106TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
106–162

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 1401

together with

ADDITIONAL, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 24, 1999.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

106TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
106–162

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 1401

together with

ADDITIONAL, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 24, 1999.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

56–735 WASHINGTON : 1999

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

FLOYD D. SPENCE, South Carolina, *Chairman*

BOB STUMP, Arizona
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOHN R. KASICH, Ohio
HERBERT H. BATEMAN, Virginia
JAMES V. HANSEN, Utah
CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
STEVE BUYER, Indiana
TILLIE K. FOWLER, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
JAMES TALENT, Missouri
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
HOWARD "BUCK" MCKEON, California
J.C. WATTS, Jr., Oklahoma
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
VAN HILLEARY, Tennessee
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida
WALTER B. JONES, Jr., North Carolina
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina
JIM RYUN, Kansas
BOB RILEY, Alabama
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada
MARY BONO, California
JOSEPH PITTS, Pennsylvania
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
STEVEN KUYKENDALL, California
DONALD SHERWOOD, Pennsylvania

IKE SKELTON, Missouri
NORMAN SISISKY, Virginia
JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr., South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
OWEN PICKETT, Virginia
LANE EVANS, Illinois
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
MARTIN T. MEEHAN, Massachusetts
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam
PATRICK J. KENNEDY, Rhode Island
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
TOM ALLEN, Maine
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
JIM TURNER, Texas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
JAMES H. MALONEY, Connecticut
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ, Texas
CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY, Georgia
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
BARON P. HILL, Indiana
MIKE THOMPSON, California
JOHN B. LARSON, Connecticut

ANDREW K. ELLIS, *Staff Director*

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	1
Purpose	2
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	2
Summary of Authorization in the Bill	2
Summary Table of Authorizations	3
Rationale for the Committee Bill	10
The Administration's Defense Budget Request	11
The Committee Bill: Managing Risk	12
Hearings	13
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION	13
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	13
OVERVIEW	13
Aircraft Procurement, Army	17
Overview	17
Items of Special Interest	21
AH–64 modifications	21
Aircraft survivability equipment (ASE)	21
Aircraft survivability equipment (ASE) modifications	22
CH–47 cargo helicopter modifications	22
Longbow	22
UH–60 Blackhawk	23
UH–60 modifications	23
Utility/cargo airplane modifications	24
Missile Procurement, Army	24
Overview	24
Items of Special Interest	27
Avenger modifications	27
Avenger system summary	27
Brilliant anti-armor (BAT) submunition	27
Multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) launcher systems	27
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	28
Overview	28
Items of Special Interest	32
Abrams upgrade program/heavy assault bridge (HAB)	32
Bradley base sustainment	32
M113 carrier modifications	33
M240 series medium machine gun	33
M249 squad automatic weapon (SAW)	33
MK19–3 grenade launcher	33
Ammunition Procurement, Army	34
Overview	34
Items of Special Interest	38
Ammunition	38
Hydra 70 rockets	38
Provision of industrial facilities	38
Other Procurement, Army	39
Overview	39
Items of Special Interest	51
Area common user system (ACUS) modification program	51
Army data distribution system (ADDS)	51
Artillery accuracy equipment	51
Automated data processing equipment (ADPE)	52
Combat support medical	52

Page

Family of heavy tactical vehicles 53
General purpose vehicles 53
High speed compactor 53
Hunter unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) 53
Information system security program (ISSP) 54
Integrated family of test equipment (IFTE) 54
Items less than $2.0 million (construction equipment) 54
Joint surveillance target attack radar system (Joint STARS) Common ground station (CGS) 55
Lightweight video reconnaissance system (LVRS) 55
M56 smoke generator system 55
Modification of in-service equipment 56
Modification of in-service equipment (tactical surveillance) 56
Night vision devices 57
Nonsystem training devices 57
Product improved (PI) combat vehicle crewman (CVC) headset 58
Ribbon bridge 58
Shortstop 59
Single channel ground and airborne radio systems (SINCGARS) family 59
Small pusher tug 60
Standard teleoperating kit 60
Super high frequency (SHF) terminal 60
Vibratory self-propelled roller 61
Wheel-mounted 25-ton crane 61
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army 61
Overview 61
Item of Special Interest 63
Chemical agents and munitions destruction 63
Aircraft Procurement, Navy 63
Overview 63
Items of Special Interest 68
CH–60S 68
Common data link (CDL) 68
Common ground equipment 68
E–2 modifications 68
EA–6B modifications 69
F–18 series modifications 69
F/A–18E/F 69
Joint primary air training system (JPATS) 70
KC–130J 70
Lightweight environmentally sealed parachute assembly (LESPA) 71
MV–22 71
P–3 series modifications 71
T–45 training system (TS) 72
UC–35 72
Weapons Procurement, Navy 72
Overview 72
Items of Special Interest 76
Aerial targets 76
Evolved seasparrow missile (ESSM) 76
Hellfire II missile 76
Joint stand-off weapon (JSOW) 76
Rolling airframe missile 77
Standard missile 77
Tomahawk missiles 78
Ammunition Procurement, Navy/Marine Corps 78
Overview 78
Items of Special Interest 81
Navy ammunition 81
Marine corps ammunition 81
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy 81
Overview 81
Items of Special Interest 84
Attack submarine force level 84
LHD–8 amphibious assault ship 84
Strategic sealift 84

Page

Other Procurement, Navy 85
Overview 85
Items of Special Interest 96
AN/BPS–16 submarine navigation radar upgrade 96
AN/SPS–73 (V) surface search radar 96
AN/USC–42 mini-demand assigned multiple access (DAMA) ultra-high frequency (UHF) satellite communications (SATCOM) terminals 96
Computer aided submode training (CAST) lesson authoring system (CLASS) 97
Fire fighting equipment 97
Joint engineering data management and information control system (JEDMICS) 97
Minesweeping equipment 98
Mobile remote emitter simulator (MRES) 98
Other training equipment 98
Shipboard display emulator (SDE) equipment 99
Sonobuoys 99
Surface sonar support equipment 99
WSN–7B ring laser gyro (RLG) and WQN–2 doppler sonar velocity log (DSVL) 100
Undersea Warfare support equipment 100
Procurement, Marine Corps 100
Overview 100
Items of Special Interest 106
155 millimeter (mm) lightweight towed howitzer 106
Body armor 106
Communications and electronic infrastructure support 106
Marine corps air ground task force (MAGTF) command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence (C4I) modification kits 107
Material handling equipment 107
Modification kits (tracked vehicles) 107
Night vision equipment 108
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 108
Overview 108
Items of Special Interest 114
Bomber modernization 114
C–17 114
C–17A aircraft modifications 114
C–130J 115
C–135 modifications 115
Defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP) 115
E–8C joint surveillance and target attack radar system (STARS) 116
F–15 modifications 116
F–16C 117
F–16 improved avionics intermediate shop (IAIS) 117
F–16 modifications 117
F–22 118
Predator unmanned aerial vehicle 119
T–38 modifications 120
Terrain awareness and warning system (TAWS) 120
Ammunition Procurement, Air Force 120
Overview 120
Items of Special Interest 123
Air Force ammunition 123
Laser guided bombs (LGB) 123
Missile Procurement, Air Force 123
Overview 123
Items of Special Interest 127
AGM–65 modifications 127
Minuteman III modifications 127
Spaceborne equipment 127
Titan 128
Other Procurement, Air Force 128
Overview 128
Items of Special Interest 135
60K a/c loader 135

Page

Aircrew laser eye protection 135
Automatic data processing equipment (ADPE) 135
Master crane 135
Military satellite communications terminals 136
National eagle system 136
Radio equipment 136
Supply asset tracking system (SATS) 137
Tactical communications-electronics (CE) equipment 137
Theater air control system (TACSI) 137
Procurement, Defense-Wide 138
Overview 138
Items of Special Interest 143
Automated document conversion system (ADCS) 143
Mentor protege 143
Nightstar binocular 143
National Guard and Reserve Equipment 143
Overview 143
Items of Special Interest 145
National guard and reserve equipment 145
Reconnaissance aircraft augmentation 145
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense 146
Overview 146
Items of Special Interest 148
Chemical agents and munitions destruction 148
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 149
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 149
Sections 101–109—Authorization of Appropriations 149
Subtitle B—Army Programs 149
Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Army Program 149
Section 112—Extension of Pilot Program on Sales of Manufactured Articles and Services of Certain Army Industrial Facilities Without Regard to Availability from Domestic Sources 149
Section 113—Revision to Conditions for Award of a Second-Source Procurement Contract for the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles 149
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 150
Section 121—F/A–18E/F Super Hornet Aircraft Program 150
Subtitle D—Chemical Stockpile Destruction Program 150
Section 141—Destruction of Existing Stockpile of Lethal Chemical Agents and Munitions 150
Section 142—Alternative Technologies for Destruction of Assembled Chemical Weapons 151
Subtitle E—Other Matters 151
Section 151—Limitation on Expenditures for Satellite Communications 151

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 152
OVERVIEW 152
Army RDT&E 155
Overview 155
Items Of Special Interest 164
Aircraft avionics 164
All source analysis system 164
Alternative vehicle propulsion initiative 164
Armament enhancement initiative 164
Army aircrew coordination training program 165
Army technical test instrumentation and targets 165
Comanche 165
Combat vehicle improvement programs 165
Combined turbine diesel engine 166
Combustion driven eye-safe laser 166
Concepts experimentation program 166
Defense healthcare information assurance program 166
Defense manufacturing technology program 167
Environmental quality technology 168
Full spectrum active protection 168
Future combat vehicle 168
Geographic synthetic aperture radar 170
Geo-positioning system—inertial measurement unit integration 170
Heart rate variability technology 170

Page

High energy laser test facility 171
High mobility artillery rocket system 172
Joint service small arms program 172
Joint surveillance target attack radar system (Joint STARS) 172
Kwajalein missile range modernization 173
Lightweight x-band radar 173
Medical materiel/medical biological defense equipment 173
MedTeams 174
Night vision advanced technology 174
Panoramic night vision goggle 174
Passive millimeter wave imaging 174
Patriot anti-cruise missile defense 174
Plasma energy pyrolysis system 175
Proximity fuzing for dual-purpose improved conventional munition submunitions 175
Security and intelligence activities 176
Self-destruct fuse 176
Semi-automated imagery processor 177
Small arms fire control system 177
Tactical voice control for maneuver control system 177
Trichloromelamine testing 177
University and industrial research centers 178
Navy RDT&E 178
Overview 178
Items Of Special Interest 188
Advanced amphibious assault vehicle 188
Advanced anti-radiation guided missile 188
Advanced waterjet propulsor demonstration program 188
Affordable advanced acoustical arrays 189
Analysis of alternatives for follow-on support jammer 189
Aquifer vulnerability/contamination assessment 190
Aviation depot maintenance technology 190
Beartrap nonlinear dynamics and environmental characterization 190
C–2 eight-blade composite propeller system 191
Claymore marine 191
Cooperative engagement capability 191
Cruiser conversion 192
Distributed surveillance system 193
DP–2 thrust vectoring system proof-of-concept demonstration 193
E–2C radar modernization 194
Electric drive propulsion for Navy ships 194
Electro-optical framing technologies 195
Environmentally safe energetic materials 195
Extended range guided munition and projectile common guidance 195
F/A–18C/D BOL chaff countermeasure 196
Free electron laser 197
Hybrid fiberoptic/wireless communications system technology 197
Hyper-spectral analysis 198
Improved software production management 198
Intercooled recuperated gas turbine engine 199
Joint experimentation program 200
Joint non-lethal weapons programs 200
Joint tactical combat training system 200
Lightweight 155MM howitzer 201
Littoral warfare fast patrol craft 201
Location of global positioning systems jammers 202
Marine Corps H–1 helicopter upgrade 202
Marine mammal research 203
Multi-function self-aligned gate technology 203
Multipurpose processor 203
National oceanographic partnership program 204
Navy aviation survivability 205
Navy land attack missile program 205
Navy theater missile defense and fleet defense radar upgrades 206
NSSN advanced submarine systems technology development and insertion 207
Optical correlation technology for automatic target recognition 208

Page
Optically fed and controlled phased array antenna 208
Optically multiplexed wideband radar beamformer 208
P–3 maritime patrol aircraft combat systems research and development 209
Parametric airborne dipping sonar 209
Phased array weather radar 210
Power electronic building blocks and power node control centers 211
Project "M" 211
S–3B surveillance system upgrade program 212
Ship survivability and personnel protection 212
Silicon carbide semiconductor substrates 212
Smart propulsor product model 213
SSGN conversion from Trident-class SSBN submarines 213
Superconducting waveform generator 214
SWATH ship mine counter-measures demonstrator 214
Tactical control system 215
Tactical Tomahawk 215
Trajectory correctable munitions development 216
Ultra-high thermal conductivity fibers 217
Undersea warfare advanced technology 217
Unmanned aerial vehicles 217
Upgrading fleet systems 218
Vacuum electronics 218
Vectored thrust ducted propeller compound helicopter demonstration 218
Virtual test bed for advanced electrical ship systems 219
Air Force RDT&E 219
Overview 219
Items Of Special Interest 229
Airborne Laser 229
Aircrew laser eye protection 229
Air Force/National Reconnaissance Office partnership 230
Air Force science and technology funding 230
Automatic target recognition 231
Crew technology 231
Friction stir welding 231
Hyperspectral imaging 231
Tactical missile propulsion 232
Ballistic missile technology 232
B–2 upgrades 232
B–52 squadrons 233
Combat training ranges 233
Commercial standardized cockpit and crew seats 234
Common imagery processor 234
Evolved expendable launch vehicle 235
Global combat support system 235
Global Hawk high altitude endurance unmanned aerial vehicle 235
Integrated satellite communications control 235
Joint airborne SIGINT program 236
Joint air-to-surface standoff missile 236
Joint strike fighter 236
Kinetic energy anti-satellite 237
Microsatellite technology 237
Military spaceplane 238
Miniature satellite threat reporting system 238
Miniaturized munitions capability 238
National polar-orbiting operational environmental surveillance system 239
Precision location and identification (PLAID) technology 239
Satellite control network 240
Simulation based forecasting decision support system (SBFDSS) 240
Space-based infrared system-high 240
Space-based infrared system-low 242
Space launch and spacelift ranges 242
Spacetrack 244
Synthetic theater operations research model 244
Defense Agencies RDT&E 244
Overview 244

Page

Items of Special Interest 253
Advanced concept technology demonstration 253
Advanced moving target indicator radar 253
Aeronautical test facilities 253
Airborne common sensor 254
Ballistic missile defense 255
Advanced technology development 255
Applied research 256
Atmospheric interceptor technology 256
Ballistic missile defense test targets 257
International cooperative programs 257
Low cost launch technology 257
Medium extended air defense system 258
National missile defense 258
Navy area defense 259
Patriot advanced capability-3 (PAC–3) 260
Space-based laser 261
Technical operations 261
Theater high altitude area defense 262
Upper tier 262
Biological warfare defense program 263
Chemical-biological defense program 264
Chemical and biological point detectors 265
Optical computing device materials for chemical sensors 265
Safeguard 265
Small unit biological detector and chemical-biological individual sampler 266
Complex systems design 266
Cryofracture disposal of anti-personnel landmines 267
CV–22 Osprey 267
Domestic preparedness for response to terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction 267
Facial recognition technology 268
Flat panel displays 268
Forging lead time technology 269
Ground-based common sensor/prophet 269
Information systems technology, superiority, and security 269
Global networked information enterprise security 270
Information assurance 271
Information assurance for national critical infrastructures 271
Report on information superiority 271
Joint theater air and missile defense organization 272
Logistics sustainment technology 272
Medical free electron laser 273
National technology alliance 273
Pilot program for revitalizing the laboratories and test and evaluation centers of the Department of Defense 274
Special operations forces reconnaissance 274
Special operations forces small boat improvements 274
Special operations tactical systems development 275
Strategic environmental research program 275
Thermionics 275
University research initiatives 276
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 276
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 276
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations 276
Section 202—Amount For Basic and Applied Research 276
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 276
Section 211—Collaborative Program To Evaluate And Demonstrate Advanced Technologies For Advanced Capability Combat Vehicles 276
Section 212—Revisions in Manufacturing Technology Program 277
Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense 277
Section 231—Additional Program Elements for Ballistic Missile Defense Programs 277
Subtitle D—Other Matters 277
Section 241—Designation of the Secretary of the Army as Executive Agent for High Energy Laser Technologies 277

Page

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 277
OVERVIEW 277
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 309
Budget Request Increases 309
Critical Readiness Accounts Increases 309
Aircraft spare parts 309
Depot Maintenance 309
Training Accounts 309
Real property maintenance and base operations support 310
Miscellaneous unfunded requirements 311
Mobility Enhancement Funding 311
Modern Field Kitchen Burner Unit 311
Army Cold Weather Clothing 312
Budget Request Reductions 312
Administration and Support Accounts 312
Advisory and Assistance Services 313
Civilian Personnel Overstatement Reductions 313
Joint Chiefs of Staff Training Exercises 313
Other Items of Special Interest 314
Commercial Activity Studies 314
Defense Fuel Surcharges 314
Information Technology 315
Environmental Issues 315
Alternative Technologies for Asbestos Treatment and Disposal 315
Environmental Contamination in Watershed Surrounding the Former Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant at McGregor, Texas 316
Navy Environmental Leadership Program 316
Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Issues 316
Overview 316
Appropriated Fund Support of Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Programs 316
Combined Stores at Closed Installations 317
Commissary Surcharge Fund 317
Military Exchange Privileges for Disabled Veterans 318
Nonappropriated Fund Retirement Plans 318
Restrictions on Patron Access to Overseas Commissaries and Exchange Stores 318
Sale of Value Brand Products in Commissary Stores 319
Vendor Representatives Overseas 319
Other Issues 319
Abrams Integrated Management Program 319
Apache Helicopter Support 320
Army Battery Management Program 321
Army Maintenance and Personnel Systems 321
Automatic Document Conversion Technology 322
Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence—Public-Private Partnerships 322
Civilian Marksmanship Program 322
Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities 323
Communicator Automated Emergency Notification System 323
Corrosion Prevention and Control Programs 324
Department of Defense Dependent Schools 324
Excess Military Property for Law Enforcement Agencies 325
Home Schooled Children Overseas 325
Information Systems Security Education 325
Joint Warfare Analysis Center 326
Military Affiliate Radio System 326
Tugboat Operations 327
Urban Warfare Training 327
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 328
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 328
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding 328
Section 302—Working Capital Funds 328
Section 303—Armed Forces Retirement Home 328
Section 304—Transfer From National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund 328

Page

Section 305—Transfer to Defense Working Capital Funds to Support Defense Commissary Agency 328
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 329
Section 311—Reimbursement of Navy Exchange Service Command for Relocation Expenses 329
Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions 329
Section 321—Remediation of Asbestos and Lead Based Paint 329
Subtitle D—Performance of Functions by Private-Sector Sources 329
Section 331—Expansion of Annual Report on Contracting for Commercial and Industrial type Functions 329
Section 332—Congressional Notification of A–76 Cost Comparison Waivers 329
Section 333—Improved Evaluation of Local Economic Effect of Changing Defense Functions to Private Sector Performance 330
Section 334—Annual Report on Expenditures for Performance of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair Workloads by Public and Private Sectors 330
Section 335—Applicability of Competition Requirement in Contracting Out Workloads Performed by Depot-Level Activities of Department of Defense 330
Section 336—Treatment of Public Sector Winning Bidders for Contracts for Performance of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair Workloads Formerly Performed at Certain Military Installations 330
Section 337—Process for Modernization of Computer Systems at Army Computer Centers 330
Section 338—Evaluation of Total System Performance Responsibility Program 331
Section 339—Identification of Core Logistics Capability Requirements for Maintenance and Repair of C–17 Aircraft 331
Subtitle E—Defense Dependents Education 332
Section 341—Assistance to Local Education Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees 332
Section 342—Continuation of Enrollment at Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools 332
Section 343—Technical Amendments to Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 332
Subtitle F—Military Readiness Issues 333
Section 351—Independent Study of Department of Defense Secondary Inventory and Parts Shortages 333
Section 352—Independent Study of Adequacy of Department Restructured Sustainment and Reengineered Logistics Product Support Practices 333
Section 353—Independent Study of Military Readiness Reporting System 334
Section 354—Review of Real Property Maintenance and its Effect on Readiness 335
Section 355—Establishment of Logistics Standards for Sustained Military Operations 335
Subtitle G—Other Matters 336
Section 361—Discretionary Authority to Install Telecommunication Equipment for Persons Performing Voluntary Services 336
Section 362—Contracting Authority for Defense Working Capital Funded Industrial Facilities 336
Section 363—Clarification of Condition on Sale of Articles and Services of Industrial Facilities to Persons Outside Department of Defense 336
Section 364—Special Authority of Disbursing Officials Regarding Automated Teller Machines on Naval Vessels 336
Section 365—Preservation of Historic Buildings and Grounds at United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, District of Columbia 337
Section 366—Clarification of Land Conveyance Authority, United States Soldiers' and Airman's Home 337
Section 367—Treatment of Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam in Defense Household Goods Moving Programs 337
MILITARY PERSONNEL OVERVIEW 338
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS 342
Subtitle A—Active Forces 342

Page

Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces 342
Section 402—Revision in Permanent End Strength Minimum Levels 342
Section 403—Appointments to Certain Senior Joint Officer Positions 343
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 344
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve 344
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves 344
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) 345
Section 414—Increase in Number of Army and Air Force Members in Certain Grades Authorized to Serve on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves 346
Section 415—Selected Reserve End Strength Flexibility 346
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 346
Section 421—Authorization of Appropriations for Military Personnel 346

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY 348
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 348
Backlog in Requests for Replacement of Military Awards and Decorations 348
Commissioning of Ms. Ella E. Gibson 348
Electronic Transmission of Certificates of Release or Discharge from Active Duty 349
Enlisted Promotions 349
Junior Reserve Officer Training Program (JROTC) 349
Merchant Marine Academy Midshipmen 350
Recruiting 350
Senior Reserve Officers' Training Program (SROTC) 351
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 351
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy 351
Section 501—Recommendations for Promotion by Selection Boards 351
Section 502—Technical Amendments Relating to Joint Duty Assignments 352
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Reserve Components 352
Section 511—Continuation on Reserve Active Status List to Complete Disciplinary Action 352
Section 512—Authority to Order Reserve Component Members to Active Duty to Complete a Medical Evaluation 352
Section 513—Eligibility for Consideration for Promotion 352
Section 514—Retention until Completion of 20 Years of Service for Reserve Component Majors and Lieutenant Commanders Who Twice Fail of Selection for Promotion 352
Section 515—Computation of Years of Service Exclusion 352
Section 516—Authority to Retain Reserve Component Chaplains Until Age 67 353
Section 517—Expansion and Codification of Authority for Space-Required Travel for Reserves 353
Section 518—Financial Assistance Program for Specially Selected Members of the Marine Corps Reserve 353
Section 519—Options to Improve Recruiting for the Army Reserve 353
Subtitle C—Military Technicians 354
Section 521—Revision to Military Technician (Dual Status) Law 354
Section 522—Civil Service Retirement of Technicians 354
Section 523—Revision to Non-Dual Status Technicians Statute 355
Section 524—Revision to Authorities Relating to National Guard Technicians 355
Section 525—Effective Date 355
Section 526—Secretary of Defense Review of Army Technician Costing Process 355
Section 527—Fiscal Year 2000 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians 355
Subtitle D—Service Academies 356
Section 531—Waiver of Reimbursement of Expenses for Instruction at Service Academies of Persons from Foreign Countries 356
Section 532—Compliance by United States Military Academy with Statutory Limit on Size of Corps of Cadets 356
Section 533—Dean of Academic Board, United States Military Academy, and Dean of the Faculty, United States Air Force Academy 356

Page

Section 534—Exclusion from Certain General and Flag Officer Grade Strength Limitations for the Superintendents of the Service Academies 356
Subtitle E—Education and Training 357
Section 541—Establishment of a Department of Defense International Student Program at the Senior Military Colleges 357
Section 542—Authority for Army War College to Award Degree of Master of Strategic Studies 357
Section 543—Authority for Air University to Award Graduate-Level Degrees 357
Section 544—Correction of Reserve Credit for Participation in Health Professional Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program 357
Section 545—Permanent Expansion of ROTC Program to Include Graduate Students 357
Section 546—Increase in Monthly Subsistence Allowance for Senior ROTC Cadets Selected for Advanced Training 358
Section 547—Contingent Funding increase for Junior ROTC Program ... 358
Section 548—Change from Annual to Biennial Reporting under the Reserve Component Montgomery GI Bill 358
Section 549—Recodification and Consolidation of Statutes Denying Federal Grants and Contracts by Certain Departments and Agencies to Institutions of Higher Education that Prohibit Senior ROTC Units or Military Recruiting on Campus 358
Subtitle F—Decorations and Awards 358
Section 551—Waiver of Time Limitations for Award of Certain Decorations to Certain Persons 358
Section 552—Sense of Congress Concerning Presidential Unit Citation for Crew of the U.S.S. Indianapolis 358
Subtitle G—Other Matters 359
Section 561—Revision in Authority to Order Retired Members to Active Duty 359
Section 562—Temporary Authority for Recall of Retired Aviators 359
Section 563—Service Review Agencies Covered by Professional Staffing Requirement 359
Section 564—Conforming Amendment to Authorize Reserve Officers and Retired Regular Officers to Hold a Civil Office while Serving on Active Duty for Not More than 270 Days 359
Section 565—Revision to Requirement for Honor Guard Details at Funerals of Veterans 360
Section 566—Purpose and Funding Limitations for National Guard Challenge Program 361
Section 567—Access to Secondary School Students for Military Recruiting Purposes 361
Section 568—Survey of Members Leaving Military Service on Attitudes Toward Military Service 361
Section 569—Improvement in System for Assigning Personnel to Warfighting Units 361
Section 570—Requirement for Department of Defense Regulations to Protect the Confidentiality of Communications Between Dependents and Professionals Providing Therapeutic or Related Services Regarding Sexual or Domestic Abuse 362
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS 363
OVERVIEW 363
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 364
Tax Deferred Savings Plans 364
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 364
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 364
Section 601—Fiscal Year 2000 Increase in Military Basic Pay and Reform of Basic Pay Rates 364
Section 602—Pay Increases for Fiscal Years after Fiscal Year 2000 364
Section 603—Additional Amount Available for Fiscal year 2000 Increase in Basic Allowance for Housing Inside the United States 365
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 365
Section 611—Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces 365

Page

Section 612—Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Nurse Officer Candidates, Registered Nurses, and Nurse Anesthetists 365
Section 613—Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Bonuses and Special Pays 366
Section 614—Aviation Career Incentive Pay for Air Battle Managers 366
Section 615—Expansion of Authority to Provide Special Pay to Aviation Career Officers Extending Period of Active Duty 366
Section 616—Diving Duty Special Pay 366
Section 617—Reenlistment Bonus 366
Section 618—Enlistment Bonus 366
Section 619—Revised Eligibility Requirements for Reserve Component Prior Service Enlistment Bonus 366
Section 620—Increase in Special Pay and Bonuses for Nuclear-Qualified Officers 367
Section 621—Increase in Authorized Monthly Rate of Foreign Language Proficiency Pay 367
Section 622—Authorization of Retention Bonus for Special Warfare Officers Extending period of Active Duty 367
Section 623—Authorization of Surface Warfare Officer Continuation Pay 367
Section 624—Authorization of Career Enlisted Flyer Incentive Pay 367
Section 625—Authorization of Judge Advocate Continuation Pay 368
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances 368
Section 631—Provision of Lodging in Kind for Reservists Performing Training Duty and Not Otherwise Entitled to Travel and Transportation Allowances 368
Section 632—Payment of Temporary Lodging Expenses for Members Making their First Permanent Change of Station 368
Section 633—Emergency Leave Travel Cost Limitations 368
Subtitle D—Retired Pay Reform 368
Section 641–644—Redux Retired Pay System Applicable Only to Members Electing New 15-Year Career Status Bonus 368
Subtitle E—Other Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits Matters 369
Section 651—Effective Date of Disability Retirement for Members Dying in Civilian Medical Facilities 369
Section 652—Extension of Annuity Eligibility for Surviving Spouses of Certain Retirement Eligible Reserve Members 369
Section 653—Presentation of United States Flag to Retiring Members of the Uniformed Services Not Previously Covered 370
Section 654—Accrual Funding for Retirement System for Commissioned Corps of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 370
Subtitle F—Other Matters 370
Section 671—Payments for Unused Accrued Leave as Part of Reenlistment 370
Section 672—Clarification of Per Diem Eligibility for Military Technicians Serving on Active Duty without Pay Outside the United States 370
Section 673—Overseas Special Supplemental Food Program 370
Section 674—Special Compensation for Severely Disabled Uniformed Services Retirees 371
Section 675—Tuition Assistance for Members Deployed in a Contingency Operations 371
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE MATTERS 372
OVERVIEW 372
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 372
Automated Clinical Practice Guidelines 372
Defense Health Program Unfunded Requirements 373
Report on Portability of TRICARE Prime Benefits 373
Report on Preventive Healthcare Services 373
Study on the Effect of TRICARE Cost Sharing on the Financial Status of Enlisted Service Members in Pay Grades E–1 Through E–4 374
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 374
Subtitle A—Health Care Services 374
Section 701—Provision of Health Care to Members on Active Duty at Certain Remote Locations 374
Section 702—Provision of Chiropractic Health Care 375

Page

Section 703—Continuation of Provision of Domiciliary and Custodial Care for Certain CHAMPUS Beneficiaries 375
Section 704—Removal of Restriction on Use of Funds for Abortions in Cases of Rape or Incest 376
Subtitle B—TRICARE Program 376
Section 711—Improvements to Claims Processing Under the TRICARE Program 376
Section 712—Authority to Waive Certain TRICARE Deductibles 376
Subtitle C—Other Matters 376
Section 721—Pharmacy Benefits Program 376
Section 722—Improvements to third-Party Payer Collection Program 377
Section 723—Authority of Armed Forces Medical Examiner to Conduct Forensic Pathology Investigations 378
Section 724—Trauma Training Center 378
Section 725—Study on Joint Operations for the Defense Health Program 378

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS 379
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 379
Section 801—Sale, Exchange, and Waiver Authority for Coal and Coke 379
Section 802—Extension of Authority to Issue Solicitations for Purchases of Commercial Items in Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold 379
Section 803—Expansion of Applicability of Requirement to Make Certain Procurements From Small Arms Production Industrial Base 379
Section 804—Repeal of Termination of Provision of Credit Towards Subcontracting Goals for Purchases Benefiting Severely Handicapped Persons 379
Section 805—Extension of Test Program for Negotiation of Comprehensive Small Business Subcontracting Plans 379
Section 806—Facilitation of National Missile Defense System 380
Section 807—Options for Accelerated Acquisition of Precision Munitions 380
Section 808—Program to Increase Opportunity for Small Business Innovation in Defense Acquisition Programs 380

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT 381
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 381
Section 901—Limitation on Amount Available for Contracted Advisory and Assistance Services 381
Section 902—Responsibility for Logistics and Sustainment Functions of the Department of Defense 381
Section 903—Management Headquarters and Headquarters Support Activities 382
Section 904—Further Reductions in Defense Acquisition and Support Workforce 383
Section 905—Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs 383
Section 906—Responsibility Within Office of the Secretary of Defense for Monitoring OPTEMPO and PERSTEMPO 384
Section 907—Report on Military Space issues 385
Section 908—Employment and Compensation of Civilian Faculty Members of Department of Defense African Center for Strategic Studies 385
Section 909—Additional Matters for Annual Report on Joint Warfighting Experimentation 385

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS 386
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 386
Counter-Drug Activities 386
Overview 386
Items of Special Interest 387
Air National Guard fighter operations 387
Colombian detection and monitoring 387
Joint interagency task force-West 388
Other joint military intelligence programs 388
Requirement for Report on Forward Operating Locations 388
Southwest border fence 389
Tethered aerostat radar system 389

Page

Transfer of military construction funding for forward operating locations ... 389
Transit zone detection and monitoring ... 389
Other Matters ... 390
Counterterrorism and Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction ... 390
Department of Defense Responsiveness to Congressional Questions for the Record ... 392
Illegal Immigration to Guam ... 392
Pentagon Reservation Renovation Security Upgrades ... 392
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 393
Subtitle A—Financial Matters ... 393
Section 1001—Transfer Authority ... 393
Section 1002—Incorporation of Classified Annex ... 393
Section 1003—Authorization of Prior Emergency Military Personnel Appropriations ... 393
Section 1004—Repeal of Requirement for Two-Year Budget Cycle for the Department of Defense ... 394
Section 1005—Consolidation of Various Department of the Navy Trust and Gift Funds ... 394
Section 1006—Budgeting for Operations in Yugoslavia ... 394
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards ... 396
Section 1011—Revision to Congressional Notice-and-Wait Period Required Before Transfer of a Vessel Stricken from Naval Vessel Register ... 396
Section 1012—Authority to Consent to Retransfer of Former Naval Vessel ... 396
Section 1013—Report on Naval Vessel Force Structure Requirements ... 396
Section 1014—Auxiliary Vessels Acquisition Program for the Department of Defense ... 396
Section 1015—Authority to Provide Advance Payments for the National Defense Features Program ... 396
Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Counter Drug Activities ... 396
Section 1021—Support for Detection and Monitoring Activities in the Eastern Pacific Ocean ... 396
Section 1022—Condition on Development of Forward Operating Locations for United States Southern Command Counter-Drug Detection and Monitoring Flights ... 397
Section 1023—United States Military Activities in Colombia ... 398
Subtitle D—Other Matters ... 399
Section 1031—Identification in Budget Materials of Amounts for Declassification Activities and Limitation on Expenditures for Such Activities ... 399
Section 1032—Notice to Congressional committees of Compromise of Classified Information within Defense Programs of the United States 400
Section 1033—Revision to Limitation on Retirement or Dismantlement of Strategic Nuclear Delivery Systems ... 400
Section 1034—Annual Report by Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Risks in Executing the Missions Called for Under the National Military Strategy ... 401
Section 1035—Requirement to Address Unit Operations Tempo and Personal Tempo in Department of Defense Annual Report ... 402
Section 1036—Preservation of Certain Defense Reporting Requirements ... 403
Section 1037—Technical and Clerical Amendments ... 403
Section 1038—Contributions for Spirit of Hope Endowment Fund of United Service Organizations, Incorporated ... 403
Section 1039—Chemical Defense Training Facility ... 403
TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL ... 404
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 404
Section 1101—Increase of Pay Cap for Nonappropriated Fund Senior Executive Employees ... 404
Section 1102—Restoration of Leave for Certain Department of Defense Employees who Deploy to a Combat Zone Outside the United States . 404
Section 1103—Expansion of Guard-and-Reserve Purposes for which Leave under Section 6323 of Title 5, United States Code, May be Used ... 404
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS ... 405

Page

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 405
Arms Control Implementation 405
Ballistic Missile Defense Discussions with Russia 406
Department of Defense Review of Satellite Licenses 406
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 407
Section 1201—Report on Strategic Stability Under START III 407
Section 1202—One Year Extension of Counterproliferation Authorities for Support of United Nations Weapons Inspection Regime in Iraq 408
Section 1203—Military-to-Military contacts with Chinese People's Liberation Army 408
Section 1204—Report on Allied Capabilities to Contribute to Major Theater Wars 410
Section 1205—Limitation on Funds for Bosnia Peacekeeping Operations for Fiscal Year 2000 410

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF FORMER SOVIET UNION 411
OVERVIEW 411
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 412
Arms Elimination Projects in Russia 412
Arms Elimination Projects in Ukraine 414
Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention in Russia 414
Chemical Weapons Destruction in Russia 415
Fissile Material Storage Facility 417
Nuclear Reactor Core Conversion 418
Nuclear Warhead Dismantlement Processing in Russia 419
Nuclear Weapons Storage Security in Russia 419
Nuclear Weapons Transportation Security 419
Other Support Programs 419
Prohibition of Specified Activities 420
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 420
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds 420
Section 1302—Funding Allocations 420
Section 1303—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Specified Purposes 420
Section 1304—Limitation on Use of Funds for Fissile Material Storage Facility 420
Section 1305—Limitation on Use of Funds for Chemical Weapons Destruction 421
Section 1306—Limitation on Use of Funds for Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention Activities 421
Section 1307—Limitation on Use of Funds Until Submission of Report and Multiyear Plan 421
Section 1308—Requirement to Submit Report 421
Section 1309—Report on Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative 421

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 423
PURPOSE 423
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW 423
STRUCTURE OF THE BUDGET REQUEST 424

TITLE XXI—ARMY 444
SUMMARY 444
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 444
Improvements to Military Family Housing 444
Environmental Remediation at Volunteer Army Ammunition Plant, Chattanooga, Tennessee 444
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 444
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 444
Section 2102—Family Housing 445
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 445
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army 445

TITLE XXII—NAVY 446
SUMMARY 446
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 446
Headquarters, Commander-in-Chief, Pacific 446
Acquisition of Prepositioned Equipment Maintenance Facilities, Blount Island Jacksonville, Florida 446

Page
Improvements to Military Family Housing 447
Unspecified Minor Construction 447
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 447
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 447
Section 2202—Family Housing 447
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 447
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy 447
Section 2205—Authorization to Accept Electrical Substation Improvements, Guam 447
Section 2206—Correction in Authorized Use of Funds, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia 448
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE 449
SUMMARY 449
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 449
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 449
Section 2302—Family Housing 449
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 449
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force 449
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES 450
SUMMARY 450
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST 450
Military Construction in Support of Base Closure and Realignment Activities 450
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 450
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 450
Section 2402—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 450
Section 2403—Military Housing Improvement Program 451
Section 2404—Energy Conservation Projects 451
Section 2405—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies 451
Section 2406—Increase in Fiscal Year 1997 Authorization for Military Construction Projects Pueblo Chemical Activity, Colorado 451
Section 2407—Condition on Obligation of Military Construction Funds for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities 451
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION 452
SUMMARY 452
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 452
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 452
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO 452
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES 453
SUMMARY 453
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 453
Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 453
TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS 454
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 454
Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law 454
Section 2702—Extensions of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1997 Projects 454
Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1996 Projects 454
Section 2704—Effective Date 454
TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS 455
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 455
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 455
Section 2801—Contributions for North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment 455
Section 2802—Development of Ford Island, Hawaii 455
Section 2803—Restriction on Authority to Acquire or Construct Ancillary Supporting Facilities for Housing Units 456

Page

Section 2804—Planning and Design for Military Construction Projects for Reserve Components 456
Section 2805—Limitation on Authority to Carry Out Small Projects for Acquisition of Facilities for Reserve Components 456
Section 2806—Expansion of Entities Eligible to participate in Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing 456
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 457
Section 2811—Extension of Authority for Lease of Land for Special Operations Activities 457
Section 2812—Utility Privatization Authority 457
Section 2813—Acceptance of Funds to Cover Administrative Expenses Relating to Certain Real Property Transactions 457
Section 2814—Study and Report on Impacts to Military Readiness of Proposed Land Management Changes on Public Lands in Utah 457
Subtitle C—Defense Base Closure and Realignment 458
Section 2821—Continuation of Authority to Use Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 for Activities Required to Close or Realign Military Installations 458
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances 458
Part I—Army Conveyances 458
Section 2831—Transfer of Jurisdiction, Fort Sam Houston, Texas 458
Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Kankakee, Illinois 458
Section 2833—Land Conveyance, Fort Des Moines, Iowa 458
Section 2834—Land Conveyance, Army Maintenance Support Activity (Marine) Number 84, Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania 458
Section 2835—Land Conveyance, Army Docks and Related Property, Alaska 459
Section 2836—Land Conveyance, Fort Huachuca, Arizona 459
Section 2837—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Cannon Falls, Minnesota 459
Section 2838—Land Conveyance, Nike Battery 80 Family Housing Site, East Hanover Township, New Jersey 459
Section 2839—Land Exchange, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois 460
Section 2840—Modification of Land Conveyance, Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois 460
Section 2841—Land Conveyance, Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, Minnesota 460
Part II—Navy Conveyances 460
Section 2851—Land Conveyance, Naval Weapons industrial Reserve Plant No. 387, Dallas, Texas 460
Section 2852—Land Conveyance, Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Orange County, Texas 461
Section 2853—Land Conveyance, Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina 461
Part III—Air Force Conveyances 461
Section 2861—Conveyance of Fuel Supply Line, Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire 461
Section 2862—Land Conveyance, Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida 461
Section 2863—Land Conveyance, Port of Anchorage, Alaska 462
Section 2864—Land Conveyance, Forestport Test Annex, New York 462
Subtitle E—Other Matters 462
Section 2871—Expansion of Arlington National Cemetery 462
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATION AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 463
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 463
OVERVIEW 463
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 476
Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative 476
Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative Construction Projects 476
Arms Control and Nonproliferation 477
Commercializing Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention 477
Commission to Review Nuclear Policy and Management 478
Comptroller General Audit of Department of Energy Contract Management Practices 478

Page
Construction Projects 479
Education 479
Eligibility to Bid on Excess Department of Energy Equipment at the Savannah River Site 480
Environmental Management Science Program 480
Environmental Management Environmental, Safety, and Health 480
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) 480
Hanford Site Tri-Party Agreement Compliance 481
Hanford Plutonium Finishing Plant Deactivation 481
Hanford Reactor Decontamination and Decommissioning 481
Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) Post 2006 Completion 481
Inertial Confinement Fusion 481
In-Tank Precipitation Process 482
International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting 482
International Nuclear Safety 482
Naval Reactors 483
Nuclear Weapons Industrial Complex 483
Nuclear Weapons Personnel Reserve 483
Oak Ridge Operations Compliance Obligations 484
Office of Counterintelligence 484
Pit Production 484
Program Direction for Defense Programs 485
Program Direction for Environmental Management 485
Records Declassification 485
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Closure Project 485
Savannah River Site Infrastructure Investment 485
Security Investigations 486
Stockpile Management 486
Stockpile Management Fissile Material Storage and Disposition 487
Technology Partnerships 487
Worker and Community Transition 488
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 488
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorization 488
Section 3101—Weapons Activities 488
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management 488
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities 488
Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal 488
Section 3105—Defense Environmental Management Privatization 489
Subtitle B—Recurring General Provisions 489
Section 3121—Reprogramming 489
Section 3122—Limits on General Plant Projects 489
Section 3123—Limits on Construction Projects 489
Section 3124—Fund Transfer Authority 489
Section 3125—Authority for Conceptual and Construction Design 489
Section 3126—Authority for Emergency Planning, Design and Construction Activities 490
Section 3127—Funds Available for all National Security Programs of the Department of Energy 490
Section 3128—Availability of Funds 490
Section 3129—Transfers of Defense Environmental Management Funds 490
Subtitle C—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 490
Section 3131—Limitation on Use at Department of Energy Laboratories of Funds Appropriated for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention Program 490
Section 3132—Prohibition on Use for Payment of Russian Government Taxes and Customs Duties of Funds Appropriated for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention Program 491
Section 3133—Modification of Laboratory Directed Research and Development to Provide Funds for Theater Ballistic Missile Defense 491
Section 3134—Support of Theater Ballistic Missile Defense Activities of the Department of Defense 492
Subtitle D—Commission on Nuclear Weapons Management 492
Section 3151–3159—Commission to Examine Nuclear Weapons Policy Management and Oversight 492

Page
Subtitle E—Other Matters 493
Section 3161—Procedures for Meeting Tritium Production Requirements 493
Section 3162—Extension of Authority of Department of Energy to Pay Voluntary Separation Payments 493
Section 3163—Fellowship Program for Development of Skills Critical to the Department of Energy Nuclear Weapons Complex 494
Section 3164—Department of Energy Records Declassification 494
Section 3165—Management of Nuclear Weapons Production Facilities and National Laboratories 494
Section 3166—Notice to Congressional Committees of Compromise of Classified Information within Nuclear Energy Defense Programs 495
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD 496
LEGISLATIVE PROVISION 496
Section 3201—Authorization 496
TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE 497
LEGISLATIVE PROVISION 497
Section 3301—Definitions 497
Section 3302—Authorized Uses Of Stockpile Funds 497
Section 3303—Elimination of Congressionally Imposed Disposal Restrictions on Specific Stockpile Materials 497
TITLE XXXIV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION 498
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 498
Great Lakes Maritime Academy 498
Merchant Marine Academy 498
Repair and Maintenance of Maritime Administration Vessels 498
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 499
Section 3401—Short Title 499
Section 3402—Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2000 499
Section 3403—Amendments to Title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 499
Section 3404—Extension of War Risk Insurance 499
Section 3405—Ownership of the JEREMIAH O'BRIEN 500
TITLE XXXV—PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION 501
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 501
Section 3501—Short Title 501
Section 3502—Authorization of Expenditures 501
Section 3503—Purchase of Vehicles 501
Section 3504—Office of Transition Administration 501
Departmental Data 502
Department of Defense Authorization Request 502
Military Construction Authorization Request 502
Committee Position 503
Communications From Other Committees 503
Fiscal Data 511
Congressional Budget Office Estimate 511
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate 512
Authorization of Appropriations 512
Committee Cost Estimate 527
Oversight Findings 527
Constitutional Authority Statement 527
Statement of Federal Mandates 527
Roll Call Votes 528
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported 534
Additional, Dissenting, and Supplemental Views 685
Additional views of Roscoe G. Bartlett, Gene Taylor, Joseph R. Pitts 685
Additional views of Patrick J. Kennedy 687
Additional views of Loretta Sanchez, Robert A. Brady, Lane Evans, Thomas H. Allen, Ellen O. Tauscher, Patrick J. Kennedy, Neil Abercrombie, Rob R. Blagojevich, Mike Thompson 688
Additional views of Ike Skelton 689

Page

Additional views of Ike Skelton, Norman Sisisky, John M. Spratt, Jr., Solomon P. Ortiz, Owen Pickett, Lane Evans, Gene Taylor, Neil Abercrombie, Martin T. Meehan, Robert A. Underwood, Patrick J. Kennedy, Rod R. Blagojevich, Silvestre Reyes, Thomas H. Allen, Jim Turner, Adam Smith, Loretta Sanchez, James H. Maloney, Ellen O. Tauscher, Robert A. Brady, Robert E. Andrews, Baron P. Hill, Mike Thompson, John B. Larson 690
Additional views of James M. Talent—Army Logistics Modernization 692
Additional views of James M. Talent—Navy's F/A 18E/F Super Hornet 695
Additional views of Gene Taylor 696
Additional views of Robert A. Underwood 698
Additional views of Robert A. Underwood, Lane Evans, Norman Sisisky, Thomas H. Allen, Solomon P. Ortiz, and Neil Abercrombie 700
Supplemental views of Ciro D. Rodriguez 702
Dissenting views of Cynthia A. McKinney 704

106TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 106–162

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

MAY 24, 1999.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1401]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 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, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment strikes out all after the enacting clause of the bill and inserts a new text which appears in italic type in the reported bill.

The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill.

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 1401. The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill. The remainder of the report discusses the bill, as amended.

PURPOSE

The bill would—(1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2000: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each reserve component of the armed forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (7) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; (8) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for the operation of the Panama Canal Commission; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for the Maritime Administration.

RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

The bill does not generally provide budget authority. The bill authorizes appropriations. Subsequent appropriation acts provide budget authority. The bill addresses the following categories in the Department of Defense budget: procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; operation and maintenance; working capital funds, military personnel; and military construction and family housing. The bill also addresses Department of Energy National Security Programs, the Panama Canal Commission and the Maritime Administration.

Active duty and reserve personnel strengths authorized in this bill and legislation affecting compensation for military personnel determine the remaining appropriation requirements of the Department of Defense. However, this bill does not provide authorization of specific dollar amounts for personnel.

SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZATION IN THE BILL

The President requested budget authority of $280.5 billion for the national defense budget function for fiscal year 2000. Of this amount, the President requested $266.9 billion for the Department of Defense (including $5.4 billion for military construction and family housing) and $12.4 billion for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The committee recommends an overall level of $288.8 billion in budget authority. This amount is consistent with the discretionary defense spending limitations imposed by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and it represents an increase of approximately $18.3 billion from the amount authorized for appropriation by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). Overall, the committee's recommendation is consistent with the amounts established in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000 for the national defense budget function.

SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

The following table provides a summary of the amounts requested and that would be authorized for appropriation in the bill (in the column labeled "Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation") and the committee's estimate of how the committee's recommendations relate to the budget totals for the national defense function. For purposes of estimating the budget authority implications of committee action, the table reflects the numbers contained in the President's budget for proposals not in the committee's legislative jurisdiction.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2000

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	FY 2000 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,229,888	1,229,888	185,323	1,415,211	1,415,211
Missile Procurement, Army	1,358,104	1,358,104	57,855	1,415,959	1,415,959
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,416,765	1,416,765	158,331	1,575,096	1,575,096
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,140,816	1,140,816	55,400	1,196,216	1,196,216
Other Procurement, Army	3,423,870	3,423,870	376,025	3,799,895	3,799,895
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army					
Operation & Maintenance	593,500	593,500	(593,500)	-	-
Procurement	241,500	241,500	(241,500)	-	-
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	334,000	334,000	(334,000)	-	-
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	8,228,655	8,228,655	575,396	8,804,051	8,804,051
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,357,400	1,357,400	407,255	1,764,655	1,764,655
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	484,900	484,900	128,000	612,900	612,900
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	6,678,454	6,678,454	8,718	6,687,172	6,687,172
Other Procurement, Navy	4,100,091	4,100,091	160,353	4,260,444	4,260,444
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,137,220	1,137,220	160,243	1,297,463	1,297,463
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	9,302,086	9,302,086	345,565	9,647,651	9,647,651
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,359,608	2,359,608	(55,947)	2,303,661	2,303,661
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	419,537	419,537	141,000	560,537	560,537
Other Procurement, Air Force	7,085,177	7,085,177	(7,415)	7,077,762	7,077,762
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,128,967	2,128,967	(21,128)	2,107,839	2,107,839
Procurement, National Guard and Reserve Equipment	-	-	60,000	60,000	60,000
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense					
Operation & Maintenance			550,000	550,000	550,000
Procurement			232,000	232,000	232,000
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation			230,000	230,000	230,000
Procurement, Defense Health Program	356,970	-	-	356,970	-
Procurement, Office of the Inspector General	2,100	-	-	2,100	-
Defense Export Loan Guarantee Program	-	-	1,250	1,250	-
Total Procurement	**53,379,608**	**53,020,538**	**2,579,224**	**55,958,832**	**55,598,512**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2000

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	FY 2000 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	4,426,194	4,426,194	282,000	4,708,194	4,708,194
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	7,984,016	7,984,016	374,513	8,358,529	8,358,529
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	13,077,829	13,077,829	134,842	13,212,671	13,212,671
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	8,609,289	8,609,289	669,105	9,278,394	9,278,394
Developmental Test & Evaluation, Defense	253,457	253,457	-	253,457	253,457
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	24,434	24,434	-	24,434	24,434
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	**34,375,219**	**34,375,219**	**1,460,460**	**35,835,679**	**35,835,679**
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE & WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS					
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	18,660,994	18,660,994	815,700	19,476,694	19,476,694
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	22,238,715	22,238,715	546,500	22,785,215	22,785,215
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,558,929	2,558,929	218,500	2,777,429	2,777,429
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	20,363,203	20,363,203	1,151,755	21,514,958	21,514,958
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	11,419,233	11,419,233	(450,619)	10,968,614	10,968,614
Office of the Inspector General	138,744	140,844	(8,000)	130,744	132,844
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,369,213	1,369,213	143,300	1,512,513	1,512,513
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	917,647	917,647	48,200	965,847	965,847
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	123,266	123,266	14,000	137,266	137,266
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,728,437	1,728,437	2,500	1,730,937	1,730,937
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	2,903,549	2,903,549	237,500	3,141,049	3,141,049
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,099,618	3,099,618	86,300	3,185,918	3,185,918
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

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2000

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	FY 2000 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	788,100	788,100	23,600	811,700	811,700
Defense Health Program	10,477,687	10,834,657	19,000	10,496,687	10,853,657
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	475,500	475,500	(31,400)	444,100	444,100
Overseas Military Investment Recovery	-	4,300	-		4,300
Disposal of DoD Real Property	-	9,500	-		9,500
Lease of DoD Real Property	-	22,700	-		22,700
Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Fund	15,000	15,000	-	15,000	15,000
Kaho' Olawe Island Conveyance Fund	-	15,000	-		15,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	55,800	55,800	(5,800)	50,000	50,000
National Science Center, Army	-	30	-		30
Burdensharing	-	278,000	-		278,000
Rocky Mountain Arsenal	-	6,000	-		6,000
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	2,387,600	2,387,600	-	2,387,600	2,387,600
Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense	1,845,370	1,845,370	-	1,845,370	1,845,370
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	**102,837,780**	**103,532,380**	**2,811,036**	**105,648,816**	**106,343,416**
Revolving and Management Funds					
Military Commissary Revolving Fund (xfer from service O&M accounts)	-	-	-		-
Defense Working Capital Funds	90,344	-	-	90,344	-
Army Working Capital Fund		62,000			62,000
Navy Working Capital Fund		-			-
Air Force Working Capital Fund		28,344			28,344
National Defense Sealift Fund	354,700	354,700	80,000	434,700	434,700
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Routine & Ongoing Sales)	(150,000)	(150,000)	-	(150,000)	(150,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Excess Sales)	-	(230,000)			(230,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Transfer to WCF Cash)	67,000	67,000	(67,000)	-	-
Armed Forces Retirement Home	68,295	-		68,295	-
Subtotal Revolving and Management Funds	**430,339**	**132,044**	**13,000**	**443,339**	**145,044**
Total Operation and Maintenance & Working Capital Funds	**103,268,119**	**103,664,424**	**2,824,036**	**106,092,155**	**106,488,460**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2000

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	FY 2000 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel	**-**	**73,723,293**	**(1,607,926)**	**-**	**72,115,367**
Military Personnel (prior emergency appropriations)	**-**	**-**	**1,838,426**	**-**	**1,838,426**
Total Military Personnel	**-**	**73,723,293**	**230,500**	**-**	**73,953,793**
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	656,003	656,003	558,402	1,214,405	1,214,405
Military Construction, Navy	319,786	319,786	613,236	933,022	933,022
Military Construction, Air Force	179,479	179,479	533,686	713,165	713,165
Military Construction, Defense-wide	193,005	193,005	599,803	792,808	792,808
Military Construction, Army National Guard	16,045	16,045	107,833	123,878	123,878
Military Construction, Air National Guard	21,319	21,319	129,851	151,170	151,170
Military Construction, Army Reserve	23,120	23,120	69,395	92,515	92,515
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	4,933	4,933	16,641	21,574	21,574
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	12,155	12,155	36,409	48,564	48,564
Base Realignment and Closure IV	705,911	681,373	-	705,911	681,373
NATO Security Investment Program	191,000	191,000	-	191,000	191,000
Unaccompanied Housing Fund	-	-			
Total Military Construction	**2,322,756**	**2,298,218**	**2,665,256**	**4,988,012**	**4,963,474**
FAMILY HOUSING					
Family Housing Construction, Army	14,003	14,003	66,197	80,200	80,200
Family Housing Support, Army	1,098,080	1,098,080	(8,268)	1,089,812	1,089,812
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	64,605	64,605	191,410	256,015	256,015
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	895,070	895,070	-	895,070	895,070
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	101,791	101,791	237,205	338,996	338,996
Family Housing Support, Air Force	821,892	821,892	-	821,892	821,892
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide	50	50	-	50	50

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2000

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	FY 2000 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	41,440	41,440	-	41,440	41,440
Homeowners Assistance Fund	-	24,538	-	-	24,538
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	78,756	78,756	-	78,756	78,756
Total Family Housing	**3,115,687**	**3,140,225**	**486,544**	**3,602,231**	**3,626,769**
OTHER DoD MILITARY					
Other Legislation (travel cards)	5,000	5,000	(5,000)	-	-
Defense Wide Contingencies		(1,650,000)			(1,650,000)
General Transfer Authority [non-additive]		[2,000,000]			[2,000,000]
National Security Education Trust Fund		8,000			8,000
Other Trust Funds		212,000			212,000
Defense Vessel Transfer Program Account		31,000			31,000
Offsetting Receipts and Other		(1,888,000)			(1,888,000)
					-
Total Other DoD Military		**(3,282,000)**	**(5,000)**	**-**	**(3,287,000)**
Total Department of Defense Military (051)	**196,461,389**	**266,939,917**	**8,402,594**	**206,476,909**	**275,341,261**
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)					
Weapons Activities	4,531,000	4,531,000	10,500	4,541,500	4,541,500
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,514,376	4,514,376	1,137,992	5,652,368	5,652,368
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	228,000	228,000	-	228,000	228,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	73,000	73,000	-	73,000	73,000
Other Defense Actitivities	1,792,000	1,792,000	(19,541)	1,772,459	1,772,459
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,054,492	1,054,492	(1,054,492)	-	-
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	150,000	150,000	(150,000)	-	-
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,500	17,500	-	17,500	17,500
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	**12,360,368**	**12,360,368**	**(75,541)**	**12,284,827**	**12,284,827**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2000

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	FY 2000 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)					
Department of Justice - Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund					
Payments to Individuals		21,714	-		21,714
Administrative Expenses		2,000	-		2,000
Department of Justice - Federal Bureau of Investigation Special Program		260,000	-		260,000
Department of Justice - National Drug Intelligence Center		27,000			27,000
Department of Transportation - Coast Guard Operations		334,000	-		334,000
Department of Transportation - MARAD Maritime Security Program		98,700	-		98,700
Department of Transportation - xfer from National Defense Sealift Fund		-			
Department of Commerce - Export Administration		1,877	-		1,877
Federal Emergency Management Agency			-		
Salaries and Expenses	26,777	26,777	(26,777)	-	-
Planning and Assistance	22,846	22,846	(22,846)	-	-
CIA Retirement and Disability System		209,100	-		209,100
National Science Foundation - Antarctic research activities		62,600	-		62,600
Selective Service System - Salaries and Expenses		25,250	-		25,250
Intelligence Community Management Account		122,415	-		122,415
Telecommunications Carrier Compliance Fund		8,000	-		8,000
Total Defense Related Activities (054)	**49,623**	**1,222,279**	**(49,623)**	**-**	**1,172,656**
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	**208,871,380**	**280,522,564**	**8,277,430**	**218,761,736**	**288,798,744**

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 once again reflects the committee's efforts to address decade-long concerns about the declining state of the U.S. armed forces. The combination of reduced defense resources and increased military commitments around the world has resulted in a diminished quality of military life, a severe degradation in the readiness of units to train for and execute their primary combat missions, and an erosion of the technological advantages enjoyed by U.S. forces on the battlefield as a result of delayed equipment modernization.

Over the past several months, the challenges confronting U.S. armed forces have been put into stark relief by the war in the former Yugoslav republic of Kosovo. The unanticipated strength of Serb resistance has resulted in a significant expansion of the U.S. and NATO air war, to the point where the number of aircraft involved in Operation Allied Force is nearing levels anticipated in a major theater war. As a result, the ability of U.S. armed forces to meet their worldwide commitments is increasingly in question. From substantial gaps in the regional deployment of aircraft carriers, to shortages of cruise missiles and other precision munitions, to strains on the fleets of specialized electronic warfare and tanker aircraft, and even to stresses on the conventional fighter and attack aircraft force, the air campaign over Yugoslavia has revealed the extent to which today's U.S. military is overextended.

Should current operations against Yugoslavia evolve into ground combat or even peacekeeping operations involving U.S. troops, the strains that such a ground operation would place on U.S. forces worldwide would escalate rapidly. According to the Administration, just a peacekeeping force in Kosovo would require 50,000 to 60,000 NATO troops, with perhaps 20,000 U.S. soldiers participating in what would likely become a long-term, open-ended commitment. There should be no doubt that any future requirement for the U.S. Army to sustain a force of such size in the Balkans, on a rotational basis, will increase the exposure of U.S. interests in other regions of the world to challenge.

For years, the committee has highlighted the difficulties U.S. armed forces would face in executing the National Military Strategy's requirement to be capable of fighting nearly simultaneous wars in the Persian Gulf and in Korea. The unforeseen challenges and shortfalls revealed by the need to wage a third "major theater war" in Europe—even absent the deployment of U.S. ground forces—unfortunately affirms the committee's long-standing concerns. Testifying earlier this month about ongoing operations in the Balkans, Secretary of Defense William Cohen admitted that "we have a situation where we have a smaller force and we have more missions, and so . . . we are wearing out systems, wearing out people." These problems are not new, and they are getting worse. The committee hopes that the obvious strains being placed on the military services as a result of Operation Allied Force will at least compel some broader recognition of the shortfalls confronting the nation's armed forces and lead to a sustained and bipartisan commitment to revitalizing America's military.

The Administration's Defense Budget Request

In the context of mounting quality of life, readiness, and modernization shortfalls, the committee once again believes the Administration's defense budget request falls short. Earlier this year, the President declared in his State of the Union address that "it is time to reverse the decline in defense spending that began in 1985....My balanced budget calls for a sustained increase over the next six years for readiness, for modernization, and for pay and benefits for our troops and their families." The President's words, following as they did on the heels of last fall's testimony by the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) that the military services had critical unfunded requirements of at least $150 billion over the next six years, provided a degree of hope that the Administration had "turned the corner" and recognized the need to substantially increase defense spending. The unfortunate reality became apparent, however, when the President unveiled his fiscal year 2000 budget request and six-year defense plan—a plan that relied heavily on budgetary gimmicks and optimistic economic assumptions and which provided increased funding sufficient to address only about one half of the Joint Chiefs' identified shortfalls in critical military requirements. Moreover, the Administration conditioned even its "50 percent solution" on the achievement of domestic political objectives involving Social Security reform.

Earlier this year, the Joint Chiefs updated their estimates of unfunded quality of life, readiness, and modernization requirements. Even assuming the validity of the budget gimmicks and optimistic assumptions contained in the Administration's budget request, the Joint Chiefs testified that the six-year defense plan still fell $46.7 billion short of their minimal requirements. If the Administration's budget gimmicks and optimistic economic assumptions are judged invalid, the six-year defense plan falls at least $70 billion short of addressing the services' shortfalls.

Even as the Administration was crafting its fiscal year 2000 budget request, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were concluding that the ability of U.S. armed forces to execute the full range of missions required by the National Military Strategy entailed "moderate to high" risk. Marine Commandant General Charles Krulak summarized the JCS' assessment in testimony before the committee, stating, "In terms of risk to the [ability to execute] the National Military Strategy, I think we've gone too far; I think we're there now. If we don't do something about this, we're going to be back into the hollow armed forces and this nation can't have that, can't take that, because the world is changing so rapidly, is so dangerous, that we need to stop this now."

During months of oversight hearings, the motto of the post-Cold-War military—"doing more with less"—was once again the predominant theme heard from all ranks and services. As Army Chief of Staff General Dennis Reimer informed the committee in January, "Army leaders at all levels have been fighting to meet expanding requirements with diminishing resources. Our commanders are struggling to balance operational readiness—supporting training and maintaining equipment—with base operations expenses and maintaining soldiers' quality of life." Likewise, Chief of Naval Op-

erations Admiral Jay Johnson expressed "serious concerns" about personnel, training, and equipment maintenance problems that were creating an "erosion of readiness at home and even the beginning stages of degradation in our deployed forces." A decade ago, Navy non-deployed units reported high states of readiness nearly 70 percent of the time, while today the figure has slipped to approximately 50 percent.

The Air Force is confronting similar problems. Air Combat Command has suffered a 56 percent drop in readiness rates since 1996. The aging of the Air Force fleet and the resulting increased costs and expanded maintenance workload caused by aircraft fatigue, corrosion, and parts obsolescence underlies the Air Force's worsening readiness problems. Under projected budgets and modernization plans, the average Air Force aircraft will be 20 years old by the turn of the century and 30 years old by 2015. Air Force "non-mission capable" rates have increased 53 percent since the Persian Gulf War while the rate of "cannibalization"—the practice of stripping parts from one aircraft or system to replace broken parts on another—has increased 75 percent.

The services' long-term quality of life, readiness, and modernization problems seem to be worsening at an exponential rate as the force shrinks, the equipment ages, and the pace of operations mounts. The mismatch between military ends and means is so large that the services' ability to conduct even smaller-scale contingencies is at risk. In the committee's view, the expanding and potentially open-ended mission in the Balkans not only highlights these risks, but exacerbates them at the same time.

The Committee Bill: Managing Risk

The committee's recommendations in the bill have been shaped by the above concerns and guided in large part by the priorities identified by the military service chiefs. The committee's first step is to put the defense budget on somewhat sounder fiscal footing. Thus, the committee bill increases the President's budget request by $8.3 billion. Within this topline increase, the committee has taken a number of steps to improve the quality of military life, to improve the readiness of the force, and to accelerate the pace of equipment modernization.

Major quality of life initiatives include a 4.8 percent basic military pay raise, substantial pay table reform, and reform of the military retirement system. The committee also rejected the Administration's inexplicable $3.1 billion cut to the already underfunded military construction accounts, instead fully funding military construction at a level of $8.6 billion to provide important improvements to the quality of military life. The committee also increased spending on critical readiness accounts by more than $2 billion, including significant increases for real property maintenance and base operations support, depot maintenance, aircraft spare parts, combat training center operations, as well as more than $700 million for other unfunded readiness priorities identified by the military service chiefs. The committee has also increased funding for equipment modernization, adding approximately $4 billion to the President's underfunded budget request for research, development, and procurement programs. Important modernization initiatives in-

clude the addition of more than $400 million to the Administration's request for missile defense programs, and substantial increases to upgrade the B–2 bomber fleet, and for EA–6B, F–15, F–16, Joint Strike Fighter, V–22, AH–64 Apache Longbow and Comanche helicopter programs.

Despite the substantial improvements this bill has made to the President's budget request, the committee is under no illusions concerning the rising level of risk U.S. armed forces are facing. The committee does not believe that "high risk" in executing the core missions of our National Military Strategy is acceptable. The nation is facing a dilemma that Secretary Cohen recently articulated in testimony to the Congress. The Secretary noted the multiple strains caused by conducting Operation Allied Force simultaneously with having to meet other important requirements, and commented that "we've got to find a way to either increase the size of our forces or decrease the number of our missions."

The committee believes that unless the nation fields the forces and provides the resources required by the National Military Strategy, the inevitable alternative is for the United States to retreat from its global responsibilities and interests. As it does with regard to the growing risk confronting our military forces, the committee also believes it is unacceptable for the United States to retreat from the aggressive promotion and protection of our interests around the world.

HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 results from extensive hearings that began on February 2, 1999 and that were completed on March 25, 1999. The full committee conducted 6 sessions. In addition, a total of 26 sessions were conducted by five different subcommittees and two panels of the committee on various titles of the bill.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

The President's $53.0 billion procurement budget request for fiscal year 2000 represents a decrease of $1.1 billion below the amount forecast in fiscal year 1999, $9.3 billion below the amount first forecast in fiscal year 1996, and continues the Department of Defense's delay in achieving the Joint Chiefs of Staff goal of a $60.0 billion procurement budget by three years (from fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 2001). Even before the initiation of Operation Allied Force the service chiefs of staff were lamenting a budget that leaves them far short of attaining their modernization requirements, despite Congress' having added over $15.0 billion to the procurement accounts in the past four years. The ongoing campaign in the Balkans has only exacerbated this situation.

For example, the Army Chief of Staff testified to the committee that "modernization is still underfunded. What I don't think will be fixed out of this [referring to the funding he expects to receive in fiscal year 2000] will be the modernization. We'll have to defer that . . . further." Commenting on his inability to recapitalize the fleets of naval ships and aircraft, the Chief of Naval Operations noted, "We continue to compensate [for readiness and personnel needs] by shifting resources from modernization and recapitalization accounts to operations and support accounts." Even more critical of the current predicament, he was the Commandant of the Marine Corps, who testified that, "As I've said for years [our problem] is long-term procurement. I have got very great concerns about the cancer of modernization that I must address." And the Air Force Chief of Staff declared that "if we don't modernize by replacing aircraft that are beyond their useful life and revitalize those with life left in them, we can expect significant additional maintenance requirements, reduced reliability, and increased costs as these aircraft deteriorate."

In order to bring the modernization problem into focus, the committee held a hearing on the Department's fleet of aging equipment. The Department clearly acknowledged that reduced modernization budgets, combined with increased deployments, have taken their toll. Its inventory of weapons is not only aging chronologically but also technologically, as older and overworked weapons systems continue to drain resources because of more frequent and more expensive maintenance. Equipment expected to leave the inventory years ago is still operational and, in some cases, approaching nearly double expected service lives. Yet, despite this situation, the procurement budget continues to receive low priority.

Although much has been touted by the Department concerning a major increase in its budget in the next six fiscal years, the procurement accounts are not the beneficiaries of any largesse. As noted above, the fiscal year 2000 procurement request actually declines from the amount forecast only one year ago. The cumulative addition to these accounts over the next four years is projected to be only $4.1 billion-hardly a significant part of a proposed six-year $84.0 billion overall increase.

Unfortunately, unless a sustained increase in procurement funding is forthcoming, the aging equipment situation will only get worse, as the impact of Operation Allied Force is felt. With the United States shouldering the largest share of the burden in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's air campaign against Yugoslavia, inventories of key precision weapons are being depleted at much faster rates than ever anticipated; units deployed for combat are stripping vital supplies from U.S.-based units, contributing to a dramatic drop in their readiness ratings; and cannibalization rates are climbing rapidly within deployed units because of spare parts shortages. Even with the substantial amount of additional funding provided by the Congress in fiscal year 1999 supplemental appropriations, the process of "getting well" from this ongoing operation will be slow and likely require substantial additional funding in the future.

Against this backdrop, the committee successfully argued for an increase to the funds allocated for national defense in the fiscal

year 2000 budget resolution and has applied much of this additional money to procurement. This marks the fifth consecutive year the committee has added funds to modernize the Department's weaponry, including:

[In millions of dollars]

Army:	
UH–60L helicopters	27.0
CH–47F upgrades	56.0
AH–64D upgrades	45.0
MLRS rocket launchers	56.0
Bradley fighting vehicles upgrades	72.0
M113A3 carrier mods	25.0
Small arms	48.0
Ammunition	55.0
Night vision devices	33.0
Shortstop	40.0
Communications equipment	92.0
Combat support equipment	63.0
Construction equipment	33.0
Navy/Marine Corps:	
KC–130J	252.0
MV–22	60.0
CH–60S	38.0
UC–35	18.0
E/A–6B upgrades.	45.0
F/A–18 series modifications	63.0
P–3 series modifications	75.0
Tomahawk missiles	300.0
Joint stand-off weapon	75.0
Hellfire missiles	52.0
Joint direct attack munition.	48.0
Maritime prepositioning ship-advance procurement	80.0
Base telecommunications upgrades	50.0
Improve & recovery vehicle	49.0
AH–1/UH–1 upgrades	27.0
Ammunition	75.0
Air Force:	
E–8C-advance procurement	46.0
B–2 upgrades	187.0
F–15 upgrades	50.0
F–16 upgrades	47.0
C–135 upgrades	68.0
Defense airborne reconnaissance program	40.0
Joint stand-off weapon	35.0
Minuteman III upgrades	40.0
AGM–65D Maverick upgrades	10.0
Joint direct attack munition	66.0
Ammunition	75.0
Theater deployable communications	35.0
Defense-Wide:	
National guard/reserve miscellaneous equipment	60.0

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION -- REQUEST --	FY 2000 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,229,888	185,323	1,415,211
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,358,104	57,855	1,415,959
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	1,416,765	158,331	1,575,096
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	1,140,816	55,400	1,196,216
OTHER PROCURMENT, ARMY	3,423,870	376,025	3,799,895
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY	1,169,000	(1,169,000)	-
TOTAL ARMY	**9,738,443**	**(336,066)**	**9,402,377**
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	8,228,655	575,396	8,804,051
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	1,357,400	407,255	1,764,655
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS	484,900	128,000	612,900
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	6,678,454	8,718	6,687,172
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	4,100,091	160,353	4,260,444
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	1,137,220	160,243	1,297,463
TOTAL NAVY	**21,986,720**	**1,439,965**	**23,426,685**
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	9,302,086	345,565	9,647,651
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	419,537	141,000	560,537
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	2,359,608	(55,947)	2,303,661
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	7,085,177	(7,415)	7,077,762
TOTAL AIR FORCE	**19,166,408**	**423,203**	**19,589,611**
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	2,128,967	(21,128)	2,107,839
NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT	-	60,000	60,000
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF-RDT&E	-	230,000	230,000
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF-PROC	-	232,000	232,000
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF-O&M	-	550,000	550,000
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	356,970	-	356,970
PROCUREMENT, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	2,100	-	2,100
DEFENSE EXPORT LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM	-	1,250	1,250
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT ACCOUNTS	**53,379,608**	**2,579,224**	**55,958,832**

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,229.9 million for Aircraft Procurement, Army in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $1,415.2 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIRCRAFT					-	
	FIXED WING					-	
001	ARL (TIARA)	-	-			-	-
002	UTILITY F/W (MR) AIRCRAFT	-	-			-	-
003	GUARDRAIL COMMON SENSOR/ACS (TIARA)	-	-			-	-
	ROTARY					-	-
004	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	8	86,140	3	26,717	11	112,857
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	16,700			-	16,700
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT		**102,840**		**26,717**		**129,557**
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
006	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)	-	18,863			-	18,863
007	ARL MODS	-	5,828			-	5,828
008	AH1F MODS	-	432			-	432
009	AH-64 MODS	-	22,565		10,000	-	32,565
010	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	-	70,738		56,100	-	126,838
011	CH-47 ICH	-	-			-	-
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
013	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	-	6,308		3,000	-	9,308
014	OH-58 MODS	-	468			-	468
015	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	-	761			-	761
016	LONGBOW	-	771,219		45,000	-	816,219
016	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(41,683)			-	(41,683)
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	35,702		4,900	-	40,602
018	UH-1 MODS	-	4,380			-	4,380

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
019	UH-60 MODS	-	12,087		10,500	-	22,587
020	KIOWA WARRIOR	-	39,046			-	39,046
021	EH-60 QUICKFIX MODS	-	4,915			-	4,915
022	AIRBORNE AVIONICS	-	43,690			-	43,690
023	ASE MODS (SIRFC)	-	11,796		11,500	-	23,296
024	ASE MODS (ATIRCM)	-	-			-	-
025	GATM	-	7,090			-	7,090
026	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M	-	2,586			-	2,586
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		**1,016,791**		**141,000**		**1,157,791**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
027	SPARE PARTS (AIR)	-	16,075			-	16,075
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**16,075**		**-**		**16,075**
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
028	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	-	88		18,100	-	18,188
029	ASE INFRARED CM	-	-			-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT						
030	AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL	-	-			-	-
031	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
032	TRAINING DEVICES	-	-			-	-
033	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	35,915			-	35,915
034	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	-	4,394			-	4,394
035	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	8,760			-	8,760

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
036	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	1,462			-	1,462
037	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS	-	43,563			-	43,563
	TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**94,182**		**18,100**		**112,282**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(494)		(494)
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**1,229,888**		**185,323**		**1,415,211**

Items of Special Interest

AH–64 modifications

The budget request contained $22.6 million for AH–64 modifications, but included no funds for an oil debris detection system (ODDS) or the continuation of the vibration management enhancement program (VMEP).

The ODDS is an on-board detection system that alerts aircrews to the presence of metal chips in engines and propeller gear boxes, allowing flights to be terminated prior to catastrophic failure of critical components. It also permits the clearing of smaller particles that routinely accumulate in engine oil and cause false impending engine failure alarms, resulting in unnecessary termination of aircraft missions and costly engine diagnostics.

The VMEP is an Army National Guard (ARNG) effort currently directed toward resolving vibration management problems on the ARNG's AH–64 Apache fleet, but the committee understands the technology is also applicable to the UH–60 Blackhawk, the CH–47 Chinook, and the OH–58D Kiowa Warrior. The committee continues to support the VMEP because of its belief that such on-board diagnostic capabilities contribute significantly to both aircrew safety and improved aircraft reliability.

Since the ODDS, which has been successfully integrated into many other Department of Defense aircraft, both reduces aircraft maintenance costs and enhances aircrew safety, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million to incorporate the ODDS on AH–64 Apaches. The committee also recommends an increase of $7.0 million to continue VMEP procurement for the ARNG Apache fleet and to transition this technology to other aircraft.

Aircraft survivability equipment (ASE)

The budget request contained $88,000 for ASE, but included no funds for the procurement of upgrades to the Aircraft Survivability Equipment Trainer (ASET) IV.

ASET IV is a ground-based, mobile aviation threat emitter simulation and training system which enables both fixed and rotary wing aviators to recognize surface-to-air-missile (SAM) and anti-aircraft artillery threats in order to employ the correct aircraft evasive maneuvers. ASET IV systems are currently fielded at major training centers throughout the United States and Germany and require that an aircraft have a fully operational ASE suite of sensors on board for training.

The Congress added $7.4 million in fiscal year 1998 and $6.4 million in fiscal year 1999 for ASET IV upgrades. However, additional validated requirements exist and several systems in their present configuration still lack the capability to simulate the most current infrared (IR) and radio frequency (RF) SAM threats, thereby limiting aircrew training against older threats-a situation which is not representative of the Army's "train as you fight" concept.

Consistent with past committee actions and based on the Army's requirement for forces to train in realistic threat environments, the committee recommends $18.2 million, an increase of $18.1 million for upgrading ASET IV systems with current IR and RF SAM threat simulators.

Aircraft survivability equipment (ASE) modifications

The budget request contained $11.8 million for the procurement of ASE modifications, but included no funds for AN/AVR–2A laser detecting sets (LDS).

The LDS is the only device in the Army inventory that provides warning to helicopter crews when they have been illuminated by a laser-targeted weapon. It detects, identifies, and characterizes threats 360–degrees-around and plus-or-minus 45 degrees above-and-below an aircraft. The committee is concerned with the growing laser threat to helicopter aircrews and notes the limited situational awareness that is currently provided by existing AN/AVR–2A technology. The committee understands that a quantum improvement to aircrew situational awareness is achievable by incorporating the precise laser azimuth and discrimination capabilities of the AN/VVR–1 ground LDS into the AN/AVR–2A aviation LDS.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to expeditiously establish an engineering change proposal (ECP) to integrate the precision laser azimuth and discrimination capabilities of the AN/VVR–1 into the AN/AVR–2A and recommends an increase of $11.5 million, which includes a $5.5 million increase for the ECP, and, $6.0 million to procure additional AN/AVR–2A LDS until the ECP is in production.

CH–47 cargo helicopter modifications

The budget request contained $70.7 million for procurement of CH–47 Chinook helicopter modifications.

The CH–47D, the Army's only heavy lift helicopter, is capable of lifting multiple types of cargo weighing up to 26,000 pounds or carrying 33 personnel. The committee understands that the average age of the CH–47 fleet is 31 years old, yet notes that the Army has delayed the start of a comprehensive CH–47 upgrade from fiscal year 1999 to fiscal year 2001. However, the committee also notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $56.1 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2000 to accelerate fielding of improved CH–47Ds in Korea by 30 months.

Therefore, based on the critical need to upgrade these helicopters, the committee recommends $126.8 million, an increase of $56.1 million for CH–47D modifications.

Longbow

The budget request contained $729.5 million to modify 74 AH–64A Apache helicopters to the AH–64D Apache Longbow configuration and $35.7 million in advance procurement to modify 60 aircraft in fiscal year 2001. The budget request did not include funds to upgrade Longbow sensor and avionics integrated circuits.

The AH–64D Apache Longbow, a day/night, all weather, heavy attack helicopter, is capable of engaging and destroying advanced, multiple threat armor targets on the future digital battlefield with minimum exposure time. The committee continues to support this upgrade. However, it notes that many of the aircraft sensors and avionics on the Longbow were not designed with an "open information architecture," and, as a result of the rapid rate of information technology advances driven by the commercial information technology market, military specification integrated circuits (IC) in

these avionics and sensors are no longer produced, resulting in processor obsolescence.

Consequently, replacement of ICs for these components will require redesign. The committee understands the cost of this redesign is estimated to be $45.0 million. Therefore, the committee recommends $45.0 million to replace obsolete Apache Longbow ICs.

The committee is concerned that the current plan for fiscal year 2001–the first year of a second five-year multiyear procurement (MYP) contract for this aircraft—only includes 60 airframe upgrades—a 12 aircraft reduction from previously approved plans. The committee understands that an additional $4.9 million in advance procurement is needed to restore the program to previously approved levels.

Therefore, the committee recommends $774.5 million, an increase of $45.0 million for obsolete IC replacement, and $40.6 million, an increase of $4.9 million for advance procurement for 12 additional aircraft modifications in fiscal year 2001. The committee also recommends approval of a second five-year MYP contract.

UH–60 Blackhawk

The budget request contained $86.1 million for procurement of eight UH–60L Blackhawk helicopters for the Army National Guard (ARNG), of which $283,000 was included for engines and accessories.

The UH–60 Blackhawk is the Army's primary utility helicopter in both the active and reserve components. The committee understands that a validated requirement for 83 additional ARNG Blackhawks remains unfilled and, therefore, consistent with past committee actions, recommends an increase of $27.0 million to accelerate fielding of 3 additional Blackhawks.

The committee is aware that the Army procured 28 additional Blackhawk engines in fiscal year 1998 and intends to use some of these engines for the helicopters to be procured in fiscal year 2000. Additionally, the Army provided no justification for accessory equipment. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $283,000. In total, the committee recommends $112.8 million for UH–60L Blackhawks.

UH–60 modifications

The budget request contained $12.1 million for UH–60 modifcations, but included no funds to procure either UH–60Q aeromedical evacuation (MEDEVAC) modification kits for the Army National Guard (ARNG) or a UH–60Q medical mockup training device.

The committee notes that new production UH–60Q MEDEVAC aircraft are not planned to be procured until fiscal year 2002; however, an interim capability exists through UH–60Q modification kits, which internally reconfigure UH–60A utility aircraft into MEDEVAC variants.

The committee also notes that while the Army plans to procure UH–60Q aircraft in the future, it has not included funds in the Future Years Defense Program for the one required UH–60Q medical mockup training device. This fully functional training device accurately replicates the interior of a UH–60Q MEDEVAC helicopter

and will provide flight medics a classroom-based, "hands-on," training capability, eliminating the current need to use dedicated aircraft on the ground for extended periods of time for this purpose.

Therefore, the committee recommends $22.6 million, an increase of $9.0 million to procure UH–60Q medical evacuation modification kits to reconfigure two ARNG UH–60A Blackhawk helicopters and an increase of $1.5 million to accelerate procurement of the UH–60Q medical mockup training device.

Utility/cargo airplane modifications

The budget request contained $6.3 million for avionics modifications to the C–12 utility aircraft.

The C–12 is the Army's primary short to medium range utility and personnel transport. The 62 aircraft in the service's inventory are located throughout the world, and the majority of them continue to operate with analog avionics technology that was current at the time they were procured in the 1970s and 1980s. Replacement of obsolete avionics with state-of-the-art communications, navigation, surveillance and flight management equipment will enable the aircraft to be more easily deployed around the world to meet emerging global requirements.

The committee is pleased that the Army has requested funds for these safety of flight upgrades but believes additional funds are required. Accordingly, and consistent with actions taken in past fiscal years, the committee recommends $9.3 million, an increase of $3.0 million to more efficiently procure C–12 avionics upgrades.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,358.1 million for Missile Procurement, Army in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $1,416.0 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	OTHER MISSILES						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
001	EFOG-M (ENHANCED FIBER OPTIC GUIDED MIS.)	-	-			-	-
002	AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	20	33,750		1,300	20	35,050
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
003	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	2,200	309,816			2,200	309,816
003	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(13,344)				(13,344)
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM						
005	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	2,682	307,677			2,682	307,677
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	98,406			-	98,406
007	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	-	-			-	-
008	MLRS ROCKET	-	3,338			-	3,338
009	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	47	130,634		55,500	47	186,134
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	15,993			-	15,993
011	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	110	95,619			110	95,619
012	ATACMS/BAT	61	76,787			61	76,787
013	BAT	846	149,254		(2,700)	846	146,554
014	MULTI PURPOSE INDV MUN	-	-			-	-
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
	TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		**1,207,930**		**54,100**		**1,262,030**
	MODIFICATIONS						
016	PATRIOT MODS	-	30,840			-	30,840
017	STINGER MODS	-	17,392			-	17,392

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
018	AVENGER MODS	-	-		4,300	-	4,300
019	ITAS/TOW MODS	-	68,306			-	68,306
020	MLRS MODS	-	6,654			-	6,654
	TOTAL MODIFICATIONS OF MISSILES		**123,192**		**4,300**		**127,492**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
021	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	19,002			-	19,002
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**19,002**		**-**		**19,002**
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
022	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	-	2,373			-	2,373
023	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)	-	989			-	989
024	MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION	-	1,397			-	1,397
025	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	-	3,221			-	3,221
	TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**7,980**		**-**		**7,980**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(545)		(545)
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**1,358,104**		**57,855**		**1,415,959**

Items of Special Interest

Avenger modifications

The budget request contained no funds to procure Avenger slew-to-cue (STC) modifications.

The STC upgrade enables the Avenger turret to automatically and rapidly slew in azimuth and elevation resulting in a 55 percent increase in target engagements. The committee understands that existing Army National Guard (ARNG) Avenger fire units require installation of a fire control computer with embedded STC capability to provide the most lethal and rapid force protection air defense capability.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.3 million to upgrade one ARNG Avenger battalion with STC-capable fire control computers.

Avenger system summary

The budget request contained $33.8 million to procure 15 Avengers for the Army National Guard (ARNG), of which $636,000 was for the installation of environmental control units/prime power units (ECU/PPU).

The Avenger, the Army's primary mobile, short-range, surface-to-air defense missile and antiaircraft artillery system, is mounted on and operates off the internal power of a High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle. The committee understands that some Avenger turrets do not have a climate control unit, resulting in either extremely high or low turret temperatures during hot and cold weather. The committee is aware of an ongoing ECU/PPU retrofit program, which provides stable turret temperatures as well as an independent power supply for the turret.

Based on the added benefits of these enhancements, the committee recommends $35.1 million, an increase of $1.3 million for additional ECU/PPU upgrades to ARNG Avengers.

Brilliant anti-armor (BAT) submunition

The budget request contained $149.3 million to procure 846 BAT submunitions, of which $5.0 million was included for test and evaluation.

The committee notes that the amount of funds requested for test and evaluation represents a 285 percent increase over the amount that was authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1999 for 420 submunitions. Additionally, the amount planned for this same requirement in fiscal year 2001 is only $2.3 million for a corresponding 1,028 missiles.

The committee is concerned with this unjustified, sharp increase in test and evaluation funds, and, therefore, recommends a decrease of $2.7 million.

Multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) launcher systems

The budget request contained $114.6 million for the procurement of 47 MLRS launcher systems for the active Army, but included no funds for the procurement of launcher systems for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The committee notes that the ARNG provides nearly 70 percent of the total Army's artillery fire support but further notes that an MLRS launcher shortfall continues to exist for ARNG units. However, the committee is aware that the Army Chief of Staff's fiscal year 2000 unfunded requirements list included MLRS launcher systems to fill ARNG MLRS battalion readiness shortfalls as a top priority.

Consistent with actions taken in past fiscal years, the committee recommends $170.1 million, an increase of $55.5 million for additional MLRS launcher systems for the ARNG.

WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,416.8 million for procurement of Army weapons and tracked combat vehicles for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $1,575.1 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD	-	2,640			-	2,640
002	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	-	308,762		72,000	-	380,762
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	27,675			-	27,675
004	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES	-	23,441			-	23,441
005	BREACHER TRAINING DEVICES	-	-			-	-
006	HAB TRAINING DEVICES	-	14,910			-	14,910
007	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)	-	4,334			-	4,334
008	FIELD ARTILLERY AMMUNITION SUPPORT VEH	-	-			-	-
009	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES	-	8,086			-	8,086
010	COMMAND & CONTROL VEHICLE	12	54,545			12	54,545
011	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	2,559			-	2,559
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
012	CARRIER, MOD	-	53,463		25,000	-	78,463
013	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	-	27,338			-	27,338
014	BFVS SERIES (MOD)	-	7,087			-	7,087
015	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	-	6,259			-	6,259
016	FAASV PIP TO FLEET	-	230			-	230
017	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	-	-			-	-
018	BREACHER SYSTEM (MOD)	-	19,680			-	19,680
019	HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)	-	67,312			-	67,312
019A	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-		14,000	-	14,000
020	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)	-	1,443			-	1,443
021	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	-	29,815			-	29,815
022	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	-	685,938			-	685,938
022	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(262,942)			-	(262,942)

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
023	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	213,406			-	213,406
024	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	192			-	192
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						-
025	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	138			-	138
026	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	-	8,924			-	8,924
	TOTAL TRACKED COMBAT VECHILES		**1,305,235**		**111,000**		**1,416,235**
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
027	ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	1,304	12,204		27,800	1,304	40,004
028	MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	-	-		10,100	-	10,100
029	GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	1,085	18,290		10,000	1,085	28,290
030	M16 RIFLE	12,479	5,744			12,479	5,744
031	XM107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	85	1,138			85	1,138
032	5.56 CARBINE M4	8,687	5,309			8,687	5,309
	TOTAL WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		**42,685**		**47,900**		**90,585**
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
033	MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS	-	1,980			-	1,980
034	M4 CARBINE MODS	-	5,315			-	5,315
035	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)	-	8,326			-	8,326
036	HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)	-	3,345			-	3,345
037	M119 MODIFICATIONS	-	4,784			-	4,784
038	M16 RIFLE MODS	-	7,180			-	7,180
039	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	1,006			-	1,006
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
040	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	1,206			-	1,206
041	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	-	4,566			-	4,566
042	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	3,084			-	3,084
043	SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	-	5,214			-	5,214
044	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		**46,006**		**-**		**46,006**
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES						
045	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	-	22,839			-	22,839
	TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		**22,839**		**-**		**22,839**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(569)		(569)
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		**1,416,765**		**158,331**		**1,575,096**

Items of Special Interest

Abrams upgrade program/heavy assault bridge (HAB)

The budget request contained $423.0 million to procure 120 M1A2 Abrams System Enhancement Program (SEP) tanks and $67.3 million to procure 13 HABs, but included no funds for HAB advance procurement.

The HAB is an 85–foot, military-load class bridge transported on a modified M1A2 SEP tank chassis. The system is capable of spanning up to 79–foot spaces, is deployable in five minutes, and can be retrieved in less than ten minutes—requirements that resulted from Army bridging system deficiencies identified during Operation Desert Storm.

The committee notes the Secretary of the Army's request for a second multiyear procurement (MYP) contract for the M1A2 SEP tank beginning in fiscal year 2001 and that an estimated $118.0 million in savings is expected from the MYP contract through fiscal year 2005. Due to the 80 percent commonality between HAB and M1A2 hardware, the committee also notes that an estimated $190.0 million in savings from fiscal year 2001 through fiscal year 2005 could be achieved from the efficiencies of a combined HAB and M1A2 MYP contract.

Based on these larger savings, the committee recommends a combined M1A2 SEP/HAB MYP contract. The committee also recommends an increase of $14.0 million to synchronize HAB advance procurement in fiscal year 2000 with M1A2 SEP tank advance procurement.

Bradley base sustainment

The budget request contained $281.1 million for the procurement of 104 Bradley A3 fighting vehicle upgrades, but included no funds for upgrading first-generation Bradley A0 fighting vehicles to the A2 Operation Desert Storm (ODS) variant for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The Bradley A2ODS variant improves the vehicle's lethality, survivability, and mobility, as well as the situational awareness of its crew. Modifications include installation of a laser range finder, Global Positioning System navigation capability, a combat identification system, a driver's thermal viewer and a missile countermeasure device.

When the Army completes all of its planned upgrades to the Bradley, the active fleet will include a mix of the most advanced A3 variant, along with A2 and A2ODS versions. The majority of the ARNG's Bradley fleet, on the other hand, will remain unmodified and be comprised mainly of first-generation A0 vehicles, which, because of major survivability deficiencies, were not used in the Persian Gulf War. However, as part of the new ARNG enhanced brigades, the committee notes that some of these A0 vehicles will be required to deploy with active Army forces.

Because ARNG enhanced brigades will comprise an increasing percentage of the Army's warfighting capability as a result of active force reductions, and consistent with actions taken in past fiscal years, the committee recommends $353.1 million, an increase of

$72.0 million for modifying Bradley "A0" vehicles to the A2ODS variant for the ARNG.

M113 carrier modifications

The budget request contained $53.5 million for 198 M113A3 carrier modifications.

The M113A3 upgrade program, forecast to add an additional 20 years of service life to the vehicle, includes installation of a new engine, transmission, external fuel tanks, driver controls, and kevlar spall liners. The committee is aware that M113A3 upgrades are one of the Army Chief of Staff's fiscal year 2000 top unfunded priorities.

Therefore, consistent with actions taken in past fiscal years, the committee recommends $78.5 million, an increase of $25.0 million for additional M113A3 upgrade kits.

M240 series medium machine gun

The budget request contained $12.2 million for the procurement of 1,304 M240 series medium machine guns.

The M240B is the infantry version of the vehicle-mounted M240 machine gun and replaces the older M60 series machine gun in light and mechanized infantry and combat engineer units. The committee notes that the Army has a validated requirement for over 6,000 M240Bs to upgrade its current inventory of 7.62mm machine guns.

Therefore, consistent with actions taken in past fiscal years, the committee recommends $40.0 million, an increase of $27.8 million to accelerate the fielding of M240B medium machine guns.

M249 squad automatic weapon (SAW)

The budget request contained no funds for the procurement of M249 SAW machine guns.

The M249 SAW is a lightweight weapon capable of delivering a sustained volume of automatic, accurate, and highly lethal fire up to ranges of 800 meters. This highly mobile machine gun is being widely fielded throughout the Army to airborne, light and mechanized infantry, as well as air cavalry units. The committee is concerned that the Army has eliminated funds for this weapon throughout the Future Years Defense Program, yet an unfunded requirement for nearly 8,000 SAWs exists. Therefore, the committee recommends $10.1 million to continue procurement of M249 SAWs to reduce this shortfall.

MK19–3 grenade launcher

The budget request contained $18.3 million to procure 1,085 MK19–3 grenade launchers.

The MK19–3 is a 40 millimeter automatic grenade launcher capable of engaging point targets up to 1,500 meters and providing suppressive fire up to 2,200 meters in range. This infantry weapon can also be mounted on armored vehicles and High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles.

The committee notes that the Army has an unfulfilled requirement of over 3,600 MK19–3s and that there are critical shortages of this weapon in European-, Republic of Korea-, and continental

United States-based units. The committee also notes this weapon's increased importance in military operations in urban terrain (MOUT) and close combat operations.

Because of the MK19–3's critical shortages and the fact that United States military forces are increasingly being deployed into MOUT and potential close combat situations, the committee recommends $28.3 million, an increase of $10.0 million to accelerate procurement of MK19–3 grenade launchers.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,140.8 million for Ammunition Procurement, Army in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $1,196.2 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	AMMUNITION						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	-	127,087			-	127,087
002	CTG 5.56MM ARMOR PIERCING M995	-	1,891			-	1,891
003	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	-	8,529			-	8,529
004	CTG 7.62MM ARMOR PIERCING XM993	600	1,355			600	1,355
005	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES	-	983			-	983
006	CTG, .45 CAL, ALL TYPES	-	-			-	-
007	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	-	23,374			-	23,374
008	CTG CAL .50 API MK211 MOD 0	-	-			-	-
009	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,764			-	2,764
010	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	-	46,618		2,000	-	48,618
011	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	-	5,353			-	5,353
012	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	-	36,645		8,000	-	44,645
013	NONLETHAL WEAPONS CAPABILITY SET	-	7,989			-	7,989
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						-
014	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	-	15,616			-	15,616
015	CTG 81MM INFRARED (IR) ILLUM XM816	-	-			-	-
016	CTG MORTAR 81MM PRAC 1/10 RANGE M880	30	1,906			30	1,906
017	REFURBISHMENT KIT F/81MM PRAC M880	-	-			-	-
018	CTG MORTAR 120MM FULL RANGE PRACTICE M931	-	-			-	-
019	CTG MORTAR 120MM HE M934 W/MO FUZE	60	46,279			60	46,279
020	CTG MORTAR 120MM ILLUM XM930 W/MTSQ FZ	-	-		5,000	-	5,000
021	CTG 120MM WP SMOKE M929A1	56	51,819		5,000	56	56,819
	TANK AMMUNITION						
022	CTG 120MM APFSDS-T M829A2/M829E3	-	-			-	-
023	CTG 120MM HEAT-MP-T M830A1	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
024	CTG TANK 120MM TP-T M831/M831A1	57	32,623			57	32,623
025	CTG TANK 120MM TPCSDS-T M865	165	86,027			165	86,027
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
026	CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1	68	2,570			68	2,570
027	CTG ARTY 105MM BLANK M395	125	6,774			125	6,774
028	CTG ARTY 105MM DPICM XM915	-	-		5,000	-	5,000
029	CTG ARTY 105MM HERA M913	-	-			-	-
030	CTG ARY 105MM M927	-	-			-	-
031	CTG ARTY 105MM ILLUM M314 SERIES	14	8,000			14	8,000
032	PROJ ARTY 155MM SMOKE WP M825	-	14,789			-	14,789
033	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M795	20	9,860			20	9,860
034	PROJ ARTY 155MM SADARM M898	227	54,546			227	54,546
035	REMOTE AREA DENIAL ARTILLERY MUNITION (RADA	100	48,250			100	48,250
036	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M107	113	24,973			113	24,973
037	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS)	367	42,938			367	42,938
	ARTILLERY FUZES						
038	FUZE ARTY ELEC TIME M767	235	32,041			235	32,041
039	FUZE MULTI OPTION	45	14,061			45	14,061
	MINES						
040	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES	251	8,067			251	8,067
041	MINE AT M87 (VOLCANO)	-	-		10,000	-	10,000
042	WIDE AREA MUNITIONS	79	10,387			79	10,387
	ROCKETS						
043	BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)	-	-		10,000	-	10,000
044	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	245	144,760			245	144,760
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
045	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	11,246			-	11,246
046	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	11,431		5,000	-	16,431

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
047	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	-	9,782			-	9,782
048	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	-	2,265			-	2,265
	MISCELLANEOUS						
049	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	-	6,876			-	6,876
050	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	-	2,928			-	2,928
051	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	7,659			-	7,659
052	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	-	10,679			-	10,679
053	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	-	5,303			-	5,303
054	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL AMMUNITION		**987,043**		**50,000**		**1,037,043**
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
055	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	46,139		5,400	-	51,539
056	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	3,525			-	3,525
057	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	-	13,043			-	13,043
058	CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	-	86,291			-	86,291
059	ARMS INITIATIVE	-	4,775			-	4,775
	TOTAL AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		**153,773**		**5,400**		**159,173**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**1,140,816**		**55,400**		**1,196,216**

Items of Special Interest

Ammunition

The budget request contained $987.0 million for procurement of ammunition. The committee recommends $1,037.0 million, an increase of $50.0 million for the following types of ammunition, which include top unfunded priorities of the Chief of Staff of the Army for fiscal year 2000:

[In millions of dollars]

Small/Medium Cal Ammunition:	
CTG 25mm All Types	2.0
CTG 40mm All Types	8.0
Mortar Ammunition:	
CTG 120mm Illum XM930 w/MTSQ FZ	5.0
CTG 120mm WP Smoke M929A1	5.0
Artillery Ammunition:	
CTG Arty 105mm DPICM XM915	5.0
Mines:	
Mine, Antitank (Volcano)	10.0
Rockets:	
Bunker Defeating Munition	10.0
Grenade, All Types:	
Smoke Screening, XM 90	5.0

Hydra 70 rockets

The budget request contained $144.8 million for Hydra 70 rockets.

The committee acknowledges the Army's actions to identify and eliminate the problem of early motor blows (EMB) experienced by the Hydra 70 from 1992 to 1995. The committee asked the General Accounting Office to conduct a review of the service's ongoing inspection program and was generally pleased with the information it received. However, the committee understands that because some of the Army's Hydra 70 rockets are prepositioned on ships and in-theater, they will not be accessible for inspection before the current inspection contract expires in November 1999. Given the potential threat EMBs pose to aircraft and crew, the committee urges the Army to extend this contract and make every reasonable effort to inspect the entire inventory of Hydra 70 rockets that could experience this problem.

Provision of industrial facilities

The budget request contained $46.1 million for Army ammunition plant (AAP) future project design, obsolete production line equipment replacement, and environmental deficiencies and infrastructure corrections, of which $9.1 million was for production line and facility upgrades to Iowa AAP. However, the budget request did not include non-recurring engineering costs for the 120 millimeter (mm) tank ammunition load, assemble, and pack (LAP) production line enhancements at this plant.

The committee is aware of the Army's future plans to improve the Iowa AAP production line, resulting in increased efficiency, safety, and reliability, as well as production line output. However, based on the implementation timeline of these plans, an estimated $4.7 million in annual savings is not expected to accrue until fiscal year 2004.

