

Calendar No. 114106TH CONGRESS }
1st Session

SENATE

{ REPORT
106-50**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION
ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000****REPORT**

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1059]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 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 17 (legislative day, MAY 14), 1999.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(106th Congress, 1st Session)

JOHN WARNER, Virginia, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina,

Chairman Emeritus

JOHN McCAIN, Arizona

BOB SMITH, New Hampshire

JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma

RICK SANTORUM, Pennsylvania

OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine

PAT ROBERTS, Kansas

WAYNE ALLARD, Colorado

TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas

JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama

CARL LEVIN, Michigan

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts

JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico

ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia

CHARLES S. ROBB, Virginia

JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut

MAX CLELAND, Georgia

MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana

JACK REED, Rhode Island

LES BROWNLEE, *Staff Director*

DAVID S. LYLES, *Staff Director for the Minority*

CONTENTS

Purpose of the Bill	1
Committee Overview and Recommendations	2
Explanation of Funding Summary	13
Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations	21
Title I—Procurement	21
Explanation of tables	21
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	22
Chemical Demilitarization Program (sec. 106)	24
Subtitle B—Army Programs	25
Multiyear procurement authority for certain Army programs (sec. 111)	49
Close combat tactical trainer (sec. 112)	49
Army aviation modernization (sec. 113)	50
Other Army Programs	52
Army Aircraft	52
UH-60 Blackhawk	52
CH-47 Cargo helicopter modifications	52
Longbow	52
UH-1 sustainment	53
Aircraft survivability equipment modifications	53
Aircraft survivability equipment infrared countermeasures	53
Army Missiles	54
Patriot Anti-cruise Missile	54
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles	54
Carrier modifications	54
Bradley fighting vehicle series modifications	54
Howitzer, self propelled, fully tracked 155mm M109A6	55
Field artillery ammunition support vehicle	55
Improved recovery vehicle	55
Heavy assault bridge system	55
Abrams upgrade program	56
Mark 19 grenade launcher	56
Army Ammunition	56
Army ammunition	56
Other Army Procurement	56
High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle	56
Secure Mobile Antijam Reliable Tactical Terminal	57
Army combat communications	57
Warfighter information network	57
Night vision devices	57
Forward area air defense command and control	58
Standard integrated command post system	58
Lightweight maintenance enclosure	58
Combat training centers support	59
Modification of in-service equipment	59
Construction equipment	59
Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism	60
Subtitle C—Navy Programs	61
LHD-8 advance procurement and advance construction (sec. 121)	88
DDG-51 multiyear procurement extension (sec. 122)	88
Repeal of requirement for annual report from shipbuilders under certain nuclear attack submarine program (sec. 123)	89
Cooperative engagement capability (sec. 124)	89
Multiyear procurement authority for the F/A-18E/F aircraft (sec. 125)	89

IV

	Page
Title I—Procurement—Continued	
Other Navy Programs	90
Navy Aircraft	90
MV-22	90
CH-60 helicopters	90
UC-35A	91
C-40A	91
KC-130J	91
EA-6B support jamming upgrade	91
F/A-18 aircraft modifications	91
AH-1 series	92
H-1 series	92
Maritime Surveillance Aircraft Programs	92
KC-130T avionics upgrades	92
AN/ALQ-165	93
Navy Weapons	93
Hellfire II	94
Improved tactical air launched decoy	94
Weapons industrial facilities	94
Navy and Marine Corps Ammunition	94
Laser guided bombs and kits	94
Marine Corps ammunition	94
Other Navy Procurement	95
AN/WSN-7 inertial navigation system	95
Afloat force protection, maritime interdiction operations equip- ment	95
Integrated condition assessment system	95
AN/BPS-16H surface search radar for submarines	96
Integration and test facility command and control initiative	96
Joint Engineering Data Management and Information Control System	96
Information Technology-21	97
Aviation life support	97
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system	97
Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat ter- rorism	98
Marine Corps Procurement	98
Modification kits-tracked vehicles	98
Night vision equipment	98
Communications and electronics infrastructure	98
High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle	98
Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force field medical equipment	99
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs	100
F-22 aircraft program (sec. 131)	117
Other Air Force Programs	117
Air Force Aircraft	118
EC-130J	118
C-130J	118
Joint primary aircrew training system	119
F-15 220E engine modification	119
F-16 aircraft modifications	119
T-43 terrain awareness and warning system	120
C-20 terrain avoidance and warning system and global air traffic management	120
KC-135 global air traffic management	121
RC-135 re-engining	121
U-2 upgrades	121
Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat ter- rorism	121
Air Force Ammunition	122
Wind corrected munition dispenser	122
Air Force Missile	122
Minuteman III guidance replacement program	122
Other Air Force Procurement	122
High mobility vehicle	122
Fuel trucks	122
60K loader	122

	Page
Title I—Procurement—Continued	
Other Air Force Programs—Continued	
Other Air Force Procurement—Continued	
Base information infrastructure	123
Tactical communications-electronics equipment	123
Aircrew laser eye protection	123
Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism	123
Defense-Wide Programs	123
Remote activation munition systems	130
Special operations forces rotary wing upgrades	130
Special operations forces small arms and weapons	130
Special operations forces demolition kits	130
Chemical and Biological Defense Program	131
Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism	131
Subtitle E—Other Matters	131
Extension of authority to carry out armament retooling and manufacturing support initiative (sec. 141)	131
Extension of pilot program on sales of manufactured articles and services of certain army industrial facilities without regard to availability from domestic sources (sec. 142)	132
Other Items of Interest	132
Army modernization overview	132
Bore erosion gauges	133
C-130J	133
C-130J deployment plan	134
C-20	135
Combat survivor evader locator radio	135
Digital facsimile machine	136
Maintaining a strong navy	136
National guard and reserve modernization	137
Report on chartering special craft and tug services	138
Unmanned aerial vehicle system	138
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	141
Explanation of tables	141
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	142
Amount for basic and applied research (sec. 202)	143
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations	144
Micro-satellite technology development program (sec. 212)	144
Space control technology (sec. 213)	144
Space Maneuver Vehicle (sec. 214)	145
Manufacturing technology program (sec. 215)	145
Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense	146
Theater missile defense upper tier acquisition strategy (sec. 221)	146
Repeal of requirement to implement technical and price competition for Theater High Altitude Area Defense system (sec. 222)	146
Space-based laser program (sec. 223)	146
Airborne Laser Program (sec. 224)	148
Subtitle D—Research and Development for Long-Term Military Capabilities	150
Research and development for long-term military capabilities (secs. 231–239)	150
Additional Matters of Interest	153
Army	153
Basic research in counter-terrorism	163
Army After Next materials	163
Missile technology	163
Humanitarian demining research	163
Combat vehicle and automotive technology	163
Human factors engineering technology	163
Environmental quality technology	163
Virtual retinal eye display technology	164
Armor system modernization	164
Digital intelligence situation mapboard	166
Acoustic technology research	166
Radar power technology	166
Tactical High Energy Laser	166

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued	
Additional Matters of Interest—Continued	
Army—Continued	
Weapons and munitions-advanced development	166
Comanche	167
Weapons and munitions-engineering and manufacturing develop- ment	167
Firefinder	167
Directed energy testbed	168
Multiple launch rocket system product improvement program	168
Combat vehicle improvement programs	168
Aircraft modifications/product improvement program	168
Navy	170
Nontraditional defense operations	181
Communications, command, and control, intelligence, surveil- lance, and reconnaissance	181
Carbon heatshield technology	181
Laser technologies	181
Superconducting wave form generator	181
Power node control centers	181
Composite helicopter hangar	182
Virtual testbed for advanced electric systems	182
Advanced technology demonstration	182
Ocean modeling for mine and submarine warfare	183
Advanced technology transition program	183
Integrated combat weapons system for mine countermeasures ships	183
Advanced water-jet technology	183
Enhanced performance electric motor brush technology	184
Standard for the exchange of product model data	184
Trident SSGN design	184
Navy common command and decision system	185
Advanced amphibious assault vehicle	185
Research in nonlethal weapons	185
Navy Collaborative Integrated Information Technology Initiative	185
Parametric Airborne Dipping Sonar	186
H-1 upgrades	186
Multi-Purpose Processor	186
Non-propulsion electronics system	187
Smart propulsor product model	187
Volume search radar	187
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system	187
Advanced Deployable System	188
Battle Force Tactical Training	188
Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat ter- rorism	188
Air Force	189
Materials research	202
Solid state electric oxygen generation	202
Space science and engineering	202
Multi-spectral battlefield simulation	202
Variable displacement vane pump technology	202
Applied research	202
High frequency active auroral research	203
Laser remote optical sensing research	203
Aerospace structures	203
Night vision technology	204
Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System	204
Standard protocol interpreter for satellite data links	204
Low altitude navigation and targeting infrared for night	204
Joint strike fighter	204
Rocket Systems Launch Program	204
B-2 advanced technology bomber datalink	205
Electronic warfare development	205
Space Based Infrared System	206
Wind corrected munitions dispenser	207
Life support systems	207
Composite payload dispenser development for the Evolved Ex- pendable Launch Vehicle	207

VII

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued	
Additional Matters of Interest—Continued	
Air Force—Continued	
Air Force test and evaluation support	207
Big Crow program office	208
B-52 upgrades	208
F-16 GOLDSTRIKE	209
EC-130H Compass Call	209
Airborne warning and control system	209
Joint surveillance/target attack radar system	210
Theater Airborne Warning System	211
E-4B national airborne operations center	211
Endurance unmanned aerial vehicles	211
Airborne reconnaissance systems	212
RC-135 global air traffic management	212
Eagle Vision	212
Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism	212
Defense-Wide	212
Recruitment and retention	223
University research initiative	223
Ballistic Missile Defense Organization funding and programmatic guidance	223
Support technology	223
National missile defense	224
Theater high altitude area defense (THAAD) system	224
Navy theater wide	225
BMD technical operations	225
International cooperative programs	225
BMD targets	225
Patriot PAC-3	225
Boost-phase intercept	226
Medical free electron laser	226
Computer security system development	227
Weapons of mass destruction related technologies	227
Complex systems design	227
Product data engineering tools	227
Joint warfighting program	227
High performance visualization program	228
Joint robotics program	228
Integrated data environment technology	228
Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force detector technologies	228
Joint Mapping Tool Kit	229
Strategic Technology Assessment Program	229
Special operations tactical system development	229
Special operations operational enhancements	229
Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism	229
OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST	230
Advanced SEAL delivery system	230
Aerostructures	230
Biological hazard research	230
Commercially Based Tactical Truck Program	231
Computer Emergency Response Teams	231
Department of Defense support of commercial space sector	231
Focus: HOPE	232
Inter-cooled recuperated gas turbine engine	232
Integrated power systems	232
National Technology Alliance	233
Personnel safety and survivability	233
Precision strike and air defense technology	234
Research in advanced optics	234
Robotics and intelligent machines	234
Smart ship manpower reduction initiative	235
Space launch reliability assessment	235
Starstreak missile	235
Maintaining a strong Navy	236

VIII

	Page
Title III—Operation and Maintenance	239
Explanation of tables	239
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	275
Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 303)	275
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations	275
Use of humanitarian and civic assistance funding for pay and allow-	
ances of special operations command reserves furnishing demining	
training and related assistance as humanitarian assistance (sec.	
312)	275
National defense features (sec. 313)	275
Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions	275
Environmental technology management (sec. 321)	275
Establishment of environmental restoration accounts for installations	
closed or realigned under the base closure laws and for formerly	
used defense sites (sec. 322)	276
Extension of limitation on payment of fines and penalties using funds	
in environmental restoration accounts (sec. 323)	276
Modification of requirements for annual reports on environmental	
compliance activities (sec. 324)	277
Modification of membership of the Strategic Environmental Research	
and Development Program Council (sec. 325)	277
Extension of the pilot program for sale of air pollution emission	
reduction incentives (sec. 326)	277
Reimbursement for certain costs in connection with Fresno Drum	
Superfund site, Fresno, California (sec. 327)	278
Payment of stipulated penalties assessed under the CERCLA in con-	
nection with F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming (sec. 328)	278
Subtitle D—Other Matters	278
Extension of warranty claims recovery pilot program (sec. 341)	279
Additional matters to be reported before prime vendor contract for	
depot-level maintenance and repair is entered into (sec. 342)	279
Implementation of jointly approved changes in defense retail systems	
(sec. 343)	279
Eligibility to receive financial assistance available for local edu-	
cational agencies that benefit dependents of Department of Defense	
personnel (sec. 345)	279
Use of Smart Card technology in the Department of Defense (sec.	
346)	280
Study on use of smart card as PKI authentication device carrier	
for the Department of Defense (sec. 347)	281
Revision of authority to donate certain Army materiel for funeral	
ceremonies (sec. 348)	281
Additional Matters of Interest	281
Base operations	281
Depot maintenance	282
Real property maintenance	282
Foreign currency fluctuation	283
Civilian personnel levels	283
Spares	283
Contract advisory, and assistance services	284
Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism ...	284
Force protection	285
Army	285
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps	285
Navy	285
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps	285
Marine Corps	285
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps	285
United States Marine Corps initial issue	285
Distance learning	285
Air Force	286
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps	286
Defense-Wide	286
Mobility enhancements	286
Jefferson Project	286
Partnership for Peace Program (Warsaw Initiative)	286
Partnership for Peace Information Management System (PIMS) ..	286
Guard and Reserve Components	287

IX

	Page
Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued	
Additional Matters of Interest—Continued	
Guard and Reserve Components—Continued	
Overseas deployment training	287
Reserve optempo	287
Miscellaneous	287
Overseas humanitarian demining and CINC emergency response activities	287
Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams	288
Other Items of Interest	289
Cultural and historic activities	289
Commissary support for the 99th Regional Support Command, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	289
Controlled humidity preservation program	290
Expeditionary Aerospace Force	290
Pine Bluff Arsenal	291
Research and development to support unexploded ordnance clearance, active range unexploded ordnance clearance, and explosive ordnance disposal	291
Unfunded environmental requirements	293
Weapons Training Facility Vieques, Puerto Rico	294
Excess inventory on order	294
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations	294
Subtitle A—Active Forces	297
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)	297
Revision in permanent end strength levels (sec. 402)	197
Reduction of end strengths below levels for two major regional contingencies (sec. 403)	297
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces	297
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)	297
End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)	298
End strengths for military technicians (sec. 413)	299
Increase in numbers of members in certain grades authorized to be on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 414)	299
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations	299
Authorization of appropriations for military personnel (sec. 421)	299
Title V—Military Personnel Policy	300
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy	300
Extension of requirement for competition for joint 4-star officer positions (sec. 501)	300
Additional three-star officer positions for superintendents of service academies (sec. 502)	300
Increase in maximum number of officers authorized to be on active-duty list in frocked grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (sec. 503)	300
Reserve officers requesting or otherwise causing nonselection for promotion (sec. 504)	302
Minimum grade of officers eligible to serve on boards of inquiry (sec. 505)	302
Minimum selection of warrant officers for promotion from below the promotion zone (sec. 506)	302
Increase in threshold period of active duty for applicability of restriction on holding of civil office by retired regular officers and reserve officers (sec. 507)	302
Exemption of retiree council members from recalled retiree limits (sec. 508)	302
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Matters	303
Additional exemptions for reserve component general and flag officers from limitation on authorized strength of general and flag officers on active duty (sec. 511)	303
Duties of reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 512)	303
Repeal of limitation on number of reserves on full-time active duty in support of preparedness for responses to emergencies involving weapons of mass destruction. (sec. 513)	304
Extension of period for retention of reserve component majors and lieutenant commanders who twice fail of selection for promotion (sec. 514)	304

	Page
Title V—Military Personnel Policy—Continued	
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Matters—Continued	
Continuation of officer on reserve active-status list for disciplinary action (sec. 515)	304
Retention of reserve component chaplains until age 67 (sec. 516)	304
Reserve credit for participation in health professions scholarship and financial assistance program limited to reserve retirement credit only (sec. 517)	304
Exclusion of reserve officers on educational delay from eligibility for consideration for promotion (sec. 518)	305
Exclusion of period of pursuit of professional education from computation of years of service for reserve officers (sec. 519)	305
Correction of reference relating to crediting of satisfactory service by reserve officers in highest grade held (sec. 520)	305
Establishment of Office of the Coast Guard Reserve (sec. 521)	305
Subtitle C—Military Education and Training	305
Authority to exceed temporarily a strength limitation for the service academies (sec. 531)	305
Repeal of limitation on amount of reimbursement authorized to be waived for foreign students at service academies (sec. 532)	306
Expansion of foreign service programs of the service academies (sec. 533)	306
Permanent authority for ROTC scholarships for graduate students (sec. 534)	306
Authority for award of Master of Strategic Studies degree by the United States Army War College (sec. 535)	306
Minimum educational requirements for faculty of the Community College of the Air Force (sec. 536)	306
Conferral of graduate-level degrees by Air University (sec. 537)	307
Payment of tuition for education and training of members in the defense acquisition workforce (sec. 538)	307
Financial assistance program for pursuit of degrees by officer candidates in Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program (sec. 539) .	307
Subtitle D—Decorations, Awards, and Commendations	307
Waiver of time limitations for award of certain decorations to certain persons (sec. 551)	307
Subtitle E—Amendments to Uniform Code of Military Justice	307
Increase in sentencing jurisdiction of special courts-martial authorized to adjudge a bad-conduct discharge (sec. 561)	307
Reduced minimum blood and breath alcohol levels for offense of drunken operation or control of a vehicle, aircraft, or vessel (sec. 562)	308
Subtitle F—Other Matters	308
Funeral honors details at funerals of veterans (sec. 571)	308
Increased authority to extend delayed entry period for enlistments of persons with no prior military service (sec. 572)	308
Army college first pilot program (sec. 573)	309
Reduction in required frequency of reporting on the Selected Reserve educational assistance program under the Montgomery GI Bill (sec. 574)	309
Participation of members in management of organizations abroad that promote international understanding (sec. 575)	309
Forensic pathology investigations by armed forces medical examiner (sec. 576)	310
Nondisclosure of information on missing persons returned to United States control (sec. 577)	310
Use of recruiting materials for public relations purposes (sec. 578)	310
Improvement and transfer of jurisdiction of Troops-to-Teachers program (sec. 579)	311
Support for expanded child care services and youth program services for dependents (sec. 580)	311
Responses to domestic violence in the armed forces (sec. 581)	311
Other Items of Interest	312
Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System 183	312
Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps 184	312
Recruiter access	313
Air Force Reserve	314
George C. Marshall Reserve Officer Training Corps Award and Seminar program	314

	Page
Title V—Military Personnel Policy—Continued	
Other Items of Interest—Continued	
Initiatives to enhance military recruiting	315
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits	317
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances	317
Fiscal year 2000 increase and restructuring of basic pay (sec. 601)	317
Pay increases for 2001 through 2006 (sec. 602)	317
Special subsistence allowance for food stamp eligible members (sec. 603)	317
Payment for unused leave in conjunction with a reenlistment (sec. 604)	318
Continuance of pay and allowances while in duty status “whereabouts unknown” (sec. 605)	318
Equitable treatment of class of 1987 of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (sec. 606)	318
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special Incentive Pays	318
One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of certain bonuses and special pays (sec. 611)	318
One-year extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 612)	319
One-year extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists (sec. 613)	319
Amount of aviation career incentive pay for Air Battle Managers formerly eligible for hazardous duty pay (sec. 614)	319
Aviation career officer special pay (sec. 615)	319
Career enlisted flyer incentive pay (sec. 616)	319
Retention bonus for special warfare officers extending periods of active duty (sec. 617)	320
Retention bonus for surface warfare officers extending periods of active duty (sec. 618)	320
Additional special pay for board certified veterinarians in the armed forces and Public Health Service (sec. 619)	320
Increase in rate of diving duty special pay (sec. 620)	320
Increase in maximum amount authorized for reenlistment bonus for active members (sec. 621)	320
Critical skills enlistment bonus (sec. 622)	320
Selected Reserve enlistment bonus (sec. 623)	320
Special pay for members of the Coast Guard Reserve assigned to high priority units of the Selected Reserve (sec. 624)	321
Reduced minimum period of enlistment in Army in critical skill for eligibility for enlistment bonus (sec. 625)	321
Eligibility for reserve component prior service enlistment bonus upon attaining a critical skill (sec. 626)	321
Increase in special pay and bonuses for nuclear-qualified officers (sec. 627)	321
Increase in maximum monthly rate authorized for foreign language proficiency pay (sec. 628)	321
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances	322
Payment of temporary lodging expenses to enlisted members making their first permanent change of station (sec. 641)	322
Destination airport for emergency leave travel to the continental United States (sec. 642)	322
Clarification of per diem eligibility of certain military technicians (dual status) serving on active duty without pay outside the United States (sec. 643)	322
Expansion and codification of authority for space required travel on military aircraft for reserves performing inactive-duty training outside the continental United States (sec. 644)	322
Reimbursement of travel expenses incurred by members of the armed forces in connection with leave canceled for involvement in Kosovo-related activities (sec. 645)	322
Subtitle D—Retired Pay, Survivor Benefits, and Related Matters	323
Retired pay options for personnel entering uniformed services on or after August 1, 1986 (sec. 651)	323
Participation in thrift savings plan (sec. 652)	323
Special retention initiative (sec. 653)	324
Applicability of dual compensation limitation to reserve officers retired after 20 years of service (sec. 654)	324

	Page
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits—Continued	
Subtitle D—Retired Pay, Survivor Benefits, and Related Matters —Continued	
Credit toward paid-up SBP coverage for months covered by make-up premium paid by persons electing SBP coverage during special open enrollment period (sec. 655)	324
Paid-up coverage under Retired Serviceman’s Family Protection Plan (sec. 656)	325
Permanent authority for payment of annuities to certain military surviving spouses (sec. 657)	325
Effectuation of intended SBP annuity for former spouse when not elected by reason of untimely death of retiree (sec. 658)	325
Subtitle E—Other Matters	325
Annual report on effects of initiatives on recruitment and retention (sec. 671)	325
Members under burdensome PERSTEMPO (sec. 672)	325
Increased tuition assistance for members of the armed forces deployed in support of a contingency operation or similar operation (sec. 673)	326
Administration of selected reserve education loan repayment program for Coast Guard Reserve (sec. 674)	326
Extension to all uniformed services of authority for presentation of United States flag to members upon retirement (sec. 675)	326
Title VII—Health Care	327
Subtitle A—TRICARE Program	327
Improvement of TRICARE benefits and management (sec. 701)	327
Expansion and revision of authority for dental programs for dependents and Reserves (sec. 702)	327
Sense of Congress regarding automatic enrollment of Medicare-eligible beneficiaries in the TRICARE Senior Prime demonstration program (sec. 703)	328
TRICARE beneficiary advocates (sec. 704)	328
Subtitle B—Other Matters	328
Care at former Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities for active duty members stationed at certain remote locations (sec. 711)	328
One-year extension of chiropractic health care demonstration project (sec. 712)	329
Program year stability in health care benefits (sec. 713)	329
Best value contracting (sec. 714)	329
Authority to order reserve component members to active duty for health surveillance studies (sec. 715)	329
Continuation of previously provided custodial care benefits for certain CHAMPUS beneficiaries (sec. 716)	330
Other Items of Interest	330
Defense Health Program organizational structure	330
Pre-deployment medical information for female service members	331
TriService Nursing Research Program	331
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters	333
Extension of test program for negotiation of comprehensive small business subcontracting plans (sec. 801)	333
Mentor-protége program improvements (sec. 802)	333
Report on transition of Small Business Innovation Research Program activities into defense acquisition programs (sec. 803)	334
Authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 804)	335
Pilot program for commercial services (sec. 805)	336
Applicability of competition requirements to purchases from a required source (sec. 806)	337
Other Items of Interest	338
Appropriate use of the government purchase card	338
Implementation of commercial pricing requirements	338
Inapplicability of certain procurement laws to commercially available off-the-shelf items	339
Information management lessons learned from Year 2000 software problem	339
Software management improvements	340
Women-owned business participation in Department of Defense contracting	341
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management	343

XIII

	Page
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management—Continued	
Subtitle A—general	343
Number of management headquarters and headquarters support activities personnel (sec. 901)	343
Additional matters for annual reports on joint warfighting experimentation (sec. 902)	343
Acceptance of guarantees in connection with gifts to the United States Military Academy (sec. 903)	344
Management of the Civil Air Patrol (sec. 904)	344
Minimum interval for updating and revising Department of Defense strategic plan (sec. 905)	345
Permanent requirement for quadrennial defense review (sec. 906)	345
Subtitle B—Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization	346
Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization (sec. 911–919)	346
Title X—General Provisions	349
Subtitle A—Financial Matters	349
Second biennial financial management improvement plan (sec. 1002)	349
Use of single payment date for invoices (sec. 1003)	350
Authority to require use of electronic transfer of funds for Department of Defense personnel payments (sec. 1004)	350
Payment of foreign licensing fees out of proceeds of sales of maps, charts, and navigation books (sec. 1005)	350
Authority for disbursing officers to support use of automated teller machines on naval vessels for financial transactions (sec. 1006)	351
Combating terrorism	351
Central transfer account for combating terrorism (sec. 1007)	352
United States contributions to NATO common-funded budgets (sec. 1008)	353
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards	354
Sales of naval shipyard articles and services to nuclear ship contractors (sec. 1011)	354
Period of delay after notice of proposed transfer of vessel stricken from naval vessel register (sec. 1012)	354
Subtitle C—Miscellaneous Report Requirements and Repeals	354
Preservation of certain defense reporting requirements (sec. 1021)	354
Annual report on combatant command requirements (sec. 1022)	355
Report on assessments of readiness to execute the national military strategy (sec. 1023)	355
Report on inventory and control of military equipment (sec. 1024)	356
Space technology guide (sec. 1025)	356
Report and regulations on Department of Defense policies on protecting the confidentiality of communications with professionals providing therapeutic or related services regarding sexual or domestic abuse (sec. 1026)	357
Comptroller General report on anticipated effects of proposed changes in operation of storage sites for lethal chemical agents and munitions (sec. 1027)	357
Report on deployments of Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection teams across state boundaries (sec. 1028)	358
Report on Consequence Management Program Integration Office unit readiness (sec. 1029)	358
Analysis of relationship between threats and budget submission for fiscal year 2001 (sec. 1030)	358
Report on NATO's defense capabilities initiative (sec. 1031)	358
Subtitle D—Other Matters	359
Limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery systems (sec. 1041)	359
Limitation on reduction in United States strategic nuclear forces (sec. 1042)	360
Counterproliferation Program Review Committee (sec. 1043)	361
Limitation regarding Cooperative Threat Reduction programs (sec. 1044)	362
Period covered by annual report on accounting for United States assistance under Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (sec. 1045)	363
Support of United Nations-sponsored efforts to inspect and monitor Iraqi weapons activities (sec. 1046)	363

XIV

	Page
Title X—General Provisions—Continued	
Subtitle D—Other Matters—Continued	
Information assurance initiative (sec. 1047)	364
Defense Science Board Task Force on television and radio as a propa- ganda instrument in time of military conflict (sec. 1048)	365
Military access to the frequency spectrum (secs. 1049–1050)	366
Repeal of limitation on amount of federal expenditures for the Na- tional Guard Challenge Program (sec. 1051)	366
Nondisclosure of information on personnel of overseas, sensitive, or routinely deployable units (sec. 1052)	367
Nondisclosure of operational files of the National Imagery and Map- ping Agency (sec. 1053)	367
Nondisclosure of information of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency having commercial significance (sec. 1054)	368
Continued enrollment of dependents in Department of Defense dom- estic dependent elementary and secondary schools after loss of eligibility (sec. 1055)	368
Unified school boards for all Department of Defense domestic depend- ent schools in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and Guam (sec. 1056)	368
Department of Defense STARBASE Program (sec. 1057)	368
Program to commemorate 50th anniversary of the Korean war (sec. 1058)	369
Extension and reauthorization of Defense Production Act of 1950 (sec. 1059)	369
Extension to naval aircraft of Coast Guard authority for interdiction activities (sec. 1060)	369
Other Items of Interest	370
Drug Interdiction & Counterdrug Activities, Operations and Mainte- nance	370
Narcotics Related Threat To Vital National Security Interests	370
Enhanced aerial reconnaissance	371
Regional counterdrug training	371
Ground based radars	371
Forward operating locations	372
Department of Energy's financial management	372
Submarine dismantlement	372
Title XI—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel	373
Accelerated implementation of voluntary early retirement authority (sec. 1101)	373
Deference to EEOC procedures for investigation of complaints of sexual harassment made by employees (sec. 1102)	373
Restoration of leave of emergency essential employees serving in a combat zone (sec. 1103)	373
Leave without loss of benefits for military reserve technicians on active duty in support of combat operations (sec. 1104)	374
Work schedules and premium pay of service academy faculty (sec. 1105)	374
Salary schedules and related benefits for faculty and staff of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (sec. 1106) ...	374
Title XII—National Military Museum and Related Matters	377
Subtitle A—Commission on National Military Museum	377
Commission on the National Military Museum (secs. 1201–1211)	377
Division B—Military Construction Authorizations	379
Base closure and realignment accounts	401
Title XXI—Army	407
Summary	407
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)	407
Family housing (sec. 2102)	407
Improvement to military family housing units (sec. 2103)	407
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)	407
Title XXII—Navy	409
Summary	409
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)	409
Family housing (sec. 2202)	409
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)	409
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)	409

	Page
Title XXII—Navy—Continued	
Summary—Continued	
Technical modification of authority relating to certain fiscal year 1997 project (sec. 2205)	409
Other Items of Interest	409
Improvements of military family housing, Navy	409
Title XXIII—Air Force	411
Summary	411
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)	411
Family housing (sec. 2302)	411
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)	411
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)	411
Other Items of Interest	411
Improvements of military family housing, Air Force	411
Title XXIV—Defense Agencies	413
Summary	413
Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)	413
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2402)	413
Military Family Housing Improvement Program (sec. 2403)	413
Energy conservation projects (sec. 2404)	413
Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2405)	413
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 1997 projects (sec. 2406)	413
Other Items of Interest	414
Authorization of military construction project for a forward deployment site for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities	414
Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program	415
Summary	415
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)	415
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)	415
Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities	417
Summary	417
Authorized National Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)	417
Title XXVII—Expiration and Extension of Authorizations	419
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2701)	419
Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1997 projects (sec. 2702)	419
Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1996 projects (sec. 2703)	419
Effective date (sec. 2704)	419
Title XXVIII—General Provisions	421
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Program Changes	421
Exemption from notice and wait requirements of military construction projects supported by burden sharing funds undertaken for war or national emergency (sec. 2801)	421
Prohibition on carrying out military construction projects funded using incremental funding (sec. 2802)	421
Defense Chemical Demilitarization Construction Account (sec. 2803) ..	421
Limitation on authority regarding ancillary supporting facilities under alternative authority for acquisition and construction of military housing (sec. 2804)	422
Availability of funds for planning and design in connection with acquisition of reserve component facilities (sec. 2805)	422
Modification of limitations on reserve component facility projects for certain safety projects (sec. 2806)	422
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration	422
Extension of authority for leases of property for special operations activities (sec. 2811)	422
Enhancement of authority relating to utility privatization (sec. 2812) ..	423
Subtitle C—Defense Base Closure and Realignment	423
Conveyance of property at installations closed or realigned under the base closure laws without consideration for economic development purposes (sec. 2821)	423

	Page
Title XXVIII—General Provisions—Continued	
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances	424
Part I—Army Conveyances	424
Land conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Bangor Maine (sec. 2831)	424
Part II—Navy Conveyances	424
Clarification of land exchange, Naval Reserve Readiness Center Portland, Maine (sec. 2841)	424
Land conveyance, Newport, Rhode Island (sec. 2842)	424
Land conveyance, Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant No. 387, Dallas, Texas (sec. 2843)	424
Part III—Air Force Conveyances	425
Land conveyance, McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center, California (sec. 2851)	425
Land conveyance, Newington Defense Fuel Supply Point, New Hampshire (sec. 2852)	425
Subtitle E—Other Matters	425
Acquisition of State-held inholdings, East Range of Fort Huachuca, Arizona (sec. 2861)	425
Development of Ford Island, Hawaii (sec. 2862)	426
Other Items of Interest	427
Family housing improvement plan for personnel assigned to the United States Southern Command in Miami, Florida	427
Military History Institute and Army Heritage Museum, Carlisle, Pennsylvania	427
Title XXIX—Renewal of Military Land Withdrawals	429
Renewal of military land withdrawals (secs. 2901–2914)	429
Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations	431
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs	431
Atomic energy defense activities	431
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations	431
Weapons activities (sec. 3101)	448
Stockpile Stewardship Programs	448
Technology Partnerships and Education	448
Stockpile Management Programs	448
Program Direction	448
Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative and Stockpile Computing Program	449
Tritium production	450
Defense programs campaigns	450
Defense environmental restoration and waste management (sec. 3102)	450
Defense facility closure projects	450
Post 2006 completion	451
Site and project completion	451
Technology development	451
Program direction	452
Off-site disposal of low level waste	452
HAMMER	452
Columbia River Corridor Initiative	452
Other defense activities (sec. 3103)	453
Nonproliferation and National Security	453
Security clearances	453
Fissile materials control and disposition	453
Worker and community transition	453
Environment, safety and health-defense	454
Counterintelligence	454
Intelligence	454
Naval reactors	454
Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104)	454
Defense environmental management privatization (sec. 3105)	454
Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program	455
Subtitle B—Recurring General Provisions	455
Reprogramming (sec. 3121)	455
Limits on general plant projects (sec. 3122)	455
Limits on construction projects (sec. 3123)	455
Fund transfer authority (sec. 3124)	456

XVII

	Page
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs—Continued	
Subtitle B—Recurring General Provisions—Continued	
Authority for conceptual and construction design (sec. 3125)	456
Authority for emergency planning, design, and construction activities (sec. 3126)	456
Funds available for all national security programs of the Department of Energy (sec. 3127)	456
Availability of funds (sec. 3128)	457
Transfers of defense environmental management funds (sec. 3129)	457
Subtitle C—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations	457
Prohibition on use of funds for certain activities under Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program (sec. 3131)	457
Continuation of processing, treatment, and disposition of legacy nu- clear materials (sec. 3132)	457
Nuclear weapons stockpile life extension program (sec. 3133)	457
Tritium production (sec. 3134)	458
Independent cost estimate of Accelerator Production of Tritium (sec. 3135)	458
Nonproliferation initiatives and activities (sec. 3136)	458
Initiatives for proliferation prevention	459
Nuclear cities initiative	460
Subtitle D—Safeguards, Security, and Counterintelligence at Department of Energy Facilities	462
Safeguards, Security, and Counterintelligence at Department of En- ergy Facilities (sec. 3151–3163)	462
Commission on Safeguards, Security, and Counterintelligence at De- partment of Energy Facilities	462
Background investigations of certain personnel at Department of En- ergy facilities	463
Plan for polygraph examinations of certain personnel at Department of Energy facilities	463
Civil monetary penalties for violations of Department of Energy regu- lations relating to the safeguarding and security of Restricted Data	464
Moratorium on laboratory-to-laboratory and foreign visitors and as- signments programs	464
Increased penalties for misuse of Restricted Data	465
Organization of Department of Energy counterintelligence and intel- ligence programs and activities	465
Counterintelligence activities at certain Department of Energy facili- ties	465
Whistleblower protection	465
Investigation and remediation of alleged reprisals for disclosure of certain information to Congress	466
Notification to Congress of certain security and counterintelligence failures at Department of Energy facilities	466
Subtitle E—Other Matters	467
Maintenance of nuclear weapons expertise in the Department of De- fense and Department of Energy (sec. 3171)	467
Modification of budget and planning requirements for Department of Energy national security activities (sec. 3172)	467
Extension of authority of Department of Energy to pay voluntary separation incentive payments (sec. 3173)	468
Integrated fissile materials management plan (sec. 3174)	468
Authority of Department of Energy to accept loans from contractors for closure projects at Department of Energy defense facilities (sec. 3175)	468
Pilot program for project management oversight regarding Depart- ment of Energy construction projects (sec. 3176)	468
Extension of review of Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, New Mexico (sec. 3177)	469
Proposed schedule for shipments of waste from the Rocky Flats Plant, Colorado, to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project, New Mexico (sec. 3178)	469
Other Items of Interest	469
Defense medical devices prototyping pilot	469
Energy savings performance contracts	470
Natural resource damages at Department of Energy sites	470

XVIII

	Page
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs—Continued	
Other Items of Interest—Continued	
Real property maintenance and reinvestment	471
Regional nonproliferation cooperative training	471
Robotics and intelligent machines	471
Nuclear waste disposal demonstration test bed facility	472
Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	473
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3201)	473
Title XXXIII—National Defense Stockpile	475
National defense stockpile (secs. 3301–3302)	475
Title XXXIV—Panama Canal Commission	477
Short title (sec. 3401)	477
Authorization of expenditures (sec. 3402)	477
Purchase of vehicles (sec. 3403)	477
Expenditures only in accordance with treaties (sec. 3404)	477
Office of Transition Administration (sec. 3405)	477
Legislative Requirements	478
Departmental Recommendations	478
Committee Action	478
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate	478
Regulatory Impact	478
Defense Authorization	478
Changes in Existing Law	479
Additional Views of Senator John McCain	480
Additional Views of Senator Carl Levin	488

106TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
106-50

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 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 17 (legislative day, May 14), 1999.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 1059]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 2000 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 2000;
- (2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the armed forces for fiscal year 2000;
- (3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the armed forces for fiscal year 2000;
- (4) authorize the annual average military training student loads for the active and reserve components of the armed forces for fiscal year 2000;
- (5) impose certain reporting requirements;
- (6) 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;

(7) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2000; and

(8) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2000.

Committee overview and recommendations

The end of the Cold War brought about a new era of international conflict. The current international security environment is replete with uncertainties and diffused threats. The Department of Defense (DOD) fiscal year budget request and the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) do not provide the level of funding necessary to meet those threats. As a result, the committee believes that the administration should establish a clear sense of priorities and a coherent strategy as it allocates scarce resources to preserve national security and the readiness of the armed forces for the next millennium.

“A review of world events during 1998 will dispel any misconception that the world is now a less violent place,” according to Admiral Jay L. Johnson, Chief of Naval Operations. As the world remains a place of violence and uncertainty, and as America’s national interests are challenged throughout the globe, it is incumbent upon our military to be prepared to act when necessary. Yet, in order for the military to respond effectively, it must receive the resources necessary to train, operate, and equip. Unfortunately, after years of declining budgets and increasing deployments, the military services are beginning to show the signs of a neglected force. Recruiting and retention problems have led to shortfalls in key skills. Insufficient procurement budgets have left our forces with equipment that is increasingly unreliable and costly to maintain. Inadequate infrastructure funding has resulted in the degradation of the facilities in which our military personnel work and live. According to General Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, “Anecdotal and now measurable evidence indicates that our current readiness is fraying and that the long-term health of the Total Force is in jeopardy.”

When the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified before the committee in September 1998 and January 1999, General Shelton stated that the readiness of the military services is lower today than it was six years ago. The General informed the committee that our ability to carry out the National Military Strategy has declined to the point that it would “take us more time, and that time to victory would mean that we would lose terrain that we subsequently would have to regain. It means that the casualties to the U.S. would be higher.” According to the latest Quarterly Readiness Report: “.there are currently 118 CINC-identified readiness related deficiencies, of which 32 are designated category 1 deficiencies—ones which entail significant war fighting risk to execution of the National Military Strategy and are key risk drivers for the [Major Theater War] scenarios.” In light of General Shelton’s statements and the recent operations in the Balkans and Iraq, the committee is concerned about the Department’s ability to disengage from the Balkans and deploy to Southwest Asia and the Korean Peninsula in the time-frames required to successfully execute the National Military Strategy. If the readiness of the force is to be restored and maintained to protect

American interests in the 21st Century, the national leadership needs to take immediate and aggressive action. In the words of General Reimer: "The secret of future victories lies in what we do today to prepare the force for the tasks ahead."

The most important part of our military capability is the men and women who serve. To deal with the serious problem of recruiting and retaining a qualified force, the committee moved aggressively to pass S. 4, The Soldiers', Sailors', Airmen's and Marines' Bill of Rights Act of 1999. The act authorized a 4.8 percent pay raise, reformed the military pay tables, and improved the military retirement system. It is the committee's hope that sending such a strong signal of support to our troops will help reverse the negative trends we have seen in recruiting and retention.

During the committee hearings held on September 29, 1998 and January 5, 1999, the Service Chiefs very clearly outlined the essential funding requirements necessary to maintain the readiness of the armed forces. General Shelton and the Joint Chiefs identified a series of problems that, without additional funding of approximately \$20.0 billion, would continue to degrade our military requirements. In addition, testimony from the Service Chiefs at both hearings established an annual requirement of \$17.5 billion to meet shortfalls in readiness and modernization. This figure does not include the additional funding necessary for contingency operations and increased pay and retirement benefits necessary to address the serious problem in recruiting and retention. The committee acknowledges that the administration's request for additional funds is a positive development; however, the proposed budget request for fiscal year 2000 falls more than \$7.0 billion short of meeting the Service Chief's minimum requirements.

One of the noteworthy shortfalls within the fiscal year 2000 budget request is the funding request for military construction, which included an advanced appropriation of \$8.4 billion for the program, with only \$5.4 billion requested to be appropriated for fiscal year 2000. The remaining amount would theoretically be appropriated in the fiscal year 2001. Such incremental funding would actually result in increased costs and delays in the construction of critical facilities. In addition, although the administration's fiscal year 2000 proposal represents an approximate \$500.0 million increase over the fiscal year 1999 budget request, it does not adequately address the quality of life needs of our armed forces. Based on concerns related to the potential adverse impact on readiness and quality of life, the committee allocated an additional \$3.3 billion to fully fund the fiscal year 2000 military construction and family housing programs, with emphasis on quality of life programs.

The committee recommends full funding for the military construction and family housing programs to allow the Department to ensure that important quality of life projects are not delayed in fiscal year 2000. In turn, these funding increases allow the Department to provide an additional \$3.1 billion for important readiness requirements in other accounts in fiscal year 2001.

Personnel

The committee focused on some of the most pressing DOD personnel issues: recruiting and retention; pay and compensation, to include reform of the military retirement system; and health care. These issues have been identified in every survey, poll and informal gathering of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, as the areas that affect decisions to join or continue to serve in the armed forces.

Recruiting and retention have been a committee priority for the last three years. Despite herculean efforts by recruiters, military leaders, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Congress, there remains a disturbing downward trend in both recruiting and retention. In order to defend the Nation's vital world-wide interests, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps must be able to recruit the best and brightest young Americans to serve in the military. Once these young men and women have been trained, it is essential that the services continue to benefit from the experience of these future military leaders.

The committee continued to focus on the need to improve military pay and compensation, consistent with the committee's aggressive efforts to move for passage of S. 4, The Soldiers', Sailors', Airmen's and Marines' Bill of Rights Act of 1999. The committee's recommendations include most of the pay and compensation elements of S. 4, as well as other innovative proposals to enable military recruiters and retention personnel to offer incentives to potential recruits and active duty members.

The committee also addressed the four difficult, but essential, missions of the Military Health Care System: (1) soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines must be medically fit and ready to deploy; (2) medical forces must be ready to deploy to provide health care and preventive medical services alongside the combat forces; (3) the system must provide health care to the families of active duty personnel; and (4) the system must provide health care to retired members and their families. After the Cold War ended, budget reduction and downsizing made it almost impossible to successfully accomplish all of these four missions. As a result, the DOD implemented a nation-wide managed care system, TRICARE, in which the DOD partnered with the private sector to deliver health care. Now, the Department is struggling to fully implement TRICARE. The committee devoted a significant amount of time and effort to reviewing TRICARE and determining potential improvements and efficiencies.

Overall, the committee primarily focused its deliberations on the possible improvements and innovative actions related to recruiting and retention. The committee recognized that unless the military services recruit and retain qualified, well trained personnel, readiness will continue to suffer. The committee believes that the proposals, resources, and policies recommended in this bill will help the military services to recruit and retain the numbers of quality personnel required to meet the National Military Strategy.

Readiness and management support

The subcommittee focused on the near-term and long-term readiness capability of the force in relation to modernization, infrastruc-

ture, quality of life, management reform, and research and development. Contingency operations in the Kosovo theater of operations, Bosnia, and Haiti, have exacerbated readiness deficiencies. Through these operations, already scarce resources have been drained and critical assets diverted.

The subcommittee also examined reports related to waste and inefficiency within the Department of Defense. The committee has noted the inconsistency associated with the Department's expressed commitment to a world class force, and its tolerance for ineffective business practices and systems. Although the size of the Department poses understandable challenges, the committee is convinced that effective modernization and sustained military readiness can only be achieved through management efficiencies. In order to meet the ever increasing threats posed by weapons of mass destruction, ballistic missiles, information warfare, and terrorism, within projected funding constraints, the Department must maximize the return on its resource investments through acquisition reform, effective financial and information management.

Over the past few years, great progress has been made in instituting acquisition reforms within the Department, particularly for commercial products and small purchases. More progress, however, is still needed to reduce the cost and time necessary to develop major weapons systems. Moreover, even though the Department has a significant investment in thousands of automated systems that support every facet of its operations, many of the potential benefits of information technology have not been fully realized.

The committee recognizes the linkage between financial management reform and the savings associated with more streamlined DOD operations. The General Accounting Office (GAO) recently testified that: "DOD acknowledges that the lack of a cost accounting system is the single largest impediment to controlling and managing weapon systems costs, including cost of acquiring, managing, and disposing of weapon systems." The Department's financial systems currently cannot provide financial information necessary to establish baseline costs. The GAO further states that the Department's reform estimates are based on: ". . . either anecdotal information or data that may have important limitations." In order to address this issue, Congress enacted section 1008 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, which directed the preparation of a biennial financial management plan to assess departmental weaknesses.

In the committee's view, the Department must address and identify specific problems with the reliability of system data and the interface with finance and accounting systems to ensure proper control of physical assets and the cost of operations, and to maintain an accurate accounting for records of disbursements. Equally important, the Department must develop a plan to ensure the competency of financial managers and effective internal controls for limited defense resources. The committee will be looking for substantial progress to be made in the areas of acquisition reform, financial management, and information management in the coming fiscal year.

Finally, the committee was deeply concerned that the DOD has proposed, for the first time in a decade, an environmental budget

that leaves substantial cleanup and compliance requirements unfunded. Insufficient funding to meet compliance requirements is a particularly troubling issue since installation commanders may be susceptible to criminal sanctions. While it has been suggested that installation commanders will likely avoid fines and penalties by utilizing training resources to pay for the compliance shortfalls, that approach is unacceptable because of the impact on readiness. Furthermore, inadequate funding for environmental cleanup programs could result in threats to human health and the environment, and increased regulatory scrutiny.

It is the committee's view that responsible environmental management within the Department of Defense must include a level of funding necessary to meet legal requirements. A continued failure to adequately fund these requirements will invite public concern and unnecessary operational impediments. Moreover, the committee expects the Department to identify responsible solutions for the environmental funding deficiencies in the fiscal year 2000 budget request and in the FYDP.

Emerging threats and capabilities

This year, the committee established the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities to provide a focus for the Department of Defense's efforts to counter new and emerging threats to vital national security interests. The subcommittee has oversight over such threats as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism directed at U.S. targets both at home and abroad, information warfare, and narco-trafficking. In addition, the subcommittee has budgetary oversight of the defense technology base, which will provide for the development of the technology necessary for the U.S. military to meet the challenges of the 21st Century. A key element of the subcommittee's responsibilities is the changing role of the U.S. military in the new threat environment, with an examination of emerging operational concepts and non-traditional military operations. In this connection, the subcommittee has oversight of the procurement, and research and development programs of the Special Operations Command.

The risk of a terrorist threat to U.S. citizens, military and civilian, is a very real and growing concern. In order to combat this threat, the President announced in January 1999, a \$10.0 billion initiative. However, little, if any additional funding—beyond that which was already planned to be requested for fiscal year 2000—was added to the defense budget in fiscal year 2000. The committee notes that the DOD has unique capabilities to respond to terrorist attacks within the United States that involve weapons of mass destruction. As a result, the committee supports the domestic preparedness role of the National Guard and recommends increased funding for the National Guard's Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams. The recommended funding will support 17 new RAID teams in fiscal year 2000.

The committee remains concerned about the Department's failure to provide a comprehensive accounting of the budget request related to combating terrorism. The DOD has numerous programs to counter terrorist threats, which are spread among a variety of different agencies and departments. Apparently, diverse management

and oversight of these programs has resulted in a distinct lack of visibility and accountability for DOD allocation of funds. In order to ensure adequate oversight, the committee recommends the establishment of a central transfer account to fund DOD programs that support programs to combat terrorism, both at home and abroad.

Countering the threat of weapons of mass destruction

The threat that U.S. military forces will encounter chemical or biological warfare munitions or agents remains high. It is imperative that the Department of Defense continue to pursue aggressive modernization efforts to ensure military forces are capable of operating and fighting in a contaminated environment. The Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and the Intelligence Community are pursuing initiatives in chem-bio defense technologies to field the most capable equipment for U.S. military forces. The committee notes the investment made in fiscal year 2000 for these programs—an increase of 18 percent from fiscal year 1999. The committee added funding to accelerate fielding of equipment that decreases physiological stress on military personnel (more “user-friendly”) thereby providing improved protection to our troops. Further, the committee believes that enhanced interagency coordination is needed to avoid redundancies and inefficiencies. Therefore, provisions have been included to reauthorize and reinvigorate the Counter Proliferation Program Review Committee.

Since preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is critical to our nation’s security, the committee has authorized over \$740.0 million for the nonproliferation programs of the Departments of Defense and Energy that provide assistance to Russia and the other states of the former Soviet Union. However, the committee is concerned about the increased burden on the United States in funding these programs and recommends initiatives to secure additional cooperation from the recipients of U.S. funds and lessen the U.S. cost share of these programs. In addition, the committee is concerned with the overall management and oversight of these programs and recommends several initiatives that will allow for greater accountability and oversight.

Defending Information Infrastructure

Virtually every aspect of America’s military activity has become dependent on information systems and information based concepts. Information superiority is a dominant theme in Joint Vision 2010, the blueprint for the military force structure and strategy of the future. In order to realize the promise of information superiority, however, the United States must be able to depend upon its information systems to deliver information in a timely and secure manner. Without a high degree of information assurance, sophisticated information systems are a weakness waiting to be exploited by numerous, faceless adversaries.

The committee notes the important steps taken by the administration and the Department to secure critical information infrastructures. In particular, DOD has established a Task Force for Computer Network Defense, a Defense-wide Information Assurance Program, and an integrated working relationship with the National

Infrastructure Protection Center at the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Notwithstanding these positive steps, significant funding deficiencies remain in the Department's fiscal year 2000 budget request and the FYDP for information assurance and related matters.

During a hearing on March 16, 1999, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (C3I) stated that a \$420.0 million increase to the fiscal year 2000 budget request and a \$1.9 billion increase to the FYDP would be required for information assurance programs. These funding shortfalls are of great concern to the committee. Therefore, the committee recommends additional funding in this area and a provision that would strengthen the Department's information assurance program and provide for improved congressional oversight.

Technology and future operational concepts

Finally, the committee is deeply concerned that the Department's science and technology program has dropped to its lowest funding level since fiscal year 1986. The military services request for the technology base program (6.1 and 6.2 programs) is at a 25-year low, while industry research and development has decreased by 50 percent. These funding trends led the committee to question the Department's long-term ability to develop and field technologies necessary to revolutionize military capabilities over the next two decades. The committee has a high priority to maintain a strong, stable investment in science and technology in order to develop superior technology that permits the United States to gain a military advantage today, provide flexible options to future warfighters, and hedge against technological surprise.

Joint Vision 2010, the Pentagon's vision for the future in force dominance, depends on swift, decisive victory with minimal casualties by a smaller force. This will require more technological advantage—not less. This will require a strong commitment and investment in the defense science and technology program. The committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense reexamine the department's commitment to science and technology funding for future years and take appropriate steps to ensure that such funding is adequate to meet the national security needs of the next century. In addition, the committee is dedicated to ensuring the capability of the Special Operations Command and supporting the new requirements of non-traditional warfare. To this end, the committee recommended an increase in funding for the Special Operations Command, and science and technology programs.

Airland

In its review of the fiscal year 2000 budget request, the committee emphasized the need for funding that secures near-term core requirements, and investments that achieve savings and support future modernization. The committee primarily focused on a review of service modernization programs—for both near- and long-term requirements—and the degree to which these programs address the most likely threats that will face the nation in the 21st Century. The subcommittee has concluded that the current DOD modernization plan falls short of what is necessary to adequately

equip the armed forces. As a result, the committee recommends increased funding to address the modernization shortfalls identified by the military services.

In testimony before the Airland Subcommittee, experts expressed concern about the declining state of tactical aviation. Although the Nation's fleet of tactical aircraft remain the best in the world, recapitalization efforts have not kept pace with requirements. The committee is concerned about the rising costs associated with new tactical aviation programs and the impact that the high costs for these fighters will have on the ability of the services to replace existing aircraft and meet operational requirements.

The committee supports the continued development of the F-22, F/A-18E/F, and the Joint Strike Fighter, however, cost growth issues associated with the F-22 and Joint Strike Fighter must be closely monitored. The committee remains concerned about proposals to restrict or eliminate certain aircraft development activities, such as testing, in order to meet cost limitations. The committee believes that testing is planned and executed to ensure the safety and operational suitability of these aircraft and will not support any compromise in this area. The state of the Nation's premier ground force is also a concern to the committee. The Army is in the process of digitizing a heavy Corps, which will field an enhanced situational awareness capability and provide soldiers with a significant advantage over any adversary. The need to gain a tactical advantage on the battlefield, however, is only one of many challenges for today's Army. The Army must address the significant limitations related to its deployability and the fundamental problems associated with moving and positioning a large, heavy force in order to accomplish its assigned missions. That problem is compounded by the fact that the Army has declined to develop a total force modernization plan designed to avoid escalating operation and support costs.

The committee supports the level of funding provided in the fiscal year 2000 budget request for the reserve components. The Department requested funding for reserve component modernization that exceeds prior year requests. The committee recognizes that funding shortfalls for both active and reserve components will likely continue; however, the fiscal year 2000 budget request and subsequent identification of unfunded requirements suggest that the military services have attempted to address reserve component modernization shortfalls.

Ongoing operations in Kosovo have offered some insight into the future national defense challenges for tactical aviation and ground forces. As the military departments identify program shortfalls, it is essential that adequate funds be provided to ensure military response to the widening range of future threats. The committee will continue to support the military departments' efforts to meet these future threats.

Seapower

The committee held hearings that focused on the nation's ability to maintain navigational freedom on the high seas, to conduct maritime military operations that serve the vital interests of the United States, and to provide strategic air and sea lift in support

of the regional commanders-in-chief (CINCs). The committee hearings were structured to review the ability to carry out the National Security Strategy of Shape, Respond, and Prepare in the 21st Century. In addition, the committee reviewed ship acquisition programs and policies, and the projected ship research and development activities.

The adverse impacts related to the continued delay of force recapitalization and modernization were of particular interest to the committee. The Navy and Marine Corps funding levels have not kept pace with the costs associated with increased forward presence and participation in contingency operations. In the past 50 years, naval expeditionary forces have responded to over 250 crises worldwide. In the past 10 years, naval forces have responded to 45 operational contingencies around the world. During the cold war, Marines were called upon to protect the national interests on an average of once every 15 weeks. Since 1990, Marines have responded once every five weeks. Submarine strategic and tactical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions have doubled since the end of the cold war. During the same period, the submarine force structure has been reduced 50 percent. Although the Quadrennial Defense Review directed an attack submarine force level of 50 submarines, the Fleet commanders-in-chief have validated peacetime requirements for 72 attack submarines.

Based on hearings and other information, the committee has determined that the Navy and Marine Corps must have the readiness capability to meet near-term and long-term threats designed to disrupt or deny maritime operations. It is the committee's view that future readiness will be at risk if recapitalization and modernization continue to be deferred. The design of more efficient ships and the reengineering of existing systems provides a return on investment through reduced ship operating and life cycle costs. Strategic sea and air lift are required to support everyday operations overseas, emergent requirements, and sustained military operations of a major theater war. In short, recapitalization and modernization must include the right quantity and quality of equipment, platforms, and weapons systems to support near-term and long-term readiness of the Navy and Marine Corps, particularly when there must be a capability to sustain simultaneous naval operations in geographically dispersed areas.

Strategic

The committee has continued to review the adequacy of programs and policies in the following areas: (1) ballistic and cruise missile defense; (2) national security space; (3) strategic nuclear delivery systems; (4) military intelligence; and (5) Department of Energy activities regarding the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear waste cleanup, and other defense activities.

On February 24, 1999, and March 11, 1999, the committee conducted hearings on national and theater missile defense programs. Based on these hearings, the committee concluded that the Department of Defense continues to pursue a severely funding-constrained ballistic missile defense (BMD) program. Although the committee is pleased by DOD's decision to substantially increase funding for the National Missile Defense (NMD) program, the committee found

that a number of Theater Missile Defense (TMD) and BMD technology programs remain severely under-funded. For example, both the Patriot PAC-3 and Navy Area Defense programs do not have sufficient funds in the FYDP to meet DOD's own development and fielding schedules. The situation regarding the upper tier TMD systems is even worse, particularly with regard to the Navy Theater Wide system. DOD has established a new "upper tier strategy" that puts the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system and the Navy Theater Wide system into an unnecessary, funding-driven, competition. As addressed elsewhere in this report, the committee has serious reservations about this approach. In the area of advanced BMD technology, the committee also determined that DOD's program is severely under-funded. In light of DOD's inadequate overall missile defense budget, BMDO's focus on major acquisition programs has caused BMDO's advanced technology programs to suffer. During 1998, the committee raised serious concerns regarding the Air Force's Airborne Laser (ABL) acquisition strategy. The committee has reviewed DOD's March 1999 ABL report to Congress and is cautiously optimistic about progress to date. The committee addresses this issue in detail elsewhere in this report.

On March 22, 1999, the committee conducted a hearing on national security space issues at Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado. As a result of this hearing and other information provided to the committee, the committee remains concerned that DOD may not be properly organized to manage national security space matters. Therefore, the committee recommends the creation of an independent commission to evaluate national security space management and organization. The committee also identified a number of areas in which budget constraints have caused DOD to insufficiently fund key space programs and technologies. The recent decision to delay the Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS) is the most glaring example. Due to budget constraints, DOD delayed the SBIRS-High program by two years, resulting in as much as \$1.0 billion in unnecessary program cost growth. The committee has also identified key areas of space technology development that require additional support, as addressed in detail elsewhere in this report.

On April 14, 1999, the committee conducted a hearing on strategic nuclear forces. The committee reviewed the Navy's decision to reduce the Trident submarine force from 18 to 14 submarines and the overarching policy of remaining at force levels associated with the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) until START II enters into force. The committee also reviewed the recommendations of the October 1998 Defense Science Board (DSB) report on nuclear deterrence. The committee is concerned by the lack of attention that DOD is giving to matters related to nuclear deterrence and strongly urges DOD to implement the recommendations contained in the DSB report. Regarding the retirement of strategic nuclear delivery systems, the committee endorses the Navy's plan to reduce the Trident submarine force structure, resulting in 14 modern boats all armed with the D-5 missile, but believes that DOD should not act prematurely to retire other elements of the strategic force structure.

Department of Energy defense activities

In weapons stewardship and management, the committee noted that the Science-based Stockpile Stewardship program, will require continued acquisition of costly new experimental facilities and massive new computing capabilities to simulate and model the various phases of nuclear detonation. The committee considers the science-based approach to be speculative. It will likely take several years to confirm that this approach is sufficient to enable the Department of Energy (DOE) to certify the reliability and safety of U.S. nuclear warheads. Even if all of the new facilities and equipment perform as expected, the DOE may not be able to accurately predict the long-term reliability of the aging warheads within the stockpile.

The committee remains concerned that the long-term investments of the DOE do not adequately balance the needs for experimental testing facilities and the sustained manufacturing capability of the four weapons production plants. The committee supports the continued investment in the production plants because these facilities are essential to the safety and viability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile. If the weapons production plants are allowed to degrade due to a lack of capitalization or modernization, there may be serious long-term national security ramifications associated with an aging and unreliable U.S. nuclear stockpile.

The committee remains concerned about the DOE tritium production program. The committee notes that the DOE has failed to request sufficient funds to complete its proposed dual track tritium production strategy. The committee expects the Secretary of Energy to reestablish a U.S. tritium production capability by the dates required in the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum. The committee is further concerned that the DOE does not have an adequate plan to remanufacture and replace plutonium pits and high explosives necessary to maintain enduring weapons systems. The committee has requested that the Secretary establish a pit production strategic plan that is linked to the DOD requirements.

In the area of Environmental Management, the committee believes that the DOE has made great progress in utilizing its resources to achieve actual cleanup and closure. The committee notes that the DOE has finally issued an accelerated cleanup plan: "Accelerating Cleanup—Pathways to Closure." The plan describes the activities necessary to close each site identified as surplus to the needs of the DOE.

The committee remains concerned that the Department of Energy is not allowing fair and open competition for the off-site disposal of low level and mixed low level radioactive wastes. The committee questions the DOE policy that promotes the use of on-site low level waste disposal, as opposed to commercial options licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Summary

The National Military Strategy of the United States envisioned that the armed forces would be prepared to fight and win two nearly simultaneous major theater wars, the most likely being the Persian Gulf and the Korean peninsula. The strategy did not anticipate a third theater of war, such as the operation in Kosovo, and

involvement in multiple, concurrent contingency operations. Strained by ongoing day-to-day operations, the contingency operations in Bosnia and Iraq, and the escalating conflict in Kosovo, it is anticipated that the long-term and indirect military readiness, quality of life, and modernization costs of these operations will be considerable. The United States is risking its ability to protect national interests in other critical regions of the world. The committee is very concerned about the administration's failure to adequately address that significant risk through policy, planning, and resource allocation. The committee looks forward to a more meaningful resolution of these issues in future budget submissions and the FYDP.

Explanation of funding summary

The administration's budget request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 2000 was \$280.5 billion, of which \$280.8 billion was for programs that require specific funding authorization.

The following table summarizes both the direct authorizations and equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2000 defense programs. The columns relating to the authorization request do not include funding for the following items: 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 \$288.8 billion in budget authority, which is consistent with the fiscal year 2000 Budget Resolution.

**Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2000**
(In Thousands of \$s)

**DIVISION A
TITLE I
PROCUREMENT**

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Recommended</u>	<u>Budget Request</u>	<u>BA Senate</u>
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,229,888	270,300	1,500,188	1,229,888	1,500,188
Missile Procurement, Army	1,358,104	53,000	1,411,104	1,358,104	1,411,104
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,416,765	262,100	1,678,865	1,416,765	1,678,865
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,140,816	69,000	1,209,816	1,140,816	1,209,816
Other Procurement, Army	3,423,870	245,200	3,669,070	3,423,870	3,669,070
<i>Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army</i>					
Operation & Maintenance	593,500	(593,500)	0	593,500	0
Procurement	241,500	(241,500)	0	241,500	0
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	334,000	(334,000)	0	334,000	0
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	8,228,655	698,600	8,927,255	8,228,655	8,927,255
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,357,400	34,700	1,392,100	1,357,400	1,392,100
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	484,900	55,800	540,700	484,900	540,700
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	6,678,454	338,000	7,016,454	6,678,454	7,016,454
Other Procurement, Navy	4,100,091	97,700	4,197,791	4,100,091	4,197,791
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,137,220	158,350	1,295,570	1,137,220	1,295,570
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	9,302,086	402,800	9,704,886	9,302,086	9,704,886
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	419,537	(7,700)	411,837	419,537	411,837
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,359,608	29,600	2,389,208	2,359,608	2,389,208
Other Procurement, Air Force	7,085,177	57,000	7,142,177	7,085,177	7,142,177
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,128,967	164,450	2,293,417	2,128,967	2,293,417
Procurement, National Guard and Reserve Equipment	0		0	0	0

**Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2000**
(In Thousands of \$'s)

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Recommended</u>	<u>Budget Request</u>	<u>BA Senate</u>
<i>Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense</i>					
Operation & Maintenance	0	593,500	593,500	0	593,500
Procurement	0	241,500	241,500	0	241,500
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	0	334,000	334,000	0	334,000
Procurement, Defense Health Program	356,970		356,970	0	0
Procurement, Office of the Inspector General	2,100		2,100	0	0
Total Procurement	53,379,608	2,928,900	56,308,508	53,020,538	55,949,438
TITLE II					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	4,426,194	245,000	4,671,194	4,426,194	4,671,194
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	7,984,016	217,100	8,201,116	7,984,016	8,201,116
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	13,077,829	489,479	13,567,308	13,077,829	13,567,308
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	8,609,289	512,901	9,122,190	8,609,289	9,122,190
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	24,434		24,434	24,434	24,434
Developmental Test & Evaluation, Defense	253,457		253,457	253,457	253,457
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	34,375,219	1,464,480	35,839,699	34,375,219	35,839,699
TITLE III					
OPERATION and MAINTENANCE & WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	18,660,994	(320,900)	18,340,094	18,660,994	18,340,094
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	22,238,715	(56,100)	22,182,615	22,238,715	22,182,615
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,558,929	53,600	2,612,529	2,558,929	2,612,529
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	20,363,203	19,200	20,382,403	20,363,203	20,382,403
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	11,419,233	(456,200)	10,963,033	11,419,233	10,963,033

**Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2000**
(In Thousands of \$'s)

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Recommended</u>	<u>Budget Request</u>	<u>BA Senate</u>
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,369,213	7,600	1,376,813	1,369,213	1,376,813
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	917,647	9,700	927,347	917,647	927,347
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	123,266	2,500	125,766	123,266	125,766
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,728,437	(1,600)	1,726,837	1,728,437	1,726,837
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	2,903,549	8,700	2,912,249	2,903,549	2,912,249
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,099,618	19,900	3,119,518	3,099,618	3,119,518
Office of the Inspector General	138,744	(500)	138,244	140,344	140,344
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	7,621		7,621	7,621	7,621
Environmental Restoration, Army	378,170		378,170	378,170	378,170
Environmental Restoration, Navy	284,000		284,000	284,000	284,000
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	376,800		376,800	376,800	376,800
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	25,370		25,370	25,370	25,370
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	199,214		199,214	199,214	199,214
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	55,800		55,800	55,800	55,800
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	788,100	(42,835)	745,265	788,100	745,265
Combating Terrorism	0	1,954,430	1,954,430	0	1,954,430
Defense Health Program	10,477,687	(24,200)	10,453,487	10,834,657	10,810,457
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	475,500		475,500	475,500	475,500
Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Fund	15,000		15,000	15,000	15,000
Overseas Contingency Operation Transfer Fund	2,387,600		2,387,600	2,387,600	2,387,600
QOL Enhancements	1,845,370		1,845,370	1,845,370	1,845,370
Defense Transfer Program	31,000		31,000	31,000	31,000
Overseas Military Facility Investment				4,300	4,300
Miscellaneous Special Funds				38,230	38,230

**Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2000**

(In Thousands of \$'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Recommended	Budget Request	BA Senate
Defense Burdensharing-Allies/Nato	102,868,780	1,173,295	104,042,075	278,000	278,000
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance			103,548,380	104,721,675	104,721,675
REVOLVING FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Fund (Air Force)	28,000		28,000	28,000	28,000
Army Working Capital Fund	62,344		62,344	62,344	62,344
National Defense Sealift Fund	354,700	40,000	394,700	354,700	394,700
Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service	67,000	(67,000)	0	67,000	0
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Routine & Ongoing Sales)	(150,000)		(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Excess of Routine Sales)				(230,000)	(230,000)
Subtotal Working Capital Funds	362,044	(27,000)	335,044	132,044	105,044
Total Operation and Maintenance & Working Capital Funds	103,230,824	1,146,295	104,377,119	103,680,424	104,826,719
TITLES IV-V-VI					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Total Military Personnel	73,723,293	(192,200)	73,531,093	73,723,293	73,531,093
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
DIVISION B					
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	656,003	378,719	1,034,722	656,003	1,034,722
Military Construction, Navy	319,786	564,850	884,636	319,786	884,636
Military Construction, Air Force	179,497	572,309	751,806	179,497	751,806
Military Construction, Defense-wide	193,005	593,585	786,590	193,005	786,590
Military Construction, Defense-wide (Fwd Op Location Transfer)		42,835	42,835	0	42,835
Military Construction, Army National Guard	16,045	163,226	179,271	16,045	179,271

**Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2000**
(In Thousands of \$'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Recommended	Budget Request	BA Senate
Military Construction, Air National Guard	21,319	211,021	232,340	21,319	232,340
Military Construction, Army Reserve	23,120	92,065	115,185	23,120	115,185
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	4,933	18,112	23,045	4,933	23,045
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	12,155	22,709	34,864	12,155	34,864
Base Realignment and Closure II, III, IV	705,911	187,000	892,911	705,911	892,911
NATO Infrastructure	191,000	(18,528)	172,472	191,000	172,472
Total Military Construction	2,322,774	2,827,903	5,150,677	2,322,774	5,150,677
<u>FAMILY HOUSING</u>					
Family Housing Construction, Army	14,003	47,528	61,531	14,003	61,531
Family Housing Support, Army	1,098,080		1,098,080	1,098,080	1,098,080
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	64,605	233,749	298,354	64,605	298,354
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	895,070		895,070	895,070	895,070
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	101,791	241,720	343,511	101,791	343,511
Family Housing Support, Air Force	821,892		821,892	821,892	821,892
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide	50		50	50	50
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	41,440		41,440	41,440	41,440
Homeowners Assistance Fund	0		0	0	0
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	78,756		78,756	78,756	78,756
Total Family Housing	3,115,687	522,997	3,638,684	3,115,687	3,638,684

DIVISION C
TITLE XXXI-XXXII
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)
Weapons Activities

4,531,000 (1,000) 4,530,000 4,531,000 4,530,000

**Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2000**

(In Thousands of \$'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Recommended	Budget Request	BA Senate
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,514,376	1,018,492	5,532,868	4,514,376	5,532,868
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	73,000		73,000	73,000	73,000
Other Defense Activities	1,792,000	29,000	1,821,000	1,792,000	1,821,000
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,054,492	(1,054,492)	0	1,054,492	0
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	228,000	(12,000)	216,000	228,000	216,000
Formerly Utilized Site Remediation	150,000	(150,000)	0	150,000	0
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,500		17,500	17,500	17,500
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	12,360,368	(170,000)	12,190,368	12,360,368	12,190,368
Recapitulation					
Department of Defense (Division A)	264,708,944	5,347,475	270,056,419	264,799,474	270,146,949
Department of Defense (Division B)	5,438,461	3,350,900	8,789,361	5,438,461	8,789,361
Net Other Funds	5,000	(5,000)	0	240,000	235,000
Transfer Authority sec 1001 [Memo Entry]	2,000,000		2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Offsetting Receipts				(1,888,000)	(1,888,000)
Total Department of Defense Military (051)	270,152,405	10,343,375	278,845,780	266,939,935	277,283,310
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	12,360,368	(170,000)	12,190,368	12,360,368	12,190,368
Total Defense Related Activities (054)	49,623	(49,623)	0	1,222,279	1,172,656
Emergency Kosovo Supplemental		(1,838,000)	(1,838,000)		(1,838,000)
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	280,724,396	8,285,752	289,198,148	280,522,582	288,808,334

**DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATIONS**

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

The budget request included \$53.0 billion for Department of Defense procurement programs. While this level of requested funding represented an overall increase in Department of Defense procurement funding, the committee is concerned that the requested level of procurement funding falls short of the \$60.0 billion target established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in prior year testimony.

The committee continues to give priority to buying essential core requirements, investing to achieve savings, and investing in the future. The committee has also worked to address primarily those modernization shortfalls that were either: (1) highlighted in the services' unfunded requirements lists, or (2) from the list of unfunded requirements, but later validated by the services as meriting attention. It is clear, however, that the current Department of Defense modernization plan, even with the best case projections of available research, development, and acquisition funding, falls short of what is necessary to modernize the armed forces adequately.

The committee continues to be pleased with the level of funding provided in the budget request for the reserve components. In the fiscal year 2000 request, the Department has requested more adequate funding for reserve component modernization than had been previously included in prior year requests. The committee recognizes that both active and reserve component funding shortfalls are likely to continue, but believes that the fiscal year 2000 budget request and subsequent service unfunded requirements lists reflect the efforts made by the services to address reserve component modernization shortfalls. The committee encourages both components to continue their collective efforts to meet the common goal of ensuring our total force is prepared for a challenging future.

Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 2000 for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted explicitly in the report, all changes are made without prejudice.

SUBTITLE A - AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

**Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2000**

(In Thousands of \$'s)

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Recommended</u>
TITLE I			
PROCUREMENT			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,229,888	270,300	1,500,188
Missile Procurement, Army	1,358,104	53,000	1,411,104
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,416,765	262,100	1,678,865
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,140,816	69,000	1,209,816
Other Procurement, Army	3,423,870	245,200	3,669,070
<i>Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army</i>			
Operation & Maintenance	593,500	(593,500)	0
Procurement	241,500	(241,500)	0
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	334,000	(334,000)	0
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	8,228,655	698,600	8,927,255
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,357,400	34,700	1,392,100
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	484,900	55,800	540,700
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	6,678,454	338,000	7,016,454
Other Procurement, Navy	4,100,091	97,700	4,197,791
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,137,220	158,350	1,295,570
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	9,302,086	402,800	9,704,886
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	419,537	(7,700)	411,837

Summary of National Defense Authorization for FY 2000

(In Thousands of \$'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Recommended
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,359,608	29,600	2,389,208
Other Procurement, Air Force	7,085,177	57,000	7,142,177
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,128,967	164,450	2,293,417
Procurement, National Guard and Reserve Equipment <i>Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense</i>	0		0
Operation & Maintenance	0	593,500	593,500
Procurement	0	241,500	241,500
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	0	334,000	334,000
Procurement, Defense Health Program	356,970		356,970
Procurement, Office of the Inspector General	2,100		2,100
Total Procurement	53,379,608	2,928,900	56,308,508

Chemical demilitarization program (sec. 106)

The budget request for the Army included \$1,169.0 million for the Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction (CAMD) program. The CAMD request included \$593.5 million for operation and maintenance, \$241.5 million for procurement, and \$334.0 million for research and development.

The Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), its resolution of ratification and implementing legislation, established a time line for the United States to complete chemical agent and munitions stockpile destruction and related efforts. Programmatic issues, however, continue to pose cost challenges and challenges to meeting time line requirements.

Program life cycle costs have risen dramatically. Original life cycle cost estimates compiled in the early 1980s for the destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile were between \$1.2 and \$2.0 billion. Current life cycle costs are expected to exceed \$12.0 billion. Federal and state permitting requirements, public safety concerns, and evaluation of new destruction technologies have contributed to program cost growth.

In addition to presenting funding challenges, the search for new destruction technologies may cause delays in meeting destruction time lines. As a result of public concern and criticism surrounding the baseline incineration process, programs for the evaluation, demonstration, or implementation of alternative methods for the destruction of bulk and assembled chemical agents and munitions were initiated. Over 25 percent of the budget request for fiscal year 2000 is for demonstrating alternative destruction technologies to the baseline incineration process. The committee continues to express concerns that any evaluation and decision process must be thorough, yet expeditious, in order to ensure appropriate destruction technologies are pursued in a timely manner.

While many of these challenges may not have been anticipated when chemical stockpile destruction began, Congress understood the magnitude and complexity of the task of stockpile destruction. Accordingly, budgeting responsibilities were directed to the Department of Defense and not to a specific military service.

Section 1521(f) of title 50, United States Code, states that funds for this program shall not be included in the budget accounts for any military department. The committee is concerned that funds for this program continue to be included in the Army budget accounts, despite the statutory requirement to the contrary. The committee expects that the Department of Defense will comply with this provision and fund the CAMD program accordingly. The committee recommends a provision that would provide funding for chemical demilitarization in a Department of Defense budget line.

