ultimately increasing the costs to the entire program and making it subject to further criticism.

The Committee is correct in closely monitoring the program and attempting to ensure that the taxpayer's money is used wisely and efficiently. However, in extensive testimony before the Airland Subcommittee this year, the Subcommittee heard from the Air Force that the program is doing extremely well. Over the past few years, the Congress has carefully watched the program and implemented milestones to ensure that the aircraft meets the needs of our military. The F/A–22 is one of the most sophisticated and complex systems in the military. Given the complexities, the program has performed exceedingly well, meeting or exceeding technical and operational requirements. The program completed a successful OSD Defense Acquisition Board review in March 2003. With only one exception, all technical challenges which the aircraft has encountered have been effectively resolved.

One issue currently being addressed is the avionics stability. The F/A–22 avionics suite is some of the most sophisticated and advanced software being developed today. Run-time for the current software has improved from 1.3 to 3.2 hours in the past month alone. Further software improvements can be expected in the coming months. Additionally in December, 2002, the Department of Defense Acquisition Executive, Secretary Aldridge, certified that the avionics hardware and architecture are sound and unrelated to the software instability. There is also no retrofit risk associated with maturing software. The only retrofit requirement related to avionics for aircraft currently being produced would be a software update. The cost of such an update is minimal and the Air Force does similar updates for every aircraft in the inventory on a recurring basis. The current avionics problem is isolated to software that is being tested now, while the Lot 4 aircraft which the Committee chose to reduce will not even deliver until 2006. There is no relationship between the proposed reduction in aircraft and the avionics issues currently being addressed.

Although it is true the F/A–22 production effort is behind in its original schedule, the proposed reduction in funding will further hinder that schedule. Aircraft number 4013, scheduled to be delivered in April 2003, experienced foreign object debris damage during its last test flight requiring an engine to be replaced and delaying delivery of that aircraft. Furthermore, the Air Force has no funding obligation or execution issues on the current aircraft being delivered. Aircraft number 4013 was delivered to the Air Force on 8 May, as the Committee was completing its mark. It is expected that aircraft numbers 4014 and 4015 will be delivered by the end of May.

Additionally, the Air Force recently announced that they would purchase one additional F/A–22 during the fiscal year 2003. Their ability to do this was based on increasing program efficiencies, increased supplier confidence, and hard work by the F/A–22 team. By decreasing the funding in FY04, the program's progress will only be hurt and will ultimately result in a per plane cost increase of approximately $3 million with a corresponding decrease in the number of aircraft delivered by as much as 10 aircraft.

The F/A–22 program is essential to the future security of the United States and to our nation's ability to defend freedom around the Globe. Full funding for this program is important to keep costs stable and the program on track. Production stability is vital to achieving future program affordability goals. The avionics challenges and any future technical issues will be overcome, but reducing procurement now will damage supplier confidence and increase supplier costs, further reducing the number of aircraft the Air Force will be able to buy.

SAXBY CHAMBLISS.
JOHN CORNYN.
LINDSEY O. GRAHAM.
JAMES M. INHOFE.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR REED

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Under the guise of maintaining flexibility and keeping all options open, this bill approves and encourages the Bush Administration to continue its push to develop, test, deploy and possibly use, nuclear weapons. Not since the days of the Cold War, when the United States turned to nuclear weapons as its only option to counter the superior conventional forces of the Soviet Union, have we even thought about nuclear weapons as a usable option. Now, in this bill, the pieces of a new nuclear policy are beginning to come together. This new policy represents a dramatic shift in direction away from nonproliferation, away from our commitments under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, and away from efforts to delegitimize nuclear weapons. Today, because we are concerned that the current stockpile of over 8,000 nuclear weapons might not deter others, because we might be self-deterred from using those nuclear weapons, we embark on a path toward new nuclear weapons, to use.