The committee understands that a $5.4 million increase in nonrecurring engineering for the LAP production line will accelerate these enhancements. Therefore, the committee recommends $51.5 million, an increase of $5.4 million for this purpose.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $3,423.9 million for Other Procurement, Army in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $3,799.9 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	632	15,277			632	15,277
002	SEMITRAILER FB BB/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T	208	7,108			208	7,108
003	SEMITRAILER LB 40T M870A1 (CCE)	24	1,926			24	1,926
004	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	285	25,365			285	25,365
005	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 7500G, BULKHAUL	63	4,124			63	4,124
006	SEMITRAILER VAN CGO SUPPLY 12T 4WHL M129A2C	70	6,260			70	6,260
007	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	867	92,092			867	92,092
008	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	-	13,076			-	13,076
009	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	2,179	425,855			2,179	425,855
010	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPM	-	7,374			-	7,374
011	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	450	190,399		6,000	450	196,399
012	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	12	7,043			12	7,043
013	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	344	50,131			344	50,131
014	TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)	24	1,960			24	1,960
015	HVY EXPANDED MOBILITY TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SE	23	4,901			23	4,901
016	MEDIUM TRUCK EXTENDED SVC PGM(ESP) (PREV SL	-	-			-	-
017	LINE HAUL ESP	115	9,256			115	9,256
018	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM	-	-			-	-
019	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	-	29,769			-	29,769
020	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)	-	1,558			-	1,558
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
021	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	3	588			3	588
022	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	36	846			36	846
023	GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	998		12,000	-	12,998
024	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	1,034			-	1,034

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
025	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT PEO	-	-			-	-
026	PROJECT MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	-	-			-	-
027	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (TACOM)	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES		**896,940**		**18,000**		**914,940**
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
028	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM	-	7,568			-	7,568
029	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	-	5,119			-	5,119
	COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
030	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SP	-	68,489			-	68,489
031	SHF TERM	16	31,950			16	31,950
032	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	-	1,547			-	1,547
033	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	-	6,557			-	6,557
034	GROUND COMMAND POST	-	-			-	-
035	SMART-T (SPACE)	-	61,761			-	61,761
036	SCAMP (SPACE)	-	5,033			-	5,033
037	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS	40	10,920			40	10,920
038	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	-	500			-	500
	COMM - C3 SYSTEM						
039	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	-	12,963			-	12,963
	COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
040	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	-	38,763		25,900	-	64,663
041	SINCGARS FAMILY	-	13,205		47,200	-	60,405
042	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS	-	980			-	980
043	ACUS MOD PROGRAM (WIN T/T)	-	109,056		900	-	109,956

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
044	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING	-	4,151			-	4,151
045	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONIC	-	3,326			-	3,326
045A	PRODUCT IMPROVED COMBAT VEHICLE CREWMAN HEADSET	-	-		15,000		15,000
046	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)	-	-			-	-
047	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	-	20,600			-	20,600
	COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM						
048	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	-	1,585			-	1,585
	INFORMATION SECUTITY						
049	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	-	11,038			-	11,038
050	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	-	28,750		3,000	-	31,750
	COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
051	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	-	2,029			-	2,029
052	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	-	1,836			-	1,836
053	ARMY DISN ROUTER	-	3,700			-	3,700
054	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)	-	440			-	440
055	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	-	2,891			-	2,891
	COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
056	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	-	56,915			-	56,915
057	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	18,454			-	18,454
058	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)	-	100,018			-	100,018
059	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	-	17,256			-	17,256
	ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)						
060	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	-	1,846			-	1,846
061	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	-	18,345			-	18,345
062	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (INTEL SPT) - TIARA	-	-			-	-
	ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
063	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	-	56,514			-	56,514
064	JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)	155	24,262			155	24,262

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
065	IEW - GND BASE COMMON SENSORS (TIARA)	-	-			-	-
066	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (TUAV)	-	45,863			-	45,863
066A	HUNTER UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		-		9,000	-	9,000
067	JOINT STARS (ARMY) (TIARA)	12	82,176		30,000	12	112,176
068	INTEGRATED BROADCAST TERMINAL MODS (TIARA)	-	-			-	-
069	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	36	24,500			36	24,500
070	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)	-	-			-	-
071	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NAT CAPABILITIES	-	4,370			-	4,370
072	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM (CIGSS	-	2,791			-	2,791
073	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION MODS (JTAGS)	-	-			-	-
074	TROJAN (TIARA)	-	4,268			-	4,268
075	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	-	9,090			-	9,090
076	CI HUMINT AUTOMATED TOOL SET (CHATS) (TIARA	-	3,137			-	3,137
077	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TIARA)	-	530			-	530
	ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
078	SHORTSTOP	-	-		40,000	-	40,000
079	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURE	-	1,691			-	1,691
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
080	FAAD GBS	11	38,379			11	38,379
081	SENTINEL MODS	-	-			-	-
082	TARGET LOCATION OBSERVATION SYSTEM (TLOS)	-	-			-	-
083	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	9,448	20,977		33,000	9,448	53,977
084	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYST	66	43,223			66	43,223
085	LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)	145	3,436		2,500	145	5,936
086	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	3,330	35,901			3,330	35,901
087	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT	275	9,486			275	9,486
088	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	-	4,283		3,000	-	7,283
089	PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SETTER (P	3,492	4,137			3,492	4,137

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
090	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)	-	6,533		5,000	-	11,533
091	DIGITIZATION APPLIQUE	-	66,423			-	66,423
092	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (L	14	6,262			14	6,262
093	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR M-30	-	2,852			-	2,852
094	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	15	3,740			15	3,740
095	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA	-	5,469			-	5,469
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
096	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	-	28,098			-	28,098
097	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS (AFATDS)	456	43,343			456	43,343
098	FIRE SUPPORT ADA CONVERSION	-	980			-	980
099	CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)	270	19,922			270	19,922
100	FAAD C2	2	10,594			2	10,594
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
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			-	30,700
	ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION						
113	ARMY TRAINING XXI MODERNIZATION	-	15,361			-	15,361
114	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	138,607		15,200	-	153,807
115	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	-	83,040			-	83,040

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	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
	TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		**1,703,765**		**229,700**		**1,933,465**
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
119	SMOKE/OBSCURANT SYSTEMS ROLL	-	6,286		16,000	-	22,286
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
124	RIBBON BRIDGE	65	12,077		13,500	65	25,577
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
125	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-H	-	-			-	-
126	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING	-	3,972		20,000	-	23,972
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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
134	LARGE CAPACITY FIELD HEATER, 400K BTU	20	1,312			20	1,312
135	AIR CONDITIONERS	-	3,756			-	3,756
136	FIRETRUCKS	-	-			-	-
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			197	2,128
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
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		15,000	-	40,250
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
157	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	135	7,811			135	7,811

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
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						
161	CONCRETE MOBILE MIXER MODOULE, 8 CUBIC YARD	19	2,170			19	2,170
162	ENGINEERING MISSION MODULES	-	-			-	-
163	BITUMINOUS DISTRIBUTOR MODULE, 2800 GAL.	12	1,086			12	1,086
164	ROLLER, VIBRATORY, SELF-PROPELLED (CCE)	-	-		10,300	-	10,300
165	COMPACTOR, HIGH SPEED	67	9,798		2,600	67	12,398
166	LOADER, SCOOP TYPE, 4-5 CU YD (CCE)	27	7,737			27	7,737
167	DUMP MODULE, 12 CUBIC YARD	63	2,241			63	2,241
168	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	34	8,300			34	8,300
169	DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS	43	16,650			43	16,650
170	CRANE SHOVEL CRAWLER MTD, 20-40 TON W/ATTAC	5	3,865			5	3,865
171	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	-	-			-	-
172	CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH	4	7,359			4	7,359
173	CRANE, WHEEL MTD, 25T, 3/4 CU YD, RT	47	12,089		8,000	47	20,089
174	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CONST EQUIP)	-	4,286		2,000	-	6,286
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT						
175	PUSHER TUG, SMALL	-	-		9,000	-	9,000
176	FLOATING CRANE, 100-250 TON	-	-			-	-
177	LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)	1	18,924			1	18,924
178	LOGISTICS SUPPORT VESSEL (ESP)	-	-			-	-
179	CONTAINERIZED MAINTENANCE FACILITY	-	-			-	-
180	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS	-	16,740			-	16,740
181	RAILWAY CAR, FLAT, 89 FOOT	-	4,951			-	4,951
182	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	-	6,837			-	6,837
	GENERATORS						

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
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
203	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM-150KW	-	-			-	-
204	DISE 60 AMP	-	-			-	-
205	DISE/RECEPTACLE	-	-			-	-
206	DISE 100 AMP	-	-			-	-
207	FEEDER SYS ELEC 200 AMP	-	-			-	-
208	KIT ELEC UTIL RECEP AND LIGHTING	-	-			-	-
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
209	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, DE, PT, RT, 50000 LB	-	-			-	-

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
210	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	215	23,569			215	23,569
211	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER CRANE	22	10,930			22	10,930
212	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MHE)	-	1,763			-	1,763
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
213	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	-	2,450			-	2,450
214	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	-	67,374		13,300	-	80,674
215	SIMNET/CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	-	75,367			-	75,367
216	FIRE SUPPORT COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	-	24,518			-	24,518
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)						
217	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	-	11,407			-	11,407
218	ELECTRONIC REPAIR SHELTER	-	10,462			-	10,462
219	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	-	41,602		10,000	-	51,602
220	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	-	14,257			-	14,257
221	ARMY DIAGNOSTICS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (ADIP)	-	5,194			-	5,194
	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		10,000	-	34,852
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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
232	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
233	ACQUISITION STABILITY RESERVE	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**778,950**		**129,700**		**908,650**
	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
	TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		**44,215**		**-**		**44,215**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(1,375)		(1,375)
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**3,423,870**		**376,025**		**3,799,895**

Items of Special Interest

Area common user system (ACUS) modification program

The budget request contained $109.1 million for the ACUS modification program in order to support its migration to the Warfighter Information Network (WIN) systems architecture, but included no funds for the procurement of high speed multiplexers (HSMUX) for Army National Guard (ARNG) signal brigades.

The WIN architecture will seamlessly link the Army's diverse information systems on the 21st century digitized battlefield. HSMUX will provide increased bandwidth to the WIN in response to the growing demand for video and data in the battlefield tactical communications environment. As part of the echelon above and below corps force support packages, ARNG signal brigades will be required to deploy with these early entry units; however, they will not be able to provide state-of-the-art video and data communications support without HSMUX upgrades.

The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified the ACUS modification program as a fiscal year 2000 top unfunded priority. In response to this requirement, the committee recommends $110.0 million, an increase of $900,000 to procure and field HSMUX upgrades to ARNG signal brigades.

Army data distribution system (ADDS)

The budget request contained $38.8 million to procure 1,280 Enhanced Position Location Reporting System (EPLRS) radios, but included no funds for the procurement of EPLRS for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The EPLRS radio is the Army's and Marine Corps' primary position location reporting system, providing battlefield commanders combat information on the position of their forces in addition to supporting the majority of the services' data communications requirements for brigade and below tactical command and control. The system provides secure, jam-resistant, near-real-time communications and is essential to support tactical operations on the battlefield.

The committee notes that procurement and fielding of additional EPLRS is on both the Army Chief of Staff's and Commandant of the Marine Corps' fiscal year 2000 unfunded priorities lists. The committee also notes that ARNG enhanced brigades must have the necessary data communications capabilities to operate alongside active Army units.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $64.7 million, an increase of $25.9 million for the procurement of EPLRS for ARNG enhanced brigades. The committee also recommends $103.2 million, an increase of $20.3 million to procure of EPLRS for the Marine Corps.

Artillery accuracy equipment

The budget request contained $4.3 million to procure the Artillery Muzzle Velocity System, but included no funds to procure the Meteorological Measuring System (MMS). The MMS provides data to field artillery units that improves firing accuracy. The committee is encouraged that the Army plans to procure 14 MMSs for the

Army National Guard (ARNG) in fiscal year 2001, however, it recognizes that accelerated fielding of MMS to the ARNG would benefit total Army mission requirements since the ARNG provides nearly 70 percent of the total Army's artillery fire support.

Therefore, the committee recommends $7.3 million for artillery accuracy equipment, an increase of $3.0 million to accelerate procurement of the MMS for the ARNG.

Automated data processing equipment (ADPE)

The budget request contained $138.6 million for procurement of ADPE, of which $38.9 million was included for the procurement of Major Army Command (MACOM) automation systems and $4.2 million was for automatic identification technology (AIT).

The committee notes a 27 percent increase in the amount requested for MACOM automation systems over the amount authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1999 and believes this growth to be excessive. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.5 million for production of these systems.

AIT devices, which consist of various radio frequency (RF), bar code scanning, and data carrier devices, are used as components of automated logistics systems, contributing to expedited receiving, storage, distribution, and inventory management of new and repairable items. For example, the committee understands that RF tagging devices are currently used in a pilot program implemented at six locations worldwide in fiscal year 1998 to track ammunition from point of origin to place of destination. The committee understands that these devices are also used to automate manufacturing process controls for aircraft repair parts and to track ground support equipment at various military depots.

The committee is impressed with the promising results achieved to date with RF tagging devices and believes that substantial savings can be achieved from further implementation of these devices in automated inventory and repair processes. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $11.0 million for ammunition AIT integration efforts and $8.7 million for maintenance AIT implementation. In total, the committee recommends $153.8 million for ADPE.

Combat support medical

The budget request contained $25.3 million for the procurement of deployable medical systems and field medical equipment, but included no funds for the procurement of the advanced surgical suite for trauma casualties (ASSTC) for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The ASSTC is a lightweight, highly mobile, self-contained medical facility for on-scene triage, minor surgery, diagnostic and preventive medical treatment, which can also be used for life-saving, resuscitative surgery for 20 casualties. It is capable of operating independently for up to 48 hours in support of contingency operations and disaster relief.

Based on the ARNG's evolving role as "first responders" to weapons of mass destruction and domestic terrorist incidents, and its requirement to deploy in response to natural disasters, the committee

recommends $40.3 million, an increase of $15.0 million for the procurement of ASSTCs for the ARNG.

Family of heavy tactical vehicles

The budget request contained $190.4 million to procure palletized load systems and related equipment, heavy expanded transporter system trucks, and heavy repair vehicles, of which $36.8 million was for 119 M984 heavy expanded mobility tactical truck (HEMTT) wreckers. However, no HEMTT wreckers were requested for the Army Reserve (AR). The HEMTT wrecker is a 10–ton, diesel-powered, eight-wheel drive vehicle designed to retrieve other heavy wheeled combat and support vehicles.

The committee notes that the AR's evolving combat support and combat service support mission requirements necessitate the need for HEMTT wreckers.

Therefore, the committee recommends $196.4 million, an increase of $6.0 million for 21 HEMTT wreckers for the AR.

General purpose vehicles

The budget request contained $1.0 million for the procurement of general purpose vehicles, but included no funds for the procurement of Military (M) Gators.

The M Gator is a low cost, air-deployable, multipurpose vehicle designed for transport of logistics equipment and personnel on the battlefield and in urban terrain. The committee understands that the XVIII Airborne Corps has submitted an urgent operational needs statement for procurement of 600 M Gators to the Chief of Staff of the Army and that an operational requirements document is currently being staffed. The committee also understands that this vehicle has been extensively tested and used by both the Army and Special Operations Command in Bosnia and in the Middle East.

Therefore, to fill the XVIII Airborne Corps' urgent operational needs, the committee recommends $13.0 million, an increase of $12.0 for M Gators.

High speed compactor

The budget request contained $9.8 million to procure 67 815F high-speed compactors. The 815F high-speed compactor is a commercially produced, self-propelled, diesel powered, tamping machine used to build roads, airfields, and dams. The committee notes that the amount in this budget request would enable the service to reach 199 of its 212 vehicle acquisition objective but that the remaining vehicles are not planned to be procured until fiscal year 2005.

The committee believes that meeting the acquisition objective should be accelerated and, therefore, recommends $12.4 million, an increase of $2.6 million for this purpose.

Hunter unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV)

The budget request contained no funds for the procurement of upgrades for the Hunter UAV.

The Hunter UAV is the Army's only operational UAV system and is used to develop corps-, division-, and brigade-level tactics, tech-

niques, and procedures, and is also available for worldwide contingency operations. It is currently deployed to the Balkans as part of Operation Allied Force supporting North Atlantic Treaty Organization operations.

The committee understands that the fielded Hunter systems have only partially received hardware and software upgrades which improve their operational effectiveness and reduce operations and support costs. Additional Hunter systems being readied for fielding and those in storage have not been similarly upgraded.

The committee believes that the Hunter UAV system will play a major role in tactics development and the enhancement of battlefield commander's tactical awareness until the follow-on Tactical UAV is fielded.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million to provide these upgrades to the Hunter UAV inventory.

Information system security program (ISSP)

The budget request contained a total of $28.8 million, $64.1 million, and $13.3 million to procure secure voice and data terminal equipment for the Army, Navy, and Air Force respectively.

The committee understands that the services are replacing older secure voice and data systems with newer multi-media secure digital communications equipment and that the systems available today provide significant operations and maintenance savings over legacy systems.

Therefore, in order to accelerate the replacement of obsolete secure voice and data terminals, the committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million to procure additional secure terminal equipment: $3.0 million for the Army ISSP, $3.0 million for the Navy ISSP, and $3.0 million for the Air Force command, control, and communications countermeasures program.

Integrated family of test equipment (IFTE)

The budget request contained $41.6 million to procure IFTE, including $12.7 million for 4 IFTE electro-optic test facilities (EOTF).

The EOTF provides automatic electro-optics (EO) test and diagnostic support and is capable of satisfying the full range of Army EO test requirements. These facilities will replace existing electronic equipment repair facilities and the committee understands that they will initially support the OH–58D Kiowa Warrior and the Improve Target Acquisition System (ITAS).

The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff identified a fiscal year 2000 unfunded priority for additional EOTFs. Accordingly, the committee recommends $51.6 million, an increase of $10.0 million to procure additional EOTFs for Kiowa Warrior and ITAS support.

Items less than $2.0 million (construction equipment)

The budget request contained $4.3 million to procure various construction equipment items less than $2.0 million, but included no funds to procure ultimate building machines. The ultimate building machine system is a highly mobile steel fabrication mechanism which can be rapidly set up to construct complex steel structures in support of field operations and interim shelter requirements.

The committee notes that each of the services has had additional requirements placed on its engineer support and construction units as a result of increased deployments for contingency, humanitarian assistance, and disaster relief operations. The committee recognizes the benefits that easily and rapidly constructed shelters contribute to these types of operations.

Therefore, the committee recommends $6.3 million, an increase of $2.0 million to procure ultimate building machines for the Army and the Army National Guard. The committee also recommends an increase of $1.0 million each for procurement of these machines by the Navy, Marine Corps, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve.

Joint surveillance target attack radar system (Joint STARS) common ground station (CGS)

The budget request contained $82.2 million to procure 12 Joint STARS CGSs, of which $6.0 million was included for pre-planned product improvements (P3I).

The Joint STARS CGS improves ground commanders' battlefield command and control capability by integrating into a single station the processing of signals, imagery, and other intelligence received through a data link from the Air Force's E–8 Joint STARS aircraft radar. The system detects, locates, tracks, and classifies both moving and stationary targets beyond the forward line of troops. The P3I program provides the Joint STARS an expanded capability to interface with additional airborne intelligence assets while incorporating joint message processing and information security upgrades.

The committee is aware of the proven success of the CGS and believes the P3I upgrades will greatly enhance the ground commanders' situational awareness. Therefore, the committee recommends $112.2 million for Joint STARS CGS, an increase of $30.0 million for these upgrades.

Lightweight video reconnaissance system (LVRS)

The budget request contained $3.4 million to procure 145 LVRSs.

The LVRS consists of a small, ruggedized, open architecture processor and generation III image intensification night vision-capable video camera/recorder. The system allows special operations forces (SOF) and light force scout and reconnaissance units to photograph, record, and transmit near real-time video images over Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio Systems from forward deployed field positions back to tactical operations centers. It facilitates rapid target identification and analysis critical to mission planning and execution on the digitized battlefield and in urban environments. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff identified a $2.5 million unfunded requirement for fiscal year 2000 to procure an additional 268 LVRSs for SOF and light forces.

Therefore, the committee recommends $5.9 million, an increase of $2.5 million to procure 268 additional LVRSs.

M56 smoke generator system

The budget request contained $6.3 million for the procurement of 14 M56 smoke generator systems.

The M56 smoke generator system, the primary battlefield obscurant for Army light forces, is a High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle-mounted system capable of disseminating smoke in both stationary positions and on the move. The M56 can defeat enemy sensors such as tank thermal sights as well as smart and guided munitions which operate in the visual through far infrared portions of the electromagnetic spectrum.

The committee understands that the M56 has been designated as an essential item of equipment for early entry forces. The committee further understands that while the Army's force package one units have a requirement of 300 of these smoke generators, only 25 have been funded in fiscal years 2000 and 2001. Therefore, the committee recommends $22.3 million, an increase of $16.0 million for additional M56 smoke generator systems.

Modification of in-service equipment

The budget request contained $24.9 million for upgrades to various marine vessels and onboard equipment, construction, and logistic vehicles, but included no funds to conduct an Army National Guard (ARNG) D–7 dozer service life extension program (SLEP).

The committee understands that the majority of the currently fielded ARNG D–7 dozers have an average fleet age of 27 years, well beyond their intended 15 year service lives and that there are no plans to replace the D–7s. The committee notes that a reserve component D–7 dozer limited rebuild program was initiated in fiscal year 1995, but that a more extensive SLEP which would extend the D–7 service life and eliminate its "unsatisfactory" readiness rating is not contemplated in the Future Years Defense Program. This, despite the greater demand placed on overage D–7 dozers by increased "operations-other-than-war" deployments.

Therefore, the committee recommends $34.9 million, an increase of $10.0 million for an ARNG D–7 dozer SLEP.

Modification of in-service equipment (tactical surveillance)

The budget request contained $6.5 million to procure fire support digitization hardware and software upgrades for the AN/TPQ–36 and AN/TPQ–37 Firefinder radars, but included no funds to procure additional AN/TPQ–36 radars.

The AN/TPQ–36 is a High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle-mounted, phased-array, X-band radar, which locates mortars and short-range rocket launchers. The system transmits near-real time target data to friendly artillery elements enabling these units to rapidly engage the targeted mortars and rocket launchers with counterfire.

The committee notes that the Army does not plan to resume procurement of AN/TPQ–36 Firefinder radars until fiscal year 2002 and is concerned both with this two-year break in production and the force protection implications related to it.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $11.5 million, an increase of $5.0 million to continue procurement of AN/TPQ–36 Firefinder radars.

Night vision devices

The budget request contained $21.0 million for the procurement of night vision devices, of which $19.0 million was included for 4,550 AN/PVS–7D night vision goggles, but included no funds for the procurement of generation III 25 millimeter (mm) image intensification tubes.

The AN/PVS–7D night vision goggle is a head- or helmet-mounted, third-generation, image intensifying, device used by soldiers for nighttime operations. The committee notes that the Army acquisition objective for this device has increased by 100,000 units since fiscal year 1998 to 381,000; however, at the end of fiscal year 1999 only 194,409 units will have been procured. The committee also notes that the "Own the Night" concept—the Army's strategy of fighting, dominating and winning battles during nighttime operations—remains as one of the Army Chief of Staff's top priorities.

The committee is aware of the joint Army/Navy/Marine Corps program to procure generation III 25mm image intensification tubes as replacements for less capable generation II tubes fielded in the AN/PVS–4 and AN/TVS–5 night vision goggles and notes that the generation III tubes provide a minimum 25 percent resolution increase.

The committee is aware that the Army Chief of Staff has identified several fiscal year 2000 unfunded requirements, two of which are, $8.0 million for AN/PVS–7D night vision goggles and $25.0 million for generation III 25mm image intensification tubes.

Based on existing shortfalls, the enhanced operational capability that night vision devices provide to combat forces, and the committee's belief that these devices will provide a pivotal "force multiplier" in future Army deployments, the committee recommends $8.0 million for AN/PVS–7D night vision goggles and $25.0 million for generation III 25mm image intensification tubes, for a total increase of $33.0million for these devices.

Nonsystems training devices

The budget request contained $67.4 million to procure nonsystem training devices, but included no funds to procure the area weapons scoring system (AWSS), improved moving target simulator (IMTS) upgrades, or the deployable force-on-force instrumented range system (DFIRST).

The AWSS is an electronic aerial gunnery scoring system used to accurately score helicopter units in day/night, live fire air-to-ground gunnery training. The committee notes that this type of training is directly related to the readiness of attack helicopter aircrews, especially for short-notice combat operations such as Operation Allied Force. The committee understands that the Army procured three AWSSs in fiscal year 1991, however, these systems are capable of supporting only 40 percent of the total Army's training requirement. The committee further understands that a validated requirement for three additional systems has existed since fiscal year 1995, yet none of these has been procured.

The 360 degree, high-resolution IMTS is an Army and Marine Corps air defense simulation system which trains personnel on Stinger surface-to-air missile operations and launch proficiency. The committee is aware of IMTS upgrades that would provide com-

puter-generated targets, variable scenario computer-generated background video images, and computer workstations for modeling air defense encounters. The committee understands that these upgrades would enhance both Army and Marine Corps air defense forces' operational proficiency by providing rapid, effective, real-world training prior to deploying into potential combat situations.

The committee understands that the DFIRST Global Positioning System satellite-based instrumentation system for mounted maneuver training exercises would contribute significantly to the furtherance of the Army National Guard's (ARNG) regional home station instrumentation training plan. This plan calls for force-on-force, simulation-based training at a number of regional centers that would produce experiences for ARNG units comparable to those received at the Army's combat training centers. The committee notes the impressive results obtained during the DFIRST evaluation and believes that this system will not only increase the readiness of ARNG units through more effective training but do so at a lower cost and with greater safety than is currently done.

Therefore, the committee recommends $80.7 million, an increase of $3.8 million to procure three AWSSs; $1.5 million for three Army IMTS upgrades; $1.0 million for an ARNG IMTS upgrade; and, an increase of $7.0 million to field two DFIRST regional ARNG training sites. In total, the committee recommends $13.3 for nonsystems training devices for the Army and ARNG. The committee also recommends an increase of $1.0 million for a Marine Corps IMTS upgrade.

Product improved (PI) combat vehicle crewman (CVC) headset

The budget request contained no funds to procure PI CVC headsets.

The committee understands that loss of communications in CVC headsets was identified in late fiscal year 1998 during armored vehicle Force XXI Battle Command Brigade and Below (FBCB2) testing and evaluation. Army testing revealed that electromagnetic interference (EMI) created by new, higher powered Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio Systems installed in armored vehicles to transmit FBCB2 data creates these communication problems. The committee believes that such communication problems could endanger crews as a result of not receiving complete command and control information and data transmissions in a high operational tempo or combat environment.

Since the PI CVC headset eliminates EMI communication losses, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million to procure PI CVC headsets to address this safety issue.

Ribbon bridge

The budget request contained $12.1 million to procure ribbon bridge equipment, but included no funds to procure this equipment for Army National Guard (ARNG) multi-role bridge companies (MRBC).

Ribbon bridge equipment consists of 10-ton, 8-wheel drive M1977 Heavy Expanded Mobility Tactical Truck Common Bridge Transporters, M15 Bridge Adaptor Pallets, and M14 Improved Boat Cradles. The committee understands that seven ARNG MRBC are

being established in fiscal year 2001 using existing engineer bridging equipment and older, lower capacity five-ton trucks. Without increased funds, these new ARNG units will not begin conversion to the new equipment required for MRBC until fiscal year 2004.

Therefore, the committee recommends $25.6 million for ribbon bridging equipment, an increase of $13.5 million to accelerate the fielding of one ARNG MRBC.

Shortstop

The budget request contained no funds to procure the Shortstop Electronic Protection System (SEPS).

The SEPS is a commercial electronics radio frequency countermeasure system that protects personnel and high value assets from artillery, mortar rounds, and rockets by detonating their proximity fuzes well before they impact. Developed as a quick reaction capability system, SEPS was deployed during Operation Desert Storm and more recently in Operation Joint Endeavor. The committee understands that initial Army testing of 5,000 rounds fired at the SEPS resulted in a 100 percent pre-detonation success rate and that follow-on tests against both artillery and rockets were also highly successful.

The committee notes that, although the theater commanders-in-chief have submitted urgent SEPS requirements, the Army has failed to fund this system for the fourth straight year. The Commander, United States Army Forces Europe has submitted the most recent such requirement for over 200 SEPS to support Balkan operations. In consideration of this requirement, in recognition of the fact that SEPS is also one of the Army Chief of Staff's fiscal year 2000 top unfunded priorities, and consistent with actions taken in past fiscal years, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million for the procurement of additional SEPS. The committee also recommends an increase of $4.0 million for the Marine Corps to ensure that Marine expeditionary forces have adequate protection from proximity-fuzed artillery rounds, mortars, and rockets.

Single channel ground and airborne radio systems (SINCGARS) family

The budget request contained $13.2 million for the fielding of SINCGARS, but included no funds to procure SINCGARS advanced system improvement program (ASIP) radios for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The SINCGARS ASIP radio upgrades earlier version, voice-only radios and includes a tactical Internet controller and integrated communications security enhancements, which provides commanders a highly reliable, easily maintained, secure voice and data handling command and control capability. The committee is aware of the Army Chief of Staff's unfunded requirement for 5,100 SINCGARS ASIP radios for force package three, which includes the ARNG. The committee understands that without these radios, ARNG forces will be unable to transmit to and receive data from their active Army components when operating together.

Therefore, consistent with prior fiscal years, the committee recommends $60.4 million, an increase of $47.2 million to procure SINCGARS ASIP radios for the ARNG.

Small pusher tug

The budget request contained no funds to procure small pusher tugs.

The small pusher tug is a 60–foot, steel hull, twin propeller vessel designed to tow general cargo barges in harbors, inland waterways, and along coastlines. It is also capable of assisting larger tugs in docking and undocking ships of all sizes, movement of floating cranes and machine shops, and performing line handling duties.

The committee is aware of the Army's intent to replace its unreliable 40–year old small tugs that were used in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm and understands that it has recently increased its requirement for seven additional tugs to replace these older vessels. The committee included an increase of $4.7 million in fiscal year 1999 to procure two additional tugs to complete the earlier requirement of eight tugs. However, the committee notes that the Army has not budgeted for the additional seven new tugs in its Future Years Defense Program.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million to accelerate procurement of three vessels towards the new Army requirement.

Standard teleoperating kit

The budget request contained $4.0 million to procure 12 Standardized Robotic System (SRS) vehicle teleoperating kits.

The SRS kit can be installed on existing tracked, construction, or wheeled vehicles to enable them to be operated by remote control, if circumstances dictate, to clear mines. The committee understands that SRS contingency sets have been responsible for detonating hundreds of mines while deployed in Bosnia.

The committee notes that redesigned combat engineer force structure requires SRS equipment at all force levels, but that the Army only intends to procure 12 kits in a "one-time buy" during fiscal year 2000. The committee disagrees with the Army's procurement strategy for this equipment and recommends $24.0 million, an increase of $20.0 million for additional SRS kits.

Super high frequency (SHF) terminal

The budget request contained $32.0 million for the procurement of 13 SHF Tri-Band Advanced Range Extension Terminals (STAR–T). The STAR–T is a High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle-mounted, multi-channel, tactical tri-band satellite terminal capable of operating with both commercial and military SHF satellites.

The committee understands that the system has experienced an eight month delay in its initial operational test and evaluation as a result of contractor team restructuring, a $20.0 million cost overrun; program complexities with the integration of asynchronous transfer mode, integrated services digital network and Internet routing capability; and antennae design, and power amplification

problems. As a result of this delay, the Milestone III procurement decision will not be made until September 2000.

The committee is concerned with these problems but recommends the amount requested. However, the committee expects the Secretary of the Army to report to the Congressional defense committees about any further complications and delays with the program and such recommendations as he may deem appropriate for dealing with them.

Vibratory self-propelled roller

The budget request contained no funds to procure vibratory self-propelled rollers. The vibratory self-propelled roller is a commercial compacting vehicle used to support construction of airfields, logistic areas, and roads required to deploy and sustain Army forces.

The committee notes that the last major procurement of this equipment occurred in the early 1980s and that its 22-year average age, combined with increased deployments, has reduced its readiness ratings to unsatisfactory levels. The committee also notes that the Army Chief of Staff identified the replacement of vibratory self-propelled rollers for both the active and reserve components as a fiscal year 2000 unfunded priority.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $10.3 million to procure additional vibratory self-propelled rollers: $5.3 million for active Army units, and $5.0 million for Army Reserve units.

Wheel-mounted 25-ton crane

The budget request contained $12.1 million to procure 47 wheel-mounted, 25-ton all-terrain cranes (ATECs), but no ATECs were requested for the Army Reserve (AR).

The ATEC is a multi-use, state-of-the-art, commercial all-terrain crane used for engineer construction excavation, lifting and loading general supplies and materiel, and bridging movement. The ATEC replaces three existing cranes, which range in age from 19 to 30 years old and suffer from low operational readiness rates and high operations and support costs with a single, state-of-the-art unit that exceeds all three obsolete cranes' capabilities and mobility characteristics.

The committee notes the importance of ATECs in fulfilling Army Reserve combat support and combat service support mission requirements and recommends $20.1 million, an increase of $8.0 million to procure ATECs for the Army Reserve.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,169.0 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of no funds for fiscal year 2000.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
001	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	-	334,000		(334,000)	-	-
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC						
	PROCUREMENT						
002	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	-	241,500		(241,500)	-	-
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M						
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
003	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	-	593,500		(593,500)	-	-
	TOTAL CHEM AGENT & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY		**1,169,000**		**(1,169,000)**		**-**

Item of Special Interest

Chemical agents and munitions destruction

The budget request contained $1,169.0 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army.

Section 1412(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986 (Public Law 99–145) requires that funds for the destruction of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions, including funds for military construction projects necessary to carrying out the demilitarization program, shall be set forth in the budget of the Department of Defense as a separate program and shall not be included in the budget accounts for any military department.

The committee reaffirms its belief that funds for the chemical demilitarization program must be authorized and appropriated in a defense-wide budget account in order to emphasize that destruction of the chemical weapons stockpile is a national issue, which affects all of the Department of Defense, not just a single military service. Section 1412(f) was intended to keep this funding separate in order to prevent it from being subject to internal service budget priorities and to avoid artificially inflating the budgets of any of the military departments. The committee believes that the reasoning behind the legislative mandate was sound in 1986, when the estimated life cycles cost of the chemical stockpile demilitarization program was approximately $1.5 billion, and is even more valid today, when the estimated cost of the program has grown almost ten-fold.

Accordingly, the committee recommends no funding for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army, a decrease of $1,169.0 million. The committee recommends an increase of $1,012.0 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $8,228.7 million for Aircraft Procurement, Navy in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $8,804.1 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
001	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER	12	301,239			12	301,239
001	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(40,795)			-	(40,795)
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	30,832			-	30,832
003	F/A-18C/D (FIGHTER) HORNET	-	-			-	-
004	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	36	2,801,108			36	2,801,108
004	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(109,119)			-	(109,119)
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	162,240			-	162,240
006	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	10	850,254	1	60,000	11	910,254
006	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(53,862)			-	(53,862)
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	71,044			-	71,044
008	AH-1W (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA	-	1,961			-	1,961
009	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	-	-			-	-
010	SH-60R	7	216,692			7	216,692
011	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE	3	248,199			3	248,199
011	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(37,737)			-	(37,737)
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	172,554			-	172,554
	TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT		**4,614,610**		**60,000**		**4,674,610**
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
013	CH-60S	13	234,577	2	38,000	15	272,577
013	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(26,084)			-	(26,084)
014	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	73,792			-	73,792
015	UC-35	-	-	3	18,000	3	18,000

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
016	C-40A	1	49,029			1	49,029
017	C-37	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		**331,314**		**56,000**		**387,314**
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
018	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	15	333,453		(2,000)	15	331,453
018	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(7,977)			-	(7,977)
019	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	9,552			-	9,552
020	JPATS	8	44,826		(1,000)	8	43,826
	TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT		**379,854**		**(3,000)**		**376,854**
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
021	KC-130J	-	12,257	4	252,000	4	264,257
	TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT		**12,257**		**252,000**		**264,257**
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
022	EA-6 SERIES	-	161,047		45,000	-	206,047
023	AV-8 SERIES	-	39,126			-	39,126
024	F-14 SERIES	-	83,352			-	83,352
025	ADVERSARY	-	-			-	-
026	ES-3 SERIES	-	-			-	-
027	F-18 SERIES	-	308,789		63,000	-	371,789

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
028	H-46 SERIES	-	17,888			-	17,888
029	AH-1W SERIES	-	13,726			-	13,726
030	H-53 SERIES	-	45,240			-	45,240
031	SH-60 SERIES	-	56,824			-	56,824
032	H-1 SERIES	-	6,339			-	6,339
033	H-3 SERIES	-	45			-	45
034	EP-3 SERIES	-	27,433			-	27,433
035	P-3 SERIES	-	276,202		75,000	-	351,202
036	S-3 SERIES	-	94,119			-	94,119
037	E-2 SERIES	-	28,201		50,000	-	78,201
038	TRAINER A/C SERIES	-	8,914			-	8,914
039	C-2A	-	19,524			-	19,524
040	C-130 SERIES	-	15,250			-	15,250
041	FEWSG	-	600			-	600
042	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	-	16,412			-	16,412
043	E-6 SERIES	-	86,950			-	86,950
044	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	-	12,761			-	12,761
045	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	-	28,782		2,000	-	30,782
046	T-45 SERIES	-	9,675			-	9,675
047	POWER PLANT CHANGES	-	15,595			-	15,595
048	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	50,584			-	50,584
049	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	-	81,599		(1,300)	-	80,299
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		**1,504,977**		**233,700**		**1,738,677**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
050	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	871,820			-	871,820
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**871,820**		**-**		**871,820**
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
051	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	413,732		(20,000)	-	393,732
052	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	12,769			-	12,769
053	WAR CONSUMABLES	-	11,683			-	11,683
054	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	39,991			-	39,991
055	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	34,177			-	34,177
056	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,471			-	1,471
057	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (M)	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**513,823**		**(20,000)**		**493,823**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(3,304)		(3,304)
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**8,228,655**		**575,396**		**8,804,051**

Items of Special Interest

CH–60S

The budget request contained $208.5 million for 13 CH–60S helicopters and $73.8 million for advance procurement of 18 CH–60S helicopters in fiscal year 2001.

The CH–60S replaces the H–46, H–1, H–3, and HH–60 helicopters, which meet combat support taskings for vertical replenishment, cargo and personnel transfer, medical evacuation, and search and rescue. The committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations included additional CH–60S helicopters in his unfunded priority list for fiscal year 2000, of which two would be assigned to the Naval Reserve.

Consequently, the committee recommends $246.5 million, an increase of $38.0 million for two additional CH–60S helicopters for the Naval Reserve.

Common data link (CDL)

The budget request contained $28.8 million for modifications to special project aircraft, of which $2.0 million was included for the CDL.

The CDL, consisting of aircraft and ground terminals, allows special project P–3 aircraft to transfer data between shore- and sea-based intelligence communication systems. The committee understands that the Navy requires two ground terminals and all four special project P–3 aircraft to be configured with the CDL, but the budget request included sufficient funding for only one ground terminal and installation of equipment on two aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends $30.8 million, an increase of $2.0 million for one additional CDL ground terminal and to procure and install the CDL equipment on the remaining two special project P–3 aircraft.

Common ground equipment

The budget request contained $413.7 million for common ground equipment.

The committee notes an approximately 30 percent increase in the budget request for common ground equipment when compared to previous and future years. The committee also notes that cost, schedule, and contractor data is not provided in the Department's budget justification material for such equipment. Based on the information provided, the committee believes that the request exceeds requirements by $20.0 million and, therefore, recommends $393.7 million, a decrease of $20 million.

E–2 modifications

The budget request contained $28.2 million for E–2 modifications, but included no funds to upgrade the E–2C aircraft fleet to the Hawkeye 2000 configuration.

The Hawkeye 2000 modification upgrades the E–2C aircraft with satellite communications; a commercial-off-the-shelf, high-capacity mission computer and associated workstations; and cooperative engagement capability. The committee understands that this modification will provide the E–2C fleet with a quantum leap in situa-

tional awareness and fleet-wide connectivity and that two aircraft are available to accept this modification in fiscal year 2000.

Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $45.0 million: $15.0 million for non-recurring engineering and $30.0 million for the modification of two aircraft to the Hawkeye 2000 configuration.

EA–6B modifications

The budget request contained $161.0 million for EA–6B modifications, but included no funds for the band 9/10 transmitter/receiver upgrade.

The band 9/10 transmitter/receiver upgrade is designed to counter the high-frequency radar techniques of a new family of electronic threats. In recognition of this emerging requirement, the committee recommended an increase of $39.0 million for fiscal year 1999 and the Congress appropriated $20.0 million for this purpose. Additionally, the committee notes that the Department has an inventory objective of 196 band 9/10 transmitter/receiver systems but currently plans to procure only 120. The committee understands that the existing band 9 transmitter is based on 1960's technology and that the cost to maintain these systems through 2015 is approximately $25.0 million.

Consistent with its previous actions, the committee recommends $206.0 million, an increase of $45.0 million to procure additional band 9/10 transmitter/receivers for the EA–6B.

F–18 series modifications

The budget request contained $308.8 million for F–18 series modifications, of which $35.1 million was included for engineering change proposal (ECP)–583 kits to modify four Marine Corps F/A–18A aircraft.

The ECP–583 modification kit upgrades the avionics and weapons capability of the F/A–18A to the same capability as the newer F/A–18C. Without this capability, the F/A–18A cannot autonomously deliver precision-guided munitions or employ the AIM–120 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile. Despite the fact that the Marine Corps has a requirement to upgrade 76 of its F/A–18As with this modification, the Department only budgeted to upgrade 24 aircraft in its Future Years Defense Program.

Since the Commandant of the Marine Corps identified ECP–583 among his highest unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2000, the committee recommends an increase of $63.0 million to procure 14 additional upgrade kits: 7 for the active and 7 for the reserve components.

F/A–18E/F

The budget request contained $2,692.0 million for 36 F/A–18E/F aircraft, and $162.2 million for advance procurement of 42 aircraft in fiscal year 2001. The committee notes that the 36 aircraft requested would begin a five-year, 222 aircraft multiyear procurement through fiscal year 2004 which is projected to cost 7.4 percent less than annual procurement of these aircraft.

During the past two years, the committee has expressed its concerns with the F/A–18E/F program due to its higher cost for a rel-

atively small capability increase when compared to the existing F/A–18C/D aircraft. As a result of prior year testimony by the Department's Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, the committee has also expressed concern that the final production configuration may not be determined until the completion of the aircraft's operational evaluation in October 1999 and that deficiencies in survivablility and radar jamming systems may not be corrected until after full-rate production begins. However, the committee supports the Navy's requirement to replace its aging fighter attack aircraft fleet and believes that the Department's proposed multiyear procurement should proceed if the aircraft demonstrates that it meets key performance parameters and requirements for effectiveness and suitability upon completion of the operational evaluation and can be procured at the Department's projected 7.4 percent multiyear contract cost savings.

Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (Section 121) that would limit the Secretary of the Navy's authority to enter into the multiyear contract until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the results of the aircraft's operational test and evaluation meet both key performance parameters and requirements for operational effectiveness and suitability and that the multiyear procurement contract cost is at least 7.4 percent less than procurement of the same number of aircraft would be through annually funded contracts. Since the committee understands that the five-year multiyear contract award date is scheduled for April 2000, it believes that the Department will be afforded ample time to review and assess the results of the F/A–18E/F's operational evaluation prior to the Secretary's certification to the congressional defense committees.

Joint primary air training system (JPATS)

The budget request contained $44.8 million for 8 T–6A aircraft and associated ground training systems, and $9.6 million for advance procurement of 24 aircraft in fiscal year 2001.

The JPATS, consisting of the T–6A aircraft and a ground-based training system, will be used by both the Navy and Air Force for primary pilot training. The committee notes that the Navy has budgeted $1.0 million for engineering change orders (ECO), but the Air Force included no funds for this purpose. Since the Navy and Air Force T–6A are the same aircraft, the committee does not understand how one service's aircraft requires ECOs and the other's does not.

Consequently, the committee recommends $43.8 million, a decrease of $1.0 million.

KC–130J

The budget request contained $12.3 million for KC–130J support costs, but included no funds for procurement of KC–130J aircraft.

The KC–130J is a tactical transport aircraft that also serves as a tanker for both helicopters and tactical fighters. The KC–130J replaces the Marine Corps' existing KC–130F, R, and T model aircraft, providing a 40 percent increase in range, a 25 percent higher cruise ceiling, a 21 percent increase in maximum speed, and a 41 percent decrease in take-off distance over the existing older models.

The Marine Corps currently has an inventory of 35 KC–130Fs, 14 KC–130Rs, and 28 KC–130Ts. The KC–130F, which was procured between 1960 and 1962, is the oldest aircraft in the inventory and is approaching the end of its service life. The committee understands that a December 1998 assessment of the KC–130F fleet revealed that, unless procurement of KC–130Js is accelerated or a comprehensive and costly service life extension is undertaken, an inventory shortfall of 15 aircraft may occur as early as 2001.

The committee recommended an increase of two KC–130Js in fiscal year 1999 and notes that additional KC–130J aircraft is the Commandant of the Marine Corps' number two unfunded aviation procurement priority for fiscal year 2000.

Therefore, consistent with its prior actions and the Commandant's priorities, the committee recommends $264.3 million, an increase of $252.0 million for four KC–130J aircraft.

Lightweight environmentally sealed parachute assembly (LESPA)

The budget request contained no funds for the LESPA.

Due to its longer repack cycle and extended service life, the committee continues to believe that the Navy will realize substantial life cycle cost savings by procuring LESPA, as compared to the use of existing parachutes. Accordingly, the committee strongly supports the LESPA to replace old parachutes in the P–3 and E–2C aircraft.

Consistent with its previous actions, the committee recommends $10.0 million to procure additional LESPAs: $5.0 million for the P–3 and $5.0 million for the E–2C.

MV–22

The budget request contained $796.4 million to procure 10 MV–22 tiltrotor aircraft and $71.0 million for advance procurement of 16 aircraft in fiscal year 2001.

The committee continues to support accelerated MV–22 procurement and endorses the Quadrennial Defense Review's (QDR) recognition of the urgent need to replace the Marine Corps' aging fleet of Vietnam-era CH–46 medium lift helicopters. The committee notes that the procurement of additional MV–22 aircraft in fiscal year 2000 is the Commandant of the Marine Corps' highest unfunded aviation procurement priority.

Therefore, consistent with its prior actions, the QDR's findings, and the Commandant's priorities, the committee recommends $856.4 million, an increase of $60.0 million to procure one additional MV–22 aircraft.

P–3 series modifications

The budget request contained $276.2 million for P–3 series modifications, of which $106.0 million was included for six anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) kits.

The AIP improves the P–3's communications, survivability, and over-the-horizon targeting capabilities through the installation of commercial-off-the-shelf components. The committee understands that the Navy's operational objective is 56 AIP-configured aircraft by fiscal year 2000 but notes that only 44, including the six requested in fiscal year 2000, have been funded. The committee also

notes that the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) has included additional AIP kits among his highest unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2000.

To reduce the Navy's shortfall and in consonance with the CNO's priorities, the committee recommends an increase of $70.0 million for an additional five AIP kits.

T–45 training system (TS)

The budget request contained $325.5 million for 15 T–45 aircraft and associated ground training systems, and $9.6 million for advance procurement of 15 aircraft in fiscal year 2001.

The T–45TS, consisting of the T–45 aircraft and ground-based training, replaces the Navy's TA–4J and T–2C as advanced pilot training aircraft.

The committee supports the T–45TS but notes unexplained cost growth for engineering change orders. Consequently, the committee recommends $323.5 million, a decrease of $2.0 million.

UC–35

The budget request contained no funds for the UC–35.

The UC–35 is a long-range medium-lift operational support aircraft. The committee understands that the Future Years Defense Program includes procurement of three UC–35s in fiscal years 2001 and 2002 to replace older CT–39s. However, the committee further understands that, since submission of the budget request, the need to replace the CT–39 has been accelerated because two of the Marine Corps' CT–39s have been transferred to the Navy for Undergraduate Naval Flight Officer training and the third aircraft is approaching the end of its service life.

Since the Commandant of the Marine Corps has included three UC–35s among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2000, the committee recommends $18.0 million to procure these aircraft.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,357.4 million for Weapons Procurement, Navy in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $1,764.7 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
001	TRIDENT II	12	476,337			12	476,337
001	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(38,849)			-	(38,849)
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	51,400			-	51,400
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
003	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	2,180			-	2,180
	TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES		**491,068**		**-**		**491,068**
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
004	TOMAHAWK	148	50,894		300,000	148	350,894
005	ESSM	-	11,668		(1,100)	-	10,568
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
006	AMRAAM	100	46,261			100	46,261
007	JSOW	615	154,913	401	75,000	1,016	229,913
008	SLAM-ER	56	38,088			56	38,088
009	STANDARD MISSILE	91	198,867	102	(39,000)	193	159,867
010	RAM	90	45,429		(1,000)	90	44,429
011	HELLFIRE	-	-	750	52,000	750	52,000
012	PENGUIN	-	-			-	-
013	AERIAL TARGETS	-	21,177		22,900	-	44,077
014	DRONES AND DECOYS	-	-			-	-
015	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	-	12,784			-	12,784
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
016	SIDEWINDER MODS	75	29,387			75	29,387

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
017	HARPOON MODS	-	-			-	-
018	STANDARD MISSILES MODS	-	41,927			-	41,927
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
019	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	20,199		(1,000)	-	19,199
020	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	-	-			-	-
021	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	9,789			-	9,789
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
022	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,125			-	4,125
	TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		**685,508**		**407,800**		**1,093,308**
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
023	ASW TARGETS	-	1,996			-	1,996
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
024	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	-	28,699			-	28,699
025	ISLMM	-	-			-	-
026	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	-	52,755			-	52,755
027	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	-	-			-	-
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					-	-
028	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	23,350			-	23,350
029	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	-	15,166			-	15,166
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
030	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,663			-	1,663
	TOTAL TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT		**123,629**		**-**		**123,629**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	OTHER WEAPONS						
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
031	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	-	880			-	880
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
032	CIWS MODS	-	2,977			-	2,977
033	5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS	-	1,444			-	1,444
034	MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS	-	1,969			-	1,969
035	MODS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	1,311			-	1,311
	OTHER						
036	PIONEER	-	-			-	-
037	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL OTHER WEAPONS		**8,581**		**-**		**8,581**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
038	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	48,614			-	48,614
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIRS		**48,614**		**-**		**48,614**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(545)		(545)
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**1,357,400**		**407,255**		**1,764,655**

Items of Special Interest

Aerial targets

The budget request contained $21.2 million for aerial targets, but included no funds for the BQM–74.

The BQM–74 is a practice aerial target designed to replicate anti-ship cruise missiles, and the committee understands that, since entering the Navy's inventory, it has satisfied over 80 percent of missions requiring high-speed aerial targets. While the Department has informed the committee that its inventory objective for BQM–74 targets is 240 at the end of each fiscal year in the Future Years Defense Program, no future BQM–74 targets have been budgeted. The committee is concerned that without BQM–74s, adequate crew training and weapons system tests will not be possible. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million to procure BQM–74 targets.

The committee notes $2.1 million of unexplained government costs for other aerial targets and recommends a decrease of this amount.

In total, the committee recommends $44.1 million for aerial targets, an increase of $22.9 million.

Evolved seasparrow missile (ESSM)

The budget request contained $11.7 million for the ESSM, of which $1.1 million was included for fleet support and integrated logistics support (ILS).

The ESSM program is a cooperative effort among 10 North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations to develop and produce an improved version of the Navy's shipboard "RIM–7P" surface-to-air missile. The committee notes that production of the missiles for which funds were appropriated in fiscal year 1999 has been delayed due to software problems and further notes that no missiles are planned for production in fiscal year 2000.