SUBTITLE B-ARMY PROGRAMS

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIRCRAFT						
	FIXED WING						
1	ARL (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	UTILITY F/W (MR) AIRCRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	GUARDRAIL COMMON SENSOR/ACS (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ROTARY						
4	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	8	86,140	9	90,000	17	176,140
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	16,700	-	-	-	16,700
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
6	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)	-	18,863	-	-	-	18,863
7	ARL MODS	-	5,828	-	-	-	5,828
8	AH1F MODS	-	432	-	-	-	432
9	AH-64 MODS	-	22,565	-	-	-	22,565
10	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	-	70,738	-	56,100	-	126,838
11	CH-47 ICH	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	-	6,308	-	-	-	6,308
14	OH-58 MODS	-	468	-	-	-	468
15	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	-	761	-	-	-	761
16	LONGBOW	-	771,219	-	45,000	-	816,219

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request				Change		Recommended	
		Qty		Cost		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
33	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	35,915	-	-	-	-	-	35,915
34	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	-	4,394	-	-	-	-	-	4,394
35	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	8,760	-	-	-	-	-	8,760
36	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	1,462	-	-	-	-	-	1,462
37	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	-	43,563	-	-	-	(8,000)	-	43,563 (8,000)
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,229,888		270,300				1,500,188
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY								
	OTHER MISSILES								
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM								
1	EFOG-M (ENHANCED FIBER OPTIC GUIDED MIS.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	20	33,750	-	-	-	-	20	33,750
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM								
3	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	2,200	309,816	-	-	-	-	2,200	309,816
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(13,344)	-	-	-	-	-	(13,344)
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM								
5	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	2,682	307,677	-	-	-	-	2,682	307,677
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	98,406	-	-	-	-	-	98,406
7	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	MLRS ROCKET	-	3,338	-	-	-	-	-	3,338
9	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	47	130,634	-	-	-	-	47	130,634

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
10	-	15,993	-	-	-	15,993
11	110	95,619	-	-	110	95,619
12	61	76,787	-	-	61	76,787
13	846	149,254	-	-	846	149,254
14	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	-	-	-	-	-	-
ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM						
ATACMS/BAT						
BAT						
MULTI PURPOSE INDV MUN						
ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
MODIFICATIONS						
16	-	30,840	-	60,000	-	90,840
17	-	17,392	-	-	-	17,392
18	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	-	68,306	-	-	-	68,306
20	-	6,654	-	-	-	6,654
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
21	-	19,002	-	-	-	19,002
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
22	-	2,373	-	-	-	2,373
23	-	989	-	-	-	989
24	-	1,397	-	-	-	1,397
25	-	3,221	-	-	-	3,221
AIR DEFENSE TARGETS						
ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MISSILES)						
MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION						
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT						
TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,358,104		(7,000)		1,411,104
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1		2,640	-	-	-	2,640
2		308,762	-	-	-	308,762
3		27,675	-	-	-	27,675
4		23,441	-	-	-	23,441
5		-	-	-	-	-
6		14,910	-	-	-	14,910
7		4,334	-	-	-	4,334
8		-	-	-	-	-
9		8,086	-	-	-	8,086
10	12	54,545	-	-	12	54,545
11		2,559	-	-	-	2,559
MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
12		53,463	-	25,000	-	78,463
13		27,338	-	-	-	27,338
14		7,087	-	74,200	-	81,287
15		6,259	-	20,000	-	26,259

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
16	FAASV PIP TO FLEET	-	230	-	20,000	-	20,230
17	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	-	-	-	72,000	-	72,000
18	BREACHER SYSTEM (MOD)	-	19,680	-	-	-	19,680
19	HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)	-	67,312	-	14,000	-	81,312
20	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)	-	1,443	-	-	-	1,443
21	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	-	29,815	-	-	-	29,815
22	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	-	685,938	-	27,600	-	713,538
	LESS: ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(262,942)	-	-	-	(262,942)
23	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	213,406	-	-	-	213,406
24	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	192	-	-	-	192
25	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	138	-	-	-	138
26	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	-	8,924	-	-	-	8,924
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
27	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES	1,304	12,204	-	-	1,304	12,204
28	ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	1,085	18,290	704	18,300	1,789	36,590
29	GRENADA LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	12,479	5,744	-	-	12,479	5,744
30	M16 RIFLE	85	1,138	-	-	85	1,138
31	XM107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	8,687	5,309	-	-	8,687	5,309
32	5.56 CARBINE M4						
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
33	MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS	-	1,980	-	-	-	1,980
34	M4 CARBINE MODS	-	5,315	-	-	-	5,315
35	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)	-	8,326	-	-	-	8,326
36	HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)	-	3,345	-	-	-	3,345
37	M119 MODIFICATIONS	-	4,784	-	-	-	4,784
38	M16 RIFLE MODS	-	7,180	-	-	-	7,180
39	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	1,006	-	-	-	1,006
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
40	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	1,206	-	-	-	1,206
41	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	-	4,566	-	-	-	4,566
42	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	3,084	-	-	-	3,084
43	SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	-	5,214	-	-	-	5,214
44	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES						
45	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	-	22,839	-	-	-	22,839
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(9,000)		(9,000)
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		1,416,765		262,100		1,678,865
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	AMMUNITION						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
1	-	127,087	-	-	-	127,087
2	-	1,891	-	-	-	1,891
3	-	8,529	-	-	-	8,529
4	600	1,355	-	-	600	1,355
5	-	983	-	-	-	983
6	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	-	23,374	-	-	-	23,374
8	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	-	2,764	-	-	-	2,764
10	-	46,618	-	2,000	-	48,618
11	-	5,353	-	-	-	5,353
12	-	36,645	-	8,000	-	44,645
13	-	7,989	-	-	-	7,989
14	-	15,616	-	9,000	-	24,616
15	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	30	1,906	-	-	30	1,906
17	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	60	46,279	-	4,000	60	50,279
20	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	56	51,819	-	-	56	51,819

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TANK AMMUNITION						
22	CTG 120MM APFSDS-T M829A2/M829E3	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	CTG 120MM HEAT-MP-T M830A1	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	CTG TANK 120MM TP-T M831/M831A1	57	32,623	-	-	57	32,623
25	CTG TANK 120MM TPCSDS-T M865	165	86,027	-	-	165	86,027
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
26	CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1	68	2,570	-	-	68	2,570
27	CTG ARTY 105MM BLANK M395	125	6,774	-	-	125	6,774
28	CTG ARTY 105MM DPICM XM915	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
29	CTG ARTY 105MM HERA M913	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	CTG ARTY 105MM M927	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	CTG ARTY 105MM ILLUM M314 SERIES	14	8,000	-	-	14	8,000
32	PROJ ARTY 155MM SMOKE WP M825	-	14,789	-	-	-	14,789
33	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M795	20	9,860	-	-	20	9,860
34	PROJ ARTY 155MM SADARM M898	227	54,546	-	-	227	54,546
35	REMOTE AREA DENIAL ARTILLERY MUNITION (RADA)	100	48,250	-	-	100	48,250
36	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M107	113	24,973	-	-	113	24,973
37	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS)	367	42,938	-	-	367	42,938
	ARTILLERY FUZES						
38	FUZE ARTY ELEC TIME M767	235	32,041	-	-	235	32,041
39	FUZE MULTI OPTION	45	14,061	-	-	45	14,061
	MINES						

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
40	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES	251	8,067	-	-	251	8,067
41	MINE AT M87 (VOLCANO)	-	-	-	18,000	-	18,000
42	WIDE AREA MUNITIONS	79	10,387	-	10,000	79	20,387
	ROCKETS						
43	BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
44	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	245	144,760	-	-	245	144,760
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
45	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	11,246	-	-	-	11,246
46	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	11,431	-	-	-	11,431
47	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	-	9,782	-	-	-	9,782
48	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	-	2,265	-	-	-	2,265
	MISCELLANEOUS						
49	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	-	6,876	-	-	-	6,876
50	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	-	2,928	-	-	-	2,928
51	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	-	7,659	-	-	-	7,659
52	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	-	10,679	-	-	-	10,679
53	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	-	5,303	-	-	-	5,303
54	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
55	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	46,139	-	-	-	46,139
56	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	3,525	-	-	-	3,525

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
57	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	-	13,043	-	-	-	13,043
58	CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	-	86,291	-	-	-	86,291
59	ARMS INITIATIVE	-	4,775	-	14,000	-	18,775
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(6,000)		(6,000)
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		1,140,816		69,000		1,209,816
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	632	15,277	-	-	632	15,277
2	SEMITRAILER FB BB/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T	208	7,108	-	-	208	7,108
3	SEMITRAILER LB 40T M870A1 (CCE)	24	1,926	-	-	24	1,926
4	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	285	25,365	-	-	285	25,365
5	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 7500G, BULKHAUL	63	4,124	-	-	63	4,124
6	SEMITRAILER VAN CGO SUPPLY 12T 4WHL M129A2C	70	6,260	-	-	70	6,260
7	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	867	92,092	-	17,000	867	109,092
8	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	-	13,076	-	-	-	13,076
9	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	2,179	425,855	-	-	2,179	425,855
10	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPM	-	7,374	-	-	-	7,374
11	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	450	190,399	-	-	450	190,399
12	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	12	7,043	-	-	12	7,043
13	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	344	50,131	-	-	344	50,131

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
14	TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)	24	1,960	-	-	24	1,960
15	HVY EXPANDED MOBILITY TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SE	23	4,901	-	-	23	4,901
16	MEDIUM TRUCK EXTENDED SVC PGM(ESP) (PREV SL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	LINE HAUL ESP	115	9,256	-	-	115	9,256
18	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	-	29,769	-	-	-	29,769
20	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TAC VEH)	-	1,558	-	-	-	1,558
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
21	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	3	588	-	-	3	588
22	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	36	846	-	-	36	846
23	GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	998	-	-	-	998
24	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	1,034	-	-	-	1,034
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
25	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT PEO	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	PROJECT MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (TACOM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
28	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM	-	7,568	-	-	-	7,568
29	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	-	5,119	-	-	-	5,119
	COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
30	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SP)	-	68,489	-	-	-	68,489

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
31	SHF TERM	16	31,950	-	-	16	31,950
32	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	-	1,547	-	-	-	1,547
33	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	-	6,557	-	-	-	6,557
34	GROUND COMMAND POST	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	SMART-T (SPACE)	-	61,761	-	(10,000)	-	51,761
36	SCAMP (SPACE)	-	5,033	-	-	-	5,033
37	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS	40	10,920	-	-	40	10,920
38	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	-	500	-	-	-	500
	COMM - C3 SYSTEM						
39	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	-	12,963	-	-	-	12,963
	COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
40	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	-	38,763	-	25,900	-	64,663
41	SINGGARS FAMILY	-	13,205	-	70,000	-	83,205
42	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS	-	980	-	-	-	980
43	ACUS MOD PROGRAM (WIN T/T)	-	109,056	-	50,000	-	159,056
44	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING	-	4,151	-	-	-	4,151
45	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONIC	-	3,326	-	-	-	3,326
46	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	-	20,600	-	-	-	20,600
	COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM						
48	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	-	1,585	-	-	-	1,585
	INFORMATION SECURITY						

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
49	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	-	11,038	-	-	-	11,038
50	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	-	28,750	-	-	-	28,750
	COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
51	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	-	2,029	-	-	-	2,029
52	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	-	1,836	-	-	-	1,836
53	ARMY DISN ROUTER	-	3,700	-	-	-	3,700
54	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)	-	440	-	-	-	440
55	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	-	2,891	-	-	-	2,891
	COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
56	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	-	56,915	-	-	-	56,915
57	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	18,454	-	-	-	18,454
58	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)	-	100,018	-	-	-	100,018
59	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	-	17,256	-	-	-	17,256
	ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)						
60	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	-	1,846	-	-	-	1,846
61	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	-	18,345	-	-	-	18,345
62	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (INTEL SPT) - TIARA	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
63	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	-	56,514	-	-	-	56,514
64	JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)	155	24,262	-	-	155	24,262
65	I EW - GND BASE COMMON SENSORS (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
66	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (TUAV)	-	45,863	-	-	-	45,863

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
67	JOINT STARS (ARMY) (TIARA)	12	82,176	-	-	12	82,176
68	INTEGRATED BROADCAST TERMINAL MODS (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
69	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	36	24,500	-	-	36	24,500
70	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
71	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NAT CAPABILITIES	-	4,370	-	-	-	4,370
72	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM (CIGSS)	-	2,791	-	-	-	2,791
73	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION MODS (JTAGS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
74	TROJAN (TIARA)	-	4,268	-	-	-	4,268
75	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	-	9,090	-	-	-	9,090
76	CI HUMINT AUTOMATED TOOL SET (CHATs) (TIARA)	-	3,137	-	-	-	3,137
77	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TIARA)	-	530	-	-	-	530
	ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
78	SHORTSTOP	-	-	-	-	-	-
79	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURE	-	1,691	-	-	-	1,691
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
80	FAAD GBS	11	38,379	-	-	11	38,379
81	SENTINEL MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
82	TARGET LOCATION OBSERVATION SYSTEM (TLOS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
83	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	9,448	20,977	-	95,400	9,448	116,377
84	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYST	66	43,223	-	-	66	43,223
85	LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)	145	3,436	-	-	145	3,436
86	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	3,330	35,901	-	-	3,330	35,901

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
87	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT	275	9,486	-	-	275	9,486
88	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	-	4,283	-	-	-	4,283
89	PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SETTER (P	3,492	4,137	-	-	3,492	4,137
90	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)	-	6,533	-	-	-	6,533
91	DIGITIZATION APPLIQUE	-	66,423	-	-	-	66,423
92	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (L	14	6,262	-	-	14	6,262
93	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR M-30	-	2,852	-	-	-	2,852
94	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	15	3,740	-	-	15	3,740
95	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS	-	5,469	-	-	-	5,469
96	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	-	28,098	-	-	-	28,098
97	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS (AFATDS)	456	43,343	-	-	456	43,343
98	FIRE SUPPORT ADA CONVERSION	-	980	-	-	-	980
99	CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)	270	19,922	-	-	270	19,922
100	FAAD C2	2	10,594	-	21,000	2	31,594
101	FAADC2I MODIFICATIONS	-	5,880	-	-	-	5,880
102	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (A	1	2,939	-	-	1	2,939
103	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE (FED)	-	15,822	-	-	-	15,822
104	STRIKER-COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	30	12,307	-	-	30	12,307
105	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	-	863	-	-	-	863
106	LOGTECH	-	4,190	-	-	-	4,190
107	TC AIMS II	-	1,739	-	-	-	1,739

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
108	GUN LAYING AND POS SYS (GLPS)	81	7,465	-	-	81	7,465
109	ISYSCON EQUIPMENT	-	14,714	-	-	-	14,714
110	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	-	52,049	-	-	-	52,049
111	STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)	-	33,711	-	-	-	33,711
112	STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM	-	30,700	-	9,200	-	39,900
	ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION						
113	ARMY TRAINING XXI MODERNIZATION	-	15,361	-	-	-	15,361
114	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	138,607	-	-	-	138,607
115	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	-	83,040	-	-	-	83,040
	ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)						
116	AFRTS	-	490	-	-	-	490
117	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (A/V)	-	2,689	-	-	-	2,689
	ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT						
118	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	-	378	-	-	-	378
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
119	SMOKE/OBSURANT SYSTEMS ROLL	-	6,286	-	-	-	6,286
120	GENERATOR, SMOKE, MECH M58	-	3,420	-	-	-	3,420
121	M6 DISCHARGER	1,878	3,038	-	-	1,878	3,038
122	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CHEM DEF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
123	HEAVY DRY SUPT BRIDGE SYSTEM	3	13,980	-	-	3	13,980

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
124	RIBBON BRIDGE	65	12,077	-	-	65	12,077
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
125	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-H	-	-	-	-	-	-
126	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING	-	3,972	-	-	-	3,972
127	METALLIC MINE DETECTOR, VEHICLE MOUNTED	-	-	-	-	-	-
128	WIDE AREA MUNITIONS (REMOTE CONTROL UNIT)	-	-	-	-	-	-
129	MINI-FLAIL ROBOTIC	-	-	-	-	-	-
130	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPM	-	4,989	-	-	-	4,989
131	BN COUNTERMINE SIP	-	8,900	-	-	-	8,900
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
132	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL UNITS	-	-	-	-	-	-
133	ARMY SPACE HEATER 120,000 BTU (ASH)	58	912	-	-	58	912
134	LARGE CAPACITY FIELD HEATER, 400K BTU	20	1,312	-	-	20	1,312
135	AIR CONDITIONERS	-	3,756	-	-	-	3,756
136	FIRE TRUCKS	-	-	-	-	-	-
137	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES	-	9,844	-	-	-	9,844
138	FLOODLIGHT SET, ELEC, TRL.MTD, 3 LIGHTS	-	2,370	-	-	-	2,370
139	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	-	3,586	-	-	-	3,586
140	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)	197	2,128	-	3,200	197	5,328
141	FORCE PROVIDER	3	18,622	-	-	3	18,622
142	FIELD FEEDING AND REFRIGERATION	55	8,654	-	-	55	8,654
143	AIR DROP PROGRAM	14,698	3,371	-	-	14,698	3,371

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
144	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CSS-EQ)	-	-	-	-	-	-
145	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (CSS-EQ)	-	2,553	-	-	-	2,553
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
146	FAMILY OF TANK ASSEMBLIES, FABRIC, COLLAPSI	-	11,249	-	-	-	11,249
147	LABS, PETROLEUM & WATER	-	6,252	-	-	-	6,252
148	DISTRIBUTION SYS, PET & WATER	-	10,716	-	-	-	10,716
149	PUMPS, WATER AND FUEL	146	3,695	-	-	146	3,695
150	INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	-	6,855	-	-	-	6,855
151	FORWARD AREA REFUELING SYS ADV AVIATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
152	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (POL)	-	3,083	-	-	-	3,083
	WATER EQUIPMENT						
153	WATER PURIFICATION SYS	-	10,396	-	-	-	10,396
154	SMALL MOBILE WATER CHILLER (SMWC)	-	-	-	-	-	-
155	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (WATER EQ)	-	1,737	-	-	-	1,737
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
156	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	-	25,250	-	-	-	25,250
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
157	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	135	7,811	-	-	135	7,811
158	WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD	95	6,072	-	-	95	6,072
159	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ)	-	3,085	-	-	-	3,085
160	STEAM CLEANER, TRAILER MOUNTED	47	1,249	-	-	47	1,249
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
182	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	-	6,837	-	-	-	6,837
	GENERATORS						
183	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	-	78,639	-	-	-	78,639
184	GEN SET, DE, 3KW, 60HZ	-	-	-	-	-	-
185	GEN SET, DE, 3KW, 400 HZ	-	-	-	-	-	-
186	POWER PLANT, AN/MJQ-38, TRL MTD	-	-	-	-	-	-
187	POWER UNIT, PU 798	-	-	-	-	-	-
188	TRL, MTG F/GEN SET, 5KW, 60HZ, AN/MJQ-35	-	-	-	-	-	-
189	POWER PLANT, AN/MJQ-37 10KW 60HZ DED	-	-	-	-	-	-
190	GEN SET, TRL MTD, POWER PLANT AN/MJQ-39	-	-	-	-	-	-
191	GEN SET, TRL MTD, DE, 15KW 60HZ, PU-405	-	-	-	-	-	-
192	GEN SET, TRL MTD 15KW 400HZ PU-800	-	-	-	-	-	-
193	GEN SET, DE, 15KW, 400HZ	-	-	-	-	-	-
194	GEN SET, DE, 15KW, 60HZ	-	-	-	-	-	-
195	GEN SET, DE, 30KW, 400 HZ	-	-	-	-	-	-
196	GEN SET, DE, 60KW, 400HZ	-	-	-	-	-	-
197	GEN SET, DE, 60KW, 60HZ	-	-	-	-	-	-
198	GEN SET, TRL MTD, POWER PLANT, AN/MJQ-40	-	-	-	-	-	-
199	GEN SET, TRL MTD, DE, 30KW 400HZ PU-804	-	-	-	-	-	-
200	GEN SET, TRL MTD, DE, 30KW 60HZ PU-803	-	-	-	-	-	-
201	GEN SET, TRL MTD, DE, 60KW 400HZ PU-806	-	-	-	-	-	-
202	LARGE SETS (=> 100 KW)	-	486	-	-	-	486

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.	FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
203						
204						
205						
206						
207						
208						
209						
210	215	23,569	-	-	215	23,569
211	22	10,930	-	-	22	10,930
212		1,763	-	-		1,763
213		2,450	-	7,000		9,450
214		67,374	-	-		67,374
215		75,367	-	-		75,367
216		24,518	-	-		24,518
217		11,407	-	-		11,407
218		10,462	-	-		10,462
219		41,602	-	-		41,602
220		14,257	-	-		14,257
221		5,194	-	-		5,194

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
222	RECONFIGURABLE SIMULATORS	-	2,408	-	-	-	2,408
223	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	-	18,093	-	-	-	18,093
224	MOBILE DETECTION ASSESSMENT RESPONSE SYSTEM	-	887	-	-	-	887
225	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (OPA-3)	-	-	-	-	-	-
226	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT	-	6,769	-	-	-	6,769
227	TRANSPORTATION AUTOMATED MEASURING SYS (TRA	-	-	-	-	-	-
228	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	-	24,852	-	8,100	-	32,952
229	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	-	16,847	-	-	-	16,847
230	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (OTH SPT EQ)	-	2,417	-	-	-	2,417
231	MA8975	-	4,406	-	-	-	4,406
232	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
233	ACQUISITION STABILITY RESERVE	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	29,600	-	29,600
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	OPA1						
234	INITIAL SPARES - TSV	-	72	-	-	-	72
	OPA2						
235	INITIAL SPARES - C&E	-	43,263	-	-	-	43,263
	OPA3						
236	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP	-	880	-	-	-	880
	TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM	-	-	-	(62,200)	-	(62,200)

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
		3,423,870		(19,000)		(19,000)
				245,200		3,669,070
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENTS					
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY					
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY					
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E					
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT					
1		334,000		(334,000)		-
	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE					
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC					
	PROCUREMENT					
2		241,500		(241,500)		-
	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC					
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M					
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
3		593,500		(593,500)		-
	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M					
		1,169,000		(1,169,000)		-
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY					

Multiyear procurement authority for certain Army programs (sec. 111)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Army to enter into multiyear procurement contracts, beginning in fiscal year 2000, for the following programs:

- (1) the M270A1 launcher;
- (2) the family of medium tactical vehicles, except that period of a multiyear contract may not exceed three years;
- (3) the command launch unit for the Javelin anti-tank missile system, except that the period of a multiyear contract may not exceed four years;
- (4) the missile for the Javelin anti-tank missile system; except that the period of a multiyear contract may not exceed four years;
- (5) the AH-64D Longbow Apache aircraft;
- (6) the Wolverine heavy assault bridge;
- (7) the system enhancement program for the M1A2 Abrams tank;
- (8) the second generation forward looking infrared system for the M1A2 Abrams tank;
- (9) the command and control vehicle, except that the period of a multiyear contract may not exceed four years;
- (10) the second generation forward looking infrared system for the Bradley A3 fighting vehicle, except that the period of a multiyear contract may not exceed four years;
- (11) the improved Bradley acquisition system for the Bradley A3 fighting vehicle, except that the period of the multiyear contract may not exceed four years; and
- (12) the Bradley A3 fighting vehicle, except that the period of a multiyear contract may not exceed four years.

The committee understands the rationale for Army efforts to enter into multiyear contracts on as many as twelve different programs in order to save scarce procurement dollars. The committee supports this effort but was concerned that the Longbow Apache helicopter multiyear request contained an unfunded requirement to address a processor obsolescence issue. The committee recommended additional funding to resolve this issue but the funding shortfall prompts additional questions. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to certify, in writing to each of the congressional defense committees, that each program identified in this provision clearly meets the criterion in section 2306b of title 10, United States Code. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit that certification prior to executing the multiyear contracts in order to avoid unnecessary exposure of risk to the government.

Close combat tactical trainer (sec. 112)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the expenditure of any funds for the close combat tactical trainer (CCTT) program until 30 days after the congressional defense committees receive a report that outlines corrective actions taken to address reliability issues. This provision further requires the Secretary of the Army to certify that these devices meet established reliability requirements prior to obligation of these funds. The budget request included \$75.4 million to procure mobile and fixed

site tank and Bradley configuration CCTT. The committee is concerned about Army procurement plans for these devices in view of continued reliability issues associated with this program. The committee notes a recent memorandum from the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, which describes CCTT as “not suitable as tested.” The committee believes it is important to understand what actions the Army has taken to resolve reliability concerns prior to expenditure of any funds requested for these devices.

Army aviation modernization (sec. 113)

The committee believes it is necessary to establish basic guidelines for a renewed look at Army aviation and recommends a provision that would direct the Army to revise current aviation program modernization plans to:

(1) Restore the Apache Longbow program to reflect filling the original objective of 747 aircraft and 227 fire control radars. The program should include a plan to qualify and train reserve component pilots as augmentation crews in the AH-64D Apache Longbow helicopters to insure 24-hour war fighting capability in deployed attack helicopter units. The program should field the number of AH-64D aircraft in reserve component aviation units required to implement this objective. The program should also include a plan to retire all AH-1 Cobra attack helicopters still in service as soon as practicable.

(2) Review the total requirements and acquisition objective for Comanche. Provide a revised program that will field Comanche helicopters to the aviation force structure as it currently exists, reflecting the restoration of the Apache Longbow program to original acquisition quantities. The committee is concerned with the logic that calls for an increase in force structure once these more capable aircraft are fielded. The Army has decided to assume risk and field aviation units with reduced numbers of current-capability reconnaissance aircraft. The increased capability of the Comanche, fielded on a one-to-one replacement basis, will significantly reduce that risk. It is unlikely that a greater than one-to-one replacement is necessary or feasible. If the total requirement for Comanche is reduced below what is currently programmed, the Army should reorient program funding and fielding plans to reflect program modifications.

(3) Establish a UH-60 Blackhawk modernization program to provide required enhancements to existing aircraft.

(4) Establish a UH-1 Huey modernization program to upgrade aging aircraft. Total force requirements for UH-1 Huey utility helicopters must be revised to reflect both war fighting support requirements and state mission requirements for those aircraft utilized by the Army National Guard. For requirements that cannot be met by UH-1 aircraft, identify additional UH-60 requirements and acquisition strategy.

(5) Establish a Kiowa Warrior modernization program to ensure the viability of these aircraft until they are retired from service.

(6) Maintain the schedule and funding for CH-47 Chinook helicopter service life extension effort.

(7) Provide a revised assessment of the Army's present and future helicopter requirements and inventory, including the number of aircraft, average age of aircraft, availability of spare parts, flight hour costs, roles and functions assigned to the fleet as a whole and to its individual types of aircraft, and the mix of active component aircraft and reserve component aircraft in the fleet.

In directing the Army to restore the Apache Longbow program to the original plan, the committee believes that the Army did not consider adequately the operational impact of the programmatic reduction at the time the decision was made to reduce the acquisition objective for these aircraft. The committee is concerned about programmatic decisions based exclusively on budgetary limitations and in the absence of a detailed review of the operational effect of such a course of action. If the Army analysis determines that the requirement for Apache Longbow helicopters is no longer valid, then the committee would be willing to reevaluate the program guidance contained in this provision.

The committee is also very concerned about the ability of the Army to maintain the fleet of rotary wing aircraft that is rapidly aging. The committee notes a growing number of obsolescent parts that are affecting procurements of major end items, as well as procurements of spare parts. The committee was very concerned to note that the fiscal year 2000 multiyear procurement authority request for the Apache Longbow helicopter required a congressional increase of \$45.0 million to address parts obsolescence problems with subcontractors. The committee believes this trend will continue and will certainly have an adverse impact on aircraft that are over 20 years old. The committee directs the Army to address how it intends to identify the extent of this problem over time, and address how the service will deal with this issue as technology continues to evolve.

Not more than 90 percent of the total of the amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 101, Aircraft Procurement, Army, may be obligated before the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Army submits to the congressional defense committees a revised comprehensive plan for the modernization of the Army's helicopter fleet.

The Secretary of the Army shall design the plan that is complete and will be fully funded in future budget submissions.

The committee continues to be concerned about the overall state of Army aviation. Modernization plans are incomplete. The Army took recent actions to provide cross-level funding from the Apache Longbow program to the Comanche program, a step taken without completing a thorough review of the impact that funding transfers would have on the warfighting ability of combat aviation units. For the last two years, the committee has tried to understand incomplete Army plans to modernize the aviation fleet and has required revisions to existing plans in an effort to identify a viable program for this critical area. Unfortunately, the Army has yet to provide a complete and funded program that adequately describes actions that would modernize, upgrade, or retire the entire range of aircraft currently in the fleet, or provide alternative fleet strategies

that would bring current modernization requirements down to a more affordable level.

The committee understands that modernization funding limitations are adversely affecting Army programs. However, unless the Army receives large infusions of modernization resources beyond what is currently budgeted, the committee believes that the service cannot continue to merely identify a range of requirements and then fund only subsets of a broader program. In fact, as troubling as the inadequate Army aviation program remains, it is even more troubling to recognize that the revised plan still does not completely identify any affordable strategy to modernize the utility helicopter fleet and ensure the operational capability and safety of Army aircraft.

OTHER ARMY PROGRAMS

Army Aircraft

UH-60 Blackhawk

The budget request included \$86.1 million to procure eight UH-60L Blackhawk helicopters. The committee continues to be concerned about an aging fleet of utility helicopters throughout the Army and inadequate Army plans to address future utility helicopter requirements. The committee acknowledges that there are outstanding requirements for modernized and fully functional utility helicopters, and notes the Army position that these aircraft provide increased lift and range, improved safety features, and have higher mission capable rates than the UH-1 helicopters they are replacing. The committee supports procurement of additional UH-60L Blackhawk helicopters and directs the Army to provide a complete and comprehensive aviation modernization plan that identifies a program that will either replace or upgrade aging aircraft currently in the fleet. The committee recommends an increase of \$90.0 million to procure an additional 9 UH-60L Blackhawk helicopters, for a total authorization of \$176.1 million.

CH-47 Cargo helicopter modifications

The budget request included \$70.7 million to support engine and operational modifications to fleet aircraft. The committee continues to be concerned about the relative pace of modernization for the medium lift CH-47 Chinook helicopter fleet. The committee believes that modernization of these critical aircraft should be accelerated and notes the current budget does not support minimum economic procurement quantities for engines and other required aircraft modifications. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$56.1 million, for a total of \$126.8 million, to procure an additional 72 engine conversion and fielding kits, and sufficient airframe kits to upgrade 36 aircraft.

Longbow

The budget request included \$771.2 million to procure AH-64D Apache Longbow helicopters. The committee was concerned to note that late last year the Army and the helicopter manufacturer had identified a processor obsolescence problem associated with the sec-

ond multi-year request for these aircraft. The committee was only recently informed that without a program increase of \$45.0 million, the multi-year contract could not be executed as the processors utilized in the first multi-year contract were no longer readily available. Unfortunately, this unfunded requirement was not identified on the Army unfunded requirements list, and only recently did the Army take action to inform the congressional defense committees of this funding shortfall. Despite Army inaction on this issue, the committee supports the Apache Longbow helicopter program and intends that the Army maintain a steady production of these aircraft until the total program procurement objective is achieved. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$45.0 million to address the processor obsolescence issue and to support successful initiation of the second multi-year procurement of AH-64D Apache Longbow helicopters.

UH-1 sustainment

The budget request included \$4.4 million to support UH-1 avionics replacement requirements. The committee is very concerned about the age of the UH-1 fleet and the absence of a funded program to upgrade or replace these aircraft. The committee has directed the Army to revise the existing modernization program to completely address modernization requirements for the entire fleet of aircraft. The committee has also supported a request by the Army for funding necessary to begin a UH-60 Blackhawk upgrade program. The committee notes an unfunded requirement necessary to begin a refurbishment and sustainment program for UH-1 aircraft. The committee believes that this action should begin as soon as possible and recommends an increase of \$72.5 million for this purpose.

Aircraft survivability equipment modifications

The budget request included no funding for aircraft survivability equipment modifications. The committee notes an opportunity to complete non-recurring engineering requirements necessary to provide advanced threat infrared countermeasures/ common missile warning system (ATIRCM/CMWS) installation A-kits into lot 7 production of Apache Longbow attack helicopters. The committee believes that aircraft survivability equipment is critical to ensure crews are able to operate effectively in hostile environments. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$8.1 million for this purpose.

Aircraft survivability equipment infrared countermeasures

The budget request included no funding for aircraft survivability equipment modifications. The committee recognizes a requirement to procure advanced threat infrared countermeasures B-kits necessary to complete the insertion of this critical aircraft survivability equipment into lot 7 production of Apache Longbow attack helicopters. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$6.6 million to support the total requirement necessary to meet the initiation of lot 7 production for the Apache Longbow helicopter.

Army Missiles

Patriot anti-cruise missile

The committee has supported development of the Patriot Anti-cruise Missile (PACM) system, which includes an advanced seeker for use in retrofitting older Patriot missiles that the Army plans to retain in the inventory for an extended period of time. The committee does not view such a program as being in competition with the Patriot Guidance Enhanced Missile (GEM) or the Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3), each of which satisfies a clearly established requirement. The committee notes the conclusion of the Army's April 1999 report to Congress, which indicated that, based on extensive ground testing, "the performance of the PACM design has been demonstrated." Based on this conclusion, the committee recommends an increase of \$60.0 million in Missile Procurement, Army, for long-lead materials and initiation of a low-rate initial production program of 200 PACM modification kits. The committee directs that none of these funds may be obligated for procurement of PACM upgrades until successful completion of two flight tests.

Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles

Carrier modifications

The budget request included \$53.5 million to upgrade 198 M113 armored personnel carrier vehicles. The committee understands the Army has over 17,500 M113 armored personnel carriers in service today. The Army has identified a critical requirement to accelerate the fielding of M113 vehicles that have been upgraded to the A3 configuration. These vehicles are required to support ongoing digitization efforts and to significantly reduce the operations and support costs associated with non-modernized vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million, for a total authorization of \$78.5 million, to procure an additional 165 upgrades and accelerate fielding to the 4th Infantry Division.

Bradley fighting vehicle series modifications

The budget request included \$7.1 million to support selective modifications to Bradley fighting vehicles. The committee recognizes the importance of providing modern, digitized Bradley fighting vehicles to support future Army warfighting requirements. The committee notes an unfunded requirement to accelerate a Bradley A2 sustainment program currently not scheduled to begin until fiscal year 2003. This effort is a critical part of Army digitization fielding activities that will result in the fielding of new, digitized Bradleys to the 4th Infantry Division and III Corps with older A2 model Bradleys being cascaded down to active and reserve component units throughout the rest of the force. The older vehicles require a significant refurbishment to ensure viability and the Army has established a program to extend the service life of the vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of \$74.2 million, for a total of \$81.3 million, to accelerate the initiation of a Bradley A2 sustainment program.

Howitzer, self propelled, fully tracked 155mm M109A6

The budget request included \$6.3 million to fund the procurement of approved modifications to M109A6 Paladin howitzers currently fielded. The committee notes an outstanding requirement to complete fielding of Paladin systems for Army National Guard artillery battalions and a request for additional funding support on the Army's unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to modify additional Paladin equipment necessary to complete fielding of 21 National Guard battalions.

Field artillery ammunition support vehicle

The budget request included \$200,000 to fund the procurement of approved modifications to Army field artillery ammunition support vehicles (FAASV). The committee notes an outstanding requirement to complete fielding of FAASV systems for Army National Guard artillery battalions and a request for additional support for the Army's unfunded requirements list related to M109A6 howitzers. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million for FAASV modification requirements necessary to complete fielding of 21 National Guard battalions.

Improved recovery vehicle

The budget request included no funding for the Hercules Improved Recovery Vehicle. The committee understands that the Army recently canceled this program due to modernization funding limitations, despite significant outstanding requirements for these critical recovery vehicles. The committee notes the Army has identified a funding shortfall for this vehicle as an unfunded priority and believes that these vehicles must continue to be fielded to meet a significant battlefield deficiency. The committee recommends an increase of \$72.0 million to procure 24 Hercules vehicles and to meet requirements associated with the traction enhancement effort. The committee expects the Army to request funding for the shortfalls identified on the unfunded requirements list in future year budget submissions.

Heavy assault bridge system

The budget request included \$67.3 million to support procurement of the Wolverine heavy assault bridge system. The committee notes that the Army has identified an opportunity to achieve acquisition efficiencies through a potential alignment of procurement for Wolverine heavy assault bridge systems with procurement for M1A2 Abrams tanks. The committee recommends multi-year procurement authority for both Abrams and Wolverine systems procurement. The committee understands that, with a modest increase in Wolverine program funding to accelerate the program, the Army could achieve a cost avoidance savings of approximately \$3.5 million during the five-year multi-year procurement. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$14.0 million, for a total authorization of \$81.3 million, to support advance procurement funding requirements for the Wolverine systems. The committee understands that this increase does not represent an increase in Wol-

verine program costs and that a corresponding reduction will take place in the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Abrams upgrade program

The budget request included \$685.9 million to fund the Abrams upgrade program. The committee is concerned about the rising costs associated with gun tube procurements and increasing costs associated with ongoing tactical internet software development. The committee understands the importance of fielding the fully modernized M1 Abrams tanks as quickly as possible. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$27.6 million necessary to address program cost increases and reduce the risk of meeting the established fielding schedule.

Mark 19 grenade launcher

The budget request included \$18.3 million for Mark 19 grenade launcher procurement. The committee understands that funding limitations will cause a break in the production of these weapons and that future procurements will have production restart costs. The committee recommends an increase of \$18.3 million to procure an additional 704 weapons. These additional funds are necessary to maintain continuous production and to avoid a 15 percent cost growth for future weapon procurements.

Army Ammunition

Army ammunition

The committee is concerned with the inadequate funding for ammunition procurement that was included in the budget request for fiscal year 2000. For the past several years, field commanders have expressed concern regarding the inadequate stocks of ammunition to support training requirements. The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Army ammunition procurement:

Item:	<i>Millions</i>
25 mm	\$2.0
40 mm	8.0
60 mm	9.0
105 mm M915	10.0
120 mm M934	4.0
Wide Area Munition	10.0
Volcano	18.0
Subtotal	61.0

Other Army Procurement

High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle

The budget request included \$92.1 million for high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWV) for the Army. The committee notes outstanding requirements for new HMMWV's for the reserve components and an opportunity to achieve a minimum sustaining rate of production for these critical vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of \$17.0 million to procure an additional 400 vehicles to achieve the minimum sustaining rate of production and improve the mobility of reserve component units.

Secure mobile antijam reliable tactical terminal

The budget request included \$61.8 million for the Secure Mobile Antijam Reliable Tactical Terminal (SMART-T), the Army's secure, multi-channel satellite terminal used with the Milstar satellite system. According to a recent review by the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, operational effectiveness of the SMART-T has not been demonstrated. According to this review, "the SMART-T is not operationally suitable due to numerous training, soldier efficiency, RAM [reliability, availability, and maintainability], and integrated support logistics issues." The report recommended that production of the SMART-T should be "specifically limited to the first option (91) terminals" while additional testing and assessment proceeds. The Army has already acquired in excess of this number of terminals. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$10.0 million in Other Procurement, Army, for SMART-T terminals.

Army combat communications

The budget request included \$38.8 million to procure enhanced position location reporting system (EPLRS) equipment necessary to meet Army data distribution requirements. The committee notes an opportunity to procure EPLRS devices at a more economic rate that would result in a two for one return on investment. The committee recommends an increase of \$25.9 million, for a total authorization of \$64.7 million, to procure EPLRS devices at a more economic rate and accelerate fielding by three years.

The committee also notes an outstanding requirement for single channel ground and airborne radio system (SINCGARS) to meet reserve component system shortfalls. The budget request included \$13.2 million for SINCGARS radio requirements. The committee believes that effective communications equipment is critical to future force viability and notes that the Army has identified a shortfall of SINCGARS radios necessary to ensure total force fielding. The committee recommends an increase of \$70.0 million, for a total authorization of \$83.2 million, to procure an additional 6,500 SINCGARS radios.

Warfighter information network

The budget request included \$109.1 million to procure components of the warfighter information network necessary for the ongoing Army digitization effort. The committee notes an opportunity to accelerate the fielding of the block II upgrade by one year. This acceleration is necessary to ensure existing systems are able to meet future communications challenges anticipated with the volume of information that will be transmitted across future battlefields. The committee recommends an increase of \$50.0 million, a total authorization of \$159.1 million, to accelerate block II fielding.

Night vision devices

The budget request included \$21.0 million to procure essential night vision devices. The committee recognizes the critical requirement to field night vision devices that allow Army forces to fight at night and has consistently supported night vision procurement programs. The committee notes significant shortfalls still exist in the Army and recommends an increase of \$95.4 million, as follows:

(1) an increase of \$34.2 million for AN/PAS-13 Thermal Weapon Sights;

(2) an increase of \$21.0 million for AN/AVS-5 Driver's Vision Enhancer equipment for use on combat and tactical wheeled vehicles;

(3) An increase of \$7.2 million to procure 4,485 AN/PEQ-2A infrared aiming lights and the associated 19,000 rail grabbers, and 12,000 AN/PAQ-4C infrared laser aiming devices and the associated 23,000 rail grabbers.

(4) an increase of \$8.0 million for 5,517 AN/PVS-7D night vision devices; and

(5) an increase of \$25.0 million for 6,502 generation III 25 millimeter image intensification tubes necessary to upgrade existing AN/PVS-4 and AN/TVS-5 night vision devices.

The committee recommends a total of \$116.4 million for night vision devices.

Forward area air defense command and control

The budget request included \$10.6 million for forward area air defense requirements. The committee recognizes the requirement for additional air and missile defense workstations for the short range air defense units assigned to combat divisions. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$21.0 million necessary to procure additional workstations, initial spares, and support software development. The committee understands that these funds will accelerate the development of block IV software by one year.

Standard integrated command post system

The budget request included \$30.7 million to procure command post systems and related equipment required to support battlefield command and control activities and Army digitization requirements. The committee understands that the Army has procured 1,546 modular command post systems and has established a total requirement for 3,303 systems. The committee believes that fielding these systems is critical to Army digitization, and command and control requirements for increasingly complex battlefields. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.2 million for modular command post systems. Additionally, the Army has identified unfunded requirements for other standard integrated command post system component support. The committee understands that current Army vehicular intercom equipment is “. . . technologically outdated and does not meet current or planned communications requirements.” The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to procure vehicle intercom systems necessary to meet the complex communications challenges associated with current and projected command and control requirements. The committee recommends a total authorization of \$39.9 million for command post procurements.

Lightweight maintenance enclosure

The budget request included \$2.1 million to procure lightweight maintenance enclosures (LME). The committee supports Army efforts to lighten logistics requirements and notes an opportunity to

procure these shelters in sufficient quantities to meet force package three requirements. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.2 million for a total authorization of \$5.3 million for LME requirements.

Combat training centers support

The budget request included \$2.5 million for combat training center support requirements. The committee supports all efforts within the Department of Defense to promote military readiness and ensure the combat effectiveness of our military forces. The committee notes an ongoing effort to provide a force-on-force training instrumentation system to improve the combat readiness of reserve component forces. The committee understands the deployable force-on-force instrumentation range system (DFIRST) is an emerging technology that will provide training opportunities and training feedback not yet available with existing training support systems. The committee believes that the Army should establish a pilot program for the reserve components to explore the capabilities and benefits of DFIRST systems and that this system should be fielded as soon as practicable. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million to establish a DFIRST pilot program. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report on the results of the pilot program and the potential future use of DFIRST as a training enhancement for reserve component training requirements.

Modification of in-service equipment

The budget request included \$24.9 million to conduct equipment modifications to equipment that is in service in the Army. The committee is concerned about reports that the Firefinder radar system has suffered from high false alarm rates in urban environments during deployments in Beirut, Somalia, Desert Storm, Bosnia and in data collection efforts at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. The committee notes an opportunity to upgrade existing antenna equipment and provide the reliability that the ground forces require to identify threat projectiles and execute counter battery fire in response to enemy activity. In light of this newly developed requirement and the current threats facing our ground forces, the committee recommends an increase of \$8.1 million to modify in-service systems and improve system reliability.

Construction equipment

The budget request did not include any funding for construction equipment. The committee notes an aging fleet of engineer construction equipment found throughout the Army and understands modernization requirements for this equipment often is deferred to support other weapon system priorities within the service. The committee recommends an increase of \$12.5 million to procure 50 new T9 bulldozers for engineer units. The committee also recommends an additional \$17.1 million for 84 heavy graders. The committee recommends a total increase of \$29.6 million to replace obsolete engineer equipment.

Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism

The committee recommends that \$62.2 million be transferred from Other Procurement, Army to section 310(25), a newly-established central transfer account for funds to combat terrorism.

SUBTITLE C - NAVY PROGRAMS

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
1	12	301,239	-	-	12	301,239
		(40,795)	-	-	-	(40,795)
2	-	30,832	-	-	-	30,832
3	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	36	2,801,108	-	-	36	2,801,108
		(109,119)	-	-	-	(109,119)
5	-	162,240	-	-	-	162,240
6	10	850,254	2	123,000	12	973,254
		(53,862)	-	-	-	(53,862)
7	-	71,044	-	-	-	71,044
8	-	1,961	-	-	-	1,961
9	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	7	216,692	-	-	7	216,692
11	3	248,199	-	-	3	248,199
		(37,737)	-	-	-	(37,737)
12	-	172,554	-	-	-	172,554
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
13	13	234,577	3	67,000	16	301,577

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(26,084)	-	-	-	(26,084)
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	73,792	-	-	-	73,792
15	UC-35	-	-	3	18,000	3	18,000
16	C-40A	1	49,029	1	54,000	2	103,029
17	C-37	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
18	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	15	333,453	-	-	15	333,453
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(7,977)	-	-	-	(7,977)
19	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	9,552	-	-	-	9,552
20	JPATS	8	44,826	-	-	8	44,826
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
21	KC-130J	-	12,257	2	129,800	2	142,057
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
22	EA-6 SERIES	-	161,047	-	25,000	-	186,047
23	AV-8 SERIES	-	39,126	-	-	-	39,126
24	F-14 SERIES	-	83,352	-	-	-	83,352
25	ADVERSARY	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	ES-3 SERIES	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	F-18 SERIES	-	308,789	-	130,400	-	439,189

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
28	H-46 SERIES	-	17,888	-	-	-	17,888
29	AH-1W SERIES	-	13,726	-	9,000	-	22,726
30	H-53 SERIES	-	45,240	-	-	-	45,240
31	SH-60 SERIES	-	56,824	-	-	-	56,824
32	H-1 SERIES	-	6,339	-	15,000	-	21,339
33	H-3 SERIES	-	45	-	-	-	45
34	EP-3 SERIES	-	27,433	-	-	-	27,433
35	P-3 SERIES	-	276,202	-	138,600	-	414,802
36	S-3 SERIES	-	94,119	-	-	-	94,119
37	E-2 SERIES	-	28,201	-	-	-	28,201
38	TRAINER A/C SERIES	-	8,914	-	-	-	8,914
39	C-2A	-	19,524	-	-	-	19,524
40	C-130 SERIES	-	15,250	-	16,800	-	32,050
41	FEWSG	-	600	-	-	-	600
42	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	-	16,412	-	-	-	16,412
43	E-6 SERIES	-	86,950	-	-	-	86,950
44	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	-	12,761	-	-	-	12,761
45	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	-	28,782	-	-	-	28,782
46	T-45 SERIES	-	9,675	-	-	-	9,675
47	POWER PLANT CHANGES	-	15,595	-	-	-	15,595
48	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	50,584	-	16,000	-	66,584
49	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	-	81,599	-	-	-	81,599

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
3	-	2,180	-	-	-	2,180
	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES					
	OTHER MISSILES					
	STRATEGIC MISSILES					
4	148	50,894	-	-	148	50,894
5	-	11,668	-	-	-	11,668
	TACTICAL MISSILES					
6	100	46,261	-	-	100	46,261
7	615	154,913	-	-	615	154,913
8	56	38,088	-	-	56	38,088
9	91	198,867	-	-	91	198,867
10	90	45,429	-	-	90	45,429
11	-	-	-	25,000	-	25,000
12	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	-	21,177	-	-	-	21,177
14	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
15	-	12,784	-	-	-	12,784
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES					
16	75	29,387	-	-	75	29,387
17	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	-	41,927	-	-	-	41,927
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES					
19	-	20,199	-	7,700	-	27,899

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
20	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	-	9,789	-	-	-	9,789
22	-	4,125	-	-	-	4,125
23	-	1,996	-	-	-	1,996
24	-	28,699	-	-	-	28,699
25	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	-	52,755	-	-	-	52,755
27	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	-	23,350	-	-	-	23,350
29	-	15,166	-	-	-	15,166
30	-	1,663	-	-	-	1,663
31	-	880	-	-	-	880
32	-	2,977	-	-	-	2,977

66

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
33	5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS	-	1,444	-	-	-	1,444
34	MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS	-	1,969	-	-	-	1,969
35	MODS UNDER \$2 MILLION	-	1,311	-	-	-	1,311
	OTHER						
36	PIONEER	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
38	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	48,614	-	-	-	48,614
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(8,000)		(8,000)
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		1,357,400		34,700		1,392,100
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS						
	PROC AMMO, NAVY						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	77,915	-	28,000	-	105,915
2	JDAM	785	35,563	-	-	785	35,563
3	2.75 INCH ROCKETS	-	21,229	-	-	-	21,229
4	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	-	9,153	-	-	-	9,153
5	PRACTICE BOMBS	-	49,106	-	-	-	49,106
6	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	-	26,826	-	-	-	26,826
7	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	-	10,469	-	-	-	10,469

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
8	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	-	34,259	-	-	-	34,259
9	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	JATOS	-	4,969	-	-	-	4,969
11	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	-	15,758	-	-	-	15,758
12	EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)	-	3,004	-	-	-	3,004
13	CIWS AMMUNITION	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	76MM GUN AMMUNITION	-	7,012	-	-	-	7,012
15	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	-	5,841	-	-	-	5,841
16	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	-	8,030	-	-	-	8,030
17	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	-	8,165	-	-	-	8,165
18	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	-	9,199	-	-	-	9,199
19	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION PROC AMMO, MC	-	2,226	-	-	-	2,226
20	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	-	12,958	-	-	-	12,958
22	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	-	7	-	-	-	7
23	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	-	28,639	-	-	-	28,639
24	.50 CALIBER	-	16,364	-	-	-	16,364
25	40 MM, ALL TYPES	-	11,247	-	1,400	-	12,647
26	60MM, ALL TYPES	-	12,433	-	4,000	-	16,433
27	81MM, ALL TYPES	-	6,152	-	-	-	6,152
28	120MM, ALL TYPES	-	12,010	-	-	-	12,010

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
28	-	3,194	-	6,200	-	9,394
29	-	1,922	-	-	-	1,922
30	-	2,270	-	-	-	2,270
31	-	1,972	-	-	-	1,972
32	-	11,030	-	9,000	-	20,030
33	-	166	-	-	-	166
34	-	14,733	-	7,200	-	21,933
35	-	2,410	-	3,000	-	5,410
36	-	1,977	-	-	-	1,977
37	-	10,702	-	-	-	10,702
38	-	5,990	-	-	-	5,990
39	-	-	-	-	-	-
				(3,000)		(3,000)
		484,900		55,800		540,700
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS						
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY						
OTHER WARSHIPS						
OTHER WARSHIPS						
1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	-	751,540	-	-	-	751,540
3	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	748,497	-	-	-	748,497
6	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	345,565	-	-	-	345,565
8	DDG-51	3	2,735,340	-	-	3	2,735,340
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(53,687)				(53,687)
9	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
10	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (MYP)	-	-	-	-	-	375,000
	LHD-8 Advanced Procurement	2	1,508,338	1	375,000	1	1,508,338
11	LPD-17	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM						
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM CO						
13	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	ADC(X)	1	439,966	-	-	1	439,966
16	SERVICE CRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	LCAC LANDING CRAFT	-	12,407	-	-	-	12,407
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(12,407)				(12,407)
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	OUTFITTING	-	171,119	-	-	-	171,119

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.	FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
20	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	2	31,776	-	-	2	31,776
22	-	-	-	-	-	-
				(37,000)		(37,000)
				338,000		7,016,454
		6,678,454				
TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY						
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
1	-	8,333	-	-	-	8,333
2	-	8,378	-	-	-	8,378
3	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
PUMPS						
6	-	-	-	-	-	-
PROPELLERS						
7	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	-	-	-	-	-	-
NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
9	-	67,516	-	15,000	-	82,516

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
10	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	-	15,638	-	-	-	15,638
	PERISCOPES						
11	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	-	65,039	-	-	-	65,039
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
12	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	17,031	-	-	-	17,031
13	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	-	12,301	-	-	-	12,301
14	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	113,506	-	-	-	113,506
15	SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	50,981	-	-	-	50,981
17	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	-	13,101	-	-	-	13,101
18	SSN21 CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	6,070	-	-	-	6,070
20	DSSP EQUIPMENT	-	7,989	-	-	-	7,989
21	LCAC	-	4,048	-	-	-	4,048
22	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	-	16,302	-	-	-	16,302
23	HM&E ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	-	126,133	-	30,900	-	157,033
25	SURFACE IMA	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROLS	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	MINI/MICRO MINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	949	-	-	-	949

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
43	TISS	-	1,755	-	-	-	1,755
	SHIP SONARS						
44	SURFACE SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	-	31,914	-	-	-	31,914
46	SSN ACOUSTICS	-	227,042	-	-	-	227,042
47	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,605	-	-	-	2,605
48	SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
49	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	-	12,095	-	-	-	12,095
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
50	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	-	11,202	-	-	-	11,202
51	SSTD	-	-	-	-	-	-
52	ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
53	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	16,674	-	-	-	16,674
54	SURTASS	-	7,267	-	-	-	7,267
55	ASW OPERATIONS CENTER	-	4,434	-	-	-	4,434
56	CARRIER ASW MODULE	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
57	AN/SLQ-32	-	1,918	-	-	-	1,918
58	AN/WLR-1	-	-	-	-	-	-
59	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	-	4,121	-	-	-	4,121
60	EW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
61	C-3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
62	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	-	48,031	-	-	-	48,031
63	COMBAT DF	-	-	-	-	-	-
64	OUTBOARD	-	-	-	-	-	-
65	COMMON HIGH BANDWIDTH DATA LINK	-	40,083	-	-	-	40,083
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
66	AN/WLQ-4	-	-	-	-	-	-
67	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	-	35,201	-	-	-	35,201
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
68	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
69	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	-	60,494	-	(21,900)	-	38,594
70	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT AFLOAT	-	25,067	-	-	-	25,067
71	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCS	-	48,222	-	-	-	48,222
72	ATDLS	-	19,143	-	-	-	19,143
73	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	-	20,762	-	-	-	20,762
74	SHALLOW WATER MCM	-	18,813	-	-	-	18,813
75	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	-	8,518	-	-	-	8,518
76	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	-	4,229	-	-	-	4,229
77	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	21,820	-	-	-	21,820
78	OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	1,011	-	-	-	1,011
79	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	44,229	-	-	-	44,229

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
80	MATCALS	-	12,412	-	-	-	12,412
81	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	7,543	-	-	-	7,543
82	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	-	19,440	-	-	-	19,440
83	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	-	35,115	-	-	-	35,115
84	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	7,277	-	-	-	7,277
85	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	-	5,318	-	-	-	5,318
86	FACSFAC	-	4,514	-	-	-	4,514
87	ID SYSTEMS	-	13,400	-	-	-	13,400
88	SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	-	590	-	-	-	590
89	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	-	20,769	-	-	-	20,769
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
90	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT ASHORE	-	9,440	-	-	-	9,440
91	OSIS EVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT (OED)	-	-	-	-	-	-
92	TADIX-B	-	6,248	-	-	-	6,248
93	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	6,634	-	-	-	6,634
94	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE	-	7,077	-	-	-	7,077
95	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS	-	41,255	-	-	-	41,255
96	RADIAC	-	7,778	-	-	-	7,778
97	GPETE	-	9,006	-	-	-	9,006
98	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	-	4,356	-	5,000	-	9,356
99	CALIBRATION STANDARDS	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
100	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	-	6,554	-	-	-	6,554
101	SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
102	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	-	5,206	-	-	-	5,206
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
103	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	-	21,487	-	-	-	21,487
104	PORTABLE RADIOS	-	-	-	-	-	-
105	SINCGARS	-	-	-	-	-	-
106	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	-	220,670	-	-	-	220,670
107	SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION	-	20,746	-	-	-	20,746
108	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
109	SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS	-	36,361	-	-	-	36,361
110	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	-	85,368	-	-	-	85,368
111	ADVANCED VLF RECEIVER	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
112	SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS (SPACE)	-	237,722	-	-	-	237,722
113	SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS (SPACE)	-	65,710	-	-	-	65,710
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
114	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	-	3,703	-	-	-	3,703
115	NSIPS	-	5,022	-	-	-	5,022
116	JEDMICS	-	-	-	9,000	-	9,000
117	GCCS EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
118	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	114,339	-	30,700	-	145,039
119	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT	-	64,139	-	12,000	-	76,139
120	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	21,133	-	-	-	21,133
121	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
122	SONOBUOYS						
122	AN/SSQ-36 (BT)	-	-	-	-	-	-
123	AN/SSQ-53 (DIFAR)	-	-	-	-	-	-
124	PASSIVE SONOBUOYS (NON-BEAM FORMING)	-	15,933	-	-	-	15,933
125	AN/SSQ-57 (SPECIAL PURPOSE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
126	AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)	-	17,111	-	-	-	17,111
127	AN/SSQ-77 (VLAD)	-	-	-	-	-	-
128	AN/SSQ-101 (ADAR)	-	12,773	-	-	-	12,773
129	AN/SSQ-110	-	-	-	-	-	-
130	SIGNAL, UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
131	MISCELLANEOUS SONOBUOYS LESS THAN \$5 MILLIO AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,193	-	-	-	2,193
132	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	12,166	-	-	-	12,166
133	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	-	62	-	-	-	62

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
134	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	-	12,456	-	-	-	12,456
135	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	-	48,659	-	-	-	48,659
136	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	-	31,504	-	-	-	31,504
137	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	1,685	-	-	-	1,685
138	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	-	17,053	-	18,100	-	35,153
139	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	-	40,455	-	-	-	40,455
140	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
141	REWSON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
142	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
143	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,187	-	-	-	4,187
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
144	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	5,871	-	-	-	5,871
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT						
145	MK-92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
146	HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
147	TARTAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
148	POINT DEFENSE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
149	NATO SEASPARROW	-	492	-	-	-	492
150	RAM GMLS	-	39,295	-	-	-	39,295
151	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	-	38,790	-	-	-	38,790
152	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	86,668	-	-	-	86,668

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
153	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	85,782	-	-	-	85,782
154	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP	-	2,075	-	-	-	2,075
155	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	-	7,218	-	-	-	7,218
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
156	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	9,359	-	-	-	9,359
157	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	-	239,514	-	-	-	239,514
158	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	-	20,446	-	15,300	-	35,746
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
159	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	-	26,056	-	-	-	26,056
160	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	3,700	-	-	-	3,700
161	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,138	-	-	-	6,138
162	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,407	-	-	-	6,407
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
163	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	-	8,965	-	-	-	8,965
164	UNMANNED SEABORNE TARGET	-	-	-	-	-	-
165	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES (CALIBRATION EQUIPMEN	-	-	-	-	-	-
166	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	-	4,362	-	-	-	4,362
167	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE						
168	FLEET MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
169	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	-	10,701	-	-	-	10,701
170	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	-	27,579	-	-	-	27,579

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
171	ACQUISITION STABILITY RESERVE	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
172	ARMORED SEDANS	-	-	-	-	-	-
173	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	25	557	-	-	25	557
174	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	-	-	-	-	-
175	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	-	1,631	-	-	-	1,631
176	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	-	2,677	-	-	-	2,677
177	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	2,285	-	-	-	2,285
178	TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	9,373	-	-	-	9,373
179	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	-	20,484	-	-	-	20,484
180	COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIP	-	-	-	-	-	-
181	MOBILE UTILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
182	COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
183	OCEAN CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
184	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	24,062	-	-	-	24,062
185	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION	-	6,075	-	-	-	6,075
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
186	FORKLIFT TRUCKS	-	-	-	-	-	-
187	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	-	6,245	-	-	-	6,245
188	OTHER MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
189	-	5,825	-	-	-	5,825
190	-	1,658	-	-	-	1,658
191	-	125,900	-	-	-	125,900
PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
TRAINING DEVICES						
192	-	3,076	-	-	-	3,076
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
193	-	14,471	-	-	-	14,471
194	-	-	-	-	-	-
195	-	5,033	-	-	-	5,033
196	-	19,439	-	-	-	19,439
197	-	5,848	-	-	-	5,848
198	-	18,354	-	-	-	18,354
199	-	1,377	-	-	-	1,377
OTHER						
200	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
201	-	276,130	-	-	-	276,130
TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM						
ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT						
					(1,400)	(1,400)
					(23,000)	(23,000)
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY					97,700	4,197,791

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES						
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1		80,714	-	-	-	80,714
2		1,706	-	-	-	1,706
3		-	-	-	-	-
4		22,853	-	60,500	-	83,353
5		-	-	-	-	-
ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
6		3,288	-	-	-	3,288
7		-	-	-	-	-
8		2,956	-	-	-	2,956
9		323	-	-	-	323
WEAPONS						
10		-	-	-	-	-
11		-	-	-	-	-
12		-	-	-	-	-
OTHER SUPPORT						
13		1,462	-	-	-	1,462
OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR						
GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						
GUIDED MISSILES						

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.	Description	FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
14	EADS MOD	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	JAVELIN	954	92,737	-	-	954	92,737
16	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP)	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION	-	3,731	-	-	-	3,731
18	PREDATOR (SRAW)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT						
19	MODIFICATION KITS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
20	AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	-	29,068	-	-	-	29,068
21	GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP.	-	7,863	-	-	-	7,863
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
22	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	-	10,303	-	-	-	10,303
23	AN/TPQ-36 FIRE FINDER RADAR UPGRADE	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	18,466	-	-	-	18,466
25	MOD KITS (INTEL)	-	18,482	-	-	-	18,482
26	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (INTELL)	-	2,083	-	-	-	2,083
27	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2M (INTELL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
28	GENERAL PRUPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE	-	4,774	-	-	-	4,774
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
29	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	-	9,032	-	8,500	-	17,532

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
30	-	102,814	-	-	-	102,814
31	-	4,383	-	-	-	4,383
32	-	6,838	-	-	-	6,838
33	-	82,881	-	-	-	82,881
34	-	65,125	-	-	-	65,125
35	-	81,770	-	54,350	-	136,120
36	-	13,821	-	-	-	13,821
37	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	-	-	-	-	-	-
40	-	4,152	-	-	-	4,152
41	-	8,286	-	-	-	8,286
42	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUPPORT VEHICLES						
ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
43	43	1,325	-	-	43	1,325
44	-	8,900	-	-	-	8,900
TACTICAL VEHICLES						
45	2,078	124,407	668	40,000	2,746	164,407
46	788	138,268	-	-	788	138,268
47	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
48	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT						
49	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
50	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	-	9,927	-	-	-	9,927
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
51	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	-	3,629	-	-	-	3,629
52	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	-	3,228	-	-	-	3,228
53	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	-	9,727	-	-	-	9,727
54	DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS	-	8,358	-	-	-	8,358
55	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	-	10,887	-	-	-	10,887
56	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE (SECM)	-	3,281	-	-	-	3,281
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
57	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
58	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
59	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	-	5,685	-	-	-	5,685
60	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP	-	6,956	-	-	-	6,956
61	WAREHOUSE MODERNIZATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
62	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	50,010	-	-	-	50,010
63	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	4,154	-	-	-	4,154
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
64	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	-	2,445	-	-	-	2,445

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
65		13,848	-	-	-	13,848
66		5,714	-	-	-	5,714
	OTHER SUPPORT					
67		-	-	-	-	-
68		-	-	-	-	-
69		9,102	-	-	-	9,102
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
70		37,458	-	-	-	37,458
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT					
		1,137,220		(5,000)		(5,000)
				158,350		1,295,570
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS					

LHD-8 advance procurement and advance construction (sec. 121)

The budget request included LHD-8 advance procurement in fiscal year 2004 and full funding in fiscal year 2005 as part of the Future Year Defense Program (FYDP). As stated in the statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for 1999 (H. Rept. 105-736), Congress authorized \$50.0 million for advance procurement of long lead materials of the construction of LHD-8 in lieu of a future service life extension program for LHA-1.

The committee received information from the LHD shipbuilder that indicates there will be substantial cost savings if funding is made available for LHD-8 in fiscal year 2000 as compared to the FYDP plan of funding advance procurement in fiscal year 2004 followed by funding the full balance in fiscal year 2005. The cost savings anticipated will be a result of continuing the LHD production which will enable the shipbuilder to retain specialized workers and maintain nationwide suppliers of materials.

The shipbuilder's estimate of savings of about \$780.0 million in procurement costs, and price of about \$1.5 billion are encouraged by the committee. The committee realizes that actual cost savings and price will be dependent on the final procurement funding profile. The committee directs the Navy to structure any contract for LHD-8 to maximize these potential savings and to report on same to the Congress.

The committee is concerned that the FYDP plan would cause an unnecessary interruption of learning curve efficiencies and the loss of long-term vendor pricing economies. This provision would authorize construction of LHD-8 and advance construction of components for the LHD-8 amphibious ship. The committee recommends an increase of \$375.0 million for these purposes.

DDG-51 multiyear procurement extension (sec. 122)

The budget request did not include a request to extend the DDG-51 multiyear procurement authorization contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997. This provision would authorize an extension of the 1997 multiyear authorization to include the fiscal year 2002 and fiscal year 2003 DDG-51 procurement. The provision would also increase the total number of ships authorized for multiyear procurement from 12 to 18 and authorize \$371.0 million for advance procurement in fiscal year 2001 for the ships associated with the extension of the multiyear procurement.

The committee received information which indicated \$371.0 million would be required in fiscal year 2001 if the Navy decides to propose multiyear procurement for the fiscal year 2002 and fiscal year 2003 DDG-51 ships. For this reason, the committee authorizes fiscal year 2001 advance procurement of \$371.0 million should the Navy decide to propose DDG-51 multi-year procurement for the fiscal year 2002 and fiscal year 2003 Arleigh Burke-class ships.

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense may decide to request reprogramming authority for advance procurement in fiscal year 2000 associated with the fiscal years 2002 and 2003 ships authorized for multiyear procurement in this provision.

The decision to request reprogramming authority may be based on vendor base issues and economic order quantity issues which would be beneficial to the government. The committee would be receptive to such a request from the Department of Defense.

Repeal of requirement for annual report from shipbuilders under certain nuclear attack submarine program (sec. 123)

The committee recommends a provision would eliminate the annual report on design responsibility for the Virginia-class attack submarine program by amending section 121(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1997.

Cooperative engagement capability (sec. 124)

The budget request included \$60.5 million for the procurement of anti-air warfare cooperative engagement capability (CEC) equipment. Of that amount, \$21.9 million is for procurement of Cooperative Engagement Transmitting/Processing System equipment. The CEC program was re-phased late in fiscal year 1998 to direct additional funding to research and development, with the intention of correcting a number of major inter-operability technical problems.

The Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 added \$98.6 million to PE 204229N and added \$26.0 million to PE 603658N to address inter-operability software problems. In addition, the conferees directed the Secretary of the Navy to report at least quarterly on CEC/combat direction system inter-operability problems and planned solutions. The Navy has provided updates for the first two quarters. It is evident from those updates that there has been a further delay in the program due to the delay in reaching agreement on how to proceed with proposed solutions and additional problem identification.

The committee fully supports the Navy's efforts to focus the CEC program on solutions for research, development, test and evaluation that must be done prior to fielding the system. The committee agreed to procure equipment in fiscal year 1999 to outfit the test and evaluation shore sites for the purpose of supporting the required development and testing. In addition, it was agreed that the opportunity to install equipment on new construction ships should not be missed because the cost to backfit would not be in the best interest of the government.

Subsequent to the submission of the statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (H. Report 105-736), \$35.0 million was added to the CEC equipment procurement program. These funds are sufficient to fund new construction DDG-51 requiring the equipment. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$21.9 million for procurement of Cooperative Engagement Transmitting/Processing System equipment because this is not needed to support installation in new construction ships.

Multiyear procurement authority for the F/A-18E/F aircraft (sec. 125)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract, for up to five

years, beginning in fiscal year 2000, for procurement of F/A-18E/F aircraft. In order to ensure that the multiyear criterion for design stability is met, this authorization is contingent upon successful completion of Operational Test and Evaluation (OPEVAL). Successful completion of OPEVAL can be interpreted as findings of operationally effective and operationally suitable in the final OPEVAL report. The committee understands this action may be accomplished with existing funds for this program and that the multiyear authority will ultimately reduce program costs. The budget request included \$2.8 billion for procurement of 36 F/A-18E/F aircraft. The F/A-18E/F has accumulated over 4,000 flight test hours and is in limited production.

The Navy has requested a multiyear procurement of the F/A-18E/F. When compared to annual purchases, the Navy has estimated that starting a multiyear procurement in fiscal year 2000 will result in savings that exceed \$700.0 million over the Future Years Defense Program. OPEVAL is scheduled to begin in May 1999, and will not be complete until November 1999. Therefore, the committee had to weigh the potential benefits of a multiyear procurement against the risks of problems arising during OPEVAL. If the Congress were to wait until fiscal year 2001 to grant multiyear procurement authority, OPEVAL results would be available. However, the cost of waiting one year could be as much as \$150.0 million in lost savings.

OTHER NAVY PROGRAMS

Navy Aircraft

MV-22

The budget request included \$850.3 million to procure 10 MV-22 Osprey aircraft. The MV-22 is a medium lift tiltrotor, vertical/short takeoff and landing aircraft that delivers twice the speed, five times the range, and three times the payload of the aging medium lift CH-46 helicopters it will replace. The committee understands that additional MV-22 aircraft in fiscal year 2000 will facilitate a more efficient fielding, transition, training, and deployment. Additional MV-22 aircraft are the number one priority on the Marine Corps unfunded requirements list. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$123.0 million for two additional MV-22 aircraft, a total authorization of \$973.3 million for 12 MV-22 aircraft.

CH-60 helicopters

The budget request included \$234.5 million for procurement and \$73.8 million for advance procurement of CH-60 helicopters. CH-60 helicopters maintain forward deployed fleet sustainability through vertical replenishment of ships and support operations through search and rescue. The committee recommends an increase of \$67.0 million for procurement of three additional CH-60 helicopters.

UC-35A

The budget request included no funds for UC-35A aircraft. The UC-35A is a fast, medium-range air transport aircraft. UC-35A aircraft are included in the Future Years Defense Program, and three aircraft have been included on the Marine Corps' unfunded priority list as replacements for the aging CT-39 aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of \$18.0 million, a total authorization of \$18.0 million, for three UC-35A aircraft.

C-40A

The budget request included \$49.0 million for the procurement of one C-40A aircraft. The C-40A is a replacement for the C-9B/DC-9 aircraft, which has an average age of over 26 years. The C-40A is a long-range aircraft used by the Navy Reserve to carry high priority cargo and passengers, ensuring that units meet ships' movement and overseas delivery of supplies. Additional C-40A aircraft are on the Navy unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of \$54.0 million for the acquisition of one additional C-40A aircraft, a total authorization of \$103.0 million.

KC-130J

The budget request included \$12.3 million for logistics and support for the seven KC-130J aircraft provided in the prior three fiscal years. The Marine Corps' active force KC-130F and KC-130R aircraft are projected to exceed fatigue life by fiscal year 2009. Recent center wing fatigue life data indicates that tanker aircraft may have to be retired earlier than planned, resulting in a KC-130 inventory shortfall as high as 15 aircraft by fiscal year 2001. As a result, the Marine Corps has included procurement of additional KC-130J aircraft on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of \$129.8 million to acquire two KC-130J aircraft, a total authorization of \$142.1 million.

EA-6B support jamming upgrade

The budget request included \$161.0 million for modifications to the EA-6B Prowler airborne electronic warfare aircraft, with \$32.4 million allocated for the ALQ-99 pods, to include the modified Band 9/10 transmitters. These modified transmitters provide the EA-6B with the ability to counter threat radar electronic protection techniques installed in a widely exported threat systems in the Band 7/8 frequency range. The committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million to accelerate the acquisition of modified Band 9/10 transmitters, a total authorization of \$186.0 million.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense may be overly optimistic in its estimate that the EA-6B Prowler will remain in service until fiscal year 2015. The integration of electronic combat has become a basic tenet of the way power projection and interdiction forces operate. A solid roadmap for maintaining this capability is essential. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to deliver a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2000, that outlines a notional schedule for analysis, demonstration, development, and production of a follow-on support jammer.

F/A-18 aircraft modifications

The budget request included \$308.8 million for modifications to the F/A-18 series aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase of \$130.4 million in F/A-18 modifications, a total authorization of \$439.2 million.

The budget request included \$35.1 million to upgrade Marine Corps' F/A-18A aircraft with engineering change proposal (ECP) 583. ECP-583 consists primarily of avionics hardware upgrades, which will give the F/A-18A the same capabilities as Lot 17 F/A-18C aircraft. The commonality in weapons employment, communications, and sensors make the modified F/A-18A a viable platform well into the next century. The committee recommends an increase of \$63.0 million for incorporation of ECP-583 into an additional seven active and seven reserve Marine Corps F/A-18A aircraft.

The budget request included \$42.2 million for the procurement of kits and installation of the AN/APG-73 radar, which replaces the less capable APG-65 radar. The Navy's unfunded requirements list included a request to retrofit an additional 18 F/A-18C/Ds with the AN/APG-73. The committee recommends an increase of \$38.0 million for this purpose.

The budget request included \$27.4 million for incorporation of the multifunctional information distribution system (MIDS). This provides a secure tactical datalink, secure communications, and navigational aids. The Navy has requested additional funding for MIDS in its unfunded requirements list to fully fund tri-service production requirements. The committee recommends an increase of \$29.4 million for F/A-18 MIDS.

AH-1 series

The budget request included \$13.7 million to support procurement of AH-1 equipment. The Marine Corps has identified an outstanding requirement for 12 night targeting systems (NTS) for reserve component AH-1W aircraft. The committee, therefore, recommends an additional \$9.0 million to procure 12 AH-1W NTS devices for a total authorization of \$22.7 million.

H-1 series

The budget request included \$6.3 million for H-1 series aircraft requirements. The committee is concerned about limitations of currently installed navigational thermal imaging systems for UH-1N aircraft. Current equipment has limitations in range performance and image quality for detection, recognition, and identification of hazards, personnel and vehicle sized targets. The committee supports an existing effort to upgrade this equipment and provide for enhanced safety for Marine Corps aviators. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million to complete upgrade requirements.

Maritime surveillance aircraft programs

The budget request included \$276.2 million for modifications to the P-3 Orion aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase of \$138.6 million, for a total authorization of \$414.8 million.

The budget request included \$106.0 million for Anti-Surface Warfare (ASUW) Improvement Program (AIP). The P-3 Orion is a long-range maritime surveillance aircraft that performs anti-submarine and anti-surface warfare in support of battle group and littoral operations. The ASUW improvement program enables the P-3 to combat emerging third world, limited operations, and surface, sub-surface, and air threats with simultaneous multi-mission capabilities. The budget request would allow the Navy to install eleven kits and buy six additional kits in fiscal year 2000. The committee understands that there is an existing operational requirements document and that additional AIP kits are on the Navy's unfunded requirements list. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$72.6 million for the acquisition of eight additional P-3C AIP kits.

The committee also understands that active P-3 aircraft need either a Service Life Extension Program (SLEP) or re-manufacture program to avoid being retired at the end of their fatigue life beginning in fiscal year 2010.

The course of action to be followed will be decided on as a result of an on-going aircraft roadmap study. The Navy's unfunded requirements list included a request for funds to commence this activity in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends an increase of \$66.0 for P-3 sustained readiness through initiation of a SLEP or re-manufacturing program.

KC-130T avionics upgrades

The budget request included \$15.3 million for C-130 and KC-130 aircraft modifications, with no funds allocated for modernizing the avionics suite. The KC-130T is the Marine Corps' theater aerial refueling and tactical assault transport aircraft. The reserves operate 28 of these aircraft, providing nearly 40 percent of the Marine Corps' total aerial refueling fleet. The avionics equipment currently installed in the KC-130T is out of production, rapidly approaching obsolescence, and becoming unsupportable. The Marine Corps' unfunded requirements list has included a request to procure one prototype installation kit to commence an avionics modernization initiative, allowing the Navy and Marine Corps to capitalize on current Air Force efforts. The committee recommends an increase of \$16.8 million for KC-130T modernization efforts, a total authorization of \$32.1 million.

AN/ALQ-165

The budget request included \$50.6 million for common electronic countermeasure (ECM) modifications, with no funds allocated for the procurement of AN/ALQ-165 defensive electronic countermeasure (DECM) systems or spares. The AN/ALQ-165 is the primary DECM for the F-14D aircraft, and is deployed on some F/A-18C/D aircraft on a contingency basis. The committee strongly supports the continued development of the follow-on system under development, the integrated defensive electronic countermeasure (IDECM) system. However, the Navy has informed the committee that there have been some technical delays in the fielding of this system. The committee understands that there is an insufficient number of replaceable assemblies in the AN/ALQ-165 logistics

pipeline to support currently deployed systems. The current operations tempo has put a great strain on these limited assets. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$16.0 million to purchase AN/ALQ-165 spares, a total authorization of \$66.6 million.

Navy Weapons

Hellfire II

The budget request did not include any funding for Hellfire missile procurement. The committee is concerned about the inventory of Hellfire missiles for Marine Corps attack helicopter requirements. The committee understands that the Marine Corps inventory will be at 62 percent of the inventory requirement by the end of fiscal year 2002 and at 53 percent by fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million to procure Hellfire II missiles and support critical training requirements.

Improved tactical air launched decoy

The budget request included no funds for the procurement of drones and decoys. The improved tactical air launch decoy (ITALD) is used to deceive and saturate an enemy's integrated air defense systems. The committee understands that the Navy is well short of its ITALD inventory objective, and that this decoy greatly enhances aircrew survival and probability of mission success. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to procure additional ITALD decoys, a total authorization of \$10.0 million.

Weapons industrial facilities

The budget request included \$20.2 million for various activities at government-owned and contractor-operated weapons industrial facilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.7 million to accelerate the facilities restoration program at the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory.

Navy and Marine Corps Ammunition

Laser guided bombs and kits

The committee is concerned with the inadequate supplies of critical munitions necessary to execute the National Military Strategy. Under the current programmed funding profile, inventories for laser guided bomb kits and bomb bodies will be less than 50 percent of required levels. This shortfall contributes to the risk associated with the execution of two major theater wars. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$28.0 million for the procurement of laser guided bomb kits and bomb bodies.

Marine Corps ammunition

The committee is concerned with the inadequate funding for ammunition procurement that was included in the budget request for fiscal year 2000. Ammunition is an important contributor to military readiness—in training and in anticipation of conflict. The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Marine Corps ammunition procurement:

Item:	<i>Millions</i>
25 mm	\$76.2
40 mm	1.4
60 mm	4.0
Fuze, hand grenade	3.0
Demolition Munitions	7.2
SMAW	9.0
Subtotal	\$30.8

Other Navy Procurement

AN/WSN-7 inertial navigation system

The budget request included \$21.8 million for procurement of AN/WSN-7 ring laser inertial navigation systems. The AN/WSN-7 continuously and automatically determines and indicates a ship's position, attitude (heading, roll, and pitch), and velocity. This system replaces three legacy navigation systems, providing equipment commonality between surface combatants, submarines, and aircraft carriers. The annual operating cost of the AN/WSN-7 is projected to be only ten percent of the cost of operating the legacy navigation systems it replaces. Accelerated procurement of the AN/WSN-7 could produce a substantial savings in maintenance costs.

The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million to the budget request for the procurement and installation of additional AN/WSN-7 navigation sets.

Afloat force protection, maritime interdiction operations equipment

The budget request did not include procurement funds for equipment required by sailors conducting maritime interdiction operations. After submission of the budget request, the committee became aware that fleet units conducting maritime interdiction operations in support of United Nations sanctions did not have the proper equipment to conduct the operations.

A visit to a fleet unit in the Persian Gulf conducting the interdiction operations confirmed that the sailors patched together equipment to conduct the operations. Although bulletproof vests, life jackets, walkie talkies, web belts, and passive restraint equipment are available, the life jackets are bulky, bulletproof vests will not stop advanced munitions, walkie talkies have insufficient range and are not secure, and web belts and passive restraint gear are adapted from other uses.

The committee recommends an increase of \$24.4 million for afloat force protection equipment for sailors to conduct maritime interdiction operations.

Integrated condition assessment system

The budget request included \$17.4 million for integrated condition assessment system (ICAS) for ships. The ICAS is a system that electronically monitors the operating parameters of machinery and electronic systems, thus reducing man-hours spent taking readings on equipment. Mine countermeasure ships have not received the full installation of ICAS equipment. The committee rec-

ommends an increase of \$6.5 million for procurement and installation of ICAS equipment.

AN/BPS-16H surface search radar for submarines

The budget request did not include funding for the procurement of AN/BPS-15/16H submarine radar navigation sets. The Navy has been procuring the AN/BPS-16H, a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) variant of the AN/BPS-15 radar navigation set, and its associated mast assembly, for installation on new construction submarines and for backfit on submarines. Procurement of the COTS variant has produced a substantial cost savings over a comparable system built to military specifications, enhanced operational performance, and improved navigational safety. The Navy established a new specification to eliminate the manpower-intensive requirement for paper navigation charts on ships. Instead of paper charts, all ships will have the Electronic Chart Display Information Systems (ECDIS-N). Operating ECDIS-N requires an upgrade to navigation radar systems. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million for AN/BPS-16(H) software and hardware upgrades to bring them into ECDIS-N compliance.

Integration and test facility command and control initiative

The Navy is continuing an initiative to provide fully integrated and supportable command, control, communications, computer, and intelligence (C4I) systems at its integration and test facilities. These facilities are used for architecture design, systems engineering, integration, and to provide life-cycle support for the fleet's C4I systems.

The committee learned that the Navy's East Coast in-service engineering Space Warfare System Center (SWSC) began the operation of an integrated product center (IPC). This IPC has connected a variety of Department of Defense laboratories and centers including the Joint Battle Center and the Maritime Battle Center. Additional communication nodes and terminal devices, as well as an increase in existing network bandwidth to accommodate additional users, would permit the facility to support the wide variety of operational protocols and physical interfaces associated with new fleet tactical C4I systems.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million above the budget request for engineering design; hardware and software procurement; and installation, testing, and documentation; and technical networking infrastructure for continued development of the SWSC's IPC.

Joint Engineering Data Management and Information Control System

The budget request included no funds for Joint Engineering Data Management and Information Control System (JEDMICS), the designated Department of Defense standard system for management, control and storage of engineering drawings. It is designed as an open, client-server architecture and is nearing full deployment for global access to the data in its repositories. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.0 for the continued security system pro-

curement, integration and accreditation surveys for the JEDMICS system.

Information Technology-21

The budget request included \$474.9 million in ship communication automation procurement. Of that amount, \$228.1 million is for satellite communications ship terminals, \$196.4 million is for ship communications automation, \$1.9 million is for ship communications items under \$2.0 million, \$6.2 million is for ship tactical communications, \$19.0 million for Global Communications and Control System-Maritime (GCCS-M) Afloat, and \$23.3 million for Naval Tactical Command Support System (NTCSS). In addition, the budget request included \$64.1 million for procurement of information systems security program equipment.

The Navy recently re-phased Information Technology-21 (IT-21) fleet installations to ensure equipment is installed in deploying carrier battle groups and amphibious ready groups at least six months prior to deployment. Fleet feedback on IT-21 equipment and resulting capabilities has been extremely positive. The IT-21 initiative is revolutionary in enhancing the fleet's operational picture and situational awareness.

The committee fully supports the Navy's IT-21 initiative and particularly the emphasis on pushing hardware to the fleet as a matter of priority. The committee also supports the re-phasing of hardware installations which ensures ships and command organizations learn to use the equipment and train with the equipment prior to ships making overseas deployment. The committee recommends an increase of \$30.7 million for the switching connectivity to make battle groups IT-21 capable, and \$12.0 million for information systems security program devices for the information assurance program.

Aviation life support

The budget request included \$17.1 million to procure a variety of Navy and Marine Corps requirements, including rotary wing aviation night vision equipment. The committee notes an opportunity to complete the retrofit of night vision goggles for all Marine Corps rotary wing units in fiscal year 2000. The committee recognizes a critical requirement to field a night vision capability to both air and ground forces as quickly as possible to ensure the combat effectiveness of our forces in future military operations. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$18.1 million, a total authorization of \$35.2 million, to retrofit OMNI IV/V night vision goggles in both the active and reserve components of the Marine Corps.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system

The budget request included \$21.5 million for procurement and installation of the NULKA anti-ship missile decoy program. NULKA is a proven decoy against anti-ship missiles. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.3 million for the procurement of launcher systems and decoys to outfit the fleet with this key self-defense equipment.

Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism

The committee recommends that \$1.4 million be transferred from Other Procurement, Navy to section 310(25), a newly-established central transfer account for funds to combat terrorism.

Marine Corps Procurement

Modification kits-tracked vehicles

The budget request included \$22.9 million to support modifications to Marine Corps tracked vehicles. The committee understands that the Marine Corps recently changed its strategy to begin procurement of M88A2 Hercules recovery vehicles in fiscal year 2003. The committee recognizes the need to provide a more capable recovery vehicle for MEF armor systems and supports the revised strategy adopted by the Marine Corps. Therefore, the committee recommends the following:

- (1) a decrease of \$7.2 million in PE 026623M, Marine Corps ground combat/supporting arms systems;
- (2) a decrease of \$3.9 million in the Marine Corps operation and maintenance account, equipment maintenance M88A1; and
- (3) an increase of \$60.5 million for modification kits-tracked vehicles to procure 24 M88A2 Hercules vehicles. The committee recommends a total authorization of \$83.4 million for modification kits-tracked vehicles.

Night vision equipment

The budget request included \$9.0 million to procure Marine Corps night vision equipment. The committee notes an opportunity to buy out acquisition objectives for generation (GEN) III night vision tubes and AN/PEQ-2 infrared target pointing devices in fiscal year 2000. The committee continues to support procurement of night vision equipment and, therefore, recommends an increase of \$8.5 million to buy out the acquisition objectives for GEN III tubes and AN/PEQ-2 devices.

Communications and electronics infrastructure

The budget request included \$81.8 million for communications and electronics infrastructure requirements. The committee supports Marine Corps' effort to upgrade communications and electronics infrastructure at Marine Corps installations, which is necessary to meet future information support requirements. The committee recommends an increase of \$54.4 million, a total authorization of \$136.2 million, to continue this effort and to achieve upgrade objectives as soon as practicable.

High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle

The budget request included \$124.4 million to procure high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWV) for the Marine Corps. The committee notes the HMMWV's throughout the Marine Corps are aging rapidly and need to be replaced to improve safety, reliability, maintainability, and durability. The committee rec-

ommends an increase of \$40.0 million to accelerate procurement of an additional 668 new vehicles.

Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force field medical equipment

The budget request included \$2.5 million to procure equipment for the Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force (CBIRF) to meet emerging mission requirements. The committee notes an outstanding requirement to procure military medical evaluation tools necessary to allow first response forces to manage and treat patients involved in a chemical or biological incident. Shortfalls include military medical evaluation tool software, detection systems for nerve gas, blister agent and nuclear material, and Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU) outfitting and deployment requirements. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$6.5 million to fill these requirements, a total authorization of \$9.0 million.

SUBTITLE D-AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE						
1	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	B-1B (MYP)	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	B-2A (MYP)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TACTICAL FORCES						
4	F-22 RAPTOR	6	1,766,213	-	-	6	1,766,213
	LESS ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (PY)		(191,232)	-	-	-	(191,232)
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	277,094	-	-	-	277,094
6	F-15A	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	F-16 C/D (MYP)	10	252,610	-	-	10	252,610
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
9	C-17 (MYP)	15	3,439,647	-	-	15	3,439,647
	LESS ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (PY)		(359,500)	-	-	-	(359,500)
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	304,900	-	-	-	304,900
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
11	WC-130	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	EC-130J	-	-	-	30,000	-	30,000
13	C-130H	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
14	C-130J	-	30,618	-	24,200	-	54,818
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
15	JPATS	21	88,232	18	85,400	39	173,632
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	HELICOPTERS						
16	V-22 OSPREY	-	29,221	-	-	-	29,221
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	20,290	-	-	-	20,290
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
18	SMALL VCX	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	C-32A	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	27	2,531	-	-	27	2,531
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
22	TARGET DRONES	-	36,152	-	-	-	36,152
23	E-8C	1	316,150	-	46,000	1	362,150
	LESS ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(35,885)	-	-	-	(35,885)
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	HAEUAV	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	PREDATOR UAV	3	38,003	-	-	3	38,003
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						

Title I - Procurement
(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
27	-	20,083	-	-	-	20,083
28	-	130,389	-	-	-	130,389
29	-	15,973	-	-	-	15,973
30	-	34,646	-	-	-	34,646
TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
31	-	24,360	-	-	-	24,360
32	-	263,490	-	20,000	-	283,490
33	-	249,536	-	130,300	-	379,836
34	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	-	85	-	-	-	85
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
36	-	70,037	-	-	-	70,037
37	-	11,863	-	-	-	11,863
38	-	95,643	-	-	-	95,643
39	-	8,713	-	-	-	8,713
40	-	174	-	-	-	174
41	-	-	-	-	-	-
42	-	499	-	-	-	499
43	-	383	-	-	-	383
44	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	-	10,021	-	-	-	10,021
TRAINER AIRCRAFT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
46	T-1	-	10	-	-	-	10
47	T-3 (EFS) AIRCRAFT	-	2,196	-	-	-	2,196
48	T-38	-	94,487	-	-	-	94,487
49	T-41 AIRCRAFT	-	91	-	-	-	91
50	T-43	-	721	-	3,100	-	3,821
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
51	KC-10A (ATCA)	-	53,366	-	-	-	53,366
52	C-12	-	2,441	-	-	-	2,441
53	C-18	-	343	-	-	-	343
54	C-20 MODS	-	3,486	-	12,200	-	15,686
55	VC-25A MOD	-	9,262	-	-	-	9,262
56	C-130	-	207,646	-	-	-	207,646
57	C-135	-	347,088	-	8,700	-	355,788
58	DARP	-	138,436	-	82,000	-	220,436
59	E-3	-	124,061	-	-	-	124,061
60	E-4	-	19,985	-	6,900	-	26,885
61	E-8	-	28,558	-	-	-	28,558
62	H-1	-	254	-	-	-	254
63	H-60	-	15,565	-	-	-	15,565
64	OTHER AIRCRAFT	-	20,204	-	-	-	20,204
65	PREDATOR MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER MODIFICATIONS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
66	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	-	9,390	-	-	-	9,390
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
67	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	420,921	-	-	-	420,921
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
68	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	171,369	-	-	-	171,369
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
69	A-10	-	8,300	-	-	-	8,300
70	B-2A	-	106,882	-	-	-	106,882
71	C-5	-	-	-	-	-	-
72	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	7,398	-	-	-	7,398
73	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	30,010	-	-	-	30,010
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
74	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	24,794	-	-	-	24,794
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
75	WAR CONSUMABLES	-	29,282	-	-	-	29,282
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
76	MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	339,606	-	-	-	339,606
	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT						
77	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	4,866	-	-	-	4,866
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
78	CANCELLED ACCOUNT PY ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DARP						
79	DARP	-	130,129	-	-	-	130,129
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENTS				(46,000)		(46,000)
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		9,302,086		402,800		9,704,886
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
1	ROCKETS	-	9,806	-	-	-	9,806
2	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	2.75" ROCKET HEAD SIGNATURE	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	2.75 IN ROCKET, FLARE IR	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CARTRIDGES						
6	CARTRIDGES	-	70,703	-	-	-	70,703
7	5.56 MM	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30 MM TRAINING	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BOMBS						

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.	FY '00 Request	FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
13	PRACTICE BOMBS	-	24,325	-	-	-	24,325
14	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	40,553	-	-	-	40,553
15	MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	GBU-28 HARD TARGET PENETRATOR	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	GBU - 37	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	2000 LB HE BOMB MK-84	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	203	61,334	-	-	203	61,334
22	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	5,410	125,605	-	-	5,410	125,605
23	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER	2,922	48,875	-	10,100	2,922	58,975
24	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FLARE, IR MJU-7B						
25	ASTE (INFRARED EXPENDABLE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	OTHER MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS	-	5,593	-	-	-	5,593
27	FLARE, IR MJU-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	MJU-10B	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	CAD/PAD	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	LUU-19 FLARE	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	INITIAL SPARES	-	2,304	-	-	-	2,304
33	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	657	-	-	-	657

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
34	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FUZES						
35	FLARES	-	26,342	-	-	-	26,342
36	JOINT PROGRAMMABLE FUSE(JPF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	WEAPONS						
	SMALL ARMS						
37	SMALL ARMS	-	3,440	-	-	-	3,440
38	M-16 A2 RIFLE	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	9MM COMPACT PISTOL	-	-	-	-	-	-
40	M-9 PISTOL	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TRANSFER TO COUNTER TERRORISM FUND				(15,800)		(15,800)
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENTS				(2,000)		(2,000)
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		419,537		(7,700)		411,837
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC	-	15,593	-	-	-	15,593
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC						
2	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	-	1,050	-	-	-	1,050

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.	FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
3	-	-	-	-	-	-
HAVE NAP TACTICAL						
4	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	193	79,981	-	-	193	79,981
6	-	220	-	-	-	220
7	210	97,279	-	-	210	97,279
TARGET DRONES						
8	-	-	-	-	-	-
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
9	-	3,064	-	-	-	3,064
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES						
CLASS IV						
10	-	2,950	-	-	-	2,950
11	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	-	31,103	-	-	-	31,103
13	-	242,960	-	40,000	-	282,960
14	-	2,800	-	-	-	2,800
15	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	-	8,919	-	-	-	8,919
18	-	100	-	-	-	100
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	Description	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS							
19	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	18,022	-	-	-	18,022
OTHER SUPPORT							
SPACE PROGRAMS							
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	-	9,594	-	-	-	9,594
22	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	-	139,049	-	-	-	139,049
23	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	31,798	-	-	-	31,798
24	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	-	11,375	-	-	-	11,375
25	INERTIAL UPPER STAGES(SPACE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	-	38,223	-	-	-	38,223
27	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)	-	111,609	-	-	-	111,609
28	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM(SPACE)	-	30,765	-	-	-	30,765
29	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS (SPACE)	-	431,165	-	-	-	431,165
30	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	1	70,812	-	-	1	70,812
31	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)	-	64,834	-	-	-	64,834
32	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPECIAL PROGRAMS							
34	CANCELLED ACCOUNT PY ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	-	716,703	-	-	-	716,703
36	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	-	199,640	-	-	-	199,640

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT						
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		2,359,608		(10,400) 29,600		(10,400) 2,389,208
	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	53	986	-	-	53	986
6	ARMORED SEDAN	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES						
7	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	TRUCK MULTI-STOP 1 TON 4X2	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	TRUCK CARRYALL	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	COMMERCIAL UTILITY CARGO VEHICLE	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	194	11,343	120	7,000	314	18,343

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	Description	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
16	TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	TRUCK, UTILITY	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	CAP VEHICLES	-	751	-	-	-	751
19	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	28,220	-	-	-	28,220
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
20	TRUCK TANK FUEL R-11	-	-	-	18,000	-	18,000
21	HMMVV, ARMORED	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-2	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	272	7,710	-	-	272	7,710
24	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	21,808	-	-	-	21,808
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
25	TRUCK CRASH P-19	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	3,869	-	-	-	3,869
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
27	TRUCK, F/L 6000 LB	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	89	6,983	-	-	89	6,983
29	60K A/C LOADER	39	81,163	9	12,500	48	93,663
30	NEXT GENERATION SMALL LOADER(NGSL)	13	9,754	-	-	13	9,754
31	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	6,637	-	-	-	6,637
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
32	TRUCK, DUMP	105	5,428	-	-	105	5,428
33	RUNWAY SNOW REMOVE & CLEANING EQUIP	65	7,392	-	-	65	7,392

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
34	MODIFICATIONS	-	887	-	-	-	887
35	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	10,070	-	-	-	10,070
36	VEHICLE LEASES	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM						
37	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
38	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	-	28,133	-	-	-	28,133
39	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	-	488	-	-	-	488
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
40	INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS	-	23,931	-	-	-	23,931
41	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	2,042	-	-	-	2,042
42	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	-	5,495	-	-	-	5,495
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
43	AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (ATCAL)	-	887	-	-	-	887
44	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	-	54,394	-	-	-	54,394
45	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENT	-	37,917	-	-	-	37,917
46	WEATHER OBSERV/FORECAST	-	25,434	-	-	-	25,434
47	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	22,143	-	-	-	22,143
48	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	-	6,371	-	-	-	6,371
49	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	-	1,801	-	-	-	1,801
50	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
		(Dollars in Thousands)					
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
51	AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	71,173	-	-	-	71,173
52	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	-	5,722	-	-	-	5,722
53	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	10,366	-	-	-	10,366
54	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	-	32,583	-	-	-	32,583
55	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	-	17,503	-	-	-	17,503
56	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM NET	-	5,168	-	-	-	5,168
57	FORCE PROTECTION/ANTI-TERRORISM	-	-	-	-	-	-
58	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	13,275	-	-	-	13,275
59	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	2,871	-	-	-	2,871
60	BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	-	28,361	-	-	-	28,361
61	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	-	47,648	-	-	-	47,648
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
62	INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS	-	14,012	-	-	-	14,012
63	BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	-	122,839	-	34,000	-	156,839
64	USCENTCOM	-	5,770	-	-	-	5,770
65	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	14,025	-	-	-	14,025
	DISA PROGRAMS						
66	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	-	14,614	-	-	-	14,614
67	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG SPACE	-	1,011	-	-	-	1,011
68	NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPACE	-	3,490	-	-	-	3,490
69	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	-	33,591	-	(1,200)	-	32,391

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
70	EASTERN/WESTERN RANGE I&M SPACE	-	83,410	-	-	-	83,410
71	MILSATCOM SPACE	-	46,257	-	-	-	46,257
72	SPACE MODS SPACE	-	2,835	-	-	-	2,835
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
73	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	-	49,710	-	36,100	-	85,810
74	COMBAT SURVIVOR/EVADER LOCATER RADIO	-	843	-	-	-	843
75	RADIO EQUIPMENT	-	16,685	-	-	-	16,685
76	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)	-	1,991	-	-	-	1,991
77	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	-	3,208	-	-	-	3,208
78	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	-	41,589	-	-	-	41,589
79	CAP COM & ELECT	-	382	-	-	-	382
80	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	7,034	-	-	-	7,034
	MODIFICATIONS						
81	COMMELECT MODS	-	56,195	-	-	-	56,195
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP						
	TEST EQUIPMENT						
82	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE	-	10,157	-	-	-	10,157
83	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKAGE	-	1,071	-	-	-	1,071
84	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	9,750	-	-	-	9,750
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP						
85	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	-	2,800	-	-	-	2,800
86	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	3,559	-	2,400	-	5,959

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
		(Dollars in Thousands)					
	DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ						
87	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	15,320	-	-	-	15,320
88	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	8,533	-	-	-	8,533
	ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT						
89	GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC	-	-	-	-	-	-
90	FLOODLIGHTS	-	13,461	-	-	-	13,461
91	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	7,638	-	-	-	7,638
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
92	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	-	14,035	-	-	-	14,035
93	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT	-	14,331	-	-	-	14,331
94	ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	-	955	-	-	-	955
95	AIR BASE OPERABILITY	-	4,417	-	-	-	4,417
96	PALLET AIR CARGO	-	-	-	-	-	-
97	NET ASSEMBLY, 108"X88"	-	-	-	-	-	-
98	BLADDERS FUEL	-	-	-	-	-	-
99	AERIAL BULK FUEL DELIVERY SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
100	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	5,932	-	-	-	5,932
101	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	-	15,093	-	-	-	15,093
102	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	-	46,865	-	-	-	46,865
103	DEPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT CONTAINERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
104	AIR CONDITIONERS	-	6,711	-	-	-	6,711
105	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	-	22,500	-	-	-	22,500

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
106	-	40,047	-	-	-	40,047
107	-	2,976	-	-	-	2,976
108	-	12,658	-	-	-	12,658
109	-	106,394	-	-	-	106,394
110	-	5,352,231	-	-	-	5,352,231
111	-	142,515	-	-	-	142,515
112	-	7,910	-	-	-	7,910
113	-	1,151	-	-	-	1,151
114	-	-	-	-	-	-
115	-	179	-	-	-	179
116	-	13,304	-	-	-	13,304
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
117	-	36,486	-	-	-	36,486
				(39,400)		
TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM				(12,400)		
ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				57,000		
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE					7,085,177	7,142,177

F-22 aircraft program (sec. 131)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to certify to the congressional defense committees, before commencing low rate initial production of the F-22, that the test program is adequate to determine its operational effectiveness and suitability, and that the development and production programs are executable within the cost caps. The budget request included \$1.8 billion for F-22 procurement. The budget request also included \$1.2 billion for F-22 engineering and manufacturing development (EMD). These funds provide substantial building activity, including \$689.7 million to complete assembly of EMD aircraft 3 through 6 and to continue assembly of aircraft 7 through 9. The EMD request also includes \$275.8 million for avionics development, \$140.1 million for engine development, and \$166.6 million for other government costs. The committee notes that funds have not been taken from the program, and are available for obligation once the Secretary of Defense provides the required certifications.