The progress toward this policy shift in nuclear policy has been steady and has occurred largely out of the public view. The December 2001 Nuclear Posture Review, a classified document, was advertised as reducing nuclear weapons and as an effort to reduce reliance on nuclear weapons. Unfortunately it did neither. No nuclear weapons were slated for destruction under this document, and, worse, the line between nuclear and non-nuclear was blurred. The new triad adopted by the Bush Administration was not a nuclear triad in the traditional sense of land, sea, and air weapons, but rather, it was a triad of concepts: offensive strike, defense, and infrastructure. Nuclear and non-nuclear weapons were grouped in the strike leg. Nuclear weapons would now be incorporated in strike plans and the nuclear weapons infrastructure was to be revitalized. The revitalization was not just to maintain the current stockpile of nuclear weapons and not just to maintain a capability to manufacture new nuclear weapons, but to be able to design, produce, and test new nuclear weapons and to modify existing nuclear weapons for new purposes.

In this bill, the Armed Services Committee has approved a requirement to develop a plan for global strike capabilities that would include new nuclear weapons, money to reduce the time needed to conduct a nuclear weapons test and a mandate to do just that, and to move more quickly on a facility to build hundreds of plutonium pits per year, a key component of nuclear weapons. This bill also includes money to modify existing large nuclear weapons to be new earth penetrators, money for advanced nuclear weapons concepts, and the repeal, as requested by the Bush Administration,

of a ten year old ban on the research and development of low yield nuclear weapons.

This is the wrong direction to take the country. The Cold War is over. The United States is the most powerful country in the world. We have demonstrated the skill, the precision, and awesome capability of our conventional weapons and the brave men and women of our armed forces. We need a strong military, we need to fight the war on terrorism, and we need to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. But we accomplish none of these goals by resuming a new nuclear arms race.

When this bill is considered by the full Senate it is my hope that the debate on nuclear weapons will continue and the subtle but dramatic shift in nuclear weapons policy will be fully aired. There is still time to change this dangerous direction.

MISSILE DEFENSE

In the area of ballistic missile defense, the committee is recommending some positive changes, such as the restoration of a national missile defense intercept test in 2004 that the Bush Administration recently cancelled and a provision which would require the Department of Defense to provide an estimate of the costs to procure missile defenses in the future.

Overall, however, I continue to have serious concerns about the Bush Administration's ballistic missile defense program. President Bush has announced his intention to begin fielding a national missile defense system in 2004, despite the fact that the Pentagon's Director of Operational Test and Evaluation concluded in his FY2002 Annual Report that the system "has yet to demonstrate significant operational capability." The planned fielding date is September 2004, weeks before the Presidential elections, but years before the system is scheduled to conduct any realistic operational testing to prove that it actually works. So the plan is to field the system before we even know if it will work.

As the events of 9/11, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the continuing global operations against terrorism continue to demonstrate, the imminent threats to this country are not from long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles. Rather, they come from shadowy networks of terrorists without the means or the desire to acquire a long-range missile. This situation will not change by September 2004. Therefore, deployment of an unproven national missile defense by then will not increase our nation's security. Instead, what the deployment is more likely to do is significantly delay the time when we may have an operationally *effective* national missile defense capability.

To add insult to injury, the national missile defense system the President has decided to field does not have a radar capable of distinguishing between a warhead and a decoy. While President Clinton had planned to build such a radar, President Bush intends to field the system without one. The radar represents the all important "eyes" of the system, and the system to be fielded by President Bush is partially blind. After repeatedly and harshly criticizing the Clinton Administration's national missile defense program, the Bush Administration has decided to deploy a system far less capable than the system President Clinton had proposed.

The only way to demonstrate that we have an effective national missile defense is to conduct realistic intercept tests of the system, during which a defensive interceptor actually engages a target made to look like an incoming threat missile. As the Pentagon's Director of Operational Testing stated in his FY2002 Annual Report, the national missile defense system has yet to complete intercept tests "against targets with signatures, countermeasures and flight dynamics more closely matching the threat."