Consequently, the committee believes that no funds are required for fleet support and ILS and recommends $10.6 million, a decrease of $1.1 million.

Hellfire II missile

The budget request contained no funds for Hellfire II missiles.

The Hellfire II missile is a laser-guided, anti-armor and anti-ship weapon used by the Marine Corps on the AH–1W helicopter and by the Navy on the SH–60B helicopter. The committee notes that, despite additional funding provided by Congress in fiscal year 1998, the Department has still not met its inventory requirement for these missiles. Consequently, the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) has included procurement of 750 Hellfire II missiles among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2000.

The committee supports the CNO's request and recommends an increase of $52.0 million to procure 750 Hellfire II missiles.

Joint stand-off weapon (JSOW)

The Navy budget request contained $154.9 million for 615 JSOWs, and the Air Force budget request contained $80.0 million for 193 JSOWs.

The JSOW is an air-to-ground glide weapon that uses the global positioning system and an inertial navigation system for its precision guidance and can be launched outside the range of most target-area surface-to-air threat systems. The committee understands that the JSOW performed flawlessly on its first 17 combat deliveries in the first half of fiscal year 1999 during Operation Southern Watch in Southwest Asia. As a result of its success rate, the committee also understands that current JSOW demand for both the European Operation Allied Force and the Southwest Asian Operation Southern Watch combat operations exceeds supply.

Consequently, the committee recommends $229.9 million for the Navy, an increase of $75.0 million for 401 JSOWs, and $115.0 million for the Air Force, an increase of $35.0 million for 207 JSOWs.

Rolling airframe missile

The budget request contained $45.4 million for 90 rolling airframe missiles (RAM). The RAM is a lightweight ship self-defense system designed to engage anti-ship missiles.

The committee notes unexplained cost growth for component improvement, government in-house engineering, and production acceptance. Consequently, the committee recommends $44.4 million, a decrease of $1.0 million.

Standard missile

The budget request contained $198.9 million for Standard missiles, of which $45.9 million was included for 75 Block IIIB missiles, $43.6 million for 16 Block IVA missiles, and $93.5 million for procurement support costs.

The Standard missile is a surface-to-air missile employed on AEGIS cruisers and destroyers. The Block III series missiles have improved homing and guidance mechanisms, while the Block IVA missile is upgraded with a new booster for better range and maneuverability and would add a near-term capability against theater ballistic missiles.

Subsequent to submission of the budget request, the committee has learned that technical problems with the development of the Block IVA missile have resulted in testing delays. The committee understands that, as a result of these delays, development and operational evaluation of the Block IVA will not be complete until early in fiscal year 2001. Since procurement of the Block IVA missile will not occur before fiscal year 2001, the committee recommends no funds for this program, a decrease of $43.6 million. Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends an increase for Block IVA missile engineering and manufacturing development.

The committee notes, however, that the Chief of Naval Operations has included additional Block IIIB missiles among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2000. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $19.0 million for 27 additional Block IIIB missiles.

The committee also notes a 39 percent increase in procurement support costs from fiscal year 1999 appropriated levels, despite the fact that the total number of missiles to be procured decreases. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $14.4 million.

In total, the committee recommends a decrease of $39.0 million for the Standard missile.

Tomahawk missiles

The budget request contained $50.9 million for the remanufacture of 148 Block II Tomahawk land attack missiles (TLAM) to the Block III configuration, but included no funds to remanufacture Tomahawk anti-ship missiles (TASM) to the TLAM Block III configuration or to re-start TLAM Block III missile production.

The Tomahawk missile is a long range, precision strike cruise missile launched from surface ships or submarines and is produced in both TASM or TLAM versions for conventional warfare. The TLAM Block III, the most current and the most sought-after version by theater commanders-in-chief, has increased range and accuracy and involves decreased planning time compared to the earlier TLAM block II configuration. In the first half of fiscal year 1999, over 500 TLAMs have been expended in Southwest Asia and European combat operations, substantially reducing the TLAM inventory below required levels.

As a result of the TLAM shortage, the Department requested $421.2 million in fiscal year 1999 emergency supplemental appropriations for the remanufacture of 424 Block II TLAMs and 200 TASMs to the Block III configuration. Despite this increase, the committee has learned that Tomahawk inventory requirements will still not be met in the Future Years Defense Program.

Consequently, the committee recommends $350.9 million, an increase of $300.0 million. Of this amount, $260.8 million is for the remanufacture of 326 TASMs to the TLAM Block III configuration, $40.0 million is for non-recurring costs to re-start the TLAM Block III production line, and $50.1 million is for the procurement of new production TLAM Block III missiles.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, NAVY/MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request contained $484.9 million for Ammunition Procurement, Navy/Marine Corps in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $612.9 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS						
	PROC AMMO, NAVY						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	77,915			-	77,915
002	JDAM	785	35,563	1,828	48,000	2,613	83,563
003	2.75 INCH ROCKETS	-	21,229			-	21,229
004	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	-	9,153			-	9,153
005	PRACTICE BOMBS	-	49,106			-	49,106
006	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	-	26,826			-	26,826
007	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	-	10,469			-	10,469
008	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	-	34,259		5,000	-	39,259
009	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS	-	-			-	-
010	JATOS	-	4,969			-	4,969
011	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	-	15,758			-	15,758
012	EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)	-	3,004			-	3,004
013	CIWS AMMUNITION	-	-			-	-
014	76MM GUN AMMUNITION	-	7,012			-	7,012
015	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	-	5,841			-	5,841
016	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	-	8,030			-	8,030
017	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	-	8,165			-	8,165
018	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	-	9,199			-	9,199
019	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	2,226			-	2,226
	TOTAL PROC. AMMO, NAVY		**328,724**		**53,000**		**381,724**
	PROC AMMO, MC						
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
020	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	-	12,958		9,000	-	21,958

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
021	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	-	7		5,000	-	5,007
022	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	-	28,639		10,000	-	38,639
023	.50 CALIBER	-	16,364		4,000	-	20,364
024	40 MM, ALL TYPES	-	11,247		1,300	-	12,547
025	60MM, ALL TYPES	-	12,433		4,000	-	16,433
026	81MM, ALL TYPES	-	6,152			-	6,152
027	120MM, ALL TYPES	-	12,010			-	12,010
028	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	-	3,194		8,200	-	11,394
029	9 MM ALL TYPES	-	1,922			-	1,922
030	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	2,270		3,000	-	5,270
031	STINGER SLEP	-	1,972			-	1,972
032	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	-	11,030		14,000	-	25,030
033	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	-	166		8,000	-	8,166
034	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	14,733		7,200	-	21,933
035	FUZE, ALL TYPES	-	2,410			-	2,410
036	NON LETHALS	-	1,977			-	1,977
037	AMMO MODERNIZATION	-	10,702			-	10,702
038	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	5,990		1,300	-	7,290
039	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL MARINE COPRS AMMO, MC		**156,176**		**75,000**		**231,176**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		**484,900**		**128,000**		**612,900**

Items of Special Interest

Navy ammunition

The budget request contained $328.7 million for procurement of ammunition. The committee recommends $381.7 million, an increase of $53.0 million to procure additional Joint Direct Attack Munitions which were among the top unfunded priorities of the Chief of Naval Operations for fiscal year 2000:

[In millions of dollars]

JDAM	48.0
MJU–52 BOL IR	5.0

Marine Corps ammunition

The budget request contained $156.2 million for procurement of ammunition. The committee recommends $231.2 million, an increase of $75.0 million for the following types of ammunition, which are among the top unfunded priorities of the Commandant of the Marine Corps for fiscal year 2000:

[In millions of dollars]

5.56mm, all types	9.0
7.62mm, all types	5.0
Linear charges, all types	10.0
.50 Caliber	4.0
40mm, all types	1.3
60mm, all types	4.0
CTG 25mm, all types	8.2
Rocket, 83mm Dual Mode HE	14.0
Artillery, all types	8.0
Fuze, Hand Grenade, practice	3.0
Charge, Demolition Assembly	7.2
Items less than $5.0 million	1.3

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $6,678.5 million for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $6,687.2 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY						
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
001	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	-	-			-	-
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	751,540			-	751,540
003	SSN-21	-	-			-	-
004	NEW SSN	-	-		5,000	-	5,000
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	748,497			-	748,497
006	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	-	-			-	-
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	345,565			-	345,565
008	DDG-51	3	2,735,340			3	2,735,340
008	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(53,687)			-	(53,687)
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL OTHER WARSHIPS		**4,527,255**		**5,000**		**4,532,255**
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
010	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (MYP)	-	-		15,000	-	15,000
011	LPD-17	2	1,508,338			2	1,508,338
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS		**1,508,338**		**15,000**		**1,523,338**
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM						
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM CO						
013	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	-	-			-	-
014	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
015	ADC(X)	1	439,966			1	439,966
016	SERVICE CRAFT	-	-			-	-
017	LCAC LANDING CRAFT	-	-			-	-
017	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-			-	-
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
019	OUTFITTING	-	171,119		(8,600)	-	162,519
020	POST DELIVERY	-	-			-	-
021	LCAC SLEP	2	31,776			2	31,776
022	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM		**642,861**		**(8,600)**		**634,261**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(2,682)		(2,682)
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		**6,678,454**		**8,718**		**6,687,172**

Items of Special Interest

Attack submarine force level

Although a baseline force of 50 nuclear powered attack submarines (SSNs) was established in the 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review, Department of the Navy witnesses testified in 1998 that theater Commanders-in-Chief (CINC) requirements for SSNs, including aircraft carrier battlegroup deployments, Arctic operations, special forces missions, and independent presence missions dictate a force of 72 SSNs. Near term fiscal constraints make such a force unaffordable.

Early in the next century, LOS ANGELES Class SSNs, procured at relatively high rates of two to four boats per year during the 1980s, will reach the end of their service lives and begin to leave the fleet in large numbers. The low SSN procurement rate between 1990 and 2005, if not redressed, will drive the SSN force level below 50 boats. Moreover, by 2015 significant military challenges from modernized military forces and the proliferation of advanced military weapons could confront our armed forces. This situation may require a Navy that has a larger SSN force. The committee is concerned that potential future threats to U.S. national security interests warrant the establishment of an absolute minimum SSN force level of 50 boats and believes the SSN procurement rates in the Future Years Defense Program must be increased and maintained at a rate to ensure that this minimum force level is sustained.

LHD–8 amphibious assault ship

The budget request contained no funds for procurement of a Wasp-class (LHD) amphibious assault ship.

The committee understands that the Navy intends to procure the LHD–8 amphibious assault ship in fiscal year 2005 but has yet to decide whether or not to conduct a service life extension program (SLEP) to the older Tarawa-class (LHA) amphibious assault ships in the fleet. Should the Navy choose to SLEP the LHA ships, it could cost almost $1.0 billion per ship and add only 15 years to the service life of each ship. An alternative to the LHA SLEP may be the new construction of LHD-class amphibious assault ships. The LHD is larger than the LHA and in most respects provides more capability. The committee understands that, with some modifications, the LHD could meet or exceed the capabilities of the LHA in all regards. The committee believes that avoiding a break in the production of LHD-class ships preserves the option of procuring these vessels as an alternative to an LHD SLEP until the Navy determines which option is more cost-effective.

Therefore, to preserve this option, the committee recommends an additional $15.0 million for advance procurement of long lead materials for the construction of LHD–8.

Strategic sealift

The budget request contained no funds for the acquisition of new sealift ships in the National Defense Sealift Fund.

The committee is concerned that the Maritime Prepositioning Force (Enhanced) MPF(E) conversion program that was intended to

provide the Marine Corps with three additional prepositioning ships by purchasing and converting used foreign vessels has proven to be more costly than originally envisioned. Since there are insufficient funds to complete all of the planned conversions and the Marine Corps prepositioning requirement has not been reduced, the committee continues to believe that the most sensible way to address the shortfall is to convert a Large Medium Speed Roll-on/Roll-off (LMSR) vessel to the Marine Corps-required configuration.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $80.0 million in the National Defense Sealift Fund: $50.0 million for the advance procurement of long lead components for the construction of an additional LMSR and $30.0 million for modification of an existing LMSR for the Marine Corps mission.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $4,100.1 million for Other Procurement, Navy in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $4,260.4 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
001	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	-	8,333			-	8,333
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	-	8,378			-	8,378
003	STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT	-	-			-	-
004	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
	GENERATORS						
005	OTHER GENERATORS	-	-			-	-
	PUMPS						
006	OTHER PUMPS	-	-			-	-
	PROPELLERS						
007	SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	-	-			-	-
008	OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS	-	-			-	-
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
009	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	-	67,516		30,000	-	97,516
	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
010	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	-	15,638			-	15,638
	PERISCOPES						
011	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	-	65,039			-	65,039
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
012	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	17,031		15,000	-	32,031
013	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	-	12,301			-	12,301
014	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	113,506			-	113,506
015	SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
016	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	50,981			-	50,981
017	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	-	13,101			-	13,101
018	SSN21 CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
019	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	6,070			-	6,070
020	DSSP EQUIPMENT	-	7,989			-	7,989
021	LCAC	-	4,048			-	4,048
022	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	-	16,302		8,600	-	24,902
023	HM&E ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-			-	-
024	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	126,133		14,000	-	140,133
025	SURFACE IMA	-	-			-	-
026	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROLS	-	-			-	-
027	MINI/MICRO MINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR	-	-			-	-
028	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	949			-	949
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT						
029	REACTOR POWER UNITS	-	-			-	-
030	REACTOR COMPONENTS	-	199,110			-	199,110
	OCEAN ENGINEERING						
031	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	-	5,521			-	5,521
032	EOD UNDERWATER EQUIPMENT	-	292			-	292
	SMALL BOATS						
033	STANDARD BOATS	-	3,143		(1,000)	-	2,143
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
034	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	3,862			-	3,862
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT						
035	PRODUCTION SUPPORT FACILITIES	-	-			-	-
036	OPERATING FORCES IPE	-	4,548			-	4,548
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
037	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	-	108,918			-	108,918
	TOTAL SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**858,709**		**66,600**		**925,309**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP RADARS						
038	AN/SPS-40	-	-			-	-
039	AN/SPS-48	-	-			-	-
040	AN/SPS-49	-	2,245			-	2,245
041	MK-23 TARGET ACQUISITION SYSTEM	-	-			-	-
042	RADAR SUPPORT	-	-			-	-
043	TISS	-	1,755			-	1,755
	SHIP SONARS						
044	SURFACE SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-		5,000	-	5,000
045	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	-	31,914			-	31,914
046	SSN ACOUSTICS	-	227,042			-	227,042
047	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,605		8,600	-	11,205
048	SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
049	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	-	12,095			-	12,095
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
050	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	-	11,202			-	11,202
051	SSTD	-	-			-	-
052	ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS	-	-			-	-
053	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	16,674			-	16,674
054	SURTASS	-	7,267			-	7,267
055	ASW OPERATIONS CENTER	-	4,434			-	4,434
056	CARRIER ASW MODULE	-	-			-	-
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
057	AN/SLQ-32	-	1,918			-	1,918
058	AN/WLR-1	-	-			-	-
059	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	-	4,121			-	4,121
060	EW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
061	C-3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	-			-	-
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
062	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	-	48,031			-	48,031
063	COMBAT DF	-	-			-	-
064	OUTBOARD	-	-			-	-
065	COMMON HIGH BANDWIDTH DATA LINK	-	40,083			-	40,083
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
066	AN/WLQ-4	-	-			-	-
067	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	-	35,201			-	35,201
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
068	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	-	-			-	-
069	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	-	60,494			-	60,494
070	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT AFLOAT	-	25,067			-	25,067
071	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCS	-	48,222			-	48,222
072	ATDLS	-	19,143			-	19,143
073	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	-	20,762			-	20,762
074	SHALLOW WATER MCM	-	18,813			-	18,813
075	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	-	8,518			-	8,518
076	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	-	4,229			-	4,229
077	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	21,820			-	21,820
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
078	OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	1,011			-	1,011
079	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	44,229		12,000	-	56,229
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
080	MATCALS	-	12,412			-	12,412
081	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	7,543			-	7,543
082	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	-	19,440			-	19,440
083	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	-	35,115			-	35,115

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
084	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	7,277			-	7,277
085	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	-	5,318			-	5,318
086	FACSFAC	-	4,514			-	4,514
087	ID SYSTEMS	-	13,400			-	13,400
088	SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	-	590			-	590
089	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	-	20,769			-	20,769
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
090	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT ASHORE	-	9,440			-	9,440
091	OSIS EVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT (OED)	-	-			-	-
092	TADIX-B	-	6,248			-	6,248
093	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	6,634			-	6,634
094	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE	-	7,077			-	7,077
095	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS	-	41,255			-	41,255
096	RADIAC	-	7,778			-	7,778
097	GPETE	-	9,006			-	9,006
098	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	-	4,356			-	4,356
099	CALIBRATION STANDARDS	-	-			-	-
100	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	-	6,554			-	6,554
101	SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-			-	-
102	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	5,206		10,000	-	15,206
	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	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	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		10,000	-	247,722
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	-	-		12,000	-	12,000
117	GCCS EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
118	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	-	114,339			-	114,339
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
119	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	-	64,139		3,000	-	67,139
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
120	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	-	21,133			-	21,133
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
121	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		**1,845,227**		**60,600**		**1,905,827**
	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SONOBUOYS						
122	AN/SSQ-36 (BT)	-	-			-	-
123	AN/SSQ-53 (DIFAR)	-	-			-	-
124	PASSIVE SONOBUOYS (NON-BEAM FORMING)	-	15,933		12,800	-	28,733
125	AN/SSQ-57 (SPECIAL PURPOSE)	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
126	AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)	-	17,111		6,000	-	23,111
127	AN/SSQ-77 (VLAD)	-	-			-	-
128	AN/SSQ-101 (ADAR)	-	12,773		1,200	-	13,973
129	AN/SSQ-110	-	-			-	-
130	SIGNAL, UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS)	-	-			-	-
131	MISCELLANEOUS SONOBUOYS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	2,193			-	2,193
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
132	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	12,166		8,000	-	20,166
133	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	-	62			-	62
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			-	17,053
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
	TOTAL AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**216,237**		**28,000**		**244,237**
	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	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
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		8,000	-	94,668
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			-	20,446
	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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
170	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	-	27,579			-	27,579
171	ACQUISITION STABILITY RESERVE	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**629,418**		**8,000**		**637,418**
	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		(1,200)	-	8,173
179	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	-	20,484			-	20,484
180	COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIP	-	-		1,000	-	1,000
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		(1,000)	-	5,075
	TOTAL CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**67,144**		**(1,200)**		**65,944**
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
186	FORKLIFT TRUCKS	-	-			-	-
187	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	-	6,245			-	6,245
188	OTHER MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
189	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	5,825			-	5,825

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
190	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,658			-	1,658
191	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	-	125,900			-	125,900
	TOTAL SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**139,628**		**-**		**139,628**
	PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	TRAINING DEVICES						
192	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	3,076			-	3,076
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
193	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	14,471			-	14,471
194	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
195	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	5,033			-	5,033
196	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	19,439			-	19,439
197	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	5,848			-	5,848
198	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	18,354			-	18,354
199	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	-	1,377			-	1,377
	OTHER						
200	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**67,598**		**-**		**67,598**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
201	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	276,130			-	276,130
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**276,130**		**-**		**276,130**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(1,647)		(1,647)
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**4,100,091**		**160,353**		**4,260,444**

Items of Special Interest

AN/BPS–16 submarine navigation radar upgrade

The budget request contained no funds for upgrading the AN/BPS–16 submarine navigation radar to make it compliant with the Navy's electronic chart display information systems (ECDIS–N). ECDIS–N compliance will eliminate the requirement for paper navigational charts on submarines by upgrading radar navigation systems with computer-based charts designed to international commercial standards.

The committee added $9.0 million in fiscal year 1999 to upgrade AN/BPS–15(H) submarine radar systems to the ECDIS–N standard. The committee continues to support the ECDIS–N compliance and recommends an increase of $8.0 million to provide for the procurement and installation of nine ship sets of equipment to upgrade the AN/BPS–16 submarine navigation radar.

AN/SPS–73 (V) surface search radar

The budget request contained $1.1 million for the procurement and installation of AN/SPS–73 (V) surface search radars.

The committee understands that the Navy currently operates several different surface search radar variants as well as commercial navigational radars and plans to replace these systems with the AN/SPS–73 (V) surface search radar, a commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) system, in order to improve performance and standardize logistics and maintenance requirements. The committee supports the accelerated adoption of a standard COTS surface search radar and believes it can be expected to greatly reduce total ownership costs to the Navy.

Therefore, the committee recommends $15.1 million, an increase of $14.0 million for necessary non-recurring combat systems integration costs and to procure and install additional AN/SPS–73 (V) surface search radars.

AN/USC–42 mini-demand assigned multiple access (DAMA) ultra-high frequency (UHF) satellite communications (SATCOM) terminals

The budget request contained $237.7 million for SATCOM ship terminals, but included no funds for AN/USC–42 mini-DAMA UHF SATCOM terminals.

The AN/USC–42 mini-DAMA terminal is a commercial-off-the-shelf variant of the shipboard DAMA transceiver miniaturized for submarine application. It provides two-way satellite encrypted voice and data communications in a much smaller package than other DAMA and non-DAMA terminals.

The committee understands that DAMA terminals may provide up to four times more UHF satellite channel capacity than conventional terminals through multiplexing, thereby providing increased utilization of existing satellite channels and reducing the requirement for additional satellites. The committee further understands that the Navy plans no additional procurement of AN/USC–42 mini-DAMA UHF SATCOM terminals even though there remains a shortfall of these units.

Therefore, the committee recommends $247.7 million, an increase of $10.0 million to procure additional mini-DAMA UHF SATCOM terminals and associated spares.

Computer aided submode training (CAST) lesson authoring system (CLASS)

The budget request contained $86.7 million for AEGIS support equipment, but included no funds for CLASS to be expanded to ships or systems other than AN/UYQ–70-equipped AEGIS destroyers.

CLASS is a commercial-off-the-shelf training system that operates with the Navy's existing CAST system, but adds multi-media capabilities such as video, audio, three-dimensional graphics, animation, and interactive simulations. The committee understands that the CLASS is being installed on AN/UYQ–70-equipped AEGIS destroyers, but the Navy does not plan to backfit this system on other AEGIS-equipped platforms or to expand it to other systems. The committee supports the incorporation of effective commercial training technologies into Navy warships and believes that the CLASS can provide flexible low-cost training capabilities to all AEGIS class ships.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $94.7 million for AEGIS support equipment, an increase of $8.0 million for the purpose of backfitting CLASS on non-AN/UYQ–70-equipped AEGIS cruisers and destroyers and to expand this technology to other systems such as cooperative engagement capability, joint maritime command information system, and global command and control system.

Firefighting equipment

The budget request contained $17.0 million for fire fighting equipment, of which $12.0 million was included for the procurement and installation of the Fire Fighters Breathers Apparatus (FFBA).

The FFBA is a self-contained, compressed air breathing device that is compatible with fire fighter protective wear, helmet and other damage control equipment. The committee understands that it is a safer system that provides breathable air to the fire fighter for a longer period of time than the current, less capable oxygen breathing apparatus (OBA).

Accordingly, the committee recommends $32.0 million, an increase of $15.0 million to accelerate the replacement of existing OBA systems with the FFBA.

Joint engineering data management and information control system (JEDMICS)

The budget request contained no funds for JEDMICS, a Department of Defense-wide repository for engineering drawings and related text.

The committee believes that the transfer of unclassified sensitive information contained in the JEDMICS database via the Internet may lead to unacceptable national security risks and is aware that, in order to provide better security for the system, the program office has identified DiamondTEK, a commercial-off-the-shelf network security product as the solution to the problem.

The committee fully supports the integration of DiamondTEK technology into JEDMICS and recommends an increase of $12.0 million for this purpose.

Minesweeping equipment

The budget request contained $16.3 million for minesweeping equipment, of which $900 thousand was included for procurement of the versatile mine exercise system (VEMS). The budget request included no funds for procurement of the Dyad mine countermeasures system.

The VEMS is a simulation system that provides realistic training for fleet and mine countermeasures forces. The system also aids in evaluating the effectiveness of mine warfare tactics and provides a quantitative assessment of equipment and ship vulnerability. The committee understands that the Navy has not met its inventory objective for the VEMS.

The Dyad mine countermeasures system is an influence minesweeping system towed behind a small craft that can mimic the magnetic and acoustic signature of a larger vessel to clear a path through a minefield for that vessel. The committee understands that the Navy evaluated this system in 1996 and favorably reported its potential for port breakout minesweeping missions.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $24.9 million for minesweeping equipment, an increase of $4.1 million to procure additional VEMS and an increase of $4.5 million to procure Dyad countermeasures systems.

Mobile remote emitter simulator (MRES)

The budget request contained $12.2 million for weapons range support but included no funds to procure MRES systems.

The MRES is a ground-based, high-power electronic warfare threat simulator that is capable of tracking fast-moving tactical aircraft, surface ships and other signal collection platforms. The committee believes that the Navy currently operates outdated electronic simulators that are incapable of tracking fast-moving tactical aircraft and do not provide high fidelity threat representations so critical for realistic training.

Therefore, to improve the quality and availability of electronic warfare threat training, the committee recommends $20.2 million, an increase of $8.0 million to procure and install one MRES system.

Other training equipment

The budget request contained $44.2 million for other training equipment, of which $27.9 million was included to procure Battle Force Tactical Training (BFTT) equipment.

The BFTT system allows surface combatants, submarines and aircraft carriers to conduct realistic, coordinated training scenarios using ownship equipment instead of shore-based training simulators. The committee understands that while BFTT is a valuable training system, it currently lacks an Air Traffic Control (ATC) training capability for aircraft carriers and a complete BFTT Electronic Warfare Trainer (BEWT) interface.

Therefore, in order to improve the utility of the BFTT system and to provide realistic low-cost ATC and electronic warfare training, the committee recommends $56.2 million, an increase of $12.0 million: $7.0 million for the procurement and installation of 12 ATC trainers and $5.0 million to complete the procurement of 30 BEWT systems.

Shipboard display emulator (SDE) equipment

The budget request contained no funds for SDE equipment for Perry and Spruance class surface combatants and older AEGIS class ships not equipped with the Vertical Launching System.

The committee understands that older surface combatants use obsolete display systems that are no longer in production and are increasingly more difficult to maintain due to the scarcity of repair parts. Consequently, the committee believes that these ships, which constitute over one quarter of the Navy's surface combatant force and are expected to remain in active service for several years, should be upgraded with modern, supportable display systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to procure and install modern state-of-the-art SDE equipment in older surface combatants.

Sonobuoys

The budget request contained $48.0 million for the procurement of sonobuoys, including the AN/SSQ–36, AN/SSQ–53E, AN/SSQ–57, AN/SSQ–62E, AN/SSQ–101, and Signal Underwater Sound buoys.

The committee notes that the Navy's peacetime annual requirement for sonobuoys is approximately 100,000 units, but that the budget request only funds approximately 50,000 sonobuoys of all types. Despite the end of the Cold War, anti-submarine warfare remains a primary mission of the Navy that requires coordinated realistic training of air, surface, and submarine units. Such training necessarily consumes large numbers of sonobuoys, and the Navy's procurement rate fails to meet the annual peacetime requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million to address this shortfall, to be distributed as follows: $12.8 million for AN/SSQ–53E, $6.0 million for AN/SSQ–62E, and $1.2 million for AN/SSQ–101.

Surface sonar support equipment

The budget request contained no funds for surface sonar support equipment.

The committee understands that the Navy has developed a new material and production process for surface ship sonar dome windows and that initial testing on FFG–7 frigate keel sonar domes has thus far validated the expected performance improvements. While the FFG–7 application is useful, the majority of Navy surface ships that are equipped with hull mounted sonars, including DDG–51 and DD–963 class destroyers, and CG–47 class cruisers, have bow-mounted sonar domes which require more complex sonar dome windows.

The committee further understands that efforts are underway to fabricate a dome made from the new material for installation on a DDG–51 destroyer and recommends an increase of $5.0 million

to refine manufacturing processes and reduce production costs of the new sonar dome.

WSN–7B ring laser gyro (RLG) and WQN–2 doppler sonar velocity log (DSVL)

The budget request contained $67.5 million for navigation equipment, of which $40.4 million was included for the procurement of 43 WSN–7 RLGs, but included no funds for the procurement of WQN–2 DSVLs.

The WSN–7 RLG is the common RLG ship navigation system for surface ships and submarines. The WQN–2 has been designated by the Navy as the fleet standard speed log to replace obsolete and maintenance intensive electro-magnetic speed logs currently in service throughout the fleet. The committee added $18.0 million in fiscal year 1999 to accelerate introduction of these systems into the fleet in order to reduce the life cycle costs of ship navigational systems and continues to strongly support an accelerated program.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for the procurement and installation of 30 additional WSN–7B RLGs to significantly accelerate the replacement of maintenance intensive WSN–2 ship conventional gyro navigation systems in surface ships. The committee also recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the procurement and installation of 30 additional WQN–2 DSVLs to upgrade ship speed logs concurrent with navigation system upgrades.

Undersea warfare support equipment

The budget request contained $2.6 million for undersea warfare support equipment, of which $1.2 million was included for procurement of 55 Launched Expendable Acoustic Devices (LEADs).

The committee is concerned that the Navy has not widely fielded effective countermeasures against submarine launched torpedoes but notes that the LEAD was approved for full production in May 1998.

To address this concern the committee recommends $11.2 million, an increase of $8.6 million for procurement of 300 LEADs and two SSTD test beds for large deck ships in order to widely disseminate throughout the fleet a capable defense against torpedoes.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request contained $1,137.2 million for Procurement, Marine Corps in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $1,297.5 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	AAV7A1 PIP	-	80,714			-	80,714
002	LAV PIP	-	1,706			-	1,706
003	LIGHT ARMORED VEHICLE	-	-			-	-
004	MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	-	22,853		49,400	-	72,253
005	ITEMS UNDER $2M (TRKD VEH)	-	-			-	-
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
006	MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)	-	3,288			-	3,288
007	ITEMS UNDER $2M (ALL OTHER)	-	-			-	-
008	MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	-	2,956		5,000	-	7,956
009	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION	-	323			-	323
	WEAPONS						
010	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	-	-			-	-
011	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM	-	-			-	-
012	ACQUISITION STABILITY RESERVE	-	-			-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT						
013	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR	-	1,462			-	1,462
	TOTAL WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES		**113,302**		**54,400**		**167,702**
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						
	GUIDED MISSILES						
014	EADS MOD	-	-			-	-
015	JAVELIN	954	92,737			954	92,737
016	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP)	-	-			-	-
017	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	-	3,731		1,000	-	4,731

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
018	PREDATOR (SRAW)	-	-			-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT						
019	MODIFICATION KITS	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT		**96,468**		**1,000**		**97,468**
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
020	AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	-	29,068			-	29,068
021	GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP.	-	7,863			-	7,863
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
022	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	-	10,303			-	10,303
023	AN/TPQ-36 FIRE FINDER RADAR UPGRADE	-	-			-	-
024	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	18,466			-	18,466
025	MOD KITS (INTEL)	-	18,482			-	18,482
026	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (INTELL)	-	2,083			-	2,083
027	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (INTELL)	-	-			-	-
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
028	GENERAL PRUPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE	-	4,774			-	4,774
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
029	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	-	9,032		8,500	-	17,532
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
030	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	-	102,814			-	102,814
031	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	-	4,383			-	4,383
032	MANEUVER C2 SYSTEMS	-	6,838			-	6,838
033	RADIO SYSTEMS	-	82,881		20,300	-	103,181
034	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	-	65,125			-	65,125
035	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	-	81,770		50,000	-	131,770

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
036	MOD KITS MAGTF C41	-	13,821		5,000	-	18,821
037	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M MAGTF C41	-	-			-	-
038	MODIFICATION KITS (OTHER)	-	-			-	-
039	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (OTHER)	-	-			-	-
040	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	-	4,152			-	4,152
041	INTELLIGENCE C2 SYSTEMS	-	8,286			-	8,286
042	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	-		4,000	-	4,000
	TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		**470,141**		**87,800**		**557,941**
	SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
043	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	43	1,325			43	1,325
044	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	-	8,900			-	8,900
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
045	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	2,078	124,407			2,078	124,407
046	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	788	138,268			788	138,268
047	LT TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT(LTVR)	-	-			-	-
048	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	-	-			-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT						
049	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION	-	-			-	-
050	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	9,927			-	9,927
	TOTAL SUPPORT VEHICLES		**282,827**		**-**		**282,827**
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
051	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	-	3,629			-	3,629

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
052	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	-	3,228			-	3,228
053	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	-	9,727			-	9,727
054	DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS	-	8,358			-	8,358
055	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	-	10,887			-	10,887
056	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE (SECM)	-	3,281			-	3,281
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
057	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-		1,000	-	1,000
058	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
059	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	-	5,685			-	5,685
060	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP	-	6,956			-	6,956
061	WAREHOUSE MODERNIZATION	-	-			-	-
062	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	50,010		16,500	-	66,510
063	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	4,154			-	4,154
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
064	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	-	2,445			-	2,445
065	TRAINING DEVICES	-	13,848			-	13,848
066	CONTAINER FAMILY	-	5,714			-	5,714
	OTHER SUPPORT						
067	MODIFICATION KITS	-	-			-	-
068	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION	-	-			-	-
069	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	9,102			-	9,102
	TOTAL ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		**137,024**		**17,500**		**154,524**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
070	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	37,458			-	37,458
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**37,458**		**-**		**37,458**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(457)		(457)
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		**1,137,220**		**160,243**		**1,297,463**

Items of Special Interest

155 millimeter (mm) lightweight towed howitzer

The budget request did not contain funds to procure the 155mm lightweight towed howitzer.

The committee notes that, as a result of production delays, the 155mm lightweight towed howitzer program was restructured and a new prime contractor was selected. Since this restructuring, program performance has improved dramatically with engineering, testing and schedule milestones being met successfully. While litigation pursued by an arsenal union/industry team against the Army regarding the original 155mm lightweight towed howitzer contract award is unfortunate and a cause for concern, the committee believes it should not be allowed to interfere with other business opportunities for the arsenal.

The committee also believes that arsenals possess valuable capabilities that are underutilized, especially in the areas of recoil mechanisms, carriages and gun barrels. The committee further believes that given the opportunity, arsenals could contribute to improved quality and reduced costs for these and other components being subcontracted for the restructured 155mm lightweight howitzer program.

Accordingly, the committee expects the Army to establish a process by which arsenals shall be afforded an opportunity to submit challenge proposals for appropriate artillery and tank system components to be considered for incorporation into these weapons systems.

Body armor

The budget request contained no funds in Procurement, Marine Corps for body armor.

In previous years, the committee noted the effectiveness of the all-torso body armor used during Operation Provide Hope in Mogadishu, Somalia, and that subsequent analyses have indicated that more than 50 percent of all life-threatening wounds received in combat could be prevented by using this armor.

The committee continues to believe that the costs of procuring and fielding this type of armor far outweigh the medical expenses and loss of human life that would be avoided by its employment. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million, for the procurement of all-torso body armor.

Communications and electronic infrastructure support

The budget request contained $81.8 million for communications and electronic infrastructure support equipment, of which $43.0 million was included for the upgrades to and fielding of base telecommunications upgrades.

For each of the last three years, the Commandant of the Marine Corps has designated base telecommunications upgrades to the Marine Corps Enterprise Network as his number one non-aviation unfunded priority.

Consistent with its past actions to support the Marine Corps' demands for transfer of all types of data among its bases, the committee recommends $131.8 million, an increase of $20.0 million for

telecommunications infrastructure upgrades at Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, $5.0 million for upgrades at Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center Bridgeport, and $25.0 million for upgrades at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar.

Marine Corps air ground task force (MAGTF) command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence (C4I) modification kits

The budget request contained $13.8 million for modifications to previously fielded MAGTF C4I equipment, of which $5.0 million was included to procure product improvements for the mobile electronic warfare support system (MEWSS).

The MEWSS is an electronic warfare equipment suite included in a variant of the Light Armored Vehicle (LAV). The MEWSS product improvement program (PIP) replaces obsolete components with upgrades that can detect, locate, and demodulate advanced adversary communications.

The committee notes that the Army and the Marine Corps were working together to field a joint, seamless ground signals intelligence collection capability. The MEWSS PIP was the Marine Corps' system, and the ground based common sensor (GBCS) was the Army's. However, the Army terminated its portion of the program in fiscal year 1998. This action directly impacted the MEWSS PIP, resulting in increased costs and delayed fielding. The committee understands that the Army has decided to lessen the impact of the GBCS termination on the MEWSS by providing GBCS residual equipment to the Marine Corps. However, modifications to this equipment will be required in order to retrofit it into the MEWSS LAV and the Marine Corps did not budget for these.

Therefore, the committee recommends $18.8 million for MAGTF C4I modification kits, an increase of $5.0 million to modify GBCS sensor systems into the MEWSS LAV.

Material handling equipment

The budget request contained $50.0 million for the procurement of various types of material handling equipment, but included no funds for the remanufacture of D7G bulldozers. The D7G bulldozer is used throughout Marine Corps combat engineer and support units to build airfields, as well as for combat clearing and debris excavation.

The committee notes that the service's bulldozer fleet is 14 years old and rapidly deteriorating. The committee also notes that the D7G remanufacturing program is one of the Commandant of the Marine Corps' fiscal year 2000 unfunded priorities and that this program will extend the life of 200 bulldozers for an additional 10 years.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $66.5 million, an increase of $16.5 million for D7G bulldozer remanufacturing.

Modification kits (tracked vehicles)

The budget request contained $22.9 for the procurement of various modifications to tracked vehicles, but included no funds for upgrading M88A1 recovery vehicles to the more capable M88A2 Hercules Improved Recovery Vehicle (IRV) variant.

The 56-ton M88A1 is capable of towing only vehicles weighing less than 60 tons. Consequently, two M88A1s are required to safely tow an Abrams tank if it is rendered immobile due to combat damage or mechanical failure. The A2 upgrade includes increased engine horsepower, as well as braking, steering, winch, lift, and suspension capabilities required to safely recover Abrams tanks and other heavy combat systems.

The committee has recommended an increase for Army IRV upgrades elsewhere in this report, and based on the critical role that this vehicle will fulfill in future expeditionary operations and warfare, the committee also recommends $72.3 million, an increase of $49.4 million for 24 M88A2 IRV upgrades for the Marine Corps.

Night vision equipment

The budget request contained $9.0 million for the procurement of night vision equipment, of which $3.2 million was included for the procurement of generation III 25 millimeter (mm) image intensification tubes, but no funds were included to procure AN/PEQ–2 laser Target/Illuminator/Aiming Light (TPIAL).

The committee is aware of the joint Army/Navy/Marine Corps program to procure generation III 25mm image intensification tubes as replacements for less capable generation II tubes fielded in the AN/PVS–4 and AN/TVS–5 night vision goggles and notes that the generation III tubes provide a minimum 25 percent resolution increase. The AN/PEQ–2 TPIAL is a dual laser, consisting of highly collimated infrared aiming light and infrared target illuminator, which are visible only through night vision goggles. These lasers can either be operated independently or in combination.

The committee notes that both generation III 25mm image intensification tubes and AN/PEQ–2 laser TPIALs are top unfunded priorities of the Commandant of Marine Corps in fiscal year 2000. Based on the enhanced operational capability that night vision devices provide to combat forces and the committee's belief that these devices will provide a pivotal "force multiplier" in future Marine Corps expeditionary operations and warfare, the committee recommends $17.5 million, an increase of $3.5 million for generation III 25mm image intensification tubes and an increase of $5.0 million for AN/PEQ–2 laser TPIALs.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained $9,302.1 million for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $9,647.7 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE						
001	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
002	B-1B (MYP)	-	-			-	-
003	B-2A (MYP)	-	-			-	-
	TACTICAL FORCES						
004	F-22 RAPTOR	6	1,766,213			6	1,766,213
004	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(191,232)			-	(191,232)
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	277,094			-	277,094
006	F-15A	-	-			-	-
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
008	F-16 C/D (MYP)	10	252,610		(2,500)	10	250,110
	TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT		**2,104,685**		**(2,500)**		**2,102,185**
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
009	C-17 (MYP)	15	3,439,647		3,500	15	3,443,147
009	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(359,500)			-	(359,500)
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	304,900			-	304,900
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
011	WC-130	-	-			-	-
012	EC-130J	-	-			-	-
013	C-130H	-	-			-	-
014	C-130J	-	30,618			-	30,618
	TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		**3,415,665**		**3,500**		**3,419,165**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
015	JPATS	21	88,232			21	88,232
	TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT		**88,232**		**-**		**88,232**
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	HELICOPTERS						
016	V-22 OSPREY	-	29,221			-	29,221
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	20,290			-	20,290
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
018	SMALL VCX	-	-			-	-
019	C-32A	-	-			-	-
020	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-				-	-
021	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	27	2,531			27	2,531
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
022	TARGET DRONES	-	36,152			-	36,152
023	E-8C	1	316,150			1	316,150
023	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(35,885)			-	(35,885)
024	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-		46,000	-	46,000
025	HAEUAV	-	-			-	-
026	PREDATOR UAV	3	38,003		20,000	3	58,003
	TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT		**406,462**		**66,000**		**472,462**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
027	B-2A	-	20,083			-	20,083
028	B-1B	-	130,389			-	130,389
029	B-52	-	15,973			-	15,973
030	F-117	-	34,646			-	34,646
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
031	A-10	-	24,360			-	24,360
032	F-15	-	263,490		50,000	-	313,490
033	F-16	-	249,536		46,900	-	296,436
034	EF-111	-	-			-	-
035	T/AT-37	-	85			-	85
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
036	C-5	-	70,037			-	70,037
037	C-9	-	11,863			-	11,863
038	C-17A	-	95,643		(2,100)	-	93,543
039	C-21	-	8,713			-	8,713
040	C-22	-	174			-	174
041	C-STOL	-	-			-	-
042	C-32A	-	499			-	499
043	C-37A	-	383			-	383
044	C-137	-	-			-	-
045	C-141	-	10,021			-	10,021
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
046	T-1	-	10			-	10
047	T-3 (EFS) AIRCRAFT	-	2,196			-	2,196
048	T-38	-	94,487		(3,400)	-	91,087
049	T-41 AIRCRAFT	-	91			-	91

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
050	T-43	-	721		10,300	-	11,021
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
051	KC-10A (ATCA)	-	53,366		6,000	-	59,366
052	C-12	-	2,441			-	2,441
053	C-18	-	343			-	343
054	C-20 MODS	-	3,486		10,800	-	14,286
055	VC-25A MOD	-	9,262			-	9,262
056	C-130	-	207,646			-	207,646
057	C-135	-	347,088		68,100	-	415,188
058	DARP	-	138,436		39,700	-	178,136
059	E-3	-	124,061			-	124,061
060	E-4	-	19,985			-	19,985
061	E-8	-	28,558			-	28,558
062	H-1	-	254			-	254
063	H-60	-	15,565			-	15,565
064	OTHER AIRCRAFT	-	20,204			-	20,204
065	PREDATOR MODS	-	-			-	-
	OTHER MODIFICATIONS						
066	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	-	9,390			-	9,390
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT		**2,013,485**		**226,300**		**2,239,785**
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
067	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	420,921			-	420,921
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**420,921**		**-**		**420,921**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
068	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	171,369			-	171,369
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
069	A-10	-	8,300			-	8,300
070	B-2A	-	106,882		35,000	-	141,882
071	C-5	-	-			-	-
072	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	7,398			-	7,398
073	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	30,010		20,000	-	50,010
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
074	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	24,794		(1,000)	-	23,794
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
075	WAR CONSUMABLES	-	29,282			-	29,282
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
076	MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	339,606		2,000	-	341,606
	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT						
077	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	4,866			-	4,866
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF						
078	CANCELLED ACCOUNT PY ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
	DARP						
079	DARP	-	130,129			-	130,129
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**852,636**		**56,000**		**908,636**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(3,735)		(3,735)
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**9,302,086**		**345,565**		**9,647,651**

Items of Special Interest

Bomber modernization

The committee report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–532) required the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a bomber modernization plan that identified upgrades required for the current bomber fleet, a funding profile for these upgrades, and a timeline for consideration of the acquisition of a follow-on bomber. The plan submitted by the Secretary would sustain the current bomber force structure, consisting of B–2, B–1, and B–52 bombers, through 2037 and would delay any planning for procurement of a new bomber until 2013. The committee considers this planned force structure is unacceptable.

Consistent with the March 1998 conclusions of the Congressionally-directed Long Range Air Power Panel, the committee continues to believe that a replacement bomber will be required much sooner than predicted in Air Force bomber roadmap. The committee notes that by 2037, on average, B–2 bombers will have been in service over 40 years, the B–1 over 50 years, and the B–52 nearly 80 years, with a fleet average of over 60 years. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide to the House Committee on Armed Services and Senate Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2000, a conceptual study of a next generation bomber, including cost estimates, to be deployed by approximately 2015.

C–17

The budget request contained $3,080.1 million to procure 15 C–17 aircraft and $304.9 million for advance procurement of 15 aircraft in fiscal year 2001. The budget request did not include advance procurement funds for a maintenance training system (MTS) for the Air National Guard.

The C–17 MTS is designed to qualify personnel to maintain the C–17 aircraft. The committee understands that the Air National Guard unit that will receive C–17 aircraft in fiscal year 2003 requires an MTS for initial qualification of its maintenance personnel prior to the arrival of the aircraft.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $3,083.6 million, an increase of $3.5 million for advance procurement of an Air National Guard MTS.

C–17A aircraft modifications

The budget request contained $95.6 million for C–17A aircraft modifications, of which $11.9 million was included for the electronic flight control system (EFCS) modification.

The EFCS modification updates the C–17A's flight control computers with increased memory and allows for future system expansion. The committee supports the EFCS upgrade but notes unexplained equipment cost growth for this modification.

Consequently, the committee recommends $93.5 million for C–17 modifications, a decrease of $2.1 million for the EFCS modification.

C–130J

The committee notes that the Marine Corps has a clear requirement for 51 KC–130J aircraft to replace existing KC–130F/Rs, many of which are already almost 40 years old. In addition, the Air Force has reported a requirement for 150 C–130J–30s to replace C–130Es delivered in the early 1960s. None, however, were included in the budget request, and the Air Force currently plans to delay procurement until fiscal year 2002. An aircraft production line cannot be simply turned off and on without major disruption to the total supplier network across the country and the loss of skilled employees it represents. Such a shutdown and restart of the C–130J production is estimated to cost $500.0 million.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to include the necessary funds in the President's fiscal year 2001 budget request for the procurement of both Marine Corps KC–130Js and Air Force C–130J–30s, in order to meet the requirement without the adverse disruption resulting from the shutdown and restart of the production line.

C–135 modifications

The budget request contained $347.1 million for C–135 modifications, of which $170.7 million was included for the compass, radar, and global positioning system modification known as PACER CRAG, but included no funds for reengining older model KC–135E tanker aircraft.

The committee has long been a strong supporter of the KC–135 reengining program and notes that 414 KC–135A/Q/E model tankers have been funded to date. The committee also notes its past disagreement with the Department's decision to cancel the KC–135E reengining modification and has added additional funding for such purpose in each of the last several years. Consistent with its past actions, the committee recommends an increase of $52.0 million for two KC–135E reengining kits.

The committee also notes excessive cost growth in PACER CRAG installation equipment when compared to prior years. Consequently, the committee recommends a decrease of $2.1 million for the PACER CRAG modification.

In total, the committee recommends an increase of $49.9 million for these C–135 modifications.

Defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP)

The budget request contained $138.4 million for various RC–135 and U–2 aircraft modifications, but included no funds for RC–135 Rivet Joint (RJ) quick reaction capabilities (QRCs) or an upgraded U–2 common data link (CDL).

The RC–135 RJ is a tactical reconnaissance aircraft that provides real-time intelligence to combat forces. The QRCs consist of new software and hardware processing modifications that allow the aircraft and its crews to exploit new adversary systems. Since the Air Force Chief of Staff included additional funding for these QRCs among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2000, the committee recommends $13.4 million for these modifications.

The U–2 is a high altitude reconnaissance aircraft, and the CDL is its data link to ground stations. The committee understands that

the U–2's current CDL, designed over 20 years ago, has limited jam resistance and is increasingly costly to operate and maintain. The committee also understands that an upgraded CDL improves jam resistance, is less costly to operate and maintain, provides enhanced throughput capacity, and is compatible with the Department's existing information architecture. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to upgrade the U–2's CDL.

In total, the committee recommends $178.1 million for DARP, an increase of $39.7 million. Explanations for other increases are addressed in the classified annex to this report.

E–8C joint surveillance and target attack radar system (STARS)

The budget request contained $280.3 million to procure one E–8C Joint STARS aircraft, but included no funds for advance procurement to continue its production.

The Department's Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) recommended reducing the number of Joint STARS aircraft to be procured from 19 to 13 based on the assumption that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) would select and purchase six Joint STARS to meet its requirements for Alliance Ground Surveillance (AGS) aircraft. Despite NATO's rejection of the Joint STARS as its AGS aircraft in 1998, the Department did not change its recommendation nor budget for more than 13 Joint STARS aircraft in its fiscal year 1999 budget request. Accordingly, the committee recommended $72.0 million in fiscal year 1999 for advance procurement of two aircraft, and the Congress appropriated $36.0 million for one aircraft.

While the committee is encouraged that the Department has funded the 14th Joint STARS aircraft in its budget request, the committee remains concerned that, despite the Joint Requirements Oversight Council-validated requirement for 19 aircraft, the Department once again intends to shut down the E–8C production line after this aircraft is produced. These "low-density, high demand" aircraft are among the most sought-after assets by the regional commanders-in-chief for a range of reconnaissance and surveillance operations.

Therefore, the committee recommends $326.3 million, an increase of $46.0 million for advance procurement of one additional E–8C Joint STARS aircraft in fiscal year 2001.

F–15 modifications

The budget request contained $263.5 million for F–15 modifications, of which $17.6 million was included for 10 modification kits that convert the F100 engine to the F100–220E configuration. However, no funds were included for conversion of the Air National Guard's (ANG) F–15A and F–15B aircraft engines to the F100–220E configuration.

Conversion kits for the F100 engine, also known as "E-kits", will provide increased thrust, greater reliability, reduced maintenance requirements, and better fuel efficiency. The committee understands that, without the E-kit modification, the ANG's F–15A/B fleet will be increasingly costly to operate and maintain, less safe, and have diminished availability to respond to contingency operations.

Consequently, the committee recommends $313.5 million for F–15 modifications, an increase of $50.0 million for upgrading for the ANG's F–15A/B aircraft with E-kits.

F–16C

The budget request contained $252.6 million for 10 F–16C aircraft, of which $5.0 million was included for engineering change orders (ECOs).

The F–16C is the Air Force's primary multi-mission fighter aircraft. The committee notes that F–16Cs have been delivered to the Air Force since fiscal year 1992 and believes that ECOs to the aircraft should be minimal at this point in the production cycle.

Consequently, the committee recommends $250.1 million, a decrease of $2.5 million.

F–16 improved avionics intermediate shop (IAIS)

The budget request contained $30.0 million for F–16 post production support, of which $10.0 million was included for two IAIS systems.