In response to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), the Comptroller General submitted an annual report that assessed the progress of the EMD phase for the F-22 program and the prospect of completion under the cost cap. The General Accounting Office (GAO) report and recent program progress was the subject of a hearing held by the Airland Subcommittee to review tactical aviation modernization issues. In the annual report and in testimony, the GAO questioned whether EMD, as planned, can be completed within the cost limitation. Cost reviews by the Air Force and the contractors in calendar year 1998 identified a potential EMD program cost growth of \$667.0 million that, if not addressed, could increase program costs above the limitation of \$18.9 billion. Much of this potential cost growth has been driven by projected late deliveries of EMD aircraft 3 through 6. These delays are caused by problems with the large titanium castings that attach the wings to the aircraft fuselage. These casting and machining problems have apparently been resolved, and the delivery schedule has been revised.

The Air Force and the contractor have developed a plan to address this potential cost growth, which includes streamlining some EMD activities, and delaying some other activities until after production. In testimony before the Airland Subcommittee, the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) said he has not yet thoroughly reviewed the revised test plans. DOT&E also raised concerns about the thoroughness of the F-22 live fire test and evaluation plan. In testimony before the Airland Subcommittee and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, Air Force officials unanimously expressed the opinion that, while challenging, the EMD program is achievable within its cost limitations. A decision to authorize the Air Force to begin low rate initial production (LRIP) is scheduled in November, 1999.

The committee is pleased with the technical performance of the F-22 displayed in its first 200 hours of flight testing. The committee, however, is concerned about the potential for EMD cost growth and the temptation to dilute the flight test program to achieve program completion within the cost cap. Before the scheduled LRIP Defense Acquisition Board, the F-22 Test and Evalua-

tion Master Plan (TEMP) must be signed by DOT&E. The Cost and Analysis Improvement Group (CAIG) of the Office of the Secretary of Defense must review executability of the program within programmed funding. These assessments should form the basis of the required certifications.

OTHER AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Air Force Aircraft

EC-130J

The budget request included no funds for the EC-130J Commando Solo (CS) aircraft. Currently, the 193d Special Operations Wing is awaiting delivery of three EC-130J aircraft. After delivery of the basic aircraft, the airframe will be modified to the CS configuration. The committee understands that there is only sufficient funding to modify two of the airframes to the CS configuration and recommends an increase of \$30.0 million to fully configure the third aircraft.

C-130J

The budget request included \$30.6 million for spares and logistics required for prior acquisitions of this aircraft. In the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, the Secretary of Defense was required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees discussing planned versus completed testing and the program cost and schedule status. This reporting requirement was delegated to the Secretary of the Air Force.

Analysis of this report details significant testing and aircraft delivery delays. The current test schedule indicates the contractor Qualification Test and Evaluation will not be complete until June 2000. A final report on the Qualification Operational Test and Evaluation will not be completed until November 2000. The initial aircraft deliveries were scheduled for July 1997. However, delivery of the first two Air Force C-130Js did not occur until February, 1999. The Air Force report states that the schedule delays have not affected the user's operational capability, since acquisition to date of C-130J aircraft for the Air Force has been earlier than required.

The committee is concerned that aircraft production has been accelerating in advance of substantive testing for operational effectiveness and suitability, and that required logistics support has not been put in place. The Air Force has emphasized the budgeted level of funding is insufficient to provide the required logistics support through the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP), and included a request for \$24.2 million in the Air Force unfunded requirements list for fiscal year 2000 to provide adequate support for the current buy profile. It should be noted that the current buy profile in the FYDP includes no additional aircraft acquisitions until fiscal year 2002. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$24.2 million for C-130J logistics and training, a total authorization of \$54.8 million.

Joint primary aircrew training system

The budget request included \$88.2 million for 21 Joint Primary Aircrew Training System (JPATS) aircraft and associated support. The Air Force has included additional aircraft high on its unfunded requirements list. The committee agrees that this acceleration will allow the Air Force to retire its aging T-37 training aircraft ahead of schedule, resulting in net savings due to avoidance of rising operation and support costs. The committee recommends an increase of \$85.4 million for an additional 18 aircraft with associated simulators, courseware, and the training integrated management systems, a total authorization of \$173.6 million.

F-15 220E engine modification

The budget request included \$263.5 million for F-15 modifications, with \$13.8 million dedicated to the 220E engine upgrade. The maintenance benefits derived from this transition from analog to digital technology, coupled with operational benefits, make this a program that merits additional support. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to further accelerate the fielding of the 220E upgrade, a total authorization of \$283.5 million.

F-16 aircraft modifications

The budget request included \$249.5 million for modifications to the F-16 aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase of \$130.3 million in F-16 modifications, a total authorization of \$379.8 million.

The budget request did not include any funding for the High Speed Anti-Radiation Missile (HARM) Targeting System (HTS) pods and Aircraft Launcher Interface computers necessary to make the F-16 a viable suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD) platform. The Air Force is using the F-16 extensively against heavily defended, integrated air defense networks, and has emphasized the importance of these SEAD modifications through high placement on the service unfunded requirements list. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$13.9 million to acquire 30 HTS pods and Aircraft Launcher Interface computers.

The budget request included \$47.8 million for F-16 precision targeting pods. Including the Air National Guard (ANG) and Air Force Reserve (AFRC) in the total force is critically important, given the extremely high operational tempo of our tactical air forces. To participate meaningfully, however, they must be capable of employing precision guided munitions. The vast majority of the older block F-16 aircraft in the ANG and AFRC are currently unable to employ precision guided munitions. The Air Force has recently selected the Litening II pod system to provide this capability for these earlier block aircraft, and identified this system as the number one ANG and AFRC funding priority. The committee recommends an increase of \$80.0 million for acquisition of additional Litening II pods.

The budget request did not include any fiscal year 2000 funding for the continuing acquisition of the hardware associated with the digital terrain system (DTS), although funding is included in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). The next release of F-16

software will include this function, and will need the hardware to be functional. The committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million to accelerate the acquisition of DTS hardware.

In fiscal year 1999, the Air Force was projected to take delivery of 20 complete F-16 reconnaissance pod systems. Each pod would have included a forward oblique camera in the front bay and a medium altitude electro-optic (MAEO) sensor in the middle bay. The committee understands that necessary engineering change proposals have caused the Air Force to scale back the scope of the contract, which now includes only five of the 20 MAEO sensors. The lack of a medium altitude sensor would subject a significant portion of reconnaissance missions to fly in riskier, low altitude regimes. The committee recommends an increase of \$13.5 million to purchase the remaining 15 MAEO sensors to fully equip the reconnaissance pods.

In the past year, there has been a significant increase in the number of F-16 engine-related mishaps. The F-16 is a single engine aircraft. In February 1999, the Air Force held an engine summit to examine the causes of the mishaps and to identify the necessary fixes. The committee believes the plan proposed by the engine summit must be initiated quickly. The funding required to execute the plan, however, is not included in the budget request. To allow the Air Force to initiate the engine modification plan, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.9 million.

T-43 terrain awareness and warning system

The budget request included \$700,000 for T-43 modifications. It included no funds for the terrain awareness and warning system modification, although funding for this modification is included in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). This is a fourth generation ground proximity warning system that cross checks the aircraft's global positioning system coordinates with a world-wide terrain database. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.1 million to accelerate by one year the incorporation of the terrain avoidance and warning system on the T-43, a total authorization of \$3.8 million.

C-20 terrain avoidance and warning system and global air traffic management

The budget request included \$3.5 million for modifications to the C-20 aircraft, with \$3.1 million for incorporation of the terrain avoidance and warning system. No funds were allocated for the incorporation of the global air traffic management (GATM), although funding is programmed in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). The terrain avoidance and warning system is a ground proximity warning system that cross checks the aircraft's global positioning system coordinates with a world-wide terrain database, while GATM provides communication, navigation, and surveillance improvements needed for operation in oceanic airspace where reduced horizontal separations are implemented. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.8 million for the terrain avoidance and warning system, and \$7.4 million for GATM for the C-20, a total authorization of \$15.7 million.

KC-135 global air traffic management

The budget request included \$347.1 million for modifications to C-135 and KC-135 aircraft including \$29.6 million for the global air traffic management (GATM) modification. The budget request included no funds to procure GATM kits for the KC-135 aircraft, although the Air Force did include these items on its unfunded requirements list. GATM adds the communications, navigation, and surveillance equipment necessary for operation in oceanic airspace where reduced horizontal separations are implemented. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.7 million for the procurement of additional GATM kits, a total authorization of \$355.8 million.

RC-135 re-engining

The budget request included \$138.4 million for reconnaissance projects, with \$60.0 million for more powerful, fuel efficient engines for two RC-135 aircraft. The committee supports the acceleration of the re-engining effort for the RC-135 aircraft, and recommends an increase of \$60.0 million to re-engine two additional RC-135 aircraft.

Other adjustments addressed elsewhere in this report amount to an increase of \$22.0 million, a total authorization of \$220.4 million.

U-2 upgrades

The U-2 aircraft, a manned high-altitude reconnaissance platform, continues to be heavily utilized. Recent increases in operational tempo have generated requirements for upgrades not included in the budget request. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the continued acquisition and installation of the 29-F radar warning receiver and "Band-Aid" electronic countermeasures systems.

The committee understands the U-2 cockpit instrumentation, navigation, and communication suite are sorely in need of modernization. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million in APAF to begin activities for U-2 cockpit modification.

The committee also understands that the pre-planned product improvement of the SYERS reconnaissance package will begin in fiscal year 1999. A polarization feature which will aid in detection of concealed and camouflaged objects was not included in this configuration because of technical risk and funding restraints. The committee understands this technical risk has been mitigated, and recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 35207F to incorporate the polarization techniques in the SYERS pre-planned product improvement evaluation.

Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism

The committee recommends that \$15.8 million be transferred from Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force to section 310(25), a newly-established central transfer account for funds to combat terrorism.

Air Force Ammunition

Wind corrected munition dispenser

The wind corrected munition dispenser (WCMD) program was started in response to lessons learned in Desert Storm. The WCMD provides the sensor fuzed weapon, combined effects munition, and the air delivered Gator mine with the capability to be launched accurately from medium-to-high altitudes, day or night, and in adverse weather. Unfortunately, the development program for this system recently experienced some technical difficulties that delayed production and will require some redesign of the fin lock mechanism. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.1 million to redesign the WCMD and restore its rate of production.

Air Force Missile

Minuteman III guidance replacement program

The committee continues to support the Minuteman III Guidance Replacement Program (GRP). The committee is concerned by the Air Force decision to reduce GRP production funding in fiscal years 1999 and 2000. This decision will result in significant delay and cost growth. The Minuteman III guidance systems are currently well beyond their original design life of ten years, and must be replaced as soon as possible. Equally important, the delay in the GRP impedes the Minuteman III Propulsion Replacement Program and the ability to utilize the Mk 21 warhead once the Peacekeeper system is retired. The committee therefore recommends an increase of \$40.0 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, for GRP and urges the Secretary of the Air Force to seek additional funds in fiscal year 2001 and beyond to establish a more efficient and expeditious production program.

Other Air Force Procurement

High mobility vehicle

The budget request included \$11.3 million for high mobility vehicles (HMTVs). The Air Force has included these and other special purpose vehicles on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million for HMTVs, a total authorization of \$18.3 million.

Fuel trucks

The budget request did not include any funds for R-11 fuel tank trucks. The Air Force included a request for funding for these and other special purpose vehicles in its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of \$18.0 million for acquisition of these trucks.

60K loader

The budget request included \$81.2 million for the procurement of 39 60K aircraft loaders. This air transportable loader operates on airfields worldwide, and replaces less efficient loaders that are unable to interface with newer military and commercial cargo aircraft. In recent testimony, the Unified Commanders in Chief em-

phasized the importance of strategic lift in meeting theater of war requirements. Fast and efficient loading of airlifters is an essential element to these lift requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$12.5 million for the procurement of nine additional 60K loaders, a total authorization of \$93.7 million.

Base information infrastructure

The budget request included \$122.8 million for base information infrastructure (BII), which funds the combat information transport system program, network connectivity, and public key infrastructure. The Air Force unfunded requirements list included a request for additional funds to procure hardware and software for computer network defense, along with network management systems to enhance reliability of command and control information system networks. The committee recommends an increase of \$34.0 million for BII.

Tactical communications-electronics equipment

The budget request included \$49.7 million for tactical communications-electronics (C-E) equipment. These advanced communications systems are on the Air Force's unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an overall increase of \$40.1 million for two elements of advanced tactical communications, a total authorization of \$89.8 million.

The first element is theater deployable communications (TDC), a lightweight compact system which consists of a satellite antenna that can access both military and commercial satellites. The committee recommends an increase of \$13.9 million for TDC.

The second element is the global combat support system (GCSS) for the Air Force. This program will support the modernization of aircraft maintenance, supply, finance, personnel, and contracting legacy automated information systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$26.2 million for GCSS.

Aircrew laser eye protection

The budget request included \$3.6 million for personal safety and rescue equipment items less than \$5.0 million, but included no funds for aircrew laser eye protection (ALEP). The use of laser-based systems on the battlefield has increased, raising the risk of permanent vision damage to aircrews from friendly or hostile forces. The Air Force plan is to introduce ALEP in three distinct phases to take advantage of evolving technologies, yet enable the Air Force to begin procurement of operationally suitable devices in fiscal year 2002. The committee believes it is important to get some capability to aircrews as quickly as possible. In order to accelerate the procurement of phase one ALEP devices, which use dielectric stack technology, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.4 million, a total authorization of \$6.0 million.

Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism

The committee recommends that \$39.4 million be transferred from Other Procurement, Air Force to section 310(25), a newly-established central transfer account for funds to combat terrorism.

Defense-Wide Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHIS						
1		309	-	-	-	309
2		88,976	-	-	-	88,976
3		20,530	-	-	-	20,530
4		5,472	-	-	-	5,472
5		1,560	-	-	-	1,560
6		-	-	-	-	-
7		-	-	-	-	-
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
9		11,525	-	-	-	11,525
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
10		25,977	-	-	-	25,977
11		20,889	-	20,000	-	40,889
12		3,557	-	-	-	3,557
13		28,279	-	-	-	28,279
14		4,119	-	-	-	4,119
15		4,755	-	-	-	4,755
16		2,969	-	-	-	2,969
17		-	-	-	-	-
18		13,785	-	-	-	13,785

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
19	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
21	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	-	47,455	-	-	-	47,455
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS						
22	VEHICLES	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
24	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	-	4,734	-	-	-	4,734
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO						
25	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
26	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	-	31,417	-	-	-	31,417
	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION						
27	PATRIOT PAC-3	32	300,898	-	60,000	32	360,898
28	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	C4I	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	NAVY AREA TBDM PROGRAM	7	55,002	-	-	7	55,002
	NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY						
	DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY						
32	EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
33	VEHICLES	-	147	-	-	-	147
34	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	34,286	-	-	-	34,286
	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY						
35	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	419	-	-	-	419
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
36	SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES	-	41,233	-	42,000	-	83,233
37	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS	-	2,107	-	-	-	2,107
38	MC-130H COMBAT TALON II	-	16,895	-	-	-	16,895
39	CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION	-	3,582	-	-	-	3,582
40	OH-6 PROCUREMENT & MODIFICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	-	26,796	-	-	-	26,796
42	C-130 MODIFICATIONS	-	98,893	-	-	-	98,893
43	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	-	1,729	-	-	-	1,729
	SHIPBUILDING						
44	ADV SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM	-	41,532	-	-	-	41,532
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(41,532)	-	-	-	(41,532)
45	PC,CYCLONE CLASS	-	-	-	-	-	-
46	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS	-	21,501	-	-	-	21,501
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(288)	-	-	-	(288)
47	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	17,286	-	-	-	17,286
48	MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEH	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.		FY '00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
49	SUBMARINE CONVERSION	-	3,284	-	-	-	3,284
50	MK V SPECIAL OPERATIONS CRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
51	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	-	37,876	-	6,000	-	43,876
52	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	-	15,992	-	-	-	15,992
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
53	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	-	86,758	-	-	-	86,758
54	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	-	19,154	-	-	-	19,154
55	SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	-	23,355	-	15,750	-	39,105
56	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS	-	2,183	-	-	-	2,183
57	NAVAL SPC WARFARE RIGID INFLATABLE BOAT	-	-	-	-	-	-
58	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	-	18,771	-	-	-	18,771
59	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	29,836	-	-	-	29,836
60	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	-	4,949	-	-	-	4,949
61	DRUG INTERDICTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
62	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	10,073	-	-	-	10,073
63	SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM	-	2,432	-	-	-	2,432
64	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	-	110,147	-	105,000	-	215,147
65	PSYOP EQUIPMENT	-	11,716	-	-	-	11,716
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
	CBDP						
66	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	-	124,612	-	18,900	-	143,512

Title I - Procurement

Ln No.	(Dollars in Thousands)	FY 00 Request		Change		Recommended	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
6	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
1	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	-	-	334,000	334,000	-	334,000
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC						
	PROCUREMENT						
2	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	-	-	241,500	241,500	-	241,500
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M						
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
3	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	-	-	593,500	593,500	-	593,500
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF				1,169,000		1,169,000

Remote activation munition systems

The committee is aware of the shortfall in procurement funds for the remote activation munition system (RAMS). RAMS is a radio frequency controlled remote initiator. It provides the special operations community with the capability to remotely control detonation of demolition charges, or the remote operation of other items of equipment, such as beacons, laser markers, radios and weapons. The committee understands that if an additional \$4.0 million were provided for this system in fiscal year 2000, the Special Operations Command would realize a 10 percent acquisition savings. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in line number 52, Special Operation Forces ordnance acquisition, for the procurement of additional RAMS basic kits and receivers.

Special operations forces rotary wing upgrades

The budget request included \$41.2 million for rotary wing upgrades. The committee understands that the Special Operations Command (SOCOM) lost a MH-47E aircraft in a 1996 accident. As a result, SOCOM is having to compensate for the lost aircraft by accumulating higher flight time on the small fleet of remaining MH-47E aircraft. This places a significant burden on operation and support funding as dynamic components experience higher than planned degradation. The committee recommends an increase of \$42.0 million, a total authorization of \$83.4 million, to replace the lost aircraft and restore the aircraft inventory to the proper level.

Special operations forces small arms and weapons

The budget request included \$23.4 million for special operations forces small arms and weapon requirements.

The committee notes outstanding requirements for additional body armor load carriage systems (BALCS). The committee believes this equipment is vital to protect the special operations forces who respond to the Nation's most challenging missions. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.8 million to procure an additional 3,600 BALCS systems.

The committee also understands that there is an outstanding requirement for integrated night/day fire control observation devices (INOD) necessary to provide optical scopes for special forces medium and heavy sniper rifles. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million to procure an additional 579 INOD systems.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$39.2 million for special operations forces small arms and weapons.

Special operations forces demolition kits

The committee is aware of the shortfall in the inventory objective for demolition kits for war reserve and training to ensure readiness for conflict. The demolition kits, which replace the Army's 1950 generation demo chest, provides the Special Operation Forces operator the capability to tailor the demolition charges to the target providing greater lethality and mission flexibility. The addition of \$2.0 million would allow Special Operation Command to meet its inventory objective of 17 percent unit cost savings. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million.

Chemical and Biological Defense Program

The budget request included \$716.9 million for the Chemical and Biological Defense Program (CBDP), a \$71.5 million increase to the program from fiscal year 1999. The request includes \$377.4 million for procurement and \$339.5 million for research and development. The budget also included \$149.5 million for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) biological warfare defense program (PE 62383E), a \$61.1 million increase to the program from fiscal year 1999.

The acquisition of chemical and biological agents continues to be pursued aggressively by adversaries of the United States and its allies. Military personnel are increasingly at risk of exposure to chemical and biological agents on the battlefield. Accordingly, the committee places a priority on “user friendly” chemical and biological defense equipment that can be used efficiently by military personnel without degrading their readiness in combat.

The committee recommends an increase of \$35.4 million for the following chemical and biological defense program activities: \$15.0 million in the Joint Service Lightweight Integrated Suit Technology program for the procurement of additional protective clothing; \$3.9 million in the M45 General Aviation Mask program to procure additional M45 masks to fill the Army acquisition shortfalls; \$1.5 million in the Modular Decontamination Systems program to procure additional units in support of the Army acquisition objective; \$5.0 million in PE 62384BP for SAFEGUARD; and, \$10.0 million in the M93 FOX NBC Reconnaissance Vehicle program for the procurement of the Block I M93A1 upgrade.

Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism

The committee recommends that \$110.9 million be transferred from Procurement, Defense-wide to section 310(25), a newly established central transfer account for funds to combat terrorism.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Extension of authority to carry out armament retooling and manufacturing support initiative (sec. 141)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority for the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support (ARMS) program through fiscal year 2001.

The committee is aware that although the budget request includes \$4.7 million for the continuation of the ARMS program, this does not satisfy all existing contractual agreements nor fund other proposals that would reduce the operating costs of Army Ammunition plants. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$14.0 million for this program. The committee expects that these funds will be utilized in a manner that will ensure preservation of these facilities, which will likely be used to fulfill the military's need to support the National Military Strategy.

Extension of pilot program on sales of manufactured articles and services of certain army industrial facilities without regard to availability from domestic sources (sec. 142)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend authorization for the pilot program for Army industrial facilities, which allows these facilities to sell to commercial entities articles or services that will ultimately be incorporated into weapon systems procured by the Department of Defense.

The committee is concerned that with the end of the Cold War and the onset of reduced defense budgets, many of our military industrial facilities are operating inefficiently due to a lack of work. The committee understands that there are some cases in which the excess capacity created by the lack of work can be utilized by allowing these facilities to provide commercial entities with articles and services for inclusion in weapon systems that will ultimately be procured by the Department of Defense. Utilizing this excess capacity would serve to create a more efficient facility, provide private industry with quality services, and maintain a critical work force.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Army modernization overview

The committee has reviewed Army modernization plans in an effort to understand the relationship between the current service modernization program and projected land force challenges. These projected challenges have been identified through government assessments, as well as by a variety of subject matter experts, to include the National Defense Panel members who provided thought-provoking testimony before the committee over the last two years. In testimony before the committee earlier this year, witnesses were asked to identify how current plans fit with future defense challenges. In some cases, it is unclear how existing Army plans address critical future land force challenges, especially rapid power projection into regions where staging areas are not available.

The committee believes it is critical that Army modernization efforts, in procurement and research and development, be tied to requirements established by the National Military Strategy to meet the challenges that land forces will face in the 21st Century. The committee also notes that, while it has received some components of the overall Army modernization plan, it has not received an overall plan that provides a comprehensive Army vision. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review existing modernization programs and provide an assessment, not later than February 1, 2000, on how these plans will meet the following future challenges:

- (1) airfield/port denial;
- (2) mine warfare;
- (3) limited strategic lift;
- (4) short reaction/build up time;
- (5) rapidly moving forces/logistics challenges;
- (6) missile threat to forward deployed forces;
- (7) smaller scale contingency operations;
- (8) evolution of precision guided munitions;

- (9) operations in an urban environment;
- (10) joint operations;
- (11) weapons of mass destruction;
- (12) homeland defense; and
- (13) information warfare.

The Secretary's analysis shall include the operational capabilities that are necessary for the Army to prevail against these threats, to include the asymmetrical threats, and the key characteristics and capabilities of the Army systems that will achieve these operational capabilities. This analysis shall also address the research and development funding necessary to achieve required technological breakthroughs, and program, schedule, and funding projections associated with Army modernization program elements that address the land force challenges listed above.

Bore erosion gauges

The committee reviewed the report on the assessment of bore erosion gauges required by the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1999. The Army report notes that extensive testing, service analysis showed that the Gun Barrel Bore Gauge System assessed has "great potential for savings" when used in conjunction with an effective rounds counter device. The committee encourages the Army to consider including funds for procurement of these devices in future budget submissions to achieve the most efficient maintenance and use of Bradley gun systems.

C-130J

The committee understands that the C-130J contractor has presented the Air Force and the Marine Corps with offers for multiyear procurement of C-130Js. The offer to the Air Force includes discounts on acquisition prices and on an initial support and training program. The offer to the Marine Corps encompasses a discount on acquisition prices alone. The contractor proposal links the procurement by the two services.

Such a proposal is worth evaluating, but there are several factors that must be considered before entering into such a multiyear contract. The criteria for approving a multiyear contract are established in section 2306b of title 10, United States Code. These criteria include: (1) a substantial savings; (2) an unchanging minimum need for the total quantity of items contemplated in the multiyear program; (3) a stable design; and (4) assurance that the head of the agency will request funding for the contract throughout the contemplated contract period at a level sufficient to avoid contract cancellation.

The potential for changing need must be addressed. The committee has been made aware of a recent study on tactical airlift modernization alternatives. That study concludes that remanufacturing existing C-130E and C-130H aircraft may be more cost effective than buying new C-130Js in some cases. The committee believes that these conclusions merit a more thorough evaluation by the Air Force.

Although there has been progress in testing in the past year, the question of having a stable design configuration must be addressed.

The committee is well aware of the delays in achieving certification with the Federal Aviation Administration. The C-130J program has also had problems in the area of performance, logistics, and test and evaluation, as reported in recent internal Defense acquisition reports.

The committee also notes that the Air Force budget request over the past several years for C-130Js has been anything but stable. The Air Force and Marine Corps could decide, through negotiations surrounding the contractor's proposal, that the offer is attractive.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the C-130 modernization plan by March 1, 2000. This report should include cost, schedule, and performance status of the C-130J program, and the range of alternative acquisition strategies the Department deems viable.

The committee supports the pursuit of the most cost effective approach in acquiring the equipment needed for our armed forces, once established performance requirements are met. However, as a prerequisite for approving multiyear procurement authority, the committee would expect that the military services would: (1) request such authority; (2) demonstrate substantial savings; (3) demonstrate sufficient testing maturity to ensure a stable design; (4) show why the alternative of remanufacturing existing C-130s is less attractive; and (5) ask for funds in the budget request and in the Future Years Defense Program sufficient to support such a request.

C-130J deployment plan

The committee understands that, within the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve, there has been a relatively stable long-term plan to modernize the existing tactical airlift force structure. In recent years within the Air National Guard, the first priority for receiving new aircraft has been afforded to units operating older C-130E aircraft that were formerly held by active units in the Pacific Air Forces. The reason for having established this priority is that these aircraft are in much poorer material condition than other C-130E aircraft of similar age because of corrosion problems.

This year, the Air Force has provided the committee with a C-130J deployment plan which represents overall priorities of the total Air Force for deploying a notional force of 168 C-130J aircraft. Within that force, a total of nine aircraft are programmed for the training mission in one Air Force Reserve training squadron. This Air Force deployment plan has changed the order of replacement represented by previous Reserve component plans. Older plans called for outfitting an Air Force Reserve training squadron with only four aircraft, and waiting until more aircraft had been fielded in operating units before increasing the size of the training squadron. The new Air Force plan would delay replacing some of these older C-130E aircraft. In the meantime, the plan would outfit the training squadron with eight aircraft to support a total 24 C-130Js deployed in operating squadrons.

The committee is not interested in legislating the priority of replacement of the tactical airlift fleet. Doing this would set a dan-

gerous precedent, but the committee is interested in how the Air Force established its priorities.

The committee directs the Secretary of Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the C-130 deployment plan by March 1, 2000. This report should include: (1) the rationale for establishing the priorities in current deployment plan; (2) the workload for qualifying new or transitioning pilots in the C-130J aircraft that necessitates accelerating expansion of the C-130J training squadron; and (3) the reasons for delaying replacement of aircraft with particular corrosion problems. The report should also identify any additional actions that will be necessary to ensure that former Pacific Air Force C-130E aircraft remain in safe operating condition.

C-20

The committee understands that the Marine Corps' only C-20G was extensively damaged during a storm in early February 1998, while parked at an airfield. Congress appropriated \$11.0 million in fiscal year 1999 to repair the aircraft. The aircraft has been disassembled and moved to a repair facility, but no repair contract has been awarded or negotiated. Approximately \$10.5 million of appropriated funds remain unexpended. The committee is concerned that there appears to be no executable plan to return this aircraft to service or replace it with another aircraft. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a letter to the congressional defense committees by January 1, 2000, that outlines the plan to restore this aircraft requirement through repair or replacement.

Combat survivor evader locator radio

The budget request included \$800,000 for the verification of preproduction performance of combat survivor evader locator (CSEL) radios. This program will lead to the eventual purchase of over 50,000 radios by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and is of direct and vital importance to military aircrews. The committee understands this program will address long-standing deficiencies in the existing survival radio, the PRC-90. An attempt was made to accelerate this effort after a pilot was shot down in June 1995. The first lot of low-rate initial production radios has not yet been delivered, and the second lot is not expected to be ordered until fiscal year 2001. Although the interim radio, the PRC-112, is no longer subject to procurement, purchase of the CSEL appears to be years away.

The committee is concerned about the status of this program, which should greatly increase the probability of survival and rescue of military members in peace and war. The production budget for fiscal year 2000 is a small fraction of the budget in fiscal years 1998 and 1999. The committee notes that some combat aircrews have actually purchased their own global positioning systems to enhance survivability. The committee is concerned about the lack of support for this program.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report by March 1, 2000, on whether the requirements for this program are still valid, and whether the acquisition strategy is op-

timized to field this survival radio with aircrews in the most expeditious manner.

Digital facsimile machine

The budget request included no funds for digital facsimile machines for the Army. The committee continues to be concerned about the viability of tactical facsimile machines and the ability of existing equipment to transmit high-resolution target quality imagery. Many machines found throughout the military services today utilize 1960's technology and are not capable of meeting the critical requirements associated with existing imagery systems. The committee notes current facsimile machine acquisitions are decentralized and there is no overall consolidated program to address obsolescence issues. The committee encourages the Army to review this policy and determine whether a consolidated procurement of these devices might provide an opportunity to reduce costs and addressing obsolescence issues. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to report on these opportunities to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1, 2000.

Maintaining a strong navy

The committee has been concerned for some time that the Department of Defense's shipbuilding program is creating a ship procurement problem that could manifest itself in significant Navy ship force structure problems in the second decade of the 21st Century. The Congressional Research Service (CRS) reports that years of relatively low ship procurement rates will result in a large ship procurement "bow wave" within the same time frame that many ships currently in service are projected to reach the end of their service lives. CRS projects the fleet will shrink to substantially less than 300 ships—the Navy's stated planning goal—in the 2020s, if procurement rates of eight to ten ships are not sustained by the Department of Defense (DOD).

DOD witnesses testified that maintaining a 300-ship Navy over time requires a steady state build rate of eight to ten ships per year. In addition, and of greater concern to the committee, Navy witnesses testified that even with the current 324 ships, the Navy and Marine Corps are being strained to keep up with regional commander in chief (CINC) requests for naval presence and National Command Authority direction to respond to contingency operations.

As a result of low procurement rates in previous years, it is projected that the Navy will have a 28-ship deficit that will grow to a 53-ship deficit in 20 years if the build rate is not maintained at eight to ten ships per year. Unfortunately, DOD has provided few specifics on the planned size of Navy force structure beyond calendar 2015 and how it intends to address the impending ship shortfall problem beyond "new ways of doing business," such as lowering acquisition costs or reducing the size of ships' crews.

The administration has acknowledged the shipbuilding shortfall by recommending to Congress an increase of \$6.1 billion for eight new construction ships over the previously planned fiscal year 2000 budget submission. Nevertheless, the Navy has testified that this is only a step in the right direction. The committee is particularly concerned that the budget increases required to buy-down the bow

wave may make it difficult, if not impossible, to maintain a 300-ship fleet. In short, the DOD plan to maintain a 300-ship Navy is becoming a visible symbol of the procurement shortfall that exists across all the services. At a time when naval forces are being called upon with increasing frequency, when we are confronted with ever-changing and challenging capabilities of potential adversaries, and when critical ocean areas are without CINC-requested aircraft carrier battle groups, the risk of deferring a commitment to a sustained shipbuilding rate needed to recapitalize the U.S. Navy of the next century must be clearly understood.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the defense committees, along with the submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2001 a report which:

- (1) details the Department's long-range shipbuilding plan through fiscal year 2030;
- (2) describes the annual funding required to procure eight to ten ships per year in the correct mix, beginning in fiscal year 2001 and extending until fiscal year 2020, to maintain the force structure verified in the Quadrennial Defense Review; and
- (3) addresses the implications and risks of not adhering to such a long-range plan for shipbuilding.

National guard and reserve modernization

The budget request included a \$350.0 million increase in National Guard and Reserve funding, a total of \$1.69 billion. The committee is pleased to note that the level of funding identified in service budget requests for Guard and Reserve modernization has continued to rise above the levels achieved in previous budget requests. The committee notes with great interest the testimony of Guard and Reserve leaders earlier this year that acknowledged this support for reserve component modernization requirements. The committee suggests a new level of cooperation and effort to achieve collective modernization objectives. It is understood that the budget request did not meet the range of requirements necessary to effectively modernize the total force, and that shortages still exist across all components. The committee, however is pleased to note the numerous priority modernization funding requirements contained on service unfunded requirement lists for the reserve components. The committee supports service efforts to identify unfunded requirements. The recommended program increases that will benefit reserve component modernization deficiencies include the following:

- (1) an increase of \$90.0 million to procure an additional 9 UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters;
- (2) an increase of \$40.0 million to procure additional Paladin artillery systems;
- (3) an increase of \$70.0 million to procure additional SINCGARS radio equipment;
- (4) an increase of \$25.9 million to procure additional EPLRS equipment;
- (5) an increase of \$80.0 million for Litening II pods for F-16 aircraft;

- (6) an increase of \$12.0 million for digital terrain systems for F-16 aircraft;
- (7) an increase of \$13.5 million for tactical air reconnaissance systems for F-16 aircraft;
- (8) an increase of \$20.0 million for F-18 avionics upgrades;
- (9) an increase of \$8.0 million for tactical radio acquisition and countermeasures subsystem for the EC-130H aircraft; and
- (10) an increase of \$30.0 million for Commando Solo upgrades.

These recommended increases of nearly \$400.0 million are only part of the modernization support provided for reserve component shortfalls in fiscal year 2000. The committee expects the services to continue to identify the range of requirements across all components.

Report on chartering special craft and tug services

The Navy, through the Military Sealift Command, has competed contracts for leasing special craft and tug services for ports in the United States and overseas. The Navy is directed to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than May 1, 2000, on the Navy's experience with leasing special craft and tugs and the potential for expanded use of such leases. The report will include a ten year projection of non-combatant ship, special craft, and tug requirements that could be economically accommodated through operating leases as described in section 2401 of title 10.

Unmanned aerial vehicle system

The budget request included:

- (1) \$3.9 million in PE 305204A for research and development and \$45.9 million in Other Procurement, Army, to procure a tactical unmanned aerial vehicle (TUAV) system;
- (2) \$38.5 million in PE 304204N for development of a vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) UAV (VTUAV) for the Navy;
- (3) \$24.5 million in PE 304204N for development of the tactical control system (TCS), a common ground control, and information distribution system for UAVs;
- (4) \$4.0 million in PE 305205F for research and development and \$38.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, to procure the Predator medium altitude endurance UAV;
- (5) \$66.8 million in PE 305205F for research and development for high altitude endurance UAVs.

Given the fact that UAV programs were devolved to the military services, there is the possibility that service-unique or mission specific aspects could creep into these programs. In disestablishing the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office (DARO), Congress was seeking a better way of managing reconnaissance development and acquisition programs. The committee does not believe that "better" means a departure from the common control systems and interfaces that should be available under the TCS program. The Navy will use TCS as the control system for VTUAV. The Army TUAV program has established a threshold requirement that TCS be "interoperable" with the TUAV, which could result in overlapping costs associated with developing another ground control system and making it interoperable with TCS. The committee continues to sup-

port Army efforts to improve its ability to survey the battlefield. However, the Army should understand that the committee will not support a TUAV system that includes unnecessary duplication of effort by developing and procuring a different ground control system.

The Air Force HAE and MAE programs remain unclear. Before the TCS program began, the Navy had developed a ground control system for the Predator, and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency was developing a common ground segment for the HAE programs. Nevertheless, to take full advantage of future payloads and to support deployed forces, Predator must be able to achieve a significant level of interoperability with TCS. Transition to TCS save life cycle costs.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to investigate the costs and benefits of transitioning to TCS to support the Predator UAV, and the extent to which TCS could be used to support HAE operations. The committee directs the Secretary to report the results of the review to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2000.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

The budget request included \$34.4 billion for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E), a decrease of \$3.1 billion from the amount provided for last's years program. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 billion, for a total authorization of \$35.8 billion for RDT&E.

The committee remains concerned about the declining resources provided by the Department of Defense for RDT&E. RDT&E provides the foundation for future modernization. In an effort to balance the competing demands of personnel, near-term readiness and modernization, the Department cannot afford to neglect the need for sustained investment in technology development.

The committee supports the concepts of transformation and revolution espoused by the Department, but remains disappointed that this strategy has not been translated into RDT&E programs. Further, the committee has repeatedly expressed concern regarding the balancing of relative near-term returns to the warfighter and ensuring technological leadership through investment in long-term, high-risk research. The committee notes that over 33 percent of the total RDT&E request is for modifications to fielded systems, while accounts that lead to the development of new capabilities were decreased by almost 25 percent.

In addition to increasing the budget request for RDT&E, the committee recommends legislation to address critical issues within the Department of Defense RDT&E system. The legislation is intended to strengthen the RDT&E program, provide incentives—and remove disincentives—for innovation, and improve the efficiency of RDT&E operations.

Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 2000 for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted explicitly in the report, all changes are made without prejudice.

SUBTITLE A - AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2000

(In Thousands of \$'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Recommended
TITLE II			
<u>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION</u>			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	4,426,194	245,000	4,671,194
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	7,984,016	217,100	8,201,116
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	13,077,829	489,479	13,567,308
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	8,609,289	512,901	9,122,190
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	24,434		24,434
Developmental Test & Evaluation, Defense	253,457		253,457
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	34,375,219	1,464,480	35,839,699

Amount for basic and applied research (sec. 202)

The budget request included \$4.1 billion for basic and applied research, commonly known as the defense technology base. The committee recommends authorization of \$4.2 billion for the technology base for fiscal year 2000, an increase of approximately \$155.4 million.

The fiscal year 2000 budget request for the Department of Defense science and technology program is cause for a number of concerns. Overall, the defense science and technology is at its lowest funding level since fiscal year 1986. The Services' request for funding of the technology base (basic and applied research) is at a 25 year low. Not surprisingly, industry research and development is also down by 50 percent. These trends raise serious questions about the Department's long-term ability to develop and field technologies to achieve the revolutionary capabilities our military will seek over the next 15 to 20 years. It is a priority of this committee to maintain a strong, stable investment in science and technology in order to develop superior technology that permits the United States to gain military advantage today, provides flexible options to future warfighters, and hedges against technological surprise. The Joint Vision 2010, the Pentagon's vision for force dominance, depends on a smaller force that achieves a swift, decisive victory with minimal casualties. This will require more technological advantage—not less—and a strong commitment and investment in the defense science and technology program.

Section 214 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 recognized the fundamental importance of the Department's science and technology program in developing the technologies that will be needed to meet future threats to national security. As a result, section 214 expressed the sense of Congress that science and technology programs should receive the same level of priority and leadership in each military service as acquisition programs. As a yardstick for measuring the Department's commitment to this objective, section 214 established a goal of increasing the Department's science and technology budget at a rate two percent above the rate of inflation for fiscal year 2000 through 2008.

The committee is disappointed by the Department's failure to live up to the goals expressed in section 214. Despite substantial overall increases in the defense budget in the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP), the Department has proposed no increase to the science and technology budget. As a result, the Department's proposed science and technology budget is almost \$100.0 million below the section 214 benchmark for fiscal year 2000 and more than a billion dollars below the section 214 benchmark for fiscal year 2005. Over the course of the FYDP, the administration budget falls short of the section 214 benchmarks for science and technology funding by more than \$4.0 billion.

The failure to provide adequate funding for science and technology programs is particularly acute in the Air Force. Section 214 placed special emphasis on the importance of science and technology funding in the Air Force, requiring the Secretary to ". . . take appropriate measures to ensure that sufficient numbers of scientists and engineers are maintained to address the techno-

logical challenges faced in the areas of air, space, and information technology." Yet, the Air Force budget shows a \$70.0 million reduction in the technology base for fiscal year 2000, and a change in the accounting for certain programs masks an even larger cut in the science and technology program. In the words of the Secretary of Defense: "We cannot afford to mortgage our future by making science and technology the billpayer for near term requirements. Technological superiority has been and continues to be one of the foundations of our national military strategy." The Air Force budget request approved by the Department of Defense directly contradicts these statements. The committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force to take measures to ensure adequate funding for the Air Force science and technology program in the future. The committee recommends an increase of \$70.4 million to the Air Force Applied Research accounts, as described elsewhere in this report.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to reexamine the Department's commitment to the science and technology funding for future years and take appropriate steps to ensure that such funding is adequate to meet the national security needs of the next century.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Micro-satellite technology development program (sec. 212)

The committee continues to support the Micro-satellite Technology Program, which has produced an important partnership between the Air Force Research Laboratory, the Naval Research Laboratory, the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The committee understands that the Air Force and its partners are evaluating a deep space experiment to demonstrate advanced micro-satellite technologies in geo-synchronous orbit. The committee supports such a demonstration as well as the ongoing XSS series of flight experiments. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would increase funding for the Micro-satellite Technology Program by \$25.0 million to be executed by the Space Test Program (PE 65864F), which is already extensively involved in ongoing micro-satellite activity. The provision also requires the Secretary of Defense to develop a micro-satellite technology development plan to guide technology investment decisions and prioritize technology demonstration activities, which shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by April 15, 2000.

Space control technology (sec. 213)

The committee has reviewed the Department of Defense Space Control Technology Program presented at a hearing of the Strategic Subcommittee on March 22, 1999. The committee believes that the Department has taken an important step in developing a credible space control policy and architecture. In particular, the committee commends the Deputy Secretary of Defense for his attention to this important matter, and the Air Force for establishing a dedicated program element to sustain the space control technology effort started by Congress in fiscal year 1999.

In order to promote a more integrated approach to this program, the committee recommends a provision that would increase funding in PE 63438F by \$10.0 million for the Air Force executed space control technology activity, and would establish a companion Army line item. The committee recommends an increase of \$41.0 million for the Army for space control technology development. The commanding general of the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command may utilize such funds as necessary for any or all of the following activities:

- (1) continued development of the Kinetic Energy Anti-satellite technology (KE-ASAT) program necessary to retain an option of conducting a flight test within two years of any decision to do so;
- (2) technology development associated with the KE-ASAT kill vehicle to temporarily disrupt threatening satellite functions; and,
- (3) cooperative technology development with the Air Force, pursuant to the Department of Defense Space Control Technology Plan.

The committee believes that the first priority for the Army should be to sustain the KE-ASAT on a path that would support a flight test within two years of any decision to do so. If additional funds are available after satisfying this requirement, the committee also strongly supports the other two activities specified above. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to establish a space control program element in the fiscal year 2001 budget and to sustain funding in the outyears for any efforts funded under this section.

Space Maneuver Vehicle (sec. 214)

The committee supports the Air Force and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) partnership to develop and test a reusable upper stage vehicle (NASA's X-37 program). The committee believes that in order for NASA and the Air Force to accomplish the objectives of both organizations and address the unique requirements of each, the Air Force will be required to acquire a second "tail number" to support the Space Maneuver Vehicle (SMV) effort. The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the purchase of this second flight test article and increase funding for this purpose by \$35.0 million in PE 63401F.

Manufacturing technology program (sec. 215)

The committee recommends a provision that would strike the mandatory cost share requirements in the Manufacturing Technology (MANTECH) program and emphasize the program's focus on high risk, defense essential requirements as well as repair and re-manufacturing solutions in support of depots, air logistics centers and shipyards. The committee remains supportive of cost sharing, where appropriate, and expects that it will be a factor in the selection of future MANTECH projects.

SUBTITLE C—BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Theater missile defense upper tier acquisition strategy (sec. 221)

The committee does not support the Defense Department's proposed change to the acquisition strategy for upper tier theater missile defense (TMD) programs—the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system, and the Navy Theater Wide (Navy Upper Tier) system. Under the proposed strategy, a decision would be made by December, 2000, to select a lead upper tier system so that funding for the two programs could be concentrated on a lead system. The funding would be consolidated in a single program element in fiscal year 2002. This approach contradicts congressional guidance from previous years and puts the two upper tier systems into an unnecessary competition for the same resources. The committee notes that the statement of managers to the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (H. Rept. 105–736) clearly stated that “the THAAD missile and the Navy Upper Tier missile should not be viewed as competing systems.” Though overlapping to a degree, the two upper tier systems serve fundamentally different sets of equally valid requirements and do so with fundamentally different technological approaches. The committee continues to believe that the United States has valid requirements for both systems, and that both systems should be deployed as soon as practicable.

For these and other reasons, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an acquisition strategy for the Navy Theater Wide system and the Theater High Altitude Area Defense system that:

- (1) retains funding for both upper tier systems in separate, independently managed program elements throughout the Future Years Defense Program;
- (2) bases funding decisions and program schedules for each upper tier system on the performance of those systems independent of one another; and
- (3) seeks to accelerate the deployment of both upper tier systems to the maximum extent practicable.

Repeal of requirement to implement technical and price competition for Theater High Altitude Area Defense system (sec. 222)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal subsection (a) of section 236 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 relating to technical and price competition for the Theater High Altitude Area Defense system.

Space-based laser program (sec. 223)

The committee has closely monitored the development of the Space Based Laser (SBL) Integrated Flight Experiment (IFX) acquisition strategy and is concerned by delays in getting a contracting team in place and moving forward on an established baseline. The committee is also troubled by an apparent desire on the part of the Air Force and the Office of the Secretary of Defense to

use the IFX as the dominant, if not the exclusive, tool for retiring technical risk and defining an operational design for an objective SBL system. This approach has caused the Department of Defense to significantly delay the launch date for the IFX, which was originally conceived as a near-term proof of principle demonstration. The IFX, as now planned, is neither a near-term demonstration nor a prototype of an operational system and, as such, may have become more a source of delay than of sound program management.

Notwithstanding these concerns, the committee is pleased that the Air Force and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization have, for the first time, fully funded a program plan that includes acquisition milestones leading to an operational capability. The committee notes that an independent review team recently reviewed and endorsed the Air Force's revised SBL program. The committee does not question the Department's desire to have an element of the SBL program oriented toward the ultimate solution. The committee, however, does not believe that it is necessary or appropriate to use the IFX as the vehicle for demonstrating extremely advanced and risky technology in hopes of thereby defining a system that cannot yet be clearly envisioned. The committee believes that a better approach is to partially separate the IFX activity from those activities that are focused on the most advanced technologies, which are also most subject to change. The IFX should be used as a proof of principle vehicle that can be operated in parallel with advanced technology and architecture efforts. Such an approach would save money and produce extremely important operational data in a more timely manner, hence enhancing our ability to define the true needs of an operational system. An IFX, thus configured, running in parallel with advanced technology efforts, would then be able to support a better informed, lower risk, and earlier SBL prototype development effort leading into a deployment capability.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to structure the SBL program to include a near-term integrated flight experiment, and an ongoing activity to develop an objective system design, including the development, testing and operation of a prototype system.

The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to structure the IFX to include the following:

- (1) An objective of an early demonstration of the fundamental end-to-end capability to detect, track, and destroy a boosting ballistic missile with a lethal laser from space.
- (2) Utilization, to the maximum extent possible, of technology that has been demonstrated in principle or can be developed in the near-term with a low degree of risk.
- (3) A goal of launching the experiment by 2006.

In order to develop an objective system design suited to the operational and technological environment that will exist at the time when such a system can be deployed, the provision requires the Secretary of Defense to structure the SBL program schedule to include:

- (1) Robust research and development on advanced technologies in parallel with the development of the IFX.
- (2) Architecture studies to assess alternative space based laser constellation and system performance characteristics.

(3) Planning for the development of a SBL prototype that utilizes the lessons learned from the IFX, is supported by the ongoing architecture and advanced technology research and development efforts, and is scheduled to be launched approximately two years before the date on which the objective SBL system design is to be completed.

The committee believes that the SBL program structure required by this section is consistent with the joint venture contracting approach and overall objective that the Department of Defense has established for the SBL program.

Finally, the provision also recommends an increase of \$25.0 million for the SBL program in PE 63876F.

The committee commends the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) and the Air Force for increasing funding in the fiscal year 2000 budget request for the SBL program, but notes that the additional funds are required to begin design of an integrated test facility and to implement the changes required by this section. The committee concurs with the SBL Independent Review Team (IRT) recommendation that "an end-to-end integrated ground test is essential to the integration and check-out efforts." Since the IRT found the existing facilities to be inadequate for the integrated ground test of the IFX, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force in coordination with the director of BMDO to begin design of the SBL test facility and recommends the use of funds from the SBL budget as may be necessary for this purpose.

The committee notes that the Air Force has expressed strong support for the development of deployable optics for the SBL system, but has also indicated that such a development may require significant risk reduction activities. The committee notes that additional investment may be required in the near-term to retire risk associated with such optics development. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force and the director of BMDO to carefully assess this matter and revise accordingly the investments needed during fiscal year 2000.

Airborne Laser Program (sec. 224)

The committee commends the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Airborne Laser Independent Assessment Team (ABL-IAT) for their thorough and timely reviews of the Airborne Laser (ABL) program. The February 1, 1999, report of the ABL-IAT, and the Secretary of Defense's March 9, 1999, report to Congress, identified the key technical and operational issues facing the ABL program. These reports also identified corrective actions that, once implemented, will place the ABL program on a much sounder footing overall and allow the Department of Defense and Congress to ensure that the program demonstrates necessary technical performance before advancing through successive acquisition milestones.

The committee also commends the Air Force for restructuring the ABL program and beginning to implement several of the key recommendations of the ABL-IAT. Nevertheless, many critical technical and operational challenges remain ahead for the ABL program, and the Air Force will need to proceed deliberately to retire program risk at each stage of the development program. Although the committee does not support unnecessary delay in advancing the

ABL program through its acquisition schedule, neither does the committee support an ABL schedule that includes milestone decisions or authority-to-proceed decisions ahead of clear demonstration of technical performance. The committee recognizes the dilemma the Air Force faces in carefully managing risk and program concurrency. If the Air Force and the DOD delay key decisions or actions needed to advance the program (such as ordering aircraft or modifying such aircraft once ordered) the program may not be in a position to exploit successful performance. If, on the other hand, such key decisions or actions are initiated prior to successful performance, the Air Force runs the risk of wasting large sums of money and damaging the credibility of the program.

The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense must develop an acquisition strategy for the ABL program that strikes an appropriate balance in managing risk and concurrency. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that addresses risk and concurrency management leading up to three critical decision points: (1) the decision to begin modification of the Program Definition and Risk Reduction (PDRR) aircraft (the first aircraft); (2) the decision to grant Authority-to-Proceed-2 (ATP-2), which, among other things, would allow the Air Force to order the Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD) aircraft (the second aircraft); and (3) the Milestone II decision governing entry into EMD. In developing this approach, the committee has drawn heavily on the findings and recommendations of the ABL-IAT and the Department's March 1999 report to Congress.

The provision directs the Secretary of the Air Force not to commence modification of the PDRR aircraft until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that test and analysis results based on the following activities justify commencement of the aircraft modification:

- (1) The North Oscura Peak dynamic test program;
- (2) scintillometry data collection and analysis;
- (3) the lethality/vulnerability program;
- (4) the countermeasures test and analysis effort; and
- (5) reduction and analysis of other existing data.

The provision also requires the Secretary of Defense to ensure that, prior to approval of ATP-2, the Secretary of the Air Force has developed, and the Secretary of Defense has approved, an appropriate plan for resolving the technical challenges identified in the Secretary of Defense's March 1999 report to Congress. The committee notes that the General Accounting Office, in its March 1999 report entitled *DOD Efforts to Develop Laser Weapons for Theater Defense* (GAO/NSIAD-99-50) recommended that the Air Force reconsider its plan to order the second ABL aircraft "before flight testing of the ABL system developed during the PDRR phase has demonstrated that the ABL concept is an achievable, effective combat system." The committee agrees with the intention behind this recommendation, but believes that the same result can be achieved if the Air Force does not commence modification of the EMD aircraft until flight testing demonstrates that it is appropriate to do so.

The provision also requires the Secretary of Defense to restructure the Milestone II exit criteria to ensure that prior to a decision

approving entry into EMD: (1) modification of the EMD aircraft does not commence; (2) the PDRR aircraft is utilized in a robust series of flight tests that validates the technical maturity of the ABL program and provides sufficient information regarding the performance of the system across the full range of its validated operational requirements; and (3) sufficient technical information is available to determine whether adequate progress is being made in the ongoing effort to address the operational issues identified in the Secretary's March 9, 1999, report to Congress. The committee notes that the Secretary's March 1999 report to Congress states that, once ordered, the "green" EMD aircraft "could be sold before [the nominal modification date] if the PDRR program failed to justify entry into EMD." Therefore, as long as DOD conducts a robust review of the PDRR program, including the results from an expanded flight test program, prior to its Milestone II decision, the committee will not insist on delaying ATP-2 until after the Milestone II decision.

SUBTITLE D—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR LONG-TERM MILITARY CAPABILITIES

Research and development for long-term military capabilities (secs. 231–239)

The committee strongly supports the defense science and technology program. The committee recognizes the importance of this in meeting the needs of near-, mid- and long-term needs of the warfighter. In 1995, the committee established the requirement for the Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan (JWSTP). The committee commends the Department's dedication to this effort and recognizes the great strides that have been made to identify key technologies for joint warfighting and to set a strategic plan to meet the goals of *Joint Vision 2010*. The committee is dedicated to maintaining a strong tie between the defense science and technology program and the warfighter. To address this concern and to further strengthen the JWSTP process, the committee recommends a provision, section 231, that would extend for an additional two years the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual report on emerging operational concepts, organizational concepts, and acquisition strategies to address emerging technologies, emerging capabilities, and changes in the international order. This provision would require the Secretary to address the research and development challenges that must be met, and the technological breakthroughs that must be made, to ensure that we are prepared to meet future military threats. The committee anticipates that the research and development objectives identified by the Secretary will serve as a benchmark for future science and technology investments, as provided in the JWSTP.

A key part of the JWSTP process is the technical area review and assessment (TARA). These reviews are conducted by TARA teams. At least two-thirds of the TARA team are from outside the Department of Defense. Most TARA team members are recognized experts from the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, the Institute of Medicine, the Defense Science Board, and the scientific advisory boards of the military, industry,

and academia. TARA teams conduct reviews of the defense technology area plans and provide feedback to the Department. Section 232 would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a summary of each TARA review in conjunction with the JWSTP submission.

In June 1998, a Defense Science Board task force on the Defense Science and Technology Base for the 21st Century reported that there is general satisfaction with the quality of program execution in both the universities and in industry. The task force, however, echoed previous studies in expressing significant concern about the quality of execution in many of the service laboratories. The task force also expressed concern that an insufficient share of the Department's science and technology program elements are devoted to revolutionary technology initiatives. The committee recommends a series of provisions to address the problems identified by the task force.

Section 233 would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology to report to the congressional defense committees on actions that the Department will take to ensure appropriate emphasis on revolutionary technology initiatives, sustain a high-quality national research base, ensure the coordinated development of joint technologies, identify and incorporate commercial technologies, effectively and efficiently manage the transition of new technologies into production, and provide appropriate education and training in technology issues to the Department's military leadership.

In an effort to provide incentives for defense laboratories to pursue high risk-high, high-payoff technologies, the committee recommended the following provisions:

Section 234 would require the Department to revise its contractor profit guidelines to provide new incentives for the private sector to participate in the development of revolutionary new defense technologies.

Section 235 would authorize the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to award competitive prizes for the development of advanced technologies for military applications. This program is expected to open the field of participation to a wider range of research and industrial activity in a field.

To address the committee's continued concern with the efficiency and effectiveness of the defense laboratories and test centers, the committee recommends the following provisions:

Section 236 would authorize a new pilot program to ensure that the defense laboratories can attract a balanced workforce of permanent and temporary personnel with an appropriate level of skills and experience, and can effectively compete in hiring processes to obtain the finest scientific talent.

Section 237 would exempt the defense laboratories from arbitrary supervisory ratios and employee ceilings that have limited their ability to attract and retain scientific talent. It would also provide the laboratories with the direct hiring authority necessary for them to compete with universities and the private sector for the most talented young scientists.

Section 238 would require the use of working capital funds for financing in research, development, test and evaluation, to ensure

that the Department's science and technology program is carried out in a cost-effective manner. The committee expects the Department to continue the use of the cost-based management tool (CBMT) required in the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999. The CBMT provides system for identifying and comparing costs among the military services' labs and test centers.

Section 239 would require the Department to carry out an independent, cross-service analysis of the resources and capabilities of the defense laboratories, to identify opportunities to consolidate responsibilities by area or function, or by designating lead agencies or executive agents. This section would also require the Department to develop a single performance review process, applicable to all of the military services, for rating the quality and relevance of the work performed by the defense laboratories.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS OF INTEREST

Army

Title II-RDT

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln No.		Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
		RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	14,193	-	14,193
0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	125,613	-	125,613
0601104A	3	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	47,066	-	62,066
		Basic Research in Counter-Terrorism		15,000	
0602104A	4	TRACTOR ROSE	6,766	-	6,766
0602105A	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	13,849	-	16,349
		AAN Materials		2,500	
0602120A	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	22,978	-	22,978
0602122A	7	TRACTOR HIP	9,298	-	9,298
0602211A	8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	30,165	-	30,165
0602270A	9	EW TECHNOLOGY	17,487	-	17,487
0602303A	10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	32,892	-	34,892
		Scramjet Technologies		2,000	
0602308A	11	MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	24,955	-	24,955
0602601A	12	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	39,749	-	46,249
		Smart Truck		6,500	
0602618A	13	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	36,287	-	36,287
0602622A	14	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,996	-	3,996
0602623A	15	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,187	-	5,187
0602624A	16	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	34,687	-	34,687
0602705A	17	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	25,796	-	25,796

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
0602709A	18	20,111	-	20,111
0602712A	19	10,321	-	12,121
			1,800	
0602716A	20	16,392	-	18,192
0602720A	21	12,758	-	20,758
			8,000	
0602782A	22	19,613	-	19,613
0602783A	23	5,210	-	5,210
0602784A	24	41,085	-	41,085
0602785A	25	12,071	-	12,071
0602786A	26	23,971	-	23,971
0602787A	27	70,136	-	70,136
0602789A	28	1,276	-	1,276
0602805A	29	18,222	-	18,222
0603001A	30	31,287	-	31,287
0603002A	31	10,539	-	15,539
			5,000	
0603003A	32	34,167	-	34,167
0603004A	33	39,893	-	39,893
0603005A	34	90,941	-	100,941
			10,000	

Title II-RDT

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0603006A	35	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,883	-	20,883
0603007A	36	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,030	-	3,030
0603009A	37	TRACTOR HIKE	12,553	-	12,553
0603013A	38	TRACTOR DIRT	-	-	-
0603017A	39	TRACTOR RED	4,582	-	4,582
0603020A	40	TRACTOR ROSE	11,151	-	11,151
0603105A	41	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	5,976	-	5,976
0603122A	42	TRACTOR HIP	2,432	-	2,432
0603238A	43	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECH DEM	24,618	-	24,618
0603270A	44	EW TECHNOLOGY	16,169	-	16,169
0603313A	45	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	43,639	-	43,639
0603322A	46	TRACTOR CAGE	2,665	-	2,665
0603606A	47	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	47,456	-	47,456
0603607A	48	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	4,869	-	4,869
0603654A	49	LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	41,619	-	41,619
0603710A	50	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	36,628	-	36,628
0603728A	51	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,337	-	1,337
0603734A	52	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	15,881	-	15,881
0603772A	53	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECH Digital Situation Mapboard	22,610	-	24,610
0604280A	54	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	-	2,000	-
0603308A	55	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	12,353	-	30,353

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
			10,000	
			4,000	
			4,000	
		4,099	-	4,099
		36,937	-	36,937
		-	-	-
		-	-	-
		1,937	-	1,937
		10	-	10
		12,804	-	12,804
		-	-	-
		3,188	-	3,188
		1,872	-	1,872
		5,746	-	5,746
		1,751	-	16,551
			14,800	
		6,514	-	6,514
		11,062	-	11,062
		12,723	-	12,723
		1,087	-	1,087
		282,937	-	282,937
		10,703	-	10,703

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0604201A	74	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	6,372	-	6,372
0604223A	75	COMANCHE	427,069	-	483,069
		Acceleration on 2nd Prototype Flight Testing/MEP		56,000	
0604270A	76	EW DEVELOPMENT	78,603	-	78,603
0604280A	77	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	36,797	-	36,797
0604321A	78	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	49,684	-	49,684
0604325A	79	FOLLOW-ON TO TOW	-	-	-
0604328A	80	TRACTOR CAGE	2,848	-	2,848
0604601A	81	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	-	-	-
0604604A	82	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,973	-	1,973
0604609A	83	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ENG DEV	918	-	918
0604611A	84	JAVELIN	493	-	493
0604619A	85	LANDMINE WARFARE	13,318	-	13,318
0604622A	86	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	-	-
0604633A	87	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	1,981	-	1,981
0604640A	88	ADVANCED COMMAND AND CONTROL VEHICLE (AC2V)	-	-	-
0604641A	89	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	-	-	-
0604642A	90	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	7,498	-	7,498
0604645A	91	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-ENG. DEV.	2,899	-	2,899
0604649A	92	ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	58,321	-	58,321
0604710A	93	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	30,644	-	30,644
0604713A	94	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	110,829	-	110,829

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0604715A	95	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV	71,034	-	71,034
0604716A	96	TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV	5,348	-	5,348
0604726A	97	INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,318	-	2,318
0604739A	98	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	4,552	-	4,552
0604741A	99	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - ENG DEV	7,995	-	7,995
0604746A	100	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	10,252	-	10,252
0604760A	101	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ENGINEERING	7,657	-	7,657
0604766A	102	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES - EMD (TIARA)	70,940	-	70,940
0604768A	103	BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT)	128,026	-	128,026
0604770A	104	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	11,535	-	11,535
0604778A	105	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)	443	-	443
0604780A	106	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	19,925	-	19,925
0604801A	107	AVIATION - ENG DEV	6,312	-	6,312
0604802A	108	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	54,943	-	40,143
		OICW		(14,800)	
0604804A	109	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	22,996	-	22,996
0604805A	110	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	23,987	-	23,987
0604807A	111	MED MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEF EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	9,705	-	9,705
0604808A	112	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV	40,916	-	40,916
0604814A	113	SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV	19,366	-	19,366
0604817A	114	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	8,658	-	8,658
0604818A	115	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	35,299	-	35,299

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
0604820A	116	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	5,128	-	5,128
0604823A	117	FIREFINDER	32,353	-	40,253
		Accelerate TBM Cueing Requirement		7,900	
0604824A	118	DUAP COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS		-	-
0604854A	119	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - EMD	65,806	-	65,806
0604256A	120	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	13,680	-	13,680
0604258A	121	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,397	-	13,397
0604759A	122	MAJOR I&E INVESTMENT	39,380	-	39,380
0605103A	123	RAND ARROYO CENTER	17,656	-	17,656
0605301A	124	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	140,344	-	140,344
0605326A	125	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	16,990	-	16,990
0605502A	126	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		-	-
0605601A	127	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	137,193	-	137,193
0605602A	128	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	30,470	-	30,470
0605604A	129	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	30,138	-	30,138
0605605A	130	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	14,230	-	19,230
		Directed Energy Testbed		5,000	
0605606A	131	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	3,021	-	3,021
0605702A	132	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,843	-	6,843
0605706A	133	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	8,796	-	8,796
0605709A	134	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	4,143	-	4,143
0605712A	135	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	68,946	-	68,946

Title II-RDT

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
0605716A	136	24,255	-	24,255
0605801A	137	64,121	-	64,121
0605803A	138	15,973	-	15,973
0605805A	139	10,537	-	10,537
0605853A	140	-	-	-
0605854A	141	-	-	-
0605856A	142	-	-	-
0605876A	143	-	-	-
0605878A	144	-	-	-
0605879A	145	-	-	-
0605896A	146	-	-	-
0605898A	147	5,191	-	5,191
0909999A	148	-	-	-
0603778A	149	36,540	-	67,140
			30,600	
0102419A	150	24,903	-	24,903
0203610A	151	-	-	-
0203726A	152	36,222	-	36,222
0203735A	153	29,544	-	50,044
			20,500	
0203740A	154	45,125	-	45,125
0203744A	155	51,644	-	83,044

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.		Request	FY 00	Recom
					Change	
0708045A	177		END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	66,167	-	66,167
1001018A	178		NATO JOINT STARS		-	-
XXXXXXX			SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY		41,000	41,000
			ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENTS		(20,000)	(20,000)
			TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL,ARMY	4,426,194	245,000	4,671,194

Basic research in counter-terrorism

The committee held two hearings this year to receive testimony on the threat of terrorism and the steps taken by the Department of Defense to combat this threat. The committee feels strongly that we must conduct research and development not only for near-term solutions, but also for investigating revolutionary approaches in science and technologies that will provide next generation solutions for force protection and terrorist threats. The committee recommends an additional \$15.0 million in the PE 61104A to initiate a basic research program to explore technologies that deter, resolve, and mitigate terrorist acts, including physical structure and physical effects research.

Army After Next materials

The committee supports the Army's efforts to develop advanced affordable multi-functional materials to meet the needs of the Army After Next (AAN). New materials technology represents one of the necessary, cross-cutting technologies that will be a major enabler to the Army After Next. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in PE 62105A to support this important effort.

Missile technology

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62303A to complete application studies and design of scramjet technologies for the advanced interceptor technology demonstration.

Humanitarian demining research

The committee recommends an increase of \$1.8 million in PE 62712A to fund the Army's research on the application of acoustic/laser technology for possible use in mine detection. The committee believes that this technology has the potential to diminish the threat that mines pose to our troops and to innocent people around the world.

Combat vehicle and automotive technology

The committee recommends an increase of \$6.5 million in PE 62601A, the Army's combat vehicle and automotive technology account: \$3.5 million for university partnering for operational support and \$3.0 for the National Automotive Center to conduct demonstrations for the "smart truck" initiative.

Human factors engineering technology

The committee recommends an additional \$1.8 million in PE 62716A for Emergency Team Coordination (MedTeams). The additional funds in fiscal year 2000 will complete the fixed facility and combat care research.

Environmental quality technology

The budget request included \$12.7 million for environmental quality technology, PE 62720A. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in PE 62720A to continue to develop, demonstrate, and validate the plasma energy pyrolysis system (PEPS) for the destruction of hazardous waste, with the primary focus on

achieving demonstration and validation of a mobile system. The purpose of PEPS is to develop an incineration process for hazardous waste disposition, which minimizes toxic air emissions and the disposal of ash contaminated with heavy metals.

Virtual retinal eye display technology

Virtual retinal eye display technology uses the human retina as the focal plane for images beamed through electronic display eyeglasses into the eye. This technology allows for increased fidelity, full color, and stereoscopic image directly onto the human visual system. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63002A for the Army to pursue this technology.

Armor system modernization

The committee has completed a review of the Department of the Army armor system modernization plan required in the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999. The revised plan includes significant changes to Army organization and the armor vehicle fielding strategy necessary to meet future national defense challenges. Specifically, the plan calls for the fielding of modern and significantly more capable armored systems to III Corps at Fort Hood, Texas in a "pure fleet" concept which concentrates those systems in three divisions, rather than spreading them piecemeal throughout the force. The committee supports this portion of the revised plan, however, remains concerned that resource limitations will prevent the fielding of these modernized systems to the 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment (ACR) within III Corps. This is particularly troubling as the 3rd ACR, assigned to III Corps, will likely be the first unit to make contact with the enemy if III Corps units are ever deployed. Unfortunately, the resource constraints that are preventing the modernization of the 3rd ACR are not limited to III Corps but are symptomatic of a greater armor system modernization problem.

The Army currently has over 7,600 M-1 Abrams tanks in the inventory. The ongoing division redesign effort will result in this number declining to approximately 6,800 tanks, with 2,760 of these tanks in the active component and the remaining tanks in the Army National Guard. The current Army modernization program will modernize only 17 percent of the total fleet. It will provide 1,174 M1A2 System Enhancement Program (SEP) tanks, with the remaining 5,610 tanks fielded in the M1A1 configuration. In support of the Army digitization initiative, the Army will field digitization applique devices to 1,135 M1A1 tanks, which will meet digitization requirements for only 40 percent of the overall Abrams fleet. Unfortunately, the plans and funding necessary to support any additional upgrades to the remainder of the force are unclear and if not forthcoming, will likely result in a large, increasingly irrelevant force of non-modernized armor.

In the context of tank modernization, it is significant to note that the Army will terminate the M1A2SEP production effort in 2004, will complete M1A1D (applique) upgrades in fiscal year 2005, and complete SEP retrofit activities by fiscal year 2009 with no additional tank upgrades programmed for 30 years. Similarly, the

Army had to cut back on other armor modernization programs due to overall modernization funding constraints.

The Army cannot and should not try to modernize the entire range of armored systems found in the Service today. The committee notes recommendations made by the National Defense Panel members and the Defense Science Board on joint operations superiority in the 21st Century that called for lighter, more deployable systems. The committee has also received numerous briefings that outline future challenges to the Nation that will likely limit our ability to rapidly transport formations of large, heavy Army vehicles. Strategic lift capabilities will be limited, access to airfield and port facilities will likely be impeded or denied by our adversaries, and the support requirements for large, heavy formations may not be achievable. Future adversaries learned from the Desert Storm conflict that they cannot hope to match U.S. combat power on an open desert battlefield, such as we saw in the Gulf. The committee believes the Army must reassess armor system requirements and develop alternatives to meet the National Military Strategy challenges in the 21st Century. The committee directs the Army to reassess armor modernization plans and provide a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 1, 2000, that addresses the following:

- (1) alternative modernization schedule and funding strategies that will reduce the number of armored vehicle combat systems in the inventory to the level required to meet the national military strategy;

- (2) an assessment of the strategic lift/preposition requirements associated with each alternative strategy, such as requirements for strategic lift technologies or capabilities not yet developed or fielded;

- (3) the quantity of armored vehicles required for a strategic reserve, and a schedule and funding plan for maintaining an appropriate level of capability within the strategic reserve;

- (4) the most appropriate path to accelerate development of the future combat vehicle necessary to meet 21st Century challenges, with linkage between termination of existing armor system modernization efforts and production, and fielding of the future combat system;

- (5) the experimentation process the Army will follow to assess the various alternatives, organizations, and operational concepts in order to arrive at the optimum decision, to include proposed use scenarios, the measures of effectiveness selected, and the measures of performance that will be assessed, and the specific coordination requirements with the other services;

- (6) program and funding requirements necessary to modernize and ensure the viability of the remaining M1 tank fleet, to include the requirement for new engines necessary to reduce operations and support costs of the M1 tank; and

- (7) for those units affected by the retirement of legacy M1 systems not required to support the national military strategy, identify new roles and functions and conversion requirements necessary to transition these units to lighter, more mobile strike force configurations.

The committee understands that there is a recent initiative within the Army to accelerate the maturation of technologies necessary to develop and field a future combat vehicle. The committee supports this initiative and believes it is necessary to establish a multi-mission combat system demonstration program in collaboration with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a plan to the congressional defense committees that lays out the program strategy. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63005A necessary to begin the acceleration of this effort.

Digital intelligence situation mapboard

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63772A for the development and testing of a miniature digital intelligence situation mapboard. This technology, compatible with the current system used by mounted troops, will provide dismounted soldiers digital situational awareness information in a small-screen display format.

Acoustic technology research

The committee is aware of research in acoustic technologies that shows promising application for detection, identification and tracking of cruise missiles and mobile missile launchers. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63308A to support continued effort in this area by the Army's Space and Missile Defense Command.

Radar power technology

The committee is aware of advanced radar power technology development at the Army Missile Defense and Space Technology Center. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63308A to continue this important research and development, especially in the area of fuel cells and other power generators, power control and distribution, heat exchangers, and integrated radar systems.

Tactical High Energy Laser

The budget request did not include funding for completion of testing of the Tactical High Energy Laser (THEL) program. The committee continues to support THEL and believes that the Army should complete testing of the THEL system so that Israel can take over final testing, deployment and operations in Israel. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63308A to support continued THEL testing and deployment activities.

Weapons and munitions-advanced development

The budget request included \$1.8 million for weapons and munitions advanced development activities, PE 63802A. The committee notes that the Army had not requested any funding for the objective individual combat weapon (OICW) in the program definition and risk reduction (PD&RR) phase. Due to a restructuring of this program, the committee recommends a transfer of \$14.8 million from PE 64802A to PE 63802A to conduct the PD&RR of the

OICW. The committee directs OICW project D134 be established in the PD&RR phase to execute the revised program.

Comanche

The budget request included \$427.1 million to continue development of the Comanche helicopter, PE 64233A. The committee continues to be concerned about the slow pace of the Comanche helicopter effort and the overall state of Army aviation modernization. There is particular concern regarding the recent Army decision to terminate production of the Apache Longbow helicopter in fiscal year 2005, to meet the funding requirements of Comanche beginning in fiscal year 2006. While the committee recognizes funding shortfalls across the broad range of Army modernization efforts, it does not support budget driven cuts to other fully funded programs without analysis of the impact of the program modification. The committee supports the Comanche, and believes its production should be accelerated, but not at the expense of the Apache Longbow program, which will provide a level of combat power on future battlefields not yet seen with rotary wing aviation. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$56.0 million, for a total authorization of \$483.1 million in PE 64223A, to accelerate flight testing of the second prototype aircraft and the development of the mission equipment package for Comanche. The committee also directs the Army to reconsider the Apache Longbow decision, as discussed elsewhere in this committee report.

Weapons and munitions-engineering and manufacturing development

The budget request included \$54.9 million for weapons and munitions engineering and manufacturing development activities, PE 63802A. The Army requested \$14.8 million for the objective individual combat weapon (OICW). The committee recommends a transfer of \$14.8 million to PE 63802A to conduct the program definition and risk reduction phase of the OICW. This action was taken due to a restructuring of the program.

Firefinder

The budget request included \$32.4 million to support system improvement research and development requirements for the Firefinder radar, PE 64823A. The committee continues to be concerned about the ballistic missile threat facing our soldiers on the battlefield. The Army has been exploring alternative means to provide cueing information on theater ballistic missiles to commanders within the target support mission area. The Army has requested funding for fiscal year 2000 to explore the ability of the Firefinder radar system to support early warning and cueing requirements, and has also identified funding for future year exploration of this concept. The Army has identified an opportunity to accelerate this effort and save funding requirements for future year activities. The committee believes this effort should be accelerated and recommends an increase of \$7.9 million, in PE 64823A, for a total authorization of \$40.3 million.

Directed energy testbed

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 65605A to develop a directed energy testbed. The committee expects this testbed to be used to conduct experiments, modeling and simulations, and lethality testing to accelerate the development of directed energy technologies as recommended in the Army's Directed Energy Master Plan which outlines a comprehensive roadmap for exploiting directed energy technologies for leap-ahead capabilities for future warfighting.

Multiple launch rocket system product improvement program

The budget request included \$36.5 million to support research and development requirements for multiple launch rocket system (MLRS), PE 63778A product improvement activities. The committee continues to support all efforts designed to produce a lighter, more deployable force that can quickly respond to future warfighting challenges. The Army continues to develop the high mobility artillery rocket system (HIMARS) that will be transportable by C-130 aircraft and capable of firing both rockets and missiles associated with the MLRS system. The committee believes this effort is critical to meet future defense challenges, and recommends an increase of \$30.6 million in PE 63778A to accelerate this effort and field HIMARS more than two years ahead of schedule.

Combat vehicle improvement programs

The budget request included \$29.5 million to conduct technical system upgrades to tracked combat and tactical vehicles, PE 23735A. The committee understands that there is an opportunity to complete the engineering and manufacturing development effort associated with the upgrade of the Bradley A3 vehicle and to complete development of A3 version software necessary to conduct test and evaluation of upgraded vehicles. Additionally, the committee notes a requirement to pursue electronic upgrades and to develop an obsolescence avoidance program that will ensure the future operational readiness of Bradley fighting vehicles. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$20.5 million, for a total of \$50.0 million in PE 23735A, to support completion of the A3 version software and related cabling requirements, and to meet obsolescence avoidance objectives.

Aircraft modifications/product improvement program

The budget request included \$51.7 million for aircraft modification and research and development activities, PE 23744A. The committee notes that the first UH-60 Blackhawk helicopter flew in 1978 and that these aircraft have an average service life of 17 years. The committee understands that the Army plans to begin service life extension activities in fiscal year 2002 and has established a high priority unfunded requirement to begin the research and development activity necessary to execute the service life extension effort. The committee recommends an increase of \$31.4 million in PE 23744A, for a total authorization of \$83.1 million, to begin that research and development effort. The committee expects

the Army to fully fund any additional requirements in future year budget submissions.

Navy

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln No.		Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
		RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
0601152N	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	15,630	-	15,630
0601153N	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	361,118	-	361,118
0602111N	3	AIR AND SURFACE LAUNCHED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	37,616	-	37,616
0602121N	4	SHIP, SUBMARINE & LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	43,786	-	43,786
0602122N	5	AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	20,660	-	20,660
0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	10,534	-	15,534
		Non-Traditional Warfare Initiatives		-5,000	
0602228N	7	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU)		-	-
0602232N	8	COMMUNICATIONS, COMMAND AND CONTROL, INTEL, SURV	68,823	-	71,823
		Hyperspectral Research		3,000	
0602233N	9	HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	30,586	-	30,586
0602234N	10	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	77,957	-	79,957
		Heatshield Research		2,000	
0602270N	11	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	24,659	-	37,659
		Free Electron Laser		10,000	
		Waveform Generator		3,000	
0602314N	12	UNDERSEA WARFARE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY	51,406	-	51,406
0602315N	13	MINE COUNTERMEASURES, MINING AND SPECIAL WARFARE	45,022	-	45,022
0602435N	14	OCEANOGRAPHIC AND ATMOSPHERIC TECHNOLOGY	60,334	-	60,334
0602633N	15	UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY	34,066	-	34,066
0602805N	16	DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	18,390	-	18,390

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
0603217N	17	AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	42,046	-	42,046
0603238N	18	PRECISION STRIKE AND AIR DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	52,580	-	52,580
0603270N	19	ADVANCED ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	18,984	-	18,984
0603508N	20	SURFACE SHIP & SUBMARINE HM&E ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	41,515	-	54,515
		Power Node Control Centers		3,000	
		Composite Helicopter Hanger		5,000	
		Virtual Testbed for Advanced Electrical Systems		5,000	
0603640M	21	MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	56,943	-	63,443
		BURRO		5,000	
		Adv Lightweight Grenade Launcher		1,000	
		Vehicle Tech Demo		500	
0603706N	22	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	15,064	-	15,064
0603707N	23	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV	20,632	-	20,632
0603712N	24	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOG	23,809	-	23,809
0603727N	25	NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM	41,840	-	41,840
0603747N	26	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,956	-	57,956
0603782N	27	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	48,711	-	57,711
		Ocean Modeling for Mine and Submarine Warfare		9,000	
0603792N	28	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	75,635	-	84,635
		Low Observable Stack		5,000	
		Vector Thrust Ducted Propellor		4,000	
0603794N	29	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	23,808	-	23,808

Title II-RDT

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
0603207N	30	30,109	-	30,109
0603216N	31	7,280	-	7,280
0603254N	32	17,780	-	17,780
0603261N	33	1,975	-	1,975
0603382N	34	6,828	-	6,828
0603502N	35	82,465	-	100,465
			18,000	
0603504N	36	-	-	-
0603506N	37	640	-	640
0603512N	38	142,783	-	142,783
0603513N	39	108,334	-	110,334
0603514N	40	-	2,000	-
0603525N	41	94,085	-	94,085
0603527N	42	7,834	-	7,834
0603536N	43	5,983	-	5,983
0603542N	44	605	-	605
0603553N	45	2,949	-	2,949
0603561N	46	115,767	-	118,067
0603562N	47	4,667	2,300	4,667
0603563N	48	5,318	-	21,318

172

**Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)**

ACCOUNT	Ln No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
		Standard for the Exchange for Product Model Data	3,000	
		Trident SSGN Design	13,000	
0603564N	49	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	12,012	12,012
0603570N	50	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	146,208	146,208
0603573N	51	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	17,727	17,727
0603576N	52	CHALK EAGLE	95,329	95,329
0603582N	53	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	46,740	51,740
		Common Command and Decision Systems	5,000	
0603609N	54	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	34,309	34,309
0603611M	55	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	94,843	121,243
		Advanced Amphibious Assault Vehicle	26,400	
0603612M	56	MARINE CORPS MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	-	-
0603635M	57	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	42,654	42,654
0603654N	58	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	11,168	11,168
0603658N	59	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	114,931	114,931
0603713N	60	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	16,813	16,813
0603721N	61	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	70,793	70,793
0603724N	62	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	4,984	4,984
0603725N	63	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,985	1,985
0603734N	64	CHALK CORAL	42,707	42,707
0603739N	65	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	-	-
0603746N	66	RETRACT MAPLE	122,217	122,217
				173

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0603748N	67	LINK PLUMERIA	48,254	-	48,254
0603751N	68	RETRACT ELM	19,535	-	19,535
0603755N	69	SHIP SELF DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	5,654	-	5,654
0603764N	70	LINK EVERGREEN	7,879	-	7,879
0603787N	71	SPECIAL PROCESSES	69,332	-	69,332
0603790N	72	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	5,461	-	5,461
0603795N	73	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	101,489	-	101,489
0603800N	74	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEM/VAL	241,238	-	241,238
0603851M	75	NONLETHAL WEAPONS - DEM/VAL Innovation Initiative	23,277	3,000	26,277
0603857N	76	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM (ASCIET)	13,027	-	13,027
0603860N	77	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	-	-	-
0603889N	78	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS	-	-	-
0604327N	79	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYS (HDBTDS) PROG	4,924	-	4,924
0604707N	80	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENG SUP NAVCIIIT	35,170	-	39,170
0603208N	81	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	311	-	311
0604212N	82	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT Parametric Airborne Dipping Sonar	48,776	-	63,776
0604214N	83	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	38,599	-	38,599
0604215N	84	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	74,325	-	74,325
0604216N	85	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	118,701	-	118,701

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
0604217N	86	S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	2,095	-	2,095
0604218N	87	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	6,095	-	6,095
0604221N	88	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,010	-	3,010
0604231N	89	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	41,599	-	41,599
0604245N	90	H-1 UPGRADES	157,683	-	184,283
		4BN/4BW Helicopter Upgrade Program		26,600	
0604261N	91	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	25,953	-	25,953
0604262N	92	V-22A	182,885	-	182,885
0604264N	93	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	6,801	-	6,801
0604270N	94	EW DEVELOPMENT	163,077	-	163,077
0604300N	95	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	162,056	-	162,056
0604307N	96	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	204,480	-	204,480
0604310N	97	ARSENAL SHIP	-	-	-
0604311N	98	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	2,608	-	2,608
0604312N	99	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	2,020	-	2,020
0604355N	100	VERTICAL LAUNCH ASROC	-	-	-
0604366N	101	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	1,140	-	1,140
0604373N	102	AIRBORNE MCM	50,642	-	50,642
0604503N	103	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	48,896	-	48,896
0604504N	104	AIR CONTROL	8,696	-	8,696
0604507N	105	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	970	-	11,970
		Multi-Purpose Processor		11,000	

Title II-RDT

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0604512N	106	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	9,052	-	9,052
0604518N	107	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	8,126	-	8,126
0604524N	108	SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM	6,546	-	6,546
0604528N	109	SWATH (SMALL WATERPLANE AREA TWIN HULL) OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIP	-	-	-
0604558N	110	NEW DESIGN SSN	241,456	-	251,456
		Non-Propulsion Electronic Systems		10,000	
0604561N	111	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	32,001	-	32,001
0604562N	112	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	13,353	-	13,353
0604567N	113	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	61,135	-	63,135
		Smart Propulsor Product Model		2,000	
0604574N	114	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,300	-	3,300
0604601N	115	MINE DEVELOPMENT	3,315	-	3,315
0604603N	116	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	1,598	-	1,598
0604610N	117	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	9,297	-	9,297
0604612M	118	MARINE CORPS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	1,002	-	1,002
0604618N	119	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	11,782	-	11,782
0604654N	120	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,133	-	7,133
0604703N	121	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	1,252	-	1,252
0604710N	122	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,446	-	5,446
0604721N	123	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	1,791	-	1,791
0604727N	124	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	30,567	-	30,567
0604755N	125	SHIP SELF DEFENSE - EMD	96,580	-	130,980

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln No.		Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
		Volume Search Radar		30,000	
		NULKA Anti-Ship Missile Decoy System		4,400	
0604771N	126	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	4,285	-	4,285
0604777N	127	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	19,808	-	19,808
0604784N	128	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	14,910	-	36,910
		Advanced Deployable System		22,000	
0604800N	129	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD		-	-
0604805N	130	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	18,729	-	18,729
0604256N	131	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	29,644	-	29,644
0604258N	132	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	52,265	-	52,265
0604759N	133	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	42,621	-	42,621
0605152N	134	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	8,531	-	8,531
0605154N	135	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	43,694	-	43,694
0605155N	136	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	3,103	-	3,103
0605502N	137	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		-	-
0605804N	138	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	6,696	-	6,696
0605853N	139	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	19,447	-	19,447
0605856N	140	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,371	-	2,371
0605861N	141	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	52,777	-	52,777
0605862N	142	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	9,258	-	9,258
0605863N	143	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	73,163	-	73,163
0605864N	144	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	270,992	-	270,992

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0605865N	145	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	9,172	-	9,172
0605866N	146	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	2,436	-	2,436
0605867N	147	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	12,121	-	12,121
0605873M	148	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	8,198	-	8,198
0909999N	149	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-
0604227N	150	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS	-	-	-
0101221N	151	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	45,907	-	45,907
0101224N	152	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	33,239	-	33,239
0101226N	153	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	3,195	-	3,195
0204136N	154	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	315,714	-	315,714
0204152N	155	E-2 SQUADRONS	16,132	-	16,132
0204163N	156	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	9,947	-	9,947
0204229N	157	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	147,223	-	147,223
0204311N	158	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	18,025	-	18,025
0204413N	159	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	-	-	-
0204571N	160	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	26,257	-	33,757
		Battle Force Tactical Training		7,500	
0204575N	161	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	9,162	-	9,162
0205601N	162	HARM IMPROVEMENT	23,642	-	23,642
0205604N	163	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	46,666	-	46,666
0205620N	164	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	16,633	-	16,633
0205632N	165	MK-48 ADCAP	20,426	-	20,426

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln	ACCOUNT No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
166	0205633N AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	53,293	-	53,293
167	0205667N F-14 UPGRADE	1,390	-	1,390
168	0205675N OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	53,564	-	53,564
169	0206313M MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	90,293	-	90,293
170	0206623M MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS Improved Recovery Vehicle	39,941	-	32,741
171	0206624M MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	9,817	(7,200)	9,817
172	0207161N TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	40,051	-	40,051
173	0207163N ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	13,544	-	13,544
176	0303109N SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	38,921	-	38,921
177	0303140N INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	22,978	-	22,978
178	0303150N WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	-	-	-
180	0305160N NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	14,507	-	14,507
181	0305188N JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	8,125	-	8,125
182	0305192N JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	2,064	-	2,064
183	0305204M TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	-	-	-
184	0305204N TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	69,742	-	69,742
185	0305206N AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,958	-	4,958
186	0305207N MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	30,958	-	30,958
187	0305208N DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	5,583	-	5,583
188	0305927N NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	712	-	712
189	0305972N SPACE ACTIVITIES	-	-	-

**Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)**

Ln	ACCOUNT	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
190	0308601N MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	9,621	-	9,621
191	0702207N DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	39,986	-	39,986
192	0708011N INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	59,104	-	59,104
193	0708730N MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	19,681	-	19,681
999	XXXXXXX TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM	516,472	(3,500)	(3,500)
	XXXXXXX Classified Programs		-	516,472
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT		(37,900)	(37,900)
	TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, NAVY	7,984,016	217,100	8,201,116

Nontraditional defense operations

The United States military forces in the 21st Century must be prepared to face a wide range of security challenges, including those that can not now be foreseen, but will likely emerge. As first responders, the Marine Corps is at the forefront of this revolution in military operations.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 62131M to explore innovative concepts for addressing non-traditional tactics and operational challenges arising in the 21st Century. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program.