One of the astonishing by-products of the President's decision to field a national missile defense is that the number of scheduled intercept tests for the system has plummeted to just over half what it had been prior to the deployment decision. Prior to the President's December 2002 decision to field the system, 20 national missile defense intercept tests had been scheduled to occur between mid–2002 and 2007. Following the President's decision, 9 of these 20 tests were cancelled. No explanation was given by the Bush Administration for this drastic reduction in test content. Furthermore, the scheduled date to complete this new, minimalist test plan is now 2009 instead of 2007. The decision to field an unproven system has thus been accompanied by a decision to eliminate or delay the very testing that must be conducted to show whether the system is effective.

This is all the more astonishing because the Bush Administration sold its "new" missile defense program on the central premise of building a sophisticated "test bed" and conducting unprecedented levels of rigorous, realistic tests to learn what would work—and only then decide what to deploy. These assurances have proven to be completely hollow. The Bush Aministration intends to deploy missile defenses long before they have been shown to work.

In addition to cancelling almost half of the planned national missile defense intercept tests, the Bush Administration proposed legislation in the fiscal year 2004 budget request that would have allowed operational testing to be waived for national missile defense. Rigorous, realistic operational testing is required by law for all major weapons systems to ensure that they work prior to being deployed to our military in the field. The proposal to waive such testing for missile defense displays a disregard for a law which for over 20 years has been critical to ensuring our military gets equipment that will actually work in battle. Thankfully, the committee bill does not provide any waivers for operational testing of missile defenses, but the Bush Administration has yet to say when such realistic testing will in fact be done for national missile defense.

The Bush Administration's ballistic missile defense program is the single largest acquisition program in the entire Department of Defense, with a budget request of more than $9 billion in fiscal year 2004 alone. For perspective, this amount of funding could buy 9 DDG–51–class destroyers, 45 F–22 Raptor fighter aircraft, or more than 2800 Stryker Armored Vehicles. Despite this huge amount of funding, however, the Bush Administration cannot describe what sort of missile defense systems will ultimately be deployed, when they will be deployed, or what types of missile threats they will defend against.

Over the last two years Congress has passed a number of laws requiring the Bush Administration to provide basic information on

its plans for missile defense. The Bush Administration has ignored many of these laws.

For example, at the beginning of fiscal year 2002 Congress required the Bush Administration to establish cost, schedule, testing and performance goals for missile defense and directed the General Accounting Office (GAO) to review whether progress was being made towards the established goals. By the end of 2002 the Bush Administration had still not established any meaningful goals for missile defense. Consequently, in November 2002 the Director of Acquisition and Sourcing Management at the GAO wrote to the committee to say that since no goals had been established, GAO could not complete its review.

There are still no meaningful cost, schedule, testing or performance goals associated with the vast majority of the missile defense funding. This lack of an overall plan for missile defense has resulted in the Bush Administration allocating no funding at all to actually procure any missile defense system. Aside from the "fielding" of a few unproven missile defense interceptors starting in 2004, there are no firm plans to ever deploy any missile defense system.

The American taxpayers have paid close to $20 billion over the last two years, and will likely pay more than $9 billion more next year, all for a missile defense program with no specified end date, no identified military requirements, and no identified products. The Bush Administration uses buzzwords like "spiral development" and "evolutionary acquisition" to defend this lack of planning. But that fact remains that it is not clear when, if ever, the administration's missile defense program will actually produce and deploy a new missile defense system that is proven to be effective.

I have been and remain a strong supporter of theater missile defenses such as the Patriot PAC–3 system deployed in the Iraq war. The PAC–3 system was developed under President Clinton and operationally tested prior to being fielded. Such systems, once proven by testing, will provide our deployed troops and allies overseas with protection from the thousands of short-range theater missiles known to be deployed in a number of potential conflict areas. I also support prudent research, development and testing of a national missile defense to defend the U.S. from the potential of a long-range, intercontinental ballistic missile attack.

But I cannot support the Bush Administration's approach to missile defense. Their program seems designed primarily to spend huge amounts of money to field unproven systems on a political time table. It cuts back on needed testing and contains no plan to fund or deploy effective missile defenses.

JACK REED.

○