The F–16 IAIS is a mobile test station used to diagnose and repair F–16 avionics problems at deployed locations. Because the F–16 IAIS uses fewer people and requires less cargo space for transit than the existing avionics intermediate shop, F–16 units have reported a savings of greater than $450 thousand per deployment. The committee understands that 55 F–16 IAISs are required, but notes that only 44 have been, or are planned to be, procured in the Future Years Defense Program.

Consequently, the committee recommends $50.0 million, an increase of $20.0 million for four F–16 IAIS systems-two for active units, and one each for Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units.

F–16 modifications

The budget request contained $249.5 million for various F–16 modifications, including $50.0 million to procure 32 LITENING II precision attack targeting systems (PATS). However, the request included no funds for long range fuel tanks or for the Digital Terrain System (DTS) upgrade.

The committee understands that Air National Guard (ANG) F–16 units are currently restricted from participation in combat operations because of their limited capability to perform precision strikes. The committee further understands that, due to this situation, the ANG Chief has designated procurement of additional LITENING II PATS as his number one unfunded priority for fiscal year 2000. This system, which consists of a third-generation forward-looking infrared and a laser spot tracker, will allow older ANG F–16s to participate in future Air Expeditionary Force deployments in support of theater commanders-in-chief precision strike taskings.

The committee believes the integration of ANG F–16s into precision strike operations is essential to the Total Force concept and, therefore, recommends $80.0 million for LITENING II PATS, an increase of $30.0 million to procure 18 additional systems.

The committee notes that the Congress provided $4.0 million in fiscal year 1999 for continued procurement of 600 gallon fuel tanks for the F–16. The committee believes that additional tanks are required to support testing with different aircraft configurations and, therefore, recommends an increase of $4.0 million for this purpose.

The DTS is designed to reduce controlled flight into terrain mishaps by providing F–16 pilots with a precise navigation and a ground collision avoidance capability. The committee has strongly supported the DTS upgrade in previous fiscal years. The committee is aware that the Air Force has a firm requirement for the DTS and is in the process of modifying the F–16's operational flight program to accommodate DTS integration. However, the committee understands that no funds are budgeted to continue this upgrade until fiscal year 2001.

Consistent with its earlier recommendations and Air Force requirements, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million to accelerate fielding of the DTS upgrade.

The committee supports all the modifications for which funds were requested but notes unexplained cost growth in the following projects: F110 digital engine control; global positioning system; mission computer kits; and engineering change orders. Consequently, the committee recommends a decrease of $7.1 million for these projects.

In total, the committee recommends $296.4 million for F–16 modifications, an increase of $46.9 million.

F–22

The budget request contained $1,575.0 million for 6 F–22 aircraft and $277.1 million for advance procurement of 10 aircraft in fiscal year 2001. The budget request also contained $1,222.2 million in PE 0604239F for F–22 engineering and manufacturing development (EMD).

The F–22, the Air Force's next-generation air superiority fighter aircraft, is currently approximately 80 percent complete in the EMD phase of acquisition and low rate initial production is planned to begin in fiscal year 2000. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (P.L. 105–85) established a cost limitation for both the EMD and procurement phases of the program, which are $18.9 billion for EMD and $43.4 billion for procurement.

Over the past year, the committee has learned that potential EMD costs could exceed the cost limitation by $667.0 million. To retain EMD costs within the cost ceiling, the Air Force has identified proposed actions to offset this amount, which included the depletion of the contractor's management reserve, deferral of external combat stores certification until after the F–22 EMD program is complete and reductions to test and laboratory infrastructure.

The committee also notes that the Department's fiscal year 2000 request for six F–22s has increased by $312.7 million, or 25 percent, compared to its forecast cost submitted with the fiscal year 1999 budget request. The committee understands that the Department based its fiscal year 1999 forecast on a cost model estimate but the fiscal year 2000 budget request reflects negotiated values and actual contractor costs. As a result of this increase, the com-

mittee also understands that costs for aircraft to be procured beyond fiscal year 2000 have been planned to cost less so that the Department can procure the planned number of aircraft within the cost limitation.

While the committee continues to support the F–22 aircraft, it is disturbed by continuing EMD cost growth; the prospect that EMD actions being eliminated or deferred will result in higher future costs, increased program risk, or both; and by unforeseen increases in procurement costs. Since future budget requests for research and development are projected to decrease and for procurement are likely to rise only modestly, the committee is concerned that future F–22 EMD and procurement cost increases could impact other programs, may require a reduction to the number of F–22s procured, or eliminate some of the aircraft's intended capabilities to remain within cost limits. Thus, the committee questions whether the present F–22 EMD and procurement programs can be completed as planned within projected budgets and limitations.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2000, that certifies that F–22 EMD and production can remain within the cost limits and that testing of the aircraft will be performed in accordance with test plans that were in place when the cost limits were established. If the Secretary is unable to make such certification, he shall inform the committees of the reasons therefor and present a revised plan, including new cost estimates, for the acquisition of this aircraft.

Predator unmanned aerial vehicle

The budget request contained $38.0 million for three Predator unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) and one ground control station (GCS).

The committee notes that the Predator has been flying support missions in Bosnia, and now Kosovo, for over three and one-half years, logging more than 11,000 total flight hours. Because of its importance to theater commanders' intelligence needs, a solid production base for this system must be continued, attrition reserve vehicles must be maintained, and improvements must be made to fully exploit the potential of this system. For example, the committee believes the laser designator upgrades now being integrated into the aircraft for immediate contingency needs should be put into long-term production.

Also, Predator operations are expected to be expanded to other theaters and operational areas. However, the committee understands Predator is currently not deployable worldwide because of some host-nation communications frequency restrictions. The committee believes the Air Force needs to add the tactical common data link (TCDL) to the air vehicles and the GCS to overcome this operational limitation.

Finally, the committee notes that when using satellite communications control of an aircraft, the GCS can only control a single air vehicle at a time. This precludes dual aircraft control for on-station relief that has been demonstrated with the line-of-sight data link. A dual-channel beyond-line-of-sight satellite communications capability needs to be retrofitted into existing aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends $58.0 million, an increase of $20.0 million to procure two additional attrition reserve UAVs and for production versions/kits of the laser designator, the dual-channel satellite communications suite and the TCDL.

T–38 modifications

The budget request contained $94.5 million for T–38 modifications, of which $85.7 million was included for the avionics upgrade program (AUP).

The AUP updates the T–38 cockpit configuration to provide state-of-the-art avionics and improve instrument management training. The committee supports the AUP but notes an unexplained increase in engineering change orders.

Consequently, the committee recommends $91.1 million, a decrease of $3.4 million.

Terrain awareness and warning system (TAWS)

The budget request contained $35.7 million for procurement and installation of the TAWS upgrade on the C–135, KC–10, and C–20 aircraft, but included no funds for upgrade of the T–43 aircraft.

The TAWS upgrade projects an aircraft's position relative to the ground and improves pilot situational awareness by warning of potential ground impact, thus preventing controlled flight into terrain (CFIT). The committee notes that CFIT is the leading cause of airline fatalities worldwide and that the TAWS is required on commercial airliners.

Therefore, the committee recommends $81.0 million, an increase of $18.2 million for the C–135, $6.0 million for the KC–10, $10.3 million for the T–43, and $10.8 million for the C–20, to accelerate the TAWS upgrade and understands that this amount will complete its procurement and installation of this equipment on these aircraft.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained $419.5 million for Ammunition Procurement, Air Force in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $560.5 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
001	ROCKETS	-	9,806		5,000	-	14,806
002	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	-	-			-	-
003	2.75" ROCKET HEAD SIGNATURE	-	-			-	-
004	2.75 IN ROCKET, FLARE IR	-	-			-	-
005	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-			-	-
	CARTRIDGES						
006	CARTRIDGES	-	70,703		14,600	-	85,303
007	5.56 MM	-	-			-	-
008	30 MM TRAINING	-	-			-	-
009	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180	-	-			-	-
010	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188	-	-			-	-
011	SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3	-	-			-	-
012	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-			-	-
	BOMBS						
013	PRACTICE BOMBS	-	24,325		23,200	-	47,525
014	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	40,553		17,500	-	58,053
015	MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	-	-			-	-
016	GBU-28 HARD TARGET PENETRATOR	-	-			-	-
017	GBU - 37	-	-			-	-
018	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	-	-			-	-
019	2000 LB HE BOMB MK-84	-	-			-	-
020	MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	-	-			-	-
021	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	203	61,334			203	61,334
022	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	5,410	125,605		66,000	5,410	191,605
023	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER	2,922	48,875			2,922	48,875

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
024	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-			-	-
	FLARES						
025	ASTE (INFRARED EXPENDABLE)	-	-			-	-
026	OTHER MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS	-	5,593			-	5,593
027	FLARE, IR MJU-7B	-	-			-	-
028	MJU-10B	-	-			-	-
029	M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE	-	-			-	-
030	CAD/PAD	-	-			-	-
031	LUU-19 FLARE	-	-			-	-
032	INITIAL SPARES	-	2,304			-	2,304
033	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	657			-	657
034	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-			-	-
	FUZES						
035	FLARES	-	26,342		14,700	-	41,042
036	JOINT PROGRAMMABLE FUSE(JPF)	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE		**416,097**		**141,000**		**557,097**
	WEAPONS						
	SMALL ARMS						
037	SMALL ARMS	-	3,440			-	3,440
038	M-16 A2 RIFLE	-	-			-	-
039	9MM COMPACT PISTOL	-	-			-	-
040	M-9 PISTOL	-	-			-	-
041	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL WEAPONS		**3,440**		**-**		**3,440**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		**419,537**		**141,000**		**560,537**

Items of Special Interest

Air force ammunition

The budget request contained $416.1 million for procurement of ammunition. The committee recommends $557.1 million, an increase of $141.0 million for the following types of ammunition, which are among the top unfunded priorities of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force for fiscal year 2000:

[In millions of dollars]

Rockets:	
2.75 inch rocket motors	5.0
Cartridges:	
.50 caliber ball, linked	1.5
.50 caliber ball/tracer, linked	0.5
20mm PGU–27/B	12.6
Bombs:	
Practice Bombs (BDU–50/56)	23.2
General Purpose Bombs	10.0
MK–84 HE	7.5
JDAM	66.0
Flares	
MJU–23	6.8
LUU–19	5.4
LUU–2	2.5

Of the amount recommended for practice bombs, the committee expects $6.0 million to be designated for MK–84 (BDU–56) cast ductile iron practice bombs.

Laser guided bombs (LGB)

The bombing campaign of Operation Allied Force clearly illustrates the importance of precision-guided munitions as a weapon-of-choice and the necessity to maintain an adequate production base of these weapons for surge requirements, replenishment, and war reserves.

The committee is concerned that reliance on a single producer could result in unnecessary delays in replenishing and rebuilding the inventory of LGBs. The committee is aware that the Air Force previously qualified a second source for LGB production and believes that a second source should be reestablished.

Consequently, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report analyzing alternative production options to the Congressional defense committees by June 30, 1999.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained $2,359.6 million for Missile Procurement, Air Force in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $2,303.7 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC						
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	-	15,593			-	15,593
	TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES		**15,593**		**-**		**15,593**
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC						
002	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	-	1,050			-	1,050
003	HAVE NAP	-	-			-	-
	TACTICAL						
004	JASSM	-	-			-	-
005	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	193	79,981	207	35,000	400	114,981
006	AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15	-	220			-	220
007	AMRAAM	210	97,279			210	97,279
	TARGET DRONES						
008	TARGET DRONES	-	-			-	-
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
009	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	3,064			-	3,064
	TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		**181,594**		**35,000**		**216,594**
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES						
	CLASS IV						
010	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	-	2,950			-	2,950

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
011	CONVENTIONAL ALCM	-	-			-	-
012	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	-	31,103			-	31,103
013	MM III MODIFICATIONS	-	242,960		40,000	-	282,960
014	AGM-65D MAVERICK	-	2,800		10,000	-	12,800
015	AGM-88C HARM	-	-			-	-
016	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE	-	-			-	-
017	PEACEKEEPER (M-X)	-	8,919			-	8,919
018	MODIFICATIONS UNDER $5.0M	-	100			-	100
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES		**288,832**		**50,000**		**338,832**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
019	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	18,022			-	18,022
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**18,022**		**-**		**18,022**
	OTHER SUPPORT						
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
020	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
021	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	-	9,594		(5,000)	-	4,594
022	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	-	139,049			-	139,049
023	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	31,798			-	31,798
024	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	-	11,375			-	11,375
025	INERTIAL UPPER STAGES(SPACE)	-	-			-	-
026	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	-	38,223			-	38,223
027	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)	-	111,609			-	111,609
028	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM(SPACE)	-	30,765			-	30,765

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
029	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS (SPACE)	-	431,165		(20,000)	-	411,165
030	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	1	70,812			1	70,812
031	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)	-	64,834			-	64,834
032	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
033	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
034	CANCELLED ACCOUNT PY ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
035	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	-	716,703		(115,000)	-	601,703
036	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	-	199,640			-	199,640
	TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT		**1,855,567**		**(140,000)**		**1,715,567**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(947)		(947)
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**2,359,608**		**(55,947)**		**2,303,661**

Items of Special Interest

AGM–65 modifications

The budget request contained $2.8 million to convert 200 AGM–65G missiles to the AGM–65K configuration, but included no funds to upgrade AGM–65B missiles to the AGM–65H configuration or for training missiles.

The AGM–65 is a precision guided tactical missile employed on the F–16 and A–10 aircraft. The "G" configuration uses an infrared (IR) target seeker, while the "K" and "H" configurations use an updated electro-optical (EO) seeker. The "B" configuration uses an obsolete EO target seeker.

The committee understands that the Air Force planned to retain its AGM–65G IR-guided missiles and convert obsolete EO-guided AGM–65B missiles to the updated AGM–65H configuration, but, due to funding constraints, chose to modify its inventory of 1200 AGM–65Gs to the AGM–65K configuration, which would eliminate IR-guided AGM–65s from its inventory.

Since the committee believes that a mix of both IR- and EO-guided AGM–65s are required for mission flexibility, it recommends $12.8 million, an increase of $10.0 million to convert AGM–65B missiles to the AGM–65H and AGM–65K configurations and to procure training missiles and associated test equipment for these variants.

Minuteman III modifications

The budget request contained $146.5 million for the Minuteman III guidance replacement program (GRP).

The committee notes that the Air Force has substantially delayed the planned procurement of GRP, which will replace older guidance packages in the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile fleet. The committee understands that the delay in the program also will force a delay of the propulsion replacement program (PRP). The PRP will replace aging solid rocket motors, but installation of the new rocket motors depends on prior installation of GRP computers. The committee also understands that the condition of solid rocket fuel in some of these rocket motors will render them unreliable prior to GRP completion and that the delay of GRP and PRP will significantly lower the operational effectiveness of the Minuteman force in the middle of the next decade.

To avoid these unacceptable operational consequences, the committee recommends $186.5 million, an increase of $40.0 million to accelerate the procurement of GRP.

Spaceborne equipment

The budget request contained $9.6 million for spaceborne communications security equipment.

The committee notes that these funds were requested to support the global positioning system and the space based infrared system but understands that these requirements have already been met.

Consequently, the committee recommends $4.6 million, a decrease of $5.0 million.

Titan

The budget request contained $431.2 million for the Titan launch vehicle and launch operations.

The committee notes a substantial increase in the request for payload integration compared to the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999. The committee also notes that the expenditure rate for prior year funds is lagging behind DOD end-of-year standards.

Consequently, the committee believes that the request exceeds requirements and recommends $411.2 million, a reduction of $20.0 million.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained $7,085.2 million for Other Procurement, Air Force in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $7,077.8 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
001	SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2	-	-			-	-
002	STATION WAGON, 4X2	-	-			-	-
003	BUSES	-	-			-	-
004	AMBULANCES	-	-			-	-
005	LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	53	986			53	986
006	ARMORED SEDAN	-	-			-	-
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES						
007	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	-	-			-	-
008	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2	-	-			-	-
009	TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	-	-			-	-
010	TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	-	-			-	-
011	TRUCK MULTI-STOP 1 TON 4X2	-	-			-	-
012	TRUCK CARRYALL	-	-			-	-
013	COMMERCIAL UTILITY CARGO VEHICLE	-	-			-	-
014	FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	-			-	-
015	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	194	11,343			194	11,343
016	TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T	-	-			-	-
017	TRUCK, UTILITY	-	-			-	-
018	CAP VEHICLES	-	751			-	751
019	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	28,220			-	28,220
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
020	TRUCK TANK FUEL R-11	-	-			-	-
021	HMMWV, ARMORED	-	-			-	-
022	TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-2	-	-			-	-
023	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	272	7,710			272	7,710

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
024	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	21,808			-	21,808
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
025	TRUCK CRASH P-19	-	-			-	-
026	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	3,869			-	3,869
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
027	TRUCK, F/L 6000 LB	-	-			-	-
028	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	89	6,983			89	6,983
029	60K A/C LOADER	39	81,163		12,500	39	93,663
030	NEXT GENERATION SMALL LOADER(NGSL)	13	9,754			13	9,754
031	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	6,637		5,000	-	11,637
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
032	TRUCK, DUMP	105	5,428			105	5,428
033	RUNWAY SNOW REMOVE & CLEANING EQUIP	65	7,392			65	7,392
034	MODIFICATIONS	-	887			-	887
035	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	10,070			-	10,070
036	VEHICLE LEASES	-	-			-	-
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM						
037	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT		**203,001**		**17,500**		**220,501**
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
038	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	-	28,133			-	28,133
039	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	-	488			-	488
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
040	INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS	-	23,931		5,000	-	28,931
041	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	2,042			-	2,042

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
042	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	-	5,495			-	5,495
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
043	AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (ATCALS)	-	887			-	887
044	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	-	54,394			-	54,394
045	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENT	-	37,917		24,000	-	61,917
046	WEATHER OBSERV/FORECAST	-	25,434			-	25,434
047	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	22,143			-	22,143
048	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	-	6,371			-	6,371
049	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	-	1,801			-	1,801
050	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM	-	-			-	-
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
051	AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	71,173		10,000	-	81,173
052	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	-	5,722			-	5,722
053	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	10,366			-	10,366
054	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	-	32,583			-	32,583
055	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	-	17,503		2,000	-	19,503
056	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM NET	-	5,168			-	5,168
057	FORCE PROTECTION/ANTI-TERRORISM	-	-			-	-
058	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	13,275		3,000	-	16,275
059	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	2,871			-	2,871
060	BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	-	28,361			-	28,361
061	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	-	47,648			-	47,648
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
062	INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS	-	14,012			-	14,012
063	BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	-	122,839			-	122,839
064	USCENTCOM	-	5,770			-	5,770
065	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	14,025			-	14,025

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	DISA PROGRAMS						
066	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	-	14,614			-	14,614
067	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG SPACE	-	1,011			-	1,011
068	NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPACE	-	3,490			-	3,490
069	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	-	33,591			-	33,591
070	EASTERN/WESTERN RANGE I&M SPACE	-	83,410			-	83,410
071	MILSATCOM SPACE	-	46,257		(6,300)	-	39,957
072	SPACE MODS SPACE	-	2,835			-	2,835
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
073	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	-	49,710		34,500	-	84,210
074	COMBAT SURVIVOR/EVADER LOCATER RADIO	-	843			-	843
075	RADIO EQUIPMENT	-	16,685		3,800	-	20,485
076	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)	-	1,991			-	1,991
077	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	-	3,208			-	3,208
078	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	-	41,589			-	41,589
079	CAP COM & ELECT	-	382			-	382
080	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,034			-	7,034
	MODIFICATIONS						
081	COMM ELECT MODS	-	56,195			-	56,195
	TOTAL ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		**963,197**		**76,000**		**1,039,197**
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP						
	TEST EQUIPMENT						
082	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE	-	10,157			-	10,157
083	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKAGE	-	1,071			-	1,071
084	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	9,750		6,600	-	16,350

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP						
085	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	-	2,800			-	2,800
086	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	3,559			-	3,559
	DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ						
087	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	15,320		10,000	-	25,320
088	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	8,533			-	8,533
	ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT						
089	GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC	-	-			-	-
090	FLOODLIGHTS	-	13,461			-	13,461
091	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,638			-	7,638
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
092	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	-	14,035		2,000	-	16,035
093	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT	-	14,331			-	14,331
094	ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	-	955			-	955
095	AIR BASE OPERABILITY	-	4,417			-	4,417
096	PALLET AIR CARGO	-	-			-	-
097	NET ASSEMBLY, 108"X88"	-	-			-	-
098	BLADDERS FUEL	-	-			-	-
099	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
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
106	INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY	-	40,047		10,000	-	50,047
107	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ	-	2,976			-	2,976

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
108	DARP RC135	-	12,658			-	12,658
109	DARP, MRIGS	-	106,394			-	106,394
110	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	-	5,352,231		(126,670)	-	5,225,561
111	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	-	142,515			-	142,515
112	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	-	7,910			-	7,910
113	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	1,151			-	1,151
114	PROJECT MANAGEMENT ADMINISTRATION	-	-			-	-
115	MODIFICATIONS	-	179			-	179
116	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	13,304			-	13,304
	TOTAL OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP		**5,882,493**		**(98,070)**		**5,784,423**
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
117	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	36,486			-	36,486
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**36,486**		**-**		**36,486**
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(2,845)		(2,845)
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**7,085,177**		**(7,415)**		**7,077,762**

Items of Special Interest

60K a/c loader

The budget request contained $81.2 million to procure 39 60K aircraft loaders.

The 60K loader replaces the Air Force's aging fleet of 1960s-era 40K loaders and wide-body elevator loaders. They provide the critical high-reach capability required to load the KC–10 and other commercial wide-body aircraft that comprise the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. The committee understands that there are 55 60K loaders currently fielded at locations around the world, providing a critical link in the responsive projection of U.S. forces and in the delivery of materiel to support humanitarian operations.

The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included 60K loaders on his list of unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2000. In order to accelerate production and fielding of this key material handling equipment, the committee recommends $93.7 million, an increase of $12.5 million to procure an additional nine 60K loaders. The committee understands that this action will enable the maximum annual production rate of the 60 K loader to be attained.

Aircrew laser eye protection

The budget request contained no funds to procure aircrew laser eye protection (LEP) equipment.

The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff recently directed that plans to procure and field LEP equipment be immediately accelerated. The committee has provided additional funds in prior years for the Air Force to complete development and evaluation of aircrew LEP technologies and understands that, as a result, two mature LEP technologies have emerged—FV–9 dye-based spectacles and visors and the clear laser eye protection for infrared (CLEPIR) dielectric spectacles. The FV–9 spectacles and visors provide protection in the visible portion of the electromagnetic spectrum, and the CLEPIR spectacles provide protection in the invisible, near infrared portion of the spectrum.

The committee strongly supports the Chief's direction to accelerate procurement and fielding of LEP spectacles and visors. Therefore, the committee recommends $6.6 million to expeditiously begin procurement of the FV–9 and CLEPIR equipment.

Automatic data processing equipment (ADPE)

The budget request contained $71.2 million for ADPE but included no funds for the spare parts production and reprocurement system (SPARES).

The committee notes the usefulness of this information system in supporting spare parts buys at the Ogden Air Logistics Center and believes it should be expanded to other installations Department-wide.

Therefore, the committee recommends $81.2 million for ADPE, an increase of $10.0 million for this purpose.

Master crane

The budget request contained no funds for the master crane.

The master crane is an aircraft component hoisting system for use on all aircraft, both fixed-wing and rotary. It is currently only in limited use within the Air National Guard (ANG) but has been found to be safer to operate, faster to use, easier to deploy, and to require much less maintenance than other cranes in the ANG's inventory.

The committee believes that the master crane is kind of equipment that is needed for today's rapid deployment forces. Therefore, the committee recommends $5.0 million to procure additional master cranes for the ANG.

Military satellite communications terminals

The budget request contained $46.3 million for military satellite communications terminals.

The committee understands that the request exceeds requirements because of a schedule delay in a military communications satellite program. Accordingly, the committee recommends $40.0 million, a decrease of $6.3 million.

National eagle system

The budget request contained no funds to upgrade the national eagle system.

The deployable national eagle system provides U.S. forces with time-sensitive, commercial satellite imagery that allows aircrews to have up-to-date access to imagery of an adversary's terrain. Such imagery can be immediately used in aircraft mission planning and rehearsal systems, contributing both to survivability and mission effectiveness. However, the committee understands that the national eagle system does not currently have an antenna or a data acquisition capability, as does the upgraded eagle vision system.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $5.0 million to procure an eagle vision antenna and data acquisition segment to upgrade the national eagle system.

Radio equipment

The budget request contained $16.7 million for radio equipment, including $15.7 million for Scope Command.

The Scope Command program provides for consolidating and upgrading the Department's network of high frequency (HF) ground stations around the world with commercial-off-the-shelf, state-of-the-art HF radio equipment. These ground stations provide the sole command and control resource for Air Mobility Command cargo and tanker aircraft.

The committee has been a strong supporter of Scope Command and understands that, with minor modifications, the network is capable of performing HF e-mail gateway functions. Since HF radio signals use the ionosphere for propagation, incorporating an e-mail capability into this network will provide an inexpensive method for forward-deployed forces to communicate with friends and families in the CONUS.

Consequently, the committee recommends $20.5 million for radio equipment, an increase of $3.8 million to incorporate an HF e-mail capability into the Scope Command network.

Supply asset tracking system (SATS)

The budget request contained $1.1 million for SATS.

SATS is one example of the Department's effort to achieve Total Asset Visibility—the ability to quickly and accurately identify and locate personnel, equipment, and supplies—through the use of commercial automated information technology (AIT). It incorporates radio frequency terminals and smart cards, enabling electronic status confirmation of supply assets from receipt to issue. The committee notes that the Congress has provided additional funds for SATS installation over the past two fiscal years and is supportive of the use of AIT to streamline business processes.

Therefore, the committee recommends $11.1 million for SATS, an increase of $10.0 million to accelerate its installation at Air Force bases worldwide.

Tactical communications-electronics (CE) equipment

The budget request contained $49.7 million for tactical CE equipment, of which $36.4 million is for theater-deployable communications (TDC) sets. TDC is a compact, ruggedized, high-bandwidth communications system used by forward-deployed Air Expeditionary Force units. Its state-of-the-art technology is much more capable than the aging equipment it replaces, and it requires significantly reduced airlift support.

In 1997, the Air Force conducted a command and control (C2) task force to establish an air and space C2 policy for the 21st century. One key finding of the task force was that the service should accelerate procurement of TDC sets and complete the buyout of this equipment by fiscal year 2001. The committee endorsed this finding and added $25.0 million ($18.0 million of which was appropriated) for this purpose in fiscal year 1998 and $20.0 million (none of which was appropriated) in fiscal year 1999.

The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included TDC sets on his list of unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2000. Accordingly, the committee recommends $84.2 million for tactical communications-electronics equipment, an increase of $34.5 million to accelerate the production and fielding of the two key components of the TDC set, the lightweight mobile satellite terminal and the integrated communications access package.

Theater air control system (TACSI)

The budget request contained $37.9 million for TACSI, but contained no funds for mobile radar approach controls (RAPCON) for the Air National Guard (ANG).

The committee is aware that the ANG has a requirement for 12 mobile RAPCONs, since, even though it is responsible for over 60 percent of the Department's wartime air traffic control (ATC) mission, it is using ATC systems originally fielded in the 1960s. The committee understands these systems are difficult to deploy, are becoming unsupportable due to lack of spare parts, and lack current-generation automation aids that reduce controller workload and fatigue. In view of this situation, funds were appropriated for fiscal year 1999 to procure the first replacement mobile RAPCON, an off-the-shelf, solid-state design system that corrects these deficiencies.

The committee supports continued modernization of ANG ATC units and recommends $61.9 million for TACSI, an increase of $24.0 million to procure an additional three mobile RAPCONs.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request contained $2,129.0 million for Procurement, Defense-Wide in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $2,107.8 million for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS						
001	MOTOR VEHICLES	-	309			-	309
002	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	-	88,976		(26,271)	-	62,705
003	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	-	20,530			-	20,530
004	ARMED FORCES INFORMATION SERVICES	-	5,472			-	5,472
005	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	-	1,560			-	1,560
006	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMIN	-	-			-	-
007	DARP	-	-			-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
009	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	-	11,513			-	11,513
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
010	MOBILE SATELLITE SYSTEM TECH	-	25,977			-	25,977
011	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	-	20,889			-	20,889
012	CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS	-	3,557			-	3,557
013	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	-	28,279			-	28,279
014	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS	-	4,119			-	4,119
015	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	4,755			-	4,755
016	STANDARD TACTICAL ENTRY POINT	-	2,969			-	2,969
017	PLANS & PROGRAM ANALYSIS SUPPORT CTR	-	-			-	-
018	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	13,785			-	13,785
019	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		-				-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
021	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	-	47,455			-	47,455
021A	AUTOMATED DOCUMENT CONVERSION SYSTEM	-	-		32,000	-	32,000

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS						
022	VEHICLES	-	-			-	-
023	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
024	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	4,734			-	4,734
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO						
025	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO	-	-			-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
026	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	-	31,417			-	31,417
	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION						
027	PATRIOT PAC-3	32	300,898			32	300,898
028	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE	-	-			-	-
029	C4I	-	-			-	-
030	NAVY AREA TBDM PROGRAM	7	55,002		(55,002)	7	-
	NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY						
	DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY						
032	EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
033	VEHICLES	-	147			-	147
034	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	34,286			-	34,286
	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY						
035	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	419			-	419
	TOTAL MAJOR EQUIPMENT		**707,048**		**(49,273)**		**657,775**
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
036	SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES	-	41,233			-	41,233

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
037	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS	-	2,107			-	2,107
038	MC-130H COMBAT TALON II	-	16,895			-	16,895
039	CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION	-	3,582			-	3,582
040	OH-6 PROCUREMENT & MODIFICATIONS	-	-			-	-
041	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	-	26,796			-	26,796
042	C-130 MODIFICATIONS	-	98,893			-	98,893
043	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	-	1,729			-	1,729
	SHIPBUILDING						
044	ADV SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM	-	-			-	-
045	PC,CYCLONE CLASS	-	-			-	-
046	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS	-	21,213			-	21,213
047	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	17,286			-	17,286
048	MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEH	-	-			-	-
049	SUBMARINE CONVERSION	-	3,284			-	3,284
050	MK V SPECIAL OPERATIONS CRAFT	-	-			-	-
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
051	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	-	37,876			-	37,876
052	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	-	15,992			-	15,992
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
053	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	-	86,758			-	86,758
054	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	-	19,154			-	19,154
055	SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	-	23,355		7,000	-	30,355
056	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS	-	2,183			-	2,183
057	NAVAL SPC WARFARE RIGID INFLATABLE BOAT	-	-			-	-
058	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	-	18,771			-	18,771
059	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	29,836			-	29,836
060	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	-	4,949			-	4,949
061	DRUG INTERDICTION	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
062	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	10,073			-	10,073
063	SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM	-	2,432			-	2,432
064	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	-	110,147		(1,500)	-	108,647
065	PSYOP EQUIPMENT	-	11,716			-	11,716
	TOTAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND		**606,260**		**5,500**		**611,760**
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
	CBDP						
066	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	-	124,612			-	124,612
067	DECONTAMINATION	-	10,920			-	10,920
068	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM	-	99,573			-	99,573
069	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	-	36,732			-	36,732
070	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	-	105,559			-	105,559
	TOTAL CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE		**377,396**		**-**		**377,396**
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	-	438,263		23,500	-	461,763
	ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(855)		(855)
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		**2,128,967**		**(21,128)**		**2,107,839**

Items of Special Interest

Automated document conversion system (ADCS)

The budget request contained no funds for the ADCS.

The committee recognizes that the ADCS is the Department's single most productive program in the conversion of legacy engineering drawings. However, a significant inventory of these drawings remain to be converted if the Department is to achieve its goal to digitize them by fiscal year 2002.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $32.0 million to continue procurement of ADCS hardware and software for this purpose.

Mentor protégé

The budget request contained $26.3 million for the Mentor Protégé program. This program provides funds to major Department of Defense prime contractors for the purpose of developing the technical capabilities of Small Disadvantaged Businesses to perform as subcontractors.

The committee notes that the legal authority for this pilot program expires at the end of fiscal year 1999. Therefore, the committee recommends no funds for the Mentor Protégé program.

Nightstar binocular

The budget request contained $23.4 million for special operations forces small arms and weapons, but included no funds for nightstar binoculars.

The nightstar binocular is a compact, lightweight, hand-held binocular that combines night vision and laser range-finding capabilities that allows the operator to transmit range, azimuth, and elevation data to external systems such as the global positioning system for immediate coordination definition. The committee understands that the Department's initial operational test and evaluation of the nightstar binocular indicates that it provides increased capabilities compared to existing night vision devices.

Consequently, the committee recommends $30.4 million, an increase of $7.0 million to initiate procurement of nightstar binoculars.

National Guard and Reserve Equipment

Overview

The budget request did not contain any funds for National Guard and Reserve Equipment for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $60.0 million for fiscal year 2000.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY RESERVE						
001	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	-		10,000	-	10,000
	NAVY RESERVE						
002	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	-		10,000	-	10,000
	MARINE CORPS RESERVE						
003	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	-		10,000	-	10,000
	AIR FORCE RESERVE						
004	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	-		10,000	-	10,000
	NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
005	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	-		10,000	-	10,000
	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
006	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	-		10,000	-	10,000
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT		**-**		**60,000**		**60,000**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

National guard and reserve equipment

The budget request did not contain any funds for National Guard and Reserve Equipment for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends an increase of $60.0 million for this equipment.

[In millions of dollars]

Army Reserve:	
Miscellaneous	10.0
Navy Reserve:	
Miscellaneous	10.0
Marine Corps Reserve:	
Miscellaneous	10.0
Air Force Reserve:	
Miscellaneous	10.0
Army National Guard:	
Miscellaneous	10.0
Air National Guard:	
Miscellaneous	10.0

The committee expects that priority consideration be given to the following items: fire fighting aircraft (with preference to U.S.-manufactured aircraft), cargo compartment expanded range fuel systems, medium tactical wreckers, night vision devices, ALR–56M radar warning receivers, and night targeting systems.

Reconnaissance aircraft augmentation

Following the end of the Cold War, conventional thinking concluded that the relatively high operations tempo rates and the numbers of reconnaissance aircraft could be reduced significantly. Indeed, the operations tempo rates for these aircraft have increased significantly since the demise of the Soviet Union. In addition to their strategic reconnaissance and operations-other-than-war roles, reconnaissance aircraft have been increasingly called on to provide direct tactical intelligence to forces engaged in numerous regional conflicts or supporting peacekeeping operations.

Unfortunately, fiscal realities make it unlikely that new reconnaissance aircraft will be procured in the near future. Further, the numbers of reconnaissance aircraft have been reduced over time due to accidents or to decisions such as the Navy's to terminate the ES–3 Shadow aircraft in fiscal year 2000 and the Air Force's to terminate the Senior Scout platform in fiscal year 2002. Although unmanned aerial vehicles may mitigate some of these force size limitations, the committee believes there is a need to enhance the reconnaissance capabilities of manned systems that are already available and in service.

The committee is aware of an initiative by the Air Force Chief of Staff (CSAF) to use the EC–130H Compass Call offensive information operations aircraft in a secondary reconnaissance role. The committee fully understands that Compass Call system operators are the same specialists that operate reconnaissance systems such as the Rivet Joint and Senior Scout. The committee also understands that the Compass Call mission equipment has some of the same technical characteristics of the Rivet Joint and Senior Scout. Consequently, the committee believes that by exercising the full extent of the Compass Call operators' skills and by employing the

Compass Call equipment in a different manner, a reconnaissance capability can be realized with only minor investment.

The committee further believes the CSAF initiative has two other important potential benefits. The first is linguist training. Currently, Compass Call linguists train primarily in language laboratories or in the Compass Call mission simulator, while their reconnaissance aircrew contemporaries train daily against their real-world mission targets. By using the Compass Call aircraft in a reconnaissance role, its operators would have the benefit of real-world operations, thereby having better training for their wartime offensive information operations role.

Second, the Air Force decision to terminate Senior Scout leaves a mission gap for the Air National Guard's 169th Intelligence Squadron (IS). This squadron provides a unique linguistic talent pool that must be retained and kept operationally proficient. Assuming the Air Force decides to use Compass Call in the additional reconnaissance role, there appears to be a logical force management decision to move part of the Compass Call mission to the Air National Guard. The 169th IS would be fully taskable for peacetime reconnaissance missions and would also be available for Air Combat Command war or contingency missions.

The committee commends the CSAF initiative and requests the Secretary of the Air Force to provide an analysis of this initiative to the Congressional defense and intelligence committees concurrent with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

Overview

The budget request contained no funds for Chemical Agents and Munitions, Defense, for fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends authorization of $1,012.0 million for fiscal year 2000, including $230.0 million for research and development, $232.0 million for procurement, and $550.0 million for operations and maintenance, as noted in the following table. Unless otherwise specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

		FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
001	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	-	-		230,000	-	230,000
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC						
	PROCUREMENT						
002	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	-	-		232,000	-	232,000
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M						
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
003	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	-	-		550,000	-	550,000
	TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION		**-**		**1,012,000**		**1,012,000**

Item of Special Interest

Chemical agents and munitions destruction

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends transferring the budget request of $1,169.0 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army, to Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction Defense.

The committee notes the progress that has been made during the last fiscal year in the continuing effort to dispose of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions and of chemical warfare related materiel, while ensuring maximum protection of the public, personnel involved in the destruction, and the environment. Of the original stockpile of 31,495 tons of chemical agent, 13.4 percent has been destroyed and 90 percent of the stockpile is under contract for destruction (as of February 28, 1999). Destruction facilities at Johnston Atoll and Tooele, Utah, are operational. Five facilities are in the design phase or under construction: Anniston, Alabama; Umatilla, Oregon; Pine Bluff, Arkansas; Aberdeen, Maryland; and Newport, Indiana. Facilities at Pueblo, Colorado, and Blue Grass, Kentucky, are on hold pending completion of the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) program demonstration.

The committee notes that the current estimate of the total cost of the chemical agents and munitions destruction program is $14.9 billion, continues to be concerned about the cost of the program, and believes that attention needs to be given to measures that could reduce this overall cost, including potential alternatives relating to the destruction of non-stockpile related materiel and to the ultimate disposition of the destruction facilities themselves. Accordingly the committee recommends a provision (sec.141) that would address the cost issue and would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congressional defense committees on cost reduction measures he might recommend.

The committee recommends $1,012.0 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense, a decrease of $157.0 million. The committee notes that even after the reduction, the amount authorized is still almost $250.0 million greater than the fiscal year 1999 appropriation for this account. The committee believes this reduction can be accommodated without a breach in U.S. compliance with the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) Treaty and with no disincentive to the Russian effort to destroy its chemical munitions stockpile.

The committee understands that the ability to complete destruction of the chemical munitions stored at Pueblo by the CWC date of April 29, 2007, requires the design and construction phase for the Pueblo facility to begin in June 1999. To meet this requirement, the committee further believes that there must be close coordination between the Project Manager for Chemical Demilitarization and the Project Manager for ACWA in order to accommodate future implementation of ACWA technologies in the design of the baseline facility currently planned for construction at Pueblo. The committee recommends a provision (sec. 142) that would require the USD (A&T) and the Secretary of the Army to ensure coordination of the activities and plans of the two project managers and

would also require the Secretary to take measures necessary to facilitate the integration of ACWA alternative technologies in the design of the baseline facility for Pueblo.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sections 101–109—Authorization of Appropriations

These sections would authorize the recommended fiscal year 2000 funding levels for all procurement accounts.

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Army Programs

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into multiyear procurement contracts for the Javelin missile system, the M2A3 Bradley fighting vehicle, the AH–64D Longbow Apache attack helicopter, and a combined M1A2 Abrams tank/Heavy Assault Bridge multiyear procurement contract in fiscal year 2000.

Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the composition of multiyear procurements in the procurement portion of the Future Years Defense Program prior to the execution of any multiyear contract.

Section 112—Extension of Pilot Program on Sales of Manufactured Articles and Services of Certain Army Industrial Facilities Without Regard to Availability from Domestic Sources

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to extend an existing pilot program through fiscal year 2001 that enables McAlester Army Ammunition Plant and Rock Island and Watervliet arsenals to continue to provide articles and services under this authority. This pilot program allows the sale of articles or services to an entity that will incorporate those articles or services into a weapon system to be procured by the Department of Defense or will use those articles or services to manufacture weapon systems that will ultimately be procured by the Department of Defense. This extension should allow sufficient time to further evaluate the viability of the program and the opportunity it provides for these facilities to generate significant additional work.

Section 113—Revision to Conditions for Award of a Second-Source Procurement Contract for the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles

This section would clarify section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). It would enable the Secretary of the Army to award a second-source full-rate production contract for the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles only after he certifies in writing that the total quantity of trucks required by the Army will be sufficient to enable the prime contractor to maintain a minimum production level of 150 trucks per month over any given 12 month period.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—F/A–18E/F Super Hornet Aircraft Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for the F/A–18E/F aircraft subject to the Secretary of Defense's certification that the results of the aircraft's operational test and evaluation meet both key performance parameters and requirements for operational effectiveness and suitability and that the multiyear procurement contract cost is at least 7.4 percent less than procurement of the same number of aircraft through annually funded contracts.

Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the composition of multiyear procurements in the procurement portion of the Future Years Defense Program prior to the execution of a multiyear contract for the F/A–18E/F.

SUBTITLE D—CHEMICAL STOCKPILE DESTRUCTION PROGRAM

Section 141—Destruction of Existing Stockpile of Lethal Chemical Agents and Munitions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the current chemical munitions stockpile destruction program with the purposes of reducing the overall cost of the program and ensuring completion of the destruction program by the date required under the Chemical Weapons Convention Treaty, while maintaining maximum protection of the environment, the general public, and the personnel involved in the actual destruction of the munitions. It would authorize the Secretary to take those actions to achieve the purposes of the assessment that could be accomplished under existing authorities and would direct the Secretary to recommend additional legislative authority that may be needed.

The section would amend paragraph 1412(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986 (Public Law 99–145) to provide that facilities constructed to carry out the chemical stockpile destruction program shall be disposed of in accordance with site-specific, mutual agreements between the Secretary of the Army and the governor of the state in which the facility is located. The committee notes the increasing practice in the stockpile destruction program, the chemical stockpile emergency preparedness program, and the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment, of meaningful involvement by state and local jurisdictions and others in the development of programmatic and policy decisions that are specific to their local stockpile storage sites and to the construction and operation of the stockpile destruction facilities at those sites. The committee believes that such authority should be extended to decisions regarding the ultimate disposition of the chemical munitions stockpile destruction facilities.

The section would also amend subsection 1412(c) to allow non-stockpile chemical agents, munitions, or related materials specifically designated by the Secretary of Defense to be destroyed at stockpile facilities once the affected states have issued the appropriate permits.

Section 142—Alternative Technologies for Destruction of Assembled Chemical Weapons

This section would direct and establish conditions for the transfer of management oversight responsibility for the assembled chemical weapons assessment (ACWA) program from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology to the Secretary of the Army.

The ACWA program was established under section 8065 of the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 104–208) as the Department of Defense program for assessment of the feasibility of alternative technologies for the destruction of assembled chemical munitions. Such technologies could provide an alternative to the baseline program, which uses incineration of chemical agents and munitions as the means for destruction of the chemical munitions stockpile. In order to facilitate coordination of the ACWA program with the baseline program during ACWA's demonstration and pilot facility phase, the provision would require the Under Secretary and the Secretary to ensure coordination of the activities and plans of the program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment and the program manager for Chemical Demilitarization. Further, if the Under Secretary decides to proceed with pilot facility testing of technologies demonstrated under the ACWA program, the provision would transfer oversight and management of the ACWA program from the Under Secretary to the Secretary.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 151—Limitation on Expenditures for Satellite Communications

This section would prohibit the Department from obligating funds to procure communications systems or lease communications services from commercial satellites, unless such systems or services have been proven through independent testing not to disrupt the reception of Global Positioning System (GPS) signals.

The committee notes the increasing importance of GPS to military operations. In recognition of this fact, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) mandated that all new Department of Defense aircraft, ships, armored vehicles, and indirect fire systems be equipped with GPS by 2005. The committee also notes that GPS is very important to civil and commercial activities as well.

The committee is disturbed that commercial satellite communications systems that provide mobile subscriber services (MSS) are increasingly likely to interfere with GPS signals. Although MSS communications are important to U.S. military forces, the committee believes that the overarching significance of GPS to the military and as a world navigation standard for commercial and civil users mandates the protection of GPS frequencies.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $34,375.2 million for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E), representing a decrease of $3,067.8 million from the amount provided for fiscal year 1999.

The committee recommends authorization of $35,835.7 million, an increase of $1,460.5 million from the budget request.

The committee expresses great concern with the reluctance on the part of Department of Defense officials to acknowledge the numerous modernization programs and science and technology efforts that have been adversely impacted by the decrease in overall research and development funding over the past several years. During the presentation of the fiscal year 1999 budget request, the Department forecasted RDT&E funding to decrease by 14 percent over the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) and maintained this planned decrease was appropriately based on a ratio of two-to-one between procurement and RDT&E. The committee notes that the Department has not justified the decline in overall RDT&E on the basis of an assessment of procurement needs versus RDT&E needs, but rather on the subjective position that a two-to-one ratio seems "about right" and has worked in the past. While the Department continues to justify this planned decline, DOD officials routinely announce that high priority programs such as Army and Navy theater missile defense programs, tactical information systems, space based early warning systems, other satellite programs, and a host of others can no longer support critically needed deployment schedules primarily due to insufficient funding.

The committee further notes that the Department's claim of increased modernization funding in the fiscal year 2000 budget request is composed of an increase of $4 billion in procurement, while RDT&E, the other half of modernization, is proposed to be reduced by over $3 billion. The committee is concerned that the Department's emphasis on addressing the backlog of military procurement is occurring at the direct expense of the nation's critical military technologies.

The committee notes that the Department's ability to pursue application of leading edge technologies is also severely constrained by the fact that over 33 percent of the total RDT&E request is for modifications to mature and aging fielded systems, while the accounts that lead to development of new capabilities have been decreased by almost 25 percent. This trend appears to continue throughout the declining RDT&E FYDP. The committee believes that this trend, if continued, will seriously undermine our nation's technological advantage.

The committee remains concerned that an alarmingly large number of high priority service programs are experiencing schedule delays and restructuring due primarily to service-wide shortages of RDT&E funds while a significant number of defense-wide RDT&E efforts appear adequately funded and in some cases are experiencing growth. The committee also questions the Department's continued trend of investing large levels of funding in environmental and other non-defense initiatives while reducing funding necessary for efficient completion of high priority defense programs.

The committee concludes that the Department's declining RDT&E strategy does not support the critical tenets of the Quadrennial Defense Review which stressed the need for a smaller, but more modern, more capable military force, and seriously threatens the ability of the United States to maintain the technological superiority critical to ensuring U.S. military dominance of tomorrow's battlefields.