The committee further requires the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on the feasibility and desirability of establishing an advanced technology transition program within the Marine Corps to explore new and innovative operational concepts and technologies that specifically focus on non-traditional military operations.

Communications, command, and control, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62232N to accelerate the introduction of fused hyperspectral, synthetic aperture radar and electronic intelligence.

Carbon heatshield technology

The Office of Naval Research has initiated the development of potential heatshield replacements for the Trident reentry body, as well as advanced carbon composites for hypersonic vehicles, which will increase stand-off distances in defending Navy ships involved in theater wide defense. The committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million to accelerate testing of these carbon composite materials.

Laser technologies

The committee supports the recommendations made by the Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) on laser technologies. Specifically, CNA recommended that the Navy should explore alternative laser technologies for defensive applications, including solid state and free electron lasers. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 62227N to develop and demonstrate a 20 kilowatt free electron laser.

Superconducting wave form generator

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62270N to accelerate the development of a high temperature superconducting sigma delta waveform generator. This technology has the potential to greatly increase the capability for cruise missile detection.

Power node control centers

The budget request did not include funding for power node control centers (PNCCs). PNCCs have the potential to integrate all of the shipboard power functions, such as switching, conversion, dis-

tribution and system operation and protection. This technology supports present and future surface ship and submarine platforms as a building block for increased use of electrical equipment. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to PE 603508N for PNCCs.

Composite helicopter hangar

The budget request included no funds for a composite helicopter hangar initiative. This initiative is a program to design and fabricate the outer shell of a DDG-51 helicopter hangar structure using composite materials. The program will leverage enabling technologies that can lead to reduced radar signatures and cost and weight savings. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63508N to continue the design and fabrication of the outer shell of a DDG-51 helicopter hangar structure using composite materials.

Virtual testbed for advanced electric systems

The budget request included no funds for a virtual testbed for advanced electric systems for the reconfigurable ship. It is the Navy's vision that future ships will move to more electrical devices to reduce total ownership costs, and in some instances, reduce ship radiated noise. Advanced electric systems for the reconfigurable ship will integrate actual hardware so that this hardware can be performance tested with advanced electrical control devices that are simulated to prove system performance. The committee fully supports this simulation and testing prior to committing to electrical system designs. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63508N for a virtual testbed for advanced electric systems.

Advanced technology demonstration

The budget request included \$56.9 million in PE 63640M to support ongoing Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations. The committee notes ongoing efforts by the Marine Corps warfighting laboratory to identify new technologies that will provide lighter and more lethal weapon systems than are currently fielded, which will provide maximum advantage to the warfighter. The Marines have identified an unfunded requirement to conduct an analysis as to the utility of developing an advanced, lightweight grenade launcher (ALGL) for combat soldiers in small, mobile tactical units. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million to support the establishment of a ALGL program in the Marine Corps and a corresponding experimentation phase in fiscal year 2000.

The committee also continues to support ongoing efforts to develop an unmanned vertical lift helicopter capable of delivering heavy supply payloads to battlefield locations. The committee believes this effort should be continued and notes a request for additional resources necessary to carry this concept forward and support development and experimentation. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for this purpose.

The committee is aware of Marine Corps' interest in the evaluation and demonstration of a diesel-powered four-wheel-drive vehicle

currently in production, which appears to meet restrictive helicopter transportable criteria. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$500,000 to evaluate and demonstrate the performance of the vehicle, consistent with the Marine Corps' criteria and requirements.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$63.4 million in PE 63640M for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstration activities.

Ocean modeling for mine and submarine warfare

The budget request included \$3.5 million for ocean modeling to provide battle space products to the Office of the Naval Oceanographer for promulgation to the war fighting commander in chiefs (CINCs). Research and development of products critical to monitoring, modeling and disseminating environmental data are key factors in battle space awareness. Specifically, the databases and information regarding environments and predictions in littoral regions require emphasis on the mine warfare mission area. Investigation, data analysis, and prediction tools are required for current and eddy flow, bottom contour and content, and thermal layer behavior, cold water phenomena and man-made clutter. Effective mine and submarine warfare are dependent on correct and timely environmental data. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.0 million in PE 603782N for ocean modeling.

Advanced technology transition program

Low observable multi-function stack (LMS) advanced technology demonstration project addresses surface ship radar and infrared signature technology issues. The vectored thrust ducted propellor (VTDP) has been selected by the Navy as an organic countermeasure alternative to the CH-60. Funding shortfalls in the Advanced Technology Transition program have limited the scope of these two programs. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for LMS and an increase of \$4.0 million for VTDP in PE 63792N to complete these two programs.

Integrated combat weapons system for mine countermeasures ships

The budget request did not include funding for an integrated combat weapons system (ICWS) for mine countermeasures ships. The global positioning system, autonomous mine-hunting neutralization, and mine sweeping capabilities all contribute to a complex mine warfare information battlefield in ICWS. The mine countermeasures ships have the responsibility of maintaining mine warfare tactical and operational situations. At present, information from multiple sources is gathered and plotted by slow and manpower-intensive methods. The committee recommends an increase of \$18.0 million in PE 6035029 for continuation of ICWS for mine countermeasures ships which will automate key tactical decision functions for mine countermeasures ships.

Advanced water-jet technology

The budget request included no funds for advanced water-jet technology. Advanced water-jet technology represents the type of

technological improvement in ship propulsion which reduces both acquisition and total ownership costs. In addition, critical war fighting ship signatures could be reduced by applying water-jet technology. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63513N for advanced water-jet technology.

Enhanced performance electric motor brush technology

The budget request included no funds for enhanced performance electric motor brush technology. Electric motors use monolithic carbon brushes to transfer electricity from a stationary stator to a rotating rotor. Carbon brushes wear down relatively quickly and must be frequently inspected and replaced. A Navy funded small business innovative research (SBIR) project recently demonstrated fiber metal brushes that show significant wear and survivability improvements compared to carbon brushes. Metal fiber electric motor brushes have the potential to significantly reduce total ownership costs of ships and increase the survivability and operational reliability of electric motors. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.3 million in PE 63561N for completion of design and testing of enhanced performance electric motor brush technology.

Standard for the exchange of product model data

The budget request included no funds for the development of a standard for the exchange of product model data for use in computer-aided engineering in shipbuilding. A neutral product model data bridge is required that links the Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) ship design, analysis, manufacturing, and in-service life cycle support elements. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63563N to develop application protocols for computer-aided engineering for shipbuilding.

Trident SSGN design

The budget request included no funding for the design of the Trident SSBN conversion to an SSGN-configuration. The statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for 1999 (H. Rept. 105-736) required the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 1999 on an analysis of converting some of the Trident SSBNs to an SSGN-configuration.

Although the committee has not received the required report, testimony by Department of the Navy officials before the committee stated, "conversion of up to four Trident SSBNs to an SSGN configuration represents a one-time, near-term opportunity which would provide a platform with a high capacity precision strike capability and which could function as a stealthy, long endurance, operating base for sustained special operating forces campaigns. SSGN would also significantly reduce the 11-year gap during which we would be below desired Special Operations Command payload carrying capacity for special operating forces submarine insertion."

The committee recognizes that the opportunity to commence design work on the SSGN capability must begin to meet the requirements for planning coincidental with the refueling of the first available platform. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of

\$13.0 million in PE 63563N to begin design activity for converting Trident SSBNs to an SSGN-configuration

Navy common command and decision system

The budget request did not include funding for a common command and decision system. The effort to develop a common command and decision capability is a pre-planned product improvement (P3I) to the AEGIS Weapon System and the Mk 2 Ship Self-Defense System (SSDS) that would replace the command and decision capability presently in these systems with a common computer architecture. This effort will reduce future life-cycle costs by reducing the number of computer programs that must be maintained, by enabling the Navy to field new or modified warfighting capability much more quickly and at a lower cost, and by improving warfighting capability by eliminating the redundant, conflicting processing now inherent in these systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for continuation and completion of small business innovative research (SBIR) project for the common command and decision system.

Advanced amphibious assault vehicle

The budget request included \$94.8 million to support continued development of the Marine Corps advanced amphibious assault vehicle (AAAV). This self-deploying, high water-speed amphibious, armored vehicle will meet critical requirements associated with ensuring the Marine Corps is able to meet future defense challenges. The committee understands that this program continues to meet cost and schedule objectives and has received several awards for engineering and manufacturing development excellence. The Marine Corps has identified an opportunity to accelerate the initial operating capability for these vehicles from fiscal year 2006 to fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends an increase of \$26.4 million, a total authorization of \$121.2 million, for technical and schedule risk mitigation and program acceleration of the initial operating capability for these vehicles.

Research in nonlethal weapons

The committee commends the work performed at the Marine Corps' warfighting laboratory, but is concerned because the limited scope of the technology development program results in heavy reliance on commercial-off-the-shelf technologies. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63851M to establish a technology innovation initiative within the Joint Nonlethal Weapons Directorate that would allow the Marine Corps to pursue research and development of new materials and technologies that offer the potential for use in nonlethal weapons.

Navy collaborative integrated information technology initiative

The committee continues to support the Navy Collaborative Integrated Information Technology Initiative (NAVCIIITI) to continue development in reliable secure communications and advanced information technologies. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 64707N for this purpose.

Parametric airborne dipping sonar

The budget request included no funds for the Parametric Airborne Dipping Sonar (PADS). The PADS program is the continuation of a small business innovative research project that is designed to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate the three dimensional, stabilized steerable acoustic beams for mine avoidance and submarine detection in shallow water. It is the only system that has the potential to provide airborne active dipping sonar anti-submarine and anti-mine capabilities for shallow water littoral operations.

The committee is encouraged with test results which demonstrated anti-mine detection capability superior to present and other planned systems. In addition, Navy analysis and present plans include the possibility of PADS being a shallow water adjunct to the Airborne Low Frequency Sonar (ALFS) system deployed on H-60 helicopters. Demonstrations of its capability with the H-60 aircraft have thus far been successful.

The dual mine and submarine warfare potential of PADS makes it a flexible and cost effective war fighting enhancement for two deficient missions: mine location and diesel submarine detection. The Navy is encouraged to continue the present testing and development of PADS with a goal of providing three initial units which could be flown quickly to an area of operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million in PE 64212N for the continued development of PADS.

H-1 upgrades

The budget request included \$157.7 million to fund engineering and manufacturing development activities associated with the Marine Corps four-bladed November/four-bladed Whiskey (4BN/4BW) helicopter upgrade program. The committee notes with concern the reports of cost growth associated with contractor overhead rates, emerging mission software requirements, and an outstanding requirement to complete a full logistics support analysis for these aircraft. The committee continues to be concerned about safety and the aging rotary wing fleet found in the Marine Corps, and believes the established schedule for the operational evaluation and fleet fielding must be maintained. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$26.6 million necessary to maintain the current development and fielding schedule for this critical program.

Multi-purpose processor

The budget request included \$40.0 million for submarine sonar improvement. The Multi-Purpose Processor (MPP) is the result of a small business innovative research (SBIR) initiative developed under the sponsorship of the new nuclear attack submarine (NSSN) program. The MPP provides a capability to easily transport new, advanced software to existing hardware installations. It lies at the heart of the Navy's Acoustic Rapid Commercial-off-the-shelf Insertion (ARCI) program. This program is designed to permit the Los Angeles-class attack submarine (SSN-688) to regain acoustic superiority over the diesel and nuclear submarines of other navies. The committee recommends an increase of \$11.0 million in PE 64503N for continuation of the SBIR follow-on for advanced devel-

opment of MPP transportable software technology, technology insertion, advanced processor software builds, and for providing MPP units and training throughout the fleet and the Navy research and development community.

Non-propulsion electronics system

The budget request included \$241.5 million for New Attack Submarine (NSSN) non-propulsion development. The purpose of the development is to reduce life-cycle costs by investigating and incorporating open systems architecture, commercial off-the-shelf software and hardware and advanced ship construction techniques. The Non-propulsion Electronics System (NPES) is comprised of 15 subsystems required to perform warfare missions. The major systems are sonar, combat control, exterior communications, electronic support measures and interconnecting architectures. To attain the possible life-cycle savings that could accrue, analysis and integration to support the 15 subsystems development is required. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to PE 64558N for integration of the 15 NPES subsystems.

Smart propulsor product model

The budget request included no funding for continuation of the development of a smart propulsor product model (SPPM) for DD-21. The SPPM will provide a complete representation of the ship's requirements, design and capabilities at each stage of the life-cycle. The SPPM program is a proposed joint Navy-industry effort to develop software that will bring together design, manufacturing, cost and capability modeling for ship propulsion devices. This development will enable the Navy to consider innovative propulsion concepts for future ships while considering life-cycle costs and manufacturing techniques. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 64567N for the SPPM.

Volume search radar

The budget request did not include funding for a new volume search radar (VSR). The budget request did include funding for the Multi-function Radar (MFR). The VSR will be required to complement the MFR on future ships. The VSR has applicability to both DD-21 and CVN-77. The committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million to PE 64755N for the development of a volume search radar.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system

The budget request included \$1.4 million for continued development and testing of the NULKA active countermeasures decoy. Development of a dual band, spatially distributed infrared signature payload is required for defense against advanced heat-seeking anti-ship missiles (ASMs).

The NULKA decoy was developed to improve surface ship survivability against ASMs. The ASM threat is growing rapidly. By the year 2000, an estimated 100 nations will possess more than 40,000 ASMs. These missiles pose a potent threat to surface combatants and amphibious ships involved in littoral operations.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.4 million in PE 64755N to complete the development and operational testing of the dual band, spatially distributed infrared signature payload upgrade.

Advanced Deployable System

The budget request included \$14.9 for Advanced Deployable System (ADS) research and development. The original schedule for completion of development and initial fielding of the system was delayed one-year due to funding constraints within the program. The committee agrees that ADS will be a battle space awareness enabler. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of \$22.0 million to complete development of the ADS one year ahead of the schedule proposed in the budget request.

Battle Force Tactical Training

The budget request included \$4.3 million for the Surface Tactical Team Trainer (STTT). The STTT is designated to further develop an existing system, the Battle Force Tactical Training (BFTT) system, so it will be able to provide joint warfare training. A highly successful small business innovative research (SBIR) project, N96-111, leveraged the capabilities of commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) operating systems and processors. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.5 million in PE 24571N for the purpose of SBIR phase III follow-on work to continue the BFTT operating system conversion.

Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism

The committee recommends that \$3.5 million be transferred from Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy to section 310(25), a newly-established central transfer account for funds to combat terrorism.

AIR FORCE

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln No.		Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
		RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, AF			
0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	209,505	-	209,505
0602102F	2	MATERIALS	63,334	-	70,534
		Resin Systems		3,000	
		Titanium Matrix		2,200	
		Friction Welding		2,000	
0602201F	3	AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	43,898	-	43,898
0602202F	4	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	51,512	-	51,512
0602203F	5	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	62,012	-	64,787
		Science and Engineering		775	
		Solid State Electrolyte Oxygen Generator		2,000	
0602204F	6	AEROSPACE SENSORS	64,988	-	73,988
		Variable Displacement Vane Pump		4,000	
		Multi-Spectral Battlespace Simulation		5,000	
0602269F	7	HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM		16,600	16,600
0602601F	8	PHILLIPS LAB EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	115,313	-	144,813
		Post-boost Control Systems		2,900	
		Missile Propulsion Technology		1,700	
		Tactical Missile Propulsion		3,000	
		Orbit Transfer Propulsion		3,000	
		Tropo-Weather		2,500	
		Space Survivability		600	

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
			800	
			10,000	
			5,000	
				42,205
				55,748
			9,300	
				17,927
				10,786
				-
				25,890
				29,825
				29,405
				5,992
				13,749
			3,000	
				38,778
				4,827
				14,841
			2,000	
				8,335
				9,443
				27,334

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0603302F	25	SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION	11,231	-	11,231
0603311F	26	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	-	-	-
0603401F	27	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	76,229	-	118,229
		SMV		35,000	
		MSTRS		5,000	
		Standard Protocol Interpreter		2,000	
0603410F	28	SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY	3,677	-	3,677
0603601F	29	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	21,479	-	32,079
		LANTRIN Support System Upgrades		10,600	
0603605F	30	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	38,995	-	38,995
0603707F	31	WEATHER SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	-	-	-
0603723F	32	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	-	-	-
0603726F	33	C31 SUBSYSTEM INTEGRATION	9,122	-	9,122
0603728F	34	ADVANCED COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY	4,507	-	4,507
0603789F	35	C3 ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	17,402	-	17,402
0603876F	36	SPACE-BASED LASER	63,840	25,000	88,840
0603260F	37	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,534	-	4,534
0603319F	38	AIRBORNE LASER PROGRAM	308,634	-	308,634
0603430F	39	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	97,066	-	97,066
0603432F	40	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	39,678	-	39,678
0603434F	41	NAT POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRON SATELLITE (SPACE)	80,137	-	80,137
0603438F	42	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	9,822	-	19,822

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
			10,000	
		Program Increase		
0603441F	43	SPACE BASED INFRARED ARCHITECTURE (SPACE) - DEM/VAL	151,378	151,378
0603617F	44	COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATION APPLICATIONS	7,833	7,833
0603742F	45	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	7,393	7,393
0603790F	46	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT(H)	4,283	4,283
0603800F	47	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	235,374	250,374
		Alternative Engine	15,000	
0603850F	48	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (DEM/VAL)	24,446	24,446
0603851F	49	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL	28,628	47,828
		RSLP	19,200	
0603852F	50	C-130J - DEM/VAL	-	-
0603853F	51	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)- DEM/VAL	-	-
0603854F	52	WIDEBAND MILSATCOM (SPACE)	53,344	53,344
0603856F	53	AIR FORCE/NRO PARTNERSHIP (AFNP)	2,905	2,905
0603860F	54	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	16,488	16,488
0603876F	55	SPACE-BASED LASER	-	-
0604237F	56	VARIABLE STABILITY IN-FLIGHT SIMULATOR TEST AIRCRAFT	-	-
0604327F	57	HARD & DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROG	4,910	4,910
0604441F	58	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	-	-
0604012F	59	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	2,970	2,970
0604201F	60	INTEGRATED AVIONICS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT	723	723
0604218F	61	ENGINE MODEL DERIVATIVE PROGRAM (EMDP)	-	-

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
0604222F	62	8,489	-	8,489
0604226F	63	203,544	-	203,544
0604227F	64	3,835	-	3,835
0604233F	65	38,656	-	38,656
0604239F	66	1,222,232	-	1,222,232
0604240F	67	201,765	-	238,765
			37,000	
0604243F	68	-	-	-
0604270F	69	90,347	-	104,347
			7,000	
			7,000	
0604441F	70	328,653	92,000	420,653
0604442F	71	77,651	-	77,651
0604479F	72	361,308	-	361,308
0604480F	73	-	-	-
0604600F	74	-	-	3,900
			3,900	
0604602F	75	8,887	-	8,887
0604604F	76	4,798	-	4,798
0604617F	77	946	-	946
0604618F	78	1,385	-	1,385
0604703F	79	7,135	-	7,135

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	Request	FY 00	Recom
No.		Change		
0604706F	80	6,135	-	9,035
			400	
			2,500	
0604708F	81	2,719	-	2,719
0604727F	82	10,307	-	10,307
0604735F	83	6,220	-	6,220
0604740F	84	196	-	196
0604750F	85	1,345	-	1,345
0604754F	86	8,705	-	8,705
0604762F	87	5,893	-	5,893
0604779F	88	5,837	-	5,837
0604800F	89	-	-	-
0604805F	90	30,485	-	30,485
0604851F	91	38,804	-	38,804
0604853F	92	324,803	-	329,303
			4,500	
0605011F	93	4,889	-	4,889
0207325F	94	-	-	-
0207414F	95	-	-	-
0305176F	96	13,412	-	13,412
0603402F	97	-	-	-
0604256F	98	32,391	-	32,391

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>Ln</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00</u>	<u>Recom</u>
			<u>Change</u>		
0604258F	99	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	192	-	192
0604759F	100	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	47,334	-	47,334
0605101F	101	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	20,560	-	20,560
0605306F	102	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	4,510	-	4,510
0605502F	103	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH	-	-	-
0605712F	104	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	23,819	-	23,819
0605807F	105	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	392,104	-	365,504
		Transfer to S&T		(1,600)	
		Program Reduction		(30,000)	
		Big Crow		5,000	
0605808F	106	DEVELOPMENT PLANNING	5,696	-	-
		Transfer to S&T		(5,696)	
0605853F	107	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION	-	-	-
0605854F	108	POLLUTION PREVENTION	2,553	-	2,553
0605856F	109	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	-	-	-
0605860F	110	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	7,913	-	7,913
0605864F	111	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	51,658	-	76,658
		Micro Satellite Technology		25,000	
0605876F	112	MINOR CONSTRUCTION (RPM) - RDT&E	-	-	-
0605878F	113	MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR (RPM) - RDT&E	-	-	-
0605879F	114	REAL PROPERTY SERVICES (RPS) - RDT&E	-	-	-
0605896F	115	BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E	-	-	-
					195

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>Ln</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00</u>	<u>Recom</u>
			<u>Change</u>		
0909900F	116	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-
0909980F	117	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT	-	-	-
1001004F	118	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,750	-	3,750
0603690F	119	INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY	491	-	491
010113F	120	B-52 SQUADRONS	32,139	-	73,539
		Radar Warning Upgrades		15,400	
		GATM		26,000	
0101120F	121	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	688	-	688
0101122F	122	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	5,344	-	5,344
0102325F	123	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	-	-
0102326F	124	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MOD PROG	13,239	-	13,239
0102411F	125	NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE SYSTEM	-	-	-
0207027F	126	AIR AND SPACE COMMAND AND CONTROL AGENCY (ASC2A)	2,946	-	2,946
0207131F	127	A-10 SQUADRONS	8,108	-	8,108
0207133F	128	F-16 SQUADRONS	112,520	-	126,920
		Goldstrike		14,400	
0207134F	129	F-15E SQUADRONS	112,670	-	112,670
0207136F	130	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	5,402	-	5,402
0207141F	131	F-117A SQUADRONS	4,807	-	4,807
0207161F	132	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	41,007	-	36,007
		Transfer to S&T		(5,000)	
0207163F	133	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	49,783	-	49,783
					196

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0207217F	134	PODDED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM	-	-	-
0207247F	135	AF TENCAP	10,102	-	10,102
0207248F	136	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	85,168	(3,900)	81,268
0207253F	137	COMPASS CALL	4,908	-	12,908
		Tactical Radio Acquisition and Countermeasures Subsystems (TRACS)		8,000	
0207268F	138	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	160,212	-	160,212
0207320F	139	SENSOR FUSED WEAPONS	11,785	-	11,785
0207325F	140	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	166,408	-	166,408
0207412F	141	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYSTEMS	467	-	467
0207414F	142	COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM	-	-	-
0207417F	143	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	33,393	-	55,793
		E-3 Computer Upgrades		17,100	
		GATM		5,300	
0207423F	144	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2,864	-	2,864
0207424F	145	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	73,336	-	73,336
0207428F	146	AIR WARFARE CENTER - NELLIS RANGE COMPLEX	-	-	-
0207433F	147	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	54,046	2,000	56,046
0207438F	148	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	43,727	-	43,727
0207581F	149	JOINT SURVEILLANCE & TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYS (JOINT STARS)	130,488	-	185,688
		Radar Technology Insertion Program (RTIP)		48,000	
		GATM		7,200	
0207590F	150	SEEK EAGLE	23,133	-	23,133

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.		FY 00	
				Request	Change
0207591F	151		ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	248,342	18,000
0207601F	152		USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	19,299	-
0207605F	153		WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,192	-
0208006F	154		MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	16,764	-
0208019F	155		TACTICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM (TIP)	1,467	-
0208031F	157		WAR RESERVE MATERIEL - EQUIPMENT/SECONDARY ITEMS	26,129	-
0208060F	158		THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES		17,300
			TAWS		
0208160F	159		TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	92,990	-
0208161F	160		SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	61,198	-
0301357F	165		NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	3,200	-
0302015F	167		E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	12,666	-
			GATM		8,300
0303110F	168		DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	8,985	-
			Transfer to S&T		(2,500)
0303131F	169		MIN ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	45,907	-
0303140F	170		INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	7,992	-
0303141F	171		GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	19,389	-
0303144F	172		JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER (JSC)		-
0303150F	173		GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,929	-
0303152F	174		WORLD-WIDE MIL C2 SYSTEMS, INFORMATION SYSTEM		-
0303601F	175		MILSATCOM TERMINALS	7,026	-
					198

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>Ln</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00</u>	<u>Recom</u>
			<u>Change</u>		
0304311F	177	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	3,000	-	3,000
0305099F	178	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	6,517	-	6,517
0305110F	179	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	61,918	-	51,618
		Transfer to S&T		(10,300)	
0305111F	180	WEATHER SERVICE	19,069	-	19,069
0305114F	181	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, & LANDING SYSTEM (ATCAL)	5,588	-	5,588
0305119F	182	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	1,179	-	1,179
0305128F	183	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	466	-	466
0305137F	184	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) PLAN	1,756	-	1,756
0305138F	185	INERTIAL UPPER STAGE (IUS)	-	-	-
0305144F	187	TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	45,379	-	45,379
0305158F	188	TACTICAL TERMINAL	239	-	239
0305159F	189	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	36,824	-	36,824
0305160F	190	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	21,535	-	21,535
0305164F	191	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYS (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	53,963	-	53,963
0305165F	192	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYS (SPACE & CONTROL SEGMENTS)	98,890	-	98,890
0305182F	194	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	43,186	-	43,186
0305205F	195	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	70,835	-	57,635
		Dark Star		(6,000)	
		Global Hawk		(7,200)	
0305206F	196	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	124,608	-	142,008
		JSAF-LBSS		17,400	

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>Ln</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00</u>	<u>Recom</u>
			<u>Change</u>		
0305207F	197	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS GATM	9,388	-	19,788
0305208F	198	SYERS Polarization DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS Eagle Vision	12,820	5,400 5,000	33,820
0305906F	199	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	16,408	21,000	16,408
0305910F	200	SPACETRACK (SPACE)	54,806	-	54,806
0305911F	201	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)	7,459	-	7,459
0305913F	202	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	14,430	-	14,430
0305917F	203	SPACE ARCHITECT	9,898	-	9,898
0305953F	204	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE (EEL V) (SPACE)	-	-	-
0308601F	205	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	1,069	-	1,069
0308699F	206	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	11,532	-	11,532
0401119F	207	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	63,041	-	63,041
0401130F	208	C-17 AIRCRAFT	170,718	-	170,718
0401214F	209	AIR CARGO MATERIAL HANDLING (463-L) (NON-IF)	502	-	502
0401218F	210	KC-135S	2,268	-	2,268
0702207F	211	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,500	-	1,500
0708011F	212	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	51,814	-	51,814
0708026F	213	PROD, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN. PROG OFC (PRAMPO)	9,382	-	9,382
0708071F	214	JOINT LOGISTICS PROGRAM - AMMUNITION STANDARD SYSTEM	11,333	-	11,333
0708611F	215	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	22,383	-	22,383

200

**Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)**

ACCOUNT	Ln		Request	FY 00	Recom
	No.			Change	
0804734F	216	CRYPTOLOGIC/SIGINT-RELATED SKILL TRAINING		-	-
0901218F	217	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	6,973	-	6,973
1001018F	218	NATO JOINT STARS		-	-
XXXXXXXX		TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM		(7,700)	(7,700)
XXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	4,360,261	-	4,360,261
		ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENTS		(51,900)	(51,900)
		TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, AF	13,077,829	489,479	13,567,308

Materials research

The committee remains concerned about the Air Force's decreasing budget for applied research in aerospace materials. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.2 million PE 62102F: \$3.0 million for the development of resin systems for Air Force engine applications; \$2.2 million for titanium matrix composites for airframe structures; and, \$2.0 million to complete development of friction welding techniques for aerospace applications.

Solid state electric oxygen generation

Solid state electrolyte oxygen separation techniques can supply pure oxygen at point-of-use. In addition to being easier to deploy and more compact, it is less expensive than traditional oxygen generation. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62202F to demonstrate the defense applications of this technology.

Space science and engineering

The Air Force Science Advisory Board has reported that one of the critical science and technology issues of the day is a decline in the present number and future supply of systems engineers that are trained and educated in space science and systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$775,000 in PE 62203F to pursue a curriculum to address this critical need. The committee expects that such a program would provide intensive instruction, as well as the "hands-on" experimentation in advanced, next generation space science and engineering technologies to meet immediate knowledge and skill needs of the current workforce of the Air Force, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other space related agencies.

Multi-spectral battlefield simulation

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 62203F to provide a multispectral synthetic battlespace simulation capability to address the critical needs of Air Force's advanced air and space sensor technologies.

Variable displacement vane pump technology

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 62203F to complete risk reduction for the variable displacement vane pump (VDVP). The variable geometry features of the VDVP will simplify aircraft thermal design and is expected to provide cost weight benefits to the KC-135 aircraft.

Applied research

The Air Force reduced its science and technology budget by \$94.6 million, which included a decrease of \$70.0 million in the applied research ("6.2") program. This program is used to take the most promising technologies from basic, or exploratory, research and apply them to defense needs. Basic and applied research make up the defense technology base which generates the legacy to tomorrow's warfighter. We must maintain a stable technology base in order to develop options for the truly long-term—beyond threats, situations, and budgets that we can predict. The committee rec-

ommends a specific increase of \$40.4 million for applied research. This increase addresses areas of critical need in the science and technology program that were zeroed out in the Air Force's fiscal year 2000 budget request. In order to restore stability to these particular accounts, the committee expects the funds to be executed as planned in the program objective memorandum (POM) for the fiscal year 1998 budget. The increase would be applied, as follows:

	<i>In millions of dollars</i>
PE 62269F Hypersonic technology program	16.6
PE 62601F Phillips Laboratory:	
Post-boost Control system	2.9
Missile propulsion technology	1.7
Tactical missile propulsion	3.0
Orbit Transfer Propulsion	3.0
Tropo-weather	2.5
Space survivability	0.6
HSI spectral sensing	0.8
PE 62702F Command Control Communications Tech:	
Electromagnetic technology	9.3

The increase would be offset with reductions in the following accounts: a decrease of \$14.0 million from the operating budget of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Air Force Chief of Staff; a decrease of \$5.8 million in PE 65808F for Developmental Planning; a decrease of \$1.6 million in PE 65807F for test and evaluation management support; a decrease of \$10.3 million in PE 35110F for research and development for the Air Force Satellite Control Network (AFSCN) and a decrease of \$1.2 million in Other Procurement, Air Force for AFSCN; a decrease of \$2.5 million in PE 33110F Defense Satellite Communications System (DSCS); and a decrease of \$5.0 million in PE 27161F for research and development related to the AIM-9X air-to-air missile.

High frequency active auroral research

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 62601F to continue experimentation in the high frequency active auroral research program.

Laser remote optical sensing research

Airborne remote sensing of chemical agents has potential to address a variety of military and intelligence missions including chemical weapons defense, information preparation of the battlefield, bomb damage assessment, weapons of mass destruction inspections, and counterdrug operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 62601F for the laser remote optical sensing research to provide capability for real-time standoff detection through the exploitation of light detection and ranging (lidar) technologies.

Aerospace structures

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63211F for development work in polymeric foam core applications. This low cost, damage tolerant material offers potential to reduce repair actions and maintenance costs on Air Force weapons systems. The committee directs the Air Force to pursue dual-use applications and industry cost sharing to the maximum extent possible.

Night vision technology

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million to complete the technology development of panoramic night vision goggles. This technology combines increased field of view with high resolution, integrated symbology, and close-to-face center of gravity with human effects improvements, such as reduced weight, reduced pilot fatigue, and ejection seat safety.

Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System

The budget request did not include funds for the Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System (MSTRS). The committee supports MSTRS to develop the capability to protect satellites from uplink jamming, interference, or intrusion. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63401F for the MSTRS program.

Standard protocol interpreter for satellite data links

The Air Force has integrated a variety of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) hardware and software products into systems for controlling and communicating with satellites. In addition, the Air Force is evaluating the possibility of utilizing COTS products for use in peripheral equipment. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63401F for development and testing of a standard protocol interpreter for communications devices for use in the military satellite communications network or other satellite networks.

Low altitude navigation and targeting infrared for night

The budget request included \$21.5 million in PE 63601F for the development of conventional weapons technology. None of these funds were allocated to upgrade the existing support system for the low altitude navigation and targeting infrared for night (LANTIRN) system. This upgrade ranks third on the Air Force fiscal year 2000 unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.6 million to upgrade the LANTIRN support system.

Joint strike fighter

The budget request included \$476.6 million (\$241.2 million in Navy research and development and \$235.4 million in Air Force research and development) for continued development of the joint strike fighter (JSF). Within that total, \$33.0 million is included for the alternate engine program. The committee remains concerned that development of an alternate engine for the JSF will not proceed to a point where it represents a viable alternative and reduces risk for the vertical and short take off and landing (V/STOL) JSF variant. The committee recommends an additional \$15.0 million in PE 63800F to reduce risk and accelerate development of the alternate engine, a total Air Force authorization of \$250.4 million.

Rocket Systems Launch Program

The committee has supported the Rocket Systems Launch Program (RSLP) and believes that this program provides an important means for utilizing excess strategic missile rocket motors. The com-

mittee recommends an increase of \$19.2 million in PE 63851F (project 1023) to demonstrate quick reaction launch capabilities.

B-2 advanced technology bomber datalink

The budget request included \$201.8 million for continued development of the B-2 bomber, with no funds allocated for the initiation of an effort to provide a datalink. The recently completed Air Force Bomber Roadmap identifies the Link-16 datalink, displayed on a center instrument display (CID), as a near-term modernization initiative for the B-2. A datalink is required on the B-2 to provide situational awareness to the flight crew, enhancing the capability to efficiently plan and execute missions. This capability was included on the Air Force modernization unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of \$37.0 million in PE 64240F to begin the integration of Link-16/CID into the B-2, a total authorization of \$238.8 million.

The committee understands considerable funding will be required to complete this project. The committee expects the Air Force to provide funding for the project in future budget requests.

Electronic warfare development

The budget request included \$90.3 million for consolidated engineering development efforts related to Air Force electronic warfare requirements. None of these funds were allocated for the precision location and identification project (PLAID), which is transitioning from an advanced technology development (ATD) to an engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) program. The committee understands that test flights have continued to be very successful, and that the Air Force is preparing to conduct a competition for EMD. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million in PE 64270F to continue risk reduction efforts and to preserve the knowledge gained through the ATD until a contract is awarded.

In testimony before the committee, the Commander in Chief of the Transportation Command (CINCTRANSCOM) highlighted threats that are faced by strategic airlift aircraft. The testimony indicated that one of the highest CINCTRANSCOM priorities is to improve aircraft capability to defend against the proliferating threat of shoulder-fired infrared (IR) guided missiles. The Air Force activities in PE 64270F include large aircraft advanced IR countermeasures (LAIRCM) activity. LAIRCM would demonstrate an advanced directed laser countermeasures suite for large signature aircraft as an engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) risk reduction.

The budget request also included \$8.9 million within PE 116404BB for Special Operations Forces aircraft defensive systems, including \$3.0 million to continue a joint U.S.-United Kingdom development effort for the directional infrared countermeasures (DIRCM) program. DIRCM, which is intended to protect larger multi-engine aircraft, is scheduled for a milestone III decision later in fiscal year 1999. The committee believes that the Air Force should investigate the potential employment of DIRCM on strategic airlift aircraft as a near-term opportunity to solve the CINCTRANSCOM problem. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million in PE 64270F, a total authorization of

\$104.3 million. The committee directs the Air Force to report the results of its investigation to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1, 2000.

Space Based Infrared System

The committee is concerned by the Air Force decision to delay the first launch of the Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS) High and Low systems by two years. The committee notes that by reducing the SBIRS High budget by \$395.0 million in fiscal year 2000, the Air Force will cause substantial program cost growth, and delay the fielding of this vital early warning and missile defense system. Especially in light of the recent launch failure of Defense Support Program satellite-19 (DSP-19), the decision to delay the SBIRS program has potentially significant detrimental consequences for U.S. early warning and missile defense capabilities.

The committee notes that the administration has stated its intention to submit an amended budget request to increase the SBIRS High program by \$92.0 million in fiscal year 2000. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$92.0 million in PE 64441F to fully fund the fiscal year 2000 portion of the revised SBIRS High program. Notwithstanding this decision, the committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should assess the possibility of restoring at least a portion of the schedule delay in light of the DSP-19 launch failure. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of the SBIRS High program, and to submit a revised SBIRS High program that fully funds and, to the extent possible, reverses delay in the program. The committee intends to closely monitor the SBIRS High program and directs the Secretary to submit a report on his review by February 15, 2000.

The committee is concerned that recent changes in Air Force acquisition strategy for SBIRS Low will defer needed risk reduction activities until Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD) and result in continued cost and schedule problems. These problems will likely result in either failure to deploy in fiscal year 2006 (despite a two-year slip from last year's budget), or a prolonged delay in reaching system full operational capability. The committee is concerned that the Air Force cancellation of the SBIRS Low flight demonstrations, after years of justifying their critical role in risk reduction for the EMD program, was driven by the low funding priority assigned to SBIRS Low, and not by an objective re-evaluation of the flight demonstration's utility.

The committee strongly believes that SBIRS Low is essential to ensure that national and theater missile defense systems have the flexibility and robustness to handle advanced threats and defend the largest possible areas. The reliable mid-course technical intelligence provided by SBIRS Low will also be critical for designing and updating interceptor terminal seekers. Based on these priorities, the committee believes the first constellation or block of SBIRS Low satellites should be designed for ballistic missile defense and mid-course technical intelligence missions. All other requirements are secondary and should not add technical risk, cost, and schedule delays to the program.

Given the above considerations, and the committee's general concern over Air Force management of SBIRS Low, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report regarding the requirements for SBIRS Low and how these relate to the technical risk and program schedule. The report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2000.

Wind corrected munitions dispenser

The budget request included no funds for development of the wind corrected munitions dispenser (WCMD) in fiscal year 2000 because the program should finish development and enter full-rate production in fiscal year 1999. The Department of Defense has informed the committee of a technical difficulty in the program, and has offered an offset for additional development funding in fiscal year 2000. The committee therefore recommends an increase of \$3.9 million in PE 64600F to complete WCMD development.

Life support systems

The budget request included \$6.1 million for life support systems development. The committee recommends an overall increase \$2.9 million, a total authorization of \$9.0 million.

\$2.0 million of the budget request was allocated for the initial engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) phase of the aircrew laser eye protection (ALEP) program. Laser hazards to aircrew are proliferating on the modern battlefield, and the committee recommends an increase of \$0.4 million in PE 64706F to accelerate this development effort.

The budget request did not include any funding for evaluating the use of inflatable restraint concepts during front line ejection equipment tests. The inflatable restraint system has the potential to reduce aircrew injuries during ejection by preventing limb flail. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in PE 64706F for this program.

Composite payload dispenser development for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle

The committee notes that the Air Force is developing a high stiffness composite payload dispenser for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program, but that insufficient funds exist in the budget request to acquire the necessary tools. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.5 million in PE 64853F to support this effort.

Air Force test and evaluation support

The budget request for Air Force Test and Evaluation support (PE 65807F) includes \$392.1 million. The committee recommends a decrease of \$30.0 million in PE 65807F. The committee remains concerned about the proportion of research, development, test and evaluation (RDTE) funding allocated to infrastructure and management support. This is especially alarming in the Air Force test and evaluation centers where a substantial portion of the operation costs are paid for through Operations and Maintenance accounts. To address these concerns, the committee directs the Comptroller General to review the financial management practices used by the

Services' test and evaluation centers to identify areas in which improvements could be made and determine the extent to which such efficiencies have been pursued and achieved.

Big Crow program office

The budget request did not specifically include funding for the Big Crow Program Office (BCPO). The Department of Defense operates the BCPO on a reimbursable basis. In the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, the conferees supported the need for a report on funding policy and management of the BCPO, as directed by the Senate (S. Rept. 105-189). On March 1, when this report was due, the committee was notified that the report was not yet complete, but would be submitted by April 30, 1999. The report has still not been submitted, even though the BCPO has been unable to generate enough reimbursable funding to operate both of its flying laboratories.

The BCPO provides services to many customers, including the Navy's Aegis program, the Ballistic Missile Defense Office, the Army Patriot air defense program, E-3A Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) program, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the North American Air Defense. The committee expects that the Department's investigation into the BCPO organization, management, and funding forecasts, a necessary result of the reporting requirement, will clearly determine the right course of action for this program. The committee understands that, with one aircraft platform scheduled for depot maintenance in fiscal year 2002, the Department may only retain one flying laboratory to provide this service.

The committee directs that both flying laboratories remain operable for conduct of BCPO operations until 90 days after the Department submits the report that outlines the plan. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to PE 65807F to allow for continued operations. The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report by March 1, 2000, which explores affordable alternatives to providing the services that are available through the BCPO.

B-52 upgrades

The budget request included \$64.3 million in PE 11113F for operational system development of the B-52 aircraft. The Air Force fiscal year 2000 unfunded requirements list includes three initiatives to modernize the B-52. The committee recommends an overall increase of \$41.4 million, a total authorization of \$105.7 million.

The first initiative involves the ALR-20 threat warning receiver, which was manufactured over 30 years ago. Many of the spare parts vendors are no longer in business. The committee recommends an increase of \$13.0 million to start the development effort to replace the B-52 primary threat warning receiver.

The second initiative involves the integration of the six Milstar communications vans (MCVs) into the mobile ground support system for the defense support program missile warning mission. This will ensure continued endurable and survivable missile warning and launch detection. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.4 million for MCV integration.

The third initiative involves the development of the global air traffic management (GATM) system for the B-52. GATM is required to maintain current oceanic access. The committee recommends an increase of \$26.0 million for GATM.

F-16 GOLDSTRIKE

The budget request included \$112.5 million for F-16 aircraft modernization efforts, but included no funds for development of the GOLDSTRIKE modification from a concept demonstrator to a combat-ready system. This modification adds a video imagery module to the improved data modem, allowing an aircraft to transmit and receive still target imagery from other aircraft and tactical aircraft control parties. The GOLDSTRIKE modification is ranked high on the Air Force unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of \$14.4 million in PE 27133F, a total authorization of \$126.9 million.

EC-130H Compass call

The budget request included \$4.9 million in PE 27253F for the continued development of the tactical radio acquisition and countermeasures subsystem (TRACS) for the EC-130H Compass Call aircraft. The Compass Call is a wide-area airborne offensive counter information system. TRACS replaces the aging compressive receiver suite with a digital, reprogrammable receiver. The program has been structured in two phases. The committee understands the second phase could now be accelerated to complete a clip-in TRACS-F capability in fiscal year 2002. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million, a total authorization of \$12.9 million.

Airborne warning and control system

The budget request included \$33.4 million for E-3 aircraft airborne warning and control system (AWACS) system modernization improvements. None of these funds were allocated for development of the global air traffic management (GATM), full integration of AWACS broadcast intelligence (BI), or AWACS data link infrastructure (DLI) modifications. These upgrades were all included on the Air Force unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of \$22.4 million in PE 27417F for these developments, a total authorization of \$55.8 million.

GATM modifications are required to maintain current airspace access on oceanic and continental routes in Europe. Rapid mobility and force projection is imperative as international airspace agencies impose tighter airspace restraints. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.3 million for E-3 GATM.

AWACS BI will re-host the software from a stand alone computer onto the AWACS mission computer, which will show intelligence contact reports on all needed consoles to display ground threats and provide cueing of air threats. AWACS DLI will reduce data latency from more than 40 seconds to less than one second, and greatly reduce annual maintenance cost. The committee recommends an increase of \$17.1 million for development of AWACS BI and DLI.

Joint surveillance/target attack radar system

The budget request included \$316.2 million for the procurement of one E-8C Joint Surveillance/Targeting Attack Radar System (JSTARS) aircraft and associated support. The request also included \$130.5 million in PE 27581F to continue various modernization efforts, with \$37.2 million for continuation of the radar technology insertion program (RTIP). The budget request does not include any funds for closing the JSTARS production line.

The Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) recommended the inventory objective for Air Force JSTARS aircraft be reduced from 19 to 13, with the assumption that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) would buy four to six aircraft for the NATO airborne ground surveillance program. NATO has not selected JSTARS for its requirement. The aircraft in the budget request will be the 14th Air Force JSTARS produced. The Air Force unfunded requirements list includes \$41.7 million for production line shutdown and last lot costs in fiscal year 2000. It is estimated that \$46.0 million would be required for long lead procurement should the Air Force decide that procurement of a 15th JSTARS aircraft is necessary. Last year, Department of Defense (DOD) witnesses testified that a review would be conducted to decide how DOD would meet the warfighting requirement that would have been met with 19 JSTARS aircraft. The Department has indicated that this review has not yet been concluded.

The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$46.0 million, a total procurement authorization of \$362.2 million, to be used, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, either for: (1) production line shutdown and last lot costs; or (2) long lead funding for aircraft number 15, if the Department reevaluates its need, and requests funding for a 15th JSTARS aircraft in the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

The budget request for RTIP supports a development program that would complete testing in fiscal year 2008. The committee has strongly supported the RTIP program and is interested in accelerating delivery of this capability. The Air Force believes that adding \$48.0 million to the fiscal year 2000 budget request could save roughly \$20.0 million, and accelerate the program by six months. The committee understands that, with additional funding in fiscal years 2001 to 2003, the Air Force could accelerate the program by two years and save more than \$140.0 million.

The Air Force unfunded requirements list also included a request for development of the global air traffic management (GATM) system in the E-8C, allowing it to maintain current access to oceanic routes and routes over continental Europe.

The committee, therefore, recommends an addition of \$48.0 million to accelerate the development of RTIP and an increase of \$7.2 million for GATM in PE 27578F, a total development authorization of \$185.7 million.

Numerous studies and real world operations have demonstrated that ground moving target indicator (GMTI) technology can enhance surveillance and reconnaissance capability. In addition to the JSTARS program, the Air Force is also evaluating alternative ways to provide GMTI data. These alternative approaches include the Discoverer II program, a joint DARPA/Air Force/National Re-

connaissance Office program to demonstrate GMTI from space, and the potential application of GMTI capability to unmanned aerial vehicles. The committee believes that fielding the GMTI capability more widely will depend heavily on reducing both the recurring and the nonrecurring costs for different GMTI applications. The technology for designing and building electronically scanned antennas (ESAs) may have progressed to the point that it may be reasonable to rely on a modular radar that could be scaled up or down, depending on the particular platform. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to investigate the potential for developing such a modular, scalable ESA-based radar for various GMTI applications. This examination should include a review of the potential life cycle costs and benefits of applying such a modular radar to various platforms, versus proceeding along different development and procurement paths for each system. The committee directs the Secretary to provide this report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2000.

Theater Airborne Warning System

The budget request included no funds for the Theater Airborne Warning System (TAWS). The committee has supported this program and continues to believe that it may offer a near-term means of augmenting Defense Support Program infrared missile warning data. The committee notes the conclusion of the Air Force's recent report on the TAWS demonstration phase, which indicated that "the test phase has been completed successfully with the timeline/accuracy predictions validated." Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$17.3 million in PE 28060F to complete non-recurring engineering and to proceed with implementation of the TAWS objective system.

E-4B national airborne operations center

The budget request included \$12.7 million for modernization development efforts for essential infrastructure and mission equipment for the E-4B national airborne operations center (NAOC). The budget request also included \$20.0 million for E-4 B aircraft modifications. The Air Force has included continued development and equipment procurement and installation of the global air traffic management (GATM) system for the NAOC on its unfunded requirements list. This modification will be required to maintain current access to oceanic and continental routes in Europe.

The committee recommends an increase of \$8.3 million in PE 32015F for E-4B GATM development, a total authorization of \$21.0 million.

The committee recommends an increase of \$6.9 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for E-4B GATM procurement, a total authorization of \$26.9 million.

Endurance unmanned aerial vehicles

The budget request included \$48.0 million for continuation of the advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD) of the Global Hawk and Dark Star endurance unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV). The Department canceled the Dark Star UAV program in fiscal year 1999. The committee believes that remaining fiscal year 1999

funds are adequate for program termination costs. The committee, therefore, recommends a decrease of \$6.0 million in PE 35205F programmed for the Dark Star evaluation in fiscal year 2000. In fiscal year 1999, Global Hawk flying quality flights were flown, and military utility flights were to commence in April. In March, 1999, a Global Hawk vehicle, with its sensors, went out of control and was destroyed. This crash has delayed the Global Hawk military utility study at least two months, which should generate additional funds for carryover into fiscal year 2000. The committee, therefore, recommends a decrease of \$7.2 million in PE35205F, a total authorization of \$34.8 million.

Airborne reconnaissance systems

The committee supports continued development of the joint signals intelligence (SIGINT) avionics family—low band subsystem (JSAF–LBSS). This system will provide all future SIGINT payloads with a standard architecture, thereby increasing SIGINT capability and reducing cost. The committee understands that if the JSAF–LBSS is to integrate next generation commercial off-the-shelf technologies, additional funding is required. The committee recommends an increase of \$17.4 million in PE 35206F for JSAF–LBSS.

RC-135 global air traffic management

The budget request included no funds for development of the global air traffic management (GATM) system modification for the RC-135 aircraft. This modification will allow continued access to oceanic and continental routes in Europe, and is on the Air Force's unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.4 million for development of the GATM modification in the RC-135.

Eagle Vision

The budget request included \$12.8 million in PE 35209F for distributed common ground systems, with \$6.1 million for a deployable commercial imagery collection and processing system, known as Eagle Vision. Funded at a low level throughout the Future Year Defense Program (FYDP), additional funding would help to accelerate meeting the Air Force requirement for commercial imagery direct-downlink. The committee recommends an increase of \$21.0 million for Eagle Vision, a total authorization of \$33.8 million.

Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism

The committee recommends that \$7.7 million be transferred from Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force to section 310(25), a newly-established central transfer account for funds to combat terrorism.

Defense-Wide

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>Ln No.</u>		<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00</u>	<u>Recom</u>
				<u>Change</u>	
		RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, DEFWIDE			
0601101D8	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	2,033	-	2,033
0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	64,293	-	64,293
0601103D8	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	216,778	-	216,778
0601105D8	4	GULF WAR ILLNESS	19,185	-	19,185
0601111D8	5	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIV RESEARCH	6,351	-	6,351
0601384BP	6	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	31,386	-	31,386
0602110E	7	NEXT GENERATION INTERNET	40,000	-	40,000
0602173C	8	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - APPLIED RESEARCH HFSWR	65,328	-	84,328
		Wide Band Gap Technologies		5,000	
0602227D8	9	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	9,719	14,000	13,719
		Research		4,000	
0602228D8	10	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENC	14,329	-	14,329
0602234D8	11	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	20,774	-	20,774
0602301E	12	COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	322,874	-	323,874
		Computer Security		1,000	
0602302E	13	EXTENSIBLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS	70,000	-	70,000
0602383E	14	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	145,850	-	145,850
0602384BP	15	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	64,780	-	69,780
		Safeguard		5,000	
0602702E	16	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	137,626	-	137,626

Title II-RDT

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0602708E	17		31,296	-	31,296
0602712E	18		235,321	-	235,321
0602715BR	19		203,512	-	208,512
		Deep Digger		5,000	
0602787D8	20		8,903	-	8,903
0305108K	21		1,968	-	1,968
0603002D8	22		2,007	-	2,007
0603104D8	23		11,183	-	11,183
0603120D8	24		-	-	-
0603121D8	25		-	-	-
0603122D8	26		52,223	-	52,223
0603160BR	27		81,245	-	81,245
0603160D8	28		-	-	-
0603173C	29		173,704	-	213,704
		Atmospheric Interceptor Technology		30,000	
		Scorpius		5,000	
		Excalibur		5,000	
0603225D8	30		14,786	-	14,786
0603232D8	31		7,775	-	7,775
0603285E	32		19,664	-	19,664
0603384BP	33		40,910	-	40,910
0603704D8	34		10,948	-	15,948

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln No.		Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
		Complex Systems Development		5,000	
0603711BR	35	VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	58,455	-	58,455
0603712S	36	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	17,336	-	19,336
		Product Data Engineering Tools		2,000	
0603716D8	37	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	53,506	-	53,506
0603727D8	38	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,872	-	17,872
		Joint Experimentation		10,000	
0603728D8	39	AGILE PORT DEMONSTRATION	-	-	-
0603738D8	40	COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH	-	-	-
0603739E	41	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	246,023	-	246,023
0603746E	42	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY	-	-	-
0603747E	43	ELECTRIC VEHICLES	-	-	-
0603750D8	44	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	117,969	-	117,969
0603752D8	45	COMMERCIAL TECHNOLOGY INSERTION PROGRAM	-	-	-
0603753S	46	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE RESOURCE CENTERS	-	-	-
0603755D8	47	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	159,099	-	162,099
		Visualization Research		3,000	
0603760E	48	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	222,888	-	222,888
0603761E	49	COMMUNICATION AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	-	-	-
0603762E	50	SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	232,319	-	232,319
0603763E	51	MARINE TECHNOLOGY	22,538	-	22,538
0603764E	52	LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	97,825	-	97,825
					215

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0603765E	53	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	77,780	-	77,780
0603800E	54	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEM/VAL	-	-	-
0603805E	55	DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAMS	-	-	-
0603805S	56	DUAL USE APPLICATION PROGRAMS	-	-	-
0603832D8	57	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	68,456	-	68,456
0605160D8	58	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	1,495	-	1,495
0603228D8	62	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	37,107	-	37,107
0603708D8	63	INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS	-	-	-
0603709D8	64	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	12,937	-	15,937
		Joint Robotics		3,000	
0603714D8	65	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,345	-	15,345
0603736D8	66	CALS INITIATIVE	1,652	-	3,652
		Integrated Data Environment		2,000	
0603790D8	67	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0603790T	68	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0603851D8	69	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	23,260	-	23,260
0603857J	70	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM (ASCJET)	-	-	-
0603861C	71	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - DEM/VAL	34,133	-	19,133
		Contractor Reimbursement		(15,000)	
0603868C	72	NAVY THEATER WIDE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM	329,768	-	449,768
		NTW Acceleration		70,000	
		NTW Radar Development		50,000	

216

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
				Change	
0603869C	73	MEADS CONCEPTS - DEM/VAL	48,597	-	48,597
0603870C	74	BOOST PHASE INTERCEPT THEATER MISSILE DEF ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL		-	-
0603871C	75	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	836,555	-	836,555
0603872C	76	JOINT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	195,722	-	200,722
		Liquid Target Development		5,000	
0603873C	77	FAMILY-OF SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION (FOS E&I)	141,821	-	141,821
0603874C	78	BMD TECHNICAL OPERATIONS	190,650	-	193,650
		Advanced Research Center		3,000	
0603875C	79	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	36,650	-	51,650
		Arrow Depolyability Program		15,000	
0603876C	80	THREAT AND COUNTERMEASURES	16,497	-	16,497
0603884BP	81	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL	62,033	-	71,233
		CBIRF		9,200	
0603892D8	82	ASAT		-	-
0603920D8	83	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	15,847	-	15,847
0603923D8	84	COALITION WARFARE	12,781	-	12,781
0605104T	85	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	353	-	353
0605110T	86	CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT		-	-
0604384BP	87	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - EMD	116,365	-	116,365
0604709D8	88	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM - EMD	12,004	-	12,004
0604764K	89	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	15,172	-	15,172
0604771D8	90	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	29,382	-	29,382
					217

Title II-RDT

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	Ln	No.	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
0604805D8	91		16,976	-	16,976
0604861C	92		577,493	-	577,493
0604865C	93		29,141	152,000	181,141
0604867C	94		268,389	-	268,389
0305889D8	95		-	-	-
0603858D8	96		1,226	-	1,226
0604942D8	97		4,900	-	4,900
0605104D8	98		29,506	-	29,506
0605104T	99		588	-	588
0605110BR	100		2,215	-	2,215
0605110D8	101		-	-	-
0605114E	102		5,000	-	5,000
0605116D8	103		2,000	-	2,000
0605117D8	104		34,937	40,000	74,937
0605122D8	105		3,299	-	3,299
0605126J	106		17,079	-	17,079
0605128BR	107		-	-	-
0605128D8	108		-	-	-
0605160BR	109		5,315	-	5,315
0605160D8	110		-	-	-
0605384BP	111		24,043	-	24,043
0605502BP	112		-	-	-

218

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>Ln</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00</u>	<u>Recom</u>
			<u>Change</u>		
0605502D8	113	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-	-	-
0605502E	114	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-	-	-
0605710D8	115	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	627	5,000	11,627
		Information Assurance Test Bed		6,000	
		Classified Program			
0605790D8	116	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION	1,713	-	1,713
0605798S	117	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	4,974	-	4,974
0605801K	118	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIC)	46,655	-	46,655
0605801S	119	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER	-	-	-
0605803S	120	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	8,261	-	8,261
0605898E	121	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	31,387	-	31,387
0908612C	122	ACQUISITION PROGRAM STABILITY RESERVE	-	-	-
0909999E	123	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-
0208045K	124	C3 INTEROPERABILITY	27,366	-	27,366
0208052J	125	JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,024	-	1,024
0302016K	128	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	613	-	613
0302019K	129	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	5,316	-	5,316
0303126K	130	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	1,316	-	1,316
0303127K	131	SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	4,274	-	4,274
0303131K	132	MIN ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	3,799	-	3,799
0303140G	133	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	232,661	-	317,661
		Information Assurance		85,000	

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln	ACCOUNT	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
134	0303149J	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	3,018	-	3,018
135	0303149K	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	388	-	388
136	0303153K	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	8,823	-	8,823
138	0305102BQ	DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	88,401	-	96,401
		Joint Mapping Tool Kit		8,000	
139	0305127V	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	437	-	437
140	0305159I	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	-	-	-
141	0305188J	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	-	-	-
142	0305190D8	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	9,480	-	14,480
		Strategic Technology Assessment		5,000	
143	0305204D8	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	-	-	-
144	0305205D8	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	-	-	-
145	0305206D8	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	-	-	-
146	0305206G	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	22,074	-	22,074
147	0305207D8	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	-	-	-
148	0305207G	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	8,494	-	8,494
150	0305208D8	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	-	-	-
152	0305208L	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	1,000	-	1,000
153	0305209D8	DARP INTEGRATION AND SUPPORT	-	-	-
155	0305885G	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	109,540	-	109,540
156	0305889G	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	-	-	-
157	0305898L	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (AUXILIARY FORCES)	-	-	-
					220

Title II-RDT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	L.n	No.	Request	FY 00	Recom
			Change		
0708011S	158	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,665	-	6,665
0902298J	159	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (OJCS)	9,531	-	9,531
0902740J	160	JOINT SIMULATION SYSTEM	18,421	-	18,421
0909999S	161	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-
1001017D8	162	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE ACTIVITIES	-	-	-
1160279BB	163	SM BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RES/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PROG	7,093	-	7,093
1160401BB	164	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,990	-	7,990
1160402BB	165	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	106,671	-	115,671
1160404BB	166	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	9,000	-	9,000
		CV-22 Modifications			
1160405BB	167	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,407	-	1,407
1160407BB	168	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,039	-	2,039
1160408BB	169	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	62,567	11,600	74,167
XXXXXXXX		TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM	1,048,214	(201,300)	(201,300)
XXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	180,000	180,000	1,228,214
		ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	(23,599)	(23,599)	(23,599)
		TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, DEFWIDE	8,609,289	512,901	9,122,190
		DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
0604940D8	1	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEI)	121,741	-	121,741
0605130D8	2	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	31,876	-	31,876
0605804D8	3	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	99,840	-	99,840

Recruitment and retention

The committee notes with concern that all military services are experiencing difficulties in the current recruiting environment. In view of expected continuing pressure on recruitment and to ensure the optimum use of military personnel, the committee recommends that of the funds authorized to be appropriated in PE 61103D, \$4.0 million be used to expand the Navy initiative to address the ascension, selection, and management of military personnel for all three services.

University research initiative

The committee commends the Department of Defense for including \$10.0 million in the budget request to continue efforts under the Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DEPSCoR) in fiscal year 2000 to broaden the infrastructure for universities that support national defense research. The committee recommends that in addition to the \$10.0 million provided in the budget request, an additional \$15.0 million of the funds authorized to be appropriated in PE 61103D should be used for this merit-based program.

Ballistic missile defense organization funding and programmatic guidance

The budget request included approximately \$3.3 billion for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E), and procurement. The committee's recommended funding allocations for BMDO are summarized in the following table. Additional programmatic and funding guidance is also provided below.

BMDO FUNDING ALLOCATION

[Millions of dollars]

Program	Request	Change	Recommendation
Support Technology	239.0	+59.0	298.0
THAAD	611.6	- 15.0	596.6
Navy Area ¹	323.4	323.4
Navy Theater Wide	329.8	+120.0	449.8
MEADS	48.6	48.6
NMD	836.5	836.5
Joint TMD	195.7	+5.0	200.7
PAC-3 ¹	330.0	+212.0	542.0
FOS E&I	141.8	141.8
BMD Tech Ops	190.6	+3.0	193.6
Int'l Coop Programs	36.6	+15.0	51.6
Threat/Countermeasures	16.5	16.5
BMDO Total	3,300.1	+399.0	3,699.1

¹ Procurement and RDT&E.

Support technology

The committee continues to support BMDO's wide bandgap electronics material development program. Higher speed and higher temperature operation afforded by wide bandgap electronic materials could enhance the miniaturization and functionality of advanced sensors and processing systems for space-based ballistic missile defense (BMD) sensors and ground-based radar systems.

The committee recommends an increase of \$14.0 million in PE 62173C to support this important activity.

The committee has supported research and development activities in the area of high frequency surface wave radar (HFSWR) technology and recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 62173C to continue this important effort.

The committee continues to support the Atmospheric Interceptor Technology (AIT) program to develop advanced interceptors with potential applications for a range of theater missile defense (TMD) programs. The committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million in PE 63173C to continue the AIT program and directs that, of this amount, \$2.0 million be utilized to develop advanced integrated missile structures and airframes.

The committee has supported BMDO's efforts to evaluate innovative and low cost launch concepts, especially those utilizing pressure-fed rocket engine technology. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63173C to support the Scorpius concept and an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63173C to support the Excalibur concept.

National missile defense

The committee is pleased that the administration has finally decided to fully fund development and procurement of a limited National Missile Defense (NMD) system. The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for his leadership in securing the necessary funding increase and in recognizing the fact that the threat is expected to justify deployment of an NMD system. The committee believes that BMDO and the Navy should also begin to evaluate options for supplementing the initial ground based NMD architecture with sea-based assets, including an upgraded version of the Navy's Theater Wide theater missile defense system. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a follow-on study to supplement the analysis that was included in the 1998 report entitled Utility of Sea-Based Assets to National Missile Defense. This report shall address the engineering steps that would be needed to develop a sea-based NMD system to supplement the ground-based NMD system. The study should evaluate requirements, performance benefits, design trade-offs, operational impacts, and refined cost estimates. The committee directs the Secretary to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2000, on this follow-on effort.

Theater high altitude area defense (THAAD) system

The budget request included \$527.9 million for THAAD demonstration and validation (Dem/Val) and \$83.7 million for THAAD engineering and manufacturing development (EMD). The committee continues to support the development, production, and fielding of THAAD as a matter of highest priority. As addressed elsewhere in this report, the committee does not support BMDO's revised upper tier acquisition strategy. The committee believes that decisions regarding the THAAD schedule and budget should be determined based on the performance of the THAAD test program and not an artificial competition with the Navy Theater Wide system. The committee remains concerned by what appears to be a

continuing pattern of quality control problems in the THAAD test program. The committee believes that if these problems are not resolved quickly, the entire THAAD program may be jeopardized. The committee notes that DOD will be reimbursed \$15.0 million by the THAAD contractor, pursuant to an agreement between DOD and the contractor, as a result of the last THAAD flight failure. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$15.0 million in PE 63861C.

Navy theater wide

The committee continues to support the Navy Theater Wide (NTW) program. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to accelerate this important development program to the extent permitted by the pace of technology development. The committee is concerned that necessary radar improvements have not kept up with developments in the NTW interceptor missile system. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$50.0 million for continuation of the Navy's competitive development of an advanced radar for theater missile defense. The committee notes that, despite being informed that the NTW program was fully funded in the Fiscal Year 2000 budget request, neither the Navy nor BMDO requested funding for the development of the radar necessary for the NTW system. The committee expects future budget requests to include funding required for all aspects of the NTW program, including radar development. The committee also recommends an increase of \$70.0 million for NTW acceleration, for an overall increase of \$120.0 million in PE 63868C.

BMD technical operations

The committee supports the efforts being performed at the Army Space and Strategic Defense Command's Advanced Research Center (ARC). The ARC continues to be a valuable tool in support of the Army's development of both theater and national missile defense systems. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63874C for support of the ARC.

International cooperative programs

The budget request included \$36.6 million for BMDO's International Cooperative Programs, which includes funding for the Arrow ballistic missile defense system. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million in PE 63875C to support the Arrow Deployability Program.

BMD targets

The committee is concerned that current TMD surrogate targets do not sufficiently represent ballistic missile threats based on liquid fuel engines. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to begin development of a new liquid fueled target, or family of targets. To support this effort, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63872C.

Patriot PAC-3

The committee remains concerned by the cost growth and schedule delays in the Patriot PAC-3 program, but understands that the

technical difficulties that caused these problems have been resolved. The committee notes that the most recent flight test of the PAC-3 system was successful and that the program is scheduled to fly again shortly. If the next flight test is successful, the PAC-3 system will be authorized to proceed into low-rate initial production, assuming sufficient funds are available. The committee has approved a reprogramming of \$60.0 million in fiscal year 1999 funds from procurement to help offset funding problems in the EMD program. The committee notes that even with this reprogramming, the EMD program remains under-funded in the fiscal year 2000 budget request by \$152.0 million. In addition, the fiscal year 1999 reprogramming has left a \$60.0 million shortfall in fiscal year 2000 budget request for procurement, which would preclude commencement of low-rate initial production during fiscal year 2000. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$152.0 million in PE 64865C for PAC-3 EMD, and an increase of \$60.0 million in Procurement, Defensewide, for PAC-3 procurement.

Boost-phase intercept

The committee is aware that BMDO and the government of Israel have examined options for boost-phase intercept (BPI) of ballistic missiles, and the possibility of a joint U.S.-Israeli program using unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) to defeat ballistic missiles in the boost-phase or missile launchers following the launch of a missile. The committee understands that to date there is no agreement between the two governments on the potential merits of the options considered, nor has agreement been reached on a joint program.

Believing that the ability to defeat ballistic missiles before and during their launch phase could significantly enhance the security of the United States and its allies, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the technical and operational feasibility of such a joint program, and determine if the missile defense benefits would justify initiating a joint U.S.-Israel BPI-attack operations program employing UAVs. The study shall include an assessment of whether a BPI-attack operations program can be developed that supports U.S. and Israeli requirements, whether the United States would support a program that is oriented primarily or exclusively toward satisfying Israeli requirements, and whether DOD supports an attack operations UAV system that does not include BPI capabilities. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report on these matters to the congressional defense committees not later than February 15, 2000.

Medical free electron laser

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 62227D to ensure reasonable stability for the program in fiscal year 2000. The committee notes that this program continues to make breakthroughs in a number of areas of importance to military medicine, including soft tissue surgery, thermal and chemical burn treatment, sepsis control, and wound healing.

Computer security system development

The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 62301E to complete demonstrations underway at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) on computer system concepts that utilize random network paths and computer redundancy techniques to reduce the vulnerability of military information technology systems.

Weapons of mass destruction related technologies

The budget request included \$203.5 million for weapons of mass destruction related technologies (PE 62715BR) of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA). There continues to be a growing threat posed by critical military facilities within hardened, deeply buried tunnel complexes. DTRA is pursuing technologies to detect, attack, and neutralize hard and deeply buried underground facilities through the Hard Target Defeat Program. The committee notes the continuing success of the Deep Digger development program and supports an increase of \$5.0 million to PE 62715BR for continued development and testing of Deep Digger.

Complex systems design

The Department of Defense currently employs a number of computer-based synthesis and analysis tools that advance all phases of the life cycle of complex defense systems. From concept design, through development and production, and throughout life cycle ownership of a complex system, these tools have dramatically improved the efficiency and reduced the costs of each discrete phase. However, since each tool employs its own unique data representation and data storage mechanism, there exists, with few exceptions, no substantial interoperability between tools at the semantic level for interchange of similar data structures. This inability to collaborate results in a development process that remains largely manual, with no means for even semi-automated configuration management of the total project design.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63704D to pursue the development of complex systems design program that would allow for an integrated digital environment for complex systems design. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program.

Product data engineering tools

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63712S to support the development of the on-demand electronic logistics support toolset. This technology has the potential to substantially reduce the cost and lead time for the acquisition of non-standard circuit cards essential for operational readiness and sustainability.

Joint warfighting program

The budget request included \$7.9 million to support joint warfighting program requirements. The committee strongly supports ongoing efforts within the Department of Defense to focus more attention on joint experimentation activities and commends

the progress made in this area. The committee believes that joint experimentation will continue to be a critical tool required to develop joint service warfighting requirements, doctrinal improvements, and further promote the values and benefits of joint operations that are expected to be the focus of future warfighting and contingency operations. The committee understands there are further opportunities for joint experimentation that could not be supported within the resource limitations of the fiscal year 2000 budget. The committee believes the concepts associated with information operations and homeland defense merit immediate attention through the joint experimentation process. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million for the purposes of expanding projected joint experimentation activities for fiscal year 2000.

High performance visualization program

Advances in telecommunications, high performance computing, and computer networking have created opportunities to overcome many of the challenges of remote visualization, collaborative exploitation of high performance computing modernization capabilities, and distance learning expansion. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63755D for the high performance visualization program to exploit these advances. This program addresses the challenges of visually displaying large amounts of data to warfighters and scientists who are physically located away from the source of the data.

Joint robotics program

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 64709D to complete engineering and manufacturing development efforts for the Vehicle Teleoperation Capability. This technology has shown potential for avoiding life cycle costs for a family of systems that are of growing importance to the mission of the warfighters.

Integrated data environment technology

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63726D for the continuous acquisition life-cycle support initiative's integrated data environment program. This technology addresses the critical issues of life cycle costs and logistic support for the warfighter.

Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force detector technologies

The Marine Corps has a requirement for chemical and biological detectors and analyzers with greater sensitivity than devices currently fielded. The Chemical and Biological Individual Sampler (CBIS) program is a research initiative to develop a sampler/analyzer to be worn by individuals. The CBIS would be capable of monitoring low level chemical/biological agent exposure. The Small Unit Biological Detector (SUBD) program develops technologies for a man-portable biological detector system. The committee supports the CBIS and SUBD research and development initiatives and recommends an increase in PE 63384BP of \$9.2 million, to be distrib-

uted as follows: \$4.0 million for the CBIS program to evaluate Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) technologies for passive detection capabilities and to develop technologies to support a real-time integrated sampler; and \$5.2 million for the SUBD program to complete phase I and II testing and provide an engineering prototype. The committee expects that the full amount specified will be provided for the CBIS and SUBD programs.

Joint mapping tool kit

The committee has supported the development of the Joint Mapping Tool Kit (JMTK) by the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA). The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in PE 35102BQ for continued development of the JMTK and the NIMA viewer.

Strategic technology assessment program

The committee supports the Strategic Technology Assessment Program. This program has produced significant results in tracking the effects of foreign technology development. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 35190D8 for continuation of this program and urges the Department of Defense to sustain this program in the future.

Special operations tactical system development

The budget request included \$106.7 million for special operations tactical system development activities. The committee supports the Special Operations Command CV-22 procurement program and recognizes the increased capability these aircraft will provide. The committee is concerned that the current plans call for the fielding of CV-22 aircraft for initial operating capability without aircraft survivability and countermeasures equipment that are programmed to be retrofitted after fielding. The committee understands that there is an opportunity to insert the wiring and structural changes into the production line in time for production build-up, to provide for a more capable aircraft. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$9.0 million in PE 1160404BB, a total authorization of \$115.7 million. This will result in an ultimate savings of \$15.0 million that would have been required for expensive retrofit requirements.

Special operations operational enhancements

The committee recommends an increase of \$11.6 million for a classified program.

Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism

The committee recommends that \$201.3 million be transferred from Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide to section 310(25), a newly-established central transfer account for funds to combat terrorism.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Advanced SEAL delivery system

The advanced SEAL delivery system (ASDS) is a mini-submarine designed to carry a Navy Sea-Air-Land (SEAL) squad or other military services' Special Operations Forces (SOF). The ASDS will eliminate exposure to cold water inherent with in-service wet submersible swimmer delivery vehicles. The ASDS will operate in a variety of environments, including those that pose a mine warfare threat. The degaussing system on the ASDS is fully designed, but only partially installed. The program office has indicated its plan to field ASDS without a fully operational degaussing system and without conducting a shock test on the ASDS. The committee evaluates the degaussing system as vital survivability equipment. Since ASDS is a unique design with a number of hull penetrations and external equipment not normally found on a manned submersible dry underwater vehicle, the committee evaluates a shock test as a minimum requirement for the program. Therefore, the committee directs the Special Operations Command to restrict ASDS operations to training operations only until shock testing can be completed and the degaussing system is fully operational.

Aerostructures

In recent years, the Department of Defense has pursued significant cost reduction efforts in the development and production of polymer matrix composites (PMC) structures for aerospace applications. The improved performance of these PMC structures in military aircraft applications has driven the manufacturing technology and process programs to continue to look for affordability improvements. The committee has recently become aware of collaborative efforts between the automotive industry and the aluminum industry, which has resulted in significant improved performance while reducing cost. With aircraft structure representing approximately 25 percent of the cost of an aircraft, the committee believes the Department should investigate these recent achievements between the automotive and aluminum industries for potential long-term applications for use in aerostructure manufacturing.

Biological hazard research

The committee is concerned that there is insufficient knowledge of the full impact and hazards to humans, animals, and plants from the potential use of biological warfare agents. Besides the obvious lethal effects on living organisms, biological warfare agents could have other very serious long-term consequences that would require a dedicated mitigation response or prophylaxis. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to pursue research and development of the technologies and methods for better measuring and understanding the full range of impacts of biological warfare hazards to people and other living organisms, and thus improve our ability to develop suitable preparations or responses to such hazards. In this effort, the Department should seek to harness existing expertise in bio-logical hazard research.

Commercially based tactical truck program

Commercially Based Tactical Truck Program (COMBATT) is a dual-use applications program that is being executed by the National Automotive Center in close partnership with the automotive industry. The goals of the program are to demonstrate a commercially based troop/cargo carrier variant of the High Mobility Multi-purpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV), and to demonstrate HMMWV remanufacture/modernization possibilities. The Army is expected to complete its initial evaluation of the prototypes produced by this program in fiscal year 2000.

While it would be premature to add additional funding before the evaluation of the prototypes is complete, the committee is concerned that the absence of funding in fiscal year 2000 could lead to a discontinuity in the COMBATT program if the evaluation proves successful. If the evaluation shows the technology to be promising, the committee urges the Army to reprogram sufficient funds in fiscal year 2000 to continue the program for the balance of the fiscal year, and to include any additional funding that may be appropriate in the fiscal year 2001 budget submission.

Computer emergency response teams

The committee has followed the National Guard Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT) pilot program, which currently includes five such teams. The committee believes that there may be an advantage to expanding this program to include additional teams. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to evaluate whether it would be cost effective to expand the National Guard CERT pilot program, possibly to a nationwide effort covering 54 states and territories. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on his findings and recommendations by February 15, 2000.

Department of Defense support of commercial space sector

In the past, dependence upon space assets was largely a requirement of the national security community. Now, commercial dependence on space assets is rapidly out-pacing that of the military. As a result, the Department of Defense's (DOD) support of the commercial space program has grown and will continue to do so in the future. This support—subsidizing space launches today and protecting space assets in the future—will place an increasing burden on the DOD and military services. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the costs and responsibilities of the DOD that provide, or will in the future provide, benefits to the commercial sector. The committee directs the Secretary to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2000. The Secretary shall include in the report any recommendations he may have on how to apportion such costs between DOD and the private sector, an assessment of current and future threats to U.S. satellites, and any recommendations for legislation or changes to existing statutory authority the Secretary determines to be necessary.

Focus: HOPE

Focus: HOPE's Center for Advanced Technologies (CAT) integrates hands-on manufacturing training and academic learning within a production setting and educates advanced manufacturing engineer-technologists at world-class levels. TEC Machining, Inc., which comprises the advanced manufacturing activities for the CAT, provides rapid parts production and just-in-time deliveries of high precision machined components and assemblies for the Department of Defense. Earlier this year, TEC Machining, Inc. was commended by the Defense Logistics Agency for contributing to the effectiveness of the Kosovo mission by providing rapid manufacturing and delivery of brake shoes that were needed to avoid delay in the shipment of trucks to the Kosovo theater of operations. The committee urges the Department of Defense to continue to work proactively with Focus: HOPE, the Center for Advanced Technologies, and TEC Machining, Inc. to meet the Department's critical needs.

Inter-cooled recuperated gas turbine engine

The budget request included \$17.7 million to complete the development portion of the "Essential Program" for the intercooled recuperated (ICR) gas turbine engine program. At that time the program will be transitioned to the United Kingdom and France for management of the qualification portion of the program, with the United States remaining engaged to ensure that qualification testing complies with U.S. Navy requirements.

The committee continues to support the ICR gas turbine engine as a viable candidate for future ship propulsion.

Integrated power systems

The budget request included \$25.7 million for integrated power systems (IPS) development. This program is designed to explore technologies required to develop power systems that could provide innovative means of generating, controlling, distributing, and using electricity in future ships. Propulsion motor development is a central focus of these explorations by the Navy and, independently, by commercial entities.

A recent Navy report entitled A Report to Congress on Navy Common Integrated Electric Drive Systems, addressed electric drive alternatives for future submarines, surface combatants, and aircraft carriers. That study reached several conclusions, to include: (1) the radial-gap permanent magnet motor has the power density, acoustic performance, and maturity of technology to be a viable propulsion motor common to the broadest range of ships; and (2) superconducting homopolar motors are not considered a viable solution for electric drive at this time. The committee believes that broad application is an important aspect of reducing life cycle costs to make the fleet of the future more affordable.

The committee understands that the Navy is considering an expansion of the integrated power system program to include permanent magnet motor technology. The committee encourages the Navy to take this step, however, the committee also expects the Navy to continue the technology base investment in superconducting alternatives as well, despite the fact that these tech-

nologies will not be mature enough for immediate applications such as DD-21.

National technology alliance

The National Technology Alliance (NTA) is a partnership of the National Media Laboratory, the National Information Display Laboratory and the National Center for Applied Technologies. The NTA has proven its ability to rapidly apply commercial technology to military applications enhancing situational awareness and ensuring insertion of state-of-the-art commercial hardware and software. The committee encourages program managers to examine the following key technology efforts by NTA for application to their programs:

- (1) design of command center sites to improve information flow with full implementation of commercially-based technology solutions resulting in state-of-the-art technology insertion capability for the life of the center;
- (2) using visualization to help situational awareness: integration of visualization capabilities into Naval intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance systems that can be deployed to a commander in chief (CINC) command center, and three-dimensional (3-D) visualization capabilities for command and control applications;
- (3) establishment of a digital video test bed program to assist government agencies in selecting information technology formats for battle space surveillance, target detection, and bomb damage assessment;
- (4) evaluation of efficacy of commercial communications systems for military applications and demonstration of utility of self-configuring, diagnosing, and fixing networks; and
- (5) managing information transfer: application of multimedia "data models" to facilitate rapid situational awareness and protection of user information.

The technologies and expertise of NTA are particularly suited to information technology intensive activities and may enhance ongoing visualization and data base management efforts. New ship construction programs and programs such as the Area Air Defense Commander Program are examples of programs that should consider NTA expertise and off-the-shelf software and hardware.

Personnel safety and survivability

The Navy is developing systems that will use state-of-the art technology to reduce manpower, improve quality of life, and enhance situational awareness. One of these efforts has been described as a sailor safety and survivability issue. However, the Navy is in the process of determining requirements and conducting preliminary analysis of systems that have potential to contribute to the situational awareness aboard future ships. The committee supports enhancing situational awareness and encourages the Navy to continue efforts including consideration of man overboard indicator technologies.

Precision strike and air defense technology

The budget request included \$52.6 million for precision strike and air defense technology, PE 63238N. The budget did not include any funds for project R2266, mobile offshore basing (MOB). The committee understands that an assessment of the technical feasibility of this project through early engineering and design studies is nearly complete, but that an operational concept has not been refined. Information provided to the committee indicates that \$1.0 million of the \$5.0 million appropriated in fiscal year 1999 is for the Department of Defense to conduct a joint assessment of MOB, and that this assessment has not yet been conducted. The committee cannot determine whether the Department supports this project, and questions whether the program has been placed in the appropriate organization for execution.

Research in advanced optics

The committee recognizes the work being performed at the Air Force's Center for Advances Optics. Current research in the field of adaptive optics is providing new capabilities and improvements in resolution and image sharpness permitting precise location and identification of threats and increasing the effectiveness of high energy weapons. The committee expects the Air Force to continue to support this important research.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to initiate an analysis of the operational utility of MOB, and report back to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2000. The analysis should include the results of the technical feasibility studies, assessment of the operational utility versus the life cycle cost of such a system, and a recommendation on whether or not to proceed with pre-development or development activities. If the recommendation is to proceed, the Department should designate an executive service with an estimate of fiscally phased resources for project execution.

Robotics and intelligent machines

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has an important need for technologies involving robotics and intelligent machines across a wide variety of national defense applications, but no coherent long range plan for developing this key enabling area. Fundamental and more broad-range advances in robotics and intelligent machines are vital to accomplish such defense missions as agile manufacturing techniques for defense hardware, flexible systems for maintaining military equipment with complex shapes, the development of small, "smart" robots for battlefield applications, and advanced material handling systems for improved defense logistics support.

The committee has noted in previous National Defense Authorization Acts that the Department of Energy (DOE) has analogous needs for robotics and intelligent machines for its defense missions. Under the committee's direction, the DOE has produced both a technology roadmap for robotics and intelligent machines and a draft program plan for integrating its previously fragmented programs into a program capable of fundamental and more long-range advances.

The committee directs the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to review the technology roadmap produced by the DOE and to prepare an analogous roadmap for robotics and intelligent machines technologies needed for DOD missions. The committee encourages DARPA to work cooperatively with DOE and other federal agencies in fostering better coordination and communication among federal robotics and intelligent machines research and development programs.

Smart ship manpower reduction initiative

The budget request included no funding for research and development of technologies which could lead to manpower reductions resulting from altering food service operations on ships. Food service operations on ships is manpower intensive in preparing and serving food, cleaning of food service areas, and maintaining food service equipment. Civilian cruise ships have developed technologies and methods of food service operations at sea that may be applicable to Navy ships. The Navy is encouraged to investigate methods of reducing manpower required for food service operations at sea, while maintaining quality and freshness of meals.

Space launch reliability assessment

The committee is extremely concerned by the recent series of space launch failures, including the loss of three Air Force Titan IV boosters and their associated payloads, and several commercial launch vehicles and their associated payloads. The committee notes that there does not appear to be a discernable pattern of technical failures that would offer a clear explanation. Nonetheless, the committee is concerned that the U.S. launch capability may be suffering from a system-wide erosion of skill, quality control, and appropriate management. In many ways, such an explanation would be more alarming than any specific technical problem. Based on these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a detailed review of U.S. space launch capabilities, including management, quality control, and government oversight, and possible ways that the system can be improved. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report on the findings of his review to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2000. The committee also directs the Secretary to evaluate all possible means of reducing the likelihood of additional launch failures in the near-term, pending the outcome of his review.

Starstreak missile

The committee supports consideration of the Starstreak missile system as potential candidate for future Army rotary wing air-to-air missile capability. The committee understands, however, that the Army has not yet elected to pursue the procurement of a missile for rotary wing aircraft self-protection due to a perceived near-term limited threat. In fact, the committee notes that while there is an existing mission needs statement for an air-to-air missile, a formal requirement has not yet been established. The committee is concerned that the initiative designed to promote a side-by-side evaluation of both Starstreak and Stinger missiles in an air-to-air mode, recently included a proposal to prohibit funding for an ongo-

ing effort to upgrade existing Stinger missiles employed worldwide in a surface-to-air mode, suggesting that Starstreak should also compete for that requirement. The committee does not support such a Stinger funding limitation, as it is clear that existing ground employed Stinger missiles must be improved to ensure they are able to engage a wider range of targets and to provide the air defense protection required. A prohibition on the funding for planned upgrades to the existing surface-to-air Stinger missile, in support of an open competition for a future air-to-air capability, would ignore the critical need for the Army to ensure the safety of maneuver for ground forces through a modernized ground-based air defense system. The Army currently employs approximately 885 Avenger systems and will have an inventory of over 30,000 Stinger missiles, which must be modernized. The committee believes that any procurement of an air-to-air missile system in the future should be based on a competitive evaluation of all candidate systems, including the Starstreak missile. The committee understands and supports Army efforts to modernize Stinger to meet surface-to-air requirements. However, the committee expects the Army to evaluate thoroughly both Stinger and Starstreak capabilities prior to selecting a missile of choice for any emerging air-to-air requirement. The committee directs the Army provide a report to the Congress by April 1, 2000, describing the test and evaluation activity completed through fiscal year 1999, an evaluation of the threat, and any corresponding programmatic conclusions on plans or programs necessary to provide an air-to-air capability when warranted.

Maintaining a strong navy

The committee has been concerned for some time that the Department of Defense's shipbuilding program is creating a ship procurement problem that could manifest itself in significant Navy ship force structure problems in the second decade of the 21st Century. The Congressional Research Service (CRS) reports that years of relatively low ship procurement rates will result in a large ship procurement "bow wave" within the same time frame that many ships currently in service are projected to reach the end of their service lives. CRS projects the fleet will shrink to substantially less than 300 ships—the Navy's stated planning goal—in the 2020s, if procurement rates of eight to ten ships are not sustained by the Department of Defense (DOD).

DOD witnesses testified that maintaining a 300-ship Navy over time requires a steady state build rate of eight to ten ships per year. In addition, and of greater concern to the committee, Navy witnesses testified that even with the current 324 ships, the Navy and Marine Corps are being strained to keep up with regional commander in chief (CINC) requests for naval presence and National Command Authority direction to respond to contingency operations.

As a result of low procurement rates in previous years, it is projected that the Navy will have a 28-ship deficit that will grow to a 53-ship deficit in 20 years if the build rate is not maintained at eight to ten ships per year. Unfortunately, DOD has provided few specifics on the planned size of Navy force structure beyond calendar 2015 and how it intends to address the impending ship

shortfall problem beyond “new ways of doing business,” such as lowering acquisition costs or reducing the size of ships’ crews.

The administration has acknowledged the shipbuilding shortfall by recommending to Congress an increase of \$6.1 billion for eight new construction ships over the previously planned fiscal year 2000 budget submission. Nevertheless, the Navy has testified that this is only a step in the right direction. The committee is particularly concerned that the budget increases required to buy-down the bow wave may make it difficult, if not impossible, to maintain a 300–ship fleet. In short, the DOD plan to maintain a 300–ship Navy is becoming a visible symbol of the procurement shortfall that exists across all the services. At a time when naval forces are being called upon with increasing frequency, when we are confronted with ever-changing and challenging capabilities of potential adversaries, and when critical ocean areas are without CINC-requested aircraft carrier battle groups, the risk of deferring a commitment to a sustained shipbuilding rate needed to recapitalize the U.S. Navy of the next century must be clearly understood.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the defense committees, along with the submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2001 a report which:

- (1) details the Department’s long-range shipbuilding plan through fiscal year 2030;
- (2) describes the annual funding required to procure eight to ten ships per year in the correct mix, beginning in fiscal year 2001 and extending until fiscal year 2020, to maintain the force structure verified in the Quadrennial Defense Review; and
- (3) addresses the implications and risks of not adhering to such a long-range plan for shipbuilding.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The budget request included \$102.9 billion for the operation and maintenance of the armed forces and component agencies of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2000.

The operations and maintenance (O&M) accounts include approximately 36 percent of the total Defense programs. Expenditures from these accounts pay the costs for the day-to-day operations of our military forces; all individual, unit, and joint training for military members; maintenance and support of the weapons, vehicles, and equipment in the military services; purchase and distribution of spare parts and supplies to support military operations; and support, maintenance, and repair of buildings and bases throughout the Department of Defense.

The funding in these accounts has a direct impact on the combat readiness of U.S. military forces. While insufficient O&M funds would lead to problems with short-term or current readiness, excessive and unnecessary O&M expenditures for low priority or non-defense programs only serve to restrict the availability of funds for modernization programs.

The committee recommends a provision (sec. 301) that would authorize approximately \$104.0 billion for the O&M accounts for fiscal year 2000, an increase of more than \$1.0 billion from the budget request.

The committee also recommends a provision (sec. 304) that would, to the extent provided in an appropriations act, transfer \$150.0 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund to the military services O&M accounts.

The committee further recommends a provision (sec. 302) that would authorize \$335.0 million for the revolving and management funds.

Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 2000 for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted explicitly in the report, all changes are made without prejudice.

SUBTITLE A - AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Summary of National Defense Authorization for FY 2000

(In Thousands of \$'s)

TITLE III

OPERATION and MAINTENANCE & WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Recommended
Operation and Maintenance, Army	18,660,994	(320,900)	18,340,094
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	22,238,715	(56,100)	22,182,615
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,558,929	53,600	2,612,529
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	20,363,203	19,200	20,382,403
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	11,419,233	(456,200)	10,963,033
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,369,213	7,600	1,376,813
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	917,647	9,700	927,347
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	123,266	2,500	125,766
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,728,437	(1,600)	1,726,837
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	2,903,549	8,700	2,912,249
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,099,618	19,900	3,119,518
Office of the Inspector General	138,744	(500)	138,244
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	7,621		7,621
Environmental Restoration, Army	378,170		378,170
Environmental Restoration, Navy	284,000		284,000
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	376,800		376,800
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	25,370		25,370
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	199,214		199,214
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	55,800		55,800
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	788,100	(42,835)	745,265

**Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2000**
(In Thousands of \$'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Recommended
Combating Terrorism	0		
Defense Health Program	10,477,687	1,954,430	1,954,430
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	475,500	(24,200)	10,453,487
Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Fund	15,000		475,500
Overseas Contingency Operation Transfer Fund	2,387,600		15,000
QOL Enhancements	1,845,370		2,387,600
Defense Transfer Program	31,000		1,845,370
Overseas Military Facility Investment			31,000
Miscellaneous Special Funds			
Defense Burdensharing-Allies/Nato			
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	102,868,780	1,173,295	104,042,075
REVOLVING FUNDS			
Defense Working Capital Fund (Air Force)	28,000		28,000
Army Working Capital Fund	62,344		62,344
National Defense Sealift Fund	354,700	40,000	394,700
Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service	67,000	(67,000)	0
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Routine & Ongoing Sales)	(150,000)		(150,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Excess of Routine Sales)			
Subtotal Working Capital Funds	362,044	(27,000)	335,044
Total Operation and Maintenance & Working Capital Funds	103,230,824	1,146,295	104,377,119

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

		<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00 Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
	<u>ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG</u>			
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES	<u>3,240,245</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,240,245</u>
2020A 10	DIVISIONS	1,151,351	0	1,151,351
2020A 20	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	342,122	0	342,122
2020A 30	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	341,220	0	341,220
2020A 40	ECHOLON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	476,924	0	476,924
2020A 50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	928,628	0	928,628
	LAND FORCES READINESS	<u>2,201,441</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,201,441</u>
2020A 60	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,090,532	0	1,090,532
2020A 70	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	465,195	0	465,195
2020A 80	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	645,714	0	645,714
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	<u>3,432,655</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,432,655</u>
2020A 90	BASE SUPPORT	2,658,717	0	2,658,717
2020A 100	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	490,964	0	490,964
2020A 110	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	126,563	0	126,563
2020A 120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	78,490	0	78,490
2020A 130	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	77,921	0	77,921

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG			
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	8,874,341	0	8,874,341
BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
2020A 140 STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	560,041	0	560,041
2020A 150 ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	326,228	0	326,228
2020A 160 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	134,797	0	134,797
2020A 170 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	69,947	0	69,947
	29,069	0	29,069
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	560,041	0	560,041
BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
ACCESSION TRAINING			
2020A 180 OFFICER ACQUISITION	328,716	0	328,716
2020A 190 RECRUIT TRAINING	65,423	0	65,423
2020A 200 ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	14,160	0	14,160
2020A 210 RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	13,924	0	13,924
2020A 220 BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMY ONLY)	134,842	0	134,842
2020A 230 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (ACADEMY ONLY)	73,009	0	73,009
	27,358	0	27,358
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	2,095,535	0	2,095,535
BASIC SKILL/ADVANCE TRAINING			
2020A 240 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	230,145	0	230,145
2020A 250 FLIGHT TRAINING	269,609	0	269,609

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

		Request	Change	Recom
	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG			
2020A 260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	87,429	0	87,429
2020A 270	TRAINING SUPPORT	466,975	0	466,975
2020A 280	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	865,351	0	865,351
2020A 290	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (OTHER TRAINING)	176,026	0	176,026
	RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING	747,591	19,000	766,591
2020A 300	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	255,417	0	255,417
2020A 310	EXAMINING	77,464	0	77,464
2020A 320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,660	0	87,660
2020A 330	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	65,375	0	65,375
2020A 340	JUNIOR ROTC	74,282	19,000	93,282
2020A 350	BASE SUPPORT (RECRUITING LEASES)	187,393	0	187,393
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	3,171,842	19,000	3,190,842
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	426,729	0	426,729
2020A 360	SECURITY PROGRAMS	426,729	0	426,729
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,648,439	0	1,648,439
2020A 370	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	546,861	0	546,861
2020A 380	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	419,672	0	419,672
2020A 390	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	321,696	0	321,696

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
2020A 400 AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	360,210	0	360,210
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	3,705,831	0	3,705,831
2020A 410 ADMINISTRATION	320,944	0	320,944
2020A 420 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	662,827	0	662,827
2020A 430 MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	154,769	0	154,769
2020A 440 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	147,606	0	147,606
2020A 450 OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	674,400	0	674,400
2020A 460 ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	116,617	0	116,617
2020A 470 REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	71,312	0	71,312
2020A 480 BASE SUPPORT	1,106,387	0	1,106,387
2020A 490 COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	346,154	0	346,154
2020A 500 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	104,815	0	104,815
SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	273,771	0	273,771
2020A 510 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	224,685	0	224,685
2020A 520 MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	49,086	0	49,086
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	6,054,770	0	6,054,770
MISC			
BASE OPERATIONS		205,000	
REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		151,000	

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recom
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG			
SMART CARD		5,000	
CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		-20,000	
CIVILIAN UNDER-EXECUTION		-45,100	
TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM		-497,800	
FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCTUATION		-138,000	
TOTAL MISC		-339,900	-339,900
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	18,660,994	-320,900	18,340,094
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS	3,833,829	0	3,833,829
1804N 10 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	2,232,508	0	2,232,508
1804N 20 FLEET AIR TRAINING	693,133	0	693,133
1804N 30 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	48,792	0	48,792
1804N 40 AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	91,823	0	91,823
1804N 50 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	746,924	0	746,924
1804N 60 AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,649	0	20,649
1804N 70 BASE SUPPORT	0	0	0
1804N 80 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG</u>	Request	Change	Recom
	<u>SHIP OPERATIONS</u>	<u>6,284,135</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6,284,135</u>
1804N 90	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,859,279	0	1,859,279
1804N 100	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	536,641	0	536,641
1804N 110	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	379,253	0	379,253
1804N 120	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,365,144	0	2,365,144
1804N 130	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,143,818	0	1,143,818
1804N 140	BASE SUPPORT	0	0	0
1804N 150	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0
	<u>COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT</u>	<u>1,439,555</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,439,555</u>
1804N 160	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	253,524	0	253,524
1804N 170	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	7,600	0	7,600
1804N 180	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	156,329	0	156,329
1804N 190	WARFARE TACTICS	121,645	0	121,645
1804N 200	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	244,484	0	244,484
1804N 210	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	486,993	0	486,993
1804N 220	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	168,216	0	168,216
1804N 230	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	764	0	764
1804N 240	BASE SUPPORT	0	0	0
1804N 250	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0
	<u>WEAPONS SUPPORT</u>	<u>1,381,477</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,381,477</u>

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
1804N 260	CRUISE MISSILE	146,555	0	146,555
1804N 270	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	812,619	0	812,619
1804N 280	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	47,113	0	47,113
1804N 290	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	375,190	0	375,190
1804N 300	BASE SUPPORT	0	0	0
1804N 310	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0
	<u>WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT</u>			
1804N 320	NWCF SUPPORT	40,643	0	40,643
		40,643	0	40,643
	<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1804N 330	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	2,572,570	0	2,572,570
1804N 340	BASE SUPPORT	391,856	0	391,856
		2,180,714	0	2,180,714
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	15,552,209	0	15,552,209
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
	<u>READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES</u>			
1804N 350	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	434,624	0	434,624
		434,624	0	434,624
	<u>ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS</u>			
1804N 360	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	284,195	0	284,195
1804N 370	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	2,966	0	2,966
		281,229	0	281,229

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

			Request	Change	Recom				
			43,082	0	43,082				
1804N	380	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	23,018	0	23,018				
1804N	390	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,089	0	1,089				
1804N	400	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	18,975	0	18,975				
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	761,901	0	761,901				
			151,247	0	151,247				
			79,873	0	79,873				
1804N	410	OFFICER ACQUISITION	5,096	0	5,096				
1804N	420	RECRUIT TRAINING	66,278	0	66,278				
1804N	430	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	0	0	0				
1804N	440	BASE SUPPORT	0	0	0				
1804N	450	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0				
			869,637	0	869,637				
1804N	460	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	251,459	0	251,459				
1804N	470	FLIGHT TRAINING	320,486	0	320,486				
1804N	480	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	85,374	0	85,374				
1804N	490	TRAINING SUPPORT	212,318	0	212,318				
1804N	500	BASE SUPPORT	0	0	0				
1804N	510	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0				

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

	Request	Change	Recom
<u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION</u>			
1804N 520 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	337,141	8,000	345,141
1804N 530 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	187,852	0	187,852
1804N 540 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	79,609	0	79,609
1804N 550 JUNIOR ROTC	46,632	8,000	54,632
1804N 560 BASE SUPPORT	23,048	0	23,048
1804N 570 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0
<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1804N 580 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	364,501	0	364,501
1804N 590 BASE SUPPORT	47,303	0	47,303
	317,198	0	317,198
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	1,722,526	8,000	1,730,526
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>			
1804N 600 ADMINISTRATION	1,709,801	0	1,709,801
1804N 610 EXTERNAL RELATIONS	648,209	0	648,209
1804N 620 CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	16,765	0	16,765
1804N 630 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	120,677	0	120,677
1804N 640 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	88,319	0	88,319
1804N 650 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	203,096	0	203,096
	369,665	0	369,665

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG</u>	Request	Change	Recom
1804N 660	BASE SUPPORT	0	0	0
1804N 670	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES	0	0	0
1804N 680	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0
1804N 690	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	263,070	0	263,070
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	1,611,712	0	1,611,712
1804N 700	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	161,738	0	161,738
1804N 710	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS	0	0	0
1804N 710	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	329,808	0	329,808
1804N 720	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	681,715	0	681,715
1804N 730	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	271,426	0	271,426
1804N 740	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	50,073	0	50,073
1804N 750	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	46,671	0	46,671
1804N 760	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	70,288	0	70,288
1804N 770	BASE SUPPORT	0	0	0
1804N 780	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	584,390	0	584,390
1804N 790	SECURITY PROGRAMS	584,390	0	584,390
1804N 800	BASE SUPPORT	0	0	0
1804N 810	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	8,431	0	8,431
1804N 820 INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	8,431	0	8,431
BASE SUPPORT	287,738	0	287,738
1804N 830 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	101,868	0	101,868
1804N 840 BASE SUPPORT	185,870	0	185,870
JUDGEMENT FUND	0	0	0
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	4,202,079	0	4,202,079
MISC			
SPARES		28,000	
BASE OPERATIONS		95,000	
REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		170,000	
FORCE PROTECTION ASHORE		12,000	
CIVILIAN UNDER-EXECUTION		-74,400	
TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM		-284,100	
FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCUATION		-10,600	
TOTAL, MISC		-64,100	-64,100
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	22,238,715	-56,100	22,182,615
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			

Title III - Operations and Maintenance
(Dollars in Thousands)
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
<u>EXPEDITIONARY FORCES</u>	<u>1,666,173</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,666,173</u>
1106N 10 OPERATIONAL FORCES	378,762	0	378,762
1106N 20 FIELD LOGISTICS	231,138	0	231,138
1106N 30 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	96,685	0	96,685
1106N 40 BASE SUPPORT	712,187	0	712,187
1106N 50 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	247,401	0	247,401
<u>USMC PREPOSITIONING</u>	<u>85,619</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>85,619</u>
1106N 60 MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	81,849	0	81,849
1106N 70 NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	3,770	0	3,770
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,751,792	0	1,751,792
BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
<u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u>	<u>84,101</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>84,101</u>
1106N 80 RECRUIT TRAINING	9,917	0	9,917
1106N 90 OFFICER ACQUISITION	294	0	294
1106N 100 BASE SUPPORT	55,333	0	55,333
1106N 110 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	18,557	0	18,557
<u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u>	<u>206,454</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>206,454</u>

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
<u>ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG</u>			
1106N 120 SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	31,443	0	31,443
1106N 130 FLIGHT TRAINING	162	0	162
1106N 140 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	8,575	0	8,575
1106N 150 TRAINING SUPPORT	84,800	0	84,800
1106N 160 BASE SUPPORT	57,212	0	57,212
1106N 170 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	24,262	0	24,262
<u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION</u>			
1106N 180 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	90,953	0	90,953
1106N 190 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	14,879	0	14,879
1106N 200 JUNIOR ROTC	9,506	4,000	13,506
1106N 210 BASE SUPPORT	8,032	0	8,032
1106N 220 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	2,447	0	2,447
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	416,372	4,000	420,372
<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>			
1106N 230 SPECIAL SUPPORT	229,433	0	229,433
1106N 240 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	28,632	0	28,632
1106N 250 ADMINISTRATION	25,241	0	25,241
1106N 260 BASE SUPPORT	14,569	0	14,569
1106N 270 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	2,056	0	2,056
<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>			
390,765			

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

		<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
1106N 280	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	90,834	0	90,834
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	390,765	0	390,765
	MISC			
	INITIAL ISSUE		10,000	
	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		82,000	
	DEPOT MAINTNENANCE		8,500	
	TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM		-53,900	
	DISTANCE LEARNING		3,000	
	TOTAL, MISC		49,600	49,600
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	2,558,929	53,600	2,612,529
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS	<u>7,973,436</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7,973,436</u>
3400F 10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,401,247	0	2,401,247
3400F 20	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	264,665	0	264,665
3400F 30	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	204,091	0	204,091
3400F 40	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	657,352	0	657,352
3400F 50	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,096,870	0	1,096,870
				255

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG			
3400F 60 COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	936,390	0	936,390
3400F 70 BASE SUPPORT	1,835,256	0	1,835,256
3400F 80 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	577,565	0	577,565
COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS			
3400F 90 GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	1,462,451	0	1,462,451
3400F 100 NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	665,827	0	665,827
3400F 110 OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	136,485	0	136,485
3400F 120 JCS EXERCISES	247,715	0	247,715
3400F 130 MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	34,588	0	34,588
3400F 140 TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	123,289	0	123,289
	254,547	0	254,547
SPACE OPERATIONS			
3400F 150 LAUNCH FACILITIES	1,114,163	0	1,114,163
3400F 160 LAUNCH VEHICLES	218,743	0	218,743
3400F 170 SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	112,504	0	112,504
3400F 180 SATELLITE SYSTEMS	259,203	0	259,203
3400F 190 OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	52,753	0	52,753
3400F 200 BASE SUPPORT	90,461	0	90,461
3400F 210 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	324,539	0	324,539
	55,960	0	55,960
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	10,550,050	0	10,550,050

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION

MOBILITY OPERATIONS

								Request	Change	Recom
3400F	220	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,685,559	0	0			<u>2,685,559</u>		<u>2,685,559</u>
3400F	230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	1,359,999	0	0			1,359,999		1,359,999
3400F	240	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	30,401	0	0			30,401		30,401
3400F	250	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	142,983	0	0			142,983		142,983
3400F	260	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	312,062	0	0			312,062		312,062
3400F	270	BASE SUPPORT	312,237	0	0			312,237		312,237
3400F	280	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	455,730	0	0			455,730		455,730
			72,147	0	0			72,147		72,147
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	2,685,559	0	0			2,685,559		2,685,559

BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING

ACCESSION TRAINING

								Request	Change	Recom
3400F	290	OFFICER ACQUISITION	205,955	0	0			<u>205,955</u>		<u>205,955</u>
3400F	300	RECRUIT TRAINING	60,067	0	0			60,067		60,067
3400F	310	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	4,494	0	0			4,494		4,494
3400F	320	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	58,012	0	0			58,012		58,012
3400F	330	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (ACADEMIES ONLY)	20,263	0	0			20,263		20,263
			63,119	0	0			63,119		63,119
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	1,370,593	0	0			1,370,593		1,370,593
3400F	340	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	240,449	0	0			240,449		240,449
3400F	350	FLIGHT TRAINING	471,526	0	0			471,526		471,526

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

		Request	Change	Recom
	<u>ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG</u>			
3400F 360	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	98,868	0	98,868
3400F 370	TRAINING SUPPORT	69,964	0	69,964
3400F 380	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	14,532	0	14,532
3400F 390	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	411,644	0	411,644
3400F 400	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (OTHER TRAINING)	63,610	0	63,610
	RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	221,695	8,000	229,695
3400F 410	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	102,502	0	102,502
3400F 420	EXAMINING	3,036	0	3,036
3400F 430	OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,587	0	87,587
3400F 440	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	72,475	0	72,475
3400F 450	JUNIOR ROTC	26,095	8,000	34,095
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	1,868,243	8,000	1,876,243
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	2,773,424	0	2,773,424
3400F 460	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	744,819	0	744,819
3400F 470	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	398,063	0	398,063
3400F 480	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	217,401	0	217,401
3400F 490	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	58,334	0	58,334
3400F 500	BASE SUPPORT	1,109,593	0	1,109,593
3400F 510	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	245,214	0	245,214

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

		Request	Change	Recom
	<u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>	<u>1,874,910</u>		<u>1,874,910</u>
3400F 520	ADMINISTRATION	150,381	0	150,381
3400F 530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	346,821	0	346,821
3400F 540	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	130,710	0	130,710
3400F 550	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	60,228	0	60,228
3400F 560	ARMS CONTROL	35,477	0	35,477
3400F 570	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	619,830	0	619,830
3400F 580	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	31,812	0	31,812
3400F 590	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	13,970	0	13,970
3400F 600	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	309,061	0	309,061
3400F 610	BASE SUPPORT	158,343	0	158,343
3400F 620	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	18,277	0	18,277
	<u>SECURITY PROGRAMS</u>	<u>596,798</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>596,798</u>
3400F 630	SECURITY PROGRAMS	596,798	0	596,798
	<u>SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS</u>	<u>14,219</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>14,219</u>
3400F 640	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	14,219	0	14,219
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	<u>5,259,351</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5,259,351</u>

MISC

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
FORCE PROTECTION INFRASTRUCTURE		5,000	
RPM		100,000	
BASE OPERATIONS		95,000	
SPARES		45,000	
SMART CARD		5,000	
DEPOT MAINTNENANCE		30,000	
CIVILAIN UNDER-EXECUTION		-59,800	
AIR STAFF (Transfer to S&T)		-4,000	
SECRETARIAT (Transfer to S&T)		-10,000	
TRANSFER TO COMABTING TERRORISM		-152,000	
FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCUATION		-43,000	
TOTAL, MISC		11,200	11,200
TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE	20,363,203	19,200	20,382,403
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</u>	1,601,967	0	1,601,967
0100D 10 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	382,269	0	382,269
0100D 20 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,219,698	0	1,219,698
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,601,967	0	1,601,967

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BAVAG/SAG

BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION

0100D	30	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	Request	Change	Recom				
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	38,312	0	38,312				

BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING

0100D	40	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	238,503	0	238,503				
0100D	50	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	9,512	0	9,512				
0100D	60	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	100,380	0	100,380				
0100D	70	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	18,000	0	18,000				
0100D	80	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	58,100	0	58,100				
0100D	90	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	7,254	0	7,254				
0100D	100	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	913	0	913				
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	44,344	0	44,344				
			238,503	0	238,503				

BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES

0100D	110	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	95,865	0	95,865				
0100D	120	ANTI-TERRORISM / DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PROGRAMS (NO YEAR)	0	0	0				
0100D	130	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	87,503	0	87,503				
0100D	140	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	4,067,679	0	4,067,679				
0100D	150	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE (FY 98/99)	0	0	0				
0100D	160	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	340,624	0	340,624				
0100D	170	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	27,138	0	27,138				
			9,540,451	-17,000	9,455,651				

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
0100D 180 DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	190,226	0	190,226
0100D 190 DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	822,904	0	822,904
0100D 200 DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	9,483	0	9,483
0100D 210 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	1,186,236	0	1,165,136
TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM		-21,100	
0100D 220 DEFENSE POW / MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	14,505	0	14,505
0100D 230 DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	65,638	-8,900	56,738
0100D 240 DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	84,395	0	84,395
0100D 250 DEFENSE SPECIAL WEAPONS AGENCY	0	0	0
0100D 260 DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	0	0	0
0100D 270 DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	0	0	0
0100D 280 DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	195,533	0	195,533
0100D 290 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,376,909	0	1,376,909
0100D 300 FEDERAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	0	0	0
0100D 310 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	158,647	0	158,647
0100D 320 OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	30,940	0	30,940
0100D 330 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	423,493	0	436,493
INFORMATION ASSURANCE INITIATIVE		10,000	
JEFFERSON PROJECT-DIA		3,000	
0100D 340 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (NO YEAR)	0	0	0
0100D 350 ON SITE INSPECTION AGENCY	0	0	0
0100D 360 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	40,263	0	40,263

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

		(Dollars in Thousands)		
		Request	Change	Recom
		ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG		
0100D 370	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	322,470	0	254,670
	TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM (Washington Services)		-67,800	
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	9,540,451	-84,800	9,455,651
		MISC		
	JCS MOBILITY ENHANCEMENT FUND		10,000	
	FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUATION		-13,000	
	DLA CIVILIAN UNDER-EXECUTION		-30,000	
	TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM- DECA		-1,000	
	TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM -DEFENSE WIDE		-317,400	
	DLA CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		-20,000	
	TOTAL, MISC		-371,400	-371,400
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	11,419,233	-456,200	10,963,033
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE		
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES		
		LAND FORCES		
2080A 10	DIVISION FORCES	634,612	0	634,612
2080A 20	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	12,469	0	12,469
2080A 30	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	26,496	0	26,496
		196,704	0	196,704

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG			
2080A 40 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	99,091	0	99,091
2080A 50 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	299,852	0	299,852
LAND FORCES READINESS			
2080A 60 FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	<u>123,643</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>123,643</u>
2080A 70 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	128,297	0	128,297
2080A 80 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	32,172	0	32,172
	33,174	0	33,174
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
2080A 90 BASE SUPPORT	<u>393,950</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>393,950</u>
2080A 100 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	314,261	0	314,261
2080A 110 UNIFIED COMMANDS	78,295	0	78,295
2080A 120 ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	40	0	40
	1,354	0	1,354
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,222,205	0	1,222,205
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
2080A 130 ADMINISTRATION	<u>147,008</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>147,008</u>
2080A 140 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	31,108	0	31,108
2080A 150 PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	23,199	0	23,199
2080A 160 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	46,346	0	46,346
	46,355	0	46,355
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	147,008	0	147,008

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

	Request	Change	Recom
MISC			
TRAINING DEPLOYMENTS		20,000	
RPM		10,000	
TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM		-22,400	
TOTAL, MISC		7,600	7,600
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,369,213	7,600	1,376,813
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS			
1806N 10 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	409,207	0	409,207
1806N 20 FLEET AIR TRAINING	283,792	0	283,792
1806N 30 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	0	0	0
1806N 40 AIR OPERATION AND SAFETY SUPPORT	17,232	0	17,232
1806N 50 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	3,829	0	3,829
1806N 60 AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPS SUPPORT	104,087	0	104,087
1806N 70 BASE SUPPORT	267	0	267
1806N 80 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recom
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG			
RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS			
1806N 90 MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	177,886	0	177,886
1806N 100 SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	72,200	0	72,200
1806N 110 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	615	0	615
1806N 120 SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	9,323	0	9,323
1806N 130 SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	92,988	0	92,988
	2,760	0	2,760
RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT			
1806N 140 COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	26,678	0	26,678
1806N 150 BASE SUPPORT	26,678	0	26,678
1806N 160 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0
	0	0	0
RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT			
1806N 160 WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,224	0	5,224
	5,224	0	5,224
BASE SUPPORT			
1806N 170 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	177,274	0	177,274
1806N 180 BASE SUPPORT	21,469	0	21,469
	155,805	0	155,805
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	796,269	0	796,269
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	121,378	0	121,378

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recom
1806N 190 ADMINISTRATION	6,768	0	6,768
1806N 200 CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	1,299	0	1,299
1806N 210 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	24,551	0	24,551
1806N 220 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	82,260	0	82,260
1806N 230 BASE SUPPORT	0	0	0
1806N 240 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0	0	0
1806N 250 COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,899	0	5,899
1806N 260 GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	601	0	601
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	0	0	0
1806N 270 AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	0	0	0
CANCELLED ACCOUNTS	0	0	0
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	121,378	0	121,378
MISC			
TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM		-5,300	
RPM		10,000	
BASE OPERATIONS		5,000	
TOTAL, MISC		9,700	9,700
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	917,647	9,700	927,347

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

		<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
MISSION FORCES				
1107N 10	TRAINING	88,642	0	88,642
1107N 20	OPERATING FORCES	18,121	0	18,121
1107N 30	BASE SUPPORT	38,529	0	38,529
1107N 40	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	14,588	0	14,588
1107N 50	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,054	0	6,054
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	11,350	0	11,350
		88,642	0	88,642
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
1107N 60	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	34,624	0	34,624
1107N 70	SPECIAL SUPPORT	7,841	0	7,841
1107N 80	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	11,116	0	11,116
1107N 90	ADMINISTRATION	476	0	476
1107N 100	BASE SUPPORT	7,441	0	7,441
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	7,750	0	7,750
		34,624	0	34,624

MISC

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recom
DEPOT MAINTENANCE		1,500	
RPM		1,000	
TOTAL, MISC		2,500	2,500
TOTAL, O&M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	123,266	2,500	125,766
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS			
3740F 10 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,643,924	0	1,643,924
3740F 20 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	1,058,142	0	1,058,142
3740F 30 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	45,972	0	45,972
3740F 40 BASE SUPPORT	265,429	0	265,429
3740F 50 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	235,907	0	235,907
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,643,924	0	1,643,924
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
3740F 60 ADMINISTRATION	84,513	0	84,513
3740F 70 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	46,819	0	46,819
3740F 80 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	20,254	0	20,254
	10,418	0	10,418

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

		Request	Change	Recom
3740F 90	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,390	0	6,390
3740F 100	AUDIOVISUAL	632	0	632
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	84,513	0	84,513
	MISC			
	RPM		10,000	
	BASE OPERATIONS		10,000	
	TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM		-21,600	
	TOTAL, MISC		-1,600	-1,600
	TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	1,728,437	-1,600	1,726,837
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES	1,558,514	0	1,558,514
2065A	10 DIVISIONS	367,379	0	367,379
2065A	20 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	773,892	0	773,892
2065A	30 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	183,763	0	183,763
2065A	40 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	139,382	0	139,382
2065A	50 LAND FORCES OPERATION SUPPORT	94,098	0	94,098

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
	193,216	0	193,216
	5,889	0	5,889
	187,327	0	187,327
LAND FORCES READINESS			
2065A 60 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS			
2065A 70 DEPOT MAINTENANCE			
	980,733	0	980,733
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
2065A 80 BASE OPERATIONS	468,029	0	468,029
2065A 90 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	111,716	0	111,716
2065A 100 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	400,988	0	400,988
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	2,732,463	0	2,732,463
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
2065A 110 STAFF MANAGEMENT	171,086	0	171,086
2065A 120 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	58,902	0	58,902
2065A 130 PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	18,981	0	18,981
2065A 140 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	50,840	0	50,840
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	42,363	0	42,363
	171,086	0	171,086
MISC			
OPTEMPO		20,000	
RPM		10,000	
TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM		-41,300	

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recom
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG			
TRAINING DEPLOYMENTS		20,000	
TOTAL, MISC		8,700	8,700
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NAT. GUARD	2,903,549	8,700	2,912,249
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS			
3840F 10 AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,087,333	0	3,087,333
3840F 20 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	1,977,442	0	1,977,442
3840F 30 BASE SUPPORT	357,487	0	357,487
3840F 40 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	299,089	0	299,089
3840F 50 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	38,130	0	38,130
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	415,185	0	415,185
	3,087,333	0	3,087,333
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
3840F 60 ADMINISTRATION	12,285	0	12,285
3840F 70 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	2,656	0	2,656
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	9,629	0	9,629
	12,285	0	12,285

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recom
ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG			
MISC			
BASE OPERATIONS		10,000	
RPM		10,000	
TRANSFER TO COMBATING TERRORISM		-100	
TOTAL, MISC		19,900	19,900
TOTAL, O&M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	3,099,618	19,900	3,119,518
TRANSFER ACCOUNTS AND MISCELLANEOUS			
TRANSFER ACCOUNTS	4,439,254	1,911,595	6,350,849
0810A 10 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	378,170	0	378,170
0810N 20 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	284,000	0	284,000
0810F 30 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	376,800	0	376,800
0810D 40 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	25,370	0	25,370
0811D 50 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY UTILIZED DEFENSE SITE	199,214	0	199,214
0105D 60 DRUG INTERDICTION	788,100		745,265
(Transfer to Milcon for Forward Operating Locations)			
COMBATING TERRORISM		-42,835	
RAID TEAMS		1,874,795	1,954,430
0118D 70 OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES	2,387,600	0	2,387,600
0841D 80 PENTAGON RENOVATION	0	0	0

Title III - Operations and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG

TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS:

Request	Change	Recom
4,439,254	1,911,595	6,350,849

MISCELLANEOUS

13,046,722	-24,700	13,022,022
10,477,687	0	10,453,487

0130D 90 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

0842D 110 DEFENSE VESSELS

0833D 120 EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE

0134D 130 FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION

0107D 140 INSPECTOR GENERAL

0844D 150 MWR PERSONEL SUPPORT

0840D 160 OPPLAN 34A-35

0819D 170 OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

1236N 180 PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWA ISLAND

0839D 190 QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS

0104D 200 U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS:

13,046,722	-24,700	13,022,022
10,477,687	0	10,453,487
31,000	0	31,000
0	0	0
475,500	0	475,500
138,744	0	138,244
0	-500	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
55,800	0	55,800
15,000	0	15,000
1,845,370	0	1,845,370
7,621	0	7,621
13,046,722	-24,700	13,022,022

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Armed forces retirement home (sec. 303)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$68.2 million from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund to be appropriated for operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2000.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Use of humanitarian and civic assistance funding for pay and allowances of special operations command reserves furnishing demining training and related assistance as humanitarian assistance (sec. 312)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize pay and allowances from within funds for the overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic assistance account, for reserve members of the Special Operations Command when performing humanitarian demining activities. This will enable reservists to benefit from the same valuable training opportunities currently experienced by active duty members, and will help mitigate the high operational tempo of the active component.

National defense features (sec. 313)

The budget request included no funds for national defense features (NDF) in commercial ships. This provision would modify section 2218 of title 10, United States Code to allow advance payments for the costs associated with installing NDF in commercial ships. The committee recommends an increase of \$40.0 million in the National Defense Sealift Fund for NDF.

SUBTITLE C—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Environmental technology management (sec. 321)

The committee recommends a provision that would hold the Department of Defense and the military departments accountable for achieving environmental technology program results. The provision ensures that the responsibility for those program results is ultimately aligned with program direction and the management of appropriated funds. The provision also establishes a strategic framework for determining the level of environmental technology effort based upon identified end-user requirements, program and budget priorities, the results of performance-based reviews, and ongoing input from the end-user community.

In order to effectively implement comprehensive environmental technology measures that are beneficial to the Department of Defense and the military departments, the requisite resources must be subject to the direction and management of the office with primary functional responsibility. In the area of environmental technology, that functional responsibility has been delegated to the Deputy Under Secretary for Defense, Environmental Security, and to counterparts within the military departments. The provision spe-

cifically focuses on environmental technology accountability within the offices with functional responsibility.

The provision applies to all levels of research, development, testing and evaluation related to environmental technology activities within the Department of Defense and the military departments. This reform initiative also applies to any executive agency authority associated with an environmental center for excellence. It is the committee's intent that the offices with functional responsibility for environmental technology shall: review and validate all environmental technology efforts; ensure performance-based results for applied research and basic research; direct the execution and adjustments to all program funding; ensure input from the end-user community; formulate a department-wide strategic plan; provide an annual report to Congress; and investigate where appropriate.

The provision is consistent with the objectives of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-62), which encourage greater efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability in federal programs and spending. As noted in a recent report by the National Academy of Sciences, *Evaluating Federal Research Programs: Research and the Government Performance Act*, development of plans to implement the Act is difficult because of an apparent inability to link results with annual investments in research. The lack of linkage is particularly evident in the area of environmental technology where there is a disconnect between the end-user need for program results and funding support within the budget process.

Establishment of environmental restoration accounts for installations closed or realigned under the base closure laws and for formerly used defense sites (sec. 322)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2703 of title 10, United States Code, to establish an environmental restoration account for Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) and for bases closed or realigned under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended (Div. B. title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act, as amended (Public Law 100-526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note). The authority of the Secretary of Defense to conduct base realignment and closure (BRAC) activities under current statutes expires on July 13, 2001. The amendment to section 2703 would extend the Secretary's authority to carry out environmental restoration activities at BRAC sites. The establishment of a specific environmental restoration account for FUDS would provide better visibility for the Army's executive agency responsibility to provide adequate funds for the cleanup of these sites.

Extension of limitation on payment of fines and penalties using funds in environmental restoration accounts (sec. 323)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the requirement that stipulated penalties assessed at environmental restoration sites be subject to congressional authorization. Under current law, environmental restoration funds may not be used for pay-

ment of a fine or penalty (including any supplemental environmental project carried out as part of such penalty) imposed against the Department of Defense or a military department, unless the act or omission for which the fine or penalty is imposed arises out of an activity funded by the environmental restoration account concerned and the payment of the fine or penalty has been specifically authorized by law (10 U.S.C. 2703). That requirement applies to the Environmental Restoration Account, Defense, for fiscal years 1995 through 1999, or to any environmental restoration account of a military department for fiscal years 1997 through 1999. The proposed provision would extend the requirement through fiscal year 2010.

Modification of requirements for annual reports on environmental compliance activities (sec. 324)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the reporting requirement in section 2706(b) of title 10, United States Code. The provision is based on a Department of Defense legislative proposal.

The current annual report on compliance, conservation, pollution prevention, and environmental technology activities of the Department of Defense requires the submission of a report that includes the following: funding levels and full-time personnel at U.S. and overseas military installations; analysis of the effect of environmental compliance on operations and mission capability; and funding levels for research, development, testing, and evaluation relevant to environmental compliance activities. The recommended provision would restructure and streamline the reporting requirement to meet current program activities.

Modification of membership of the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program Council (sec. 325)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2902(b) of title 10, United States Code, so that the provision is consistent with a reorganization that occurred within the Department of Defense. The provision is based upon a Department of Defense legislative proposal.

The Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) Council and membership was established under section 2902 of title 10, United States Code. The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology has been reorganized. The duties previously assigned to the Director, Defense Research and Engineering with respect to SERDP have been assumed by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Science and Technology.

Extension of the pilot program for sale of air pollution emission reduction incentives (sec. 326)

The committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize a pilot program for the sale of air emission reduction incentives established under section 351 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85). The original legislation authorized the pilot program to run for two years from the date of enactment. The military installations did not receive imple-

mentation guidance until the second year. The committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize the pilot program for two years in order to allow the military departments to fully assess the feasibility and advisability of the sale of economic incentives.

Reimbursement for certain costs in connection with Fresno Drum Superfund site, Fresno, California (sec. 327)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse the Fresno Drum Special Account within the Hazardous Substance Superfund, established by section 9507 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9507). The recommended provision would direct the release of funds from the environmental restoration accounts of the Department of Defense and the military departments, in an amount not to exceed \$778,425 for response costs incurred at the Fresno Industrial Supply, Inc. site in Fresno, California.

In May 1998, the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) entered into an agreement related to the reimbursement for Superfund response costs incurred at the Fresno Drum Industrial Supply Site, Fresno, California. The agreement stipulated that the DOD would seek congressional authorization in fiscal year 2000 for payment of costs previously incurred by EPA at the site. According to EPA, the DOD and the military departments are liable under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) as generators of the hazardous substances that were stored at the site. No other financially solvent parties have been identified.

Payment of stipulated penalties assessed under the CERCLA in connection with F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming (sec. 328)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the payment of stipulated penalties assessed at F.E. Warren Air Force Base (AFB), Wyoming, under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.). The stipulated penalty was based on remedial action milestones established by a Federal Facilities Agreement between the Air Force and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In January 1998, the EPA denied an Air Force extension request for the completion of an interim remedial action and assessed stipulated penalties in the amount of \$55,000. Through dispute resolution and protracted discussions, the Air Force and EPA eventually reached agreement on a negotiated penalty of \$20,000.

The Air Force missed the enforceable milestone due to a need for additional funds. An extension of roughly 30 days was requested for the purpose of acquiring the requisite funds. According to the Air Force, the delay would not have posed any additional risk to human health or the environment. Based on the facts, it appears that the extension was requested in good faith.

The committee is concerned that the EPA, Region 8, may have failed to consider all of the reasonable options in this case. In the future, the committee expects that the EPA will work in a more cooperative manner with the personnel at F.E. Warren AFB.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS**Extension of warranty claims recovery pilot program (sec. 341)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority for the warranty claims recovery pilot program to recover funds owed the Department of Defense for work performed at government expense on engines under warranty.

Additional matters to be reported before prime vendor contract for depot-level maintenance and repair is entered into (sec. 342)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense or the secretaries of the military departments to include within the report required by section 346 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, an analysis of the extent to which the contract conforms to the requirements of sections 2466 and 2464 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee is concerned about the Department of Defense decisions related to the award of prime vendor contracts. The Department may not be adequately considering the long-term consequences of these contracts in relation to the requirements of law. Current law requires that the Department maintain the capability to perform maintenance on its core weapons systems in organic, government owned and operated, facilities. Current law also requires that at least 50 percent of all depot maintenance workloads be assigned to these organic facilities in order to ensure the core maintenance capabilities are sustained in a cost efficient manner. The committee is concerned that the process for making the award of prime vendor contracts focusses on the initial procurement costs of a weapon system and does not adequately consider the long-term maintenance costs, maintenance capabilities, or the impact the award will have on the Department's ability to meet its statutory core maintenance requirements.

Implementation of jointly approved changes in defense retail systems (sec. 343)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to implement recommendations of the Joint Services Due Diligence Exchange Integration Study only if the recommendation is approved by all of the secretaries of the military departments. The committee believes that, should each of the service secretaries agree on one or more recommendations of the long-awaited due diligence study on exchange integration, the services should be permitted to implement the recommendations.

Eligibility to receive financial assistance available for local educational agencies that benefit dependents of Department of Defense personnel. (sec. 345)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 386(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 20 U.S.C. 7703 note), which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide financial assistance to

certain local education agencies with significant numbers of military dependent students. The recommended provision would require the Department of Defense to use preceding year average daily attendance to determine whether a local education agency qualifies for financial assistance. The current requirement to use the average daily attendance of the fiscal year in which the assistance is provided unnecessarily delays the distribution of much needed funds.

The recommended provision is consistent with the standard used to determine eligibility for impact aid under section 8003(a) of title 20, United States Code.

Use of smart card technology in the Department of Defense (sec. 346)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to designate the Navy as the lead agency for development and implementation of the SMART CARD program. The provision would further authorize the Navy to spend up to \$30.0 million for further fielding of the Smart Card. The provision would further authorize up to \$5.0 million for the Army, and \$5.0 million for the Air Force, to expand implementation of smart card technology throughout the Department of Defense.

The committee is pleased with the Navy's efforts to develop and implement smart card technology. As part of its Revolution in Business Affairs initiative, the Navy has begun to use smart cards to re-engineer the processing of new recruits, ensure seamless transitions from ship to shore in its carrier battle groups, and significantly improve manifesting and in-transit visibility of troops.

The committee encourages the Navy to expand upon its existing program, and begin to roll out smart card technology across the entire department. The Navy should also begin to identify ways smart cards can be exploited to further improve business processes. One potential area is the conversion of existing paper-based personnel records to electronic media for systems that have been modified to use smart card technology.

The committee understands that both the Army and the Air Force have expressed an interest in smart card technology, and have begun to examine ways in which smart cards can be exploited. With the progress already made by the Navy, benefits and savings of smart card technology can best be achieved by ensuring that smart card initiatives are coordinated among all military services. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a senior coordinating group, led by the Navy, to oversee the development and implementation of smart card technology across the services. To ensure that duplicative systems are not needlessly developed, the senior coordinating group should take particular care to ensure that smart cards are interoperable both within and among the services.

The senior coordinating group should identify and fund demonstration projects in the Army and Air Force that will exploit smart cards to improve business processes and enhance readiness. The committee allocates \$5.0 million for each service for this purpose. The committee is particularly impressed with reports from USTRANSCOM that smart cards have reduced the time required

to manifest a wide-body aircraft from 3 to 4 hours, to under 20 minutes. A demonstration project that builds upon the initial success of USTRANSCOM would be an appropriate use of the Air Force funds.

Study on use of smart card as PKI authentication device carrier for the Department of Defense (sec. 347)

The Department of Defense (DOD) is planning to use Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) devices as a tool for authenticating and securing electronic mail and other network communications as part of its information assurance program. Smart card technology appears to be a strong candidate for contributing to the satisfaction of this requirement. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of the possibility of using smart card technology for application to satisfy DOD's PKI requirements. The provision also requires the Secretary to submit to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees a report on the results of the study not later than January 31, 2000.

Revision of authority to donate certain Army materiel for funeral ceremonies (sec. 348)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the number of ceremonial rifles that can be loaned to local honor guard units for veterans funeral ceremonies from 10 to 15. The provision would also expand the list of eligible local units to include National Cemetery honor guards and law enforcement units. By adding law enforcement and National Cemetery honor guards to the list of eligible recipients, groups who frequently perform honors at the funerals of service members would now be eligible to receive excess M1 rifles and blank ammunition to perform these ceremonies. These changes should increase the number of honor guards that would be equipped and available to help meet the anticipated increase in the number of veterans funeral ceremonies.

The provision would also allow the Army to donate, as well as loan, excess M1 rifles to these groups, and allow the Army to set any conditions on the loan or donation that the Secretary of the Army believes are appropriate. This should reduce administrative burdens while allowing the Army to ensure that necessary and appropriate controls are maintained over these ceremonial rifles.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS OF INTEREST

Base operations

The committee is concerned with the continued underfunding of essential base operations. The joint chiefs have informed the committee that the military services have more than \$650.0 million in base operating requirements that were not funded within the budget request for fiscal year 2000. Insufficient funding for base operations forces unit commanders to migrate funding from training accounts in order to meet the day-to-day requirements of military installations, such as sewer, electricity, and communications.

The committee recommends an increase of \$420.0 million for base operations, as follows:

	<i>Millions</i>
Army	\$205.0
Navy	95.0
Air Force	95.0
Navy Reserve	5.0
Air Force Reserve	10.0
Air National Guard	10.0

Depot maintenance

The committee is concerned with the continuing decline in the readiness rates of Air Force aircraft and Marine Corps equipment. Aging equipment and extensive deployments have led to increased cannibalization rates, and decreased mission capable rates, which can only be reversed if necessary maintenance is performed. The committee is aware of the significant shortfall in depot maintenance that needs to be performed in order to restore the readiness of this equipment. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million for Air Force depot maintenance, and \$10.0 million for maintenance of aging Marine Corps equipment (\$8.5 million for Active and \$1.5 million for Reserves).

Real property maintenance

The committee is concerned with the continuing growth in the backlog of real property maintenance (RPM) throughout the Department of Defense. The current backlog of real property maintenance exceeds \$30.0 billion. The insufficient funding dedicated to maintaining our military infrastructure has a direct and negative impact on military readiness as necessary repairs on roads, airstrips, rifle ranges, and other training and operational facilities are continually deferred. Furthermore, the lack of funding has undermined the quality of life of our military personnel and their families as repairs on the buildings in which they work and live, such as barracks, are also deferred. A visit to Fort Bragg demonstrated how deferred maintenance has impacted the soldiers in a barracks complex where buckets and cans were used, to deal with leaking roofs. Furthermore, the leaks were so bad that the soldiers had to work desperately to prevent the moisture from damaging weapons stored in the basement armory. If this necessary maintenance continues to go unfunded, the Department of Defense will be faced with even larger costs to repair damages caused by inclement weather and other environmental conditions. In many cases, this deferral of property maintenance will lead to higher costs in a few short years when the military is already facing a "bow wave" of procurement to replace its aging weapons systems.

The committee recommends an increase of \$554.0 million to the operations and maintenance accounts of the military services for the maintenance of real property, as outlined below:

	<i>Millions</i>
Army	\$151.0
Navy	170.0
USMC	82.0
Air Force	100.0
Army Reserve	10.0
Navy Reserve	10.0
USMC Reserve	1.0
Air Force Reserve	10.0
Army National Guard	10.0

Air National Guard	<i>Millions</i> 10.0
Total	\$554.0

Foreign currency fluctuation

The committee recommends a reduction of \$204.6 million for the purchase of services and goods overseas to reflect the \$124.0 million Foreign currency savings that will be realized in fiscal year 2000 and to draw down the Foreign currency fluctuation account to a suitable level. The committee believes that there will be more than enough to compensate for any unforeseen weakening of the dollar in relation to foreign currencies.

The committee notes the continuing strength of the American dollar in relation to other currencies. This makes the purchase of services and goods overseas less expensive than originally projected by the Department of Defense preparing the fiscal year 2000 budget request. Furthermore, the committee is aware that the FCF account currently contains approximately \$500.0 million, or 24 percent of the amount the services have budgeted to spend in foreign countries during fiscal year 2000. The committee understands that after an adjustment this year for unprogrammed costs, the Department will still have approximately \$320.0 million in the FCF account. The committee further understands that current exchange rates mean the Department will accumulate an additional \$124.0 million during fiscal year 2000, a total of \$444.0 million.

Civilian personnel levels

The committee notes that the Department of Defense civilian personnel drawdown continues at a more rapid pace than expected. During the past several years, civilian personnel levels in the Department of Defense have been reduced faster than anticipated when the budgets for each succeeding fiscal year were drafted. This drawdown resulted in lower-than-budgeted civilian personnel levels, yielding savings of several million dollars during the past few fiscal years. The General Accounting Office's analysis of the budget request indicates that underexecution will continue during fiscal year 2000. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction to the civilian personnel budgets of the military services and the defense agencies to reflect the expected savings, as follows:

Army	\$45.1
Navy	74.4
Air Force	59.8
Defense Wide	30.0
Total	209.3

Spares

The committee is concerned with the continuing reports of increased cannibalization rates and decreased mission capable rates as a result of insufficient quantities of spare parts. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, Admiral Clemens, Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, and Admiral Reason, Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, outlined the negative impact of spare parts shortfalls on the readiness over the past two years. Furthermore, General Ryan,

Chief of Staff of the Air Force, identified spare part inventories as the number one unfunded readiness priority for the Air Force.

The committee recommends an increase of \$28.0 million for Navy spare parts, and an increase of \$45.0 million for Air Force spare parts.

Contract advisory, and assistance services

The committee understands the need of the Department of Defense to procure the assistance of outside experts to perform essential services. However, the committee believes that such services should only be procured when it is not otherwise available to the Department from internal sources, and when the services are important to accomplishing the mission of the Department. Unfortunately, it appears that such criteria have not been applied in some circumstances where the Department has awarded contracts for duplicative services or less than vital functions.

For example, the committee was recently contacted by one contractor hired by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) to poll congressional representatives regarding their opinions of a recently released DLA report. The DLA should be capable of making such inquiries and save the Department the cost of the contract. In addition, the committee was contacted by three different companies that were awarded a contract by the Army to research and make recommendations regarding the Army's ability to effectively communicate.

The committee believes that in this era of fiscal austerity, the Department of Defense must ensure that the contracts it awards provide it with essential services vital to the performance of the Department's mission. The committee does not believe that the contracts awarded by the Army and the DLA meet this threshold. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$20.0 million in the operations and maintenance accounts of Army and DLA for contract advisory, and assistance services.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to undertake a comprehensive review of the contracts for advisory assistance and other support services. The review should examine the extent to which each contract provides the Department with essential services vital to the performance of the Department's mission.

Transfer of funds to a central transfer account to combat terrorism

The committee recommends that \$1,510.5 million be transferred from Operation and Maintenance to section 310(25), a newly-established central transfer account for funds to combat terrorism. The funds should be transferred as follows: Army, \$497.8 million; Army Reserve, \$22.4 million; Army National Guard, \$41.3 million; Navy, \$284.1 million; Navy Reserve, \$5.3 million; Marine Corps, \$11.9 million; Air Force, \$151.5 million; Air Force Reserve, \$21.6 million; Air National Guard, \$100,000; Department of Defense Inspector General, \$500,000; Defense Health Program, \$24.2 million; Defense-wide, \$317.4; Defense Working Capital Fund, \$132.4 (Navy, \$42.0 million; Air Force, \$500,000; Defense Commissary Activity, \$1.0 million; Defense Logistics Agency, \$21.1 million; Washington Headquarters Services, \$67.8 million).

Force protection

The committee is concerned with the inadequate funding provided to the military services in their infrastructure accounts for the installation of force protection measures at military facilities. This is particularly critical at those facilities where key Department of Defense personnel, facilities, and other resources are vulnerable to terrorist activity aimed at achieving an operational or symbolic strike. As the threat of asymmetric attacks continues to rise, we must ensure that all steps are taken to defend these key resources.

The committee is aware that the budget request has a shortfall in funding necessary to install the force protection measures identified by the MacDill Antiterrorism/Force Protection working group in order to protect personnel and operations at the U.S. Central Command and the U.S. Special Operations Command. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for the installation of these force protection measures.

The committee is also aware that the Navy has an unfunded requirement to enhance the effectiveness of its Naval Security Forces ashore. In fact, according to the Chief of Naval Operations, this is the Navy's number one unfunded priority. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million for these requirements.

Army

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The committee recommends an increase of \$19.0 million for Army Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Navy

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million for Navy Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Marine Corps

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

United States Marine Corps initial issue

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in the operation and maintenance accounts for the Marine Corps to purchase items of individual combat clothing and equipment. This will help provide Marines in the field with the clothing, gear, and other equipment they need to survive and sustain themselves during combat operations.

Distance learning

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for Marine Corps distance learning. This will allow Marines greater access to education opportunities.

Air Force

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million for Air Force Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Defense-Wide

Mobility enhancements

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to repair and replace infrastructure associated with the deployment of forces.

With the end of the Cold War and the reduction in the number of U.S. military personnel stationed abroad, the armed forces are far more dependent upon strategic lift and the supporting mobility infrastructure. Unfortunately, much of this infrastructure has been subject to significant degradation as a result of insufficient funding to maintain military installations. The committee is concerned that this degraded infrastructure will delay the deployment of military forces to a theater of operation, and thereby increase the risk associated with the successful execution of that operation, unless properly repaired.

Jefferson Project

The committee continues to support the Jefferson Project which studies foreign biological weapons programs and capabilities in order to prevent technological surprise. To continue this important effort, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to the Defense Intelligence Agency operation and maintenance account.

Partnership for Peace Program (Warsaw Initiative)

The budget request included \$48.9 million within the Defense Security Cooperation Agency budget line for the Partnership for Peace (PfP) program. This program, which began in fiscal year 1996, provides assistance for joint military exercises and interoperability programs conducted between the United States and the PfP nations. While the committee believes that this program has merit, the committee is concerned with the proposed increase of 17 percent in funding for this program over the fiscal year 1999 appropriated level. The committee believes that this level of growth is unjustified. Therefore, the committee recommends \$40.0 million for this program in fiscal year 2000, a decrease of \$8.9 million from the budget request.

Partnership for Peace Information Management System (PIMS)

The committee continues to support the Partnership for Peace Information Management System (PIMS) which enhances interoperability between the United States and Partnership for Peace nations by establishing a dedicated information management and communication infrastructure in partner countries. It is the committee's understanding that \$5.0 million is needed in fiscal year 2000 for the operation and maintenance of the existing system. Therefore, the committee directs that of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Partnership for Peace program, \$5.0 million

shall be available for PIMS. The committee notes that in order for this program to continue to be effective, research and development funding will be needed to create and improve databases for the system. The committee urges the Department of Defense to include research and development funding for PIMS in the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Guard and Reserve Components

Overseas deployment training

The committee is aware of the valuable training that the Army Reserves and the Army National Guard receive as a result of the overseas deployment training program. Regional commanders-in-chief, and other commanders of overseas units have identified the importance of this program in relation to their mission. General Reimer has also identified the important training benefits of this program to participating reserve and guard units. Unfortunately, the budget request is insufficient to execute the level of deployments that have been requested by commanders.

Therefore, the Committee recommends an increase of \$40.0 million (\$20.0 million for the Army Reserves and \$20.0 million for the Army National Guard) for this program, including U.S. Southern Command's "New Horizon" deployments. These amounts are in addition to what is otherwise provided in the budget request.

Reserve optempo

The committee is concerned about the significant shortfall in resources necessary to maintain the readiness of the reserve components of the Army. With the reduced size of the active force structure, the reserve components will play an important role in any future conflict. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million for National Guard operational tempo.

Miscellaneous

Overseas humanitarian demining and CINC emergency response activities

The committee strongly supports the humanitarian demining and Commander-in-Chief emergency response activities of the Department of Defense. These activities have enabled military personnel of the Department of Defense to forge constructive relationships with the armed forces and civilian population of other nations, while carrying out valuable training that enhances the military skills of our troops. However, the committee is concerned that the Department continues to request funding for humanitarian activities that do not enhance military training or require military unique capabilities; these activities should therefore, be funded through the Department of State. These activities include paying commercial carriers to deliver privately-donated goods to foreign recipients and procuring food solely for humanitarian relief operations.

The committee recommends \$27.5 million to fully fund the CINC emergency response activities. The committee further recommends \$26.6 million for the humanitarian demining program, an increase

of \$1.0 million. These demining funds are in addition to the \$8.8 million in fiscal year 1999 funds that will remain available in fiscal year 2000.

The committee supports the budget request of \$1.7 million for the procurement of Humanitarian Daily Rations in fiscal year 2000; however, the committee will no longer support procuring these rations through the Department of Defense. The committee does not recommend the \$1.0 million that was requested to pay commercial carriers to deliver privately-donated goods to foreign recipients.

The committee expects the Department of State to fund those activities and programs that do not require military unique capabilities, and do not enhance the military mission. If the Department continues to request funding for activities that are clearly foreign assistance, rather than activities related to a military mission, the committee will recommend legislation to provide strict guidelines for future activities funded through this program.

Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams

Section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997 authorized the use of the National Guard and other reserve components in response to an emergency involving a weapon of mass destruction. Subsequently, on March 17, 1998, the Secretary of Defense announced the creation of ten Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams, comprised of 22 full-time National Guard personnel who are specially trained and equipped to deploy and assess suspected nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological events in support of local first responders. Last year, the committee provided funding for these ten RAID teams.

The committee strongly supports the RAID team initiative by the Department of Defense (DOD). However, the committee is concerned that the DOD is not moving quickly enough to establish an adequate number of RAID teams. Although the DOD is requesting five additional RAID teams in fiscal year 2000, the budget request contains only partial funding for those teams. Under the administration's plan, these five additional teams would be funded in fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001, and would not become operational until January 2001. That is not soon enough to meet the growing terrorist threat. The committee is concerned with the Department's failure to provide timely and adequate funding for this important initiative.

The committee recommends an increase of \$107.4 million for the establishment of 17 fully-funded RAID teams in fiscal year 2000. This will result in a total of 27 RAID teams by the end of fiscal year 2000. It is the intent of the committee to ultimately provide for the establishment of 54 RAID teams—one for each state and U.S. territory—as recommended in the January 1998 DOD report entitled “Department of Defense Plan for Integrating National Guard and Reserve Component Support for Response to Attacks Using Weapons of Mass Destruction”.

Other Items of Interest

Cultural and historic activities

In section 331 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201), Congress established criteria for determining whether certain conservation and cultural activities are eligible for appropriated funds within the Legacy Resource Management Program. The statutory criteria ensures that activities funded through Legacy have some connection with existing legal requirements or support military operations.

The committee is aware that there are three sunken U.S. vessels that have gained cultural and historic significance based on their unique design and the circumstances in which the vessels sank: the *H.L. Hunley*, a Civil War submarine; the *U.S.S. Monitor*, a Civil War ironclad warship; and the *C.S.S. Alabama*, a Civil War commerce raider. Consistent with the criteria for Legacy-funded activities, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy in fiscal year 2000 to use funds available within the Legacy Management Program to provide funding necessary to preserve the cultural and historic significance of these three vessels through the recovery of artifacts or major components, and, if feasible and appropriate, the raising of the vessels.

According to the Department of Defense and the Navy, all three of these vessels qualify for listing on the National Register under the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*). In addition, these Civil War vessels have been identified as wargraves. As a matter of policy, the Department of Defense and the Navy, on behalf of the United States, have asserted sole ownership and survey responsibility for submerged vessels that serve as wargraves.

Commissary support for the 99th Regional Support Command, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

The committee strongly supports efforts to ensure military personnel and other authorized patrons have an appropriate commissary store available to them. The 99th Regional Support Command is relocating to new facilities at the Greater Pittsburgh International Airport from a Cold War-era NIKE missile and radar site as a result of Base Realignment and Closure decisions. The current commissary, at the old NIKE site, is limited by its size, 8,000 square feet, and is unable to provide the full range of line items the 67,000 area beneficiaries deserve. The existing substandard commissary is located in a far corner of the site and is only accessible by a secondary road. Weight limits on this road restrict the use of the delivery trucks commonly used by grocery suppliers. A new commissary, or a commissary-exchange mall, at the site of the 99th Regional Support Command would be accessible by a modern highway system affording safer, all-weather access for suppliers and beneficiaries.

The committee is well aware that commissaries are constructed with nonappropriated funds from the surcharge account. However, in spite of the personal support of Mr. Richard Beale, Director of the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA), this project has not been forwarded for consideration by the Committees on Armed Services

of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The committee directs that DeCA and the Army Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) to jointly report, not later than January 21, 2000, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, answering the following questions:

- (1) Where on the list of priorities does a new commissary and exchange for the greater Pittsburgh region rank?
- (2) Provide an appraisal of the conditions and adequacy of the current commissary and exchange facilities at the NIKE site.
- (3) Provide an assessment as to whether the current commissary and exchange satisfy current and projected customer needs.
- (4) Would DeCA and AAFES construct a new facility at the 99th Regional Support Command site if sufficient funds were available?
- (5) Provide an assessment of the feasibility of building a common wall commissary and exchange facility with funds initially provided by AAFES with subsequent reimbursement from DeCA.
- (6) Should DeCA or AAFES include an exchange and commissary for the 99th Regional Support Command in the Fiscal Year 2000 nonappropriated fund construction request, the requirement for this report is vitiated.

Controlled humidity preservation program

The committee is concerned about the impact of corrosion on the readiness of military equipment. According to a recent study by the Naval Audit Service, corrosion and other moisture-related malfunctions are major contributors to avionics failures in Navy and Marine Corps aircraft located in areas of relatively high humidity. Navy studies indicate that dehumidification is an effective means of increasing mission capable rates and decreasing avionics failures caused by humidity. Test data indicates that mission capable rates can be increased by four to six percent, maintenance hours can be reduced by four to 22 percent, and time between avionics failures can be increased from seven to 30 percent.

The committee is aware of the National Guard's ongoing corrosion control program using dehumidification technology. The committee urges each of the services to explore the use of such dehumidification devices to increase readiness and reduce maintenance costs.

Expeditionary Aerospace Force

The committee is encouraged by the Air Force's Expeditionary Aerospace Force concept and supports its implementation. By imposing much more predictable schedules for steady state contingency tasking, this innovative approach to managing scarce resources will improve efficiencies of operations and maintenance activities, and improve morale and retention of our airmen. The committee requests that the Secretary of the Air Force provide a report, not later than one year after enactment of this Act, regarding the progress in implementation of the Expeditionary Aerospace Force concept, to include information on: (1) the anticipated impact

on overall Air Force readiness, operational efficiency, and personnel demands; (2) anticipated risks, if any, in fighting one or more major theater wars, including two wars simultaneously; (3) schedule and costs for implementation; (4) anticipated long-term steady state savings, if any, per annum; (5) what disadvantages, if any, will be incurred for force elements that are not collocated; and (6) mechanisms for sharing high demand, low density assets across the Expeditionary Aerospace Force.

Pine Bluff arsenal

The committee recognizes that, in fiscal year 1999, Congress directed the Department of Defense (DOD) to establish a Domestic Preparedness Sustainment Training Center in existing facilities at the Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas. The DOD is in the process of transferring the Domestic Preparedness Training Program to the Department of Justice (DOJ), which will be assuming the lead federal agency role for the Domestic Preparedness Training Program on, or before, October 1, 2001. The committee recommends that the DOJ fully utilize the existing facilities at the Pine Bluff Arsenal in the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium, which was created to ensure that centers are developed to establish a coherent national program for preparing relevant federal, state and local officials for response to an incident involving a weapon of mass destruction. The committee further urges the DOJ to consider the Pine Bluff Arsenal as a sustainment center for the domestic preparedness equipment distributed through the Department of Justice's equipment grant program.

Research and development to support unexploded ordnance clearance, active range unexploded ordnance clearance, and explosive ordnance disposal

In April 1998, the Defense Science Board Task Force completed its final report on unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance/remediation. The report is primarily focused on the issue of the Department of Defense (DOD) remediation responsibilities associated with decades of military training, exercises, and testing of weapons systems. It is estimated that there are about 1500 relevant sites within the continental United States involving approximately 15 million acres. According to the Task Force, the use of current technology and management practices to conduct cleanup at these sites could result in total expenditures in excess of tens of billions of dollars.

The Task Force expressed the need to reallocate the current DOD investment in actual UXO remediation in order to provide for an aggressive research and development track. Except for the recent Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) initiatives, DOD's research, development, testing, and evaluation (RDT&E) base lacks a coherent set of technology requirements specifically designed to support UXO remediation needs. The DOD funding for ongoing UXO remediation RDT&E efforts is about \$20.0 million. The RDT&E efforts of the military departments reflect warfighting needs, with UXO remediation technology receiving incidental support.

The technologies that are currently utilized for sub-surface UXO remediation require tedious review of suspect acreage with metal

detection devices, placing a flag at each location of a detection and manually digging up detected objects. The use of this “Mag and Flag” technique is not cost-effective for large sites and may not be feasible for all terrain. Moreover, “Mag and Flag” surveys are subject to high false alarm rates. In relation to about \$125.0 million expended per year for UXO remediation, approximately \$70.0 to \$80.0 million is expended annually for labor-intensive practices.

The Task Force made several major recommendations to enhance the DOD UXO remediation efforts: (1) identify a DOD internal and external focal point for UXO objectives, policy, plans, and programs; (2) establish a DOD initiative for a two-fold increase of UXO-related RDT&E funding to support an aggressive program that utilizes universities and industry to reduce the false detection rate by about a factor of 10 within the next 3 to 5 years; (3) formulate and direct a program using up to 20 percent of the total DOD UXO remediation funds; (4) establish two separate DOD accounts for UXO remediation and related RDT&E to provide more visibility, flexibility, balance, and control over commitments and expenditures; and (5) use contractor incentives to encourage commercialization of promising technologies. The committee is aware that the DOD has responded favorably to some of the Task Force recommendations: designation of a DOD lead office for UXO remediation and a UXO Center for Excellence; initiation of efforts to draft instructions related to UXO remediation; establishment of a self-evaluation process; and formulation of a Keystone Dialogue to focus on a cradle-to-grave munitions policy and includes the various public and private stakeholders.

In addition, the committee notes that in the January 1999 report, *Major Management Challenges and Program Risks: Department of Defense*, the General Accounting Office (GAO) stated that: “While the DOD reported nearly \$40.0 billion in estimated environmental cleanup and disposal liabilities for fiscal year 1997, its reports excluded costs associated with military weapon systems or training ranges—these undisclosed liabilities are likely to be an additional tens of billion of dollars.”

The committee is concerned about the magnitude of the UXO remediation problem and the apparent lack of focus in this area. The findings of the Task Force and GAO suggest many unanswered questions regarding the accuracy of overall DOD environmental remediation cost estimates and the progress related to the development of effective UXO remediation technology.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 1, 2001, that gives a complete estimate of the current and projected costs, to include funding shortfalls, for UXO remediation at active facilities, installations subject to base realignment and closure, and formerly used defense sites. The report should also identify a plan for UXO remediation technology, provide detailed information regarding the obligation and expenditure of funds for UXO remediation RDT&E efforts, discuss the progress of the Department’s ongoing assessment and implementation of the Task Force recommendations, and evaluate the applicability of section 349 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). Subsequent reports on UXO remediation costs shall

be specifically incorporated in the annual report to Congress on environmental restoration. (10 U.S.C. 2706(a)).

Unfunded environmental requirements

The Department of Defense (DOD) has proposed, for the first time in a decade, an environmental budget that leaves substantial environmental priorities unfunded. These priorities include: (1) a \$454.0 million shortfall in the fiscal year 2000 cleanup funding within the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) account, which has been characterized as an incremental funding approach; (2) \$54.5 million of unfunded Air Force cleanup and compliance requirements in fiscal year 2000; (3) \$76.0 million of unfunded Air Force cleanup requirements over the course of the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP); (4) zero funding for the Air Force environmental technology program; (5) \$25.0 million of unfunded Army compliance requirements; (6) a \$23.0 million reduction in the Army pollution prevention funding level; and (7) \$20.0 million of unfunded Navy cleanup requirements.

The committee is particularly concerned about the cuts in the Air Force environmental program. The Air Force identified \$54.5 million in unfunded environmental cleanup and compliance requirements. The total unfunded requirements involved \$45.0 million for high priority compliance projects and \$9.5 million to fulfill negotiated cleanup agreements. The failure to fund the high priority compliance projects in fiscal year 2000 could result in fines and criminal penalties. The inability to meet cleanup milestones may result in stipulated penalties and erode an established credibility with the regulators.

Insufficient funding to meet Air Force compliance requirements suggests a distinct lack of support for installation commanders. These commanders could be subject to criminal sanctions for such deficiencies. The Air Force has suggested that installation commanders will likely avoid fines and penalties by using funding for readiness priorities to pay unfunded compliance requirements. The committee views this as an unacceptable result. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1, 2000, that describes how unfunded requirements have been funded and describes the impacts related to the failure to fund these requirements.

The environmental programs of the DOD and military departments are essential to the protection of human health and safety of installation personnel and the public. Moreover, good faith support for funding levels necessary to meet environmental requirements enables the DOD and military departments to sustain installation and training operations through an established credibility as responsible stewards of over 25 million acres of public lands. If that credibility is placed in doubt because of inadequate funding for environmental programs, public support could fade and regulatory scrutiny could intensify, potentially resulting in unnecessary operational impediments.

Weapons Training Facility Vieques, Puerto Rico

The committee is concerned about the accident on April 19, 1999, at the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility on the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, that took the life of Mr. David Sanes Rodriguez. After the time of his death, Mr. Rodriguez was a Navy contract employee who was working outside the observation post at the training range when a United States Marine Corps F/A-18 aircraft dropped a bomb. The committee is pleased to learn that the Secretary of the Navy and the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet are investigating the cause of the accident and studying ways to improve the safety and operating procedures on the training range.

The committee recognizes the importance of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility to the national security of the United States, particularly in light of the commitments that the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps are undertaking throughout the world. The committee understands that the training range on Vieques provides our Naval forces with vital preparation for the challenges posed by combat in the regional conflicts throughout the world today and in the foreseeable future. The committee also understands that a thorough investigation is in progress to determine the cause of the accident. The committee believes that a formal assessment of the current and projected training practices in the Live Impact Area and Eastern Maneuvering Area of the Vieques Weapons Range is required.

The committee recognizes that the Secretary of the Navy is undertaking such a review to include range operation and safety procedures, necessary equipment in support of safe range operations, quantities and type (live and inert) of ordnance expended, and limitations on Navy ranges that may affect the continued requirement for use of Vieques. In defining the review, the committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to solicit government officials of Puerto Rico, including the governor, to identify areas of concern. The committee understands that the Department is currently planning to conduct training exercises, including the use of explosive ordnance, before completion of the investigation. The committee urges the Department to review the planned training during this period in light of the current level of concern and make such adjustments as it determines necessary to ensure that relations with the local community are not irreparably harmed.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate with a report on the conclusions of the investigation and range review, not later than August 30, 1999.

Excess inventory on order

The committee is concerned about recent reports that the Department of Defense continues to possess several billion dollars worth of excess inventory, and that several hundred million dollars worth of inventory, on order at the end of fiscal year 1998, was for items in excess to the Department's own approved acquisition objective. While the committee understands that as a result of changing requirements and economic purchase orders, there will always be some items on order that are in excess to the inventory goals. How-

ever, the committee believes that this can be reduced if the the military services and the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) carefully evaluate requirements and exercise appropriate management oversight.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to perform a review of the orders of the military services and the DLA, for the latest year with available data, later judged to be excess inventory on order and determine the extent to which the items were excess when the order was first made. The report should also review the Department's actions to cancel such orders and determine if the actions resulted in the most efficient use of defense funding.

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 2000, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year—		
	1999 authoriza- tion	2000 request	2000 rec- ommendation
Army: Total	480,000	480,000	480,000
Navy: Total	372,696	371,781	371,781
Marine Corps: Total	172,200	172,148	172,240
Air Force: Total	370,882	360,877	360,877

The increase in Marine Corps end strength includes an increase of 92 to support the additional requirements for Marine Security Guard Detachments that will be activated during fiscal year 2000.

The committee expects that the Marine Corps will include in future budget requests the end strength increases necessary to support the additional planned Marine Security Guard Detachment activations, as requested by the Department of State.

Revision in permanent end strength levels (sec. 402)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the active duty end strength floors for fiscal year 2000, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year—	
	1999 floor	2000 floor
Army: Total	480,000	480,000
Navy: Total	372,696	371,781
Marine Corps: Total	172,200	172,148
Air Force: Total	370,802	360,877

Reduction of end strengths below levels for two major regional contingencies (sec. 403)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 691(d) of title 10, United States Code, to permit the Secretary of Defense to reduce the end strength floors only after notifying Congress in writing of the scope of the reduction and the justification for such reductions.

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 2000, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year—		
	1999 authoriza- tion	2000 request	2000 rec- ommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	357,223	350,000	350,623
The Army Reserve	208,003	205,000	205,000
The Naval Reserve	90,843	90,288	90,288
The Marine Corps Reserve	40,018	39,624	39,624
The Air National Guard of the United States	106,992	106,678	106,744
The Air Force Reserve	74,243	73,708	73,764
The Coast Guard Reserve	8,000	8,000	8,000

The increase in the Army National Guard end strength includes an increase of 425 Active Guard Reserve personnel in fiscal year 2000 as the first step toward a goal of 23,500 in fiscal year 2001 and an increase of 198 Active Guard Reserve personnel required to man the 12 additional Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams authorized in another title of this bill.

The increase in the Air National Guard end strength includes an increase of 66 Active Guard Reserve personnel required to man the 12 additional RAID teams authorized in another title of this bill.

The increase in the Air Force Reserve end strength includes an increase of 56 Active Guard Reserve personnel required by the transfer of the functional check flight and test support missions within Air Force Material Command from the active Air Force to the Air Force Reserve.

End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize full-time support end strengths for fiscal year 2000, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year—		
	1999 authoriza- tion	2000 request	2000 rec- ommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	21,986	21,807	22,430
The Army Reserve	12,807	12,804	12,804
The Naval Reserve	15,590	15,010	15,010
The Marine Corps Reserve	2,362	2,272	2,272
The Air National Guard of the United States	10,931	11,091	11,157
The Air Force Reserve	992	1,078	1,134

The increase in the Army National Guard end strength includes an increase of 425 Active Guard Reserve personnel in fiscal year 2000 as the first step toward a goal of 23,500 in fiscal year 2001 and an increase of 198 Active Guard Reserve personnel required to man the 12 additional Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams authorized in another title of this bill.

The increase in the Air National Guard end strength includes an increase of 66 Active Guard Reserve personnel required to man the 12 additional RAID teams authorized in another title of this bill.

The increase in the Air Force Reserve end strength includes an increase of 56 Active Guard Reserve personnel required by the transfer of the functional check flight and test support missions within Air Force Material Command from the active Air Force to the Air Force Reserve.

End strengths for military technicians (sec. 413)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the minimum level of dual status military technician end strengths for fiscal year 2000, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year—		
	1999 authoriza- tion	2000 request	2000 rec- ommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	23,125	21,361	22,396
The Army Reserve	5,395	5,179	5,179
The Air National Guard of the United States	22,408	22,247	22,247
The Air Force Reserve	9,761	9,785	9,785

The increase in the Army National Guard dual status military technician floor includes an increase of 1,035 personnel in fiscal year 2000 as the first step toward a goal of 25,500 in fiscal year 2001.

The provision would also authorize non-dual status military technician end strengths for fiscal year 2000, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year—	
	2000 request	2000 rec- ommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	1,800	1,800
The Army Reserve	1,295	1,295
The Air National Guard of the United States	342	342
The Air Force Reserve	342	342

Increase in numbers of members in certain grades authorized to be on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the control grades for Active Guard Reserve personnel. The recommended control grade increases support the necessary grade structure for full-time personnel required with regard to the Army and Air National Guard Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection teams, the transfer of two missions from the active Air Force to the Air Force Reserve, Army National Guard enhanced separate brigades, Army National Guard support of active/reserve integration, Army Reserve congressionally authorized increases, and Air National Guard Formal Training Units.

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS**Authorization of appropriations for military personnel (sec. 421)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of \$71,693,093,000 to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel.

The budget request of \$73,723,293 was reduced by \$192,200 due to adjustments in foreign currency fluctuation and military personnel under execution. An additional \$1,838,000 provided in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill related to operations in the Balkans was reallocated to readiness and procurement accounts.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY

Extension of requirement for competition for joint 4-star officer positions (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the exemption of combatant commanders (CINCs), the Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the United States European Command (DCINCEUR), and the Commander-in-Chief, United States Forces, Korea from the ceiling for grades above major general or rear admiral for three years from September 30, 2000 to September 30, 2003.

The committee is still not satisfied with the progress of efforts to break the traditional patterns for filling CINC positions. Until the committee is convinced that competition for these positions is truly meritorious and selection is not based on traditional service alignments, this authority will remain temporary.

Additional three-star officer positions for superintendents of service academies (sec. 502)

The committee recommends a provision that would exclude an officer serving in the position of Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, or Superintendent of the United States Air Force Academy in the grade of lieutenant general, or vice admiral in the case of the Navy, from counting against the limit on three- and four-star general or flag officers. The recommended provision would require that, upon termination of a detail as Superintendent, the officer must retire. The recommended provision would become effective with the appointment of the next Superintendent at each academy.

The recommended provision does not limit the tenure or establish a tour length for the position of Superintendent. The recommended provision does not preclude a service from extending an officer assigned to a position of Superintendent for an additional tour, should the service have a policy that establishes a specific tour length as a Superintendent. The recommended provision does not preclude an officer who retires following an assignment as a Superintendent from being subsequently recalled to active duty at the discretion of the Service Secretary.

Increase in maximum number of officers authorized to be on active-duty list in frocked grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (sec. 503)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the number of officers permitted to be frocked to the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral from 35 to 55.

Reserve officers requesting or otherwise causing nonselection for promotion (sec. 504)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate a loophole in section 617(c) that permitted reserve officers to request nonselection by a promotion board and, as a result of a subsequent nonselection, avoid a service obligation and recoupment of bonus payments while regular officers are prohibited from such actions.

Minimum grade of officers eligible to serve on boards of inquiry (sec. 505)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the required board membership for Boards of Inquiry from the current requirement of three officers in the grade of colonel, or captain in the case of the Navy, to one officer in the grade of colonel, or captain in the case of the Navy, and two officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel, or commander in the case of the Navy. The recommended provision does not change the requirement that the members of the board must be senior in grade to any officer considered by that board.

Minimum selection of warrant officers for promotion from below the promotion zone (sec. 506)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize below the zone selection for promotion of warrant officers in all competitive categories even when the promotion zone lacks sufficient numbers to permit recommendation for promotion of an officer from below the promotion zone using the current formula.

Increase in threshold period of active duty for applicability of restriction on holding of civil office by retired regular officers and reserve officers (sec. 507)

The committee recommends a provision that would change the number of days reserve officers or retired regular officers may hold civil office while serving on active duty from 180 days to 270 days. The recommended change makes sections 973(b)(1)(B) and (C) of title 10, United States Code, conform to the maximum number of days for which a reservist may be called to active duty under the Presidential Selective Reserve Call-up (PSRC) authority. When the Congress extended the maximum number of days for which a reservist may be called to active duty under the PSRC the maximum number of days reserve officers or retired regular officers may hold a civil office while serving on active duty should have been extended as well. The recommended provision does not permit any officer holding a civil office while serving on active duty to exercise any activities associated with that office while on active duty.

Exemption of retiree council members from recalled retiree limits (sec. 508)

The committee recommends a provision that would exempt retired officers recalled to active duty for purposes of attending the annual meeting of a retiree council from counting against the limitation on the number of retired officers who may be recalled to active duty.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MATTERS**Additional exemptions for reserve component general and flag officers from limitation on authorized strength of general and flag officers on active duty (sec. 511)**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit up to 25 reserve component general and flag officers to serve on active duty for periods of 180 days or longer without counting against the active duty general and flag officer limits. The committee continues to seek ways to provide opportunities for reserve component general and flag officers to use their expertise and to gain valuable experience serving on the staff of a CINC or other joint duty positions. The recommended provision is not intended to be a source of manpower for the active components nor is it intended to be used in cases in which the duties would not provide the reserve general or flag officer significant experience in a joint or critical service staff position.

Duties of reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 512)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the functions and duties authorized to be performed by Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) personnel. The recommended provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to review how AGR personnel will be used given the expanded functions and duties since some of the missions that may be assigned to AGR personnel, which are currently assigned to active component units. The category of personnel known as reserves on active duty in support of the reserves may be better redesignated simply as reserves on active duty. In addition, the recommended provision would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on whether AGRs should be accounted for within the active component end strength and funded within the appropriations for active component military personnel.

The committee has, for several years, recognized that the military services were using AGR personnel for functions and missions other than those permitted in section 12310 of title 10, United States Code. The recommended provision, developed in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, is intended to permit AGR personnel to perform a broader range of duties, some of which are currently performed only by active component units. Performing these new functions and duties would, in fact, make AGR personnel more like an extension of the active component. Therefore, the committee directs the secretaries of the military departments to promulgate policies that would require AGR personnel to compete for promotion and other centralized selection activities against each other in a separate category.

Repeal of limitation on number of reserves on full-time active duty in support of preparedness for responses to emergencies involving weapons of mass destruction. (sec. 513)

The committee recommends a provision to repeal the limitation on the number of reserves on full-time active duty who can provide support in response to an emergency involving weapons of mass destruction.

Extension of period for retention of reserve component majors and lieutenant commanders who twice fail of selection for promotion (sec. 514)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the period of service of reserve component majors and lieutenant commanders following a second failure to be selected for promotion. The extension period is the later of six months after the President approves the report of the promotion board or upon completion of 20 years of commissioned service. The recommended provision would provide a reserve component major or lieutenant commander with twenty years of service, or less than six months to reach twenty years of service, a six month period to transition out of the service.

Continuation of officer on reserve active-status list for disciplinary action (sec. 515)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit service secretaries to retain, on the Reserve Active Status List, any reserve officer until the completion of a court-martial action. The recommended provision prevents reserve officers from separating from the service to avoid prosecution. Service secretaries currently have a similar authority for retaining active component officers.

Retention of reserve component chaplains until age 67 (sec. 516)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to retain reserve component chaplains until age 67. The recommended provision extends an authority to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force that is currently provided to the Secretary of the Navy.

Reserve credit for participation in health professions scholarship and financial assistance program limited to reserve retirement credit only (sec. 517)

The committee recommends a provision that would specify that the award of service credit for reservists who participate in a health professions scholarship and financial assistance program applies only to those who complete a satisfactory year of service in the selected reserve. The recommended provision would revise the existing statutes to ensure that reserve service credit for reservists who participate in a health professions scholarship and financial assistance program is not awarded for pay and longevity purposes.

Exclusion of reserve officers on educational delay from eligibility for consideration for promotion (sec. 518)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit promotion eligibility for reserve officers in an educational delay status. The recommended provision delays the promotion eligibility for reserve officers in an educational delay status until these officers have had an opportunity to receive performance evaluations and thus be more competitive for promotion. Currently, an officer whose service consists only of attending a civilian educational program is disadvantaged when considered for promotion with officers who are performing in mission critical positions.

Exclusion of period of pursuit of professional education from computation of years of service for reserve officers (sec. 519)

The committee recommends a provision that would not include the years spent in a college student commissioning service status in the computation of years of service for a reserve officer. Currently, such time is not included in the computation of years of service for active duty officers. The recommended provision would permit reserve officers to serve several more years before facing mandatory separation based on years of service.

Correction of reference relating to crediting of satisfactory service by reserve officers in highest grade held (sec. 520)

The committee recommends a provision that would correct an erroneous reference in section 1370(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

Establishment of Office of the Coast Guard Reserve (sec. 521)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish in the Coast Guard an Office of Reserve Affairs headed by an officer in a grade above captain. This office would be similar to Offices of Reserve Affairs in the other armed forces (10 U.S.C. 3038, 5143, 5144, and 8038). No additional billets would be established, as the Coast Guard has traditionally assigned a flag officer as the Director of the Coast Guard Reserve. The primary responsibility of the Director of the Coast Guard Reserve would be to oversee the functions and activities of the Coast Guard's Reserve component. However, the office of the Coast Guard Reserve and the Director of the Coast Guard Reserve could have other duties, as determined by the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

Subtitle C—Military Education and Training

Authority to exceed temporarily a strength limitation for the service academies (sec. 531)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the secretary of a military department the authority to waive the 4,000 cadet strength limitation by five percent after the secretary notifies the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The committee is aware that the United States Military Academy will exceed the cadet strength limitation due to lower than anticipated attrition and higher than expected acceptance rates. The committee recognizes that the only solution currently available to the Superintendent and the Secretary of the Army is to under-assess for the next entering class, which would result in under-assessing the officer cohort four years later. The committee believes that, when a cadet overstrength occurs as a result of an unexpected positive event such as low attrition and a higher than expected acceptance rate, the service should not be required to take an action that may result in officer shortages in the future. The committee does expect the Secretary of the Army and the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy to review the attrition models and take prudent actions to return the Corps of Cadets to the 4,000 cadet limit as expeditiously as possible.