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	FY 2000 CMTE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMENDATION
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY	**4,426,194**	**282,000**	**4,708,194**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	3,357,522	254,400	3,611,922
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,068,672	27,600	1,096,272
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY	**7,984,016**	**374,513**	**8,358,529**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	6,097,950	282,413	6,380,363
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,886,066	92,100	1,978,166
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE	**13,077,829**	**134,842**	**13,212,671**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	10,103,541	88,795	10,192,336
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,974,288	46,047	3,020,335
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSEWIDE	**8,609,289**	**669,105**	**9,278,394**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	7,576,515	411,950	7,988,465
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,032,774	257,155	1,289,929
TOTAL, DIRECTOR OF TEST & EVALUATION DEFENSE	**253,457**	**-**	**253,457**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	253,457	-	253,457
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
TOTAL, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	**24,434**	**-**	**24,434**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	24,434	-	24,434
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION	**34,375,219**	**1,460,460**	**35,835,679**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	**27,413,419**	**1,037,558**	**28,450,977**
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	**6,961,800**	**422,902**	**7,384,702**

ARMY RDT&E

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $4,426.2 million for Army RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of $4,708.2 million, an increase of $282.0 million.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2000 Army RDT&E program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ACCOUNT	000	**RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY**			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
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	1,400	48,466
		Advanced and Interactive Displays Consortium			[+1,400]
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**186,872**	**1,400**	**188,272**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	186,872	1,400	188,272
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602104A	4	TRACTOR ROSE	6,766		6,766
0602105A	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	13,849		13,849
0602120A	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	22,978	4,000	26,978
		Geo Positioning System - Inertial Measurement Unit Integration			[+1,000]
		Passive Millimeter Wave Imaging			[+3,000]
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		32,892
0602308A	11	MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	24,955		24,955
0602601A	12	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	39,749	24,500	64,249
		Alternative Vehicle Propulsion Initiative			[+10,000]
		Future Combat Vehicle			[+12,000]
		Full Spectrum Active Protection			[+2,500]
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
0602709A	18	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	20,111	10,000	30,111
		Panoramic Night Vision Goggle			[+10,000]
0602712A	19	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	10,321		10,321
0602716A	20	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	16,392	3,400	19,792
		MedTeams			[+3,400]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0602720A	21	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	12,758	3,000	15,758
		TRIES Computer-based Land Management Model			[+3,000]
0602782A	22	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	19,613		19,613
0602783A	23	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	5,210		5,210
0602784A	24	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	41,085	15,000	56,085
		Geographic Synthetic Aperture Radar			[+15,000]
0602785A	25	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	12,071		12,071
0602786A	26	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	23,971		23,971
0602787A	27	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	70,136	4,000	74,136
		Heart Rate Variability Technology			[+4,000]
0602789A	28	ARMY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY	1,276		1,276
0602805A	29	DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	18,222		18,222
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**555,258**	**63,900**	**619,158**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	555,258	63,900	619,158
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603001A	30	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	31,287		31,287
0603002A	31	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	10,539		10,539
0603003A	32	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	34,167		34,167
0603004A	33	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,893	2,500	42,393
		Proximity Fuze for DPICM Submunitions			[+2,500]
0603005A	34	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	90,941	2,000	92,941
		Combined Turbine Diesel Engine			[+2,000]
0603006A	35	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,883		20,883
0603007A	36	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,030	2,000	5,030
		Army Aircrew Coordination Training Program			[+2,000]
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 TECHNOLOGY DEMONST	24,618		24,618
0603270A	44	EW TECHNOLOGY	16,169		16,169

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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	5,000	9,869
		OICW Improvements, 5.56 Ammo Development, High Velocity Small Arms Projectile Tech			[+5,000]
0603654A	49	LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	41,619		41,619
0603710A	50	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	36,628	3,000	39,628
		Helmet Mounted Sensors for Firefighters and Damage Control Personnel			[+3,000]
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 TECHNOLOGY	22,610		22,610
0604280A	54	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	-		-
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**524,925**	**14,500**	**539,425**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	524,925	14,500	539,425
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION			
0603308A	55	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	12,353		12,353
0603619A	56	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	4,099		4,099
0603639A	57	ARMAMENT ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVE	36,937	8,000	44,937
		TERM-KE			[+8,000]
0603640A	58	ARTILLERY PROPELLANT DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0603645A	59	ARMORED SYSTEM MODERNIZATION - ADV DEV	-		-
0603653A	60	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	1,937		1,937
0603713A	61	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	10		10
0603747A	62	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	12,804		12,804
0603766A	63	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	-	2,500	2,500
		Semi-Automated Imagery Processor			[+2,500]
0603774A	64	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,188		3,188
0603790A	65	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,872		1,872
0603801A	66	AVIATION - ADV DEV	5,746		5,746
0603802A	67	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV	1,751		1,751
0603804A	68	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	6,514		6,514
0603805A	69	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	11,062		11,062
0603807A	70	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	12,723		12,723

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603851A	71	TRACTOR CAGE (DEM/VAL)	1,087		1,087
0603854A	72	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	282,937		282,937
0603856A	73	SCAMP BLOCK II DEM/VAL	10,703		10,703
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION	**405,723**	**10,500**	**416,223**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	405,723	10,500	416,223
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT			
0604201A	74	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	6,372	15,300	21,672
		Airborne Command and Control System (A2C2S).			[+15,300]
0604223A	75	COMANCHE	427,069	56,000	483,069
		Comanche			[+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	(4,700)	44,984
		Undistributed Reduction			[-4,700]
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	3,000	33,644
		Combustion Driven Eye-Safe Laser			[+3,000]
0604713A	94	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	110,829		110,829
0604715A	95	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV	71,034		71,034
0604716A	96	TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV	5,348		5,348

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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 DEVELOPMENT	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	8,000	19,535
		Program Increase			[+8,000]
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	2,500	57,443
		Small Arms Fire Control System			[+2,500]
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	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	9,705	3,500	13,205
		LSTAT			[+3,500]
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
0604820A	116	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	5,128		5,128
0604823A	117	FIREFINDER	32,353		32,353
0604824A	118	DUAP COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS	-		-
0604854A	119	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - EMD	65,806		65,806
		TOTAL, ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	**1,495,741**	**83,600**	**1,579,341**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	427,069	56,000	483,069
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,068,672	27,600	1,096,272
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0604256A	120	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	13,680		13,680
0604258A	121	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,397		13,397
0604759A	122	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	39,380		39,380
0605103A	123	RAND ARROYO CENTER	17,656		17,656

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0605301A	124	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	140,344	8,000	148,344
		Range Modernization			[+8,000]
0605326A	125	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	16,990	5,000	21,990
		Mounted Manuever Battlespace Lab			[+5,000]
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	1,200	31,670
		Characterization and Quantification of Missile Hazards to Aircraft			[+1,200]
0605604A	129	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	30,138		30,138
0605605A	130	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	14,230	24,000	38,230
		High Energy Solid State Laser Development			[+20,000]
		Navy's Free Electron Laser Technology			[+4,000]
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
0605716A	136	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	24,255		24,255
0605801A	137	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	64,121		64,121
0605803A	138	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	15,973		15,973
0605805A	139	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	10,537		10,537
0605853A	140	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION	-		-
0605854A	141	POLLUTION PREVENTION	-		-
0605856A	142	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	-		-
0605876A	143	MINOR CONSTRUCTION (RPM) - RDT&E	-		-
0605878A	144	MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR (RPM) - RDT&E	-		-
0605879A	145	REAL PROPERTY SERVICES (RPS) - RDT&E	-		-
0605896A	146	BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E	-		-

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0605898A	147	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	5,191		5,191
0909999A	148	FINANCING FOR CANCELED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**665,304**	**38,200**	**703,504**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	665,304	38,200	703,504
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0603778A	149	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	36,540	30,900	67,440
		High Mobility Rocket System (HIMARS)			[+30,900]
0102419A	150	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	24,903		24,903
0203610A	151	DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION	-		-
0203726A	152	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	36,222		36,222
0203735A	153	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	29,544	2,000	31,544
		Lightweight Vehicle Track Development			[+2,000]
0203740A	154	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	45,125	1,000	46,125
		Tactical Voice Control for Maneuver System			[+1,000]
0203744A	155	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	51,644		51,644
0203752A	156	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	2,900		2,900
0203758A	157	DIGITIZATION	28,180		28,180
0203759A	158	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	44,225		44,225
0203761A	159	FORCE TWENTY-ONE (XXI), WARFIGHTING RAPID ACQUISITION PROGRAM	55,921		55,921
0203762A	160	STRIKER (WRAP)	-		-
0203763A	161	RADIO FREQUENCY TECHNOLOGY (RF TAGS) - ICS3	-		-
0203801A	162	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	29,985		29,985
0203802A	163	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	9,914		9,914
0203806A	164	TRACTOR RUT	-		-
0203808A	165	TRACTOR CARD	3,898		3,898
0208010A	166	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	18,432		18,432
0208053A	167	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	28,061		28,061
0301359A	168	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	6,584		6,584
0303140A	169	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	9,426	6,000	15,426
		Defense Healthcare Information Assurance Program			[+6,000]
0303142A	170	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	36,230		36,230
0303150A	171	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	11,606		11,606
0305114A	172	TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEM	-		-

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0305128A	173	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	-	10,000	10,000
		Army's Intelligence Command Land Information Warfare Activity (INSCOM LIWA)			[+10,000]
0305204A	174	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	3,866		3,866
0305206A	175	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,932		4,932
0305208A	176	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	8,066		8,066
0708045A	177	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	66,167	20,000	86,167
		Munitions Manufacturing Technology			[+17,000]
		Rotary Wing Sustainment Manufacturing Technology			[+3,000]
1001018A	178	NATO JOINT STARS	-		-
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**592,371**	**69,900**	**662,271**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	592,371	69,900	662,271
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		TOTAL, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY	**4,426,194**	**282,000**	**4,708,194**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	3,357,522	254,400	3,611,922
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,068,672	27,600	1,096,272

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Aircraft avionics

The budget request contained $6.4 million in PE64201A for the Army Airborne Command and Control System (A2C2S).

The A2C2S is a UH–60 deployable command post, which provides a secure and nonsecure, highly mobile data, voice, and imagery command and control (C2) capability in support of Corps through Brigade level commanders. The committee is aware that the A2C2S is one of the Army Chief of Staff's top unfunded priorities in fiscal year 2000 and that additional funding would enable the system to complete engineering and manufacturing development, initial operational test and evaluation, and be fielded to the first digital corps.

Therefore, the committee recommends $21.7 million in PE64201A, an increase of $15.3 million for these purposes.

All source analysis system

The budget request contained $49.7 million in PE 64321A, including $43.7 million for the Army's all source analysis system (ASAS), an increase of over 50 percent from the fiscal year 1999 estimate.

The committee recognizes the importance of the ASAS capability. However, it is troubled by the development costs of this service intelligence support system, particularly when compared to the modest costs for the other services' intelligence systems.

The committee recommends $45.0 million in PE 64321A, a decrease of $4.7 million.

Alternative vehicle propulsion initiative

The budget request contained $39.7 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but included no funding for the alternative vehicle propulsion program.

The committee notes that one of the Army's most significant challenges is to develop lighter, more efficient propulsion systems for future vehicles. The committee believes that dramatic advances in vehicle propulsion require harnessing the combined capabilities of academia, the private sector, and government research facilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62601A for the ongoing alternative propulsion initiative and urges the Army to aggressively pursue greater private and public sector involvement in this effort.

Armament enhancement initiative

The budget request contained $36.9 million in PE 63639A for the armament enhancement initiative, but included no funding for the tank extended range munition-kinetic energy (TERM–KE).

The committee notes that the armament enhancement initiative is intended to develop improved tank ammunition to continue providing an overmatch capability for tanks. TERM–KE is intended to provide a higher lethality, extended range kinetic energy munition for the M1 tank main gun.

The committee supports development of improved munitions and recommends $44.9 million, an increase of $8.0 million for TERM–KE.

Army aircrew coordination training program

The budget request contained $3.0 million in PE 63007A for manpower, personnel and training, but included no funding for aircrew coordination training.

The committee notes the recent increase in the Army aviation accident rate and believes that aviation safety must be enhanced. The committee is aware that the aircrew coordination training program holds promise in reducing aviation accident rates, and strongly urges the Army to accelerate this program and field an enhanced air crew training capability for Army aviation units as soon as possible.

The committee recommends $5.0 million in PE 63007A, an increase of $2.0 million for aircrew coordination training.

Army technical test instrumentation and targets

The budget request contained $30.5 million in PE 65602A for Army technical test instrumentation and targets, but included no funding for characterization and quantification of missile debris hazards to aircraft.

The committee recommends $31.7 million in PE 65602A, an increase of $1.2 million for continuation of characterization and quantification of missile hazards to aircraft.

Comanche

The budget request contained $427.0 million in PE 64223A for Comanche demonstration and validation.

Comanche is the Army's highest priority modernization program and is often referred to as the "quarterback of the digital battlefield." The committee notes that while the capabilities provided by the Comanche are described as vital to the success of the Army in the next century, the Army is still struggling to complete development flight testing of a totally new, state-of-the-art aircraft with a single test aircraft. Though the Army has received the second Comanche prototype, it is not scheduled to be flown in the flight test program until fiscal year 2001, due only to a shortage of funding.

The committee is aware that additional funding is necessary to accelerate development of the mission electronics package and enable a more aggressive flight test program using at least two aircraft. The committee notes that additional funding for Comanche is the Army's number one unfunded modernization requirement and strongly supports the earliest possible fielding of this important new capability. The committee recommends $483.0 million in PE 64223A, an increase of $56.0 million for Comanche program acceleration.

Combat vehicle improvement programs

The budget request contained $29.5 million in PE 23735A for combat vehicle improvement programs.

The committee notes that tracks for existing and future tracked vehicles are a life-cycle cost driver. The committee supports devel-

opment of a lighter, higher performance track that offers the potential of life-cycle cost improvement.

The committee recommends $31.5 million in PE 23735A, an increase of $2.0 million for improved vehicle track development.

Combined turbine diesel engine

The budget request contained $90.9 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology, but contained no funding for the ongoing turbine diesel engine.

The committee notes that turbine diesel engine development has been slowed by technical obstacles and funding delays. The committee also notes that the contractor has successfully developed an operating prototype.

The committee recommends $92.9 million in PE 63005A, an increase of $2.0 million to complete development and testing of a prototype engine. The committee urges the Army to support any further funding required for follow-on evaluation.

Combustion driven eye-safe laser

The budget request contained $30.6 million in PE 64710A for night vision systems, but included no funding for the combustion driven eye-safe laser.

The committee notes increasing concern for laser hazards and supports development of eye-safe lasers. The committee also notes that emerging combustion driven selective emitter technology can be used to pump an eye-safe, portable, stealthy, low cost radar system that identifies friend and foe.

The committee recommends $33.6 million in PE 64710A, an increase of $3.0 million for combustion driven eye-safe laser.

Concepts experimentation program

The budget request contained $17.0 million in PE 65326A for the concept experimentation program.

The committee notes that the Army mounted maneuver battlespace lab (MMBL) has formulated a strategic research plan to develop strategies and doctrine for the application of Force XXI technologies on the battlefield. The new strategies and doctrine are intended to give combat commanders the ability to dominate the future maneuver battlespace.

The committee recommends $22.0 million in PE 65326A, an increase of $5.0 million for execution of the MMBL strategic research plan.

Defense healthcare information assurance program

The budget request contained $9.4 million in PE 33140A for the Army information systems security program.

The Congress provided $2.5 million in fiscal year 1998 to initiate a demonstration program for military healthcare information protection that would be consistent with national healthcare and information protection initiatives. An additional $4.0 million was provided in fiscal year 1999 to continue the program. The two-phased program will initially establish a prototype for protection of sensitive data integral to the military healthcare information system at a single service medical facility, then extend the prototype eval-

uation to other military services, regional medical centers, and civilian medical treatment facilities.

The committee notes the progress that has been made to date in the prototype phase of the program and supports the plans for extending the program to additional sites, refinement of information protection technology, policy, procedures, and development of industry wide security criteria for healthcare systems. The committee understands that available funds are sufficient for completion of the demonstration program and test of the prototype, and that a decision could be made to begin fielding a defense healthcare information assurance system in fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends $15.4 million in PE 33140A, an increase of $6.0 million to support initiating deployment of the defense healthcare information assurance system. The additional funds may not be obligated until 30 days after the Secretary of the Army reports to the Congressional defense committees the results of the beta-test of the system and gives recommendations for continuation of the program.

Defense manufacturing technology program

The budget request contained a total of $132.5 million for the manufacturing technology (ManTech) program, including $14.9 million in PE 78045A, $59.1 million in PE 78011N, $51.8 million in PE 78011F, and $6.7 million in PE 78011S.

The committee has reviewed the Department's "Five-Year Plan (FY00–FY04) for the Manufacturing Technology Program." Although the committee supports the overall direction of the ManTech program, the committee notes that, for the second year in a row, the total program falls far short (approximately $60.0 million) of the Congressional funding guidelines for the program that are contained in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105–340).

Section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–736) amended section 2525 of title 10, United State Code, to establish annual goals for cost sharing in the DOD ManTech program and procedures for waiver of the cost sharing requirements in the program. The intent of the Congress in the amendment was to provide increased flexibility to the Secretary of Defense in the administration of the cost sharing requirement, rather than establishing fixed, rigid guidelines. To clarify the Congress' intent regarding the flexibility available to the Secretary in his administration of the cost sharing requirement, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 212), which would eliminate percentages goals for cost sharing in manufacturing technology projects.

The committee notes a significant reduction in the manufacturing technology program managed by the Defense Logistics Agency. The committee also notes a significant reduction in the Army's manufacturing technology program, including the failure to continue increased funding for development of munitions manufacturing technology that could result in reduced production costs for ammunition in the future. In view of the fact that the Army is the single service manager for the defense ammunition program, the committee believes that insufficient priority is being given in the Army's ManTech program for this critical area. The committee is

aware that the estimated cost of air burst munitions for the objective individual combat weapon (OICW) will probably limit their use in training and believes that increased emphasis should be given to a small arms ammunition ManTech initiative that is specifically focused on decreasing the overall cost of the OICW air burst munitions through warhead and fuse cost reductions.

The committee recommends $34.9 million in PE 78045A for the Army's manufacturing technology program, an increase of $17.0 million for munitions manufacturing technology (including the small arms ammunition initiative) and $3.0 million for rotary wing sustainment manufacturing technology, and $74.1 million in PE 78011N, an increase of $15.0 million for the Navy's ManTech program. Elsewhere in this report the committee recommends additional funding to accelerate new initiatives in the Defense Logistics Agency's ManTech program.

Environmental quality technology

The budget request contained $12.8 million in PE 62720A for environmental quality technology, but included no funding for the Texas Regional Institute for Environmental Studies (TRIES).

The committee notes that TRIES, working with the Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, has been developing a computer-based land management model to reduce costs and time for training area recovery.

The committee supports well focused military environmental clean-up efforts and recommends $15.8 million in PE 62720A, an increase of $3.0 million to complete development of the TRIES computer-based land management model.

Full spectrum active protection

The budget request contained $39.7 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology.

The committee is aware that the Army needs a capability to defend armored vehicles against attack by hit-to-kill anti-tank guided missiles, as well as kinetic energy and high explosive anti-tank projectiles.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million for development of full spectrum active protection within the tank and automotive technology effort.

Future combat vehicle

The budget request contained $39.8 million in PE 62601A for armored systems modernization.

The committee notes that the Army's armored system modernization strategy has become more an incidental by-product of the administrative process of the Army budget than a commitment to a vision. The consequences of this approach to modernization increases program instability and reinforces short term reactive planning rather than adherence to a strategy. Moreover, the committee believes that the consequences for not having a comprehensive, coherent, and enduring armored system modernization strategy are no longer acceptable.

The committee is encouraged, however, by the Army's vision for the Army After Next. In particular, the committee fully supports

the attributes and capabilities described by both the Army and the Quadrennial Defense Review as essential in future combat vehicles, and believes that the development efforts essential for their fielding should begin immediately. However, there is a serious mismatch between what the vision calls for and the Army's ability without full DOD support and participation, to execute the necessary experimentation and demonstration of future alternatives while attempting to sustain its current aging fleet of over 6,000 M–1 tanks.

The committee understands that the current fleet demands an exponentially increasing sustainment budget that is depleting funds intended for incremental modernization of the fleet. Left unchecked, it would soon take the entire armored systems modernization budget to sustain an M1 fleet that will have further compounded its problems by evolving into at least four different configurations. The Army's current armored systems modernization budget has been decreased to such a low level that between the years of 2000 and 2030 the resulting tank fleet will be composed of only 17 percent modernized M1A2 SEP tanks, while the remaining 4,000 plus tanks will be in varying stages of deterioration and questionable deployability. The committee believes current armored systems cannot be evolved to meet the critical land warfare requirements identified by the QDR and as essential to the Army After Next. Thus, a commitment to decisive action must be made now to redress the armor system modernization dilemma. To delay is to limit the possibilities and make them unaffordable.

Therefore, the committee recommends a legislative provision (Sec. 211) that would direct the Secretary of the Defense to establish a collaborative combat vehicle demonstration program between the Army and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). While the Army has committed $67.0 million of its fiscal year 2000 RDT&E science and technology request toward this critical requirement, related DARPA efforts are not focused to support any similar initiative. The committee further directs the Secretary to establish the necessary DOD-level priority for this program to ensure that both the Army and DARPA complete this effort in an efficient and timely manner. While the committee understands that the Army fully intends to pursue this critical modernization initiative, DARPA participation is also required to enable rapid prototyping, special contract authorities, and pursuit of high risk, high gain technologies essential to the success of this program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army and the Director of DARPA to establish and enter into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to develop an appropriate competitive demonstration project that will consider and evaluate all promising combat vehicle technologies including lethality, propulsion, mobility, survivability, robotics, human engineering, and C4ISR technologies. The project will conduct competitive demonstrations of these technologies integrated into potential combat vehicle platforms with an objective of identifying the most promising candidates for a full development program to begin by fiscal year 2006. The Secretary and the Director shall provide a report to the Congressional defense committees with submission of the fiscal year

2001 budget request that outlines the MOA, objective schedule, and required funding for the joint Army/DARPA project.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for the future combat vehicle modernization program for fiscal year 2000. Additionally, the committee recommends that of the amounts authorized and appropriated for DARPA fiscal year 2000 funding, not less than $38.0 million in PE 63764E and $18.2 million in PE 62702E shall be for the Army/DARPA future combat vehicle program.

Geographic synthetic aperture radar

The budget request contained $41.1 million in PE 62784A for military engineering technology, but included no funding for geographic synthetic aperture radar (SAR).

The committee notes that an airborne geographic SAR is being developed to generate high-resolution, three dimensional maps of the earth. This dual band interferometric SAR will be able to map above, through, and below the vegetation canopy.

The committee is aware that airborne foliage penetrating radar may offer potential target identification enhancement to the Army and recommends $56.1 million in PE 62784A, an increase of $15.0 million to evaluate dual band airborne interferometric SAR technology for possible Army applications.

Geo-positioning system—inertial measurement unit integration

The budget request contained $23.0 million in PE 62120A for sensors and electronics survivability.

The committee notes that uses for the geo-positioning system (GPS) and inertial measurement units (IMU) include personnel, weapon and non-weapon system platforms, and an increasing variety of smart weapons. The burgeoning applications for these types of systems, coupled with advances in electronics integration and the emergence of micro electro mechanical systems (MEMS) technology now make possible full integration of GPS and MEMS on a single chip that offers the possibility of dramatic reductions in the cost. Though the development cost of full GPS–IMU integration may be unattractive to an individual acquisition program, the recurring cost savings make such development an imperative for the Department of Defense as a whole.

The committee strongly supports efforts to reduce the cost of smart weapons and directs the Secretary of the Army to establish a focused program to develop a fully integrated GPS–IMU on a single chip capable of meeting the needs of service missile, artillery, and other appropriate applications. The committee is aware that there are disparate efforts in industry, government laboratories, and academia to reduce the size and cost of GPS and IMUs which may be leveraged.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million for GPS–IMU chip level integration.

Heart rate variability technology

The budget request contained $70.1 million in PE 62787A for medical technology.

The committee notes that heart rate variability technology offers potential for enhancing on-site assessment of disease and trauma by enabling physiological measurement of the nervous system functioning and balance. Improvements in these areas could lead to improved treatment and victim survivability. The committee believes that this technology, designed for point-of-injury assessment for emergency response personnel in civilian and military trauma environments, may also have significant applications for enhancing early detection and prevention of chemical and biological agent effects.

The committee urges the Army Medical Command to pursue testing of this technology and to assess its potential for improved chem-bio detection and prevention, as well as other military emergency response applications, and recommends $74.1 million, an increase of $ 4.0 million in PE 62787A.

High energy laser test facility

The budget request contained $14.2 million in PE 65605A for the high energy laser system test facility (HELSTF).

The committee notes that the Army has taken the initiative to develop and publish a Directed Energy Master Plan, laying out a road map for future high power directed energy technology exploitation. However, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense does not have a central directed energies (DE) technology clearing house to identify, assess, and develop the full range and potentials of these promising technologies.

The committee further notes that Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) has proposed that HELSTF be the premier joint service open-air laser test facility for all high power DOD laser programs, providing testing for laser lethality and system effectiveness as well as threat exploitation, directed energy bio-effects, and susceptibility testing. A high-power laser facility capable of testing lasers over a broad range of wavelengths is required to support all these critical parameters. The committee believes that leveraging past investments in HELSTF infrastructure and building on past Army research and development in high power lasers is a cost effective means of developing next generation high power lasers capable of operating with variable wavelengths and pulse formats.

The committee supports the use of the HELSTF to focus development of high power free electron and other solid-state lasers as a complement to various chemical laser development programs, and recommends a provision (Sec. 241) that would direct the Secretary of Defense to designate the Commander, SMDC as the DOD executive agent for oversight of high-power solid state laser and directed energy technologies with potential weapons applications. The committee notes that the HELSTF is currently controlled by SMDC and directs that HELSTF be established as the DOD center of excellence for high-power, solid state laser and directed energy technologies. Additionally, the committee recommends the establishment of a relationship between Livermore National Laboratory, with its high power laser expertise, and appropriate industry participants to create a national center of excellence for high power solid-state laser development.

The committee recommends $38.2 million for the HELSTF in PE 65605A, an increase of $20.0 million for assessment and development of high energy solid state lasers and other directed energy technologies, and an increase of $4.0 million for evaluation of the Navy's free electron laser technology program.

High mobility artillery rocket system

The budget request contained $36.5 million in PE 63778A for the multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) product improvement program (PIP), and included $6.0 million for the MLRS high mobility rocket system (HIMARS).

The committee notes that the HIMARS is a C–130 transportable, wheeled version of the MLRS launcher, capable of firing all rockets and missiles in the current and future MLRS family of missiles. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense recognizes the importance of the improved deployability provided by HIMARS and supports accelerated development of the program.

The committee strongly encourages accelerated development and fielding of HIMARS and recommends $67.4 million in PE 63778A, an increase of $30.9 million for HIMARS.

Joint service small arms program

The budget request contained $4.9 million in PE 63607A for the joint service small arm program.

The committee is aware that the present family of individual weapons as well as the objective individual combat weapon (OICW) for the future will have a 5.56mm capability. The committee is informed that accuracy of the 5.56mm round can be improved significantly as was the 7.62mm round with relatively little expense.

The committee believes that, despite the emergence of "smart weapons," the importance of individual combat weapons will remain and that ammunition for these weapons should be as accurate as modern production technology will allow. The committee also notes that there is a new technology which reduces drag in the barrel that offers much higher projectile velocity from the same caliber small arms cartridges. The committee is also aware that features such as laser ranging and target tracking which are important for the OICW air-burst round could be included in the initial OICW with a small additional investment.

Therefore, the committee recommends $9.9 million, an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63607A for OICW improvements, development of more accurate 5.56 ammunition, and assessment of new high-velocity small arms projectile technology.

Joint surveillance target attack radar system (Joint STARS)

The budget request contained $11.5 million in PE 64770A for system improvements to the Joint STARS Common Ground Station (CGS).

The committee notes the proven success of the Joint STARS system in both Operation Desert Storm and Operation Joint Endeavor in Bosnia and its current support to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Operation Allied Force. A key feature of Joint STARS is the secure, encrypted, anti-jam Surveillance Control Data Link (SCDL), which links the Air Force's E–8 Joint STARS aircraft to

the Army's ground support modules and CGSs, enabling real-time data transfer of command and control information between the aircraft and ground stations.

The committee is aware that the ongoing SCDL System Improvement Program (SIP), which eliminates obsolete parts and updates older digital circuit boards with state-of-the-art, software-based array boards, will increase data transfer rates as well as reduce component size, weight, and power requirements by as much as 50 percent. Consistent with past committee actions and based on the benefits of the SIP, the committee recommends $19.5 million, an increase of $8.0 million in PE 64770A to complete this upgrade.

Kwajalein missile range modernization

The budget request contained $140.3 million in PE 65301A for Kwajalein missile range (KMR) modernization.

The committee is concerned that delays in KMR modernization will increase risk in key tests of the national missile defense (NMD) system. This modernization effort includes replacement of obsolete components, upgrade of hardware and software architectures, and provision for remote operation of range sensors and instrumentation. The committee believes that accelerating modernization of the range will not only reduce NMD development risks, but will substantially reduce annual KMR operations and maintenance costs.

The committee recommends $148.3 million in PE 65301A, an increase of $8.0 million for KMR modernization.

Lightweight x-band radar

The budget request contained $24.9 million in PE 12419A for the Aerostat Joint Project Office, but included no funds for lightweight x-band radar technology.

The committee understands that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization has examined the potential of lightweight x-band radar technology for application to the Army's Aerostat project and found it to be useful to the requirement for fire control radar.

The committee recommends that the Army evaluate this technology from within existing funds and make a recommendation to the Congressional defense committees providing the results of the evaluation.

Medical materiel/medical biological defense equipment

The budget request contained $9.70 million in PE 64807A for medical materiel/medical biological defense equipment, including $491,000 for the Life Support Trauma and Transport (LSTAT) system EMD program.

The committee has learned that the EMD program is underfunded and that it could easily be completed in fiscal year 2000 if properly resourced. Furthermore, the committee understands that the Army does support the LSTAT program and plans to procure the system on a multiyear basis.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $13.2 million in PE 64807A, an increase of $3.5 million to complete LSTAT EMD in fiscal year 2000.

MedTeams

The budget request contained $16.4 million in PE 62716A for human factors engineering technology, but included no funding for continuation of the medical teams (MedTeams) program.

The committee notes that the MedTeams effort provides development and testing of methods to provide improved coordination of emergency medical teams.

The committee supports development of improved medical care and recommends $19.8 million in PE 62716A, an increase of $3.4 million.

Night vision advanced technology

The budget request contained $36.6 million in PE 63710A for night vision advanced technology.

The committee notes that damage control capability is critical to military survivability. Sensor technology has been and is being developed for ground forces to improve night vision situational awareness. Damage control personnel also require night vision situational awareness. The committee supports adaptation of emerging sensor technology to develop helmet mounted sensors for firefighters and damage control personnel.

The committee recommends $39.6 million in PE 63710A, an increase of $3.0 million for helmet mounted sensors for firefighters and damage control personnel.

Panoramic night vision goggle

The budget request contained $20.1 million in PE 62709A for night vision technology.

The committee notes that wide field of view night vision capability for aviation is increasingly critical as operations migrate from daylight to dark. Existing night vision equipment has a very narrow field of view, excessive weight, and very poor depth perception in inclement weather.

The committee supports development of superior night vision equipment to improve safety and increase the capability of our forces. The committee recommends $30.1 million in PE 62709A, an increase of $10.0 million for the panoramic night vision goggle, including emerging technologies that may be generally applicable to night vision improvement.

Passive millimeter wave imaging

The budget request contained $23.0 million in PE 62120A for sensors and electronics survivability, but contained no funding for passive millimeter wave imaging.

The committee is aware that passive millimeter wave and associated devices may offer the ability to solve problems in the nap-of-the-earth wire and other obstacle collision avoidance for the Apache and other aircraft.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for passive millimeter wave imaging for obstacle/collision avoidance.

Patriot anti-cruise missile defense

The budget request contained no funding in PE 23801A for the Patriot anti-cruise missile (PACM) seeker upgrade.

In the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–736), the conferees directed the Secretary of the Army to complete a rigorous PACM test program and to evaluate the effectiveness of the PACM seeker against a full range of cruise missile threats. The committee notes that a preliminary evaluation has been completed prior to flight testing of the seeker, and that a more thorough evaluation will be possible only after the flight testing is completed. Without this more thorough evaluation, the committee is unable to reach a definitive conclusion on the ability of PACM to meet the cruise missile threat cost effectively.

The committee understands that the Patriot advanced capability–3 (PAC–3) will have substantial capability against cruise missiles, in addition to providing effective ballistic missile defense. The committee also understands that the PACM seeker would be used to upgrade older PAC–1 missiles that have very limited capabilities to defend against ballistic missile attack. The committee notes that a thorough analysis of the cost trade-offs between acquisition of PACM and PAC–3 is also needed prior to consideration of PACM acquisition.

The committee recommends no funding in PE 23801A for PACM. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to prepare a report, following completion of PACM flight testing, with a thorough assessment of PACM capabilities and the opportunity costs of additional PACM development and eventual PACM procurement. The report shall be submitted to the Congressional defense committees prior to any budget request for additional PACM funds.

Plasma energy pyrolysis system

The budget request contained $12.8 million in PE 62720A for environmental quality technology, but included no funds for the plasma energy pyrolysis system (PEPS).

A total of $15.9 million has been invested in this program to develop a transportable PEPS prototype which is now undergoing testing. The committee is aware that PEPS testing is intended to determine its ability to destroy, vitrify, and dispose of several hazardous waste streams. The Army intends to await completion of the PEPS evaluation program and analysis of the results to determine cost and performance of PEPS prior to proceeding further in acquisition.

The committee supports development of safe, economical means to eliminate hazardous waste and encourages the Army to continue its efforts with PEPS.

Proximity fuzing for dual-purpose improved conventional munition submunitions

The budget request contained $39.9 million in PE 63004A for the Army's weapons and munitions advanced technology development program and $101.5 million in PE 63795N for the Navy's land attack technology development program.

The committee notes the common use by the Army and the Navy of the M80 grenade submunition. This submunition is now dispensed by the dual-purpose improved conventional munition (DPICM) 120 mm mortar, the 5–inch gun, 155mm cannon projec-

tiles, the multi-launch rocket system (MLRS) warhead, the extended range guided munition (ERGM), and the Best Buy projectile advanced technology demonstration. The committee also notes that Army and Navy studies and tests indicate that lethality gains of 10 percent to 200 percent are possible if a height of burst proximity fusing option were incorporated in the M80 submunition. The committee understands that the Army and the Navy are teaming to develop a proximity fuzing feature that could be added to the existing self-destruct fuze in the M80 grenade and greatly increase the armor penetration and anti-personnel lethality of the grenade. The committee believes that a joint program to develop a common proximity fuze for DPICM submunitions could capitalize on the efforts of both the Army and the Navy by deferring the development and testing of individual service prototypes and result in significantly reduced costs through the economy of scale that would be gained by the production of a single fuse and submunition for both services.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63004A and $2.5 million in PE 63795N to establish a joint Army/Navy program to develop a proximity fuze for DPICM submunitions. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Congressional defense committees on the establishment of the joint program and the plan and funding for the proximity fuze development with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Security and intelligence activities

The budget request contained no funding for security and intelligence activities in PE 35128A.

The committee notes the government's increasing dependence on computer-based information systems and the growing world-wide threat to these systems. It is also aware of the Army Intelligence Command's (INSCOM) state-of-the-art land information warfare activity (LIWA) and its developing capability to protect the world-wide computer infrastructure. The LIWA has recently demonstrated a significantly enhanced capability for responding to computer systems viruses and attacks by rapidly identifying and providing protection and corrective actions to all supported systems. The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense has recognized the potential of the LIWA to offer significant improvements in providing timely assessments of intelligence information to the warfighter.

The committee strongly supports improved and strengthened information system protection and processing and recommends $10.0 million in PE 35128A for the INSCOM LIWA.

Self-destruct fuse

The committee notes that there are a number of apparently duplicative efforts within service and defense-wide programs to pursue self-destruct fuzes for munitions. The Army has recently type-classified self-destruct fuses for some Army munitions, and yet it appears that there is no Department wide program development to the share the Army's completed development or to coordinate other service efforts.

The committee directs that the Secretary of Defense conduct a study of unexploded ordnance problems and establish a defense-wide program to develop affordable, reliable self-destruct fuses for munitions, and report the results of this study and the actions being by December 31, 1999.

Semi-automated imagery processor

The budget request contained no funding in PE 63766A for tactical electronic surveillance systems.

The committee notes that the semi-automated imagery processor (SAIP) is an advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD) designed to provide automatic target cueing to support imagery analysts. Further, the tool provides a limited capability for automated target recognition. While the SAIP is not perfected, the committee notes the development effort and results to date. The committee remains concerned that current and future imagery collection systems are overwhelming the limited number of imagery analysts available to put "eyes on target." Automated capabilities to reduce imagery analyst workloads are critically needed. The committee believes that the SAIP represents the best effort to date to provide such radar imagery automation. However, the Department has failed to provide sufficient funding to transition a needed ACTD capability to an operational application.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63766A to transition the SAIP effort from an ACTD to an operational capability. The committee notes that the SAIP is not a total solution and expects the Army to continue efforts to refine and improve the SAIP.

Small arms fire control system

The budget request contained $54.9 million in PE 64802A for weapons and munitions, but included no funding for the small arms fire control system (SAFCS).

SAFCS is a lightweight optical sight that corrects the aimpoint of small arms. The committee notes that the SAFCS offers potential for improved accuracy and probability of hit for small arms.

The committee supports improvements in small arms accuracy and recommends $57.4 million in PE 64802A, an increase of $2.5 million for engineering development and type classification for SAFCS.

Tactical voice control for maneuver control system

The budget request contained $45.1 million in PE 23740A for the maneuver control system (MCS).

The committee notes that tactical voice recognition systems have been proven to provide more accurate, faster and robust command and control than conventional input/output devices.

The committee recommends $46.1 million for PE 23740A , an increase of $1.0 million for tactical voice control for MCS.

Trichloromelamine testing

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) directed the Secretary of the Army to conduct toxicity studies of trichloromelamine (TCM) disinfectant to

provide appropriate Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) registration for Army future procurement from TCM suppliers, thus ensuring competition and recommend additional funding for this purpose.

The committee notes that the Army has failed to complete directed testing and, therefore, reiterates its earlier direction that the Army complete testing and EPA registration for TCM as rapidly as possible from within funding in PE 63002A for medical advanced technology.

University and industrial research centers

The budget request contained $47.1 million in PE 61104A for university and industrial research centers, and included $5.9 million for advanced displays.

The committee notes that, despite the importance of advanced and interactive displays for the Army After Next, funding for the advanced and interactive displays consortium has been reduced over the past four years. The committee supports the development of innovative, cost-effective displays and recommends $48.5 million in PE 61104A, an increase of $1.4 million for the advanced and interactive displays consortium.

NAVY RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained $7,984.0 million for Navy RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of $8,358.5 million, an increase of $374.5 million.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2000 Navy RDT&E program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ACCOUNT	000	**RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY**	-		
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601152N	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	15,630		15,630
0601153N	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	361,118	0	361,118
		Marine Mammal Research			[500]
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**376,748**	**0**	**376,748**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	376,748	0	376,748
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602111N	3	AIR AND SURFACE LAUNCHED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	37,616	13,000	50,616
		Free Electron Laser [+4.0 M in PE 65605A]			[+3,000]
		Phased Array Weather Radar			[+10,000]
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		10,534
0602228N	7	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU)	-		-
0602232N	8	COMMUNICATIONS, COMMAND AND CONTROL, INTEL, SURVEILLANCE	68,823	8,000	76,823
		Hybrid Fiberoptic/Wireless Communication Technology			[+2,500]
		Optically Fed and Controlled Phased Array Antenna			[+2,500]
		Optically Multiplexed Wideband Radar Beamformer			[+3,000]
0602233N	9	HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	30,586		30,586
0602234N	10	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	77,957	7,500	85,457
		Silicon Carbide Semiconductor Substrates			[+3,000]
		Ultra-High Thermal Conductivity Fibers			[+2,500]
		Superconducting Waveform Generator			[+2,000]
0602270N	11	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	24,659		24,659
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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0602633N	15	UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY	34,066	2,000	36,066
		Microelectromechanical Systems (MEMS)			[+2,000]
0602805N	16	DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	18,390		18,390
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**523,839**	**30,500**	**554,339**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	523,839	30,500	554,339
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603217N	17	AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	42,046	5,000	47,046
		DP-2			[+5,000]
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	9,500	51,015
		Power Node Control Centers			[+1,500]
		Virtual Test Bed for Advanced Electrical Ship Systems			[+3,000]
		Project M			[+5,000]
0603640M	21	MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	56,943		56,943
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 TECHNOLOGY	23,809		23,809
0603727N	25	NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM	41,840	8,000	49,840
		Joint Warfighting Experimentation Program			[+8,000]
0603747N	26	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,956		57,956
0603782N	27	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	48,711		48,711
0603792N	28	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	75,635	7,700	83,335
		Claymore Marine			[+2,700]
		Littoral Warfare Fast Patrol Craft			[+5,000]
0603794N	29	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	23,808		23,808
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**519,523**	**30,200**	**549,723**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	519,523	30,200	549,723
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION			
0603XXXN	xx	C2W REPLACEMENT FOR EA-6B	-	5,000	5,000
		Analysis of Alternatives			[+5,000]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603XXXN	xx	SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT	-	4,500	4,500
		Tri Service Software Program Managers Network			[+4,500]
0603207N	30	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	30,109		30,109
0603216N	31	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	7,280		7,280
0603254N	32	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,780	6,000	23,780
		Beartrap			[+6,000]
0603261N	33	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	1,975		1,975
0603382N	34	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	6,828		6,828
0603502N	35	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	82,465		82,465
0603504N	36	ADVANCED SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0603506N	37	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	640		640
0603512N	38	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	142,783		142,783
0603513N	39	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	108,334	4,000	112,334
		Ship Survivability and Personnel Protection			[+4,000]
0603514N	40	SHIP COMBAT SURVIVABILITY	-		-
0603525N	41	PILOT FISH	94,085		94,085
0603527N	42	RETRACT LARCH	7,834		7,834
0603536N	43	RETRACT JUNIPER	5,983		5,983
0603542N	44	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	605		605
0603553N	45	SURFACE ASW	2,949		2,949
0603561N	46	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	115,767	16,500	132,267
		Advanced Submarine Technology Insertion			[+6,500]
		Affordable Advanced Acoustical Arrays			[+10,000]
0603562N	47	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	4,667		4,667
0603563N	48	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	5,318	3,000	8,318
		Smart Propulsor Product Model			[+3,000]
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	3,000	49,740
		COTS Insertion Initiative			[+3,000]
0603609N	54	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	34,309	10,700	45,009
		Environmentally Safe Energetic Materials			[+2,000]
		Optical Correlation Technology for Automatic Target Recognition			[+8,700]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603611M	55	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	94,843	26,400	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	4,200	46,854
		Lightweight 155mm Howitzer			[+4,200]
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	3,000	73,793
		Aviation Depot Maintenance Technology			[+3,000]
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
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	50,000	55,654
		MFR/VSR Suite / SPY-1 Upgrades / Adjunct X-Band Radar			[+50,000]
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	16,500	117,989
		Extended Range Guided Munition Technical Risk Reduction			[+10,000]
		Projectile Common Guidance and Control			[+4,000]
		Proximity Fuze for DPICM Submunitions			[+2,500]
0603800N	74	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEM/VAL	241,238		241,238
0603851M	75	NONLETHAL WEAPONS - DEM/VAL	23,277		23,277
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	-		-

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604327N	79	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	4,924		4,924
0604707N	80	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	35,170		35,170
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION	**2,086,062**	**152,800**	**2,238,862**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,086,062	152,800	2,238,862
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT			
0603208N	81	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	311		311
0604212N	82	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	48,776		48,776
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
0604217N	86	S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	2,095	7,000	9,095
		Surveillance System Upgrade			[+7,000]
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	26,600	184,283
		4BN/4BW 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	6,000	169,077
		Location of Global Positioning Systems Jammers			[+6,000]
0604300N	95	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	162,056		162,056
0604307N	96	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	204,480	9,000	213,480
		Cruiser Conversion			[+9,000]
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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604507N	105	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	970		970
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	18,500	259,956
		Advanced Technology Insertion			[+18,500]
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	6,000	67,135
		Cruiser Conversion			[+6,000]
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		96,580
0604771N	126	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	4,285		4,285
0604777N	127	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	19,808		19,808
0604784N	128	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	14,910	19,000	33,910
		FDS Fiber Optic Sensor			[+8,000]
		ADS Improved Detection and Tracking Algorithms			[+11,000]
0604800N	129	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD	-		-
0604805N	130	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	18,729		18,729
		TOTAL, ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	**1,953,882**	**92,100**	**2,045,982**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	67,816	0	67,816
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,886,066	92,100	1,978,166

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
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
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	4,000	16,121
		Hyper-spectral Analysis			[+4,000]
0605873M	148	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	8,198	1,500	9,698
		Aquifer Vulnerability/Contamination Assessment			[+1,500]
0909999N	149	FINANCING FOR CANCELED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**646,489**	**5,500**	**651,989**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	646,489	5,500	651,989
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
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	2,500	318,214
		LAU 138A/A BOL Chaff Countermeasure			[+2,500]
0204152N	155	E-2 SQUADRONS	16,132	15,000	31,132
		Radar Modernization Program			[+15,000]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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		26,257
0204575N	161	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	9,162		9,162
0205601N	162	HARM IMPROVEMENT	23,642	10,000	33,642
		Advanced Anti-Radiation Guided Missile			[+10,000]
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
0205633N	166	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	53,293	5,000	58,293
		New Propeller Testing for the C-2 Aircraft			[+5,000]
0205667N	167	F-14 UPGRADE	1,390		1,390
0205675N	168	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	53,564		53,564
0206313M	169	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	90,293		90,293
0206623M	170	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	39,941		39,941
0206624M	171	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	9,817		9,817
0207161N	172	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	40,051		40,051
0207163N	173	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	13,544		13,544
0303109N	176	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	38,921		38,921
0303140N	177	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	22,978		22,978
0303150N	178	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	-		-
0305160N	180	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	14,507		14,507
0305188N	181	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	8,125		8,125
0305192N	182	JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	2,064		2,064
0305204M	183	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	-		-
0305204N	184	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	69,742	6,000	75,742
		Multi-function Self-aligned Gate Arrays [+3.0 M in PE 35207F]			[+3,000]
		Tactical Control System			[+3,000]
		System Integration Lab			[4,500]
0305206N	185	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,958	5,000	9,958
		EO Framing Technologies			[+5,000]
0305207N	186	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	30,958		30,958
0305208N	187	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	5,583		5,583

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0305927N	188	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	712		712
0305972N	189	SPACE ACTIVITIES	-		-
0308601N	190	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	9,621		9,621
0702207N	191	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	39,986		39,986
0708011N	192	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	59,104	15,000	74,104
		Manufacturing Technology Program			[+15,000]
0708730N	193	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	19,681		19,681
XXXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	516,472	4,913	521,385
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,877,473**	**63,413**	**1,940,886**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,877,473	63,413	1,940,886
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY	**7,984,016**	**374,513**	**8,358,529**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	6,097,950	282,413	6,380,363
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,886,066	92,100	1,978,166

Items of Special Interest

Advanced amphibious assault vehicle

The budget request contained $94.8 million in PE 63611M for the advanced amphibious assault vehicle (AAAV).

The AAAV is a self-deploying, high water-speed, armored, amphibious assault vehicle capable of operating in all weather and in nuclear, chemical, and biological environments. The committee notes that the AAAV is the Marine Corps highest priority ground modernization requirement and that additional funding will permit incorporation of improvements identified during testing, reduce program technical risk, and position the program for acceleration of initial operational capability from fiscal year 2006 to fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommends $121.2 million in PE 63611M, an increase of $26.4 million, for the AAAV.

Advanced anti-radiation guided missile

The budget request contained $23.6 million in PE 25601N, including $10.8 million to continue development and demonstration of the advanced anti-radiation guided missile (AARGM).

The committee notes that ARRGM is a Phase III small business innovative research (SBIR) program to develop and demonstrate a dual-mode guidance section on a high-speed anti-radiation missile (HARM). Program objectives are to demonstrate an effective and affordable lethal suppression of enemy air defenses (SEAD) capability against mobile, relocatable, or fixed air defense threats in the presence of potential emitter shutdown or other anti-radiation missile countermeasures.

The ARRGM technology demonstration program is an outgrowth of a Phase I and Phase II competitive SBIR program, which successfully demonstrated the feasibility of a dual-mode seeker to address radar "shut-down" anti-radiation missile countermeasures. The dual-mode technology being developed in the AARGM program has demonstrated very high potential to solve the problem of "shut-down" not only in the HARM, the primary SEAD weapon, but has also demonstrated the potential for integration with other missile airframes.

The committee recommends $33.6 million in PE 25601N, an increase of $10.0 million to continue risk reduction, test, and other field activities to prepare for a potential fiscal year 2001 Milestone II decision to enter engineering and manufacturing development.

Advanced waterjet propulsor demonstration program

The budget request contained $75.6 million in PE 63792N for Navy advanced technology demonstrations, but included no funds for demonstration of an advanced waterjet propulsor for future naval applications.

The committee notes that a number of propulsion technologies are being considered for use in the DD–21 land attack destroyer and other future naval ships, with the goal of increased operational performance and reduced acquisition and life-cycle costs.

The committee notes the development under an extension of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's maritime technology

program of an advanced waterjet propulsor which could meet operational performance, signature and cost reduction requirements for the DD–21 and other naval ships. The committee notes proposals for ¼-scale at-sea demonstration and cavitation tunnel testing of the waterjet propulsor to validate critical performance criteria and potential application of the propulsor to the DD–21 or other naval ships.

The committee urges that the Secretary of the Navy assess the requirement for further development, demonstration, and evaluation of advanced waterjet propulsor technology and provide to the Congressional defense committees by December 1, 1999, a report which includes the Secretary's recommendations regarding the demonstration, a program execution plan, and Navy funding for the program.

Affordable advanced acoustical arrays

The budget request contained $115.8 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine systems development, including $71.6 million for advanced submarine combat systems development.

The committee notes the Navy's continued development of advanced sonar arrays for surface, submarine, and distributed surveillance systems, including single and multi-line towed arrays, conformal-hull mounted arrays, and advanced arrays for use in the fixed-distributed and advanced-deployable systems. The committee strongly supports the development and demonstration of all-optical array and other key enabling technologies for advanced acoustical arrays that could significantly improve array performance and dramatically reduce the cost of future acoustical array systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63561N to accelerate the development and transition of all-optical array and other key enabling technologies to advanced towed, hull-mounted, and distributed acoustical array systems.

Analysis of alternatives for follow-on support jammer

The budget request contained $87.3 million in PE 64270N for engineering and manufacturing development of the EA–6B electronic countermeasures aircraft system. The budget request states that a requirement exists to begin planning and analysis of alternatives for a command and control warfare (C2W) replacement for the EA–6B aircraft, however, no funds were requested for this purpose.

The committee notes the high demands that are being placed on the EA–6B aircraft as an electronic countermeasures weapons system, projections that there will not be enough EA–6B aircraft to meet mission requirements beyond 2015, and considerations to retire the EA–6B in 2015. The committee notes further that a mission needs statement for a C2W platform that would replace the EA–6B and achieve initial operational capability in 2012 is being reviewed by the Navy. The committee understands that a C2W follow-on platform would incorporate air vehicle enhancements that would reduce operational and maintenance costs, improve reliability, and significantly increase command, control, and operational effectiveness. The committee believes that the Navy should initiate an analysis of alternatives for a C2W follow-on platform

which will determine the most cost-effective approach for replacing the EA–6B in the radar support jamming mission.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63XXXN to initiate the analysis of alternatives for a C2W replacement for the EA–6B aircraft, and directs the establishment of a separate concept exploration/product definition and risk reduction program element for the program.

Aquifer vulnerability/contamination assessment

The budget request contained $8.2 million in PE 65873M for Marine Corps program-wide support, but included no funding for acquifer vulnerability/contamination assessment.

The committee recognizes the potential for groundwater contamination at military bases due to fuel spills, hazardous chemical handling, and waste disposal. The committee recommends $9.7 million in PE 65873M, an increase of $1.5 million to conduct an analysis and acquifer mapping of a candidate military site to establish contamination identification.

Aviation depot maintenance technology

The budget request contained $70.8 million in PE 63721N for environmental protection.

The committee notes that new environmentally friendly repair processes are being developed that offer significant productivity improvements and potential cost savings. To this end, the Congress provided $2.0 million in fiscal year 1999 for the development and demonstration of aviation depot maintenance technologies that will significantly reduce maintenance and repair costs and reduce or eliminate hazardous waste and pollution products.

The committee recommends $73.8 million in PE 63721N, an increase of $3.0 million to complete the program for demonstration of advanced maintenance technologies for removal of coatings from large aircraft, cleaning and stripping of metal surfaces, and application of tungsten carbide coatings to aircraft landing gear and hydraulic components.

Beartrap nonlinear dynamics and environmental characterization

The budget request contained $17.8 million in PE 63254N for anti-submarine warfare (ASW) system developments, including $5.3 million for Project Beartrap.

The committee notes that the budget request for Beartrap supports hardware and software developments for advanced capability acoustic and non-acoustic sensors, as well as data collection and analysis for threat assessment and environmental characterization. The committee understands that basic research in nonlinear dynamic stochastic resonance (NDSR), supported by the Office of Naval Research, has advanced to the point that it offers explanations for many observed physical phenomena, and it offers the potential to develop significantly improved acoustic and non-acoustic AWS sensor systems. The committee believes that NDSR technology offers a significant opportunity to enhance the capabilities of Beartrap at a time when evolving ASW requirements indicate the critical need to integrate these latest relevant technologies. Specific areas include characterization of the ocean nonlinear dy-

namics environment, application of NDSR technology in advanced Beartrap sensors, and validation of NDSR ASW performance.

The committee also notes that the Navy requires extensive environmental data to achieve effective performance from the extended echo ranging (EER) devices used in shallow littoral waters. These active acoustic devices are key to naval airborne ASW performance. The Beartrap program is well suited to collect this environmental data.

The committee recommends $23.8 million in PE 63254N for ASW systems development, an increase of $6.0 million for Project Beartrap for the purposes outlined above.

C–2 eight-blade composite propeller system

The budget request contained $53.3 million in PE 25633N for improvements in operational Navy aviation and aviation support systems.

The committee is aware that the Navy is seeking a solution to operational limitations encountered with the propeller system used on E–2C and C–2A aircraft. The current propeller system incorporates technology developed in the 1950's and the 1960's, is difficult and expensive to maintain, and is no longer in production. Following committee recommendations in its report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105–132) for initiation of a development and demonstration of an eight-blade composite propeller for E–2C and C–2A aircraft, the Navy began a program for design, development, test, and production of the propeller system. The committee notes that the program includes flight and ground test of the new propeller system for the E–2 aircraft, but includes only ground tests for the new propeller on the C–2 aircraft.