Repeal of limitation on amount of reimbursement authorized to be waived for foreign students at service academies (sec. 532)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the current limits on the number of foreign students at service academies for which the Secretary of Defense may waive reimbursement for tuition costs.

Expansion of foreign service programs of the service academies (sec. 533)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the foreign exchange student program in the service academies. The recommended provision would increase the number of cadets who may participate in exchange programs from 10 to 24 and increase the authorized expenditures to support the exchanges from \$50,000 to \$120,000.

Permanent authority for ROTC scholarships for graduate students (sec. 534)

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent a temporary authority that permits graduate students to be awarded Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) scholarships. The recommended provision would limit the number of graduate student ROTC scholarships awarded to 15 percent of the total number of scholarships.

Authority for award of Master of Strategic Studies degree by the United States Army War College (sec. 535)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Commandant of the United States Army War College to confer the degree of Masters of Strategic Studies upon graduates of the War College who fulfill the requirements of the degree.

Minimum educational requirements for faculty of the Community College of the Air Force (sec. 536)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Commander of the Air Force Air Education and Training Command to establish minimum requirements relating to education for Com-

munity College of the Air Force professors and instructors. The recommended provision would permit the Commander, Air Education and Training Command to make certain educational requirements part of the job descriptions for professors and instructors in the Community College of the Air Force.

Conferral of graduate-level degrees by Air University (sec. 537)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Commander of the Air Force Air University to confer graduate-level degrees upon graduates of Air University who fulfill the requirements of a degree. The recommended provision would permit award of the degrees of Master of Strategic Studies for the Air War College, Master of Military Operational Art and Science for the Air Command and Staff College, and Master of Airpower Art and Science for the School of Advanced Airpower Studies.

Payment of tuition for education and training of members in the defense acquisition workforce (sec. 538)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit payment of tuition for education and training of military personnel in the acquisition workforce on the same basis as civilian personnel in the acquisition workforce.

Financial assistance program for pursuit of degrees by officer candidates in Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program (sec. 539)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide financial assistance to an eligible enlisted member of the Marine Corps Reserve for expenses incurred in pursuit of a baccalaureate degree and a commission in the Marine Corps. The recommended provision would permit the Secretary of the Navy to support this valuable officer accession program and would revise the current program in which officer candidates in the Platoon Leaders Class receive service credit for the time they spend in pursuit of a baccalaureate degree.

Subtitle D—Decorations, Awards, and Commendations

Waiver of time limitations for award of certain decorations to certain persons (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision that would waive the statutory time limitations for the award of military decorations to certain individuals who have been recommended by the service secretaries for these awards.

SUBTITLE E—AMENDMENTS TO UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Increase in sentencing jurisdiction of special courts-martial authorized to adjudge a bad-conduct discharge (sec. 561)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 19 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (10 U.S.C. 819) to increase the sentencing jurisdiction of those special courts-martial

which are authorized to adjudge a bad-conduct discharge to include confinement for one year and forfeiture of two-thirds pay for one year. The amendment would apply to charges referred to trial by such special courts-martial on or after the first day of the sixth month following the month on which this Act is enacted.

Reduced minimum blood and breath alcohol levels for offense of drunken operation or control of a vehicle, aircraft, or vessel (sec. 562)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 111 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (10 U.S.C. 911) to reduce, from 0.10 grams to 0.08 grams, the blood and breath alcohol levels for the offense of drunken operation of a vehicle, aircraft, or vessel. The amendment would take effect on the date of enactment and would apply to offenses committed on or after that date.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Funeral honors details at funerals of veterans (sec. 571)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the minimum composition of a funeral honors detail to provide honors at the funeral of a veteran. The recommended provision would require the Secretary of Defense to provide, at a minimum, two uniformed military personnel and the capability to provide a high quality recording of taps. At least one member of the funeral honors detail must represent the service of the deceased veteran. The Secretary of Defense may use either active or reserve component or a mix of active and reserve component personnel to provide the funeral honors. The ceremony would, at a minimum, include folding and presentation of the United States flag and the playing of taps. The recommended provision would authorize reserve component personnel who participate in an honor guard detail to receive retirement point credit, would authorize medical treatment for any illness or injury a reservist might incur during the period in which they are participating in an honor detail and would authorize a \$50 stipend for the performance as part of a funeral honors detail. The recommended provision would also make deceased members or former members of the Selected Reserve eligible for funeral honors. The recommended provision would permit the Secretary of Defense to accept the voluntary services of veterans support organizations to assist in performing funeral honors. The committee encourages the veterans support organizations at the national and local level to cooperate with the Department of Defense to the maximum extent possible to provide those veterans whose families request military honors the recognition they deserve.

Increased authority to extend delayed entry period for enlistments of persons with no prior military service (sec. 572)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the period in which a potential recruit may be extended in the delayed entry program from 180 days to 365 days. The committee notes that the military services are actively recruiting on college campuses. Many college students may be willing to enter the delayed

entry program if they are able to complete college or junior college course before enlistment. The recommended provision would permit the military services to retain a prospective enlistee in the delayed entry program for a maximum of two years.

Army college first pilot program (sec. 573)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to establish a pilot program, during the period beginning on October 1, 1999 and ending on September 30, 2004, to assess whether the Army could increase the number and quality of persons recruited for the Army by encouraging recruits to pursue or continue higher education, vocational or technical training before entering active duty. The pilot program authority could consist of two unique alternatives. In one, recruits could be placed in the delayed entry program for a maximum of two years and receive a \$150 stipend each month while completing their higher education, vocational or technical training prior to entering active duty. In another, recruits would enlist in the selected reserve, complete initial entry training and be assigned to a Selected Reserve unit while participating in a two year program of higher education, vocational or technical training. Upon completion of their schooling, the member would be discharged from the Selected Reserve and enlist in the active component. The recommended provision would require the Secretary of the Army to assess the effectiveness of the pilot program and report that assessment to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than February 1, 2004. The committee believes this pilot program will enable the Army to appeal to that growing portion of the eligible population that plan to attend college or other vocational or technical training. There is evidence that many of these young men and women see military service as a detour from their intended educational goals. The committee believes that the recommended pilot program may permit these young men and women to see military service as a means of achieving their educational goals.

Reduction in required frequency of reporting on the Selected Reserve educational assistance program under the Montgomery GI Bill (sec. 574)

The committee recommends a provision that would change the frequency for the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congress concerning the operation of the Selected Reserve educational assistance program under the Montgomery G.I. Bill from annually to every two years, covering the period of time since the last report. The recommended provision would permit the Secretary of Defense to submit a report more frequently if he deems such an activity to be appropriate.

Participation of members in management of organizations abroad that promote international understanding (sec. 575)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1033(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, to add to the classes of non-federal entities therein certain overseas entities that pro-

mote understanding between U.S. military personnel stationed abroad and the people of the host nation. Such entities as the Federation of German-American Clubs in the Federal Republic of Germany have for many years promoted international understanding and benefited U.S. military personnel by carrying on social events, cultural exchanges, and other friendship activities. Similar entities exist in Korea and elsewhere. It is appropriate that the Secretaries concerned have the authority to authorize members of the armed forces to participate in the management of these entities that offer such benefits to our personnel abroad.

Forensic pathology investigations by armed forces medical examiner (sec. 576)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Armed Forces Medical Examiner or the installation commander to direct that a forensic pathology investigation, which may include an autopsy, be conducted to determine the cause or manner of death of a deceased person under certain conditions. The recommended provision would permit a forensic pathology investigation be conducted in cases where it appears that the decedent was killed or that the cause of death was unnatural; the cause of death is unknown; there is reasonable suspicion that the death was by unlawful means; it appears that the death may have resulted from an infectious disease or from the effects of a hazardous material that may have an adverse effect on the military installation or the community; or the identity of the decedent is unknown. These conditions would only apply to deaths when the decedent was found dead or died at an installation that is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; the decedent was a member of the armed forces on active duty or inactive duty for training or a former member recently retired as a result of an injury or illness incurred while on active duty or inactive duty for training; and the decedent was a civilian dependent of a member of the armed forces and was found dead or died outside the United States. In addition, the recommended provision would repeal provisions in title 10, United States Code, requiring Army and Air Force installation commanders to direct a summary court-martial to investigate the circumstances of the death. The committee understands that installation commanders have independent authority to investigate the circumstances of deaths occurring on an installation that is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.

Nondisclosure of information on missing persons returned to United States control (sec. 577)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit disclosure of the record of any debriefings conducted by an official of the United States authorized to conduct such a debriefing of a missing person returned to the U.S. control.

Use of recruiting materials for public relations purposes (sec. 578)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Department of Defense to use advertising materials developed for

recruiting and retention of personnel to be used for public relations purposes.

Improvement and transfer of jurisdiction of Troops-to-Teachers program (sec. 579)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1151 of title 10, United States Code, to improve the current Troops-to-Teachers program and to provide for the transfer of this program to the Department of Education. The recommended provision would change the eligible population from military personnel separated from the services to those who will retire on or after October 1, 1999. Participating members would be required to obtain certification or licensure as an elementary or secondary school teacher, or vocational or technical teacher, and to accept an offer of full-time employment as an elementary or secondary school teacher, or vocational or technical teacher. The recommended provision would authorize either a \$5,000 stipend to be paid to each participant or a \$10,000 bonus to be paid to those who agree to accept full-time employment as an elementary or secondary school teacher, or vocational or technical teacher for not less than four years in a high need school. The recommended provision would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation to transfer responsibility for the Troops-to-Teachers program to the Secretary of Education, not later than October 1, 2001.

Support for expanded child care services and youth program services for dependents (sec. 580)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide financial assistance to eligible civilian providers of child care services or youth program services for members of the armed forces and other eligible federal employees. The recommended provision would also authorize the Secretary to permit children who are not otherwise eligible for these services to participate on a space available basis.

The committee believes that the recommended financial assistance is necessary to supplement and expand essential quality of life services for children of military personnel and eligible federal employees at an affordable cost. Permitting other children and youth to participate will allow more efficient use of DOD resources, enhance integration with the civilian community, and authorize partnering with schools and other youth services organizations.

Responses to domestic violence in the armed forces (sec. 581)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a military-civilian task force on domestic violence. The task force would serve for three years. Within six months of appointment, the task force would recommend actions to the Department of Defense: a standard format for agreements with civilian law enforcement authorities relating to acts of domestic violence involving members of the armed forces; a requirement that commanding officers provide to persons protected by a "no contact order" a written copy of that order within 24 hours; standard guidance to commanders on factors to consider when de-

termining appropriate action on substantiated allegations of domestic violence; and a standard training program for all commanding officers on the handling of domestic violence cases. The task force would submit additional periodic reports to the Secretary of Defense containing analyses and recommendations for responding, or improving responses, to cases of domestic violence.

The recommended provision would also require the Secretary to establish a central database and report annually to Congress on each reported case of domestic violence, the number and action taken on substantiated allegations, and the number and description of allegations where the evidence is insufficient to support disciplinary action.

The committee believes these provisions are necessary to ensure that all of the services are able to benefit from a standardized policy and adequate reporting requirement to properly address and track incidences of domestic violence. The recommended provision would also take steps to ensure that armed forces personnel, civilian law enforcement personnel, and domestic violence and sexual assault advocates have the opportunity to participate in the development of policies to protect victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in the military community.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System

The committee is encouraged by progress in developing the Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS) as a single, fully integrated, all-service, all-component, military personnel and pay management system. Last year, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the reserve components, to conduct a comprehensive study of the personnel management and finance systems supporting the reserve components to determine the advisability and feasibility of standardizing the systems used by the reserve components with those used to manage and support the active forces. The report of this study is the Mission Need Statement describing the coordinated and approved objectives of the DIMHRS program. This coincides with the requirement contained in section 8147 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999 that requires the Secretary to establish a Defense Reform Initiative (DRI) enterprise program for military manpower, personnel, training and compensation programs using a revised DIMHRS as a baseline. The committee strongly endorses the DRI enterprise program for continued enhancement of DIMHRS. The need for such an integrated program is illustrated by the case of a reservist who received 11 separate W-2 forms from his servicing Defense Finance and Accounting Center. In this age of integrated, network-centric computer systems, there certainly is a way to ensure finance and personnel records are not compartmentalized to the point where multiple W-2 forms are a common business practice.

Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps

The committee strongly supports the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) program. The committee recognizes that

there is a direct relationship between the JROTC program and recruitment. Strong testimony from the Joint Chiefs of Staff this year confirmed this relationship. More than half of the young men and women who voluntarily participate in this high school program affiliate with the military in some fashion after graduation. JROTC is open to all students, affluent or disadvantaged from all races, in the high schools where the program is offered. JROTC is a proven instrument for instilling a sense of personal discipline and pride in the cadets. In many cases, JROTC is the single source for training on values and ethics. JROTC produces more productive, proud, and patriotic adults. The committee is aware that there are hundreds of high schools on the services' JROTC waiting lists. The interest and support for this program is unchallenged.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense does not have a plan or policies in effect with regard to how schools on a waiting list are selected for a new JROTC program. In testimony before the Personnel Subcommittee, OSD and service officials admitted that they did not have established criteria for placing schools on a waiting list or for awarding a JROTC program to a school currently on a waiting list. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the secretaries of the military departments, to develop criteria and policies to ensure that local communities know where they stand on a waiting list and to ensure that when new JROTC programs are awarded that they are awarded based on established criteria to realize the most benefit for the Department of Defense and the local community.

The committee was disappointed that the Commander, U.S. Army Reserve Officer Training Corps Cadet Command was not available to meet with staff to discuss the Army JROTC program. The committee has anecdotal information that Army JROTC programs are under-resourced and ill-equipped. The committee has reports that, in some cases, JROTC instructor personnel purchase equipment to support their curriculum using personal funds and, in other cases, the cadets are not provided with uniforms. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to initiate an inspection of each Army JROTC program, to be conducted by the Inspector General of the Army, to determine whether the programs are properly resourced and equipped. As part of this inspection, the Inspector General shall compare the resourcing, equipping, and manning of Army JROTC programs with those of the other services. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to report the results of this inspection to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 15, 2000.

Recruiter access

The committee strongly supports efforts to ensure military recruiters have access to high school and college campuses. Section 558 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 prohibits the Department of Defense from providing funds by grant or contract to any institution of higher education that has a policy of denying or which effectively prevents military recruiters from entry to the campus, access to students on campuses, or access to directory information pertaining to students over the age of 17. The

committee has learned that some in the Department of Defense may be interpreting this prohibition in a manner inconsistent with the intent of the Congress. The congressional intent is that if a college or university denies military recruiters access, then the entire institution shall be denied any further Department of Defense funds. The committee has been advised that if, for instance, a law school or a medical school denies access to military recruiters only funds to that specific school would be withdrawn. The committee intends that the entire university or institution would be affected by the prohibition on providing Department of Defense funds. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the policies related to the prohibition of Department of Defense funds to institutions of higher learning that deny access to military recruiters, to ensure that the policies and practices are consistent with the intent of the Congress.

The committee is also aware that numerous high schools are denying military recruiters access to campuses and students. The prohibition in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 does not apply to secondary schools. However, the committee believes that denying military recruiters access to high schools is not in the best interests of the students or the Nation. To many young men and women, military service is the most effective avenue to gaining skills, learning discipline, and earning funds for further educational opportunities. When recruiters are denied the opportunity to meet with high school students and acquaint them with the benefits and opportunities that accrue as a result of military service, the results are contrary to the best interests of the individuals and the Nation. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to take immediate action to work with local educational agencies and local government officials in every case in which military recruiters are denied access to a secondary school campus and students.

Air Force Reserve

The committee is aware that the Air Force is retiring its aging C-141 aircraft fleet and replacing the venerable aircraft with the C-17 aircraft. Five Air Force Reserve units are scheduled to begin retiring their C-141 aircraft in fiscal year 2003. The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Air Force has not designated any follow-on mission for these units. In view of the critical shortfall in pilots and the high operational tempo of the Air Force's strategic lift elements, any delay in designating a follow-on mission for the Air Force Reserve C-141 units may aggravate the current problems. The committee urges the Secretary of the Air Force to designate a mission for Air Force Reserve units affected by the retirement of the C-141 as soon as practical and to notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the new mission assignments for each of the affected reserve units.

George C. Marshall Reserve Officer Training Corps Award and Seminar program

For over 20 years, the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) has sponsored The George C. Marshall Reserve

Officer Training Corps Award and Seminar program. This annual program brings together top Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) cadets from colleges nationwide to discuss security issues facing our Nation today. The impact of George Marshall's contributions to worldwide reconstruction following the devastation of World War II provides an historical perspective for today's political, military and economic challenges worldwide. Further, emphasis is placed on the unique character and integrity of George Marshall, soldier-statesman, to underscore the importance of these attributes for tomorrow's potential leaders.

The committee notes the success of this program for ROTC cadets. The Army Junior Reserve Officer Training (JROTC) program, also administered by TRADOC, is a character and leadership development program similar to the ROTC program. The committee provided \$19.0 million in additional funding for the Army JROTC program for fiscal year 2000.

Like ROTC cadets, JROTC cadets can also learn from George Marshall's exemplary character and leadership. Accordingly, the committee urges the Department of the Army to develop a JROTC award and seminar program similar to the ROTC award and seminar program. An important element of this JROTC award and seminar program should be an emphasis on those qualities of George Marshall that make him a role model of the 20th Century.

Initiatives to enhance military recruiting

The committee recognizes and is concerned about the challenges the military services are facing as they attempt to recruit and retain the necessary quality and quantity of young men and women for military service. Previously, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program to examine the possible benefits that might be derived from outsourcing functions associated with recruiting. The committee is aware of several initiatives in this area, and has received very positive—but anecdotal—information about these initiatives. The committee believes that the severity of the recruiting challenges facing the services and the amount of funds already dedicated to all aspects of the recruiting mission argue in favor of aggressive, innovative experiments and pilot programs that go beyond merely addressing the margins of traditional practices. The importance of assessing the right quality and quantity of military personnel for each of the services cannot be overstated. Therefore, the committee strongly urges the secretaries of the military departments to test a wide spectrum of approaches, including outsourcing significant portions of the recruiting mission by function or by recruiting unit.

The committee is also aware of innovative partnerships that have enhanced military recruiting. In one case, a state employment agency informs job applicants about the training, college scholarship incentives, and opportunities available in the Army. In return, Army recruiters make regular visits to employment agency offices to answer questions from job applicants who may be interested in enlisting. A successful enlistment counts as a recruiting success for the Army and a successful placement by the employment agency. Similarly, recruiters who regularly visit Job Corps centers have had great success. The committee encourages the services to work

with state and federal agencies in innovative ways to assist in their recruiting efforts.

**TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL
BENEFITS**

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

**Fiscal year 2000 increase and restructuring of basic pay
(sec. 601)**

The committee recommends a provision that would waive section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, and increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services by 4.8 percent. This increase would be effective January 1, 2000. In addition, the recommended provision would, effective July 1, 2000, restructure the pay tables for the uniformed services to relieve compression between grades by restoring significance to promotion pay raises and eliminating inconsistencies in the current pay tables. The proposed restructuring of the pay tables would shift the emphasis toward promotion while reducing and making longevity increases more uniform than those in the current pay tables.

Pay increases for 2001 through 2006 (sec. 602)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, to provide that the military pay raises for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2006 be equal to the Employment Cost Index plus one-half percent. The committee intends that military pay raises during the Future Years Defense Plan exceed the annual growth in private sector wages, as indicated by the Employment Cost Index, to close the gap between military pay and private sector wages. The committee recognizes that this formula may be extended in the future, following an evaluation of the gap between military and private sector wages.

Special subsistence allowance for food stamp eligible members (sec. 603)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a special subsistence allowance of \$180 per month payable to enlisted personnel in grades E-5 and below who can demonstrate eligibility for food stamps. This allowance would be payable for a period of twelve months, unless one of the following events occurs: the service member is no longer eligible for food stamps; the service member is promoted to a higher grade; or the service member is transferred in a permanent change of station. Once the allowance is terminated, the service member may re-apply for the allowance if continued eligibility for food stamps is demonstrated. The recommended provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report on the number of military personnel eligible to receive food stamps to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1

of each year. The special subsistence allowance would be effective within 180 days of enactment and would expire after five years. The committee believes that the Nation should take extraordinary measures to assist the neediest military families who now require federal food stamp assistance. This allowance, when combined with the 4.8 percent pay raise, restructuring of the pay tables, and the requirement for future pay raises to be based on the Employment Cost Index plus one-half percent, is estimated to assist nearly 10,000 military personnel to discontinue the use of food stamps.

Payment for unused leave in conjunction with a reenlistment (sec. 604)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit service members to sell back unused leave when they reenlist more than three months prior to the expiration of the current term of service. The recommended provision would modify the current authority by permitting service members to sell back leave when they reenlist early, however, the current career limit of selling back 60 days of leave remains in effect.

Continuance of pay and allowances while in duty status “whereabouts unknown” (sec. 605)

The committee recommends a provision that would continue payment of pay and allowances to a member of the uniformed services on active duty or performing inactive-duty training who is in a duty status “whereabouts unknown”. Currently, when a service member is missing and declared in a duty status “whereabouts known” all pay and allowances are suspended. The recommended provision would continue the pay and allowances while the service member remains in a duty status “whereabouts unknown” allowing the family to receive the member’s pay.

Equitable treatment of class of 1987 of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (sec. 606)

The committee recommends a provision that would correct an inequity in crediting years of service for the Class of 1987 of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. A change in policy on providing service credit for students at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences adversely affected the Class of 1987. The recommended provision would correct this inequity. The recommended provision does not authorize retroactive payment of pay and allowances or reconsideration by promotion or other selection boards convened before October 1, 1999.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL INCENTIVE PAYS

One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of certain bonuses and special pays (sec. 611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 31, 2000, the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonuses for critical skills, the special pay for nuclear qualified officers who extend the period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus.

One-year extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 31, 2000, the authority to pay the special pay for critically short wartime health specialists in the Selected Reserve, the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonuses, the Selected Reserve enlistment bonuses, the special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high priority units in the Selected Reserve, the Selected Reserve affiliation bonus, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, the repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, and the prior service enlistment bonus.

One-year extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists (sec. 613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 31, 2000, the authority to pay certain bonuses and special pay for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists.

Amount of aviation career incentive pay for Air Battle Managers formerly eligible for hazardous duty pay (sec. 614)

The committee recommends a provision that would protect Air Battle Managers from reductions in incentive pay when they convert from non-rated to rated personnel. Non-rated Air Battle Managers received hazardous duty pay. As the Air Force converts this speciality from non-rated to rated, the personnel qualify for aviation career incentive pay in lieu of hazardous duty pay, which would result in some personnel receiving less incentive money. The recommended provision provides a “save-pay” authority for these personnel.

Aviation career officer special pay (sec. 615)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the need for secretaries of the military departments to define critical aviation specialties annually and permit them to offer bonuses of up to \$25,000 for each year that aviation officers in the grade of O-5 and below agree to remain on active duty in aviation service, up to 25 years of aviation service.

Career enlisted flyer incentive pay (sec. 616)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a career enlisted flyer incentive pay for enlisted crewmen currently receiving hazardous duty incentive pay when performing flying duty. The career enlisted flyer incentive pay would range from \$150 to \$400 per month based on years of aviation service. The recommended provision includes a “save-pay” provision to ensure that no enlisted crewman receives less in career enlisted flyer incentive pay than previously received in hazardous duty incentive pay.

Retention bonus for special warfare officers extending periods of active duty (sec. 617)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a retention bonus of \$15,000 per year for special warfare officers in the grades of O-3 and O-4 who extend their period of active duty for at least one year.

Retention bonus for surface warfare officers extending periods of active duty (sec. 618)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a retention bonus of \$15,000 per year for surface warfare officers in the grade of O-3 who extend their period of active duty for at least one year.

Additional special pay for board certified veterinarians in the armed forces and Public Health Service (sec. 619)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a special pay ranging from \$2,000 per year to \$5,000 per year, depending on years of service, for board certified veterinarians in the armed forces and the Public Health Service. The recommended provision would authorize board certified special pay for veterinarians on the same basis as other health care professionals.

Increase in rate of diving duty special pay (sec. 620)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the maximum monthly amount of the diving duty special pay from \$200 to \$240 for officers and from \$300 to \$340 for enlisted personnel.

Increase in maximum amount authorized for reenlistment bonus for active members (sec. 621)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the maximum amount of the active duty reenlistment bonus from \$45,000 to \$60,000.

Critical skills enlistment bonus (sec. 622)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the maximum amount of the active duty enlistment bonus for designated critical skills from \$12,000 to \$20,000, and would permit the entire enlistment bonus to be paid in a single lump-sum upon completion of training and award of the service skill designation. The committee believes increasing the maximum amount of and paying the enlistment bonus in a lump-sum will serve as an incentive to enlistees to successfully complete their skill training.

Selected Reserve enlistment bonus (sec. 623)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the military services to offer an enlistment bonus to persons who enlist in the Selected Reserve for three-, four- or five-year enlistments and to increase the maximum bonus from \$5,000 to \$8,000. Currently, to receive an enlistment bonus, a person must enlist in the Selected Reserve for a six-year period. The committee notes the current recruiting difficulties in the reserve component, as well as the active component. The recommended provision will provide re-

serve component recruiters additional options to offer prospective recruits.

Special pay for members of the Coast Guard Reserve assigned to high priority units of the Selected Reserve (sec. 624)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to pay a special pay, not to exceed \$10 per drill period, to Coast Guard Selected Reservists serving in certain high priority units designated by the Secretary. The recommended provision would provide the Secretary of Transportation with authority similar to that of the Secretary of Defense.

Reduced minimum period of enlistment in Army in critical skill for eligibility for enlistment bonus (sec. 625)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Army to incentivize the two-year enlistment option for certain critical skills. The committee notes the current recruiting difficulties and believes that one solution may be to increase the number of shorter-term enlistments. The recommended provision will permit the Army to offer an enlistment bonus in conjunction with a two-year enlistment contract.

Eligibility for reserve component prior service enlistment bonus upon attaining a critical skill (sec. 626)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the military services to offer an enlistment bonus to persons with prior service who enlist in the Selected Reserve when they attain certain critical skills. Currently, prior service personnel must possess the critical skill in order to qualify for an enlistment bonus. The recommended provision would authorize the reserve components to pay a bonus once the prior service enlistee completes the necessary training and is determined to be qualified in the critical skill. The committee notes the current recruiting difficulties in the reserve component, as well as the active component. The recommended provision would provide reserve component recruiters additional options to offer prospective recruits.

Increase in special pay and bonuses for nuclear-qualified officers (sec. 627)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase, from \$15,000 to \$25,000, the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers who extend the period of active service; increase the nuclear career accession bonus from \$10,000 to \$20,000; and would increase the nuclear career annual incentive bonuses from \$12,000 to \$22,000 for nuclear qualified officers and from \$5,500 to \$10,000 for nuclear qualified officers who received their nuclear training as an enlisted person.

Increase in maximum monthly rate authorized for foreign language proficiency pay (sec. 628)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the maximum monthly amount of the foreign language proficiency pay from \$100 to \$300.

**SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION
ALLOWANCES****Payment of temporary lodging expenses to enlisted members making their first permanent change of station (sec. 641)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize temporary lodging expenses for enlisted personnel moving their families to their first permanent duty station. Currently, payment of temporary lodging expenses is only authorized for movements to the second and subsequent permanent duty stations.

Destination airport for emergency leave travel to the continental United States (sec. 642)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary concerned to pay for commercial transportation to the airport closest to the destination, when the cost is less than that of government provided transportation to the closest international airport in the continental United States, for emergency leave travel of members assigned to overseas locations. The recommended provision would permit service members and their families on emergency leave from an overseas assignment to travel to an airport closest to their destination, as long as the cost of the ticket is less than the cost of government provided transportation to an international airport of debarkation.

Clarification of per diem eligibility of certain military technicians (dual status) serving on active duty without pay outside the United States (sec. 643)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military technicians on leave from technician employment and serving on active duty outside the United States, deployed without an adequate opportunity to apply for a commutation of subsistence and quarters, to receive a per diem allowance. The recommended provision would be retroactive to February 10, 1996 to cover those military technicians who deployed in support of contingency operations related to Bosnia.

Expansion and codification of authority for space required travel on military aircraft for reserves performing inactive-duty training outside the continental United States (sec. 644)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand and codify section 8023 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998 to authorize space required travel for any reservist performing inactive-duty training outside the continental United States. Currently, such travel is only authorized for reservists whose unit or residence are in Hawaii or Alaska.

Reimbursement of travel expenses incurred by members of the armed forces in connection with leave canceled for involvement in Kosovo-related activities (sec. 645)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the secretary of a military department to reimburse a member of the

armed forces for travel expenses incurred as a result of being recalled from leave to meet a requirement related to Operation Allied Force. The committee believes it is not appropriate for the service member to pay the expenses resulting from a recall to duty for an operational necessity.

SUBTITLE D—RETIRED PAY, SURVIVOR BENEFITS, AND RELATED MATTERS

Retired pay options for personnel entering uniformed services on or after August 1, 1986 (sec. 651)

The committee recommends a provision that would afford service members who entered the uniformed services on or after August 1, 1986 the option to elect to retire under the pre-1986 military retirement plan or to accept a one-time \$30,000 lump sum bonus and to remain under the “Redux” retirement plan. Service members would be permitted to select between the two retirement programs within 180 days of completing 15 years of service. Service members who elect to accept the lump sum bonus would be obligated to serve the remaining five years to become retirement eligible. Those who do not complete the required service would be required to repay a prorated amount based on the unserved amount of the obligation. With the Thrift Savings Plan, recommended in another section of this bill, service members would be permitted to elect to have the pre-tax value of the bonus deposited directly into a Thrift Savings account, to the extent permitted under current Internal Revenue Service law. The committee believes that the provision fulfills the request of the Joint Chiefs by permitting those subject to the “Redux” retirement system to transfer to the pre-1986 retirement plan. However, those who would prefer to receive a cash bonus may elect to remain under the “Redux” retirement system. The committee believes these options are both cost effective and provide the necessary incentives for mid-career personnel to remain on active duty.

Participation in thrift savings plan (sec. 652)

The committee recommends a provision that would, effective July 1, 2000, authorize members of the uniformed services to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan now available for federal civil service employees. Service members would be eligible to deposit up to five percent of their basic pay, before tax, each month. The government is not required to match the service member’s contributions. In addition, service members would be permitted to directly deposit special pays for enlistment, reenlistment and the lump-sum for electing to remain in the “Redux” retirement program, pre-tax up to the extent allowable under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, into their Thrift Savings account. The Secretary of Defense may delay the effective date for members of the Ready Reserve for 180 days if the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Thrift Retirement Investment Board, finds that immediate implementation would place an excessive administrative burden on the Thrift Board’s ability to accommodate participants.

Participating in a Thrift Savings account would encourage personal savings and enhance the retirement income for service mem-

bers, who currently do not have access to a 401k savings plan. Under current Thrift Savings Plan regulations, participants may borrow from Thrift Savings accounts for such worthy purposes as college tuition and purchasing a home. If enacted, military personnel would be able to join other federal workers in a savings program that will enhance the value of their retirement system and permit them to improve quality of life. The committee believes this provision will be an important incentive for military personnel to remain on active duty or in the Ready Reserve.

Special retention initiative (sec. 653)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize service secretaries to make contributions to the Thrift Savings Plan of a service member serving in a speciality designated as critical to meet service requirements. The recommended provision would be entirely discretionary and would permit the service secretary to offer to make monthly contributions, up to the maximum amount contributed from basic pay by the service member, for a period of six years in return for a six year service commitment on the part of the service member. The Joint Chiefs testified as to the difficulty the services are experiencing with mid-career retention in critical specialities. Pilots, air crewmen, special operations personnel, surface warfare officers, and other critical military specialities have been identified as examples of the hemorrhage of highly trained, experienced military personnel. The committee believes this provision would provide service secretaries with a powerful tool to be used to encourage personnel in the most critical specialities to remain on active duty.

Applicability of dual compensation limitation to reserve officers retired after 20 years of service (sec. 654)

The committee recommends a provision that would, effective October 1, 1999, make Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) officers who retire after 20 years of active service subject to the same dual compensation limitations as regular officers. Elsewhere in this bill, the committee recommended a provision that would expand the functions of AGRs to include assumption of missions currently performed by the active force and would recognize that AGRs have evolved into a career force. As a result, the committee believes that retired AGR officers and retired active officers should be treated equitably.

Credit toward paid-up SBP coverage for months covered by make-up premium paid by persons electing SBP coverage during special open enrollment period (sec. 655)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit members who elected coverage in the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) during the special open enrollment period to receive credit for the months covered by the premium payments toward a paid-up SBP after 30 years of payments and attaining age 70. Members electing to participate in SBP during the special open enrollment period were required to pay premiums as if they had enrolled when first eligible. The recommended provision would permit these members

to credit those months for which they paid premiums towards their paid-up SBP.

Paid-up coverage under Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan (sec. 656)

The committee recommends a provision that would correct an oversight in drafting section 641 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 by including participants in the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan when considering participants in the Survivor Benefit Plan, as paid-up after the later of the month in which they have paid premiums for 30 years or they reach age 70.

Permanent authority for payment of annuities to certain military surviving spouses (sec. 657)

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent the authority to pay an annuity to certain military surviving spouses, known as the "Forgotten Widows".

Effectuation of intended SBP annuity for former spouse when not elected by reason of untimely death of retiree (sec. 658)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) benefits for former spouses who, incident to a proceeding of divorce, dissolution or annulment, entered into a written agreement for the retired member to make an election to provide SBP benefits to the former spouse, but died before the effective date of the legislative authority to make such an election.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Annual report on effects of initiatives on recruitment and retention (sec. 671)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report, beginning December 1, 2000, on the Secretary's assessment of the effectiveness of the improved pay and other benefits in title VI of this bill in relation to the recruitment and retention of personnel for the armed forces.

Members under burdensome PERSTEMPO (sec. 672)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish procedures to manage the deployment of service members. Specifically, the recommended provision would require that the first general or flag officer in the chain of command approve the deployment of a member who would be deployed more than 180 days of the past 365 days. The recommended provision would also require that deployments of members who would be deployed more than 200 days of the past 365 days be approved by a four-star general or flag officer. The recommended provision would require that service members deployed in excess of 220 days of the past 365 days be paid \$100 per day for each day over 220 days. The recommended provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to suspend applica-

bility of this section when the Secretary determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

The committee finds that excessive time away from home station and families is the reason most cited by service members and their families for dissatisfaction with military service. The United States military is deployed to more places doing more missions now than at any time in our history. In testimony, military and civilian leaders within the Department of Defense recognized the deleterious effects of repeated deployments. Unfortunately, in spite of urging by the Congress, as in section 565 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, these leaders have not taken aggressive steps to reduce the burdensome personnel tempo. The committee recommends the management standards in this provision as a first step in gaining control of the factor most responsible for declining retention in the armed forces.

Increased tuition assistance for members of the armed forces deployed in support of a contingency operation or similar operation (sec. 673)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the secretary of a military department to pay 100 percent of the tuition costs for courses in which members deployed outside the United States in support of a contingency operation are enrolled.

Administration of selected reserve education loan repayment program for Coast Guard Reserve (sec. 674)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to repay a portion of an educational loan for Coast Guard Selected Reservists serving in specialties designated by the Secretary. The recommended provision would provide the Secretary of Transportation with authority similar to that of Secretary of Defense.

Extension to all uniformed services of authority for presentation of United States flag to members upon retirement (sec. 675)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend to all the secretaries concerned the authority to present a United States flag to members of the uniformed services upon the member's retirement. Last year, the Congress authorized the secretaries of the military departments to present a United States flag to members of the armed forces upon retirement. The recommended authority extends that authority to apply to members who retire from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Public Health Service.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE

SUBTITLE A—TRICARE PROGRAM

Improvement of TRICARE benefits and management (sec. 701)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a number of improvements to TRICARE benefits and management. The recommended provision would require the Secretary of Defense, to the maximum extent practicable, to ensure that health care coverage under TRICARE is substantially similar to the health care coverage available under similar health plans offered under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. The recommended provision would also require TRICARE benefits to be portable throughout the various regions, require that the authorization and certification requirements as a condition of access to TRICARE be minimized, and that TRICARE claims processing follow the best business practices of the health care provider industry. In addition, the recommended provision would permit the Secretary of Defense to reimburse health care providers at rates higher than the current Medicare limits when the Secretary determines that higher reimbursement rates are necessary to ensure adequate network coverage. The new authority would permit military treatment facilities to collect reasonable charges, from a third-party insurer, that are incurred on behalf of a covered beneficiary.

The committee is concerned with the number of complaints about TRICARE from beneficiaries, military health care professionals, and civilian providers. The committee believes TRICARE is a viable health care delivery system that needs attention from management at all levels, a concerted cooperative effort from the military chain of command and military health care professionals to ensure the system is responsive to beneficiaries and providers. This will require the personal involvement and dedication of commanders, senior noncommissioned officers, military health care providers, and contractor personnel. The committee urges all of the parties involved to unite in a team effort to provide quality health care to the deserving beneficiary population.

Expansion and revision of authority for dental programs for dependents and Reserves (sec. 702)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand eligibility for voluntary enrollment dental plans to include members of the Ready Reserve described in section 10144(b) of title 10, United States Code, (subject to involuntary order to active duty) and dependents of members of the Ready Reserve not on active duty for more than 30 days. Plans for members of the Selected Reserve, members of the Ready Reserve described in section 10144(b) of title 10, United States Code, and active duty dependents. The provision

would require the member to pay a share of the premium charged for the plan. Plans for other members of the Individual Ready Reserve and for eligible dependents of members of the Ready Reserve, not on active duty for more than 30 days, would require the member to pay the entire premium charged for the plan.

Sense of Congress regarding automatic enrollment of Medicare-eligible beneficiaries in the TRICARE Senior Prime demonstration program (sec. 703)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that a uniformed services beneficiary who is enrolled in a managed health care program of the Department of Defense where the TRICARE Senior Prime demonstration is conducted and who attains eligibility for Medicare should be authorized automatic enrollment in the TRICARE Senior Prime demonstration program.

TRICARE beneficiary advocates (sec. 704)

The committee recommends a provision that would require each TRICARE lead agent to establish a beneficiary advocate for TRICARE beneficiaries, and would require the commander of each military treatment facility to designate a person, as a primary or collateral duty, to serve as beneficiary advocate for beneficiaries served at that facility. The committee believes that beneficiaries who have concerns about their TRICARE benefits should have someone other than the TRICARE contractor to call upon to represent their interests. The committee expects the lead agents and the military treatment facility commanders to aggressively market the existence of the beneficiary advocate and the services that office will provide. The committee further expects that each military treatment facility, TRICARE Prime location, and TRICARE Service Center will have signs identifying the lead agent beneficiary advocate, the local beneficiary advocate, and the toll free telephone numbers prominently displayed.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Care at former Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities for active duty members stationed at certain remote locations (sec. 711)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active duty personnel who live within the service areas of TRICARE Designated Providers (formerly Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities) to receive health care from a TRICARE Designated Provider if the active duty member is more than 50 miles from the nearest medical treatment facility. This provision is consistent with TRICARE remote legislation (10 U.S.C. 1074(C)). The current active duty exclusion applicable to TRICARE Designated Providers (section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201)) remains in effect; the only change is to authorize active duty personnel to use TRICARE Designated Providers in the very limited situation where they live within the service area and are more than 50 miles from the nearest medical treatment facility. The committee believes that this will be an ef-

fective and cost efficient method of providing health care to service members in some remote duty locations.

The committee is disappointed that the Secretary of Defense has not implemented a TRICARE Remote program for active duty military personnel and their families. The committee acted, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, with the concurrence of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs to direct that active duty personnel assigned to geographically separated units be provided health care locally. Subsequently, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs began to develop a TRICARE Remote Program that would also provide health care to the families of active duty personnel in remote locations. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to implement a TRICARE Remote program for active duty personnel and their families, not later than January 21, 2000. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report the implementation date and details of the program to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than January 21, 2000.

One-year extension of chiropractic health care demonstration project (sec. 712)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, by one year, the period in which the Secretary of Defense must carry out a chiropractic health care demonstration program. The one-year extension would permit the demonstration program to continue while the evaluation of the demonstration program is conducted.

Program year stability in health care benefits (sec. 713)

The committee recommends a provision that would reduce the frequency of modifications to Military Health Care System benefits and administrative practices by requiring that changes become effective on the first day of each fiscal year unless the Secretary of Defense determines that a different effective date would improve care to eligible beneficiaries.

Best value contracting (sec. 714)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that health care contracts in excess of \$5.0 million provide the best value to the United States. The recommended provision would require that greater weight be afforded to technical and performance-related factors than cost and price-related factors.

Authority to order reserve component members to active duty for health surveillance studies (sec. 715)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 12301 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to authorize the service secretary concerned to order a member of a Reserve component to active duty, with his consent, to complete a required health surveillance study or medical evaluation in conjunction with a Department of Defense program of data collection, analysis, and information dis-

semination. The recommended provision would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to retain a Reserve component member on active duty to receive medical treatment for an illness or disease associated with the study or evaluation.

Continuation of previously provided custodial care benefits for certain CHAMPUS beneficiaries (sec. 716)

The committee recommends a provision that would ensure continued coverage for certain beneficiaries who have been receiving custodial care normally disallowed under current law and regulations that exclude CHAMPUS/TRICARE coverage for custodial care.

Other Items of Interest

Defense Health Program organizational structure

The committee is concerned that the current Defense Health Program (DHP) organizational structures are unnecessarily complex and unwieldy. The military health care environment continues to evolve and new variables affect the DHP's ability to accomplish the mission. Examples of this mission evolution are increased frequency of deployment, force protection issues, and the emphasis on prevention rather than intervention. All of these variables demand rapid decision making, effective communication, and reevaluation of priorities and resource allocations. The committee is concerned that current structure may not facilitate rapid responses or flexibility.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the extent to which the creation of a single joint medical command would, as a natural evolution of the military health care system, clarify command and control, facilitate unity of effort, and improve centralized planning, while maintaining decentralized execution. The committee is especially interested in the extent to which the creation of such a command would reduce headquarters staff requirements by eliminating redundancy, permit the rapid transfer of lessons learned across the system, permit the leveraging of the purchasing power of the current TRICARE regions, reduce the variability of the health care product, and would facilitate a better understanding of the benefit for all beneficiaries.

At a minimum, this review shall address the following issues: the relationships between a new joint medical command and the surgeons general, service chiefs, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Commanders-in-Chief and the Joint Staff; medical doctrine that currently differs across the services because of where care for deployed personnel is provided, while the essence of the missions are the same; the way the DHP budget is developed, specifically, how the military departments budget for percentage of eligible beneficiaries and specific readiness, training, and wartime requirements; whether TRICARE regions should match the U.S. commands or align with the Veterans Administration Integrated Service Networks (VISNs).

The Secretary of Defense shall provide a report of this review and any other related matters to the Committees on Armed Serv-

ices of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1, 2000.

Pre-deployment medical information for female service members

The committee is concerned about the adequacy of medical information provided to female service members prior to deployment. Pre-deployment preparation is a critical element in successfully completing any mission. As a part of deployment preparations, military units should prepare service members to address gender-specific field health care issues and inform them of the availability of medical services provided in the field.

The committee is aware that pre-deployment health booklets for commanders and for service members have been drafted by the Army and are currently being revised. The committee is also aware that the Navy is developing a program known as "Operation Obstetrics and Gynecology," a specialized training program for medical care providers.

The committee urges the Army and Navy to expedite development and implementation of these programs, and the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the value and effectiveness of the programs. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report the results of this evaluation to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representative, not later than March 15, 2000.

TriService Nursing Research Program

The committee strongly supports the TriService Nursing Research Program (TNRP) authorized by section 2116 of title 10, United States Code. TNRP has conducted 167 studies during its seven year history. It has sponsored the only longitudinal research on women who served in the Gulf War. It has also sponsored studies on the wellness status of active and reserve military personnel, the identification of stress factors related to depression in Navy recruits, and the impact of wartime and deployment separation on military families. TNRP is developing and testing the newest technology in monitoring patients during evacuation. All of these medical issues relate directly to the quality of life of military and civilian personnel of all services. The committee urges the Department of Defense to continue to provide adequate funding to continue the valuable work of the TNRP.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Extension of test program for negotiation of comprehensive small business subcontracting plans (sec. 801)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for five additional years the test program for negotiation of comprehensive small business subcontracting plans established by section 834 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991. Under the test program, prime contractors may submit a plan designed to provide the maximum subcontracting opportunity for small, small disadvantaged, and women-owned small business concerns that covers all anticipated contracts on a plant, division, or corporate basis rather than for each Federal contract and subcontract of \$500,000 or more (\$1,000,000 in the case of construction contracts) awarded as required under section 8(d) of the Small Business Act.

Mentor-protege program improvements (sec. 802)

The committee recommends a provision to extend for five years the pilot mentor-protege program established by section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991. The provision would also codify a number of the program improvements instituted by the Department of Defense. In particular, the provision would: limit program participation terms to three years, absent exceptional circumstances; limit the annual funding of a mentor-protege agreement to \$1.0 million a year, absent exceptional circumstances; require annual reviews of the performance of mentor-protege agreements by the Defense Contract Management Command; make incremental funding of mentor-protege agreements contingent upon past performance; and require annual reports to Congress on program performance.

The pilot mentor-protege program provides incentives to major defense contractors to assist small disadvantaged businesses and qualified organizations employing the severely disabled to enhance their capabilities as contractors on Department of Defense contracts. The mentor-protegee program does not guarantee contracts to qualified small businesses. Instead, it is designed to equip these businesses with the knowledge and expertise that they need to win such contracts on their own, in the competitive market place.

Section 821 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 extended the mentor-protege program for one year, through fiscal year 2000. At the same time, the committee expressed concerns about the extent to which the mentor-protege program was realizing its objectives in a cost-effective manner. In authorizing this extension, the committee noted that “the mentor-protegee program should be thoroughly evaluated before any further extensions are contemplated.”

In response to the concerns expressed by the committee, the Department took a number of measures to strengthen the mentor-protege program, including improved tracking and reporting requirements; limitations on the size and duration of mentor-protege agreements; and new linkages between performance and funding. These improvements appear to have resulted in significantly improved program performance.

Report on transition of Small Business Innovation Research Program activities into defense acquisition programs (sec. 803)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to report to Congress by March 2000 on the progress made in implementing the plan established by section 818 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

The Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program was established by the Small Business Innovation Development Act of 1982 and is intended to stimulate technological innovation by using small businesses to meet federal research and development needs. The law requires that 2.5 percent of all federal research and development funding be spent through the SBIR program. Under the SBIR program there are two phases of activities funded at different levels. Phase I agreements may be funded by an agency at up to \$100,000 per year for initial research. Phase II agreements, funded at up to \$750,000 a year, take technologies proven in Phase One and develop applications for specific program needs. Under section 638, title 15, United States Code, federal agencies may enter into Phase III follow-on agreements using non-SBIR funding.

Congress, in section 18 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, directed the Secretary of Defense to investigate and report on processes that would facilitate the rapid transition of successful SBIR projects to Phase III incorporation into DOD acquisition programs. As a result, the Department sent its SBIR transition plan to Congress in February, 1999. The primary goals of the plan are to: (1) establish early communication between developers of SBIR technology and their end customers in acquisition programs; (2) enable acquisition programs and other potential users of SBIR technologies to leverage their investment in SBIR technologies; (3) issue guidance, from Senior Acquisition Executives to acquisition program managers, to include SBIR as part of ongoing program planning; (4) implement metrics of the extent to which acquisition programs integrate SBIR technologies into their programs; and (5) educate the acquisition program and SBIR communities on the process for, and advantages of, integrating SBIR technologies into acquisition programs.

Through this effort, the Department has become the first agency to establish quantifiable, performance based measures for its SBIR program based on the degree to which SBIR technologies are commercialized in military and private sector markets. The Department is also working on incentives, such as the Phase II enhancement policy to encourage the transition of SBIR research and development into Department of Defense acquisition programs. Under this policy, the Department will provide additional SBIR funding if

a company can attract non-SBIR funding from acquisition programs or the private sector.

The committee is supportive of these efforts to gain a better return on the Department's \$550.0 million annual investment in the SBIR program. In the report required under this section, the Department should provide performance data on the success of SBIR Phase III activity, including the amount of such activity, the number of Phase III projects that were in transition into Department of Defense acquisition programs, the number of projects that involved nongovernmental funding, the amount of additional non-SBIR investment, and commercial non-governmental sales of new products derived from SBIR research.

The committee also requests the Department's view of the feasibility of establishing a process by which small businesses could recommend topics for inclusion in SBIR solicitations involving technologies under development by major or other acquisition programs, including fielded systems.

Authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 804)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to ensure that the General Accounting Office (GAO) has audit access to other transaction prototype authority agreements that provide for payments in excess of \$5.0 million. Other transaction prototype authority is authorized under section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994. Under section 845, a prototype project is not defined and the Department has interpreted the term broadly to include efforts such as the \$1.0 billion Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) and a new Navy oceanographic research ship. Further, senior DOD officials have sought legislation to extend other transaction authority to production contracts. Under current authority, there is some debate about whether GAO has audit access to other transactions. As the size, costs, and complexity of programs being funded using other transactions increases, the committee wants to ensure that the GAO has audit access in relation to the higher levels of spending and added risks.

The recommend provision also provides a technical correction to section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 relating to other transaction authority for prototype projects. These technical corrections correct references in section 845 to section 2371 of title 10, United State Code, as amended by section 267 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997.

The committee is assessing the utility of other transaction prototype authority. The statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act of 1999 directed the Secretary of Defense to report on the use of this authority to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 1, 1999. In addition, both the Department of Defense Inspector General and the General Accounting Office are reviewing the use of other transaction prototype authority and will report to Congress in the coming year.

The committee is interested in the extent that new commercial firms are entering the DOD marketplace through the use of other

transaction authority, as well as the degree of cost sharing between the government and non-federal government parties. The committee is also interested in any lessons learned from the broad exemptions to federal law provided by other transaction authority. For example, other transactions are exempt from the Competition in Contracting Act, Truth in Negotiations Act, Contract Disputes Act, Antikickback Act of 1986, Procurement Integrity Act, Service Contract Act, Buy American Act, and chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. Questions have been raised about whether the government's interest is adequately protected in the absence of the applicability of these statutes. Conversely, advocates of the view that the government should take advantage of the flexibility of other transactions have championed proposals to extend other transaction authority to production.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a new report that updates information in the March 1999 report on the use of other transaction prototype authority to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2000.

Pilot program for commercial services (sec. 805)

The committee recommends a provision to authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to treat procurements of certain classes of services as procurements of commercial items.

The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) of 1994 defines a commercial item as an item that is of a type customarily used by the general public or by nongovernmental entities for purposes other than governmental purposes and has been sold, leased or licensed to the general public, or offered for sale, lease, or license to the general public. This definition includes those items that evolve from commercial technology and those commercial items that are modified for government purposes. Commercial items are subject to fewer statutory barriers to their acquisition and because of this the Federal Government has achieved greater access to previously unavailable advanced commercial products and technologies.

Commercial services are included in the definition of a commercial item and are purchased under the same streamlined framework. Commercial services are defined in section 403(12)(F) of title 41, United States Code as services offered and sold competitively, in substantial quantities, in the commercial marketplace based on established catalog or market prices for specific tasks performed and under standard commercial terms and conditions. The majority of the \$48.0 billion in services that the Department of Defense purchases, however, do not fit under this definition.

Since commercial services were defined in FASA in 1994, there have been questions raised about whether a more flexible definition is warranted to keep pace with the rapid changes in the services industry driven by new technology and competition. On the other hand, \$12.0 billion of Department of Defense services contracts are awarded without competition and \$18.0 billion are bought on a cost contract basis. Past experience has shown that the Department needs to ensure there are effective accountability measures in place when contracting on a cost or sole source basis.

The committee recognizes the need to balance greater efficiency with maintaining accountability in federal contracting. In the past five years, Congress has strived to maintain this balance while enacting legislation to streamline the contracting process. It is with these goals in mind that the committee recommends a pilot program for commercial services to test the concept of treating certain classes of services as commercial items. The three service classes chosen—utilities and housekeeping, education and training, and transportation, travel and relocation services—comprise \$7.0 billion in annual sales to the Department of Defense and represent highly competitive commercial sectors. The data generated from this pilot program should prove useful in any future determinations Congress makes on whether other classes of services should or should not be treated as commercial items.

Applicability of competition requirements to purchases from a required source (sec. 806)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 141 of title 10, United States Code, to change the procedures the Department of Defense (DOD) uses to make purchases from Federal Prison Industries (FPI).

The provision would permit DOD to perform market research to determine whether products offered by private sector companies provide a better value than FPI. If FPI offers a product that is comparable in price, quality, and time of delivery to the products available from the private sector, the Department would be required to purchase that product on a sole-source basis from FPI. If DOD determines that the FPI product is not competitive, it would conduct a competition in which FPI would be permitted to participate.

The provision would also permit the Department of Defense to purchase from a source other than FPI a product that is integral to, or embedded in, another product. For example, in a major construction project, the Department's prime contractor would be permitted to utilize its usual commercial sources and purchase products in the most economical manner.

In addition, the provision would exempt national security systems from the FPI mandatory source requirement, reflecting the committee's view that it is not appropriate to require the Department of Defense (as FPI has done in the past) to purchase missile guidance systems or other critical defense items that are made with prison labor.

Finally, the provision would permit DOD to make purchases of less than \$2,500 from sources other than FPI. This provision is consistent with the "micro-purchase threshold" that has been set in law to enable DOD officials to use credit cards for small purchases. Under current regulations, FPI exempts only purchases of \$25 or less—an approach that is inconsistent with the Department's acquisition streamlining efforts.

Other Items of Interest

Appropriate use of the government purchase card

Over the last several years, the Department of Defense has aggressively promoted the use of the government purchase card as a tool to simplify small purchases and move toward a paperless contracting system. As a result of this effort, the Department reports that in fiscal Year 1998 more than 86 percent of purchases valued below \$2500 are being made with the purchase card.

The committee commends the Department for the increased use of the purchase card and its ongoing effort to eliminate unneeded paperwork in the procurement system. The committee recognizes that there are cases where it may not be in the best interest of the Department or the taxpayer to make an open market credit card purchase. When the Department has the ability to aggregate its purchases of a particular category of items and exercise market leverage to negotiate lower prices, it should do so. Although there are a wide variety of circumstances in which using the purchase card for open market purchases is appropriate and should be encouraged, the Department should exercise caution that it does not inadvertently encourage cardholders to purchase items at retail prices when they could be obtained at wholesale prices.

The committee directs each of the military services to conduct a review of purchase card transactions and report to Congress on their findings by no later than March 1, 2000. The review should use appropriate sampling techniques to assess the categories of purchases for which the purchase card has been used and to determine whether any such categories of purchases would more appropriately be made through contracting mechanisms that would enable the government to negotiate more favorable prices. In making this determination, the review should also factor in transaction costs for both credit card and other contracting mechanisms. In addition, the committee requests that each military service describe the controls put in place to prevent fraudulent use of the purchase card.

Implementation of commercial pricing requirements

Last year, the committee received testimony from the Department of Defense Inspector General (IG) and the General Accounting Office (GAO) about a number of cases in which the transition to a more flexible commercial pricing environment appears to have led to substantial increases over previous prices paid for spare parts. In written testimony this year, the IG and GAO reported that the current contracting environment for sole-source commercial items continues to present negotiating challenges for Department of Defense contracting personnel. The IG and GAO identified additional cases in which this environment appears to have resulted in higher prices than those previously paid.

The committee continues to believe that the Department has sufficient regulatory and administrative authority to allow defense acquisition personnel to respond effectively to the new commercial procurement environment. Moreover, sections 803 and 808 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal

Year 1999 provide the Department with additional tools and guidance with which to address this problem.

Unfortunately, the Inspector General's testimony indicates that little action has been taken to date to implement the requirements of sections 803 and 808. The committee directs the Department to take prompt action to comply with the requirements of these two sections.

The committee also notes that the Truth in Negotiations Act authorizes federal agencies to waive the requirement for contractors to provide certified cost or pricing data in "extraordinary circumstances." The statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 stated that Congress intended that this waiver authority be used only in limited circumstances. The committee understands that the Department granted roughly \$2.5 billion of waivers to the Truth in Negotiations Act in fiscal years 1997 to 1998. The committee directs the Inspector General to review these waivers to ensure that: (1) the Department's waiver authority has been properly justified and utilized in appropriate circumstances; and (2) the Department has taken appropriate steps to ensure that prices are fair and reasonable in cases where the requirement has been waived.

Inapplicability of certain procurement laws to commercially available off-the-shelf items

The 1994 Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) included significant reforms to make it easier for the government to acquire commercial items. Further reforms were enacted under the Clinger-Cohen Act (divisions D and E of Public Law 104-106).

FASA created a new system for the acquisition of commercial items and authorized the waiver of 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 the same 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 authorize additional waivers that the administration might be hesitant to waive if applied to the larger commercial items definition. No statutes have been waived for COTS products under this authority.

In the interest of further streamlining of the procurement process, the committee encourages the Office of Federal Procurement Policy to utilize the authority provided in the Clinger-Cohen Act to waive statutes for COTS items. The committee further requests that the Department of Defense report to Congress on the impact that the failure to waive these statutes has had on the efficient and economical acquisition of commercially available off-the-shelf items within the Department of Defense.

Information management lessons learned from Year 2000 software problem

In section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, Congress enacted the first legislative provision addressing the Year 2000 (Y2K) problem—a requirement for the Department of Defense (DOD) to assess the risks from the Y2K prob-

lem and to purchase Y2K compliant products. In the Senate report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (S. Rpt. 104–267) the committee first expressed concerns that the Department was underestimating the potential problem of converting date fields in software code and embedded system to accommodate operation in 2000.

Although Department of Defense management was slow to focus on the Y2K threat to its operations, the committee has been encouraged by the recent effort to mitigate the impact of Y2K on critical missions. Although the Department may not be totally free from potential disruptions to some operations, it continues to report progress and the committee has been assured of minimal disruptions to its mission essential systems.

The committee is hopeful that DOD can improve departmental information management practices from lessons learned from the experience addressing the potential Y2K problem. As noted in various GAO and Defense Inspector General reports, the Department did not have the necessary management controls and processes in place or even the information available to assist management in assessing the problem. Since the Department recognized the seriousness of the Y2K threat, progress has been achieved to address the problem such as: developing an inventory of systems to identify those systems that are mission essential, non-mission critical and those that could be retired; and identifying interfaces between information systems, developing contingency plans, and conducting operational end to end tests. These efforts also serve as a foundation for improving the security of the Department of Defense information infrastructure, internal controls, and the management of information systems development, acquisition, operations, and maintenance.

The committee is concerned that there has been limited emphasis on maintaining these inventories and contingency plans to meet the information security, internal control, and management needs of the Department. Therefore, the committee requests the Secretary of Defense report to Congress by February 1, 2000, on the progress made in maintaining an inventory of systems, an inventory of systems interfaces, and contingency plans. The report should also include the efforts to improve information management, internal controls and information security based on lessons learned from the Y2K effort.

Software management improvements

The Department of Defense has a history of costly and long-standing software development and acquisition problems. These problems are documented in many General Accounting Office (GAO), Inspector General, and Department studies. The committee is concerned that, although these problems have been well documented, not enough has been done to adopt management best practices to the acquisition, development, and maintenance of software defense-wide.

Industry and academic studies show that 35 to 50 percent of the development and maintenance work on software is rework to correct product defects. As result, these studies identify rework as the single largest cost driver of the \$11.0 billion the Department in-

vests annually in information technology to support business operations and the tens of billions more spent annually on information technology that supports weapon systems.

The committee requests the Department report to Congress by February 1, 2000 on its efforts to identify and adopt best practices in software development. Included in the report, the Department should address: (1) how risk management is used in a project or program's software development process; (2) the process used to control and manage requirements changes during the software development process; (3) metrics required to serve as an early warning of evolving problems, measure the quality of the software product, and measure the effectiveness of the software development or acquisition process; (4) measures used to determine successful fielding of a software product; (5) how the Department ensures that duplication of ongoing software development efforts are minimized, and commercial software and previously developed software solutions are used to the maximum extent practicable; and (6) the portion of defense software expenditures (including software developed for national security systems, as defined by section 5142 of the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 1996) used for rework.

The committee also directs the GAO review and comment on the Department's report on software best practices by April 1, 2000.

Women-owned business participation in Department of Defense contracting

Section 7106 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 established a five percent government-wide annual goal for women-owned business participation in federal contracting and required each agency to establish a specific goal for women-owned business participation. The Department of Defense (DOD) has established a five percent goal under this authority. The committee recognizes that much progress has been made to meet this goal. The Department awarded over \$2.0 billion in prime contracts and \$1.9 billion in subcontract awards to women-owned businesses in fiscal year 1997. While this is a significant improvement over prior years, the Department has yet to meet its five percent goal. The committee encourages the Department to maximize the use of existing programs, outreach, training and technical assistance to further the participation of women-owned businesses in DOD contracting and to report to Congress by February 1, 2000 on how it plans to achieve the five percent women-owned business contracting goal.

**TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION
AND MANAGEMENT**

SUBTITLE A—GENERAL

**Number of management headquarters and headquarters
support activities personnel (sec. 901)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 130a of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998. The provision would require a 35 percent reduction of management headquarters and headquarters support activities (MHA) personnel, using as a baseline the number of MHA personnel in the Department of Defense as of October 1, 1989, in lieu of the current required 25 percent reduction based and on an October 1, 1997 baseline. The current statute requires a 5 percent reduction each year to achieve this goal.

The Department of Defense reduced MHA personnel from 72,620 to 53,174 between 1989 and 1997, a 27 percent reduction. The committee notes that an additional 25 percent reduction from the 1997 number would result in a total reduction of 45 percent, and would not give the Department of Defense credit for reductions taken from 1989 to 1997. A 35 percent reduction from a 1989 baseline will reduce MHA personnel to 47,069, and is achievable without compromising critical Department of Defense activities.

The committee is disappointed that the Secretary of Defense has failed to submit the reports required by section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998. Failure to comply with the requirements enacted in 1997 enhances the perception that the Department of Defense is not committed to reducing overhead, while pursuing an aggressive reduction of military personnel strengths. The committee is willing to recognize the reductions in MHA made before 1997, however, the Department of Defense has not yet made sufficient reductions in MHA to achieve the original goals established by the Congress.

**Additional matters for annual reports on joint warfighting
experimentation (sec. 902)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 485(b) of title 10, United States Code, to require commanders to provide additional information in the annual reports on joint warfighting experimentation. The provision would require commanders to make recommendations about the development or procurement of advanced technologies, the elimination of unnecessary equipment and redundancies in capabilities, and the fielding of advanced technologies.

Acceptance of guarantees in connection with gifts to the United States Military Academy (sec. 903)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to receive a guarantee in connection with a major gift to purchase, construct, or otherwise procure real or personal property for the benefit of the U.S. Military Academy.

The recommended provision would allow a donor to make a gift sufficient to fund a substantial portion of a major project in reasonable anticipation that other donors would contribute the additional funds needed to complete the project. The project could commence while the donor seeks the additional funding from other donors. The original donor would guarantee that if the additional funds are not obtained, he or she will make an additional gift sufficient to complete the project. The amount of the guarantee would be considered as available funds sufficient to provide obligation authority for the purposes of federal fiscal and contractual requirements. For example, this would permit a donor to make a gift sufficient to fund a substantial portion of a construction project for the U.S. Military Academy, and construction could commence, even though other donors have not yet agreed to contribute the remaining funds necessary to complete the project. If other donors do not contribute the rest of the funds needed, the original donor would provide those funds.

The recommended provision would limit the authority to receive guarantees to major gifts of a value of at least one million dollars and would require an unconditional letter of credit from a major bank or an account control agreement among the donor, the Secretary of the Army, and a major United States investment management firm. The account control agreement would require the donor to maintain an investment account with a major investment management firm and agree to maintain the value of the account in an amount equal to an amount greater than the amount guaranteed by a percentage of not less than thirty percent. In the event the value of the account falls below this amount the agreement would require the investment management firm to liquidate the account and reinvest the proceeds in United States Treasury bills.

Management of the Civil Air Patrol (sec. 904)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend current law by requiring the Secretary of the Air Force to appoint the members of the National Board of Directors of the civil air patrol (CAP) and to establish regulations that will govern the operations of the CAP.

The committee strongly supports the valuable contribution that the CAP provides to the United States, including the important role it plays in shaping the lives of thousands of young Americans. However, the committee is concerned about the lack of oversight and control that the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force can exercise over the CAP. As an auxiliary of the Air Force, the CAP receives much of its budget and a significant amount of non-appropriated support, such as the free use of on-base facilities, from the Air Force. Unfortunately, there have been a number of allegations raised regarding the inappropriate use of appropriated funds by the CAP's corporate leadership. The

committee believes that the concerns raised by these allegations can best be addressed by ensuring that the leadership of the Air Force exercises appropriate oversight of the CAP corporation.

Minimum interval for updating and revising Department of Defense strategic plan (sec. 905)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 306(b) of title 5, United States Code, to require that the Department of Defense update and revise its strategic plan once every four years instead of the currently required three years. This would conform this requirement to the scheduled Quadrennial Defense Review, which serves as the strategic plan of the Department of Defense for purposes of the Government Performance and Results Act.

Permanent requirement for quadrennial defense review (sec. 906)

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent the requirement in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, that the Secretary of Defense conduct a Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). The QDR is conducted at the beginning of each new administration to determine and express the defense strategy of the United States, and establish a revised defense plan for the next 10 to 20 years. The Secretary shall provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives with a report on the results of the QDR, to include: a comprehensive discussion of the defense strategy of the United States and various force structures suited to implement that strategy; the threats to U.S. national interests examined for the purposes of the review; the assumptions used in the review; the effect on the force structure of preparations for and participation in peace operations; the effect of anticipated technological advancements on the force structure; the manpower and sustainment policies required under the defense strategy; the anticipated roles and missions of the reserve components; the appropriate ratio of combat forces to support forces; the required air and sea-lift capabilities; the forward presence and repositioning requirements under the strategy; the extent to which resources must be shifted from one theater to another under the defense strategy; and recommended changes to the Unified Command Plan. The report would be submitted not later than September 30 of the year in which the review is conducted.

The provision would also require the establishment of a National Defense Panel (NDP) that would conduct an assessment of the defense strategy, force structure, force modernization plans, infrastructure, budget plan, and other elements of the defense program and policies established under the previous quadrennial defense review. The assessment will be made with a view toward recommending the most critical changes that should be made to the defense strategy of the United States for the next 10 to 20 years, and any changes considered appropriate by the Panel regarding major weapon systems programmed for the force. The panel will be established in the year immediately preceding a year in which a President is inaugurated and will consist of nine individuals from the

private sector who are recognized experts in matters relating to national security. The Panel Members will be selected, as follows: three members appointed by the Secretary of Defense; three members appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, in consultation with the Ranking Member; and three members appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Ranking Member.

The Secretary would submit the Panel's report, together with the Secretary's comments, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives approximately one month prior to the inauguration of the new administration. This would allow the new administration to consider the recommendations of the NDP prior to conducting the QDR.

SUBTITLE B—COMMISSION TO ASSESS UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization (sec. 911-919)

The committee believes that the United States confronts a largely unexploited opportunity to enhance significantly U.S. national security through more complete utilization of space for military purposes.

The committee has closely monitored the evolution of U.S. national security space management and is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) may not be ideally oriented—intellectually or organizationally—to fully exploit space for national security purposes. Notwithstanding a significant annual budget for space programs and operations, for the most part DOD tends to treat space as an information medium to support existing air, land, and sea forces, rather than the strategic high ground from which to project power. The organization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, which explicitly categorizes space as a subset of “information superiority,” clearly illustrates this point. The committee believes that the United States must begin to take steps to exploit more fully space as a natural power center. This calls for greater utilization of space to support the full range of power applications, from missile defense and space control, to force application.

The committee notes that the Air Force and the Defense Department currently prefer to pursue “air and space integration” rather than the development of more dedicated “spacepower” concepts. Although the committee does not necessarily oppose such an approach in the near term, it does support efforts to ensure that we not unnecessarily constrain our thinking and planning for utilizing space in support of U.S. national security. In this regard the committee believes that it is appropriate to establish an independent commission to review U.S. national security space management and organization. The Defense Department's current approach may adequately serve U.S. national security today, but the Department may not be ideally suited for objectively looking beyond existing programs, policies and organizational structures. An independent commission of experts could do precisely this.

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a "Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization." The commission would conduct a six month review and report on near-term, medium-term and long-term changes that would strengthen U.S. national security. Specifically, the commission would consider the following:

(1) The relationship between the intelligence and non-intelligence aspects of national security space (so-called "white space" and "black space"), and the potential benefits of a partial or complete merger of the two aspects;

(2) The benefits of establishing any of the following new organizations:

(a) an independent military department and service dedicated to the national security space mission;

(b) a corps within the United States Air Force dedicated to the national security space mission;

(c) an Assistant Secretary of Defense for space within the Office of the Secretary of Defense; and

(d) any other change to the existing organizational structure for managing national security space management and organization.

(3) The benefits of establishing a new major force program, or other budget mechanism, for managing national security space funding within the Department of Defense.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Second biennial financial management improvement plan (sec. 1002)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the second biennial financial management improvement plan, to include additional items the committee believes will improve the overall financial management within the Department of Defense. The provision would require the plan to include:

- (1) an inventory of the finance and accounting systems and the data feeder systems of the Department;
- (2) a comprehensive roadmap and timetable for consolidating these systems, ensuring easy and reliable interfaces with the Department's finance and accounting systems, and ensuring the integrity of data in these systems;
- (3) a detailed plan for professional development of financial managers; and
- (4) a plan to ensure the adequacy of the internal controls and internal review activities of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS).

The provision requires a review of the plan by the Department of Defense Inspector General.

In the committee's view, the Department must address and identify specific problems with the reliability of feeder system data and interfaces with finance and accounting systems in order to ensure proper accountability and control over its physical assets, proper accounting for the costs of operations, and proper recording and reconciling of disbursements. Equally important, the Department must develop a plan to ensure the competency of financial managers and internal controls in dealing with limited defense resources.

While the first biennial plan identified a number of initiatives undertaken by the services to consolidate and improve their individual data feeder systems, it failed to provide a strategic vision for how the Department would integrate these systems into a functioning financial management system. As reported by the General Accounting Office in January 1999, the plan:

- (1) failed adequately to address actions to ensure feeder system data integrity; and
- (2) failed to provide a specific roadmap for the transition from the existing data feeder systems to the envisioned future financial management environment.

The committee is aware that the Department could not address every issue in detail in the first biennial plan and that the Department's financial management reform effort is ongoing. However, the committee believes that the Department must address its sys-

tems problems in a comprehensive manner to ensure the ready availability of reliable financial data, in compliance with applicable statutory requirements. The Department would be required to identify specific deficiencies, performance objectives, milestones, and resources necessary to reach the goal of an auditable financial statement, as well as address the special interest items required in the original provision.

Use of single payment date for invoices (sec. 1003)

The committee recommends a provision that would align Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) commercial practices and regulations of the Prime Vendor Program with commercial practices of private industry. The provision would eliminate excess costs incurred by the Department of Defense, as well as private industry.

The Prompt Payment Act has a general requirement that the government pay its contractor within 30 days of receiving invoices for contracted goods. The Act specifies different payment periods for certain categories of food, such as meats, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables, all of which have due dates for payment shorter than the standard 30 days. Using the Prime Vendor Program, DLA may have many different types of commodities on the same invoice that may require up to four different payment dates. The recommended provision would eliminate administrative costs and would align DLA's commercial practices to those of private industry.

Authority to require use of electronic transfer of funds for Department of Defense personnel payments (sec. 1004)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the authority to the Secretary of Defense to require military members and civilian employees of the Department receive payments by electronic fund transfer. The provision would reduce operating costs for the Department, while ensuring personnel readiness.

The current electronic transfer statutes allow individuals the sole discretion to determine whether or not the receipt of payment by electronic funds transfer would create a hardship. The effect of this self-determined waiver is that persons may exempt themselves from the requirement to receive payment by electronic transfer. This provision allows the Secretary of Defense to grant waivers where the Secretary considers it necessary and appropriate.

Payment of foreign licensing fees out of proceeds of sales of maps, charts, and navigation books (sec. 1005)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) to pay licensing fees to foreign countries and international organizations from increased proceeds of its public sales. The remainder of those proceeds would continue to be deposited into the U.S. Treasury. There would be no effect on Treasury spending or receipts.

NIMA prepares the maps, charts, and nautical books required in navigation. This responsibility is of significant benefit to mariners, navigators, sailors, and the public, including those who use a variety of NIMA products. Foreign countries are insisting NIMA pay royalties or license fees in exchange for NIMA's right to use their

data, much of which is copyrighted. This provision increases the cost of the products sold to the public by the amount of the anticipated payments made to foreign governments. Without this provision, the increased costs would be paid by NIMA, to the detriment of NIMA's mission.

Authority for disbursing officers to support use of automated teller machines on naval vessels for financial transactions (sec. 1006)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Department of Defense disbursing officials to provide operating funds to Automated Teller Machines (ATMs) on naval vessels and to accept funds transferred from credit unions and commercial banks via these ATMs.

The provision would have a significant quality of life impact, as the Navy expands the use of ATMs onboard ships. This provision would eliminate the need for the current split pay option and allow a sailor to have access to money onboard ship without having to transact business with a disbursing officer.

Combating terrorism

The terrorist threat to our citizens, both military personnel and civilians, at home and abroad, is real and growing. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction has dramatically raised the stakes and increased the potential for massive casualties in the event of a terrorist attack. In the wake of the Oklahoma City disaster, the World Trade Center bombing, the Aum Shinrikyo attack in the Tokyo subway, and most recently, the arrests in Las Vegas of persons suspected of possessing deadly anthrax agent, the committee is concerned with the growing prospect of a terrorist attack against the United States using nuclear, biological or chemical agents. In fact, in the first four months of 1999 there have been close to 100 RF threats made alleging anthrax possession. Fortunately, anthrax was not actually used in any of those cases.

This year, the committee established a new Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities to focus on the terrorist threat, and other non-traditional threats to our national security. Both the full committee and the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee held several hearings on the subject of nuclear, biological, and chemical threats to the United States by states and non-state actors such as terrorists, and the U.S. government's strategy and capabilities to prevent or respond to such attacks.

At least 16 countries, including Iran, Iraq, and North Korea, currently have active chemical weapons programs, and perhaps a dozen nations are pursuing offensive biological weapons programs. A number of these countries, including Iran, Iraq, Syria, and North Korea, have a history of sponsoring terrorism. In addition, Russia's remaining offensive biological warfare program, which according to published reports could include biological warheads on intercontinental ballistic missiles, as well as the potential for transfer of scientific expertise, or actual biological agents, from the Russian program to rogue states or terrorist groups, is of particular concern to the committee. Further, the serious prospect that known-terrorist Osama Bin Ladin or other terrorists might use chemical or biologi-

cal weapons is of great concern. Bin Ladin's organization is just one of approximately a dozen terrorist groups that have expressed an interest in, or have sought, chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agents. Bin Ladin, for example, has called the acquisition of these weapons a "religious duty" and noted that "how we use them is up to us."

The threat of biological and chemical attack poses extraordinary challenges, ranging from the difficulty of detecting the production of such agents and providing timely warning of a potential attack, to the consequences of a biological event, which could, under certain circumstances, be more lethal than a nuclear explosion. The ready availability and dual use nature of the materials and equipment used to prepare biological and chemical agents makes effective defensive measures extremely difficult. Further, unlike nuclear weapons, it is relatively easy for a small group of terrorists to produce such substances. The possibility of genetic engineering to defeat countermeasures and increase the virulence and infectivity of biological agents is a frightening prospect.

To confront this continuing and growing threat, it is critical that our government-wide efforts to combat terrorism are coordinated and clearly focused. Currently, there are approximately 40 federal departments and agencies engaged in the fight against terrorism. The committee, in an attempt to better clarify and coordinate government-wide efforts to combat terrorism, has recommended a number of legislative actions in recent years, and continues that trend with the initiatives contained in this bill.

In January of 1999, the President announced a \$10 billion initiative to combat terrorism. While this announcement helped raise awareness of this critical issue, the committee notes that as far as the Department of Defense's budget is concerned, the initiative is primarily a compilation of the funds previously planned to be requested in fiscal year 2000 for combating terrorism rather than a request for substantial additional funding.

Combating terrorism is a national security priority which relies heavily on the resources of the Department of Defense. The President's fiscal year 2000 budget allocates to the Department of Defense approximately 50 percent of the total government-wide budget request for combating terrorism. While a large portion of this amount is appropriately dedicated to protecting our forces from a terrorist attack, the committee believes that the unique capabilities of the Department of Defense to respond to attacks in the United States by terrorists utilizing weapons of mass destruction should continue to be applied to our nation's domestic preparedness and response mission.

The committee has and will continue to play a key role in the overall effort to combat terrorism by providing focus and accountability for the Department of Defense's activities in this area, as well as by ensuring the appropriate utilization of the Department of Defense's unique expertise in the domestic preparedness area.

Central transfer account for combating terrorism (sec. 1007)

The Department of Defense (DOD) has numerous programs to combat terrorism divided among scores of offices, agencies and services, the funding for which is buried in the overall budget sub-

mission. The committee has tried unsuccessfully for months to gather accurate and complete information on the specific budget and programs that comprise the Department's efforts to combat terrorism. The committee believes that the Department's efforts in this critical area should be more visible, and organized in a coordinated and coherent fashion. With current budget submissions, it is difficult for the committee to determine the scale of the Department's effort to combat terrorism, the effectiveness of the effort, how well the Department's efforts respond to the threat, and how the DOD programs fulfill the overall government policy and strategy in this area.

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1989 established a Central Transfer Account (CTA) to centrally fund and manage the Department's counterdrug activities which were executed by the services and defense agencies. Establishment of the CTA has provided better accountability and increased the visibility and focus of the Department's counterdrug efforts. The Department's efforts to combat terrorism deserve similar attention.

Therefore, the committee recommends including two legislative provisions to achieve this goal. The first provision sets forth separately the amounts authorized to be appropriated in titles I, II and III for the Department's programs to combat terrorism and transfers those funds to the CTA. Amounts appropriated for military construction and military personnel are not included in this provision. Within this provision, amounts over \$15.0 million may not be transferred from programs within the CTA unless congressional defense committees approve through normal reprogramming procedures.

The committee notes that the amount of military personnel funding the Department credits to combating terrorism far exceeds the funding to combat terrorism in the remaining titles of the budget. The committee is concerned about the way the Department counts its military personnel funding to combat terrorism. The entire amount of pay and allowances for personnel who perform many different functions, one of which is combating terrorism, is counted as funding to combat terrorism. This method overestimates the level of effort to combat terrorism. The committee urges the Department to develop a method of accounting to address this problem.

The second provision directs the Department of Defense, beginning with the fiscal year 2001 budget submission, to set forth separately all funds for combating terrorism within its overall budget request to Congress.

The committee notes that these provisions are primarily for the purpose of enhanced congressional oversight of the Department's budget request for funds to combat terrorism and are not intended to alter in any way the authority of the Secretary of Defense with regard to his role in combating terrorism.

United States contributions to NATO common-funded budgets (sec. 1008)

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 NATO for each fiscal year, beginning in fiscal year 1999, that 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 2000, including the use of unexpended balances from prior years.

SUBTITLE B—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Sales of naval shipyard articles and services to nuclear ship contractors (sec. 1011)

The committee recommends a provision that would waive the restrictions contained in section 2208(j)(2) and section 2553(a)(1) and (c)(1), of title 10, United States Code, if a sale of articles or services is made by a naval shipyard to a contractor under a Department of Defense contract for a nuclear ship in order to provide the contractor with access to additional highly skilled workers not readily available in the commercial sector. This provision would allow a commercial contractor to hire a Naval shipyard as a subcontractor on nuclear related workloads if the shipyard is not currently operating at full capacity and some of its workers are therefore available. This will provide for a more efficient use of highly skilled nuclear qualified personnel.

The committee also recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to waive the restriction in 2208(j) and 2553(a)(1) and (c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, when necessary to protect national security.

Period of delay after notice of proposed transfer of vessel stricken from naval vessel register (sec. 1012)

The committee recommends provision that would modify the requirement in section 7306(d) of title 10, United States Code. This provision would require notification of Congress followed by 60 legislative days on which at least one house of Congress is in session before transfer of a naval vessel. This provision will allow time for congressional review while permitting the Secretary of the Navy the flexibility and responsiveness required to transfer naval vessels.

SUBTITLE C—MISCELLANEOUS REPORT REQUIREMENTS AND REPEALS

Preservation of certain defense reporting requirements (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would preserve certain reports presently required to be made to the Congress by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and other officials. Section 3003 of Public Law 104-66, enacted December 21, 1995, repealed, effective December 21, 1999, the requirements for a large number of periodic reports to the Congress, unless legislative action was taken prior to December 21, 1999, to preserve these requirements. While agreeing that many of these reports are no longer needed, the committee is of the opinion that others on the list of those to be repealed still have value to the Congress and should continue to be submitted.

Annual report on combatant command requirements (sec. 1022)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs to submit a report to the congressional defense committees that would contain a consolidation of the integrated priority lists of the requirements of the combatant commands. The report should also contain the Chairman's views on the consolidated lists, to include a discussion of the actions taken to meet these requirements and identification of the requirements with the greatest priority.

The committee is concerned about the continued underfunding of programs required by the combatant commands to execute the National Military Strategy. According to the latest Quarterly Readiness Report of the Department of Defense: ". . . there are currently 118 CINC-identified readiness related deficiencies, of which 32 are designated category 1 deficiencies—ones which entail significant warfighting risk to execution of the National Military Strategy and are key risk drivers for the Major Theater War scenarios."

The committee believes that the identification of the requirements by those who would command U.S. military forces in any contingency operation, major theater war, or other military operation, is essential to making the best decisions for resourcing the military services.

Report on assessments of readiness to execute the national military strategy (sec. 1023)

The committee is concerned with the declining readiness of the U.S. Armed Forces. In September of 1998, and again in January of 1999, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified that the risk associated with the execution of two major theater wars has increased over the past six years and is now moderate to high. According to the Chairman, this risk ". . . means that the casualties to the U.S. would be higher."

The decline in the state of readiness is primarily attributable to the fact that our forces have been asked to perform more missions with fewer resources. This has led to a deteriorating infrastructure, an aging fleet of equipment, an exodus of high skilled personnel, and fewer training opportunities to increase the skills of those individuals who remain.

The committee believes that the current state of readiness, and the resulting threat of higher American casualties, is unacceptable. If the U.S. Armed Forces are expected to perform numerous contingency operations and maintain the ability to execute two major theater wars, they must receive the resources necessary to perform these missions.

Therefore, the committee recommends an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the capability of the United States to execute the National Military Strategy. This report should include a discussion of all models used by the armed forces to assess our military capability, the level of casualties that these models project, the difference in the projected level of casualties that would incur if the risk is moderate-high rather than low-moderate, and the resources required to

reduce the level of risk from moderate-high to low-moderate. In executing the models and preparing the report, the Secretary should assume that the armed forces are engaged in the current level of operations and equipped, supplied, manned, and trained at current levels.

Report on inventory and control of military equipment (sec. 1024)

The committee recommends a provision that would require each of the military services to perform a systematic inventory of major-end-items. A report on the results of each of these inventories shall be provided to Congress, not later than August 31, 2000. These reports should include the status and location of each accountable item, and the number and type of items for which there is accountability. The report should identify the steps taken to locate these items and improve future oversight.

The committee is concerned about recent reports that the Department of Defense is unable to account for billions of dollars in assets because of inadequate inventory management capabilities. Last year the General Accounting Office reported that the Department was unable to locate items such as aircraft engines and one launcher for an AVENGER weapon system. This year, the GAO reported that the Navy's Inventory Control Point at Philadelphia was unable to account for \$2.5 billion worth of inventory. While the committee understands that much of this is simply the result of poor record keeping on the part of the military services, the committee is concerned that it demonstrates a lack of oversight and control on the part of the senior leadership. Such oversight and control is essential to ensuring that the resources of the Department are efficiently and effectively managed, and that these systems are not inappropriately disposed of through sale or transfer.

Space technology guide (sec. 1025)

The committee has strongly supported a range of innovative space technology efforts and notes that the Air Force is pursuing options for a range of space technology demonstrations. The committee was encouraged by the publication of United States Space Command's Long Range Plan of March 1998, and Air Force Space Command's Strategic Master Plan of December 1997, both of which addressed long-range technology issues.

Notwithstanding these important developments, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has not focused sufficient attention on long-range planning for space technology development. The committee believes that the Department should develop a space technology guide—a "roadmap"—to assist in the development of the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) and longer-range planning, to include technical and operational concepts for more thoroughly utilizing space for national security.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a space technology guide to inform decisions regarding science and technology investments, technology demonstrations, and system planning and development. The goal of this "roadmap" will be to identify technologies and technology demonstrations that will be needed to leverage United States use of

space for national security purposes in the near-term, the mid-term, and the long-term.

In developing this “roadmap,” the committee directs the Secretary to include two alternative technology paths: one that is consistent with current funding limitations associated with the FYDP, and one that is not constrained by such funding limitations. The space technology guide shall include the potential for cooperative investment and technology development with other departments and agencies and with private entities. The “roadmap” shall also take into consideration all studies and reports that may be relevant to the development of the plan, including, but not limited to, “United States Space Command’s Long Range Plan of March 1998” and “Air Force Space Command’s Strategic Master Plan of December 1997.”

The Secretary shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 15, 2000, on the space technology development plan.

Report and regulations on Department of Defense policies on protecting the confidentiality of communications with professionals providing therapeutic or related services regarding sexual or domestic abuse (sec. 1026)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to study the policies, procedures, and practices of the military departments for protecting the confidentiality of communications between military dependents, who have engaged in or who are victims of sexual harassment, sexual abuse, or intra-family abuse, and the professionals with whom the dependent seeks professional services concerning these matters. The recommended provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations, policies, and procedures the Secretary considers necessary to protect these communications, consistent with the findings of the Comptroller General; relevant professional organization standards; federal and state law; the best interest of the victims of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or intrafamily abuse; military necessity; and other factors, that the Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, consider appropriate. The Comptroller General would be required to submit a report on his findings to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense would be required to report, not later than January 21, 2000, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives with regard to the policies recommended.

Comptroller General report on anticipated effects of proposed changes in operation of storage sites for lethal chemical agents and munitions (sec. 1027)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to review the Army’s plans to reduce the federal civilian workforce involved in the operation of the eight storage sites for lethal chemical agents and munitions in the continental United States and to convert to contractor operation of the storage sites.

Report on deployments of Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection teams across state boundaries (sec. 1028)

The committee is concerned with the apparent lack of established procedures by which states can employ a Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) team which is based in another state. Since a RAID team is a federally resourced asset provided to a state's governor for regional response, the committee wants to ensure that there is a procedure in place that would allow a RAID team to respond to an incident outside of its home base state. The committee has included a provision directing, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense to submit to the committee a report detailing the specific procedures which have been established among the states by which a RAID team would be dispatched to an incident outside of its home base state.

Report on Consequence Management Program Integration Office unit readiness (sec. 1029)

The committee is concerned with the overall readiness of the active and reserve component units associated with the Consequence Management Program Integration Office. The committee included a provision directing the Secretary of Defense to include within the next Quarterly Readiness Report an annex on the readiness, training status and future funding requirements of all active and reserve component units that are considered assets of the Consequence Management Program Integration Office. The provision directs the Secretary to include within the report a detailed description of how these units are integrated with the Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams in the overall Consequence Management Program Integration Office. In addition, the report requires the Secretary to prepare a plan, which includes cost requirements, for bringing the decontamination units within the Consequence Management Program Integration Office to the highest level of readiness, and for establishing procedures ensuring that decontamination units are available to respond to incidents within 12 hours of notification by a RAID team.

Analysis of relationship between threats and budget submission for fiscal year 2001 (sec. 1030)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the relationship between the defense budget for fiscal year 2001 and the current and emerging threats to the national security interests of the United States, as identified in the President's annual national security strategy report. The Secretary's report would be submitted on the date the President submits the budget for fiscal year 2001 to Congress.

Report on NATO's defense capabilities initiative (sec. 1031)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than January 31 of each year beginning in 2000, to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Serv-

ices of the Senate and House of Representatives on the implementation of the Defense Capabilities Initiative by the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Alliance.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery systems (sec. 1041)

The committee continues to support the policy of remaining at strategic force levels consistent with the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) until START II enters into force. The committee notes that officials of the Department of Defense have reaffirmed the administration's continued support for this policy.

Although the committee does not support unilateral implementation of START II, it does support efforts to find affordable ways to maintain a modern and robust strategic Triad that may differ from the force structure traditionally associated with START I. The committee supports selectively modernizing and upgrading the Strategic Triad of bombers, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) deployed on strategic submarines, and, in certain cases, retiring elements of the force that are no longer essential to maintaining a strong deterrent.

The committee supports the Navy's plan to modernize the Trident submarine force with all D-5 missiles. Although this effort will reduce the overall ballistic missile submarine force by four boats, it will nonetheless result in a more modern, effective, and sustainable sea-based deterrent for the long run. Additionally, this approach provides an option to convert four Trident submarines no longer needed for strategic deterrence to critical non-nuclear missions.

The committee does not believe that the decision to adjust the Trident submarine force will detract from the overall U.S. deterrent posture or change the basic policy of remaining at START I force levels until START II enters into force. With 14 Trident submarines, 50 Minuteman III ICBMs, 50 Peacekeeper ICBMs, 21 B-2 bombers, and 76 B-52H bombers, the United States will retain a force that closely approaches the limits imposed by START I and clearly satisfies U.S. operational requirements. At a time when Russian strategic forces are dropping below START I levels, the committee views such a force as adequate. Over time, as U.S. budgetary and operational needs change, and as Russian strategic forces continue to decline, the United States will be able to reconsider this force mix. And, if START II should enter into force, the United States will make the reductions required by that treaty.

The committee does not believe that the United States should be reluctant to adjust its strategic forces as long as budgetary pressures are not the sole reason for doing so. As long as the United States maintains a robust deterrent force and a well balanced Triad that satisfies U.S. operational requirements, the committee will remain open to more affordable ways of sustaining the force.

The committee believes that it is important for Congress to retain some control over the composition of U.S. strategic forces. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would pro-

hibit the retirement or dismantlement of specified strategic forces through the end of fiscal year 2000. Just as the administration has decided to review this matter on a year-by-year basis, the committee believes that Congress must also conduct an annual review.

The committee believes that the United States should maintain a prohibition on retiring the Peacekeeper ICBM for at least one more year unless START II enters into force, in which case the legislative prohibition would no longer apply. The committee notes that such an approach is consistent with the Secretary of Defense's decision to fund Peacekeeper sustainment during fiscal year 2000. Such legislation would clearly indicate to Russia that the benefits of START II will come only from treaty ratification.

The committee notes that the October 1998 Defense Science Board report on nuclear deterrence concluded that the administration has not provided sufficient investment in and planning for nuclear deterrence. The committee supports prompt resolution of this problem. In addition to maintaining a Triad of strategic delivery systems, the United States must revitalize its overall approach to strategic deterrence. The end of the Cold War did not diminish the administration's responsibility to execute careful and competent nuclear planning. The committee urges the administration to take the Defense Science Board report seriously and to move promptly to implement its recommendations for revitalizing the U.S. physical and intellectual nuclear infrastructure.

Limitation on reduction in United States strategic nuclear forces (sec. 1042)

The committee notes that the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START II) calls for reductions of each nation's strategic forces to a level of no more than 3,500 deployed nuclear warheads. Once the Russian State Duma ratifies START II, the United States and Russia have agreed to negotiate a START III treaty that would further limit U.S. and Russian strategic forces to a level of no more than 2,500 deployed nuclear warheads.

Both these treaties include only the United States and the Russian Federation as parties. Although other nations have or are developing nuclear weapons, no nuclear weapon nations other than the United States and Russia are constrained by arms control limits on their nuclear forces or programs. For example, the Peoples' Republic of China is embarking on a nuclear modernization program that could expand its nuclear forces and capabilities to levels considerably greater than its current force levels. The committee believes the administration should take Chinese and other foreign nuclear forces and modernization programs into account when reducing U.S. nuclear forces and when negotiating a START III Treaty with Russia.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision that reflects these concerns. It would require that, before the United States reduces its nuclear forces below the START II limit, the President would have to provide to Congress an assessment indicating that such reductions would not impede the capability of the United States to respond militarily to any militarily significant increase in

the challenge to U.S. security or strategic stability posed by the nuclear weapon modernization programs of the Peoples' Republic of China or any other nation. It would also state the sense of the Congress that in negotiating a START III Treaty, the United States should take into account the nuclear forces and modernization programs of China and every other nation possessing strategic nuclear weapons.

Counterproliferation Program Review Committee (sec. 1043)

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160), Congress established the Counter-proliferation Program Review Committee (CPRC) to ensure that priority was given to the most appropriate technologies and acquisition programs to counter the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The coordination by the CPRC of ongoing research and development programs was necessary to ensure that efforts were not duplicated and limited resources were used efficiently.

The CPRC has helped to focus the efforts within the Department of Defense (DOD), the Department of Energy (DOE), and the intelligence community in support of counterproliferation policy, and has reported to the congressional defense committees annually on these activities. The termination date for the CPRC is September 30, 2000. In order to ensure that the departments and agencies represented in the CPRC continue to address nonproliferation, counterproliferation, and nuclear, biological and chemical counterterrorism in a coordinated fashion, the committee recommends a provision that would extend the CPRC to September 30, 2004. The provision also advances the date on which the CPRC annual report is submitted to Congress from May 1 to February 1.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104-201) designated the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Warfare (ATSD(NCB)) as the CPRC Executive Secretary. The ATSD(NCB) also serves as the chairman of the CPRC Standing Committee. In both leadership positions, the ATSD(NCB) reports to the CPRC chairman on the efforts of the CPRC to perform its assigned duties and implement CPRC recommendations.

The ATSD(NCB) position has been vacant since calendar 1997 and there have been no indications that the President will nominate a candidate for the position. In fact, the legislative package submitted by the administration for the fiscal year 2000 authorization bill included, for the second consecutive year, a provision to eliminate the ATSD(NCB) position. As stated previously in the Senate report accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (S. Rept. 105-189), the committee continues to strongly oppose this proposal and recommends the administration nominate an individual for this position as soon as possible.

The committee believes that, in addition to fulfilling congressionally-mandated responsibilities of the CPRC and other Department of Defense and inter-departmental committees, the ATSD(NCB) position is necessary to ensure appropriate senior-level policy oversight and implementation guidance within the Department, as required by section 142 of title 10, United States Code. Until such

time as the administration nominates an individual for the ATSD(NCB) position, the committee recommends a provision to designate the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Strategy and Threat Reduction, to be the CPRC Executive Secretary.

The committee notes that the CPRC has recommended increased, formal coordination between the DOD and DOE with respect to research and development initiatives in chemical and biological defense and related acquisition programs. Accordingly, the CPRC established working groups to develop an integrated research and development plan for chemical/biological weapons detectors and sensors. The committee supports this initiative.

In addition to increased coordination between the departments and the intelligence community, the CPRC also identified the need to increase user involvement in the research, development and acquisition process. Such involvement helps both to define requirements and to increase user acceptance of fielded equipment.

The same principle may logically apply to the research, development, and acquisition of technology and equipment that is intended to be or is available for the domestic preparedness mission related to weapons of mass destruction. The committee is concerned that there may be insufficient input from the user community, including state and local officials and first responders, in developing equipment that will be used to respond to a domestic contingency.

In 1996, Congress added a mission to the CPRC charter that required efforts to “. . . negate paramilitary and terrorist threats involving weapons of mass destruction.” Given this responsibility, and the resources and expertise available to the CPRC, the committee believes that the CPRC should consider establishing a mechanism for working with the domestic response program to help ensure that the research, development, and acquisition of equipment for domestic response to weapons of mass destruction has appropriate involvement from the user community. The committee directs the CPRC to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 15, 2000, on this recommendation and its potential benefit to the domestic response program.

In 1996, the CPRC recommended that the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy establish an integrated research, development, and acquisition plan for technologies associated with chemical and biological counterproliferation. To date, there has been no visible result of this CPRC recommendation. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology to submit the integrated plan to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1, 2000.

Limitation regarding Cooperative Threat Reduction programs (sec. 1044)

The budget request included \$475.5 million for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program, an increase of \$35.0 million over the fiscal year 1999 appropriated level. The committee is concerned that the increase reflected in the budget request is due primarily to the fact that the United States will be funding a larger share of the CTR program and assuming a portion of the program that originally was to be paid for by the Russians.

The committee believes that the goals of this program—destroying or otherwise preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction—is in the interest of the United States. Therefore, the committee recommends fully funding the budget request. The committee, however, believes that this program is also in the interest of the Russian government. Indeed, much of the destruction of the Russian inventory funded by the CTR program enables Russia to meet its obligations under existing international arms control treaties. In light of the increased burdens on the U.S. side in funding CTR, the committee directs the Department to review what actions may be taken to secure additional cooperation from the recipients of CTR funds in attaining the goals of the CTR program and in providing additional funding to lessen the U.S. cost share of this program.

The committee is concerned about recent reports that President Yeltsin approved a number of decisions relating to Russia's nuclear forces and nuclear weapons complex, including plans for the development and use of tactical nuclear forces. In addition, on April 16, the Duma unanimously adopted a resolution calling for increased defense budgets, re-nationalization of some defense industries, and restructuring of the military command. The committee believes that these Russian actions are counter to the goal of the CTR program as well as agreements by Presidents Gorbachev and Yeltsin to eliminate certain tactical nuclear weapons. The committee does not believe the United States should continue to fund the dismantlement of old Russian weapons while the Russians spend resources to enhance their nuclear weapons capability. These developments have occurred since the President certified that Russia was eligible to receive CTR funds. The committee believes that these developments are significant enough to require recertification. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would direct that, before any funds may be obligated or expended under the CTR program, the President certify to Congress that the government of the country receiving funds is committed to: (1) complying with all relevant arms control agreements; (2) facilitating U.S. verification of weapons destruction; (3) forgoing any use of fissionable and other components of destroyed nuclear weapons in new nuclear weapons; (4) forgoing any military modernization program that exceeds legitimate defense requirements; and (5) forgoing the replacement of destroyed weapons of mass destruction.

Period covered by annual report on accounting for United States assistance under Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (sec. 1045)

The committee recommends a provision that changes the period covered in the annual report on accounting of assistance under the Cooperative Threat Reduction program required under section 1206(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 from the previous calendar year to the previous fiscal year.

Support of United Nations-sponsored efforts to inspect and monitor Iraqi weapons activities (sec. 1046)

The committee recommends a provision that extends, for one year, at current funding levels, the Department of Defense's au-

thority to support United Nations-sponsored efforts to ensure full Iraqi compliance with international obligations to destroy its weapons of mass destruction.

Information assurance initiative (sec. 1047)

The committee notes the important steps the administration and the Department of Defense (DOD) have taken to secure the defense information infrastructure and other critical information infrastructures. Presidential Decision Directive-63 (PDD-63) of May 22, 1998, established a comprehensive national policy in this area, reflecting virtually all of the recommendations of the President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection, as published in the Commission's October 1997 report entitled "Critical Foundations: Protecting America's Infrastructures." For its part, the DOD has also taken important steps to organize, train, and equip the military services and the defense agencies for dealing with information warfare and other cyber threats. In particular, DOD has established a Task Force for Computer Network Defense, a Defensewide Information Assurance Program, and an integrated working relationship with the National Infrastructure Protection Center at the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Notwithstanding these positive steps, the committee notes significant funding deficiencies in the DOD's fiscal year 2000 budget request and Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) for information assurance and related matters. In addition, the committee notes that much remains to be done to implement the policy set forth in PDD-63. Despite the focus on information assurance that PDD-63 provided, the DOD did not receive additional funding pursuant to PDD-63. During a hearing of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities on March 16, 1999, DOD officials indicated that significant funding shortfalls remain in the following areas: (1) the Department's efforts to accelerate information assurance technology development and acquisition; (2) development and use of public key infrastructure services; (3) improvements to information technology training and retention of information technology professionals; (4) development of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance modeling and simulation capability; and (5) creation of incentives for industry to address information assurance. According to the Pentagon, in order to satisfy these requirements, an additional \$420.0 million would be required during fiscal year 2000, with an additional \$1.9 billion required over the outyears of the FYDP. These funding shortfalls are of great concern to the committee.

Due to the rapidly growing information warfare threat and the urgency associated with the Department's Information Assurance Program, the committee recommends a provision that would assist DOD in its information assurance efforts. Specifically, the provision would require the Department to establish (1) an information assurance roadmap to guide the development of appropriate organizational structures and technologies; and (2) an information assurance testbed to provide an integrated organizational structure within DOD to plan and facilitate the conduct of simulations, wargames, exercises, experiments, and other activities designed to prepare the DOD for information warfare threats, and to serve as

a means by which the Department can conduct integrated or joint exercises and experiments with civil and commercial organizations responsible for the oversight and management of critical infrastructures on which the Department depends.

The committee finds that, although the Secretary of Defense can and should play an important role in helping address a broad range of information warfare threats facing the United States, the Secretary must focus primarily on addressing the vulnerabilities associated with the defense information infrastructure and other infrastructures that the Department depends on. The committee encourages the Secretary to work closely with all relevant agencies and departments to identify areas in which the Department can contribute to securing critical national infrastructures beyond those directly overseen by the Secretary.

In light of the funding deficiencies outlined above, the committee recommends an increase of \$120.0 million for information assurance programs, projects and activities. Specifically, the committee recommends the following increases for the specified purposes:

(1) \$10.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, for acquisition by the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) of secure terminal equipment for the military services and defense agencies.

(2) \$10.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, for acquisition by DISA of tools for real-time computer intrusion detection, analysis and warning.

(3) \$5.0 million in PE 65710D8 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence to take the lead in establishing and operating the information assurance testbed, as specified above.

(4) \$85.0 million in the National Security Agency's Information System Security Program (ISSP) research and development account (PE 33140G) for the following: secure wireless communications; public key infrastructure; tool development by the Information Operations Technology Center; critical infrastructure modeling; and software security research, including evaluation of the Trusted RUBIX database guard.

(5) \$10.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for training, education, and retention of information technology professionals at the DOD.

As discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee also recommends a related increase of \$34.0 million in Other Procurement, Air Force, for base infrastructure protection, based on an unfunded requirement identified by the Air Force, and a related increase of \$12.0 million in Other Procurement, Navy, for information assurance activities associated with the Information Technology-21 program.

Defense Science Board Task Force on television and radio as a propaganda instrument in time of military conflict (sec. 1048)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a task force of the Defense Science Board to examine the use of radio and television broadcasting as a propaganda instrument and the adequacy of the capa-

bilities of the U.S. armed forces in this area to deal with situations such as the conflict in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The task force would submit its report containing its assessments to the Secretary of Defense, not later than February 1, 2000. The Secretary would submit the report, together with his comments and recommendations, to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1, 2000.

Military access to the frequency spectrum (secs. 1049–1050)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that any system licensed to operate on portions of the frequency spectrum currently used by the Department of Defense be designed in such a way as to ensure that it neither interferes with, nor receives interference from, the military systems of the Department of Defense that operate in those bands. The provision would further require that any costs associated with redesigning military systems to move away from a frequency so that it can be made available for use by another system, public or private, be paid by the entity whose system or systems displace the military system.

The committee remains concerned about the encroachment into portions of the electromagnetic radio frequency spectrum historically reserved for the Department of Defense. While the committee recognizes the importance of efficient allocation of the frequency spectrum to advance commercial development, the committee believes that it is essential that national security requirements be accommodated in any allocation decision.

Last year, the Congress required that the Department of Defense be reimbursed for any costs incurred as a result of making bandwidth available for auction. That requirement allows the auction of these frequencies to continue without placing an undue financial burden on the Department of Defense. The committee is concerned that the Department may also incur costs if other entities are licensed to operate systems in the same frequency bands as those used by military equipment unless the systems are designed in such a way as to ensure that they neither interfere with, nor receive interference from, the military systems of the Department of Defense that are operating in those bands.

The committee further recommends a provision that would prohibit the issuance of any license or permit, or award of any federal contract, to any company that illegally broadcasts, or whose subsidiaries illegally broadcast, signals into the United States on frequencies used by the Department of Defense.

The committee is concerned about reports that some entities are seeking to deploy systems, such as communications satellites, from overseas facilities that are designed to broadcast signals into the United States using frequencies they are not licensed to use by the U.S. government, and that are currently used by the Department of Defense. The committee believes that this is both a violation of U.S. sovereignty and a threat to U.S. interests.

Repeal of limitation on amount of federal expenditures for the National Guard Challenge Program (sec. 1051)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the provision of law that limits federal expenditures under the Na-

tional Guard Challenge Program to \$50.0 million in any fiscal year. The recommended provision would permit the National Guard Challenge Program to expand to more states, while leaving in place the current requirement that participating states fund a share of the costs of their program. The committee supports the funding level of \$62.5 million in the budget request.

Nondisclosure of information on personnel of overseas, sensitive, or routinely deployable units (sec. 1052)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense and, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating under the Navy, the Secretary of Transportation to withhold from disclosure to the public the name, rank, duty address, official title, and pay information of personnel assigned to units that are sensitive, routinely deployable, or overseas.

The military services routinely deny Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552) requests for the names and duty addresses of personnel assigned to units that are sensitive, routinely deployable, or overseas. This information is withheld as a force protection measure to protect the members and their families from heightened vulnerability to terrorist attack or harassment due to their duty location or the nature of their duties. Some requestors now seek only the names of these personnel.

Existing exemptions to the FOIA based on force protection do not clearly apply to a request for "names only." The committee believes there are serious security risks inherent in releasing the names only of these military members. Listing names of service members without an address highlights the fact that they are in vulnerable positions. Internet databases can provide an address based on an individual's name alone. Using Internet resources, requestors can determine if an American abroad is in the military, and they can trace operational members who transfer to units that routinely deploy overseas and locate their families either abroad or in the United States.

The definitions within the provision are derived from those used by the Department of Defense since 1990 in determining the units where release of names and duty station addresses of assigned personnel are not subject to release. Units designated for deployment on contingency plans not yet executed, and units that participate in exercises outside the United States or its territories on an infrequent (annual or semiannual) basis would not fall within the definition of routinely deployable units. However, units that are alerted for deployment outside the United States or its territories during actual execution of a contingency plan, or in support of a crisis operation, would qualify under the exemption.

Nondisclosure of operational files of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (sec. 1053)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to withhold from public disclosure the operational files of the former National Photographic Interpretation Center of the Central Intelligence Agency, which were transferred in 1996 to the new National Imagery and Mapping 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 originally provided for under section 701 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 431).

Nondisclosure of information of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency having commercial significance (sec. 1054)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to withhold from public disclosure information in the possession of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency, if the Secretary determines, in writing, that public disclosure of the information would compete with, or otherwise adversely affect, commercial operations in any existing or emerging industry, or the operation of any existing or emerging market, and that withholding the information from disclosure is consistent with the national security interests of the United States. This authority in no way limits the continuing authority of the Director of Central Intelligence to withhold or require the withholding of imagery under the National Security Act of 1947 and applicable directives.

Continued enrollment of dependents in Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools after loss of eligibility (sec. 1055)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to allow, for good cause, dependents of a member or former member of the armed forces, or of a federal employee or former federal employee, to continue their education in a Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary or secondary school, even after the status of the member or the employee changes. The recommended provision would allow approval of requests for the continued education of former members or former employee's dependents in unique circumstances, such as where the member or employee is killed in the line of duty.

Unified school boards for all Department of Defense domestic dependent schools in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and Guam (sec. 1056)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize one school board for all Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools (DDESS) arrangements in Puerto Rico and one school board for all DDESS arrangements in Guam, even though there may be schools located on more than one military installation in Puerto Rico and Guam. The recommended provision is consistent with the existing structure of one superintendent for all DDESS arrangements in Puerto Rico and one superintendent for all DDESS arrangements in Guam.

Department of Defense STARBASE Program (sec. 1057)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a science, mathematics, and technology education improvement program known as the DOD STARBASE Program. The recommended provision would require the Secretary to establish a minimum of 25 academies under the program, with minimum annual funding of \$200,000 per academy.

The recommended provision would authorize the Secretary to provide administrative and logistical support for activities under the program and to accept financial and other support from other federal agencies, state and local governments, and not-for-profit and other organizations in the private sector.

STARBASE is a unique educational program that targets at-risk youth and combats some of the most challenging problems facing America's youth today: negative feelings towards science and math; lack of personal direction; and substance abuse. It was initiated as a pilot program at Selfridge Air National Guard Base in Michigan in 1990. The Department of Defense has funded this program since 1993.

Military facilities provide ideal settings for STARBASE. The resources available allow for varied and exciting platforms for the STARBASE curriculum, giving students a new perception of math and science, the techniques for development of positive self-esteem, and answers to questions on how to avoid substance abuse. It also offers positive exposure to the military for STARBASE children, older siblings, parents, and teachers.

Children who participate in STARBASE are sparked with an enthusiasm to learn, gain more confidence in their abilities, and are motivated to lead successful, self-satisfying, drug free lives. Families of children who participate in STARBASE report a greater respect for military service. The committee believes that, over time, this program will increase the technical skills required for military service and increase interest in military service for many program participants.

Program to commemorate 50th anniversary of the Korean war (sec. 1058)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the expenditure of up to \$7.0 million for the United States of America Korean War Commemoration during fiscal years 2000 through 2004. This limitation would be in addition to the expenditures of any local commander to commemorate the Korean War from funds available to that command.

Extension and reauthorization of Defense Production Act of 1950 (sec. 1059)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950 through September 30, 2000.

Extension to naval aircraft of Coast Guard authority for interdiction activities (sec. 1060)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend to Navy aircraft with Coast Guard members aboard, the authority for Coast Guard to fire warning and disabling shots at maritime vessels suspected of transporting illegal narcotics and refusing to stop. This authority already exists for Naval vessels on which members of the Coast Guard are assigned and is intended to enhance the ability of these vessels to interdict other vessels suspected of transporting illegal drugs to the United States.

Other Items of Interest

Drug interdiction & counterdrug activities, operations and maintenance

[In thousands of dollars—may not add due to rounding]

Fiscal Year 2000 Drug and Counterdrug Request	\$954,600
Goal 1 (Dependent Demand Reduction)	16,811
Goal 2 (Support to DLEAs)	95,015
Goal 3 (DOD Personnel Demand Reduction)	72,206
Goal 4 (Drug Interdiction—TZ/SWB)	440,755
Goal 5 (Supply Reduction)	329,845
Increases:	
Regional Counterdrug Training	1,000
Enhanced Aerial Reconnaissance	4,000
Decreases:	
Ground Based Radars	5,000
Transfers (To MILCON)	
Forward Operating Locations	42,835

Narcotics Related Threat To Vital National Security Interests

Over the past few years, the international trafficking of illegal narcotics has led to an increasing threat to U.S. national security interests. Although narcotics have always posed a threat to American lives with thousands of deaths each year linked to the abuse of these controlled substances, this has largely been a threat that was best combated by law enforcement agencies and drug treatment programs. However, with the growing links between the large narcotics traffickers and other criminal and terrorist organizations, the threat has evolved into a national security problem that requires the combined efforts of many local, state, and federal agencies, including the U.S. Armed Forces.

The requirement for military participation is particularly true today as revenues from the narcotics trade are providing the means by which the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) is challenging the control of the Colombian government over its sovereign territory, and spreading its influence into the neighboring countries of Ecuador, Venezuela, and Panama. The FARC has already been involved in the killing of Americans.

The FARC has also attacked oil pipelines resulting in the destruction of countless barrels of oil. With the expanding power of the FARC into Ecuador and Venezuela, America's largest foreign supplier of oil, the FARC will be able to significantly disrupt U.S. energy supplies. Furthermore, with the expansion of the FARC into Panama, the FARC is quickly placing itself in a position, with the departure of U.S. military forces from the Canal Zone, to disrupt the operations of the Panama Canal, if it so desires.

Finally, the lure of significant profits from narco-trafficking have helped to build smuggling operations that could be used by terrorists seeking to introduce weapons, including weapons of mass destruction, into the United States. In order to disable these smuggling operations, it is necessary to increase the cost of narco-trafficking and thereby reduce its attraction. To achieve this, a combination of demand reduction, drug interdiction, and source zone eradication is required. Source zone eradication can only be achieved by host nations with sovereign control of their territory.

The U.S. Armed Forces are in a unique position to assist America's counter-narcotics efforts in two of these areas. The military services have the necessary assets to provide for the detection and monitoring of suspected narco-traffickers in the source and transit zone. The military also has the assets to assist the Coast Guard, where necessary, in the interdiction of these suspected traffickers. Furthermore, the military services have the skills necessary to help train appropriate foreign security forces so that they are able to defeat the narco-traffickers and their allies, and thus regain and retain control of their territory.

Enhanced aerial reconnaissance

The committee is concerned about the diminished readiness of the U.S. Southern Command's (SOUTHCOM) detection and monitoring capabilities resulting from the reduction of aerial intelligence assets in the theater. The detection and monitoring capabilities of the U.S. military provide a unique contribution to the Nation's overall War on Drugs. Unfortunately, with the decline in defense resources over the past several years, and the increased requirements for aerial intelligence assets in other theaters of operations, including the Balkans, the DOD has been unable to provide the required level of detection and monitoring to the Southern Command.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for the deployment of aerial reconnaissance assets, such as the Army's Airborne Reconnaissance Low and the Air National Guard's Senior Scout, to SOUTHCOM's area of responsibility. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a report that outlines the actions taken by the DOD to acquire the necessary aerial reconnaissance assets to increase the readiness of SOUTHCOM's detection and monitoring capabilities.

Regional counterdrug training

The committee understands the valuable counter-narcotics training that the U.S. military can provide law enforcement agencies. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$1.0 million for the Regional Counterdrug Training Academy.

Ground based radars

The committee understands the valuable capability provided by the relocatable over the horizon radars (ROTHR) used for counter-narcotics, and is encouraged that the newest ROTHR will be operational at the beginning of fiscal year 2000. The operation of this radar will provide the capability to monitor the region currently monitored by less capable source zone ground-based radars. However, the budget request continues to fund these ground-based radars. The committee believes that with the initial operation of the new ROTHR, the resources dedicated to the source zone ground-based radars could be put to more productive use in other counter-narcotics activities. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$5.0 million for these ground-based radars. The committee expects the Department to begin the process of removing these radars from the source zone.

Forward operating locations

The committee supports the proposed creation of forward operating locations (FOLs) to replace the capability lost with the closure of Howard Air Force Base. The committee understands the importance of these sites to the continuing ability of the U.S. Armed Forces and law enforcement agencies to effectively wage the war against drugs in the source and transit zones. Therefore, the committee recommends a transfer of \$42.8 million to the Defense-wide military construction account to make necessary modifications to existing facilities that will house these FOLs.

Department of Energy's financial management

The committee notes with concern that the Department of Energy has received a qualified audit opinion based on possible inaccurate measures of the Department's environmental liability. Audit opinions in prior years did not express similar concern about the Department's ability to accurately estimate the environmental liability that would be incurred by the government. The committee expects the Department to take corrective action prior to the audit of the fiscal year 1999 financial statements.

Submarine dismantlement

The Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program has worked to eliminate Russian ballistic missile submarines. The Department of Energy (DOE) and Department of Defense (DOD) are looking at the possibility of broadening the cooperative relationship with Russia to include dismantlement of nuclear powered submarines capable of delivering nuclear weapons. The committee believes that more information is needed on this initiative. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare a report outlining the cost, schedule, number and type of each Russian submarine that the DOD would propose to dismantle. In addition, the Secretary should identify the current location, status, and condition of each submarine. The report should also include a description of the steps needed to dismantle any such submarines, including modifications to existing shipyards or facilities. The Secretary should identify any anticipated Russian contribution, financial or in kind, to support the project. The committee also directs the Director of Central Intelligence to conduct an assessment of the threat, if any, posed by Russian general purpose nuclear powered submarines to U.S. national security interests, and a review of Russian submarine modernization efforts, including research and development activities, to be included in the report submitted by the Secretary of Defense. The report may include a classified annex. The report should be submitted to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2000. In preparing the report the Secretary should consult with the Secretary of Energy on issues related to spent nuclear fuel transportation, storage, and disposal.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Accelerated implementation of voluntary early retirement authority (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1109(d) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 by changing the effective date from October 1, 2000 to October 1, 1999 of modifications to voluntary early retirement authority for civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

Deference to EEOC procedures for investigation of com- plaints of sexual harassment made by employees (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1561 of title 10, United States Code, by limiting its applicability to complaints of sexual harassment made to a commanding officer by a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps under his command. Section 1561 presently requires the military chain of command to investigate both complaints made by such members and complaints made to a commanding officer by civilian employees under his supervision. However, the civilian employees of the Department of Defense are not a part of the military chain of command and are not ordinarily subject to discipline by members of the armed forces. For this reason, the committee does not believe that it is appropriate for commanding officers to investigate complaints of sexual harassment filed by civilians. The committee notes that such civilian employees are covered by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with respect to such complaints. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which enforces Title VII, has issued regulations requiring federal agencies to comply with its processing procedures and time limits. Members of the armed forces, on the other hand, are exempt from Title VII; therefore, it is appropriate that military personnel submit sexual harassment complaints through the military chain of command. The amendment would continue to afford a member of the armed forces the right to a command investigation of his complaint, while obviating the possibilities of duplicative processing of and disparate decisions regarding a civilian employee.

Restoration of leave of emergency essential employees serv- ing in a combat zone (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would define a Department of Defense emergency essential employee and provide for automatic restoration of any excess annual leave that the employee would lose because of service in a combat zone.

Leave without loss of benefits for military reserve technicians on active duty in support of combat operations (sec. 1104)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 6323(d)(1) of title 5, United States Code, so that leave protections would apply when dual-status military technicians participate on active duty in combat, as well as noncombat, operations outside the United States, its territories and possessions.

Work schedules and premium pay of service academy faculty (sec. 1105)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 4338, 6952, and 9338 of title 10, United States Code, concerning the employment and compensation of the civilian faculties at the U.S. Military Academy, the Naval Academy, and the Air Force Academy. The recommended provision would exclude the civilian faculty from the provisions in subchapter V, chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, concerning premium pay, and the provisions in chapter 61 of title 5, United States Code, concerning hours of work. Generally, those provisions provide for specific hours within a work day or work week, and premium pay or compensatory time off for work performed in excess of those specific hours. Work hours of civilian faculty members at the service academies, like those of faculty members at other colleges and universities, vary greatly. Faculty members may be required to teach, counsel, research, write, attend meetings, and perform a host of other functions at all hours. Because of the flexibility required to meet these responsibilities, it is difficult to apply the rules in title 5, United States Code, that require specificity in determining an appropriate work schedule. This amendment would provide service secretaries with the flexibility necessary to establish reasonable work requirements for the civilian faculty, similar to the requirements for faculty members at other colleges and universities. It would not eliminate requirements to comply with other law, such as the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Salary schedules and related benefits for faculty and staff of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (sec. 1106)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the authority of the Secretary of Defense to prescribe pay schedules for civilians employed as faculty and staff of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS). Section 2113(f)(1) of title 10, United States Code, requires the Secretary to establish pay schedules and provide retirement and benefits that place USUHS faculty and staff on a comparable basis with employees of fully accredited health professions schools located in the vicinity of the District of Columbia. The Department of Defense has interpreted section 5373 of title 5, United States Code, which limits the annual rate of basic pay set by administrative action to no more than the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule, and section 5307 of title 5, United States Code, which limits total cash compensation (basic pay plus allowances, bonuses, or other cash payments) to the rate for level I of the Executive Schedule, as limiting the Secretary's au-

thority under section 2113(f)(1) of title 10, United States Code. In many cases, these limitations have prevented the Secretary from prescribing pay schedules comparable to those of employees of fully accredited health professions schools located in the vicinity of the District of Columbia.

**TITLE XII—NATIONAL MILITARY MUSEUM AND
RELATED MATTERS**

**SUBTITLE A—COMMISSION ON NATIONAL MILITARY
MUSEUM**

**Commission on the National Military Museum (secs. 1201-
1211)**

The United States is the only major world power that does not have a recognized National Military Museum to honor the service of the military personnel or educate current and future generations regarding the armed forces and the sacrifices of the members of the armed forces. Although each of the military services maintain extensive, well run service specific museums throughout the Nation, none are located in the highly visited central core of the National Capital Area where it would be most effective in fulfilling the role of preserving, educating, and honoring the proud military history of the United States.

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a Commission on the National Military Museum to conduct a study and make a recommendation, not later than 12 months after its first meeting, to the Congress on the need for a National Military Museum. In carrying out the study, the Commission would:

(1) determine whether existing military museums, historic sites, or memorials adequately provide, in a cost effective manner, for the display of and interaction with artifacts and representation of the armed forces and of the wars in which the United States has fought; honor the service of the armed forces to the United States; educate current and future generations regarding the armed forces and the sacrifices of the armed forces and the Nation in furtherance of the defense of freedom; and foster public pride in the achievements and activities of the armed forces;

(2) determine whether adequate inventories of artifacts and representation of the armed forces and the wars in which the United States has been engaged would be available from current inventories, or in private or public collections that could be loaned to the museums; and

(3) develop preliminary concepts for a basic design, location within the National Capital Area, and an approximate cost of design, construction, and operating costs of a National Military Museum.

If the Commission determines that the Congress should authorize the museum, it should further determine a recommended timeline for construction, the potential effects on the environment, the facilities and roadways, the fund raising levels, the governing structure and potential location.

The provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide up to \$2.0 million to support the Commission's study. The provision would also preclude any land transfers or alternative future uses for the Navy Annex property for 24 months after receipt of the study on the expansion of Arlington Cemetery required by the Joint Exploratory Statement of the statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261) and the related Senate report (S. Rept. 105-189).

DIVISION B - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary of National Defense Authorization for FY 2000

(In Thousands of \$'s)

DIVISION B

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Recommended
Military Construction, Army	656,003	378,719	1,034,722
Military Construction, Navy	319,786	564,850	884,636
Military Construction, Air Force	179,497	572,309	751,806
Military Construction, Defense-wide	193,005	593,585	786,590
Military Construction, Defense-wide (Fwd Op Location Transfer)		42,835	42,835
Military Construction, Army National Guard	16,045	163,226	179,271
Military Construction, Air National Guard	21,319	211,021	232,340
Military Construction, Army Reserve	23,120	92,065	115,185
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	4,933	18,112	23,045
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	12,155	22,709	34,864
Base Realignment and Closure II, III, IV	705,911	187,000	892,911
NATO Infrastructure	191,000	(18,528)	172,472
Total Military Construction	2,322,774	2,827,903	5,150,677

FAMILY HOUSING

Family Housing Construction, Army	14,003	47,528	61,531
Family Housing Support, Army	1,098,080		1,098,080

**Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2000**

(In Thousands of \$'s)

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Recommended</u>
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	64,605	233,749	298,354
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	895,070		895,070
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	101,791	241,720	343,511
Family Housing Support, Air Force	821,892		821,892
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide	50		50
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	41,440		41,440
Homeowners Assistance Fund	0		0
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	78,756		78,756
Total Family Housing	3,115,687	522,997	3,638,684

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
1 Alabama	Army	Anniston AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph VII	7,000	(7,000)	-
2 Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	Officer Transient Student Dormitory	10,600	10,600	10,600
3 Alabama	Chem Demilitarization	Anniston AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph VII	7,000	7,000	7,000
4 Alabama	Army National Guard	Redstone Arsenal	Unit Training Equipment Site	8,916	8,916	8,916
5 Alabama	Air National Guard	Dannelly Field	Medical Training and Dining Facility	6,000	6,000	6,000
6 Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	2,200	12,400	14,600
7 Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Ammunition Surveillance Facility	2,300	2,300	2,300
8 Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Emission Reduction Facility	2,300	13,200	15,500
9 Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	MOUT Collective Training Facility	17,000	17,000	17,000
10 Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Repair Runway	3,334	10,666	14,000
11 Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Repair KC-135 Parking Ramp	941	3,059	4,000
12 Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Weapons Release Systems Facility	1,451	4,649	6,100
13 Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Alter Roadway, Davis Highway	9,500	9,500	9,500
14 Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Construct C-130 Parking Ramp	3,995	13,005	17,000
15 Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Dormitory	3,727	12,073	15,800
16 Alaska	Def Logistics Agency	DFSC Elmendorf AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	4,700	18,800	23,500
17 Alaska	Def Logistics Agency	Eielson AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	9,000	17,000	26,000
18 Alaska	Army National Guard	Anchorage	CSMS/MATES	2,940	10,910	13,850
19 Alaska	Air National Guard	Kulis	Composite Support Complex	2,170	7,830	10,000
20 Alaska	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	Fort Wainwright	Hospital Replacement Ph I	18,000	18,000	18,000
21 Arizona	Navy	MCAS Yuma	Land Acquisition	3,650	10,750	14,400
22 Arizona	Navy	MCAS Yuma	Child Development Center Addition	640	1,980	2,620
23 Arizona	Navy	NAVDET Camp Navajo	Magazines Modernization	1,910	5,650	7,560
24 Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Aircraft Processing Ramp	1,847	5,953	7,800
25 Arizona	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	Davis-Monthan AFB	Ambulatory Health Care Center Add/Alt	2,400	7,600	10,000
26 Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph IV	61,800	(61,800)	-

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recon
27 Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Chemical Defense Qualification Facility		18,000	18,000
28 Arkansas	Air National Guard	Little Rock AFB	Vehicle/Base Engineer Maintenance Complex	1,881	6,818	8,699
29 Arkansas	Air Force Reserve	Little Rock AFB	Alter Aerial Port Training Facility	209	591	800
30 Arkansas	Chem Demilitarization	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph IV		61,800	61,800
31 California	Army	Fort Irwin	Rotational Unit Facility Maintenance Area	3,300	10,100	13,400
32 California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	BEQ	4,840	14,290	19,130
33 California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	Cast Trainer Addition	420	1,250	1,670
34 California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	Tactical Vehicle Maintenance Facility	3,420	10,540	13,960
35 California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Tactical Vehicle Maintenance Facility	2,210	6,800	9,010
36 California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	BEQ	2,390	7,350	9,740
37 California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Integrated Communication Hub	960	2,850	3,810
38 California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Armory	660	1,960	2,620
39 California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Staff Non-Com Off Academic	1,640	4,840	6,480
40 California	Navy	MCLB Barstow	Test Track/Test Pond Facility	1,150	3,520	4,670
41 California	Navy	MCRD San Diego	Physical Fitness Center Addition	810	2,390	3,200
42 California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Aviation Armament Facility	1,460	4,340	5,800
43 California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Aircraft Ordnance Loading Facility	3,010	8,890	11,900
44 California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Engine Maintenance Shop Addition	600	1,760	2,360
45 California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Strike Fighter Weapons Training Facility	1,000	2,960	3,960
46 California	Navy	NAS North Island	Berthing Wharf (Incr. I)	40,760	13,660	54,420
47 California	Navy	NAVHOSP San Diego	BEQ Modernization	5,470	16,120	21,590
48 California	Navy	NAVHOSP Twentynine Palms	BEQ	1,930	5,710	7,640
49 California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Flightline Fire Station	2,086	6,814	8,900
50 California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Add To Physical Fitness Center	1,754	5,746	7,500
51 California	Command	NAB Coronado	Naval Special Warfare C2 Addition	2,272	3,728	6,000
52 California	Air National Guard	Moffett Federal Airfield	Replace Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	3,033	10,967	14,000

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction (Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
53 California	Air National Guard	Fresno ANGS	Operations, Training /Dining Facility		9,100	9,100
54 California	Navy Reserve	MCRS Camp Pendleton	Reserve Training Complex	1,649	8,291	9,940
55 California	Data Center	Presidio, Monterey	DoD Center Renovation	6,712	21,288	28,000
56 California	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	Los Angeles AFB	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	2,400	11,200	13,600
57 California	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	Travis AFB	Facility	2,000	5,500	7,500
58 Colorado	Army	Peterson AFB	US Army Space Command Headquarters	3,700	21,300	25,000
59 Colorado	Army	Pueblo AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph I	11,800	(11,800)	-
60 Colorado	Air Force	Air Force Academy	Upgrade Academic Facility	4,056	13,444	17,500
61 Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	USSPACECOM/NORAD Headquarters	7,887	25,113	33,000
62 Colorado	Air Force	Schriever AFB	Physical Fitness Center	929	2,971	3,900
63 Colorado	Air Force	Schriever AFB	Sanitary Sewer Line	1,296	4,204	5,500
64 Colorado	Chem Demilitarization	Pueblo AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph I		11,800	11,800
65 Connecticut	Army Reserve	West Hartford	ADAL Reserve Center		17,525	17,525
66 Connecticut	Air National Guard	Orange ANGS	Air Control Squadron Complex		11,000	11,000
67 Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Visitors Quarters		12,000	12,000
68 Delaware	Army National Guard	Smyrna	Readiness Center		4,381	4,381
69 D.C.	Army	Fort McNair	Chapel	380	870	1,250
70 D.C.	Army	Walter Reed	Physical Fitness Training Center	1,020	5,780	6,800
71 Florida	Navy	NAS Whiting Field Milton	JPATS T-6A Trainer Facility	1,200	3,550	4,750
72 Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Squadron Operations Facility	1,566	5,034	6,600
73 Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Dormitory	1,635	5,365	7,000
74 Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Dormitory	2,161	6,939	9,100
75 Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Runway Repair/Taxiway	2,269	7,431	9,700
76 Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Add to and Alter Physical Fitness Center	1,302	4,198	5,500
77 Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Air Freight/Passenger Terminal Facility	1,967	6,333	8,300
78 Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Base Supply/Traffic Management Complex	2,238	7,262	9,500

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction (Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
79 Florida	Army Reserve	Joint Reserve Complex	Land Acquisition - Joint Reserve Complex	690		690
80 Florida	Air Force Reserve	Homestead AFB	Fire Fighter Training Facility	524	1,476	2,000
81 Florida	Army National Guard	Pensacola	Readiness Center		4,628	4,628
82 Florida	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	NAS Jacksonville	Branch Medical/Dental Clinic Add/Alt	780	3,000	3,780
83 Florida	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	NAS Pensacola	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,300	3,000	4,300
84 Florida	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	Patrick AFB	Medical Logistics Facility Replacement	200	1,550	1,750
85 Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	7,100	39,900	47,000
86 Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Ammunition Holding Area	420	980	1,400
87 Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Contingency Logistics Facility		19,000	19,000
88 Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart/Hunter AAF	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal w/Dining	7,000		7,000
89 Georgia	Army	Hunter Army Air Field	Multi-Purpose Training Range	1,100	6,100	7,200
90 Georgia	Navy	MCLB Albany	Field Maintenance Shop	1,540	4,720	6,260
91 Georgia	Navy	NAS Atlanta	BEQ-A		5,430	5,430
92 Georgia	Air Force	Fort Benning	Air Support Operations Squadron Facility	911	2,989	3,900
93 Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Squadron Operation Facility	763	2,437	3,200
94 Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	KC-135 Flight Simulator Facility	789	2,561	3,350
95 Georgia	Command	Fort Benning	Regimental Command & Control Facility	2,272	7,928	10,200
96 Georgia	Air National Guard	Savannah IAP	Composite Support Complex	2,116	7,684	9,800
97 Georgia	Air National Guard	Savannah IAP	Regional Fire Training Facility	368	1,332	1,700
98 Georgia	Army Reserve	Fort Gillem	USAR Ctr/Org Mnt Shop/Dir Spt/Warehouse	3,610	18,511	22,121
99 Georgia	Air Force Reserve	Dobbins AFB	Training	558	1,572	2,130
100 Georgia	Air Force Reserve	Robins AFB	Add/Alter AFRC HQ & ATACC	3,666	10,334	14,000
101 Georgia	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	Moody AFB	WRM Warehouse/BEE Facility	200	1,050	1,250
102 Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	14,200		14,200
103 Hawaii	Navy	Camp Smith	CINCPAC Headquarters (Incr. I)	15,870		15,870
104 Hawaii	Navy	MCAS Kaneohe Bay	RATCC Center	1,460	4,330	5,790

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
105 Hawaii	Navy	NAVSTA Pearl Harbor	BEQ Modernization	4,720	13,880	18,600
106 Hawaii	Navy	NSB Pearl Harbor	Berthing Wharf	7,470	21,990	29,460
107 Hawaii	Navy	NSY Pearl Harbor	Abrasive Blast & Paint Facility	2,690	7,920	10,610
108 Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Fire Training Facility	785	2,515	3,300
109 Hawaii	Army National Guard	Bellows AFS	Regional Training Institute		12,105	12,105
110 Idaho	Navy	NSWC Bayview	Underwater Equipment Laboratory	2,540	7,500	10,040
111 Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Enhanced Training Range, Idaho, Ph II	3,487	11,113	14,600
112 Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Defense Access Road	564	1,836	2,400
113 Idaho	Air National Guard	Gowen Field	A-10 Expand Arm and Disarm Apron	350	1,250	1,600
114 Idaho	Air National Guard	Gowen Field	Fuel Cell and Corrosion Control Hanger		2,300	2,300
115 Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Drill Hall Replacement	2,830	8,360	11,190
116 Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Recruit In-Process Barracks	3,370	9,940	13,310
117 Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	All Weather Running Track	354	1,026	1,380
118 Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	BEQ - "A School"	7,700	23,710	31,410
119 Illinois	Army National Guard	ARNG Marseilles Trng Area	Battalion Training Complex	2,325	8,627	10,952
120 Indiana	Army	Newport AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph II	61,200	(61,200)	-
121 Indiana	Chem Demilitarization	Newport AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph II		61,200	61,200
122 Indiana	Air National Guard	Fort Wayne	Medical Training Facility/Dining Hall		7,200	7,200
123 Iowa	Air National Guard	Sioux City IAP	Vehicle Maintenance Facility		3,600	3,600
124 Kansas	Army	Fort Leavenworth	US Disciplinary Barracks, Ph III	18,800		18,800
125 Kansas	Army	Fort Leavenworth	Water Treatment Plant	1,200	6,900	8,100
126 Kansas	Army	Fort Leavenworth	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	3,900	22,100	26,000
127 Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Whole Barracks Renovation		27,000	27,000
128 Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	KC-135 Squadron Operations/AMU	2,280	7,320	9,600
129 Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	Improve Family Housing Area Safety		1,363	1,363
130 Kansas	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	Fort Riley	Consolidated Troop Medical Clinic	1,060	4,940	6,000

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
131 Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph I	11,800	(11,800)	-
132 Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass AD	Ammunition Surveillance Facility	900	5,100	6,000
133 Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Support	11,000	-	11,000
134 Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Physical Fitness Training Center	900	5,100	6,000
135 Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	MOUT Training Complex, Ph I	2,150	12,250	14,400
136 Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Sabre Heliport Improvements	2,475	17,025	19,500
137 Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	4,800		4,800
138 Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Vehicle Maintenance Facility		17,000	17,000
139 Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Multi-purpose Digital Training Range, Ph II	2,400		2,400
140 Kentucky	Air Force	Fort Campbell	Air Support Operations Squadron Facility	1,472	4,828	6,300
141 Kentucky	Chem Demilitarization	Blue Grass AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph I	11,800		11,800
142 Louisiana	Army Reserve	Fort Polk	Organizational Maintenance Shop	4,309		4,309
143 Louisiana	Navy Reserve	Lafayette	Marine Corps Reserve Center	3,330		3,330
144 Louisiana	Air National Guard	NAS Belle Chase	Ammunition Storage Igloo	1,350		1,350
145 Maine	Navy	NAS Brunswick	BEQ Replacement	4,270	12,620	16,890
146 Maryland	Army	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph II	66,600	(66,600)	-
147 Maryland	Army	Fort Meade	Military Entrance Processing Center	1,350	3,100	4,450
148 Maryland	Army	Fort Meade	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	2,700	15,300	18,000
149 Maryland	Navy	NSWC Indian Head	Sewage Treatment Plant	2,550	7,520	10,070
150 Maryland	Air Force	Andrews AFB	Squadron Operations Facility		9,900	9,900
151 Maryland	Chem Demilitarization	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph II		66,600	66,600
152 Maryland	Agency	Fort Meade	Perimeter Fence (East)	903	-	903
153 Maryland	Agency	Fort Meade	Reconfigure Ops1 Chilled Water	2,043	-	2,043
154 Maryland	Tri-Care Mgmt Agency	Andrews AFB	Medical Logistics Facility Add/Alt	2,000	1,000	3,000
155 Maryland	Tri-Care Mgmt Agency	NAS Patuxent River	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,200	2,950	4,150
156 Massachusetts	Army	Westover AFB	Military Entrance Processing Center	1,200	2,800	4,000

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction (Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
157 Massachusetts	Air Force	Hanscom AFB	Acquisition Management Facility Renovation	16,000		16,000
158 Michigan	Air National Guard	Camp Grayling	Air Ground Range Support Facility	5,800		5,800
159 Minnesota	Army Reserve	Camp Ripley	Combined Support Maintenance Shop	10,368		10,368
160 Mississippi	Navy	NCBC Gulfport	BEQ Renovation	1,600		6,310
161 Mississippi	Navy	NCBC Gulfport	BEQ Modernization	3,260		12,860
162 Mississippi	Air Force	Columbus AFB	Add to T-1A Hanger	2,600		2,600
163 Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	C-130J Simulator Facility	8,900		8,900
164 Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Student Dormitory	4,679		19,900
165 Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Student Dining Facility	1,686		7,100
166 Mississippi	Command	Mississippi Army Ammo Plant	Complex	9,600		9,600
167 Mississippi	Command	Mississippi Army Ammo Plant	Land/Water Ranges	-	3,300	3,300
168 Mississippi	Army National Guard	Camp Shelby	Multi purpose Range Ph III	14,900		14,900
169 Mississippi	Army National Guard	Vicksburg	Readiness Center	5,914		5,914
170 Mississippi	Air National Guard	Jackson International Airport	C-17 Simulator Building	3,600		3,600
171 Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Wolverine/Grizzly Simulator Facility	1,600		10,600
172 Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Low Observable Restoration Facility	5,428		23,000
173 Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	Physical Fitness Center	447		1,900
174 Missouri	Air National Guard	Rosencrans Mem APT	Upgrade Aircraft Parking Apron Ph II	9,000		9,000
175 Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Dormitory	11,600		11,600
176 Montana	Air National Guard	Great Falls IAP	Base Supply Complex	1,400		1,400
177 Nebraska	Air Force	Offutt AFB	Dormitory	1,941		8,300
178 Nevada	Army	Hawthorne Army Depot	Container Repair Facility	1,700		1,700
179 Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Addition	773		3,300
180 Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	F-22 Composite and Fabrication Shop	1,756		7,500
181 Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	F-22 Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	1,859		7,800
182 New Hampshire	Air National Guard	Pease Trade Port	Upgrade KC-135 Parking Apron	9,600		9,600

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
183 New Jersey	Army	Fort Monmouth	Barracks Improvement	11,800	11,800	11,800
184 New Jersey	Navy	NAWCAD Lakehurst	Aircraft/Platform Interface Laboratory	3,970	11,740	15,710
185 New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Visiting Officers Quarters	2,765	9,035	11,800
186 New Jersey	Army Reserve	Fort Dix	Centralized Tactical Vehicle Wash Facility	1,607	4,017	5,624
187 New Mexico	Air National Guard	Kirtland AFB	Composite Support Complex	9,700	9,700	9,700
188 New York	Army	USMA West Point	Cadet Physical Development Center, Ph II	28,500	28,500	28,500
189 New York	Air Force	Rome Laboratory	Laboratory	3,002	9,798	12,800
190 New York	Army Reserve	Fort Wadsworth	Ac	2,066	3,720	5,786
191 New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara Falls	Visiting Officers Quarters	16,508	6,300	6,300
192 N Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal, Ph II	14,400	14,400	14,400
193 N Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Upgrade Barracks D-Area	5,600	1,400	7,000
194 N Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	MOUT Training Complex, Ph II	4,500	25,500	30,000
195 N Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Heavy Drop Rigging Facility	550	3,250	3,800
196 N Carolina	Army	Sunny Point (MOTSU)	Ammunition Surveillance Facility	330	1,010	1,340
197 N Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Family Services Center	130	390	520
198 N Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Aircraft Taxiway Addition	910	2,700	3,610
199 N Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Property Control Facility	2,140	6,610	8,750
200 N Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Road and Utility Construction	2,120	6,280	8,400
201 N Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Maintenance & Operations Facility	1,070	3,160	4,230
202 N Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Physical Fitness Center	1,076	3,524	4,600
203 N Carolina	Air Force	Fort Bragg	Air Support Operations Group Facility	1,802	5,898	7,700
204 N Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Dangerous Cargo Pad	2,272	16,328	18,600
205 N Carolina	Command	Fort Bragg	Battalion Operations Complex	1,500	-	1,500
206 N Carolina	Command	Fort Bragg	Deployable Equipment Facility	912	3,385	4,297
207 N Carolina	Army National Guard	Charlotte	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,504	5,583	7,087
208 N Carolina	Army National Guard	Charlotte	Readiness Center			

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
209 N Carolina	Def Education Activity	MCB Camp Lejeune	Tarawa Terrace II Elementary School	2,387	8,183	10,570
210 N Carolina	Tri-Care Mgmt Agency	MCAS Cherry Point	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,000	2,500	3,500
211 N Carolina	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	Parking Apron Extension		9,500	9,500
212 Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Control Tower	934	3,066	4,000
213 Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Consolidate Avionics Research Laboratory	3,230	10,370	13,600
214 Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Convert to Physical Fitness Center		4,600	4,600
215 Ohio	Tri-Care Mgmt Agency	Wright-Patterson AFB	Occupational Health Clinic/BEE Replacement	2,800	1,100	3,900
216 Ohio	Navy Reserve	Columbus AFB	Reserve Center Addition		3,541	3,541
217 Ohio	Air National Guard	Springfield	Complex		1,770	1,770
218 Oklahoma	Army	Fort Sill	Rail and Containerization Facility	2,000	11,200	13,200
219 Oklahoma	Army	McAlester AAP	Fire Station	900	2,100	3,000
220 Oklahoma	Army	McAlester AAP	Ammunition Road Infrastructure	1,020	5,780	6,800
221 Oklahoma	Army	McAlester AAP	Railyard Infrastructure	2,000	4,800	6,800
222 Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Test Fac (CWF)	4,001	12,999	17,000
223 Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Dormitories	1,602	5,198	6,800
224 Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Repair and Upgrade Runway		11,000	11,000
225 Oklahoma	Air Force	Vance AFB	Upgrade Center Runway		12,600	12,600
226 Oklahoma	Air National Guard	Tulsa IAP	Composite Support Complex		10,800	10,800
227 Oregon	Army	Umatilla DA	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph V	35,900	(35,900)	-
228 Oregon	Chem Demilitarization	Umatilla DA	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph V		35,900	35,900
229 Oregon	Army National Guard	Salem	Armed Forces Reserve Center		15,255	15,255
230 Pennsylvania	Army	Carlisle Barracks	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	750	4,250	5,000
231 Pennsylvania	Army	Letterkenny Army Depot	Ammunition Containerization Complex	570	3,080	3,650
232 Pennsylvania	Navy	NFPC Philadelphia	Cating Pits Modification		13,320	13,320
233 Pennsylvania	Navy	NSPCC Mechanicsburg	Water Distribution System Improvements	760	2,230	2,990
234 Pennsylvania	Def Logistics Agency	Def Dist New Cumberland - DDSP	Public Safety Center	867	4,133	5,000

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction (Dollars in Thousand)

<u>State</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Installation Name</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
235 Pennsylvania	Navy Reserve	NAS Willow Grove	Hazardous Material Storage Facility	320	1,610	1,930
236 Pennsylvania	Navy Reserve	NAS Willow Grove	Ground Equipment Shop		600	600
237 Pennsylvania	Air National Guard	Johnstown Cambria	Air Traffic Control Facility		6,200	6,200
238 Rhode Island	Air National Guard	Quonset	Maintenance Hanger and Shops		16,500	16,500
239 S Carolina	Army	Fort Jackson	Emergency Services Center	1,100	6,300	7,400
240 S Carolina	Navy	Charleston	Air Traffic Control Engineering Center	1,930	5,710	7,640
241 S Carolina	Navy	MCAS Beaufort	Corrosion Control Facility	2,200	6,500	8,700
242 S Carolina	Navy	MCAS Beaufort	Armory Facility	450	1,340	1,790
243 S Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 Corrosion Control Facility	4,389	13,811	18,200
244 S Carolina	Def Education Activity	Laurel Bay	Laurel Bay Intermediate School Addition	642	2,232	2,874
245 S Carolina	Air National Guard	McEntire ANGB	Replace Control Tower		8,000	8,000
246 S Carolina	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Education/Library Center		10,200	10,200
247 Tennessee	Air Force	Arnold AFB	Phase III	1,851	5,949	7,800
248 Tennessee	Army National Guard	Henderson	Organizational Maintenance Shop		1,976	1,976
249 Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Ammunition Hot Load Facility	1,700	9,700	11,400
250 Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Air Deployment Facility Complex	2,550	14,450	17,000
251 Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Aircraft Loading Apron	3,300	18,700	22,000
252 Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Force XXI, Soldier Development Ctr, Ph II	14,000		14,000
253 Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Fixed Wing Aircraft Parking Apron	4,600	26,400	31,000
254 Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Deployment Ready Reactive Field & Trails	2,000	6,000	8,000
255 Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Railhead Facility, Ph II	14,800		14,800
256 Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	4,350	24,650	29,000
257 Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Child Development Center		5,400	5,400
258 Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Dormitory	1,257	4,043	5,300
259 Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Security Forces Center	1,893	6,207	8,100
260 Texas	Air Force	Laughlin AFB	JPATS Beddown - ADAL Various Facilities	766	2,484	3,250

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousand)

<u>State</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Installation Name</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
261 Texas	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	Fort Sam Houston	Veterinary Instructional Facility	600	5,200	5,800
262 Texas	Army Reserve	Fort Hood	Area Mnt Spt Act/Equipmt Conc Site	2,684	6,747	9,431
263 Texas	Air National Guard	Lackland AFB	F-16 Squadron Ops Flight Trng Complex		9,700	9,700
264 Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB, Utah	CAD/PAD Spares Storage Facility	1,081	3,519	4,600
265 Utah	Air National Guard	Salt Lake City IAP	Upgrade Aircraft Maintenance Complex		9,700	9,700
266 Utah	Navy Reserve	MCRC Camp Williams	MC Reserve Training Center Addition	150	740	890
267 Vermont	Army National Guard	Northfield	Multipurpose Training Facility		8,652	8,652
268 Virginia	Army	Fort Belvoir	Military Police Station	640	1,510	2,150
269 Virginia	Army	Fort Belvoir	Fire Station	500	1,200	1,700
270 Virginia	Army	Fort Eustis	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	5,800	33,200	39,000
271 Virginia	Army	Fort Myer	Emergency Services Center	870	2,030	2,900
272 Virginia	Navy	MCCDC Quantico	BEQ	5,270	15,550	20,820
273 Virginia	Navy	NAS Oceana	Aircraft Acoustical Enclosure	2,910	8,580	11,490
274 Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Berthing Wharf (Incr. II)	12,690		12,690
275 Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Pier Electrical Upgrades II	4,720	13,940	18,660
276 Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Pier Replacement	8,600	31,400	40,000
277 Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Waterfront Athletic Complex	2,760	8,130	10,890
278 Virginia	Navy	NSY Norfolk, Portsmouth	Bach Enlisted Quarters-Trans E1/E4	4,460	13,170	17,630
279 Virginia	Navy	NWS Yorktown	Trestle Replacement & Pier Upgrade	6,330	18,710	25,040
280 Virginia	Navy	TACTRAGRULANT Dam Neck	BEQ	2,610	7,700	10,310
281 Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Dormitory	1,486	4,814	6,300
282 Virginia	Command	FCTC Dam Neck	Mission Support Facility	2,273	2,427	4,700
283 Virginia	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	Cheatham Annex	FHSO Container Holding Yard	500	1,150	1,650
284 Virginia	Tri-Care Mgmt Agcy	NAS Norfolk	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,150	2,900	4,050
285 Virginia	Army National Guard	Fort Pickett	Multipurpose Range		13,500	13,500
286 Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Physical Fitness Training Center	1,850	4,350	6,200

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
287 Washington	Army	Yakima Training Center	Tank Trail Erosion Mitigation-Yakima, Ph V	2,000	10,000	12,000
288 Washington	Army	Yakima Training Center	Ammunition Supply Point	1,560	3,640	5,200
289 Washington	Navy	NWPN Station Port Hadlock	Tomahawk Magazine	870	2,570	3,440
290 Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Dredging	3,950	11,660	15,610
291 Washington	Navy	NSB, Bangor	D5 Missile Support Facility	1,600	4,700	6,300
292 Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Survival Training Logistics Complex	1,071	3,429	4,500
293 Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	Maintenance Unit	1,858	6,042	7,900
294 Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Flight Line Support Facility		9,100	9,100
295 Washington	Def Logistics Agency	Fairchild AFB	Add To Hydrant Fuel System	1,500	10,900	12,400
296 Washington	Army National Guard	Yakima Training Center	Mates, Ph 1	3,464	12,852	16,316
297 Washington	Air Force Reserve	McChord AFB	Maintenance Unit Fac	864	2,436	3,300
298 Washington	Tri-Care Mgt Agency	Fort Lewis	North Dental Clinic Replacement	4,950	550	5,500
299 Washington	Tri-Care Mgt Agency	NAS Whidbey Island	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,300	3,400	4,700
300 Washington	Air National Guard	Fairchild AFB	Composite Support Complex		9,800	9,800
301 West Virginia	Army National Guard	Eleanor	Maintenance Complex		18,521	18,521
302 West Virginia	Army National Guard	Eleanor	Readiness Center		9,583	9,583
303 Wisconsin	Air National Guard	Volk Field	Replace Troop Training Quarters	1,923	6,977	8,900
304 Classified	Air Force	Classified	Special Tactical Unit Detachment Facility	244	733	977
305 Classified	Air Force	Classified	Air Control Squadron Operations Complex	1,200	3,900	5,100
306 Classified	Air Force	Classified	Classified Project	9,700	-	9,700
307 Classified	Air Force	Classified	Classified Project	1,093	-	1,093
308 CONUS	Army	CONUS Various	Classified Project	36,400	-	36,400
309 Antilles	Defense Wide	Forward Deployment Site	Facilities upgrade		4,880	4,880
310 Bahrain	Navy	ASU Bahrain	BEQ - Transient	5,840	17,930	23,770
311 Bahrain	Navy	ASU Bahrain	Operations Control Center	8,550	26,220	34,770
312 Bahrain	Navy	ASU Bahrain	BEQ (Security Force)	6,230	18,320	24,550

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
313 Costa Rica	Defense Wide	Forward Deployment Site	Facilities upgrade		6,726	6,726
314 Diego Garcia	Navy	Diego Garcia NAVSUPFAC	Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Facility	2,070	6,080	8,150
315 Ecuador	Defense Wide	Forward Deployment Site	Facilities upgrade		31,229	31,229
316 Germany	Army	Ansbach	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	3,150	17,850	21,000
317 Germany	Army	ASG Bamberg	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	1,230	6,970	8,200
318 Germany	Army	ASG Bamberg	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	1,400	7,900	9,300
319 Germany	Army	ASG Bamberg	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	860	4,840	5,700
320 Germany	Army	Mannheim	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	675	3,825	4,500
321 Germany	Tri-Care Mgt Agency	Ramstein AFB	Dental Clinic Addition/Alteration	2,550	4,550	7,100
322 Greece	Navy	NSA Souda Bay	Operational Support Facilities	1,620	4,760	6,380
323 Guam	Air Force	Andersen AFB	Landfill Closure	2,097	6,803	8,900
324 Guam	Def Logistics Agency	Andersen AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	2,600	21,700	24,300
325 Guam	Army Reserve	Barrigada	USAR Ctr/Org Mnt Shop/Area Mnt Spt Act	1,116	16,430	17,546
326 Guam	Def Education Activity	Andersen AFB	Anderson Elementary School	10,026	34,144	44,170
327 Italy	Navy	NSA Naples	Operational Support Facility	7,370	19,380	26,750
328 Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Radar Approach Control Facility	966	2,734	3,700
329 Korea	Army	Camp Casey	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	4,650	26,350	31,000
330 Korea	Army	Camp Howze	Water System Upgrade	920	2,130	3,050
331 Korea	Army	Camp Stanley	Electrical System Upgrade	1,100	2,550	3,650
332 Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Dormitory	3,482	8,518	12,000
333 Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Add to and Alter Physical Fitness Center	2,229	5,371	7,600
334 Korea	Tri-Care Mgt Agency	Yongsan	Warehouse Repl	2,300	250	2,550
335 Korea	Tri-Care Mgt Agency	Yongsan	Hospital Addition/Alteration	9,570	29,000	38,570
336 Kwajalein	Army	Kwajalein	Power Plant, Ph II - Roi Namur Island	35,400		35,400
337 Portugal	Air Force	Lajes Field, Azores	Apron Security Lighting	479	1,321	1,800
338 Puerto Rico	Air National Guard	Puerto Rico IAP	Facility	1,212	4,388	5,600

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction (Dollars in Thousand)

<u>State</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Installation Name</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
339 Puerto Rico	Air National Guard	Puerto Rico IAP	C-130 Add to Aircraft Parking Apron	490	1,760	2,250
340 Puerto Rico	Air National Guard	Puerto Rico IAP	C-130 Upgrade Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	825	2,975	3,800
341 Puerto Rico	Army Reserve	Fort Buchanan	USAR Ctr	1,431	8,670	10,101
342 Puerto Rico	Tri-Care Mgt Agency	NAVSECGRUACT Sabana Seca	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	1,120	2,880	4,000
343 Spain	Def Logistics Agency	Moron AB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	4,100	11,100	15,200
344 Spain	Def Education Activity	NS Rota	Construct New Elementary School	3,854	13,166	17,020
345 United Kingdom	Air Force	Ascension	Station	512	1,638	2,150
346 United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Feltwell	Wastewater Treatment Plant	786	2,214	3,000
347 United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Consolidated Support Complex	3,221	9,179	12,400
348 United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Child Development Center	1,519	4,281	5,800
349 United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	Hazardous Material Storage Facility	267	733	1,000
350 United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	KC-135 Flight Simulator Facility	600	1,700	2,300
351 United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	Operations Facility	1,076	3,024	4,100
352 United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	Consolidated Corrosion Crl & Maint Complex	2,693	7,507	10,200
353 United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Molesworth	Wastewater Treatment Plant	445	1,255	1,700
354 United Kingdom	Agency	Station	Medical Center Expansion	500	-	500
355 United Kingdom	Def Education Activity	RAF Feltwell	Construct Multipurpose Facility	1,023	3,547	4,570
356 United Kingdom	Def Education Activity	RAF Lakenheath	Construct Gymnasium Building	841	2,929	3,770
357 United Kingdom	Tri-Care Mgt Agency	RAF Lakenheath	Dental Clinic Additional/Alteration	1,000	6,100	7,100
358 Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Insp and Overhead - MilCon	30,689	(30,689)	-
359 Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Minor Construction	9,500		9,500
360 Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Host Nation	21,300		21,300
361 Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	60,705	1,409	62,114
362 Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(30,689)	30,689	-
363 Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(6,178)	6,178	-
364 Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,342		7,342

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
365 Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning & Design	65,630	599	66,229
366 Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Insp and Overhead - MilCon	6,178	(6,178)	-
367 Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Insp and Overhead - MilCon	3,376	(3,376)	-
368 Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(3,376)	3,376	-
369 Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	28,004	10,260	38,264
370 Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	8,741		8,741
371 Worldwide	Office Sec of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design (Defense Level)	18,000	(15,000)	3,000
372 Worldwide	Office Sec of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Minor Construction (Defense Level)	2,900		2,900
373 Worldwide	Special Ops Cmd	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	5,700	340	6,040
374 Worldwide	Special Ops Cmd	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,300		2,300
375 Worldwide	Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	124	15,000	15,124
376 Worldwide	Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,248		1,248
377 Worldwide	OSD Contingencies	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	938		938
378 Worldwide	NATO	Unspecified Worldwide	NATO Security Investment Program	191,000	(18,528)	172,472
379 Worldwide	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning & Design	4,129	3,538	7,667
380 Worldwide	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	771		771
381 Worldwide	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	4,951	6,920	11,871
382 Worldwide	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000		2,000
383 Worldwide	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Insp and Overhead - MilCon	712	(712)	-
384 Worldwide	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	8,500	1,768	10,268
385 Worldwide	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,416		1,416
386 Worldwide	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(712)	712	-
387 Worldwide	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Insp and Overhead - MilCon	32	(32)	-
388 Worldwide	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning & Design	1,778	-	1,778
389 Worldwide	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(32)	32	-
390 Worldwide	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,036		1,036

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction (Dollars in Thousand)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
391 Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Insp and Overhead - MilCon	407	(407)	-
392 Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,467		4,467
393 Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(407)	407	-
394 Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,867	-	1,867
395 Worldwide	DFAS	Unspecified Worldwide	Minor Construction	1,500		1,500
396 Worldwide	Base Closure IV	BRAC IV	Base Realignment and Closure	705,911	187,000	892,911
397 Worldwide	Joint Chiefs of Staff	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,083		6,083
398 Worldwide	Def Education Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,000		1,000
399 Worldwide	Improvement Prgm	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	6,558	25,342	31,900
400 Worldwide	Tri-Care Mgt Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,587		3,587
401 Worldwide	Tri-Care Mgt Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	9,500		9,500
402 Worldwide	Army	Various Worldwide	Financial Adjustment	-		-
403 Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Various Worldwide	Conforming Storage Facilities	1,300	7,600	8,900
		Transfer Account		2,322,756	2,827,858	5,150,614
		Total				

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

		(Dollars in Thousands)				
<u>State</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Installation Name</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
1 Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Replace Family Housing Ph 5	2,707	7,293	10,000
2 Arizona	Navy	MCAS Yuma	Replace Family Housing (100units)		17,000	17,000
3 California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Replace Family Housing Ph 3	2,301	6,199	8,500
4 California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Family Housing	4,472	12,048	16,520
5 California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Area B Housing Ph 5	4,404	11,866	16,270
6 California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Replace Mil Fam Housing, Ph 7	4,548	12,252	16,800
7 D.C.	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Replace Family Housing Ph 5	2,537	6,838	9,375
8 Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Replace Family Housing Ph 1	3,812	10,268	14,080
9 Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Replace Family Housing Ph 4	2,446	6,588	9,034
10 Hawaii	Navy	MCB Hawaii	Replace Family Housing (84 units)	22,639	22,639	22,639
11 Hawaii	Navy	MCAS Kaneohe Bay	Replacement (100 Homes)	5,320	21,295	26,615
12 Hawaii	Navy	NB Pearl Harbor	Replacement (96 Homes)	3,831	15,336	19,167
13 Hawaii	Navy	NB Pearl Harbor	Replacement (133 Homes)	6,031	24,137	30,168
14 Mississippi	Air Force	Columbus AFB	Replace Family Housing Ph 2	3,327	8,963	12,290
15 Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Replace Family Housing	2,050	5,520	7,570
16 Nebraska	Air Force	Offutt AFB	Replace Mil Family Housing Ph 5	3,343	9,009	12,352
17 Mexico	Air Force	Holloman AFB	Replace Family Housing (76 Units)		9,840	9,840
18 N Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Military Family Housing (PH5)	3,300	8,887	12,187
19 N Dakota	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase A	2,720	7,330	10,050
20 N Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace Mil Fam Housing Ph 6	2,912	7,844	10,756
21 Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Replace Family Housing Ph 3	2,030	5,470	7,500
22 Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Family Housing New Construction (60 units)	4,400	19,600	24,000
23 Portugal	Air Force	Lajes Field, Azores	Replace Mil Fam Housing Ph 1	3,509	9,455	12,964
24 Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	482		482

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>State</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Installation Name</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
25	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning	4,300		4,300
26	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	5,303	27,297	32,600
27	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adj - FH Improvements	(345)	345	-
28	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	92,453		92,453
29	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	47,715		47,715
30	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	44,970		44,970
31	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	222,294		222,294
32	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	469,211		469,211
33	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Interest Payments	3		3
34	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	220,952		220,952
35	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Insp and Overhead-FH	631		631
36	Worldwide Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Construction	(286)	286	-
37	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	170,991		170,991
38	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	397,723		397,723
39	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	31,708	133,342	165,050
41	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,180		1,180
42	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning	17,715		17,715
43	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Insp and Overhead-FH	2,805	-2,805	-
44	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	63,589		63,589
45	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	82,925		82,925
46	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	145,953		145,953
47	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	73		73
48	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Improvements	(1,897)	1,897	-
49	Worldwide Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Construction	(908)	908	-

398

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)						
<u>State</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Installation Name</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
50	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	32,636		32,636
51	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	36,997		36,997
52	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Construction	(1,033)	1033	-
53	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	33		33
54	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	415,733		415,733
55	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	118,509		118,509
56	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	MFH Improvements	34,280	95,672	129,952
57	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	2,640		2,640
58	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	160,117		160,117
59	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Insp and Overhead-FH	1,161	-1161	-
60	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	56,413		56,413
61	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning	17,093	378	17,471
62	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Improvements	(128)	128	-
63	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	31,450		31,450
64	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Services Account	75		75
65	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Maintenance Of Real Property	370		370
66	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Furnishings Account	21		21
67	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Utilities Account	414		414
68	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Management Account	247		247
69	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Construction Improvements	50		50
70	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Maintenance Of Real Property	244		244
71	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Services Account	1,029		1,029
72	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Leasing	13,374		13,374
73	Worldwide	Agency	Furnishings Account	3,401		3,401

Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

State	Service	Installation Name	Project Name	Request	Change	Recom
74	Worldwide Agency	Worldwide	Leasing	22,265		22,265
75	Worldwide Defense-Wide	Worldwide	Family Housing Improvement Fund	78,756		78,756
Total				3,115,687	522,997	3,638,684

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Base closure and realignment accounts

The committee recommends authorization of \$892,911,000 in fiscal year 2000 for the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Account, 1990, that supports the recommendations of the 1993, and 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commissions.

The committee will continue to carefully monitor the justification for the construction projects funded within these accounts and the other cost elements of these accounts. Although funding is not specifically limited to projects identified in its budget justification, the Department of Defense identified the following construction projects for fiscal year 2000 that it plans to fund from these accounts.

FY 2000 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)

Army: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Alabama	Fort McClellan	Alabama ARNG Enclave	11,000
	Fort McClellan	Ammunition Transfer Point	1,600
Colorado	Fitzsimons Army Medical Center	Reserve Center	2,250
Missouri	Fort Leonardwood	Expand Dining Facility	3,250
New Jersey	Camp Pedricktown	Sewage Treatment Plant Bypass	1,100
Pennsylvania	Tobyhanna Army Depot	Guided Missile Maintenance Facility	6,700
		Total Army-BRAC IV Construction	25,900

FY 2000 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)

Navy: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
California	MCAS, Camp Pendleton	Warehouse and Special Storage Facilities	5,994
Virginia	Norfolk, Naval Station	Building Renovation and Alterations	1,523
	Oceana, Naval Air Station	Hangar Renovation	21,313
		Total Navy-BRAC IV Construction	28,830

FY 2000 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)

Air Force: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Texas	Kelly Air Force Base	Alter Base Maintenance Shop	820
	Kelly Air Force Base	Alter Communications Facility	750
	Lackland Air Force Base	Add/Alter Base Engineer Facility	3,100
	Various Locations	Planning and Design	230
		Total Air Force-BRAC IV Construction	4,900

FY 2000 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)

Defense Logistics Agency: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Utah	Defense Distribution Region West, Depot Hill AFB	Contract Hardstand	1,100
		Total DLA-BRAC IV Construction	1,100

TITLE XXI—ARMY

SUMMARY

The Army requested authorization of \$656,000,000 for military construction and \$1,112,080,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of \$1,034,722,000 for military construction and \$1,112,080,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000.

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

This section contains the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2000. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2000.

Improvement to military family housing units (sec. 2103)

This section would authorize improvements to existing family housing units for fiscal year 2000.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's budget for fiscal year 2000. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

SUMMARY

The Navy requested authorization of \$319,789,000 for military construction and \$959,675,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of \$884,591,000 for military construction and \$1,193,424,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

This section contains the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2000. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be 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 2000.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2000.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Navy's budget for fiscal year 2000. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

Technical modification of authority relating to certain fiscal year 1997 project (sec. 2205)

The committee recommends a provision that would correct from 92 units to 72 units the number of housing units authorized for construction at Naval Air Station Brunswick, Maine in the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 1997.

Other Items of Interest

Improvements of military family housing, Navy

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for improvements of military family housing and facilities, the Secretary of the Navy execute the following projects: \$9,100,000 for family housing improvements (91 units) at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina and \$2,700,000 for family housing improvement at Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

SUMMARY

The Air Force requested authorization of \$179,000,000 for military construction and \$923,683,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of \$751,788,000 for military construction and \$1,165,403,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

This section contains the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2000. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be 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 2000.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2000.

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 2000. This section also would provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

Other Items of Interest

Improvements of military family housing, Air Force

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for improvements of military family housing and facilities, the Secretary of the Air Force execute the following project: \$5,550,000 for family housing improvements (50 units) at Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUMMARY

The Defense Agencies requested authorization of \$235,840,000 for military construction and \$41,490,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of \$829,425,000 for military construction and \$41,490,000 for family housing. The increase in funding for defense wide military construction reflects the transfer of the Chemical Demilitarization construction funding from the Army.

Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

This section contains the list of authorized Defense Agencies construction projects for fiscal year 2000. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2402)

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2000 in an amount not to exceed \$50,000.

Military Family Housing Improvement Program (sec. 2403)

This section would authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund.

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 line item in the Defense Agencies budget for fiscal year 2000. This section also would provide an overall limit on the amount the Defense Agencies may spend on military construction projects.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 1997 projects (sec. 2406)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the table in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 to increase the authorization for the construction of the Pueblo Chemical Activity, Colorado from \$179,000,000 to \$203,500,000.

Other Items of Interest**Authorization of military construction project for a forward deployment site for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities**

The budget request included \$42.8 million for the acquisition and construction of three forward deployment sites for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities. The projects would be constructed in Ecuador, Netherlands Antilles and Costa Rica using funds appropriated for the Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense. The committee authorized the projects and transferred funds from Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense to the Defense-wide military construction account. The Secretary of Defense is directed to designate the appropriate service to carry out the construction and provide a detailed description of the construction requirements at each designated forward operating location to the congressional defense committees before executing the projects.

**TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION
SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM**

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of \$191,000,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends \$172,472,000.

Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

This section 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 bill 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 section would authorize appropriations of \$172,472,000 as the contribution of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program. The committee recommends a reduction of \$18,528,000 in budget authority based on the anticipated prior year savings and recoupments from the NATO Security Investment Program.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested a military construction authorization of \$77,572,000 for fiscal year 2000 for National Guard and Reserve facilities. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2000 of \$584,705,000 to be distributed, as follows:

Army National Guard	\$179,271,000
Air National Guard	232,340,000
Army Reserve	115,185,000
Air Force Reserve	34,864,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	23,045,000
Total	584,705,000

Authorized National Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for the National Guard and Reserve by service component for fiscal year 2000. The state list contained in this report is intended to be 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 section would provide that authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and National Guard and Reserve projects will expire on October 1, 2002, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2003, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2001, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for these projects, whichever is later.

Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1997 projects (sec. 2702)

This section would provide for selected extension of certain fiscal year 1997 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2000, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2001, whichever is later.

Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1996 projects (sec. 2703)

This section would provide for selected extension of certain fiscal year 1996 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2000, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2001, whichever is later.

Effective date (sec. 2704)

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, and XXVI of this bill shall take effect on October 1, 1999, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAM CHANGES

Exemption from notice and wait requirements of military construction projects supported by burden sharing funds undertaken for war or national emergency (sec. 2801)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2350j, title 10, United States Code, to waive the 21-day notice and wait period on the use of burden sharing funds for construction projects in time of war and national emergency. In the event the secretary of a military department directs construction of a project under these conditions, the secretary would be required to submit a report to the Committees on the Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 30 days after directing such action.

Prohibition on carrying out military construction projects funded using incremental funding (sec. 2802)

The committee believes that adopting the administration's request to phase fund the fiscal year 2000 military construction program would have set a precedent with negative long-term impacts on military construction. The administration proposed that Congress authorize and appropriate funds for specific military construction projects that were known to be insufficient to complete those projects. This approach would have undermined responsible planning and budgeting, and would have severely complicated the execution and administration of these project funds.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments from obligating funds for a military construction project if the funds appropriated are insufficient to provide for the construction of a usable facility. The provision would also express the sense of Congress that the President should submit annual budget requests with funding sufficient to fully fund each construction project and that the Congress should authorize and appropriate sufficient funds to fully fund each construction project.

Defense Chemical Demilitarization Construction Account (sec. 2803)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a Chemical Demilitarization Account to which would be credited all funds authorized and appropriated for the construction of chemical demilitarization facilities, as defined by section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1986. The committee rec-

ommends this provision since the Office of the Secretary of Defense has repeatedly ignored the request of the Congress to fund the construction of the chemical demilitarization facilities within a separate account rather than through the Army Military Construction program.

Limitation on authority regarding ancillary supporting facilities under alternative authority for acquisition and construction of military housing (sec. 2804)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2881 of title 10, United States Code, to limit the type of ancillary facility that may be included in the acquisition or construction of military family housing units under the Military Housing Privatization Initiative. The provision would limit ancillary facilities to those that would not be in competition with any resale activity or services provided by the Army and Air Force Exchange Services, the Navy Exchange Services Command, the Marine Corps Exchange, the Defense Commissary Agency, and the Non-Appropriated Fund Morale, Welfare and Recreation programs.

Availability of funds for planning and design in connection with acquisition of reserve component facilities (sec. 2805)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 182333(f)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to use authorized and appropriated funds for the design of reserve component construction military construction projects.

Modification of limitations on reserve component facility projects for certain safety projects (sec. 2806)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 18233a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of unspecified minor construction funds for construction projects costing less than \$3,000,000 and intended to correct deficiencies that are a threat to life, safety, and health. The provision would also authorize the use of funds available from the operations and maintenance appropriations for projects costing less than \$1,000,000 to correct deficiencies that are a threat to life, safety, and health.

**SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES
ADMINISTRATION**

Extension of authority for leases of property for special operations activities (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend until September 30, 2005 the authority provided to the Secretary of Defense in section 2680 of title 10, United States Code, for the lease of property required for special operations activities conducted by the Special Operations Command.

**Enhancement of authority relating to utility privatization
(sec. 2812)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2688 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the service secretary that conveys a utility system to enter a contract for utility services, not to exceed 50 years. The committee urges the service secretary to exercise caution in entering long-term contracts to avoid committing resources for services that may not be required. The provision would also authorize the military departments to use, where economically beneficial, military construction funds authorized and appropriated for specific utility construction, repair, or replacement projects as a leverage to facilitate the conveyance of a utility system. The funds would be used only by the recipient of the utility system for construction, repair, and replacement of the utility system conveyed. The secretary would be required to report the use of the military construction funds in the notification required on the utility conveyance.

**SUBTITLE C—DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND
REALIGNMENT**

**Conveyance of property at installations closed or realigned
under the base closure laws without consideration for
economic development purposes (sec. 2821)**

The committee recommends a provision to amend section 2905(b)(4) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and section 204(b)(4) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (BRAC 1988). The provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer property on an installation recommended for closure to the local redevelopment authority (LRA), without consideration, if authority's reuse plan provides for the property to be used for job creation and any economic benefits are reinvested in the economic redevelopment of the installation and surrounding community. Existing requirements to screen the property for use by other federal agencies, eligible recipients of public benefit conveyances, and under the provisions of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act are applicable. The provision would not alter the applicable methods for determining whether or not the military services need existing personal property at other installations. The provision would be applicable to conveyances concluded or after April 21, 1999.

The provision would provide the Secretary with the authority to modify existing economic development conveyances (EDCs), provided the modification: is necessary to achieve rapid economic revitalization and replacement of lost jobs; does not require the return of payments or in kind consideration; is necessary to generate additional employment opportunities and is subject to the same requirements as those granted under this new authority. The committee urges the Secretary to apply the most stringent criteria in exercising this authority to ensure only those communities with the greatest needs benefit.

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

Part I—Army Conveyances

Land conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Bangor Maine (sec. 2831)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the City of Bangor, Maine a parcel of excess real property including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately five acres and containing the Harold S. Slager Army Reserve Center. The purpose of the conveyance would be for educational purposes. The provision would include a reversionary clause in the event that the Secretary determines that the conveyed property has not been used for educational purposes.

Part II—Navy Conveyances

Clarification of land exchange, Naval Reserve Readiness Center Portland, Maine (sec. 2841)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2852 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (division B of Public Law 105–261) to make certain technical corrections.

Land conveyance, Newport, Rhode Island (sec. 2842)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property to the City of Newport, Rhode Island consisting of approximately 15 acres at the Naval Station, Newport, known as the Ranger Road site. The conveyance would be subject to the condition that the city would use the property as a satellite campus of the Community College of Rhode Island, a center for child day care and early childhood education, or a center for offices of the Government of the State of Rhode Island. The property would revert to the United States, if the Secretary determines within five years that the property is not used for any of the purposes for which conveyance is authorized.

Land conveyance, Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant No. 387, Dallas, Texas (sec. 2843)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, to the City of Dallas, Texas all rights, title, and interest to and in parcels of real property consisting of approximately 314 acres at the Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant No. 387, Dallas, Texas. The conveyance would be for economic purposes or such other public purposes as the City determines to be appropriate, including conveyance to an appropriate public entity. The provision would authorize the conveyance of the property to a private entity at fair market value. The funds derived from this type of conveyance would be deposited in the Treasury. The Secretary would be authorized to convey to the City those improvements, equipment, fixtures, and other personnel property that the Secretary determines to be no longer

required by the Navy for other purposes. The provision would authorize an interim lease of the facility and require the Secretary under the current lease to continue to maintain the property until it is conveyed. The provision would include a reversionary clause if the Secretary determines that the conveyed property is not used for economic purposes.

Part III—Air Force Conveyances

Land conveyance, McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center, California (sec. 2851)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, to the Regents of the University of California a parcel of excess real property known as the McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center (MNRC). The provision would authorize the Secretary to pay to the Regents, on behalf of the University of California, \$17,593,000 in exchange for the University holding the Air Force harmless for the cost of closing the facility and any liability accruing from the continued operation of the MNRC. The provision would direct the Secretary to provide to the Regents an opportunity to inspect the MNRC and to hold the Regents harmless for latent defects that a thorough inspection would not have revealed. The Department of the Air Force would be responsible for compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to fund the cost associated with operating the MNRC at a level adequate to maintain a valid operating license until it is conveyed to the University of California, Davis or September 30, 2003, whichever is earlier.