The committee recommends $58.3 million in PE 25633N, an increase of $5.0 million to support flight testing the new propeller system on the C–2 aircraft sequentially with the E–2 flight test program.

Claymore marine

The budget request contained $75.6 million in PE 63792N for the Navy's advanced technology demonstration program, including $3.9 million for the Claymore Marine advanced technology demonstration.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.7 million in PE 63792N for risk reduction and to maintain the schedule for the Claymore Marine advanced technology demonstration.

Cooperative engagement capability

The budget request contained $114.9 million in PE 63658N to continue hardware and software engineering, integration, test and evaluation of the Navy's cooperative engagement capability (CEC).

The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–736) directed the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Congressional defense committees at least quarterly on the interoperability problems between CEC, ship self-defense, and the Aegis combat direction system that were first encountered in 1997 during fleet operational test and evaluation of

the systems and the Navy's plan for and progress in resolving these problems.

The committee has reviewed the Secretary's first quarterly report and notes that the Navy has made significant progress in developing a plan that focuses on interoperability to support carrier battle group deployments in the near term, and on force-level systems engineering to coordinate requirements, capital investments, development, and installation of new system capabilities for the fleet in the far term. The Program Executive Office for Theater Surface Combatants has been created to provide a common management structure for all surface ship combat direction systems and interfacing systems, including systems integration and interoperability of CEC, Aegis, the advanced combat direction system, and related joint command and control systems. The committee also notes that the Navy has significantly increased land-based system engineering analysis and testing capabilities for combat systems and is establishing a shore-based, distributed engineering test capability that provides the ability to address battle group level combat system interoperability issues and to validate operational tactics, techniques and procedures prior to shipboard installation of the systems. The committee recognizes the potential provided by the Distributed Engineering Plant for reducing the cost of system, acquisition, testing, and training and encourages the Navy to continue to develop and support its shore-based, distributed engineering test capability. The committee notes further that the Navy has realigned and reprogrammed the funds necessary to address these issues.

The committee understands that recent land-based and at-sea testing has demonstrated continuing progress in resolving combat systems interoperability issues. However, the committee believes that resolution of the interoperability issues will require a stable program plan and funding and a coordinated effort on the part of the Navy and the supporting system contractors.

The committee recommends $114.9 million in PE 63658N to continue CEC development, systems integration, and test and evaluation.

Cruiser conversion

The budget request contained $28.5 million in PE 64307N and $11.5 million in PE 64567N for cruiser conversion program design and engineering studies but did not include any procurement funds.

Aegis class cruisers are the Navy's premier air defense and strike warfare platforms. The first ships of this class have now been in service over 15 years and some of their systems are approaching technical obsolescence. The committee understands that, in order to protect its investment in these highly capable ships, the Navy is planning to extensively upgrade the Aegis cruisers' combat systems and engineering equipment beginning in fiscal year 2002. These upgrades include new computer systems, cooperative engagement and theater ballistic missile defense capabilities, land attack and area air defense commander functions, and other hull and mechanical improvements.

The committee supports upgrading these cruisers and recommends $37.5 million in PE 64307N and $17.5 million in PE 64567N, a total increase of $15.0 million, including $9.0 million in PE 64307N and $6.0 million in PE 64567N for engineering studies associated with expansion of the conversion program to include all Aegis cruisers.

Distributed surveillance system

The budget request contained $14.9 million in PE 64784N for continued development of the distributed surveillance system.

The Integrated Undersea Surveillance System (IUSS) program includes both fixed and relocatable acoustic sensor systems to detect and track diesel and nuclear powered submarines. The Fixed Distributed System (FDS) is a series of permanently installed acoustic arrays and the Advanced Deployable System (ADS), currently under development, will comprise sensors that can be rapidly deployed in littoral environments.

The committee understands that the incorporation of fiber optic sensor technologies in acoustic arrays can greatly reduce maintenance requirements for these systems. Littoral anti-submarine warfare (ASW) operations pose complex challenges in the evaluation and analysis of acoustic sensor data due to the high volume of traffic and diverse environmental conditions. The committee is concerned that the ADS program does not adequately address automation of detection and tracking functions, connectivity to the Global Command and Control System (GCCS) and web-based network centric warfare systems.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $33.9 million, an increase of $19.0 million in PE 64784N for the distributed surveillance system including $8.0 million for the continued application of remote-powered fiber optic sensor technologies for FDS acoustic arrays; and $11.0 million for the development of improved detection and tracking algorithms to provide increased automation for the ADS and an interface among it, the GCCS, and other network centric warfare systems.

DP–2 thrust vectoring system proof-of-concept demonstration

The budget request contained $42.0 million in PE 63217N for development of air systems and weapons advanced technology. No funds were requested for continuation of the DP–2 thrust vectoring system proof-of-concept demonstration.

DP–2 is a proof of concept program to demonstrate thrust vector control to achieve vertical takeoff and conventional takeoff capabilities in a one-half scale flight test vehicle. This technology offers the potential for a low cost, medium range aircraft of advanced composite construction.

The committee recommends $47.0 million in PE 63217N, an increase of $5.0 million to complete the proof-of-concept flight test demonstration and provide the basis for a potential Department of the Navy decision to proceed with a full-scale aircraft development program.

E–2C radar modernization

The budget request contained $16.1 million in PE 24152N for the E–2C maritime surveillance aircraft, including $12.1 million for the E–2C radar modernization program.

The committee notes that the radar modernization program is an advanced technology transition demonstration of a new E–2C radar system that will provide improved airborne surveillance capabilities for carrier battle groups engaged in littoral operations. However, funding for the radar modernization program was sharply reduced in this year's budget request. The committee understands that restoration of the funds would accelerate the development and integration of the new radar system and enable participation in the Navy's early operational assessment of the cooperative engagement capability (CEC) with the E–2C. The committee also understands that this would accelerate the E–2C CEC demonstration by one year, reduce risk, and provide the opportunity to forward-fit the capability into new production E–2C aircraft. The committee notes that in addition to demonstrating the potential for significant improvements in airborne surveillance support for littoral operations, the radar improvement program also addresses major obsolescence and reliability issues associated with the current E–2C radar system.

The committee recommends $31.1 million in PE 24152N, including an increase of $15.0 million for the E–2C radar modernization program.

Electric drive propulsion for Navy ships

The budget request contained $108.3 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development, including $25.7 million for integrated power systems (IPS) development.

The committee notes the Navy's increased interest in the development of electric drive propulsion technology and the potential use of electric drive propulsion in future surface combatants and submarines, including insertion of an electric drive propulsion system in the DD–21 land attack destroyer and in the New Attack Submarine (NSSN) programs. A common integrated electric drive system appears to offer significant advantages, however, implementation of such a system has been limited by the technology needed for reliable electric motors of the power (approximately 30,000 to 50,000 shaft horse power (shp)) required. The committee is aware that several alternative electric propulsion motor concepts have been proposed that are of varying degrees of technical maturity.

The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 4103 (H. Rept. 105–746) directed the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the Congress which evaluates the installation of a common integrated electric drive system for DD–21, a NSSN variant, and the next-generation CV(X) aircraft carrier with both a common integrated electric drive system and a conventional mechanical drive system. The Secretary's report, dated March 1, 1999, states that the Navy has concluded that the radial-gap PM motor possesses the power density, acoustic performance, and maturity of technology to be a viable propulsion motor common to the broadest ranges of ships and that the Navy is currently considering expand-

ing its IPS development to a corporate Navy program that will include state-of-the-art permanent magnet motor technology.

The committee recommends $108.3 million in PE 63513N, including $25.7 million for integrated power systems development. The committee will consider recommendations by the Secretary for further development and demonstration of electric drive propulsion technology for Navy ships which identify necessary funding and provide a program plan for the development.

Electro-optical framing technologies

The budget request contained $5.0 million in PE 35206N for airborne reconnaissance systems, including $2.0 million for electro-optic (EO) framing technologies.

The committee continues to support development of the revolutionary digital EO framing technologies with on-chip forward motion compensation (FMC). The committee notes the Navy F–14 Tactical Air Reconnaissance Podded System—Completely Digital (TARPS CD) demonstration system using this technology has recently been successfully employed at sea. Based on this success, the committee believes there is a need for additional TARPS CD risk-reduction pods and that the Navy should expand this effort. Further, the committee believes that the EO framing with on-chip FMC should be fully developed and improved to satisfy current and future applications on aircraft such as tactical unmanned aerial vehicles and other tactical fighter aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends $10.0 million in PE 35206N, an increase of $5.0 million for continued development of EO framing with on-chip FMC technologies. These efforts shall include development of the high quantum efficiency infra-red framing chip, precision strike improvements, and step-framing technologies.

Environmentally safe energetic materials

The budget request contained $34.3 million in PE 63609N for development and demonstration of improvements in Navy conventional munitions. No funds were requested to continue the program for development of environmentally safe energetic materials.

The Congress has supported the accelerated development and demonstration of energetic materials and processes for explosives, propellants and pyrotechnics for use in undersea, surface, and other weapons systems, which minimize or eliminate any adverse environmental impact normally associated with these materials in production and demilitarization. These new environmentally safe materials are expected to meet insensitive munitions and system performance requirements while lowering the total ownership costs of the weapons systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63609N to continue the development of environmentally safe energetic materials.

Extended range guided munition and projectile common guidance

The budget request contained $101.5 million in PE 63795N for gun weapons system technology demonstration and validation, including $37.7 million for continued development of the EX–171 extended range guided munition (ERGM).

The committee notes that the ERGM projectile, the modified 5–inch, 62 caliber gun, and a land attack missile comprise the Navy's near-term program for improving the Navy's surface fire support capability.

The committee is aware that technical problems in development of the ERGM projectile have caused schedule delays and potential increases in program costs, and that the system contractor's decision to relocate the ERGM development program to a new site has only exacerbated these delays and increased costs. The committee believes that while the technology issues facing the ERGM program are low to medium risk, additional effort will be required to control potential cost growth and to minimize any further delay in fielding ERGM to the fleet.

The committee notes that both the Navy and the Army are pursuing the development of projectile guidance and control that will use the global positioning system (GPS) and rugged inertial navigation systems (INS). The current guidance and control system for the Navy's ERGM uses mid–1990's technology that typically accounts for at least 50 percent of the total projectile cost. The committee is aware that the Navy and the Army have been modestly investing in the development of micro electro-mechanical sensor (MEMS) technologies that can significantly reduce the cost of navigation systems that use GPS/INS guidance. Use of MEMS to upgrade the baseline (non-MEMS) guidance section would save at least 10 percent of the total cost of each ERGM. If the MEMS system were packaged to fit within the NATO standard fuze, the resulting guidance integrated fuze that could be used by the Army, Navy, Marines, and NATO allies in a variety of current and future projectiles would reduce the cost of the ERGM up to 40 percent. The potential production base for MEMS GPS/INS guidance and control and make low-cost, precision-guided munitions a reality for all services and NATO allies.

The committee recommends that the Navy and the Army capitalize on the development of MEMS GPS/INS technology by incorporating the technology in the ERGM projectile, and establishing a joint program for the development of common guidance and control for cannon-fired projectiles. Such a program could leverage technologies developed by the Competent Munitions Advanced Technology Demonstration, Multifunction Fuze, and ERGM programs.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63795N for ERGM baseline development and to accelerate integration of MEMS-based GPS/INS into the ERGM, and an increase $4.0 million to initiate the joint Projectile Common Guidance program. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Army to report to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request, the program plan, schedule, and funding for the joint Projectile Common Guidance program.

F/A–18C/D BOL chaff countermeasure

The budget request contained $315.7 million in PE 24136N for F/A–18 aircraft operational systems development, including $169.1 million for the development of improvements to fielded F/A–18 air-

craft. No funds were requested to continue the certification of BOL chaff countermeasures for the F/A–18C/D.

The committee notes that the LAU–138A/A Guided Missile Launcher Set and its associated chaff countermeasures (RR184 and RR189), commonly referred to as BOL chaff, have been qualified and deployed on the F–14 aircraft. The launcher significantly increases aircrew/aircraft survivability and mission effectiveness by dispensing increased quantities of countermeasures against radar homing and infra-red missiles that are dispensed from the rear of the aircraft launcher rail without displacing other aircraft weapons from the launcher rail. The committee further notes that Phase I integration testing of the LAU138A/A on the F/A–18C/D aircraft will be completed in fiscal year 1999. However, the committee understands that funding for completion of Phase 2 of the F/A–18C/D qualification program, which would lead to a production decision is insufficiently funded.

The committee recommends $318.2 million in PE 24136N, an increase of $2.5 million to complete Phase 2 testing and qualification of the LAU 138A/A BOL chaff countermeasure on the F/A–18C/D strike fighter.

Free electron laser

The budget request contained $37.6 million in PE 62111N for applied research in surface/aerospace surveillance and weapons technology, and $14.2 million in PE 65605A for the high energy laser system test facility (HELSTF).

The committee understands that the Department of Energy is considering a technology program for development and demonstration of a free electron laser that operates in the infrared spectrum and desires to evaluate the technology for potential ship self-defense applications. A program has been proposed for upgrade of the free electron laser demonstration facility for applied research in the potential use of tunable free electron lasers as countermeasures against anti-ship and anti-aircraft missile infrared seekers.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62111N to initiate the demonstration facility upgrade program, and an increase of $4.0 million in PE 65605A for evaluation of this technology by the DOD HELSTF to determine suitability to address Navy requirements. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2001 budget request, a Navy supported program plan and DOD funding required to complete the project. The committee further directs the Commander, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, as DOD executive agent for high power solid-state laser technology, to provide a report containing the results of the HELSTF evaluation of the proposed free electron laser technology program prior to a Navy request for funding for the demonstration facility upgrade program.

Hybrid fiberoptic/wireless communications system technology

The budget request contained $68.8 million in PE 62232N for applied research in command, control, and communications technology.

The Congress provided $1.0 million in fiscal year 1999 for development and demonstration of the technology for hybrid fiberoptic/wireless communications systems. The committee understands that the application of this technology to shipboard communications systems would combine the characteristic flexibility and mobility of wireless base stations with the security of point-to-point fiberoptic communications to achieve increased mobility and security while reducing the effects of frequency interference.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62232N to continue the development of hybrid fiberoptic/wireless communication system technology.

Hyper-spectral analysis

The budget request contained $12.1 million in PE 65867N, including $10.5 million for the Navy Force Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities (TENCAP), $10.1 million in PE 27247F for Air Force TENCAP, and $7.8 million in PE 63232D8 for automatic target recognition.

The committee understands that hyperspectral sensor systems could provide the capability to detect and identify targets that are not discernible with conventional sensors by exploiting the spectral signature of both the target and the environment. The committee also understands that the Navy and the Department of Defense now believe that recent design and component technology innovations have reached a level of maturity where hyperspectral technology can be used to provide enhanced capabilities to existing and planned airborne reconnaissance sensors. The committee notes hyperspectral technology has been successfully tested on a limited scale onboard Navy intelligence collection aircraft. The technology provides real-time, automated, hyper-spectral, wide-area search functionality. By searching for spectral anomalies, it provides users with automated target nominations without prior detailed information. This could dramatically cut imagery analyst workloads, while greatly improving real-time targeting and threat warning. The committee believes such a capability is needed to exploit the vast amount of imagery data that the intelligence community is able to provide.

Therefore, the committee recommends $10.8 million in PE 63232D8, an increase of $3.0 million for advanced development of hyperspectral technology for automatic target recognition, and $16.1 million in PE 65867N and $14.1 million in PE 27247F, an increase of $4.0 million respectively for the services to procure and test hyper-spectral sensors and exploitation tools.

Improved software production management

The budget request contained no funding for improved software development and production management. The committee notes that the Office of the Secretary of Defense recently acknowledged that Department of Defense software expenditures had risen to $42 billion annually by 1994, and that 40 to 50 percent of this amount was attributed to software rework and correction of problems.

The committee also notes that industry has demonstrated the ability to significantly reduce required rework by more than a factor of four by implementing an initiative known as best software

practices. It further notes that even a far more conservative percentage of cost avoidance would result in annual savings of billions of dollars that could be invested elsewhere by the Department of Defense.

Another serious problem addressed by this industry initiative is an increasing shortage of qualified programmers. Industry has determined that the number of highly qualified software programmers is declining and that acheiving significant reductions in software re-work enables more efficient use of best qualified software programmers, enabling the focus on new development efforts.

The implementation of best software practices by industry has proven that more efficient software development offers a dramatic potential for acquisition cost savings, and the committee believes that this potential must be pursued by the Department for defense programs. The Tri-Service Software Program Managers Network has been established to identify best industry practices for software development and management and to convey these best to the services. The committee is concerned that although the savings possible through use of industry best practices have been documented and an associated implementation plan developed by the Tri-Service Software Program Managers Network, the Department has failed to implement this plan. While a significant number of industry segments are aggressively pursuing best software practices to cut their costs, the annual $42.0 billion cost to the Department of Defense is so large that even a fraction of possible savings, if realized, would have a dramatic impact on force modernization.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to mandate the use of identified best practices for software development and management for all acquisition programs and recommends $4.5 million in PE 63XXXN for the Tri Service Software Program Managers Network.

Intercooled recuperated gas turbine engine

The budget request contained $17.7 million in PE 63573N to continue development and full scale system testing of the intercooled recuperated (ICR) gas turbine engine.

The committee supports the development of the ICR gas turbine as the next-generation marine propulsion gas turbine and potential power plant for surface combatants and other ships based on the significantly reduced life cycle fuel costs and improved capabilities that have been demonstrated during the development program. The engine is being developed in accordance with cooperative agreements between the United States and the United Kingdom and the United States and France.

The committee notes that in 1998 the Navy significantly restructured the ICR program in accordance with program guidance contained in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 4103 (H. Rept. 105–746). The ICR Essential Program has been structured to meet development milestones for the United Kingdom and France's common new generation frigate and to provide industry with a qualified marine gas turbine for consideration as the prime mover for the DD–21 next-generation surface combatant. Under the program the Navy will complete sufficient development testing to characterize technical attributes and risks,

complete the second 500 hour development test, and identify a preproduction engine configuration that will then undergo qualification testing by the United Kingdom and France. During the qualification test phase of the program, U.S. Navy participation will include technical review, witnessing tests, and accepting test results.

The committee recommends the budget request in PE 63573N. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2001 budget request those measures necessary to ensure completion of the ICR Essential Program.

Joint experimentation program

The budget request contained $41.8 million in PE 63727N for the Joint Warfighting Experimentation program.

The program funds the field experiments and supporting simulation to evaluate potential systems and concepts and their contribution toward achieving the objective of enhanced effectiveness and dominance of U.S. armed forces in future military operations. The committee notes that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff's "Joint Vision 2010" and supporting conceptual doctrine statements by the military services stress the critical role that technology will play in achieving new levels of effectiveness across the range of future military operations. The committee also notes that the program will initially focus on experiments relative to the contribution of advanced information technology to joint warfighting capabilities. The committee supports a coordinated joint program that will explore and experiment with new operational concepts, doctrine, organizations, training, and system technologies to understand the new capabilities needed to achieve the next century's military requirements.

The committee recommends $49.8 million in PE 63727N, an increase of $8.0 million for Joint Warfighting Experimentation program.

Joint non-lethal weapons programs

The budget request included $23.3 million in PE 63851M for non-lethal weapons.

The committee understands that the XM 303 Under-Barrel Tactical Payload System (UBTPS) is being examined for use in internal security and rear area security activities by the military services, Special Operations Command, and the National Guard.

Accordingly, the committee considers the continued development and evaluation of the UBTPS in fiscal year 2000 to be a matter of Congressional interest. Further, the committee expects the military services, Special Operations Command, and the National Guard to consider the XM 303 UBTPS for the purpose of determining their requirements for non-lethal systems.

Joint tactical combat training system

The budget request contained $26.3 million in PE 24571N for Consolidated Training Systems Development, including $8.0 million for continued development of the Joint Tactical Combat Training System (JTCTS).

The JTCTS is a Navy-led, joint Air Force/Navy program for the development of fixed, transportable, and mobile range instrumentation for shore-based tactical air crew training and for deployable, at-sea naval expeditionary force training. The committee report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–532) directed the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force, to conduct an assessment of the feasibility and desirability of a transition strategy from the existing Navy large area tracking ranges (LATR) and the Air Force's AN/ASQ–34 Kadena Interim Training System (KITS) to the objective JTCTS capability. The committee expressed the belief that such a strategy should include potential improvements in the legacy systems, requirements for interoperability with the JTCTS, and ultimate replacement of the legacy systems by JTCTS. The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 4103 (H. Rept. 105–746) directed the Department of Defense to conduct a technical evaluation to compare the capabilities, performance, and costs of an integrated LATR/KITS system to JTCTS.

The committee notes that the report of the Navy's JTCTS transition strategy assessment, dated February 1999, concluded that programmatic, technical, and operational use factors indicate a marginal return on investment for improvements to existing legacy systems. The assessment concludes that neither of the legacy systems (LATR or KITS) possesses the capabilities needed to meet the key operational requirements for JTCTS. The committee also notes that the Department intends to complete the technical evaluation required by the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 4103 (H. Rept. 105–746) by August 1999.

The committee recommends the budget request for continued development of JTCTS.

Lightweight 155MM howitzer

The budget request contained $42.7 million in PE 63635M for Marine Corps ground combat supporting arms systems and included $23.2 million for the XM 777 lightweight 155mm towed howitzer.

The XM 777 howitzer was developed as the replacement for the aging and operationally deficient M198 towed howitzer for the Marine Corps and the Army. The XM 777 will retain the range of the M198 while reducing the weight from 16,000 pounds to 9,000 pounds. The weight reduction significantly improves transportability by sea, air, and land platforms while providing increased rate of fire.

The committee supports this urgently needed replacement and recommends $46.9 million in PE 63635M, an increase of $4.2 million for the XM 777.

Littoral warfare fast patrol craft

The budget request contained $75.6 million in PE 63792N for the Navy's advanced technology demonstration program.

The committee notes that the Office of Naval Research is evaluating initial results of concept evaluation of a littoral warfare fast patrol craft including preliminary design of the ship and fire support weapons module, development of a communications module,

and at-sea demonstration of the concept. The committee believes that the concept could provide an enhanced in-shore surveillance, communications, and fire support capability in support of Navy and Marine littoral operations, and that the Navy should continue the evaluation and determine the validity of an operational requirement for such a capability. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2001 budget request, the program plan, schedule, and funding for the concept development and evaluation program.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63792N to continue the concept development and evaluation program for the littoral warfare fast patrol craft.

Location of global positioning systems jammers

The budget request contained $163.1 million in PE 64270N for development of electronic warfare systems. No funds were requested to continue development and demonstration of a state-of-the art precision surveillance and targeting system for location of global positioning systems jammers (LOCO GPSI).

The Congress provided $3.5 million in fiscal year 1997 and $2.8 million in fiscal year 1998 to develop and demonstrate a prototype system for locating and targeting global positioning system jammers. The committee understands that the laboratory, field, and initial flight tests of the LOCO GPSI prototype have demonstrated the ability of the prototype to target such jammers.

The committee recommends $169.1 million in PE 64270N, an increase of $6.0 million to continue the development and evaluation of the LOCO GPSI system. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to assess the operational requirement for an electronic countermeasures system for precision targeting global positioning system jammers and the program plan for development of such systems, and to report the results of the assessment to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Marine Corps H–1 helicopter upgrade

The budget request contained $157.7 million in PE 64245N to continue engineering and manufacturing development for upgrade of the Marine Corps fleet of light/attack helicopters.

Under the upgrade, the existing fleet of 201 AH–1W attack and 104 UH–1N utility helicopters will be remanufactured into 180 AH–1Z and 100 UH–1Y helicopters. The program was initiated in 1995 to provide increased performance, reliability, maintainability, and commonality at an "affordable" cost, reduce maintenance and spare parts cost and overhead, and extend the life of the existing Marine light/attack helicopter fleet until an advanced rotor craft common to all services would become available around 2020. Known as "4BN/4BW," the program replaces the current two-bladed rotor system in both helicopters with a new, identical, four-bladed, all composite rotor system, a common engine and power train, and a fully integrated state-of-the-art cockpit.

The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has included an increase of $26.6 million for this program as his number one unfunded priority for aviation research and develop-

ment in fiscal year 2000. Consequently, the committee recommends $184.3 million in PE 64245N, an increase of $26.6 million. The committee is concerned, however, by the continuing cost growth for a weapons system the Marine Corps regards as critical to its future warfighting capability and expects the Secretary of the Navy to review the program, establish a revised program baseline, and take measures necessary to manage the program within the revised baseline.

Marine mammal research

The budget request contained $361.1 million in PE 61153N for the Navy's defense research sciences program.

Of the funds provided in PE 61153N, the committee recommends $500,000 for continuation of the Navy's cooperative marine mammal research program.

Multi-function self-aligned gate technology

The budget request contained $69.7 million in PE 35204N for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) and $9.4 million in 35207F for manned reconnaissance systems. No funding was provided in either program element for the multi-function self-aligned gate (MSAG) active aperture antenna (AAA) technology.

The Congress has supported this AAA technology for several years, and the committee is pleased with the successful MSAG antenna demonstration completed in August 1998. During this unprecedented demonstration, the MSAG provided wide-band, duplex communications links simultaneously to a ground vehicle, an aircraft, and a satellite surrogate.

The committee believes that a single, electronically-steered antenna array that can provide multiple wide-band communications links would be a cost-effective solution to numerous Department of Defense communications requirements. However, the committee is concerned to note that the Department has failed to provide even minimal funding for this technology.

The committee understands that the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence) is considering initiation of an advanced concept technology demonstration of the MSAG technology and that the Air Force is supportive of testing this antenna technology on reconnaissance aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 35204N for operational evaluation of the MSAG AAA on the tactical control station and the Predator UAV. The committee also recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 35207F for evaluation of the MSAG AAA onboard the RC–135 Rivet Joint aircraft.

Multipurpose processor

The budget request contained $40.0 million in PE 64503N for the submarine sonar improvement program, including $22.5 million to continue development of the Acoustic Rapid Commercial-Off-the-Shelf Insertion (A–RCI) program.

The committee notes the significant improvement in sonar system capabilities that has resulted from the application of multipurpose processor (MPP) acoustics signal processing technology to

Navy submarine sonar systems. The committee has strongly supported the Navy's selection of the MPP as the cornerstone for sonar upgrades for existing submarines in the A–RCI program. The committee has also supported the development of advanced MPP signal processing capabilities in the A–RCI program, in the Navy science and technology base, and in the integration of those capabilities in submarine, airborne, surface sonar, and undersea surveillance systems.

The committee recommends the budget request for the submarine sonar improvement program and continued funding support for the development of advanced MPP acoustics signal processing technologies as an integral part of the Navy's sonar improvement research and development program.

National oceanographic partnership program

The budget request contained $60.3 million in PE 62435N for applied research in oceanographic and atmospheric technology, including $10.0 million for Department of the Navy support to the National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

Sec. 282 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) established the National Oceanographic Partnership Program to promote U.S. national goals of assuring national security, advancing economic development, protecting quality of life, and strengthening science education and communication through improved knowledge of the ocean and to coordinate and strengthen oceanographic efforts in support of those goals.

The committee has reviewed the National Ocean Research Leadership Council's fiscal year 1999 report to the Congress on the National Oceanographic Partnership Program and notes the steadily increasing activity in pursuit of the program goals and increased funding for the program from the participating federal agencies. The committee notes that the Ocean Research Advisory Panel believes the program has fostered a culture of partnership among participating government agencies, academia, and industry which has resulted in unique new approaches to ocean research. The committee also notes the panel's finding that one of the most pressing concerns in oceanography is the need for integrated ocean observation systems.

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy is declassifying and will make available for use by the public and by private institutions and agencies previously classified acoustical data from the Navy's underwater Sound Surveillance System (SOSUS) and data on ocean temperature and salinity levels under the Arctic ice cap. The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–736) requested that the Chairman of the National Oceanographic Research Council conduct an assessment of the value of data from the Navy's underwater Sound Surveillance System (SOSUS) in public and private ocean research. The committee understands that the council will consider support for a SOSUS pilot project to determine the feasibility of providing routine access to declassified SOSUS data.

The committee recommends $60.3 million in PE 62435N, including $10.0 million for the National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

Navy aviation survivability

The budget request contained $7.3 million in PE 63216N for aviation survivability.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense has conducted an extremely successful Foreign Comparative Test (FCT) of the K–36D Russian ejector seat and that this seat demonstrated crew survivable ejection capability which surpassed that of current U.S. ejection seats. The committee notes that the Air Force has continued evaluation of the K–36D and has developed a new version, the K–36/3.5A in order to meet U.S. requirements and yet provide equivalent capabilities in a lighter weight version.

While the Air Force is actively pursuing enhanced crew safety capability offered by the K–36/3.5A, the committee is concerned that the Navy has not seriously considered this opportunity to afford Navy and Marine Corps aviators the same increased safe ejection capability. The Navy has proposed to enter into a multi-year procurement F/A–18 E/F Super Hornet aircraft that do not offer the same level of crew safety as the K–36/3.5A. Additionally, the Marine Corps is engaged in re-manufacture of its fleet of AV–8B Harrier jets to correct serious safety and sustainability problems.

The committee believes that both of these Navy aircraft represent the backbone of Navy aviation force projection capability and should be required to seriously evaluate the enhanced crew safety offered by the K–36/3.5A ejection seat. The committee recommends that the Secretary of the Navy provide a report to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request including the details of that evaluation.

Navy land attack missile program

The budget request contained $101.5 million in PE 63795N for systems integration and testing, including $21.8 million for the Navy's land attack missile program.

The committee notes the operational requirement for a land attack missile system in the Navy's near-term and far-term fire support systems. The committee continues to support the development, risk reduction, and analytical activities leading to a defense acquisition milestone decision for a missile system program that will satisfy the operational requirements for a Navy land attack missile system

The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–736) directed the Secretary of Defense to ensure the conduct of an analysis of alternatives (AOA) to support the acquisition of a Navy land attack missile, and further directed that the Navy should not proceed to a Milestone I decision until the AOA and other requirements appropriate to a major acquisition milestone decision have been satisfied. The committee notes that the analyses and studies to satisfy this guidance are currently underway. The March 1999 letter report from the Director of Defense Operational Test and Evaluation, which was submitted in response to the direction contained in the Appropriations com-

mittee report on H.R. 4103 (H. Rept. 105–591), states that the results of the studies will be examined as part of a 1999 Defense Acquisition Board review of the land attack missile program and that the Department of Defense intends to conduct operational testing to verify the issues on any land attack missile option that is pursued. The committee expects that these actions should result in the selection from among the competing alternatives of the most cost- and operationally effective near-term solution to the operational requirement.

The committee also notes that the far-term naval surface fire support program will require an advanced land attack missile system for the DD–21 land attack destroyer when that ship joins the fleet in 2009, and that the Navy has yet to establish a development program for such a missile. The committee believes that a competitive development program should be established beginning in fiscal year 2001to ensure the availability of an advanced land attack missile for the first DD–21.

The committee recommends $21.8 million in PE 63795N to continue development and systems integration for the Navy's near-term land attack missile. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Congressional defense committees the program plan and funding requirements for development of an advanced land attack missile system for the DD–21 and other naval combatants with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Navy theater missile defense and fleet defense radar upgrades

The budget request contained $329.8 million in PE 63868C for the Navy theater wide (NTW) theater ballistic missile defense (TMD) system and $5.7 million in PE63755N for ship self defense.

The committee notes the benefits of leveraging the large investment in the Aegis weapon system as the technical basis for the development of an effective sea-based theater missile defense system. The committee understands, however, that the current SPY–1 radar does not meet TMD mission requirements and that significant radar upgrades are required to reach the objective capabilities for the NTW system. At the same time, the committee recognizes that radar upgrades required by the TMD mission need to be thoroughly integrated with continuing radar improvements required for fleet defense to meet aircraft and cruise missile threats, development of the cooperative engagement capability (CEC), and continued development of next generation Navy destroyers and cruisers.

The committee is aware that the Navy has two radar alternatives under consideration to meet its immediate TMD requirements, an adjunct X-band radar and a S/C band SPY–1 upgrade. The committee also understands that the Navy is conducting a competitive development of a multi-function radar/volume search radar (MFR/VSR) suite for the DD–21 and CVN–77 programs. The committee is concerned that the Navy is simultaneously conducting three different surface ship radar development programs and that two major competitors are participating in all three efforts. All three of these radar programs support similar area search and tracking requirements for current and future surface ships, and the committee believes that all three alternatives should be carefully

evaluated to determine the most cost effective and technically feasible approach for supporting NTW and fleet defense radar requirements.

The committee notes that the Navy has unique expertise in developing radar and command and control capabilities required for fleet defense, and that these requirements overlap those derived from the TMD mission. However, the committee believes that the Navy needs to lay out a clearly defined roadmap of radar requirements and technology approaches to enable identification of the best approach for various programs.

The committee also notes that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization shares TMD development costs for a number of programs, including the Space Based Laser, Navy Area Defense, and Patriot Advanced Capability-3 Configuration 3 (PAC–3) programs, while retaining program oversight over the executing service. The committee believes that this is a sound management and funding structure for NTW as well.

Therefore, the committee recommends $55.7 million in PE 63755N, an increase of $50.0 million for continued development of an adjunct X-band radar, a SPY–1 upgrade, and the MFR/VSR suite to meet fleet defense and TMD requirements. The committee further directs that the Secretary of the Navy provide the Congressional defense committees a comprehensive TMD and fleet defense radar roadmap with submission of the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

NSSN advanced submarine systems technology development and insertion

The budget request contained $241.5 million in PE 64558N for continued engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) of the VIRGINIA Class New Attack Submarine (NSSN) and $115.8 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine systems development.

The committee continues to strongly support the development of advanced submarine technologies for the NSSN, and is pleased with the manner in which the Navy has adopted and is executing a strategy for increasing the capabilities of the NSSN submarine. Incremental insertion of advanced technologies in the follow-on ships of the class will lead to the production of a more capable, less expensive nuclear attack submarine.

The committee has reviewed the February 1999 report from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology) on the updated technology insertion plan and notes that the program has been extended through the first seven ships of the class. The committee notes that, overall, the budget request contains approximately $292.0 million in EMD and Ship Construction, Navy funding to support the VIRGINIA Class technology insertion program. The committee also notes shortfalls in the advanced submarine technology program that have been identified by the Chief of Naval Operations.

The committee recommends the following increases for the NSSN advanced submarine systems technology development and insertion program that have been recommended by the Navy to accelerate and enhance critical warfighting capabilities in the VIRGINIA

Class NSSN: $6.5 million in PE 63561N, $18.5 million in PE 64558N, and $5.0 million in Ship Construction, Navy.

Optical correlation technology for automatic target recognition

The budget request contained $7.8 million in PE 63232D8Z for the development and demonstration of automatic target recognition technology and $34.3 million in PE 63609N for the Navy's conventional munitions program.

The committee report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–532) directed the Undersecretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology) to provide to the Congressional defense committees the Department's overall plan and program for the development and demonstration of optical correlator technology for automatic target recognition. The committee has reviewed the plan and notes that the Director, Defense Research and Engineering supports the development and demonstration of the technology as a priority of the ATR technology assessment program. The committee also notes that additional funding support to the program has resulted in key technology advances and increased the potential for near term transition of the technology and its applications to weapon systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.7 million in PE 63609N to continue the program for development and demonstration of a miniature, rugged optical correlator for automatic target recognition and improved aim point selection for the Navy's Standard Missile.

Optically fed and controlled phased array antenna

The budget request contained $68.8 million in PE 62232N for applied research in communications, command and control, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, including $22.2 million for radar technology.

The committee notes the potential for the development of monolithic circuits that combine photonic, optic, and microwave technologies in highly integrated, multi-level photonic modules. The use of such modules could provide increased bandwidth, advanced beamforming capabilities, and improved performance in advanced military radar and communication systems that are lower in cost, smaller in size and weight, and require less power than those systems that employ current phased-array radar technology.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62232N for applied research in the development and application of multi-level photonic module technology to optically fed and controlled phased array radar and communications systems.

Optically multiplexed wideband radar beamformer

The budget request contained $68.8 million in PE 62232N for applied research in communications, command, control, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance technology, including $22.2 million for radar technology.

The committee understands that high instantaneous bandwidth is needed in shipboard radar surveillance systems to achieve the necessary resolution for theater ballistic missile defense, ship self-defense, and non-cooperative target identification. The committee notes that the use of optical wavelength-division multiplexing

(WDM) technology, now being developed in the commercial sector, may provide the capability for wideband beamforming that could result in the demonstration of a wideband electronically-steered active radar antenna with high instantaneous bandwidth and the resolution necessary for theater ballistic missile defense and non-cooperative target identification. Use of optical WDM technology to reduce hardware complexity would permit reductions in system cost and achieve performance levels that are needed for ship self defense in a littoral environment.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62232N to initiate a cooperative program for research, development, and demonstration of a prototype optically multiplexed, wideband, radar beam-forming array using optical WDM technology.

P–3 maritime patrol aircraft combat systems research and development

The budget request contained $3.0 million in PE 64221N for engineering and manufacturing development in support of the P–3 maritime patrol aircraft.

The program provides upgrades to P–3C aircraft systems to enhance surface and subsurface tracking, classification, and attack capabilities, specific emitter identification, and improved radar tracking, and develops the software necessary to integrate advanced sensors into embedded P–3C Update III computer systems.

The committee notes that major theater combatant commanders continue to give high priority to the use of P–3C aircraft for reconnaissance and surveillance missions in both maritime and littoral operations. The Navy's recently-published Integrated Submarine Warfare Roadmap, which responded to direction contained in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–736), cites improvements in P–3 system capabilities as either essential or critical to near-term anti-submarine warfare operational capabilities. The committee also notes that there is, as yet, no program for development of a new multi-mission maritime aircraft. The committee strongly believes that increased priority must be given to the maintenance of a robust, continuing research and development program to support sustainment of existing P–3C aircraft anti-submarine warfare and anti-surface warfare capabilities and introduction of new capabilities.

The committee recommends the budget request, and strongly recommends that the Secretary of the Navy carefully review the fiscal year 2001 budget request for the P–3 maritime patrol aircraft program to ensure that it is in accordance with the program priorities established in the Integrated Submarine Warfare Roadmap.

Parametric airborne dipping sonar

The budget request contained $58.0 million in PE 63747N for undersea warfare advanced technology development and $118.7 million in PE 64216N for the multi-mission helicopter upgrade program. No funds were requested for the parametric airborne dipping sonar (PADS).

The committee notes that the Block II Upgrade to the LAMPS Mark III Weapons System will make significant improvements in

both the anti-submarine warfare (ASW) and anti-surface warfare mission areas. The Airborne Low Frequency Sonar (ALFS) will provide the principle improvement in the LAMPS Mark III ASW mission capability.

The committee also notes that, in addition to the ALFS program, the Navy's advanced technology demonstration of a prototype PADS has indicated the significant potential of parametric sonar technology against both mine-like and submarine targets in littoral waters. The results of the Navy's recent at-sea test of PADS indicate that the essential goals of the PADS demonstration have been met and suggest its potential for mine detection. However, the PADS ASW performance has not yet been demonstrated against a submarine target. The Secretary of the Navy's evaluation report, dated January 1999, states that the PADS technology merits further pursuit and that the Navy intends to continue demonstrations of parametric sonar technology using increases provided by the Congress. The committee believes that demonstrations of the PADS prototype technology against a submarine target must be completed before any decision is made to continue with a development program for PADS.

The committee recommends the budget request in PE 63747N and PE 64216N and awaits recommendations from the Secretary of the Navy to continue further demonstrations and development of PADS.

Phased array weather radar

The budget request contained $37.6 million in PE 62111N for applied research in surface/aerospace surveillance and weapons technology.

The committee notes ongoing Navy tests of the capability of the AN/SPY–1 phased array radar for the measurement of detailed local atmospheric conditions over water and in clear air. The committee is aware of proposals that have been made for the use of the SPY–1 radar at the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency's (NOAA) National Severe Storms Laboratory to evaluate the radar's capability for the collection of weather data and to test the technology for upgrading the WSR–88D weather radar with phased array radar capabilities. The committee believes that such an evaluation could result in advanced radar capabilities for severe weather warning, and could also result in enhanced capabilities for the SPY–1 radar for over-land surveillance and missile engagement guidance and control during littoral operations.

The committee encourages the Navy, NOAA, and the National Science Foundation (NSF) to enter into a cooperative agreement for loan of a SPY–1 radar to the National Severe Storms Laboratory and evaluation of the potential use of the radar system for weather prediction, observation, and warning.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62111N, to be used as matching funds to support a joint Navy-NOAA-NSF evaluation of the SPY–1 radar's capability for the collection of weather data and the technology for upgrading weather radar with phased array radar capabilities.

Power electronic building blocks and power node control centers

The budget request contained $41.5 million in PE 63508N for surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical advanced technology, including $18.0 million for development of advanced shipboard electrical systems.

The committee notes that the budget request supports the continued development and demonstration of power electronic building block technology, however, no funds were requested to continue the development of power node control centers. The committee continues to believe that power node control centers offer potential for significant improvements in efficiency and effectiveness for advanced electrical distribution system fault detection, switching, reconfiguration, and control of shipboard electrical power systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63508N to continue the program for development and demonstration of power node control centers.

Project "M"

The budget request contained $41.5 million in PE 63508N for submarine and surface ship handling, machinery, and engineering systems, including $2.4 million to complete the development, demonstration, and transition of advanced vibration control and quieting technology for naval machinery support structures.

The committee has closely followed the progress of Project M, a mounting system for active control of noise and vibration cancellation on ship machinery support systems, from its inception as a Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency advanced submarine technology program to the transition and continued development of the technology by the Navy. The results of the program have shown that the active machinery raft may provide unprecedented quieting for submarines and other ships. The committee notes the Navy's plan to conduct in-water tests of the Project M technology installed in a large scale test vehicle at the Navy's underwater acoustic test range and believes that these tests must be completed in order to fully characterize the overall performance of the technology.

The statement of managers which accompanied the conference report on H.R. 3616 (H.Rept 105–736) requested that the Secretary of the Navy assess the potential of the application of the Project M technology in surface ships. The Secretary's assessment, dated April 1999, concluded that, although Project M offered potential benefits in low frequency vibration control, the impact on surface ship design make it unlikely that such technologies would be used in existing or future surface combatants. Consequently, the Secretary stated that a full-scale prototype development and demonstration of Project M technology should not be pursued. However, the assessment also stated that these conclusions should not confine or limit continued science and technology investments in active control vibration reduction technologies for other applications.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63508N for completion of the in-water evaluation of Project M quieting technology in the ¼-scale submarine vehicle and transition of the technology to the Naval Sea Systems Command.

S–3B surveillance system upgrade program

The budget request contained $2.1 million in PE 64217N for the weapon system improvement program for the S–3B maritime patrol aircraft.

The committee notes that the objective of the S–3B surveillance system upgrade program is the integration of off-the-shelf radar, electro-optic and infrared sensors, electronic support measures, and tactical data links to demonstrate an enhanced stand-off surveillance capability in support of Navy battle group operations that could be achieved with low risk and at relatively low cost. For fiscal year 1997, Congress added funds to demonstrate the APS–137V(V)5 synthetic aperture radar on the S–3B in phase I of the program. The committee notes Navy proposals for phase II of the program which would demonstrate an integrated surveillance system mission package on the S–3B aircraft. The committee believes that the phase II program is a logical follow-on to phase I system demonstrations to be conducted later this year.

The committee recommends $9.1 million in PE 64217N, an increase of $7.0 million for the S–3B surveillance system upgrade program.

Ship survivability and personnel protection

The budget request contained $108.3 million in PE 63513N, including $6.6 million for development and demonstration of survivability and protection technologies.

The committee notes that requirements for increased mission capabilities and reduced manning in future naval ships will place a premium on protection of ships personnel and the ability to monitor personnel status under all conditions. The committee has followed closely the Navy's efforts to develop and introduce to the fleet a computer-based, total ship damage control information management system that would enable rapid, coordinated response to wartime and peacetime casualties, reduce crew manpower requirements, and improve manpower utilization. The committee notes that the Navy is evaluating a personal status monitor that could provide the capability for detecting man overboard incidents. The committee continues to support the evaluation of commercial off-the-shelf, non-developmental items (COTS NDI) that could improve operational safety and combat survivability and have a high potential for contributing to safety of flight, fire fighting, damage control, emergency preparedness ashore, and survival at sea.

The committee recommends $112.3 million in PE 63513N, an increase of $4.0 million for development, demonstration, and evaluation of ship survivability and protection technologies.

Silicon carbide semiconductor substrates

The budget request contained $78.0 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials, electronics, and computer technology.

The committee is aware that silicon carbide is a wide band-gap semiconductor material with unique physical and electrical properties that will make possible the fabrication of the next-generation of microelectronic devices. These devices will be capable of operation in radiation environments and at high temperatures, high voltages, high power levels, and high frequencies in the microwave

regime. These capabilities will enable a wide range of applications in military and commercial systems, such as high voltage/high power systems, advanced radar, nuclear instruments, satellite communications, and advanced sensors. The committee supports the progress that has been made in the development of silicon carbide materials and encourages partnerships with industry for early commercialization of the technology.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62234N for the continued development of silicon carbide semiconductor materials and to advance high electrical power control and other applications for next generation military platforms.

Smart propulsor product model

The budget request included $5.3 million in PE 63563N for development and validation of design tools and methods for ship concept studies.

The Congress provided an increase of $3.0 million in fiscal year 1999 for the smart propulsor product model (SPPM), a joint Navy/industry effort to develop software design and analysis tools that bring together design, manufacturing, cost and capabilities modeling for ship propulsion devices. The committee notes that successful completion of the development program for the SPPM should enable the Navy to consider innovative propulsion concepts for future ships while considering life-cycle cost, manufacturing techniques, and their overall impact on ship system performance and cost.

The committee recommends $8.3 million in PE 63563N, an increase of $3.0 million to continue development of the SPPM.

SSGN conversion from Trident-class SSBN submarines

The budget request contained no funds for conversion of Trident-class ballistic missile submarines (SSBN) to a conventional cruise missile (SSGN) configuration.

The committee believes that sustaining a robust nuclear deterrent ought to be of the highest priority for future use of Trident class SSBN's. The committee notes Section 1032 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 1998 (Public Law 105–85, 111 Stat. 1948), as amended, limits the expenditure of funds for the retirement of any of the 18 Trident SSBNs and other strategic nuclear systems unless START II enters into the force and the Secretary of Defense exercises a waiver to implement START II.

The committee further notes that the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–736) directed the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congressional defense committees by March 1, 1999 on an analysis of Trident SSBN conversion to the SSGN configuration. This analysis is intended to address a range of conversion issues, including costs and schedule, major problem areas requiring additional analysis, implications for arms control treaty compliance, and possible benefits. The committee notes that the Secretary's report has not been received.

If the decision is made to retire SSBN submarines as a result of arms control agreements, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should consider the one time, near term opportunity Trident SSBN conversion to SSGN presents to the United

States military. As a result, upon such a decision and the release of the Secretary of Defense's report, the committee directs the Navy to consider submitting a reprogramming request to the Congressional defense committees to reprogram funds required to support concept validation and cost and operational effectiveness analysis leading to a defense acquisition milestone decision on conversion of the Trident SSBN to SSGN conversion. The reprogramming authorization to initiate concept evaluation and validation for the SSGN conversion should not alter the nation's policy of remaining at START I force levels until START II enters into force, nor shall it detract in any way from the overall U.S. deterrent posture or policy.

The committee re-emphasizes the importance it places on the requested report and directs the Secretary to provide it to the Congressional defense committees at the earliest possible date.

Superconducting waveform generator

The budget request contained $78.0 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials, electronics, and computer technology, including $9.8 million for radio frequency solid state device and control components.

The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the Office of Naval Research demonstrated notable performance gains through the use of cryogenic electronics and high temperature superconductivity technology in analog and digital electronic components. The Congress provided $1.0 million in fiscal year 1999 to continue the development of super conducting waveform generator and analog-to-digital converter technology that could lead to the demonstration of an advanced "cryo-radar" with increased performance and clutter rejection and reduced size, power, and weight. The committee has since learned that the program cannot be executed at the funding level provided.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62234N to continue the program for development of superconducting waveform generator and analog-to-digital converter technology, and to fulfill the intent expressed by the conferees in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–736).

SWATH ship mine counter-measures demonstrator

The budget request contained $75.6 million in PE 63792N for Navy advanced technology demonstrations. No funds were requested for demonstration of a high-speed mine counter-measures (MCM) ship.

The committee notes that the Navy's existing force of dedicated mine warfare ships are proven and capable of sustained mine hunting and clearance operations, but their slow speed and limited operational radius limits the effectiveness of their deployment with Navy surface combatant forces. The committee also notes that Navy studies indicate continued requirements for a dedicated MCM force for the foreseeable future.

The committee is aware of proposals that have been made for evaluation of advanced, high-speed hull designs as MCM ships. These proposals include the adaptation of existing Navy small

water area, twin hull (SWATH) craft, equipped with air and surface MCM systems, as a system demonstrator for evaluation in fleet battle experiments of the effectiveness of such craft in MCM operations.

The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to assess the requirement for a high-speed MCM ship demonstration program and provide to the Congressional defense committees by October 1, 1999, a report which includes the Secretary's recommendations regarding the demonstration, a program execution plan, and Navy funding for the program.

Tactical control system

The budget request contained $69.7 million in PE 35204N for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV), and included $24.6 million for the tactical control system (TCS). No funding was provided for the operation of the UAV systems integration laboratory (SIL) or to continue its development of the multiple UAV simulation environment (MUSE).

The committee continues to be supportive of the TCS and notes that TCS software is the key to interoperability for future medium-altitude and tactical UAVs and their payloads. Further, the committee is supportive of the TCS objective to interface with high-altitude UAVs.

The committee notes that the Naval Surface Warfare Center program office continues to develop most of the TCS software and expend most of the TCS developmental funding in-house. The committee believes that the TCS program could be more efficiently managed if the TCS developments, including software engineering and maintenance, were to be outsourced in whole to the prime system integration contractor. Further, the committee believes such outsourcing would allow for a smaller and more efficient government program office. The committee believes that holding a prime contractor responsible for total system performance has demonstrated success with many other programs.

Finally, the committee notes that the U.S. Atlantic Command (USACOM) has been without a TCS capability for its UAV testing, and that additional funding is required to provide such a capability.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for procuring a TCS ground station for USACOM. Further, the committee directs a reallocation of $4.5 million within PE 35204N specifically to realize the program office efficiencies discussed above and to move software development and maintenance responsibility to the prime contractor. This funding is to be reapplied within the TCS program to fund the SIL MUSE efforts.

Tactical Tomahawk

The budget request contained $147.2 million in PE 24229N for Tomahawk and Theater Mission Planning Center operational systems development, including $145.3 million for the Tactical Tomahawk program.

The committee has supported the Navy's initiation of the Tactical Tomahawk program. However, the committee report on H.R. 3116 (H. Rept. 105–532) expressed particular concern about the Navy's

ability to establish a competitive environment for future Tactical Tomahawk procurement and directed the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Congressional defense committees the Navy's plan for ensuring competitiveness in the production phase of the program.