Land conveyance, Newington Defense Fuel Supply Point, New Hampshire (sec. 2852)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, to the Pease Development Authority, New Hampshire a parcel of excess real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 10 acres at the Newington Defense Fuel Supply Point at Newington, New Hampshire. The provision would authorize the Secretary to convey, concurrent with the real property, approximately 1.25 miles of pipeline, and an easement relating to the pipeline, consisting of approximately five acres. If the property is under the control of the Administrator of General Services at the time of enactment, the Administrator would be authorized to convey the property. The provision would require the Administrator to conduct a federal screen, as required by section 2696(b) of title 10, United States Code.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Acquisition of State-held inholdings, East Range of Fort Huachuca, Arizona (sec. 2861)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by eminent domain, with the

consent of the State of Arizona, all right, title and interest in approximately 1,500 acres of unimproved Arizona State Trust lands, located in the Fort Huachuca East Range, Cochise County, Arizona. As consideration, the Secretary may convey to the State of Arizona federal land of equal value under the jurisdictions of the Bureau of Land Management in Arizona. The value, determined according to the Uniform Appraisal Standard for Federal Land Acquisition, and specific acreage would have to be acceptable to the State of Arizona. The provision would authorize the lands acquired by the Secretary to be withdrawn and reserved for uses by the Secretary of the Army for military training and testing in the same manner as other federal lands in the Fort Huachuca East Range. The withdrawal would not occur until the agencies comply with all applicable environmental laws regarding land withdrawal.

Development of Ford Island, Hawaii (sec. 2862)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of the Navy special authority for the purposes of facilitating the development of Ford Island, Hawaii. These special authorities would include the authority to convey excess or lease real or personal property in the State of Hawaii to any public or private person or entity for the purpose of developing Ford Island. The provision would authorize the Secretary to accept a lease of any facility constructed under this authority in lieu of a cash settlement for the sale or lease of real property under this authority. The lease would not be for more than 10 years and, upon termination, the Secretary would have the right of first refusal to acquire the property. The Secretary would be required to use competitive procedures when exercising any of the authorities provided by this provision. As compensation for the sale or lease of real or personal property, the Secretary would be authorized to accept cash, real property, personal property, services or any combination, the amount of which shall be not less than the fair market value of the real or personal property conveyed or leased. The provision would establish an account known as the Ford Island Improvement Account to carry out improvements and obtain property support services for property or facilities on Ford Island. The Secretary would be authorized to provide support services to or for the leased real property. Any payment received for providing these services would be credited to the appropriation account or fund from which the cost of providing the service was paid.

The provision would require the Secretary of the Navy to provide a master plan for the development of Ford Island and wait 30 days before exercising any of the authorities under this provision. The Secretary, 30 days prior to carrying out a transaction under this provision, would also be required to submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing and justifying the transaction. The provision would prohibit the Secretary from acquiring, constructing, or improving family or unaccompanied housing under this authority. The provision would authorize the Secretary to transfer funds to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund and the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing fund for such purposes. To allow the Secretary maximum flexibility in the development of Ford Island, the provi-

sion would waive sections 2667 and 2696 of title 10, United States Code, section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act and sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.

Other Items of Interest

Family housing improvement plan for personnel assigned to the United States Southern Command in Miami, Florida

The headquarters of the United States Southern Command (USSOUTHCOM), in Miami, Florida, depends exclusively on private sector housing to support the housing needs for the approximately 1,000 assigned military personnel. In order to support the housing requirements for these personnel, the Army is leasing 60 unaccompanied housing units, 62 family housing units, and eight homes for key and essential personnel. The committee is aware that the housing in the Miami area is scarce and expensive. General Wilhelm, Commander-in-Chief, USSOUTHCOM, testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that living in Miami: "For anybody below the rank of major, it is a real challenge making it from payday to payday."

Despite the acknowledged housing problem, the Department of Defense has requested only legislative relief to the unit cost ceiling for key and essential personnel housing. Although the committee is supportive of the Department's request, it is a piecemeal approach to USSOUTHCOM's overall housing problem. In order to provide adequate and affordable housing for all personnel assigned to USSOUTHCOM headquarters, the committee encourages the Department to submit with the fiscal year 2001 budget request a comprehensive and fully justified housing improvement program.

Military History Institute and Army Heritage Museum, Carlisle, Pennsylvania

The committee is aware of discussions between the Secretary of the Army, officials representing the City of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania regarding the establishment of a Military History Institute and Army Heritage Museum in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. During the discussions, the Secretary of the Army committed to making the proposed institute a first class facility. The community and the Commonwealth offered to provide 54 acres of land and \$5.0 million to establish the facility. The committee applauds the commitments made by the Army and the people of Pennsylvania, and urges the Secretary of the Army to continue to work closely with the Carlisle project coordinators to advance the completion of the Military History Institute and Army Heritage Museum.

TITLE XXIX—RENEWAL OF MILITARY LAND WITHDRAWALS

Renewal of military land withdrawals (secs. 2901–2914)

The committee recommends several provisions that renew the withdrawal of certain public lands under the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–606). The Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986, which expires on November 6, 2001, provides for six military training ranges that are the key components of the National Defense training base: Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range, Arizona; Ft. Greely Maneuver Area, Alaska; Ft. Wainwright Maneuver Area, Alaska; McGregor Range, New Mexico; Nellis Air Force Range, Nevada; and Fallon Naval Air Station, Bravo-20 Bombing Range, Nevada. The recommended provision, however, does not include the Nellis Air Force Range or the Naval Air Station Fallon, Bravo-20 Bombing Range in Nevada.

In order to ensure continued use of the military ranges that are subject to renewal of withdrawal, it is important for the Departments of Defense and Interior to move forward expeditiously to comply with the statutes relevant to the withdrawal of public lands, such as: the Engle Act of 1958; the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976; and the Endangered Species Act of 1973. The committee is aware of the collaborative effort between the two departments and the desire to develop a consensus based process. It should also be noted that this is one of many examples of the Department of Defense efforts to work cooperatively with federal and state land management agencies to accomplish military training objectives in an environmentally responsible manner.

Portions of these provisions are modeled after The Military Withdrawal Act of 1986, with the incorporation of some recommendations stated in the 1999 Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statements prepared by the military departments on the renewal of withdrawal. The provisions also include administration input through testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, as well as concerns expressed by members of Congress. The committee believes that these provisions will improve the environmental stewardship of the withdrawn lands and afford quality training for the armed forces.

Based on testimony provided to the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, the administration's process for renewal of withdrawal is ongoing. The committee, however, remains concerned about the projected completion date for that process. The recommended provisions are intended to help resolve the outstanding issues associated with the renewal of withdrawal for all of the relevant military ranges in Arizona, Alaska, New Mexico, and Nevada. The committee remains eager to receive the administration's final legislative proposal to ensure that a consensus can

be achieved prior to the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. That result would be consistent with the administration's expressed commitment to complete that process within the first session of the 106th Congress. The committee strongly endorses that commitment.

The committee notes that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate has primary jurisdiction over land withdrawal legislation. The congressional defense committees have jurisdiction over issues related to Department of Defense training activities.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Atomic energy defense activities

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2000, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental restoration and waste management; operating expenses; and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). The title would authorize appropriations in five categories: weapons activities; defense environmental restoration and waste management; other defense activities; defense environmental management privatization; and defense nuclear waste disposal.

The fiscal year 2000 budget request for the atomic energy defense activities totaled \$12.4 billion, a 2.8 percent increase over the adjusted fiscal year 1999 level. Of the total amount requested, \$4.5 billion was for weapons activities, \$4.5 billion was for defense environmental restoration and waste management activities, \$1.0 billion was for defense facility closure projects, \$228.0 million was for defense environmental management privatization, \$1.8 billion was for other defense activities, \$112.0 million was for defense nuclear waste disposal, and \$150.0 million was for the formerly utilized sites remedial action program.

The committee recommends \$12.2 billion for atomic energy defense activities, a reduction of \$170.0 million to the budget request, or a 1.6 percent increase over adjusted fiscal year 1999 levels. The committee recommends \$4.5 billion for weapons activities, \$5.5 billion for defense environmental restoration and waste management (including defense facility closure projects), \$216.0 million for defense environmental management privatization, \$1.8 billion for other defense activities, and \$112.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal. The committee recommends no funds for the formerly utilized sites remedial action program.

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

**Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2000**

(In Thousands of \$'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Recommended
TITLE XXXI-XXXII			
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)			
Weapons Activities	4,531,000	(1,000)	4,530,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,514,376	1,018,492	5,532,868
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	73,000		73,000
Other Defense Activities	1,792,000	29,000	1,821,000
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,054,492	(1,054,492)	0
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	228,000	(12,000)	216,000
Formerly Utilized Site Remediation	150,000	(150,000)	0
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,500		17,500
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	12,360,368	(170,000)	12,190,368

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT TITLE</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Stockpile Stewardship			
Core Stockpile Stewardship	1,635,355	(20,000)	1,615,355
Operation and maintenance			
Construction:			433
00-D-103, Terascal simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	8,000	0	8,000
00-D-105, Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	26,000	0	26,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	1,800	0	1,800
99-D-102 Rehabilitation of maintenance facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	3,900	0	3,900
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities,			

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	0	2,000
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA.	2,400	0	2,400
99-D-105 Central health physics calibration facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	1,000	0	1,000
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification test center, SNL Albuquerque, NM	6,500	0	6,500
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	7,005	0	7,005
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	61,000	0	61,000
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	2,640	0	2,640
			434

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT TITLE</u>	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
96-D-104 Processing and environmental technology laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	10,900	0	10,900
Total, Construction	<u>133,145</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>133,145</u>
Total, Core Stockpile Stewardship	<u>1,768,500</u>	<u>(20,000)</u>	<u>1,748,500</u>
Inertial Fusion			
Operation and maintenance	217,600	0	217,600
Construction:			
96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF), LLNL, Livermore, CA	248,100	0	248,100
Total, Inertial Fusion	<u>465,700</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>465,700</u>
Technology Partnerships/Education			
Technology partnership Education	22,200	(7,000)	15,200
	29,800	(10,500)	19,300
Total, Technology Partnerships/Education	<u>52,000</u>	<u>(17,500)</u>	<u>34,500</u>
Total, Stockpile Stewardship	<u>2,286,200</u>	<u>(37,500)</u>	<u>2,248,700</u>
Stockpile Management			

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT TITLE</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00 Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
Operation and maintenance	1,839,621	41,000	1,880,621
Construction:			
99-D-122 Rapid reactivation, various locations	11,700	0	11,700
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	17,000	0	17,000
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	3,429	0	3,429
99-D-132 Stockpile Management Restructuring Initiative nuclear material S&S upgrade project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	11,300	0	11,300
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium facility modernization and consolidation, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	21,800	0	21,800
98-D-124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y-12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	3,150	0	3,150
			436

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT TITLE</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00 Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	33,000	0	33,000
98-D-126 Accelerator production of tritium (APT), various locations	31,000	0	31,000
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	4,800	0	4,800
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	18,000	0	18,000
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	3,500	0	3,500
Total, Construction	158,679	0	158,679
Total, Stockpile Management	1,998,300	41,000	2,039,300
Program Direction	246,500	(4,500)	242,000
Subtotal, Weapons Activities	4,531,000	(1,000)	4,530,000

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
Use of prior year balances	0	0	0
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,531,000	(1,000)	4,530,000

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MANAGEMENT

Site/Project Completion			
Operation and maintenance	892,629	0	892,629
Construction:			
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H areas, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	3,100	0	3,100
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEEL, ID	7,200	0	7,200
98-D-401 H-tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	2,977	0	2,977
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	16,860	0	16,860

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT TITLE</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00 Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
98-D-700 INEEL road rehabilitation, INEEL, ID	2,590	0	2,590
97-D-450 Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	4,000	0	4,000
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay lab, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	12,220	0	12,220
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	24,441	0	24,441
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEEL, ID	11,971	0	11,971
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	931	0	931
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	0	2,000
Total, Construction	<u>88,290</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>88,290</u>

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT TITLE</u>	FY 00		<u>Recom</u>
	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	
Total, Site/Project Completion	980,919	0	980,919
Post 2006 Completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,658,997	(31,000)	2,627,997
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	240,000	(20,000)	220,000
Construction:			440
00-D-401 SNF treatment and storage facility Title I & II, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	7,000	0	7,000
99-D-403 Privatization phase I infrastructure support, Richland, WA	13,988	0	13,988
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	20,516	0	20,516
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	4,060	0	4,060
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from			

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	253,000	(12,000)	241,000
Use of prior year balances	(25,000)	0	(25,000)
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION	228,000	(12,000)	216,000
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Nonproliferation and National Security			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D	215,000	0	215,000
Operation and maintenance			
Construction:			
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	6,000	0	6,000
Arms control	296,000	(20,000)	276,000
Intelligence	0		0
Total,	517,000	(20,000)	497,000
Nuclear safeguards and security	59,100	0	59,100

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT TITLE</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>FY 00 Change</u>	<u>Recom</u>
Security investigations	30,000	17,000	47,000
Offset to user organizations	(20,000)	0	(20,000)
Emergency management	21,000	0	21,000
HIEU transparency implementation	15,750	0	15,750
International nuclear safety	34,000	0	34,000
Program direction	90,450	0	90,450
Total,	230,300	17,000	247,300
Total, Nonproliferation and National Security	747,300	(3,000)	744,300
Intelligence	36,059	0	36,059
Counterintelligence	31,200	35,000	66,200
Worker and Community Transition	26,500	0	26,500
Worker and community transition	3,500	0	3,500
Program direction	30,000	0	30,000
Total, Worker and Community Transition	30,000	0	30,000
Fissile Materials Control and Disposition	129,766	0	129,766
Operation and maintenance	129,766	0	129,766

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>ACCOUNT TITLE</u>	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
Construction			
00-D-142, Immobilization and associated processing facility, various locations	21,765	0	21,765
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, various locations	28,751	0	28,751
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, various locations	12,375	0	12,375
Total, Construction	<u>62,891</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>62,891</u>
Program direction	7,343	0	7,343
Total, Fissile materials control and disposition	<u>200,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>200,000</u>
Environment, Safety & Health			
Office of environment, safety and health (defense) Program direction	67,231	(13,000)	54,231
Total, Environment, Safety and Health	<u>24,769</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>24,769</u>
Office of hearings and appeals	3,000	0	3,000
			444

Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
Nuclear Energy			
Nuclear technology research and development	0	0	0
Independent assessment of DOE projects	0	0	0
Russian plutonium disposition	0	0	0
Russian uranium disposition	0	0	0
National security programs administration support	0	0	0
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors development	620,400	10,000	630,400
Operation and maintenance			
Construction:			
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	9,000	0	9,000
98-D-200 Site laboratory/facility upgrade, various locations	3,000	0	3,000
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell			445

**Titles XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)**

ACCOUNT TITLE	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	12,000	0	12,000
Total, Construction	24,000	0	24,000
Total, Naval Reactors Development	644,400	10,000	654,400
Program Direction	20,600	0	20,600
Total, Naval Reactors	665,000	10,000	675,000
Subtotal, Other Defense Activities	1,804,559	29,000	1,833,559
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances	0	0	0
Contribution from labs	(12,559)	0	(12,559)
Total, Adjustments	(12,559)	0	(12,559)
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,792,000	29,000	1,821,000
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	112,000	0	112,000
Transfer to nuclear waste disposal	(39,000)	0	(39,000)
Total, Defense nuclear waste	73,000	0	73,000
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTIONS PROGRAM	150,000	(150,000)	0

Titles XXXI-XXXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	Request	FY 00 Change	Recom
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR ACTIVITIES	12,342,868	(170,000)	12,172,868
DEFENSE NUCLEAR SAFETY BOARD	17,500		17,500
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	12,360,368	(170,000)	12,190,368

Weapons activities (sec. 3101)

The committee recommends a provision which would authorize \$4.5 billion for atomic energy defense weapons activities of the Department of Energy, a reduction of \$1.0 million from the requested amount of \$4.5 billion. The amount authorized is for the following activities: \$2.2 billion for stockpile stewardship, a reduction of \$37.5 million; \$2.0 billion for stockpile management, an increase of \$41.0 million; and \$242.5 million for program direction, a reduction of \$4.5 million.

Stockpile Stewardship Programs

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for the Micro Systems Complex at the Sandia National Laboratories and a reduction of \$30.0 million to the Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI) and Stockpile Computing programs.

The committee recommends that \$5.0 million be made available for the Robotics and Intelligent Machines program at the Sandia National Laboratories; \$5.0 million be made available to the Savannah River site to study the feasibility of producing medical isotopes in accelerator facilities; and \$1.8 million be made available for the Sandia Computational Engineering Laboratory.

Technology Partnerships and Education

Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for stockpile stewardship, the committee recommends \$15.2 million for the technology partnerships subaccount, a reduction of \$7.0 million, and \$19.3 for education subaccount, a reduction of \$10.5 million. Of the amounts available in the technology partnerships and education, the committee recommends \$10.0 million for the American Textiles Partnership project. The committee understands that Department of Energy (DOE) funding for this partnership will end in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends no funds to relocate, or prepare for relocation, the U.S. Atomic Museum in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The committee believes that the local community derives the principal economic benefit from the commercial activities at the museum and should, therefore, bear the major share of any new construction costs. The committee recommends \$8.0 million be made available for the Northern New Mexico Educational Enrichment Foundation, the requested amount. The committee recommends \$6.0 million be made available for education support to school districts in the vicinity of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, the requested amount.

The committee believes that the Amarillo Plutonium Research Center is more appropriately funded by the Office of Fissile Materials Control and Disposition and, accordingly, recommends no stockpile stewardship funds for this activity.

Stockpile Management Programs

The committee recommends an increase of \$55.0 million for weapons production plants, to be allocated as follows: \$15.0 million for the Pantex Plant to support scheduled workload requirements associated with weapons dismantlement activities and for skills re-

tention; \$15.0 million for the Kansas City Plant to support advanced manufacturing efforts such as the Advanced Development Program and for skills retention; \$23.0 million for the Y-12 Plant to support maintenance of core stockpile management capabilities; and \$2.0 million for the Savannah River site to support infrastructure and maintenance activities.

The committee recommends that \$5.0 million be made available to study the feasibility of constructing a replacement for the Chemical and Metallurgical Research building at Los Alamos National Laboratory and that \$2.7 million be made available for the Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory at the Pantex Plant.

The committee is concerned that physical limitations and aging of the Department of Energy's Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory at Pantex may restrict the ability of the Department to conduct needed tests and experiments on nuclear weapons as a part of the Stockpile Management program.

The committee believes that the following activities are more appropriately funded through the Office of Fissile Materials Control and Disposition and, accordingly, recommends a reduction of \$29.0 million to be taken as follows: \$22.0 million for storage of special nuclear materials that have been designated surplus to U.S. military needs; \$4.0 million for the Parallax mixed oxide fuel project at Los Alamos National Laboratory; and \$3.0 million for plutonium pit disassembly and conversion activities. The committee believes that these activities are more consistent with the missions and functions of the Office of Fissile Materials Control and Disposition and directs the director of that office to assume responsibility for those programs. The committee expects that future years funding requirements for these activities will be reflected in the Office of Fissile Materials Control and Disposition.

Program Direction

The committee recommends a \$4.0 million reduction to the budget request for program direction. The committee is disappointed that the Department has failed to implement fully the realignment recommendations described in the Institute for Defense Analysis 1997 report on the Department's management structure for weapons activities. The statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) directed the Department to begin implementation of these recommendations as soon as practicable. The committee believes that the proposed reduction to the program direction account can be achieved through savings and efficiency gains resulting from program realignment efforts. The committee believes that the performance of the Office of Defense Programs will be improved by eliminating duplicative efforts and by streamlining management control of DOE weapons activities.

Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative and Stockpile Computing Program

The committee is disappointed that the Department failed to follow congressional guidance included in the statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) to slow the rate of acquisition in the Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI) and Stockpile Computing programs. The committee continues to support the ASCI and Stockpile Computing programs, but believes that the Department has not fully justified the rate of growth in this program in light of other programmatic requirements of the Office of Defense Programs. The committee notes that even at this reduced level of funding, the ASCI and Stockpile Computing programs will experience significant growth over fiscal year 1998 and 1999 funding levels.

The committee supports the Secretary of Energy's continued utilization of the capabilities and facilities of the Pittsburgh supercomputing Center. The committee has not yet received the report required by the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) identifying how leased computational capabilities can better meet the Department's supercomputing needs in lieu of planned acquisitions proposed within the ASCI program. The committee expects the Secretary to provide this report at the soonest possible date and expects the Secretary to take steps to ensure that future congressional reporting requirements are met in a timely manner.

Tritium production

Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for stockpile management, the committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million for the accelerator production of tritium project. The committee recommends full funding for the Secretary of Energy's preferred technology option, the commercial light water reactor.

Defense programs campaigns

The committee fully supports the "Defense Programs Campaigns" concept proposed by the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs. Campaigns will greatly assist Congress in assessing the degree of integration among varied experiments, simulation, research, and weapons assessments activities carried out at the DOE weapons laboratories and production plants.

Defense environmental restoration and waste management (sec. 3102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$5.5 billion for environmental management activities of the Department of Energy, excluding defense environmental management privatization, a reduction of \$48.0 million from the requested amount of \$5.6 billion. The amount authorized is for the following activities: \$1.1 billion for closure projects, an increase of \$15.0 million; \$980.9 million for site and project completion, the amount of the request; \$2.9 billion for post 2006 completion, a decrease of \$51.0 million; \$235.5 million for technology development, an increase of \$5.0 million; and \$344.4 million for program direction, a decrease of \$5.0 million.

Defense facility closure projects

Of the amounts authorized for defense facility closure projects, the committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million for the

Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site to ensure that the site meets its 2006 closure deadline.

Post 2006 completion

Of the amounts authorized for post 2006 completion, the conferees recommend an increase of \$10.0 million for the National Spent Fuel Program; an increase of \$15.0 million to address planning, demonstration and other requirements associated with modification of the Savannah River in-tank precipitation process; an increase of \$15.0 million for Savannah River infrastructure requirements; an increase of \$5.0 million for operations and maintenance activities at the Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System project; an increase of \$10.0 million for the 324-B Cell project at Hanford; an increase of \$5.0 million for the Columbia River Corridor Initiative at Hanford to continue reactor decontamination and decommissioning activities; an increase of \$8.0 million to the Oak Ridge Operations Office to assist with missed cleanup milestones; a reduction of \$20.0 million to the uranium decommission and decontamination fund contribution; a reduction of \$20.0 million to environment, safety and health studies related to off-site releases of contamination; a reduction of \$20.0 million to account for increased contractor efficiencies to be gained through contract management reforms; a reduction of \$71.0 million to the Pit 9 project to account for uncosted, available funds; and a total reduction of \$8.0 million to construction projects 88-R-830 and 94-E-602.

The committee recommends that \$10.0 million be made available for contingency planning for the Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System project. The committee recommends that \$1.3 million be made available for planning and pre-conceptual design of a site operations center at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. The committee recommends \$5.9 million for the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response training facility. The committee recommends full funding for the F-canyon and H-canyon materials processing facilities.

Site and project completion

The committee recommends the full request for site and project completion activities. The committee recommends that \$12.0 million be made available for the Oak Ridge Transuranic Waste Treatment project.

Technology development

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to the Office of Science and Technology for applied research and development activities. In addition, the committee recommends that applied research activities of the Office of Science and Technology focus areas be increased by \$12.0 million to be offset by a reduction of \$2.0 million to the risk policy program, a reduction of \$2.0 million to data base development and information management activities, and a reduction of \$8.0 million to the environmental management science program.

The committee supports the integration of industrial programs and university based programs into the Environmental Management technology focus areas. The committee understands that this

approach will better link such research efforts with site needs. The committee believes that the Office of Science and Technology cannot meet its objectives without the active participation of industry and academia. The committee encourages the Office of Science and Technology to continue its inclusion of industry and universities in technology development and deployment activities.

The committee notes that the Department's cleanup and waste management efforts will continue well into the 21st Century with costs anticipated to exceed \$3.0 billion annually after 2010 and with much clean up work scheduled to continue beyond the year 2030. These schedules and costs require meaningful investments in innovative science and technology in order to reduce costs, reduce safety and health risks, and develop solutions to problems for which there are currently no available technologies.

Program direction

The committee recommends a reduction of \$5.0 million to program direction.

Off-site disposal of low level waste

The committee remains very concerned that the Department's policy on the use of commercial low level waste disposal facilities (Ref. DOE Order 5800) precludes DOE site managers from utilizing off-site commercial low level radioactive and mixed low level radioactive waste disposal options, in many cases, even when such options are less expensive than on-site disposal. The committee believes that some Department of Energy sites could derive cost savings from utilizing commercial, off-site disposal options. The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit a report to the defense committees of Congress not later than March 1, 2000, on the life-cycle cost comparisons of on-site versus off-site disposal of low level radioactive wastes. The report shall assess the potential costs to the federal government for long-term monitoring and maintenance at DOE-owned disposal sites; a comparison of such costs with those that would be required if DOE-owned disposal sites were required to comply with commercial disposal standards found in the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations (Ref. 10 CFR Part 61) for low level radioactive waste disposal; and the impact of DOE Order 5800 on open competition for disposal contracts at DOE sites.

HAMMER

The committee supports continued operation of the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response training facility located in Richland, Washington.

Columbia River Corridor Initiative

The committee supports the Columbia River Corridor Initiative to accelerate cleanup along the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River. The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management to establish a schedule by which the 100 square miles of the Hanford site that adjoin the Columbia River could be cleaned up on an accelerated schedule and proposed

for delisting from the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The committee authorizes \$1.8 billion for other defense activities, an increase of \$29.0 million to the budget request.

Nonproliferation and National Security

The committee recommends \$747.3 million for nonproliferation and national security, a reduction of \$3.0 million. The committee recommends \$25.0 million for Initiative for Proliferation Prevention, a reduction of \$5.0 million; \$15.0 million for the Nuclear Cities Initiative, a reduction of \$15.0 million; and \$145.0 million for Materials, Protection, Control, and Accounting, the requested amount.

Security clearances

The committee recommends \$47.0 million for security clearances, an increase of \$17.0 million. The additional funds would be used to decrease the backlog of background investigations and to elevate certain DOE and contractor employees' clearances, as would be required by another provision in this Act.

Fissile materials control and disposition

The committee recommends \$200.0 million for fissile materials control and disposition. The committee recommends that up to \$5.0 million be made available to explore potential applications of cold crucible melter technology demonstrated by the Office of Environmental Management to support fissile materials immobilization activities in the Office of Fissile Materials Control and Disposition. The committee directs the Office of Fissile Materials Control and Disposition to report to the congressional defense committees not later than January 1, 2000, on any potential applications for this technology to the missions of that office.

The committee believes that many activities currently carried out by the Office of Defense Programs would be more appropriately carried out by the Office of Fissile Materials Control and Disposition. The committee recommends that the Office of Fissile Materials Control and Disposition be responsible for the following activities from the weapons activities account: storage of special nuclear materials that have been designated surplus to U.S. military needs; the Parallax mixed oxide fuel project at Los Alamos National Laboratory; the Amarillo Plutonium Research Center; and surplus plutonium pit disassembly and conversion activities. The committee believes that this action will more accurately reflect the missions and functions of the Office of Fissile Materials Control and Disposition. The committee expects that future year funding requirements for these activities will be reflected in the materials disposition program budget account.

Worker and community transition

The committee recommends \$30.0 million for worker and community transition, the amount of the request.

Environment, safety and health-defense

The committee recommends \$79.0 million for environment, safety and health-defense, a reduction of \$13.0 million. The reduction would be taken from proposed increases in health studies at Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities. The committee believes such studies are not appropriately funded in this account. The committee notes that the costs of such health studies at commercial Superfund cleanup sites is dramatically lower than those proposed by the Department.

Counterintelligence

The committee recommends \$66.2 million for the Office of Counterintelligence, an increase of \$35.0 million. The committee notes that another provision in this Act would place additional responsibilities and duties under the cognizance of the Director of Counterintelligence. The committee recommends that \$10.0 of the increase be utilized for added responsibilities and duties and that \$25.0 million of the increase be utilized to implement an enhanced computer security program at DOE facilities, including cyber security measures such as intrusion detection, early warning, reporting, and analysis capabilities. The committee directs that priority being given to implementing such added computer security at the three weapons laboratories.

The committee further directs the Secretary to consolidate all Department of Energy computer security matters under the cognizance of the Director of Counter Intelligence. The committee believes that responsibility for computer security must be vested in a single organization and that the Director of Counterintelligence is the appropriate departmental officer to carry out these responsibilities. The committee takes this action without prejudice to the Office of Human Resources and Administration.

Intelligence

The committee recommends \$36.0 million for the Office of Intelligence, the amount of the request.

Naval reactors

The committee recommends \$675.0 million for naval reactors, an increase of \$10.0 million. The committee expects these funds to be utilized to expedite decommissioning and decontamination activities at surplus training facilities.

Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104)

The committee recommends \$112.0 million for the Department of Energy fiscal year 2000 defense contribution to the Defense Nuclear Waste Fund. The authorized amount would be offset by \$39.0 million to account for transfer of funds to the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund.

Defense environmental management privatization (sec. 3105)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$241.0 million for defense environmental management privatiza-

tion projects, a reduction of \$12.0 million from the requested amount.

Of the amount authorized, the committee recommends: \$106.0 million for the Tank Waste Remediation System project, phase I (Richland); \$110.0 million for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment project (Idaho); \$5.0 million for spent nuclear fuel dry storage (Idaho); and \$20.0 million for environmental management/waste management disposal (Oak Ridge). The committee declined to recommend privatization funds for the Oak Ridge Transuranic Waste Treatment project. The committee recommended the full \$12.0 million request for this project in the Site and Project Completion account.

The committee authorizes the use of \$25.0 million in fiscal year 1998 unobligated, uncosted balances within the Defense Environmental Management Privatization account to reflect the cancellation of the spent nuclear fuel transfer and storage project (Savannah River). The committee notes that this project will be carried out as a Post 2006 account activity.

The committee declined to accept the request for a multiyear funding authorization for defense environmental management privatization activities.

The committee fully supports the Tank Waste Remediation System privatization project at the Hanford site. The committee believes that the technological approach proposed to address the wastes stored in the Hanford tanks is viable and realistic.

Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program

The committee recommends no funds for the Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program. Accordingly, the committee recommends a \$150.0 million reduction to this account.

SUBTITLE B—RECURRING GENERAL PROVISIONS

Reprogramming (sec. 3121)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the reprogramming of funds in excess of 110 percent of the amount authorized for the program, or in excess of \$1.0 million above the amount authorized for the program, until the Secretary of Energy submits a report to the congressional defense committees and a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed after the date on which the report is received.

Limits on general plant projects (sec. 3122)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Energy to carry out any construction project authorized under general plant projects if the total estimated cost does not exceed \$5.0 million. The provision would require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees if the cost of the project is revised to exceed \$5.0 million. Such a report would include the reasons for the cost variation.

Limits on construction projects (sec. 3123)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit any construction project to be initiated and continued only if the esti-

mated cost for the project does not exceed 125 percent of the higher of the amount authorized for the project or the most recent total estimated cost presented to the Congress as justification for such project. The Secretary of Energy may not exceed such limits until 30 legislative days after the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a detailed report setting forth the reasons for the increase. This provision would also specify that the 125 percent limitation would not apply to projects estimated to cost under \$5.0 million.

Fund transfer authority (sec. 3124)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit funds authorized by this Act to be transferred to other agencies of the government for performance of work for which the funds were authorized and appropriated. The provision would permit the merger of such transferred funds with the authorizations of the agency to which they are transferred. The provision would also limit, to not more than five percent of the account, the amount of funds authorized by this Act that may be transferred between authorization accounts within the Department of Energy.

Authority for conceptual and construction design (sec. 3125)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the Secretary of Energy's authority to request construction funding until the Secretary has completed a conceptual design. This limitation would apply to construction projects with a total estimated cost greater than \$5.0 million. If the estimated cost to prepare the construction design exceeds \$600,000, the provision would require the Secretary to obtain a specific authorization to obligate such funds. If the estimated cost to prepare the conceptual design exceeds \$3.0 million, the provision would require the Secretary to request funds for the conceptual design before requesting funds for construction. The provision would further require the Secretary to submit to Congress a report on each conceptual design completed under this provision. The provision would also provide an exception to these requirements in the case of an emergency.

Authority for emergency planning, design, and construction activities (sec. 3126)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Energy to perform planning and design with any funds available to the Department of Energy pursuant to this title, including those funds authorized for advance planning and construction design, whenever the Secretary determines that the design must proceed expeditiously to protect the public health and safety, to meet the needs of national defense, or to protect property.

Funds available for all national security programs of the Department of Energy (sec. 3127)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize, subject to section 3121 of this Act, amounts appropriated for management and support activities and for general plant projects to be made available for use in connection with all national security programs of the Department of Energy.

Availability of funds (sec. 3128)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize amounts appropriated for operating expenses or for plant and capital equipment for the Department of Energy to remain available until expended. Program direction funds would remain available until the end of fiscal year 2002.

Transfers of defense environmental management funds (sec. 3129)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the manager of each field office of the Department of Energy with limited authority to transfer up to \$5.0 million in fiscal year 2000 defense environmental management funds from one program or project under the jurisdiction of the office to another such program or project, including site project and completion and post 2006 completion funds, once in a fiscal year.

**SUBTITLE C—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS,
RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS**

Prohibition on use of funds for certain activities under Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program (sec. 3131)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of funds, authorized to be appropriated by this Act to conduct treatment, storage, or disposal actions at Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) sites in fiscal year 2000 and future years.

The committee notes that section 3162 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105- 261) expressed the Sense of Congress that the Office of Management and Budget should transfer funding for FUSRAP sites to a non-defense discretionary portion of the federal budget. The committee regrets that the President chose to ignore this Sense of Congress by requesting FUSRAP funds in the defense portion of the budget.

Continuation of processing, treatment, and disposition of legacy nuclear materials (sec. 3132)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to maintain a high state of readiness at the F-canyon and H-canyon facilities at the Savannah River site.

The committee notes that maintaining F-canyon and H-canyon facilities has been recommended by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board and continues to be consistent with Department of Energy program requirements.

Nuclear weapons stockpile life extension program (sec. 3133)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the Stockpile Life Extension Program (SLEP) within the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Defense Programs. The provision would require the Secretary of Energy to submit a long range SLEP plan, including, but not limited to: (1) detailed proposals for the remanufacture of each weapon design designated to be included in the enduring stockpile, (2) detailed proposals to expedite the collection of

those data necessary to support SLEP, such as materials and component aging, new manufacturing techniques, and materials replacement issues, (3) the role and mission of each DOE nuclear weapons laboratory and production plant, including anticipated workload, modernization, and skills retention requirements, and (4) funding requirements for each program element, identified by weapon type and facility. The SLEP plan would be provided to the defense committees of Congress not later than January 1, 2000. The Secretary would be required to update the plan each year and submit it to the defense committees of Congress at the same time the President submits the annual budget to Congress. The provision would further require the Secretary to request adequate funds to carry out the activities identified in the SLEP plan and in the annual SLEP plan updates.

The committee commends the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs for initiating the stockpile life extension concept for selected U.S. warhead types.

Tritium production (sec. 3134)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to produce new tritium to meet the requirements of the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum at the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) Watts Bar or Sequoyah nuclear power plants, consistent with the Secretary's December 22, 1998, decision designating the Department of Energy's preferred tritium production technology. The provision would require the Secretary to design and construct a new tritium extraction facility in the H-Area of the Department of Energy Savannah River Site in order to support fully the Secretary's decision. The provision would further require the Secretary to complete engineering development and preliminary design of the Accelerator Production of Tritium (APT) technology as a backup source of tritium to the Department of Energy's preferred technology consistent with the Secretary's December 22, 1998, decision, and to make available those funds necessary to complete engineering development and demonstration, preliminary design, and detailed design of key elements of the APT system, consistent with the Secretary's decision of December 22, 1998.

Independent cost estimate of Accelerator Production of Tritium (sec. 3135)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to conduct an independent cost estimate of the Accelerator Production of Tritium program at the highest possible level given the state of maturity of the program, but not less than a Type III "sampling technique" method as it is currently defined by the Department of Energy. The Secretary would be required to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the cost estimate not later than April 1, 2000.

Nonproliferation initiatives and activities (sec. 3136)

The committee believes that the risk that unemployed weapons of mass destruction (WMD) scientists in the former Soviet Union will work for or sell sensitive information to rogue countries or terrorist groups poses a serious threat to our national security. To

combat that threat, the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP) was established in 1994 to engage weapons scientists and institutes in the former Soviet Union in non-military work and to create jobs in the commercial world for unemployed WMD scientists and engineers. In late 1998, the Nuclear Cities Initiative (NCI) was launched to create jobs for displaced workers in the 10 "secret" cities of the Russian nuclear weapons complex. Both of these programs are funded in the nonproliferation and national security budget accounts of the Department of Energy (DOE). The budget request included a total of \$30.0 million for the IPP and \$30.0 million for the NCI. The committee recommends a reduction of \$5.0 million for the IPP and \$15.0 million for the NCI.

Initiatives for proliferation prevention

In February 1999, the General Accounting Office (GAO) issued a report entitled *Nuclear Nonproliferation Concerns with DOE's Efforts to Reduce the Risks Posed by Russia's Unemployed Weapons Scientists* that revealed problems and deficiencies in the Department's implementation of its IPP and NCI programs. DOE concurred with many of the report's findings and recommendations. The committee is especially concerned with the following:

(1) Only 37 percent of the IPP funding went to the scientific institutes in the former Soviet Union, while 63 percent of the program funds were spent mostly by the DOE national laboratories in implementing the program. Of the funds that went to Russia, individual scientists received only a small fraction due to high Russian taxes and administrative costs of the institutes.

The committee believes that U.S. nonproliferation objectives would be better served if the maximum amount of the IPP program funds reach WMD scientists and engineers. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit more than 40 percent of the IPP program funds available in any fiscal year after fiscal year 1999 from being obligated or expended by the DOE national laboratories to carry out or provide oversight of any activities under this program. In addition, the committee recommends a provision that would set forth the sense of the Congress that the President should enter into negotiations with the Russian government for purposes of concluding an agreement between the U.S. and the Russian government to provide for the permanent exemption from taxation by the Russian government of the non-proliferation activities of the Department of Energy under the IPP program.

(2) Some IPP funds are supplementing the salaries of scientists and engineers who are currently working on WMD projects. In addition, funds are being distributed to scientists and institutes who did not have a direct association with WMD programs or defense-related activities.

The purpose of the IPP program is to engage weapons scientists and engineers of the former Soviet Union in productive, non-military work. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require that none of the funds available in any fiscal year after fiscal year 1999 for the IPP program may be used to increase or otherwise supplement the pay or

benefits of a scientist or engineer if the scientist or engineer: (a) is currently engaged in activities directly related to the design, development, production, or testing of chemical or biological weapons or a missile system to deliver such weapons; or (b) was not formerly engaged in weapons of mass destruction activities.

(3) Dual-use IPP projects may have unintentionally provided useful defense-related benefits to former Soviet Union scientists and institutes and chemical and biological projects may not be sufficiently reviewed prior to approval. In addition, a large number of projects were found to have limited commercial success.

The committee believes that the IPP review process must be tightened to ensure that projects are consistent with U.S. national security interests. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require that the DOE establish a formal review process for consideration of the IPP projects to ensure: (a) that the military applications of projects are not unintentionally transferred or utilized for military purposes; (b) that activities under the projects are not redirected toward work relating to WMD; and (c) that the national security interests of the United States are otherwise fully considered before the commencement of the projects. Further, the Department of Energy is directed to review all IPP projects and eliminate those that are not likely to achieve their intended commercial objectives.

(4) There is evidence that some of the institutes and scientists that benefitted from the IPP program had contacts with countries of proliferation concern. GAO reported that a researcher from a biological institute, which received IPP funds, reported that he had gone to Iran on a teaching contract. Also, in January of 1999, the President imposed economic penalties on one of the institutes receiving IPP funds for providing sensitive missile or nuclear assistance to Iran.

Such reports are of great concern to the committee and therefore the committee recommends a provision that would require IPP funding be terminated for any scientist or institute if that the Secretary of Energy determines that the scientist or institute has made a scientific or business contact, in any way associated with or related to weapons of mass destruction, with a representative of a country of proliferation concern, as defined by the Director of Central Intelligence for purposes of this act.

Nuclear cities initiative

The NCI is focused exclusively on creating jobs in the 10 cities that performed the most sensitive aspects of the Russian nuclear weapons program. The NCI is intended to redirect skills not only to high-technology areas but also to the service, information, education, and small business sectors. The 10 nuclear cities contained the most secret facilities in the former Soviet Union. Today, access to the cities is still restricted. They are surrounded by fences and are geographically isolated. It has been estimated that there are one million inhabitants in the nuclear cities. Russian officials be-

lieve that 30,000 to 50,000 new jobs need to be created in the 10 cities. Russia has estimated that the NCI could cost up to \$2.0 billion. The DOE has not estimated the total cost of this initiative to the DOE.

Given the current economic situation in Russia, the poor infrastructure, the isolated locations of and the access restrictions to the nuclear cities, the committee is concerned about the short and mid-term prospects of promoting investment within the nuclear cities. In addition, the committee is concerned that the limited access to the nuclear cities may not allow for sufficient oversight and accountability of the program. The committee believes that the DOE should proceed cautiously in implementing the NCI program and therefore recommends a provision that directs DOE to focus its efforts on the initial three cities it has chosen and two serial production sites for fiscal year 2000. Further, the committee recommends a provision that would require DOE to conduct a study of the potential economic effects of each commercial program proposed under the NCI before providing assistance for that program.

The committee is also concerned with the prominent role of the DOE in implementing the NCI. The committee understands that the DOE was given primary responsibility for this project because of its experience in restructuring the former nuclear weapons laboratories in the United States. Because restructuring a communist system to a market-based economy is a very different task, it is the committee's view that DOE may not have the necessary background and skills needed to build market infrastructures. The committee believes that the Commerce Department is better suited to create commercialization programs in Russia. DOE has informed the committee that it will seek assistance from the interagency community in carrying out the initiative. The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Energy to provide to the congressional defense committees a report describing the interagency participation and contribution to the NCI by January 1, 2000.

The NCI was intended to be a joint program with the Russian government. According to the GAO report, at one point the Russians said that they would provide \$30.0 million to the NCI. Due to the current economic crisis in Russia, DOE reports that any Russian assistance will be in the form of in-kind contributions, such as labor and buildings. The NCI has the potential to provide the Russian government with significant economic benefit. According to the DOE, the benefit to the United States is to have the Russians close or dismantle the nuclear weapons complexes in these 10 cities. However, the Russians have not agreed to close or dismantle weapons-related facilities in these cities in exchange for U.S. assistance. This greatly concerns the committee. In the absence of such a Russian agreement this initiative could result in great financial benefit for the Russians, without any reduction in Russian weapons capability. The committee believes that the Russian government must do more to support the nonproliferation goals of the NCI effort. The committee believes that a prerequisite for U.S. funding for the NCI must be a Russian agreement to close facilities engaged in work on WMD. Thus, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of any funds for

the NCI until the Secretary of Energy certifies to the Congress that Russia has agreed to close or dismantle some of its facilities engaged in work on WMD.

In addition to the above requirements, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Energy to provide the following information to the committee by January 1, 2000:

(1) A strategic plan for the IPP and for the NCI, which establishes the objectives for the program and means for measuring the achievement of such objectives.

(2) A list of the most successful IPP projects, the name of the institute and scientists who have participated or are participating in those projects, the number of jobs created through those projects, and the manner in which the project has met the nonproliferation objectives of the United States.

(3) A list of the institutes and scientists associated with WMD or defense-related programs in the former Soviet Union that the Department seeks to engage in commercial work under IPP and NCI, including a description of the work performed by such scientists or institutes under WMD programs or other defense-related work and a description of any work proposed to be performed by such institutes and scientists under the IPP or NCI programs.

SUBTITLE D—SAFEGUARDS, SECURITY, AND COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FACILITIES

Safeguards, Security, and Counterintelligence at Department of Energy Facilities (sec. 3151-3163)

The committee recommends a set of provisions that would enhance safeguards, security, and counterintelligence activities of the Department of Energy.

Commission on Safeguards, Security, and Counterintelligence at Department of Energy Facilities

The provision would repeal Sections 3161 and 3162(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), eliminating the requirement for the “Department of Energy Security Management Board.” The provision would create a permanent, independent safeguards, security, and counterintelligence oversight commission to assess the adequacy of safeguards, security, and counterintelligence at Department of Energy (DOE) facilities. The commission would specifically assess the adequacy of: (1) safeguards, security, and counterintelligence programs, plans, and budgets of each DOE headquarters program element and each DOE field office; (2) capabilities and skills within Headquarters and field organizations; and (3) all relevant DOE guidance, including DOE Orders, Presidential Decision Directives, and the Design Threat Basis document. The commission would make recommendations regarding any changes in security or counterintelligence policies and procedures necessary to balance risk and capability in order to deter or react to credible threats.

The commission would be composed of nine members serving four-year, staggered terms. Appointments would be made not later than 60 days after enactment of the provision as follows: two by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, in consultation with the ranking member of that Committee; one by the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, in consultation with the Chairman of that Committee; two by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the ranking member of that Committee; one by the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Chairman of that Committee; one by the Secretary of Defense; one by the Director of Central Intelligence; and one by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The chairman of the commission would be designated from among the members of the commission by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. The commission would submit to the defense committees of Congress, not later than February 15 of each year, an annual activities, findings, and recommendations report. The report would include any recommendations for legislation and administrative action.

The committee recommends that of the funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2000 by sections 3101 and 3103, not more than \$1.0 million be available to the commission.

Background investigations of certain personnel at Department of Energy facilities

The provision would require that a full background investigation meeting the requirements of section 145 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 be conducted on any DOE employee or DOE contractor employee whose duties or assignments are required to be carried out in physical proximity to locations where Restricted Data or Formerly Restricted Data may be located or who has regular access to locations where Restricted Data is located. The Secretary of Energy would have one year from the date of enactment of this provision to meet the requirements of this provision. The one-year implementation period is intended to give the Secretary of Energy adequate time to upgrade the clearances of those personnel who would be affected by this provision and to identify and address any practical problems that may arise. The committee encourages the Secretary to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2000, regarding any practical problems encountered in implementing this provision.

The committee understands that this requirement will result in increased costs to the Department. In order to address this need, the committee has recommended an increase of over 50-percent the Department's budget for security investigations in another provision of this Act.

Plan for polygraph examinations of certain personnel at Department of Energy facilities

The provision would require the Secretary of Energy to prepare a plan describing how DOE employees and DOE contractor employ-

ees who have regular access to Restricted Data or Sensitive Compartmented Information might be polygraphed on periodic basis as part of a personnel assurance program. The plan would be submitted to the defense committees of Congress not later than 120 days after enactment of this provision. The plan would include recommendations for any legislation necessary to implement the plan. The provision would further prohibit obligation of more than 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2000 for travel expenses until the plan is received by the defense committees of Congress.

Civil monetary penalties for violations of Department of Energy regulations relating to the safeguarding and security of Restricted Data

The provision would amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2282a) by inserting a new section that would authorize the assessment of civil penalties of not more than \$100,000 per incidence for any person who violates an applicable Department of Energy rule, regulation, or order related to safeguarding or securing Restricted Data. The provision would further authorize the Secretary of Energy to assess monetary penalties against Department of Energy contractors for any violation of a law, regulation, or Department of Energy Order relating to the protection of Restricted Data or Formerly Restricted Data.

Moratorium on laboratory-to-laboratory and foreign visitors and assignments programs

The provision would prohibit obligation or expenditure of any funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Energy by Section 3101 or 3103 for conducting a cooperative program (including studies and planning) with the People's Republic of China, Nations of the Former Soviet Union, or any nation designated as a sensitive nation by the Secretary of State beginning on the date that is 45 days after date of enactment of this provision and continuing until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Energy, the Director of Central Intelligence, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation submit a certification that such programs: (1) are compliant with DOE Orders, regulations, and policies relating to counterintelligence, safeguards and security, and personnel assurance program matters; (2) are compliant with Presidential Decision Directives and other regulations relating to counterintelligence and safeguards and security matters; (3) include adequate protections against inadvertent release of Restricted Data, National Security Information, or any other information that might harm the interests of the United States; and (4) do not represent an undue risk to the national security interests of the United States. The certification would be provided to the defense committees of Congress, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives. The prohibition would not apply to ongoing activities carried out under title III of this Act relating to cooperative threat reduction with states of the former Soviet Union or to programs carried out pursuant to section

3103(a)(1)(A)(ii) for the materials protection control and accounting program of the Department of Energy, but would apply to the Nuclear Cities Initiative and Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention.

Increased penalties for misuse of Restricted Data

The provision would modify the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 by increasing the penalties for release of Restricted Data.

Organization of Department of Energy counterintelligence and intelligence programs and activities

The provision would require the Secretary of Energy to maintain an Office of Counterintelligence and an Office of Intelligence. The Office of Counterintelligence would be headed by a senior executive of Federal Bureau of Investigation with experience in matters relating to counterintelligence. The Director of the Office of Counterintelligence would report directly to the Secretary of Energy and ensure that the Secretary, the Director of Central Intelligence, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are informed regularly on the status and effectiveness of counterintelligence efforts at DOE sites. The Director would be required to submit an annual assessment to the Secretary, Director of Central Intelligence, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the defense committees of Congress on the effectiveness of counterintelligence efforts at Department of Energy facilities. Such an assessment would be provided in both classified and unclassified form not later than March 1 of each year. The Director would be required to develop and implement specific security and counterintelligence programs to reduce the threat of loss of classified and sensitive information at DOE sites. The Director of Intelligence would also report directly to the Secretary and would be responsible for intelligence and energy security analysis.

Counterintelligence activities at certain Department of Energy facilities

The provision would require the Secretary of Energy to assign at each DOE facility an individual to assess security and counterintelligence matters at that site. Such individuals would report directly to the DOE Director of Counterintelligence.

Whistleblower protection

The provision would require the Secretary of Energy to establish a whistleblower protection program to ensure that no DOE employee or DOE contractor employee may be discharged, demoted, or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for disclosing information relating to the protection of classified information which the employee reasonably believes to provide direct and specific evidence of a violation of any federal law, gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, abuse of authority, of a false statement to Congress on a material fact. Such disclosures of information would be protected only if they are made to a federal entity designated by the Secretary of Energy to receive such information, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Inspector General of the Department of Energy, or a member of a committee of Congress having primary responsibility for oversight of the department, agency, element of

the federal government to which the information relates, an employee of a committee of Congress having primary responsibility for oversight of the department, agency, element of the federal government to which the information relates and who holds an appropriate security clearance for access to the information.

Investigation and remediation of alleged reprisals for disclosure of certain information to Congress

The provision would require the DOE Inspector General to review all complaints submitted to him by DOE employees or DOE contractor employees that such employees have been discharged, demoted, or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for disclosing information relating to the protection of classified information which the employee reasonably believes to provide direct and specific evidence of a violation of any federal law, gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, abuse of authority, of a false statement to Congress on a material fact. The information must have been disclosed pursuant to section 3160 of this Act. The Inspector General would be required to investigate all such complaints that he determines to be not frivolous. The Inspector General would be required to provide a quarterly report all such investigations and a summary of the results of such investigations to the defense committees of Congress. In addition, the provision would require the Secretary to take remedial action when appropriate.

Notification to Congress of certain security and counterintelligence failures at Department of Energy facilities

The provision would require the Secretary of Energy to notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives within 30 days upon learning of any serious failure in security or counterintelligence at a DOE defense nuclear facility, if such failure is deemed by the Secretary to be likely to cause significant harm or damage to the national security interests of the United States.

The provision also requires the establishment of procedures to carry out its requirements, by congressional rule or resolution, to protect against the unauthorized disclosure of classified information, sensitive law enforcement information, or information relating to intelligence sources and methods. The committee anticipates that these procedures and rules will be similar to the procedures and rules currently applicable to similar information provided to the select committees on intelligence of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The committee understands that the information to be disclosed to the defense committees of Congress pursuant to this provision is a subset of the information already required to be disclosed to the select committees on intelligence of the Senate and House of Representatives under Section 413 to Title 50.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS**Maintenance of nuclear weapons expertise in the Department of Defense and Department of Energy (sec. 3171)**

The committee recommends a provision that would enact measures to assist with nuclear weapons expertise within the Departments of Defense and Energy and their contractor workforces. The provision would: (1) revitalize the role of the joint Department of Energy-Department of Defense Nuclear Weapons Council to oversee the nuclear missions of the Departments of Energy and Defense; (2) require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to submit an annual report on the activities of the weapons council; (3) require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a Nuclear Mission Management Plan; (4) require the Secretaries of Energy and Defense to prepare a Nuclear Expertise Retention Plan; (5) require that any reports on critical difficulties at nuclear weapons plants or laboratories of the Department of Energy be included in the supporting documents accompanying the annual nuclear stockpile certification sent to the President; and (6) amend section 179 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide a mechanism to appoint an acting staff director for the Nuclear Weapons Council in the event the position is vacant for more than nine months.

The committee notes its continuing concern that the important position of Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense remains vacant.

Modification of budget and planning requirements for Department of Energy national security activities (sec. 3172)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3155(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) to require that the Secretary of Energy, beginning in fiscal year 2001, include in the President's annual budget request to Congress, a five-year program and budget plan for the activities anticipated to be carried out by the national security programs of the Department of Energy. The program and budget plan would be submitted at the same level of detail as the President's annual budget request to Congress and would include a description of anticipated workload requirements for each site. The provision would further require the Secretary of Energy, beginning in fiscal year 2001, to identify how each element of the President's budget request for weapons activities would help ensure that the weapons stockpile is safe and reliable as determined in accordance with the performance criteria established pursuant to section 3158 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) during each year of the five year period.

The committee is concerned that the Department chose to disregard the requirements of section 3155 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) by failing to include a five year budget plan in the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request to Congress. The committee notes that the Department of Defense provides such out-year planning infor-

mation with each annual budget request. The committee expects the Department of Energy to adhere to this requirement and directs the Secretary to provide a five-year planning document to the defense committees of Congress beginning with fiscal year 2000, and that is consistent with the requirements of this section, not later than October 1, 1999.

Extension of authority of Department of Energy to pay voluntary separation incentive payments (sec. 3173)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for a period of one year authority granted to the Secretary of Energy by the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208) to pay voluntary separation incentive payments to certain federal employees.

Integrated fissile materials management plan (sec. 3174)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to develop a long-term integrated fissile materials management plan describing (1) how the overlapping responsibilities of the Offices of Environmental Management, Nuclear Energy, Fissile Materials Disposition, and Defense Programs could achieve budgetary efficiencies through the consolidation or integration of fissile materials treatment, storage or disposition activities and (2) any investments necessary at Department of Energy (DOE) sites that are anticipated to have an enduring plutonium management mission. The plan would be submitted to the defense committees of Congress not later than February 1, 2000.

The committee believes that the DOE Offices of Environmental Management, Nuclear Energy, Fissile Materials Disposition, and Defense Programs have several overlapping and redundant activities in the area of plutonium and uranium management and that the Department can achieve programmatic and budgetary efficiencies by consolidating some activities of these offices.

Authority of Department of Energy to accept loans from contractors for closure projects at Department of Energy defense facilities (sec. 3175)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Energy to accept loans from a contractor carrying out closure projects at a Department of Energy facility from funds paid to the contractor as fees by the Secretary. The Secretary should use such funds to conduct additional closure activities at the same facility at which the fees were earned. Any such loans made available to the Secretary would be interest free.

Pilot program for project management oversight regarding Department of Energy construction projects (sec. 3176)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Energy to initiate a project management oversight (PMO) pilot effort in at least one defense programs and one environmental management construction project with a total estimated cost of at least \$25.0 million. The PMO pilot projects would assess the effectiveness of using PMO service providers to help control cost and schedule overruns at large Department of Energy (DOE)

construction projects. Such services would include monitoring the project's progress in order to determine if the project is on time, within budget, in conformance with the approved plans and specifications, and being implemented efficiently and effectively. The Secretary would be required to submit a report to the defense committees of Congress on the effectiveness of the pilots not later than September 1, 2000. The Secretary would be required to procure such services on a competitive basis from among those commercial firms who have expertise in managing large construction projects, but who do not currently manage or operate a facility where a pilot would be conducted.

The committee remains concerned that DOE has failed to take appropriate action to control costs in large construction projects at its facilities. The committee notes a finding by the General Accounting Office that, as of April 15, 1999, all fiscal year 1999 new construction starts in the Office of Defense Programs are behind schedule by at least five months. The committee further notes that most large commercial construction projects enlist PMO-type services to act on behalf of the project owners by overseeing day-to-day matters. The committee believes that the DOE, as "owner" of many large and complex construction projects, could greatly benefit from PMO services.

Extension of review of Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, New Mexico (sec. 3177)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the Environmental Evaluation Group for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) for five additional one-year periods. The Environmental Evaluation Group provides independent reviews and evaluations of the WIPP design, construction and operation as they relate to protection of the public health and safety and the environment.

Proposed schedule for shipments of waste from the Rocky Flats Plant, Colorado, to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project, New Mexico (sec. 3178)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act a proposed schedule for the commencement of shipments of waste from the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

Other Items of Interest

Defense medical devices prototyping pilot

The committee supports establishing a limited pilot program to ensure that technologies developed within the Department of Energy (DOE) weapons programs are carefully evaluated for their potential to enhance health sciences and improve medical care. The committee notes that the DOE has a proven track record of developing innovative devices that have broad application to both DOE weapons programs as well as medical device engineering. The committee recommends that of the funds available to the Department

of Energy for weapons activities, up to \$6.0 million be made available for this effort in fiscal year 2000. Such funds would be available only for activities that support the national security missions of the DOE and priorities established by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Any DOE funds utilized should be leveraged with at least equal funding from NIH. No funds shall be available for these activities until DOE and NIH enter into a cooperative agreement defining mutual needs and until the Secretary of Energy submits a plan to the defense committees of Congress describing how this effort would be organized and how any proposed activities would support the national security missions of the DOE.

In developing an agreement for this program, the committee recommends that the Joint Conventional Munitions Memorandum of Understanding between the Departments of Energy and Defense be reviewed as a model for a Department of Energy-National Institutes of Health partnership.

Energy savings performance contracts

The committee is aware that the Department of Energy (DOE) Albuquerque Operations Office facilities are old and will need to be replaced in the next several years. Under 42 U.S.C. 8287 federal agencies can enter into certain energy savings performance contracts (ESPC) to improve energy efficiencies and to reduce energy costs. The DOE Albuquerque Operations Office has proposed that it use an ESPC to offset, or possibly cover, the cost of a new office building. The committee urges the DOE to explore the possibility of using such a contracting method. The committee cautions, however, that the Department must comply with all requirements for seeking construction funding for a new building even if an ESPC is used for all or part of the building. The committee directs the Secretary to complete a report on the feasibility of using an ESPC mechanism and to submit such report to the Congressional defense committees prior to seeking any construction funding for a replacement office building and prior to making any contractual commitments using the ESPC concept.

Natural resource damages at Department of Energy sites

The committee endorses the creation of a pilot program at a Department of Energy (DOE) closure site to explore appropriate mechanisms for negotiating and mitigating any potential natural resource damage (NRD) liabilities of the Department under section 107(a)(4)(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607(a)(4)(c)) prior to final cleanup and closure of the site.

The committee remains concerned that sites controlled or operated by the Department of Energy may have large unfunded liabilities under NRD statutes. The committee commends the manager of the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS) for her forethought in examining potential NRD liabilities. The committee further commends the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment for creating a cooperative closure-focused atmosphere at the RFETS.

Real property maintenance and reinvestment

The Committee directs the Secretary to review the Department of Energy (DOE) complex as a whole and establish a comprehensive long term plan for real property maintenance and capital reinvestment to ensure the physical infrastructure is adequate to meet future demands. The plan should be completed and submitted to the congressional defense committees by January 1, 2001.

The committee is concerned that the DOE has postponed or deferred needed real property maintenance and capital reinvestment requirements to pay for other programmatic priorities. While this is understandable in the constrained budget environment of the past few years, attention must be focused on the infrastructure at the DOE defense facilities to ensure future operations and missions are not impacted. This problem exists at all of the various plants and laboratories that will have long term missions and is not limited to any one defense funded program. The committee is supportive of the Secretary's recent decision to have the heads of DOE field installations report directly to an assistant secretary. The committee is, however, concerned that the Department's approach to real property maintenance and capital reinvestment efforts will be even more fragmented and sites will have more difficulty obtaining needed funding as a result of this restructured reporting requirement.

Regional nonproliferation cooperative training

The Department of Energy (DOE) provides training to other nations to combat proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical materials, and weapons of mass destruction. In this effort, DOE programs have provided instruction to representatives from Middle Eastern and Asian countries on regional security issues, to include border and demilitarized zone monitoring and verification, physical security, electronic security, on-site inspection technologies, and other technologies that support confidence building measures. The committee supports these efforts. From the funds available for Arms Control and Nonproliferation at the Department of Energy, \$7.0 million may be available for these training programs.

The DOE has indicated that these training programs have matured to the point where implementation of technical demonstration programs commensurate with the goals of the training programs may be warranted. The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to review the proposals for these technical demonstrations and assess the contribution, if any, to ongoing U.S. government nonproliferation and counter proliferation efforts. The committee directs the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees the results of this assessment by March 1, 2000.

Robotics and intelligent machines

The committee, in reports accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261), directed the Secretary of Energy to develop a comprehensive Robotics and Intelligent Machines Initiative. The committee understands that the Department of Energy has made substantial progress in responding to this directive. Under the direction of the Under Secretary of Energy, the Department has com-

pleted and published a technology roadmap for robotics. Using the technology roadmap as a guide, the Department has drafted its first biennial program plan for fiscal year 2001–2005 for a coordinated robotics program. In response to this progress, the committee has allocated \$5.0 million in this year's budget authorization specifically for efforts to integrate robotics programs across programmatic boundaries within the Department. The committee looks forward to continued progress by the Department to build on its planning and coordination efforts, and encourages the Department to continue to work to increase interagency awareness and cooperation on research and development related to robotics and intelligent machines.

Nuclear waste disposal demonstration test bed facility

The committee concludes that a critical need exists to develop and demonstrate technologies to ensure safe, secure, and transparent management and storage of nuclear waste materials by all nuclear states. The committee directs the Department of Energy to develop a plan to establish a demonstration and training program using the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) repository system as a test bed facility to develop transparent monitoring technologies for waste storage and to demonstrate them to the international community. The Department will report its plan to the Congress by March 1, 2000.

**TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY
BOARD**

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends \$17.5 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) for fiscal year 2000.

The committee notes that the DNFSB, through its initiatives, has helped to ensure a continuous improvement of the safety culture at the Department of Energy's (DOE) defense nuclear facilities. The most notable DNFSB initiatives relate to Integrated Safety Management plans, improved operation of weapons activities at the Pantex plant and Savannah River site, and continued safety improvements at Department's defense laboratories. In addition, the committee notes that the DNFSB's initiatives continue to have a positive influence on the safety and cost effectiveness of the materials stabilization and clean up activities at defense nuclear facilities. The committee encourages the DNFSB to continue these important initiatives.

The committee commends the DNFSB for its timely submittal of the report required by section 3202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) regarding the costs and benefits of establishing a new external regulation regime at DOE defense nuclear facilities. The committee supports the conclusions of the DNFSB's report. The committee notes that the report concludes that any benefits that may be derived from implementing a new external oversight program at DOE defense nuclear facilities are far outweighed by the potentially high costs. The committee further notes that the report concludes that any move toward external regulation of weapons facilities could have an adverse effect on U.S. national security interests.

The committee remains concerned that the implementation of a new external regulation approach would draw scarce resources away from high priority, compliance-driven clean up actions and critical national security activities. As a result, the committee does not support any further move toward external regulation of DOE defense nuclear facilities. The committee notes that the Secretary of Energy has also put the external regulation effort on hold.

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

National defense stockpile (secs. 3301–3302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Stockpile Manager to obligate \$78.7 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transfer Fund during fiscal year 2000 for the authorized uses of funds under section 9(b)(2) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The committee further recommends a provision that would clarify earlier congressional direction that authorized the quantity of materials authorized for disposal. The provision would limit the amounts necessary to achieve the revenue requirements.

TITLE XXXIV—PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

Short title (sec. 3401)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish Title XXXV of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2000 as the “Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000”.

Authorization of expenditures (sec. 3402)

The committee recommends a provision that would grant the Panama Canal Commission authority to make expenditures from the Panama Canal Commission Revolving Fund within existing statutory limits. The provision would also establish ceilings for the reception and representation expenditures of the supervisory board, administrator, and secretary of the Commission. The Commission requested that the amounts authorized in this provision be equal to the amounts enacted by Congress for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends those amounts be reduced by three-quarters since the Commission will only be in operation for the first quarter of fiscal year 2000.

Purchase of vehicles (sec. 3403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Panama Canal Commission to purchase replacement vehicles for official use.

Expenditures only in accordance with treaties (sec. 3404)

The committee recommends a provision that would confirm the obligation of the Panama Canal Commission to make expenditures only in accordance with the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements.

Office of Transition Administration (sec. 3405)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the operations of the Office of Transition Administration. Subsection (b) of section 1305 of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3714a(b)) requires the Panama Canal Commission to establish an office to close out the affairs of the Commission that are still pending after the termination of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977. The office established by the Commission for this purpose is designated the Office of Transition Administration. Effective at noon on December 31, 1999, following the termination of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, the Commission will no longer have as its mission the management, operation, and maintenance of the Panama Canal. Its sole remaining mission, in accordance with section 1305(b) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979, will be to close out its affairs through the Office of Transition Administration. The committee understands that, under that section, the Office of Transi-

tion Administration has the powers and authorities found in the Panama Canal Act of 1979 that are necessary to carry out this mission. The Director of the Office of Transition Administration has the same authority as the Administrator of the Panama Canal Commission for the purposes of compliance with the procurement laws of the United States. The operation of the Office of Transition Administration will be subject to review by an independent auditor, consistent with the past practice of the Panama Canal Commission under section 1313 of the Panama Canal Act of 1979. While section 1305(c)(6) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 authorizes funding of the close out activities until October 1, 2004, it is anticipated that the Office of Transition Administration will complete its activities in calendar year 2000. Finally, the committee recommends that the Commission enter into an agreement with the head of a department or agency of the Federal Government to supervise the close out of the affairs of the Commission.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

By letter dated March 23, 1999, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 2533 to the Committee on Armed Services on March 26, 1999. Executive Communication 2533 is available for review at the committee. Senators Warner and Levin introduced this legislative proposal as S. 974, by request, on May 6, 1999.

Committee Action

In accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, there is set forth below the committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

Vote: Adopted by a roll call vote of 20-0.

The roll call votes on amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the mark-up 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 2000.

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 SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN ON THE
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL FOR FISCAL
YEAR 2000

The Armed Services Committee has voted out unanimously a bill worthy of the Senate's support. Building upon recommendations and discoveries regarding growing readiness and modernization problems throughout the services, the Committee has done an admirable job of addressing many of the more pressing issues contributing to the myriad of problems that have been brought to its attention over the past year.

The President's budget request failed again to provide adequate funding to meet the minimum requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fund critical readiness, personnel and modernization programs. Particularly disturbing is the degree to which the budget request ignored clear and convincing evidence that there are serious readiness, retention and recruiting problems throughout the military. The Service Chiefs testified before the Armed Services Committee in September last year, and again in January, that they require an additional \$20 billion in fiscal year 2000 above the amount included in the current year's budget to reverse negative trends in force readiness. During posture hearings, the Service Secretaries and Chiefs confirmed that readiness unfunded requirements still exist and submitted lists to meet their readiness requirements.

The defense budget had been in steady decline in real terms since 1986. While that decline has finally subsided, the pace at which forces are operating, combined with a still seriously constrained resource environment, has served to exacerbate the negative impact of that decade of inadequate attention to national defense. Moreover, the Administration's promise of a \$12.6 billion increase in the FY2000 budget represents considerably less of an increase than meets the eye. In fact, only \$4.1 billion of that increase represents credible budget authority. The remaining \$8.5 billion of the so-called increase comes from "smoke and mirrors" gimmickry like anticipated lower inflation and fuel costs, cuts in previously funded programs, and an incremental funding plan for military construction projects.

The nuclear carrier USS ENTERPRISE (CVN-65) was recently deployed in the Persian Gulf, undermanned by some 800 sailors. We are losing pilots to the commercial airlines faster than we can train them. The Navy has one-half the F/A-18 pilots, one-third of the S-3 pilots, and only one-quarter of the EA-6B pilots it needs. Only 26 percent of the Air Force pilots have committed to stay beyond their current service agreement. The Army states that five of its 10 divisions lack enough majors, captains, senior enlisted personnel, tankers and gunners. Over 60 percent of Naval Special Warfare officers are leaving the service. It is imperative that the

President work diligently to address these problems and begin to fund the military at a level commensurate with ever-increasing operational requirements.

Force Modernization

The military's problems do not stop at recruiting and retention. For example, the Army's number one modernization program, the Comanche helicopter, is undergoing flight testing with just one asset. The Army has another test platform but has testified that they simply cannot afford to fly it. Although the Administration failed to address this shortfall, the Committee funded the second flying prototype so that the program will proceed on a more secure footing.

The Navy is struggling to maintain a fleet of 300 ships, down from over 500 in the early 1990s. The Future Years' Defense Plan will not support a Navy of even 200 ships. The Marine Corps saves money in spare parts by retreading light trucks and Humvees, so as to afford small arms ammunition for forward deployed Marines. The list goes on and on, but what must be recognized is the scale of these very serious modernization problems that continue to grow and must be reversed if this nation's ability to execute major operations in the future is to be assured.

Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC) Process

It was extremely disturbing that, again, politics prevailed and the Committee failed to approve additional base closure rounds. Amendments were defeated that would have mandated additional base closures. These amendments included specific provisions to ensure the Secretary of Defense considered local government concerns, rescheduled the commissioning of members to avoid the effects of presidential elections, and further restricted opportunities to privatize-in-place. The failure of the amendments continued a trend in the Committee's unwillingness to tackle the politically difficult but militarily necessary requirement for the services to divest themselves of unneeded infrastructure.

The Armed Forces clearly need to correct the current imbalance between force structure and infrastructure. Excess infrastructure, currently estimated at 23%, wastes scarce defense resources. Realistically, defense budgets will, at best, remain stable in the foreseeable future. Maintaining that excess infrastructure drains scarce financial resources from much-needed modernization programs like tactical aircraft, strategic lift, and research and development programs designed to maintain our technological edge over potential adversaries.

The Department of Defense clearly recognizes the need to eliminate excess base structure. The Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) recommended base closure rounds. The National Defense Panel endorsed this recommendation in its report accompanying the QDR. The service Secretaries have written letters to Congress endorsing the need for further BRAC rounds. The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, as well as all four Service Chiefs have been outspokenly supportive of additional base closures.

Communities in all of our states are understandably nervous about additional base closures. The history of communities that have endured the closing of installations, however, is far more encouraging than critics of the process would have the Congress and the public believe. Base closures do not have to cause long-term economic devastation. Most communities affected by previous rounds have rebounded very quickly, with incomes rising faster, and unemployment rates lower, than the national average. Furthermore, arguments that local communities should not be subjected to the anxiety that accompanies base closure and realignment rounds ignore the fundamental requirement that installations recommended for closure by the services undergo analytical comparisons with other installations in those particular categories.

Finally, the Administration's politicization of the 1995 round certainly undermined the integrity of the process. The actions in question, however, do not argue against proceeding with future rounds. There have been a total of four such rounds to date, and the politicization involved one category of installation in the last round only. Future Administrations should not be deprived of the authority to close excess infrastructure because of the actions of the current Administration.

I hope that my colleagues will rethink their opposition to further base closure rounds and recognize the seriously adverse impact on modernization and readiness that will continue if we do not take steps now to reduce unnecessary expenditures associated with maintaining excess infrastructure.

Member-Adds not requested by the Defense Department

As usual, this year's defense bill emerged from committee with a large number of programs totaling more than \$3.3 billion that were not requested by the Defense Department. In the past, there has been an increasing tendency to manipulate the process by which the services produce their unfunded priorities lists, important to the Committee's ability to allocate funds added by Congress to the Administration's budget request. In addition to questionable Member-adds that are reflected on those lists, there continue to be too many programs added to the bill that were neither requested nor included on those lists.

In my view, the Congress should stop compelling the military to pursue research programs that do not meet their requirements. Spending hundreds of millions of defense dollars to study the energy of the aurora borealis is an unconscionable waste of taxpayer dollars. These kinds of programs should be turned over to privately funded universities, research institutions, or other organizations where they could be pursued as purely scientific endeavors.

Personnel initiatives: pay raise, recruitment, retention, and retirement benefits

The bill contains a package of benefits for military personnel that would go a long way toward addressing the readiness problems facing all the services. These were already endorsed by the Senate in S.4 The Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen's and Marines' Bill of Rights Act of 1999. It combines overall pay increases with retirement incentives, savings plans, and educational benefits. It should aid in alle-

viating the problem of military families on food stamps. It is focused and balanced, and directly answers the most pressing needs as stated by the service chiefs and service secretaries.

Military pay, by almost all accounts, has fallen considerably behind civilian pay. Arguments can be made as to the precise pay differential, and at which pay grades and mission areas the gap is greatest, but there is no credible argument as to whether or not we need to address the issue of compensation.

The tables that define military base pay for all ranks are out-of-date and badly in need of reform. Middle leadership positions for both enlisted ranks and officers must reflect the responsibilities that come with these positions. Towards that end, the bill proposed reform of the pay tables, rewarding service and promotion without over-compensating very senior officers, is an important step in the right direction.

Testimony by the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarding the deleterious effect the current retirement system has had on retention forced a much-needed examination of that issue. The reduced retirement plan implemented in 1986, known as Redux, has emerged as a serious problem among service members. Its repeal is expensive, but necessary. For that reason, the Committee's decision to include proposed changes previously sponsored by several Committee members represented a major advance in addressing retention problems. This legislation gives service members the option of switching to the pre-Redux plan, or remaining with it and taking a \$30,000 bonus, which can in turn be rolled tax-free into the thrift savings plan. It is anticipated that many service members will choose this alternative in response to immediate family requirements.

The thrift savings plan established in the bill allows members to put aside up to 5 percent of their pay and all special bonuses, tax free, in a plan that does not require them to serve a full career of 20 years to earn that "nest egg". Each service is given the discretion of matching these funds up to the full 5 percent.

Lastly, the Committee should be commended for including a provision establishing a special subsistence allowance that will take almost 10,000 service members off food stamps. This benefit will help the most junior and most needy of our hard-working enlisted troops. It will remove the stigma of food stamps from the military family and it will do so fairly, without aggravating pay discrepancies, and in an honorable manner.

These personnel initiatives are the first step to ensuring that our Armed Forces continue to be the premiere fighting force into the 21st century.

Troops to teachers

One of the most important issues facing our nation is the education of our children. Providing a solid, quality education for each and every American child is a critical component in their quest for personal success and fulfillment. As we work to ensure that each child has a quality education, we will face many challenges including a shortage of quality teachers. In fact, Department of Education estimates that local school districts are facing a shortage of two million teachers over the next decade. The Troops to Teachers program is an important resource that will help schools address

this shortfall by recruiting, funding and retaining new teachers to make America's children ready for tomorrow, particularly in the areas of math, reading and science. This is why I am pleased that my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee have worked with me to ensure that this important program continues and is strengthened.

Barry M. Goldwater range and other military training range withdrawals

The Committee-reported bill contains a provision relating to renewal of the withdrawal of the Goldwater Range from public use. This provision is intended simply as a placeholder to ensure that, if an Administration proposal is submitted to the Congress this year, it can be appropriately considered in the normal legislative process.

The provision essentially mirrors the language of Public Law 99-606, which withdrew the Range from public use for 15 years. The Committee-approved provision does not specify a period of time for withdrawal, nor does its inclusion in the bill preclude an alternative means of ensuring that the Range is protected for military use as well as preserved as the unique desert land that it is.

As we work for renewal of various military training ranges throughout the nation, our pilots are airborne over hostile territory executing their missions in support of Operation Allied Force. These same pilots, that we sent to participate in Desert Storm and Desert Fox, and that today are in harm's way over Serbia, trained for their missions on these military ranges here in the United States that are necessary to be withdrawn. Their successes are a direct result of the quality of training we, as a nation, are able to offer. The need for a realistic combat training environment that allows aircrews to train the way they plan to fight in actual combat is an unquestionable requirement demonstrated throughout the history of aerial warfare.

One of the premier training ranges in the continental United States is the Barry M. Goldwater Range located in southern Arizona. This range is used extensively by all the services and literally dozens of visiting units from the United States and overseas. According to Congressional testimony, about 95% of all U.S. fighter pilots in the Persian Gulf war trained on the Barry M. Goldwater Range. Range operations include ground exercises conducted by the Marine Corps and extensive air exercises conducted by all services including live weapon deliveries and low level flight training by tactical aircraft and helicopters.

I would also like to note that military equipment and tactics are constantly changing to best serve the needs of our national defense. New aircraft are in development that will have increased performance and engine noise parameters different from those presently flying today. New strike weapons are in development that will have extended ranges resulting in a requirement for larger buffer zones around target areas. Furthermore, the Marines are exploring their effectiveness in an urban warfare environment and have constructed a simulated city on the range to support their coordinated ground and air-to-ground training efforts. New threats in the future will require continued weapon development and continued re-

finement of today's military operations. We must remain flexible to meet our military training requirements into the next century.

As important as the Goldwater Range is for military readiness, it is also a unique desert ecology that has been preserved because of its special status as withdrawn public lands.

The Wildlands Project, an environmental interest group, recognized the importance of this region as an essential element of the continued health of the Sonoran Desert. In their report, they stated: "The combined area of the Pinacate Biosphere reserve [along the U.S. border], Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, and the Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range is the largest contiguous, essentially un-fragmented area under protective management in the lower 48 contiguous states or Mexico." Almost sixty years of military training has minimized other human intrusions, such as mining, ranching, agriculture, intensive recreation, and urban encroachment. Presently, only about six percent of the 2.7 million-acre Goldwater range is designated as weapon impact areas. The remaining lands are relatively undisturbed Sonoran Desert. The Department of the Interior, the Department of Defense, and many environmental groups recognize that the uniqueness of this environment and its diversity of plant and wildlife make the Goldwater Range a national asset.

The military currently spends over \$77 million a year on conservation efforts on the Barry M. Goldwater Range and employs 87 professionals to ensure proper environmental management of the land. These employees dedicate their skills to continued protection of the Goldwater Range and include expert archaeologists, biologists, bio-environmental engineers, geologists, hydrologists, ornithologists, and other natural resources experts.

The provision included in the Committee-passed authorization bill is based on the existing land withdrawal law and includes changes to improve environmental stewardship and land management. It mandates at least the same level of resource management and preservation be maintained at the range, and requires the Secretary of the Interior to provide a report on any additional recommended management measures. It also includes a provision requiring a study and recommendations on the proposal to include the Goldwater Range in the Sonoran Desert National Park, which must be submitted to Congress within two years.

Through the Committee process, the language was amended to address various concerns. It is subject to further negotiation and amendment, pending submission of the Administration's legislative proposal to Congress, which it has repeatedly promised will be sent to Capitol Hill this summer. It is important that all viewpoints are heard in crafting the final language, both because of the importance of the Goldwater range as a military training range, and to preserve the natural environment of this 2.7 million acre area.

Finally, the military is also very involved in supporting our rich Native American heritage. The Air Force and the Tohono O'odham Nation work hand-in-hand to mitigate the effects of military training over the Nation's land, and in archeological efforts to discover and preserve historical sites of our Native ancestors. Over 1,000 of these archeological sites have been found on the range and efforts are ongoing to inventory these historical treasures and to preserve

them for future generations. The Air Force has recently identified 111,000 acres of range that it does not require for training purposes, and I support efforts to properly transfer this acreage to the Indian Nation trust.

Depot-Level Maintenance

In FY2000, the Army will spend 79% of its funds on operations and maintenance, the Navy 65%, and the Air Force 60%. This means the Army will have available only 19% of its FY2000 funds for RDT&E and procurement, the Navy 34%, and the Air Force 39%. For science and technology, the seed corn for the "Force After Next," the Army has a meager 1.9% of its FY2000 funds available, the Navy 1.7%, and the Air Force 1.5%.

The services need to provide depot workload managers increased flexibility for the purpose of achieving greater efficiencies and effective utilization of facilities and equipment at Government-owned, Government-operated depots. The allocation of funds for depot workloads should be on a facility-basis as opposed to a personnel-based approach, thereby enhancing the opportunities for teaming, partnering and joint venturing. This is not a suggestion that Congress fundamentally alter the current 50/50 funding allocation between the public and private sectors. It is, however, recognition that a modest, balanced, common sense first step toward improved use of both public and private sector capabilities is warranted.

This concept would benefit public depots by allowing them to be even more competitive and to win competitions they would not otherwise be able to win through enhanced private-public partnerships. Additionally, it would benefit public depots by bringing additional private sector jobs onto the installation and improving capacity utilization. We must constantly strive to identify areas where we can streamline operations in an effort to save taxpayers dollars and improve productivity. Our careful management of the workloads at our critical depots is one such area. This is an issue that warrants continued consideration.

Military Construction Projects

Military construction continues to fall victim to funding gimmicks and undue Congressional management. This year the Administration broke a sound policy of fully funding military construction projects in the year construction begins, and instead proposed an incremental funding scheme that purportedly saved billions of dollars. This method of funding construction would potentially leave new personnel barracks with no roofs, runways with no taxiways, or buildings with no lights all because the required "increment" of funding was not approved. The Congress is taking steps to fix this egregious oversight, however the Administration remains responsible for poor fiscal management in this area.

Unfortunately, while wisely rejecting the incremental funding proposal, Congress promptly added a number of military construction projects, totalling around \$700 million, that are not priority items for the Department of Defense. This practice of Congressional adds is detrimental to the budget process and continues to make a mockery of other earnest attempts to save and wisely spend our tax payers dollars.

F-16 Engine Fixes

The recent spate of F-16 crashes, 11 in six months, has focused attention on vital safety issues involving that aircraft. The high accident rate resulted in three safety stand-down periods, during which flight operations were suspended for as long as 10 days. In recent letters to the Air Force, I expressed concern about the rise in the F-16 aircraft accident rate, and requested that the service review its training and funding programs and advise the Committee of its recommendations for addressing the problem. The department's response identified specific engine component failures that resulted in at least eight of the most recent crashes. In addition, its investigation revealed that certain F-16 components common throughout the fleet were a high probability to fail. The Air Force has researched the cost and schedule of fixing or replacing these components, and has outlined a required funding profile.

The F-16 is the Air Force's front line fighter. The total Air Force F-16 inventory is over 1,400 aircraft, of which over 160 are currently deployed to the Balkans, a number that continues to grow daily. Additionally, F-16s continue to enforce both the southern and northern no-fly zones over Iraq and have been one of the mainstay aircraft of every conflict since Desert Storm. I continue to support all efforts to identify and fix the engine problems being experienced by our F-16 fleet. I firmly believe that the safety of our aircrew and the combat readiness of our Air Force are priority concerns that require our immediate attention. For that reason, the Committee's decision to add funds for F-16 engine modifications essential to maintain that aircraft's readiness.

In closing, it should be reemphasized that the Committee continues to try to address extremely serious near and long-term readiness and modernization problems within an exceptionally constrained budgetary environment. While the tendency of Members to continue business-as-usual practices of adding programs and earmarking for parochial reasons needs to be curtailed, vitally important retention issues have been addressed that will aid immeasurably in reversing a very serious decline in the services' ability to retain skilled personnel. For that, the Committee should be commended.

JOHN MCCAIN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR CARL LEVIN

I support the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. General Shelton, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has assured us that our armed forces are fundamentally sound and capable of fulfilling their role in our national military strategy. This bill meets the requirements that Secretary Cohen and our senior military leaders have said are necessary to ensure that our armed forces remain the best-equipped and most effective fighting force in the world.

BASE CLOSURES

I am disappointed that the Committee turned down the very strong recommendation of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to authorize another round of base closures in the Department of Defense. The case for closing more military bases is clear and overwhelming.

Last year's congressionally-mandated Report on Base Closures from Secretary Cohen contains almost 1,800 pages of material and responds to those who said last year that we need a thorough analysis before we can reach a decision on the need for more base closures. This Report reaffirms that DOD still has more bases than it needs.

From 1989 to 1997, DOD reduced total active duty military end strength by 32 percent, a figure that will grow to 36 percent by 2003. Even after 4 base closure rounds, DOD's base structure in the United States has been reduced only 21 percent.

The Defense Department's analysis concluded that DOD has about 23 percent excess capacity in its current base structure. For example, by 2003:

The Army will have reduced the personnel at its classroom training commands by 43 percent, while classroom space will have been reduced by only 7 percent.

The Air Force will have reduced the number of fighters and other small aircraft by 53 percent since 1989, while the base structure for those aircraft will be only 35 percent smaller.

The Navy will have 33 percent more hangars for its aircraft than it requires.

The Defense Department has also documented the substantial savings that have been achieved from past base closure rounds.

By 2001, DOD estimates that BRAC actions will produce a total of \$14.5 billion in net savings. After 2001, when all of the BRAC actions must be completed, steady state savings will be \$5.7 billion per year.

CBO and GAO reviewed the DOD Report and agreed that base closure saves substantial amounts of money. Last July the Congressional Budget Office said, in reviewing DOD's 1998 Report, "the report's basic message is consistent with CBO's own conclu-

sions: past and future BRAC rounds will lead to significant savings for DoD.”

Based on the savings from the first four BRAC rounds, every year we delay another base closure round, we deny the Defense Department, and the taxpayers, about \$1.5 billion in annual savings that we can never recoup.

This year the Armed Services Committee received letters from Secretary Cohen, from all six members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and from all three service secretaries urging approval of more base closures rounds.

In his letter, Secretary Cohen states, “The Department’s ability to properly support America’s men and women in uniform today and to sustain them into the future hinge in great measure on realizing the critical savings that only BRAC can provide.”

The letter signed by all six members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff this week puts it very clearly: “Simply stated,—the Chiefs tell us—“our military judgment is that further base closures are absolutely necessary.”

That is the real issue. Our military forces need quality training and precision weapons to fight with a lot more than they need extra military bases. We have a great many higher priorities for our defense dollars than funding bases we no longer need.

A decade ago, the Armed Services Committee had the vision and courage to start the BRAC process. DOD would be facing very significant financial problems today if they were not able to count on the savings from the previous BRAC rounds.

The Armed Services Committee has made a point of asking the Joint Chiefs how much more money they think they need, and where to add it. Those are legitimate questions, and the Committee has tried to address the Chiefs’ major concerns in this bill in terms of adding funds for high priority programs.

The Committee also has an obligation to the Chiefs and to all the men and women in uniform to listen to the Chiefs when they ask us to do something that is a little harder to do than just adding money to the budget, and that is to allow the military services to close bases. If the Chiefs’ opinions are important to us, we can’t just pay attention to the advice we agree with and ignore them when they ask us to make a tough choice.

The senior civilian and military leaders of DOD are telling us again that they need to close more bases. I hope that we have the same vision and courage that we showed ten years ago when we started the BRAC process and authorize DoD to close unneeded military bases.

CARL LEVIN.