The Secretary's letter report, dated September 25, 1998, noted the Navy's decision to continue with the current Tomahawk manufacturer for both the Tactical Tomahawk development contract and the full rate production program that would commence in fiscal year 2003. The report also asserted that the cost to the Navy associated with acquisition of a comprehensive technical data package for the missile and facilitating a second source would be prohibitive and that the delay in bringing on a second source would not support the required schedule for the delivery of missiles to the fleet.

The committee notes that the justification and approval (J&A) on which the sole-source decision for the Tactical Tomahawk program was based stated that the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) contract would require the contractor to develop and maintain a complete technical data package to support EMD and future missile production. The committee also notes that since the approval of the J&A and award of the EMD contract for Tactical Tomahawk, the Navy has determined that it does not have the ability to provide a technical data package to firms that would wish to compete in related warhead programs because the "EMD contract does not include a requirement for a technical data package."

The committee believes that the Navy's decision not to acquire a technical data package for the Tactical Tomahawk denies the ability to establish a second production source for the missile, should that be required in the future, and the ability of the Navy to compete any future procurement of the missile. In view of the operational expenditures of the Tomahawk missile as a weapon of choice in current operations and the imminent need to replace those expenditures, the committee considers such a policy shortsighted.

The committee also notes that the estimated cost of the Tactical Tomahawk program dictate that any procurement decision should be made only after a formal defense acquisition program milestone decision review at an appropriate time in the development program. The committee believes that such a milestone decision review should consider measures for establishing competitiveness in the production phase of the program.

The committee recommends the budget request of $147.2 million for continuation of the Tomahawk development program. The committee directs the Undersecretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology) to review the Tactical Tomahawk program and the decision not to acquire a technical data package for the missile. The Secretary shall report to the Congressional defense committees by December 31, 1999, on measures that will be taken to insure competition in future Tactical Tomahawk procurement and related programs.

Trajectory correctable munitions development

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) provided $5.0 million in PE 63635M for the

joint Army-Marine Corps Trajectory Correctable Munitions (TCM) development.

The committee notes that the various agreements required for a joint international program have been agreed to by all parties and are to be signed in the near future. The committee continues to support TCM development and directs the Secretary of Defense to release the previously authorized funding to the Marine Corps promptly after the agreements are signed.

Ultra-high thermal conductivity fibers

The budget request contained $78.0 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials, electronics, and computer technology.

The committee notes that over the last four years the Navy has engaged in a program to advance the use of ultra-high thermal conductivity fibers in high-performance, high-density electronic modules. Success in this area could permit the expanded use of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) electronic components in military aircraft and avionics (where the high thermal output of such components has constrained their use), and in substantial savings in system procurement costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62234N to continue the development of applications for ultra-high thermal conductivity fibers technology.

Undersea warfare advanced technology

The budget request contained $34.1 million in PE 62633N for applied research in undersea warfare weapons technology.

The committee recommends $36.1 million, an increase of $2.0 million to continue the development and application of microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) technology to Navy undersea weapons systems.

Unmanned aerial vehicles

The committee notes that the Congress directed the establishment of the office of Director for Expeditionary Warfare (N85) within the Chief of Naval Operations as a provision of Public Law 102–484, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993. This action was taken to address Congressional concerns about the adequacy of Navy resources dedicated to expeditionary warfare areas such as amphibious lift, mine warfare, and naval surface fire support. The Navy subsequently established responsibility for requirements generation and resource sponsorship for unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), and assigned the new responsibilities to the expeditionary warfare directorate based on the vital role these systems play in reconnaissance and targeting support to expeditionary operations.

The committee understands that the Navy is considering transferring responsibility for naval UAVs from N85 to the office of the Director of Air Warfare (N88). The committee is concerned that the migration of responsibility for naval UAVs may lead to decreased emphasis on the vital role these systems perform in expeditionary operations. The committee urges the Navy to consult the Congressional defense committees on any planned transfer of responsibility

for naval UAVs and provide sufficient rationale prior to executing such a transfer.

Upgrading fleet systems

The budget request contained $46.7 million in PE 63582N for combat systems integration demonstration and validation.

The committee understands that the recently created Systems Engineer of the Navy (NAVSEA 007) provides a focal point for interoperability and configuration control with the authority to direct overall upgrade of obsolete equipment across Navy systems. The office has developed a methodology for reducing the logistics costs associated with maintaining legacy equipment: identifying and analyzing legacy systems in the fleet, then replacing aging and obsolete equipment with state-of-the-art, commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) equipment. Results of the program should significantly reduce ownership costs to the Navy and realize cost reductions estimated to be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. The committee supports the initiative and encourages its implementation by the Navy as soon as possible.

The committee recommends $49.7 million in PE 63582N, an increase of $3.0 million to support implementation of the COTS insertion initiative for upgrading fleet systems.

Vacuum electronics

The budget request contained $78.0 million in PE 62234N for applied research in advanced materials, electronics, and computer technology, including $10.0 million for vacuum electronics technology.

The committee supports continuation of a robust vacuum electronics research and development program and expects the Navy as the Department of Defense (DOD) executive agent for the program to insure a coordinated vacuum electronics research and development program among the military services and defense agencies, and with other federal agencies, that will meet DOD requirements for advanced vacuum electronics technology.

The committee recommends $10.0 million in PE 62234N for applied research in vacuum electronics technology. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to assess the Department's requirements for advanced vacuum electronics technology and to report the results of that assessment and the long-term funding plan for the Department's vacuum electronics technology program to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Vectored thrust ducted propeller compound helicopter demonstration

The budget request contained $75.6 million in PE 63792N, including $5.0 million to begin an advanced technology demonstration of the Vectored Thrust Ducted Propeller (VTDP) Compound Helicopter, and $48.8 million in PE 64212N, including $34.9 million for development and evaluation of the CH–60S Fleet Combat Support helicopter.

The committee notes that the request for CH–60S helicopter development includes completion of a three-phase demonstration of its suitability for airborne mine countermeasures (MCM) towing

missions. The Navy has placed a high priority on the development of an organic airborne mine countermeasures capability and the demonstration of a variant of the CH–60 helicopter for the towed airborne MCM mission that will begin in fiscal year 1999. As a back-up technology, the Navy plans an advanced technology demonstration of the VTDP helicopter to demonstrate and assess the helicopter's towed airborne MCM capability, other multi-mission capabilities, and life cycle cost effectiveness. The committee also notes that the Navy plans to address the requirements, content, schedule, and cost of the plan for the VTDP advanced technology demonstration.

The committee recommends the budget requests for PE 63792N and PE 64212N and further recommends that the Navy complete the assessment of requirements, schedule, and cost of conducting an ATD for VDTP and provide the assessment and recommendations to the Congressional defense committees in conjunction with submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2001.

Virtual test bed for advanced electrical ship systems

The budget request contained $41.5 million in PE 63508N for development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical advanced technology.

The committee has supported the development of technologies that will lead to lower cost designs for future naval ships. The Congress provided funds in fiscal year 1999 to accelerate the development and use of virtual prototyping and a virtual test bed to demonstrate and evaluate advanced shipboard electrical power system concepts. The test bed provides the capability to dynamically test hull, mechanical, and electrical system designs in an interactive, distributed simulation. The committee believes that the test bed can be further developed through the integration of actual hardware and advanced electrical control device simulations to provide a distributed hardware-in-the-loop simulation that will permit realistic evaluations of ship hull, mechanical, and electrical systems performance.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63508N to continue the development and application of the virtual test bed.

AIR FORCE RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained $13,077.8 million for Air Force RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of $13,212.7 million, an increase of $134.8 million.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2000 Air Force RDT&E program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table and in the classified annex to this report.

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ACCOUNT	000	**RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE**	-		
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	209,505		209,505
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**209,505**	**0**	**209,505**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	209,505	0	209,505
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602102F	2	MATERIALS	63,334	3,000	66,334
		Friction Stir Welding			[+3,000]
0602201F	3	AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	43,898		43,898
0602202F	4	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	51,512	10,800	62,312
		Crew Safety			[+10,800]
0602203F	5	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	62,012		62,012
0602204F	6	AEROSPACE SENSORS	64,988	3,600	68,588
		ATR			[+3,600]
0602269F	7	HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	-		-
0602601F	8	PHILLIPS LAB EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	115,313	12,600	127,913
		Tactical Missile Propulsion and IHPRPT			[+5,300]
		Hyperspectral Imaging			[+7,300]
0602602F	9	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	42,205		42,205
0602702F	10	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	46,448		46,448
0602805F	11	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	17,927		17,927
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**507,637**	**30,000**	**537,637**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	507,637	30,000	537,637
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603106F	12	LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	10,786		10,786
0603108F	13	INTEGRATED DATA SYSTEMS	-		-
0603112F	14	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	25,890		25,890
0603202F	15	AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION	29,825		29,825
0603203F	16	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	29,405		29,405
0603205F	17	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	5,992		5,992
0603211F	18	AEROSPACE STRUCTURES	13,749		13,749

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603216F	19	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	38,778		38,778
0603227F	20	PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	4,827		4,827
0603231F	21	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	14,841	4,500	19,341
		Aircrew Laser Eye Protection			[+4,500]
0603245F	22	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	8,335		8,335
0603253F	23	ADVANCED SENSOR INTEGRATION	9,443		9,443
0603270F	24	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	27,334		27,334
0603302F	25	SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION	11,231		11,231
0603311F	26	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	-	8,000	8,000
		Continued Technology Development and Demonstration			[+8,000]
0603401F	27	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	76,229	15,000	91,229
		Low Cost Launch Technology			[+8,000]
		Military Spaceplane			[+5,000]
		Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System			[+2,000]
0603410F	28	SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY	3,677		3,677
0603601F	29	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	21,479		21,479
0603605F	30	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	38,995		38,995
0603707F	31	WEATHER SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603723F	32	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603726F	33	C3I 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		63,840
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**465,687**	**27,500**	**493,187**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	465,687	27,500	493,187
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION			
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	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYS (SPAC	80,137	(15,000)	65,137
		Program Reduction			[-15,000]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603438F	42	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	9,822	10,000	19,822
		KE-ASAT			[+10,000]
0603441F	43	SPACE BASED INFRARED ARCHITECTURE (SPACE) - DEM/VAL	151,378	(110,000)	41,378
		Transfer to PE 63XXXC BMDO			[-110,000]
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	30,000	265,374
		Acceleration of Alternate Engine Development			[+30,000]
0603850F	48	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (DEM/VAL)	24,446		24,446
0603851F	49	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL	28,628		28,628
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)	-
		Air Force/NRO Partnership			[-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 AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	4,910		4,910
0604441F	58	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	-		-
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION	**1,076,853**	**(87,905)**	**988,948**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,076,853	(87,905)	988,948
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT			
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)	-		-
0604222F	62	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	8,489		8,489
0604226F	63	B-1B	203,544		203,544
0604227F	64	DISTRIBUTED MISSION TRAINING (DMT)	3,835		3,835
0604233F	65	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING	38,656		38,656
0604239F	66	F-22 EMD	1,222,232		1,222,232

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604240F	67	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	201,765	152,000	353,765
		B-2 Upgrades			[+152,000]
		Next Generation Bomber Study			[2,000]
0604243F	68	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0604270F	69	EW DEVELOPMENT	90,347	13,700	104,047
		Precision Location and Identification (PLAID) Technology			[+13,700]
0604441F	70	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	328,653	(168,653)	160,000
		Airborne and Space Experiments			[10,000]
		Transfer to PE 64XXXC BMDO			[-168,653]
0604442F	71	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) LOW EMD	77,651		77,651
0604479F	72	MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	361,308	3,000	364,308
		Integrated Satellite Communications Control			[+3,000]
0604480F	73	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM BLOCK IIF (SPACE)	-		-
0604600F	74	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0604602F	75	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,887	38,000	46,887
		Minaturized Munitions Capability			[+38,000]
0604604F	76	SUBMUNITIONS	4,798		4,798
0604617F	77	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	946		946
0604618F	78	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	1,385		1,385
0604703F	79	AEROMEDICAL/CHEMICAL DEFENSE SYSTEMS	7,135		7,135
0604706F	80	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	6,135	4,000	10,135
		Commercial Crew Seats			[+4,000]
0604708F	81	CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING	2,719		2,719
0604727F	82	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	10,307		10,307
0604735F	83	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	6,220	6,000	12,220
		ADOSM			[+6,000]
0604740F	84	COMPUTER RESOURCE TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (CRTT)	196		196
0604750F	85	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,345		1,345
0604754F	86	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	8,705		8,705
0604762F	87	COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLOVERS)	5,893		5,893
0604779F	88	JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEMS (JINTACC	5,837		5,837
0604800F	89	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER EMD	-		-
0604805F	90	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	30,485		30,485
0604851F	91	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - EMD	38,804		38,804

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604853F	92	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE) - EMD	324,803	(2,000)	322,803
		Program Reduction			[-2,000]
0605011F	93	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	4,889		4,889
0207325F	94	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	-		-
0207414F	95	COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM	-		-
0305176F	96	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	13,412		13,412
		TOTAL, ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	**3,023,074**	**46,047**	**3,069,121**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	48,786	0	48,786
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,974,288	46,047	3,020,335
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0603402F	97	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (SPACE)	-		-
0604256F	98	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	32,391		32,391
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		392,104
0605808F	106	DEVELOPMENT PLANNING	5,696		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		51,658
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	-		-
0909900F	116	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0909980F	117	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT	-		-
1001004F	118	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,750		3,750
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**592,480**	**0**	**592,480**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	592,480	0	592,480
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0603690F	119	INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY	491		491
0101113F	120	B-52 SQUADRONS	32,139	(15,000)	17,139
		Program Reduction			[-15,000]
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 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	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		112,520
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		41,007
0207163F	133	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	49,783		49,783
0207217F	134	PODDED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM	-		-
0207247F	135	AF TENCAP	10,102	4,000	14,102
		Hyper Spectral Analysis			[+4,000]
0207248F	136	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	85,168		85,168
0207253F	137	COMPASS CALL	4,908		4,908
0207268F	138	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	160,212	(30,000)	130,212
		Acceleration of Alternate Engine Development			[-30,000]
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		33,393

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0207423F	144	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2,864		2,864
0207424F	145	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	73,336		73,336
0207428F	146	AIR WARFARE CENTER - NELLES 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 AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JOINT STARS)	130,488	30,000	160,488
		Radar Technology Insertion Program			[+30,000]
0207590F	150	SEEK EAGLE	23,133		23,133
0207591F	151	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	248,342	8,000	256,342
0207601F	152	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	19,299	2,500	21,799
		Synthetic Theater Operations Research Model			[+2,500]
0207605F	153	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,192		5,192
0208006F	154	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	16,764		16,764
0208019F	155	TACTICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM (TIP)	-		-
0208031F	157	WAR RESERVE MATERIEL - EQUIPMENT/SECONDARY ITEMS	1,467		1,467
0208060F	158	THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES	26,129		26,129
0208160F	159	TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	92,990		92,990
0208161F	160	SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	61,198		61,198
0301357F	165	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	3,200		3,200
0302015F	167	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	12,666		12,666
0303110F	168	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	8,985		8,985
0303131F	169	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	45,907		45,907
0303140F	170	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	7,992		7,992
0303141F	171	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	19,389	3,000	22,389
		Acclerated Development of GCSS-AF			[+3,000]
0303144F	172	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER (JSC)	-		-
0303150F	173	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,929		3,929
0303152F	174	WORLD-WIDE MILITARY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS, INFORMATION SYSTEM	-		-
0303601F	175	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	7,026		7,026
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		61,918
		Examination and Testing of Commercial Technologies			[2,500]
0305111F	180	WEATHER SERVICE	19,069		19,069
0305114F	181	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	5,588		5,588

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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 SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	53,963		53,963
0305165F	192	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS)	98,890		98,890
0305182F	194	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	43,186	3,000	46,186
		Universal Space Port			[+3,000]
0305205F	195	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	70,835	25,000	95,835
		Global Hawk High Altitude Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicle			[+25,000]
0305206F	196	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	124,608	7,000	131,608
		JSAF			[+7,000]
0305207F	197	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	9,388	3,000	12,388
		Evaluation of the MSAG AAA On-board the RC-135 Rivet Joint Aircraft			[+3,000]
0305208F	198	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	12,820		12,820
0305906F	199	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	16,408		16,408
0305910F	200	SPACETRACK (SPACE)	54,806	(12,300)	42,506
		Program Reduction			[-12,300]
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 (EELV) (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	PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN. PROG OFC	9,382		9,382

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0708071F	214	JOINT LOGISTICS PROGRAM - AMMUNITION STANDARD SYSTEM	11,333		11,333
0708611F	215	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	22,383	3,000	25,383
		Simulation Based Forecasting Decision Support System (SBFDSS)			[+3,000]
0804734F	216	CRYPTOLOGIC/SIGINT-RELATED SKILL TRAINING	-		-
0901218F	217	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	6,973		6,973
1001018F	218	NATO JOINT STARS	-		-
XXXXXXXXX		Classified Programs	4,360,261	86,000	4,446,261
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**7,202,593**	**119,200**	**7,321,793**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	7,202,593	119,200	7,321,793
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	0	-
		TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE	**13,077,829**	**134,842**	**13,212,671**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	10,103,541	88,795	10,192,336
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,974,288	46,047	3,020,335

Items Of Special Interest

Airborne laser

The budget request contained $308.6 million in PE 63319F for the airborne laser (ABL) program.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) required an independent assessment of the ABL program, including the need for any additional testing, the adequacy of criteria for entry into engineering and manufacturing development, and the adequacy of ABL operational concepts.

The committee notes that the independent assessment team (IAT) stated that "the nation is on the threshold of being able to acquire a long-sought military HEL [high energy laser] capability" and that such a capability would "represent a truly revolutionary weapon in the nation's arsenal." While acknowledging that technical uncertainties remain, the IAT also stated that "subsystem development and analyses have matured to the point where the remaining questions relate to system issues which can only be answered by a complete HEL flying system, gathering data and demonstrating effectiveness in an operational environment."

The committee notes that the ABL program has been restructured to accommodate a $25.0 million congressional reduction. The restructured program will increase efforts to characterize atmospheric turbulence that could degrade ABL performance, demonstrate the effectiveness of ABL's atmospheric compensation, and examine both the lethality of the laser and potential countermeasures. The committee notes that the program has consistently met its budget, technical, and schedule milestones, and that the initiatives in the program restructuring address all relevant congressional concerns. The committee further notes that the ABL program offers the potential for significant contributions to advancing laser technology generally, including a better understanding of laser lethality, laser optics, acquisition, aiming, pointing, tracking, and command and control.

The committee recommends $308.6 million, the amount requested for the airborne laser.

Aircrew laser eye protection

The budget request contained $14.8 million in PE 63231F for crew systems and personnel protection technology, including $1.3 million for aircrew laser eye protection.

The committee has consistently supported the Department of Defense's efforts to enhance aircraft crew member protection systems. The committee is aware of the ongoing efforts to develop both laser eye protection technologies and an overall laser threat analysis system. The committee urges continued development of these initiatives and encourages them to be viewed as a high priority.

The committee recommends $19.3 million in PE 63231F, an increase of $4.5 million to be used for the development of helmet-mounted sensory and laser protection technologies as well as the laser threat analysis system.

Air Force/National Reconnaissance Office partnership

The budget request contained $2.9 million in PE 63856F for the Air Force/National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) partnership program.

The Air Force/NRO partnership program funds studies and analyses of opportunities to better integrate the activities of the two organizations. The committee believes that the leadership structure of the two organizations is appropriate to foster such integration, and that each organization should be highly motivated to leverage the investments of the other as a means of conserving scarce resources. The committee believes that the activities funded in this program should be part of the regular order of business for both the NRO and the Air Force.

The committee recommends no funding in PE 63856F.

Air Force science and technology funding

The budget request contained $209.5 million for Air Force 6.1 basic research and $507.6 million for 6.2 applied research for a total Air Force science and technology (S&T) request of $717.1 million.

The committee notes with concern that the Air Force S&T budget request reflects a disturbing decline in basic and applied research investments from the fiscal year 1999 appropriated level of $802.0 million. This reduced amount is also less than either the Army or Navy S&T request and gives rise to serious concern for the health of future Air Force modernization capabilities. The committee is extremely disappointed that the service with the vision to first employ such leading edge technologies as stealth, precision guided weapons, and space-based information systems could sacrifice the very tools that delivered these powerful leap-ahead technologies and prioritize instead a series of near-term upgrades to existing legacy systems. While the committee recognizes the importance of sustaining the existing capability inherent in todays weapon systems, it views sacrificing the research essential to open the door to future modernization without full acknowledgment at the highest levels of leadership as irresponsible and unacceptable.

The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has identified a collection of non-space related S&T programs totaling $94.0 and included them among the Air Force unfunded priorities. While the committee understands the extreme pressures experienced by the services as they attempt to preserve their most critical modernization programs, the importance of these omitted S&T programs is difficult to understand. The committee disagrees with the lower priority placed on these programs and believes that several fielded systems development programs offering only incremental improvements to existing equipment, while necessary, should still be considered lower in importance to critically needed S&T investments.

Therefore, the committee recommends the following program decreases explained in detail elsewhere in this report: $12.1 million in PE 11113F, a decrease of $15.0 million for B–52 squadrons; and $65.1 million in PE 63434F, a decrease of $15.0 million for the national polar-orbiting operational environmental surveillance system. While the committee has expressed great concern over the se-

rious decline in overall RDT&E funding and does not consider RDT&E program decreases lightly, it does believe that these programs are far lower priorities than the S&T program reductions proposed by the Air Force.

In conjunction with the above decreases, the committee recommends restoration of the following critical non-space S&T programs:

Automatic target recognition

The budget request contained $65.0 million in PE 62204F for aerospace sensors, but included no funding for automatic target recognition (ATR).

The committee notes the importance of accurate target recognition capability and the high sensitivity to collateral damage displayed during recent regional conflicts. Technologies such as ATR should be thoroughly evaluated for potential improvements to all applicable weapon systems.

The committee recommends $68.6 million in PE 62204F, an increase of $3.6 million for continued evaluation of ATR technology.

Crew technology

The budget request contained $51.5 million in PE 62202F for human effectiveness applied research, but included no funding for crew technology.

The committee believes that the Air Force should place high priority on research devoted to crew safety, altitude protection, and the ability to effectively operate aircraft during long periods of sustained operations, and that this area of research should be viewed as a fundamental tenet for the Air Force.

The committee recommends $62.3 million in PE 62202F, an increase of $10.8 million for continuation of crew technology research.

Friction stir welding

The budget request contained $63.3 million in PE 62102F for materials research, but included no funding for the continuation of friction stir welding.

The committee notes that the Air Force has been evaluating a unique materials technology known as friction stir welding. This program has demonstrated a materials joining approach that does not require consumables and exhibits the capability to join dissimilar materials. The committee believes this technology holds significant potential for a number of aerospace applications and recommends $66.3 million, an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62102F for continued evaluation of friction stir welding.

Hyperspectral imaging

The budget request contained $115.3 million in PE 62601F for Phillips laboratory exploratory development, but included no funds for hyperspectral imaging technology.

The committee recommends increases in funding for hyperspectral imaging technology for Navy and Defense-wide programs described elsewhere in this report and notes that hyperspectral imaging and sensing technology is one of the many science and technology efforts that were listed as unfunded prior-

ities by the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. This technology offers significant improvements to airborne and other reconnaissance sensors and targeting data collection systems by providing enhanced wide-area search and targeting and threat warning capability.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.3 million in PE 62601F for hyperspectral imaging technology.

Tactical missile propulsion

The budget request contained $115.3 million in PE 62601F for Phillips laboratory exploratory development, but included no funds for tactical missile propulsion or Integrated High Payoff Rocket Propulsion Technology (IHPRPT).

The committee notes that continued research in this technology offers significant improvements and enhanced safety of operations for air-to-air and air-to-ground tactical missile programs, as well as improved propulsion technologies for orbital transfer, space maneuvering, and satellite propulsion technology offered by the IHPRPT program.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.3 million in PE 62601F to continue research in tactical missile propulsion and IHPRPT.

Ballistic missile technology

The budget request contained no funding in PE 63311F for ballistic missile technology (BMT).

The committee understands that the BMT program is developing and demonstrating technologies that will permit a conventionally armed ballistic missile to successfully attack hardened and deeply buried targets that are now immune from attack by everything except nuclear weapons. The committee notes this effort should continue in light of the importance of this potential target set, which includes command and control bunkers and chemical weapons storage sites. The committee believes that the next logical step in this effort is a missile technology demonstration of a new penetrating hard target fuse and simulated high explosive against a hardened and deeply buried tunnel. The committee also notes that the program will demonstrate progress in several enabling technologies, including global positioning system (GPS) guidance and navigation and radiation hardened circuit technology and fabrication techniques.

Therefore, the committee recommends $8.0 million in PE 63311F for continued technology development and demonstration.

B–2 upgrades

The budget request contained $201.8 million in PE 64240F for B–2 engineering and manufacturing development and $106.9 million in post production support.

The committee notes that the Long Range Air Power Commission concluded last year that, in order to reach the full potential of the bomber force, additional investments should be fully supported. Commission members testified that upgrades to the B–2 identified by the Air Force would enhance low observable maintainability, further improve the B–2's stealthiness, and significantly increase situational awareness for its aircrews. The committee is concerned

that the budget request does not support an integrated low-observable maintainability/upgrade effort or other modernization initiatives recommended last year by the commission and the committee. The committee believes that continued enhancement of B–2 capabilities is critical in light of their limited number and the leverage they provide on the battlefield.

Therefore, the committee recommends $353.8 million in PE 64204F, an increase of $152.0 million for the integration of Link 16 on the B–2, a new mission display system, and a stealth enhancement initiative. Link 16 will provide the B–2 with a new data link terminal, antennas, and aircrew interfaces that will increase responsiveness, enhance survivability, and enable real time targeting. The committee notes that the Chief of Staff of the Air Force identified B–2 Link 16 as a high unfunded priority for fiscal year 2000. The mission display system would increase aircrew situational awareness by more effectively displaying threat and targeting information provided through Link 16. The stealth enhancement program would reduce the aircraft's radar cross section.

The committee also recommends $141.9 million for post production support, an increase of $35.0 million to procure an inflight planner capable of real time flight planning and generating the most survivable route to target.

Of the amount authorized for the B–2, the committee directs that $2.0 million shall be available for a conceptual study of a next generation bomber described elsewhere in this report.

B–52 squadrons

The budget request contained $32.1 million in PE 11113F for B–52 bomber fleet support.

The committee notes that the B–52 fleet support program has increased by $29.6 million from last year's projected level for fiscal year 2000 in order to accelerate an avionics mid-life upgrade initiative which will replace aging computers and inertial navigational systems (INS) with non-developmental items. This initiative, while justified, was previously planned to start in fiscal year 2003 and the scheduled completion dates for both the new computer and the INS are well beyond the current five year defense program. The committee does not support the proposed three years of acceleration for the B–52 avionics mid-life upgrade program at the expense of other higher priorities.

The committee recommends $17.1 million in PE 11113F, a decrease of $15.0 million for B–52 fleet support.

Combat training ranges

The budget request contained $6.2 million in PE 64735F and $17.5 million in procurement for combat training range upgrades. The budget request also contained $339.6 million for miscellaneous production charges.

The committee notes that aircrews at the Nellis and Tyndall combat training ranges are unable to train with their primary air-to-air weapon, the Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM), because information regarding its simulated performance must be encrypted for classification reasons before being transmitted to ground instrumentation sites. The committee under-

stands that the requirement for an encryption device, the Advanced Data Oriented Security Module (ADOSM), has existed for some time but that ADOSM units were not available to be integrated into the Nellis Air Combat Training System (NACTS) or the Tyndall Range Expansion (TRE) upgrades.

Since ADOSM is now qualified and in production, the committee believes it should be incorporated into both the NACTS and TRE in order to take full advantage of AMRAAM in exercises conducted at these ranges. Accordingly, the committee recommends $12.2 million in PE 64735F, an increase of $6.0 million; $19.5 million in combat training ranges, an increase of $2.0 million; and $340.6 million in miscellaneous production charges, an increase of $2.0 million for this purpose. The committee expects these additional funds to be expeditiously obligated in order to achieve ADOSM operational capability at the earliest possible date.

Commercial standardized cockpit and crew seats

The budget request contained $6.1 million in PE 64706F for life support systems, but included no funds for commercial standardized cockpit and crew seats.

Commercial standardized cockpit and crew seats are designed to protect crew members and passengers during aircraft crash loads up to 16 times the force of gravity. However, older military transport aircraft, such as the C–130, C–135, C–141, and C–5, were designed with crew and passenger seats that can withstand crash loads up to nine times the force of gravity.

The committee understands that a commercial standardized cockpit and crew seat has been developed for the RC–135, but it requires safety and functionality improvements for its application to other military transport aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends $10.1 million, an increase of $4.0 million to develop safety and functionality improvements to the RC–135 commercial standardized cockpit and crew seat for its application as a common seat for other military transport aircraft.

Common imagery processor

The budget request included $4.9 million in PE 35208F for the common imagery processor (CIP).

The committee understands that the CIP has been manufactured with a known design input/output limitation that precludes it from processing real-time imagery from current and future digital cameras. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense pursued a common government solution to digital imagery processing without ensuring a capability to process the high data rates from current and future digital cameras. Further, the committee is aware that the Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) has integrated commercial imagery processing technologies into a system that can process these high data-rates in real-time. These commercial solutions are not only less expensive, but provide a viable upgrade path for future requirements.

The committee notes the partnering relationships now being fostered between the government contractor and the NRL to provide a CIP that is more commercially-based and capable of processing modern digital imagery. The committee strongly supports this rela-

tionship, and it expects the Air Force and Navy to work more closely together to ensure that modern digital camera systems can be fully exploited in real-time by the CIP.

The committee recommends the budget request.

Evolved expendable launch vehicle

The budget request contained $324.8 million in PE 64853F for the evolved expendable launch vehicle.

The committee notes unjustified growth in funding for the system program office and recommends $322.8 million, a decrease of $2.0 million.

Global combat support system

The budget request contained $19.4 million in PE 33141F for the Global Combat Support System—Air Force (GCSS–AF).

The committee notes that the GCSS–AF program will modernize, and integrate Air Force and other Department of Defense legacy combat support information systems into a system that will be compliant with the Defense Information Infrastructure common operating environment. The centerpiece of the GCSS–AF program will be a shared data environment that will ensure the availability of critical decision making information required by Air Force operational commanders. GCSS–AF will emphasize commercial off-the-shelf products and reusable software to reduce program development costs.

The committee recommends $22.4 million in PE 33141F, an increase of $3.0 million to accelerate the development of GCSS–AF.

Global Hawk high altitude endurance unmanned aerial vehicle

The budget request contained $70.8 million in PE 35205F for endurance unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV), including funding for Global Hawk and DarkStar air vehicles.

Since the budget request was developed, the Air Force has terminated the DarkStar aircraft, leaving Global Hawk as the only endurance UAV program. While some residual funding may result, termination costs for DarkStar are yet to be determined. However, the committee understands the Air Force plans to use any residual funds for Global Hawk testing and evaluation.

Recently, a Global Hawk test air vehicle crashed, destroying with it the only integrated reconnaissance sensor package. The committee notes the importance of resuming the user evaluation and testing of Global Hawk, and of sustaining the industrial base until completion of the user evaluation.

The committee recommends $95.8 million in PE 35205F, an increase of $25.0 million for Global Hawk.

Integrated satellite communications control

The budget request contained $361.3 million in PE 64479F for Milstar satellite communications, including $12.1 million for development of the Automated Communications Management System (ACMS).

The committee is concerned that military satellite communication (SATCOM) resources continue to be allocated inefficiently among forward-deployed units. The committee understands that

utilization of a web-based technology which incorporates the ACMS has the potential to significantly lower communications costs and promote the efficient utilization of SATCOM assets. Consequently, the committee believes that continued development of ACMS software is key to this approach by enabling the use of common standards that will allow efficient use of legacy hardware systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends $364.3 million in PE 64479F, an increase of $3.0 million to accelerate ACMS development.

Joint airborne SIGINT program

The budget request contained $124.6 million in PE 35206F, including $81.6 million for joint signals intelligence (SIGINT) avionics family (JSAF).

The committee notes that JSAF funding provides resources for developing both high and low wave length components of the future airborne SIGINT collection system, which is expected to become operational in FY 2007.

The committee recommends $131.6 million in PE 35206F including $88.6 million for JSAF, an increase of $7.0 million.

Joint air-to-surface standoff missile

The budget request contained $166.4 million in PE 27325F and $2.0 million in PE 64312N for continued development of the joint air-to-surface standoff missile (JASSM).

The committee understands that the JASSM program plan reflects funding for integration of the missile only on the "threshold" aircraft (B–52H and F–16) through the end of the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) and that neither the Air Force nor the Navy has programmed funding for integration of JASSM on the "objective" aircraft (B–2, B–1B, F–16, F–15E, F–117, and F/A–18E/F). Initial operational capability for JASSM is scheduled for fiscal year 2003. In view of the services' recent operational experience that has placed a priority on the use of precision-guided weapons systems, the committee believes that additional priority should be given to integrating JASSM on the objective aircraft.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy to report jointly to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request regarding the plan and program for the integration of JASSM on the objective aircraft systems of each service.

Joint strike fighter

The budget request contained $241.2 million in PE 63800N and $235.4 million in PE 63800F for Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) development and $160.2 million in PE 27268F for the aircraft engine component improvement program (CIP).

The committee continues its strong support for the development of an alternate engine to ensure sustainment of critical industrial base capabilities, control of engine cost growth, and reduction of risk to the reliability and maintainability of the planned fleet of 3,000 JSF aircraft. The committee is concerned that while the Department now states a commitment to development of an alternative engine for JSF, the planned funding levels outlined to sup-

port that commitment do not enable cost-efficient and timely completion of the effort.

Meanwhile, the Department is also conducting other jet engine development efforts in PE 27268F as part of the aircraft engine CIP. The committee notes that requested funding for this level of effort program has increased by $66.6 million, over 40 percent, from the level projected for fiscal year 2000 just last year. The justification for the requested increase is to reduce backlog of proposed engineering tasks for currently fielded engines. While supportive of the CIP, the committee does not consider the proposed increase to this program to be of higher priority than development of a new state-of-the-art alternative engine for JSF. The committee notes that full development of a flight qualified jet engine also provides opportunities to migrate proven new technologies to existing engines.

Therefore, the committee recommends $130.2 million in PE 27268F, a decrease of $30.0 million, and $265.4 million in PE 63800F, an increase of $30.0 million, and directs that this increase in JSF funding be used only for acceleration of alternate engine development.

Kinetic energy anti-satellite

The budget request contained $9.8 million in PE 63438F for space control, but included no funding for the kinetic energy anti-satellite (KE ASAT) system.

The committee believes space control will be increasingly important to U.S. national security as the threats posed to U.S. military forces from foreign space assets grow and satellite surveillance and targeting technology spread. The committee is encouraged that the Department of Defense is making progress in both developing a coherent space control policy and recognizing the importance of space control capabilities. The committee is concerned, however, that the failure to resource KE ASAT will limit the range of options open to the Department to deploy effective space control systems in the near term. The committee notes that KE ASAT has been in development for 10 years, and that additional investment could provide the ability to deploy an effective ASAT capability in a short period of time.

Therefore, the committee recommends $19.8 million in PE 63438F, an increase of $10.0 million for further development of KE ASAT integrated command and control system and ground based hardware-in-the-loop tests.

Microsatellite technology

The committee notes significant progress in preparation for the XSS–10 flight test of microsatellite technologies. However, the committee is concerned that this demonstration may be delayed because the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is withdrawing from an agreement to launch the XSS–10 on a space shuttle flight in fiscal year 2000. The committee understands that NASA is now offering a shuttle flight for XSS–10 in late fiscal year 2001. The committee believes that such a delay in the flight test will disrupt the program, defer the development of microsatellite technology that will benefit both military and civil space pro-

grams, and threaten to waste both NASA and Air Force investments in this effort. The committee strongly urges NASA to uphold its commitment to make a shuttle flight available for the XSS–10 in fiscal year 2000.

Military spaceplane

The budget request contained $76.2 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but included no funding for the military spaceplane.

The committee notes: (1) that U.S. military forces are increasingly reliant on space-based capabilities, (2) that the U.S. Space Command and the Air Force have identified requirements that are best met by a military spaceplane and its associated family of vehicles, and (3) that Air Force Space Command has drafted a "requirements to acquisition" strategy for a spaceplane. The committee believes that a family of reusable space vehicles for orbital insertion, space maneuver, and payload delivery to meet military unique requirements would substantially enhance military access to space and the ability to conduct rapid global military operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63401F to continue development of military unique spaceplane technologies and concepts of operations.

Miniature satellite threat reporting system

The budget request contained $76.2 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but included no funding for the miniature satellite threat reporting system (MSTRS).

The MSTRS will allow detection of interference, intrusion, jamming, and unauthorized use of satellite communications uplink receivers and determine the source location of the disruptive transmissions. The committee believes that this technology is important in light of increasing military and commercial reliance on satellite communications and the vulnerability of these satellites. The committee notes that $5.0 million was appropriated for MSTRS in fiscal year 1999, but understands that the Secretary of Defense continues to withhold this funding.

The committee directs the Secretary to release the fiscal year 1999 funds, and recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63401F to continue preparation of MSTRS for orbital testing.

Miniaturized munitions capability

The budget request contained $8.9 million in PE 64602F for Air Force Armament Development, but included no specific funding for Miniaturized Munitions Capability (MMC).

The committee is aware that the Air Force is currently conducting an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) to determine which emerging technologies can be harnessed to yield the best MMC weapon and notes that the Navy has recently joined the development effort. At least two emerging MMC technologies offer considerable promise for addressing future fixed and mobile targeting capability. The Small Smart Bombs (SSB) program, utilizes a small diameter, GPS/INS-guided munition to attack fixed targets with increased accuracy, enhanced effectiveness, and reduced collateral damage. The Low Cost Autonomous Attack System (LOCAAS) pro-

vides an alternative approach by combining a laser radar seeker, shoot down warhead, onboard guidance and navigation system, and miniature turbojet, all packaged as an autonomous flying munition for use against relocatable targets.

The current AoA effort, which prioritizes MMC capability for all types of strike aircraft, is anticipated to lead to a program start in fiscal year 2002 and an initial operating capability (IOC) in fiscal year 2007. The committee is concerned that such a schedule does not adequately satisfy potential warfighting requirements and urges a concerted effort to accelerate this concept.

Therefore, the committee recommends $46.9 million in PE 64602F, an increase of $38.0 million, to accelerate development of the MMC with particular attention given to the Small Smart Bomb and Low Cost Autonomous Attack System initiatives. Furthermore, the committee directs both the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a comprehensive joint study regarding the potential acceleration of MMC IOC, and to report the results of the study to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request. The report shall include total estimated costs including integration and test funding requirements associated with acceleration, an assessment of the technical feasibility of such acceleration, and an assessment of the anticipated warfighting applicability of such technology.

National polar-orbiting operational environmental surveillance system

The budget request contained $80.1 million in PE 63434F for the national polar-orbiting operational environmental surveillance system (NPOESS).

The NPOESS program is developing the next generation weather satellite to meet the meteorological needs of both the military and civil communities. The committee supports the structure of the NPOESS program, with cost and program management authority shared between the Air Force, the Commerce Department, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The committee notes, however, that the current generation of weather satellites, developed in the Defense Meteorological Satellite program (DMSP), will continue to be launched through fiscal year 2005, and the first launch of NPOESS is not scheduled until fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends $65.1 million in PE 63434F, a decrease of $15.0 million to bring the pace of development in more appropriate alignment with the fiscal year 2008 first launch date.

Precision location and identification (PLAID) technology

The budget request contained $90.3 million in PE 64270F for electronic warfare development, but included no funding for the PLAID technology program.

The PLAID technology program will enhance aircrew situational awareness by providing precise, on-board location and specific identification of threat radars. The improved situational awareness resulting from this technology will allow combat pilots to effectively avoid radar-guided surface-to-air missiles. While the PLAID technology may be applied to improve the radar warning receivers of most present day fighter aircraft and has been identified as critical

technology for the joint strike fighter, its present development is focused on the ALR–69 radar warning receiver.

To continue PLAID technology development, the committee recommends $104.0 million in PE 64270F, an increase of $13.7 million for the ALR–69 radar warning receiver.

Satellite control network

The budget request contained $61.9 million in PE 35110F for the satellite control network.

The satellite control network is a global system of control centers, remote tracking stations, and communications required to control satellites in orbit. The committee understands that telemetry and commanding data rates need to be improved and supports the modernization of the current inefficient and manpower-intensive system. The committee believes that commercially available technologies offer the Air Force opportunities to leverage its own research and development effort and to explore outsourcing alternatives.

The committee recommends the requested amount for PE 35110F and directs that, of the funds authorized, $2.5 million shall be available for the examination and testing of commercial technologies that have the potential to meet Air Force satellite control requirements.

Simulation based forecasting decision support system (SBFDSS)

The budget request contained $22.4 million in PE 78611F for support systems development.

The committee is concerned with Air Force equipment maintenance backlog levels as well as the service's processing and accounting capabilities for addressing this problem. The committee notes a particular service inability to accurately forecast serviceable spare engines over a relatively short period of time (e.g., 6 to 12 months), and recognizes the need to implement a system of spare parts support for depot-level engine repair in conjunction with manpower, shop flow time, and equipment availability requirements. The committee understands that without the proper accounting for these constraints, forecasts of serviceable spare engines will remain insufficient and therefore urges the Air Force to take appropriate measures.

The committee recommends $25.4 million in PE 78611F, an increase of $3.0 million to provide for the existing standard maintenance information system initiatives and to pursue the development and implementation of the Simulation Based Forecasting Decision Support System (SBFDSS).

Space-based infrared system-high

The budget request contained $328.7 million in PE 64441F for the space-based infrared system-high (SBIRS High).

The committee notes that the budget request for SBIRS High reflects a reduction of $235.5 million dollars when compared to the projections in the fiscal year 1999 budget request. The Air Force also delayed the first launch of SBIRS High from fiscal year 2002 to fiscal year 2004, and justified this delay in part because deployment of a National Missile Defense (NMD), which SBIRS High will

support, was shifted from fiscal year 2003 to fiscal year 2005. Also referenced was the fact that the Defense Satellite Program (DSP) satellites, which SBIRS High will replace, are lasting longer than planned. This delay will increase SBIRS High program costs by $500 million to $1 billion in the outyears.

Further, although the NMD deployment date now proposed by the Administration is two years later than last year, the committee understands that the deployment date could be accelerated if the NMD test program proceeds well. SBIRS High will also support theater missile defenses, particularly in meeting the growing threat posed by longer range missiles, against which the United States has only very limited defensive capabilities. Finally, with first launch in fiscal year 2004, the full constellation of SBIRS High would not be available to support a 2005 NMD deployment. The committee strongly supports the SBIRS High mission and concludes that the restructuring and delay of this program is unjustified.

The committee further notes that the Secretary of the Air Force concedes that the requested funding for SBIRS High falls short by $92.0 million of supporting the planned first launch in fiscal year 2004, and that the Adminstration has not come forward with an amended budget request to correct this deficiency.

The committee also strongly objects to the manner in which the Air Force implemented a work slowdown in anticipation of approval of its proposed fiscal year 2000 program reduction. The committee was not informed of this decision until after the contractor had been ordered to restructure the program spending rates to accommodate the proposed schedule change. This procedure precluded any realistic opportunity for congressional review of the Air Force decision and preempted congressional oversight prerogatives. The committee recognizes that restoring SBIRS High to a first launch date of fiscal year 2002 is now impossible, and to restore the date to fiscal year 2003 would require approximately $400 million in additional funding in fiscal year 2000. The committee strongly objects to these management failures by the Air Force and the Department of Defense, especially concerning a high priority program such as SBIRS High.

The committee believes that, because of the delay in the program and the substantial cost growth that results, the Department will have the opportunity to examine competitive alternatives that may be available to achieve comparable or superior capabilities at comparable or lower costs. Therefore, of the funds authorized for SBIRS High, the committee directs that $10.0 million may be used only for airborne and space experiments of a sensor technology described in the classified annex.

To sustain the SBIRS High program in the most effective manner and assure that it is accorded a high priority in the future, the committee recommends $328.7 million for SBIRS High. The committee believes that this increase will maintain the currently planned SBIRS High schedule. The committee recommends that the SBIRS High funding be allocated as follows: $168.7 million in a new SBIRS High program element in the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, 64XXXC, and $160.0 million in PE 64441F. The committee believes that an alternate management and funding

structure in which BMDO provides management oversight, the Air Force serves as executive agent, and BMDO and the Air Force share funding responsibility, would provide the most thorough assessments of SBIRS High importance in the future.

Space-based infrared system-low

The budget request contained $151.4 million in PE 63441F and $77.7 million in PE 64442F for the space based infrared system-low (SBIRS Low).

The committee notes that the Air Force substantially restructured the SBIRS Low program, terminating two planned demonstration projects and delaying the first launch of SBIRS Low from 2004 to 2006. The Air Force argues that the cancellations were justified because much had been learned from the effort to develop the demonstrators, that proof of principle had already been established in earlier experiments, and that schedule delays and cost growth in the demonstration projects had increased program risk and cost.

The committee believes that deployment of SBIRS Low is critical to meeting the growing long range ballistic missile threats, and that the delay is very damaging to the U.S. effort to field capable systems in response to these threats in a timely manner. The committee is also informed that the Navy Theater Wide (NTW) missile defense system will rely on SBIRS Low for discrimination and external cueing. The SBIRS Low delay could seriously degrade the capabilities of the currently planned interim NTW system known as Block I and could slow progress toward the NTW objective system.

The committee strongly objects to the manner in which the Air Force carried out the SBIRS Low program restructuring. The Air Force informed the Congressional defense committees the day prior to notifying the contractors of the cancellation of the demonstration projects, effectively precluding review of an important decision in a program of high congressional interest. Further, the committee believes that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) was not adequately consulted concerning the decision. To ensure that SBIRS Low is accorded the high priority the committee believes is warranted by wider military requirements and to ensure that other service and DOD equities in the program are protected, the committee recommends $110.0 million in a new BMDO program element, 63XXXC, $41.4 million in PE 63441F, and $77.7 million in PE 64442F for SBIRS Low. The committee believes that an arrangement, in which BMDO provides management oversight, the Air Force serves as executive agent, and BMDO and the Air Force share funding responsibility, provides the best chance of success in the future.

Space launch and spacelift ranges

The budget request contained $43.2 million in PE 35182F for research and development for the spacelift range system, $83.4 million for spacelift range procurement, and $223.0 million for operations and maintenance of the eastern and western launch ranges.

The committee believes that reliable access to space is both vital to U.S. national security and, increasingly, the economic well being

of the nation. Thus, the committee is concerned that the nation's space launch infrastructure appears to be in deep disarray. The committee believes that a series of space launch failures, the lack of efficient operation and modernization of the spacelift ranges by the Air Force, and setbacks in the development of the next generation of U.S. launch vehicles could jeopardize this access.

The committee notes that the launch industry has suffered six catastrophic launch failures since August 1998, including three consecutive failures of the Titan IV launch vehicle and failure of the first two launches of the Delta III launch vehicle. These have resulted in the loss of commercial and important national security payloads worth in excess of $2.0 billion.

The committee understands that to support future launch requirements, the Air Force is funding the development of two variants of the evolved expendable launch vehicle (EELV), with the intent of purchasing commercial launch services from two launch vendors starting in 2003. However, the Delta III is a technical stepping stone to one of the EELV variants. The other is based on Russian engine technologies. To date, the contractor has been unable to acquire the necessary licenses to allow for co-production of the engine in the United States and Russia. The long delay in the licensing process has left the ability of the contractor to meet launch schedule requirements in serious doubt.

The committee believes that the spacelift ranges at Cape Canaveral, Florida, and Vandenberg Air Force Base, California are in equal disarray. The committee notes that commercial space launches now far outnumber military launches and that commercial launch demand is expected to continue to grow. The Air Force has done an inadequate job of modernizing the ranges, funding for operations and modernization has been insufficient, and range equipment is aging. As a result, the ranges are unable to meet commercial demands for greater range efficiencies. At the same time, the rationale for continued Air Force funding for the operation, management, and modernization of the ranges is unclear in light of the fact that by 2003, when the Air Force expects to contract with commercial vendors for launch services, the only major operational users of the ranges will be commercial launch vendors. The committee notes that continued Air Force funding and management of the ranges would constitute a substantial subsidy to the commercial launch industry, while extending control by an organization that has managed and funded range operations and modernization inadequately to meet commercial and national security needs.

The committee is aware that the Secretary of the Air Force has directed a broad area review of space launch to analyze the causes of recent launch failures, recommend changes in practices, procedures and operations that might prevent such failures, and assure continued access to space for the Department of Defense. The committee is also aware of ongoing efforts to determine appropriate steps pertaining to range modernization and operations. The committee believes that these analyses must result in alternative funding, management, operations, and modernization arrangements that will result in a more efficient and effective launch infrastructure.

Consistent with this perspective, the committee recommends $46.2 million in PE 35182F, an increase of $3.0 million for feasibility studies, planning, and design of a universal space port at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.

The committee also directs the Department to include a separate budget line for initial spares for spacelift range procurement in its fiscal year 2001 budget request, consistent with the discussion elsewhere in this report regarding the Air Force's proposed implementation of the Reengineered Supply Support Process.

Spacetrack

The budget request contained $54.8 million in PE 35910F for space tracking capabilities.

The committee notes that the budget request for this program is nearly double the amount forecasted in the fiscal year 1999 budget plan. The committee recognizes the importance of further development of the ground-based electro-optical deep space surveillance (GEODSS) system now planned in fiscal year 2000. However, the committee notes that other planned projects can be more moderately paced without impacting the effectiveness of the spacetrack effort.

The committee recommends $42.5 million in PE 35910F, a decrease of $12.3 million.

Synthetic theater operations research model

The budget request contained $19.3 million in PE 27601F for modeling and simulation, including $2.5 million for the synthetic theater operations research model (STORM).

The committee notes that the STORM model is the only Air Force campaign analysis program directed for use by the defense modeling and simulation office common technical framework. The program is currently underfunded, resulting in limitations to planned utilization by Air Force and other service units during joint exercises.

The committee recommends $21.8 million in PE 27601F, an increase of $2.5 million, including $5.0 million for STORM simulation efforts.

DEFENSE AGENCIES RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained $ 8,887.2 million for Defense Agencies RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of $9,556.3 million, an increase of $669.1 million.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2000 Defense Agencies RDT&E program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Defense Agencies request are discussed following the table.

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ACCOUNT	000	**RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSEWIDE**	-		
		BASIC RESEARCH			
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	1,500	218,278
		Military Programmers			[+1,500]
		Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DEPSCoR)			[25,000]
0601105D8	4	GULF WAR ILLNESS	19,185		19,185
0601111D8	5	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH	6,351		6,351
0601384BP	6	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	31,386	4,500	35,886
		Optical Computing Device Materials for Chemical Sensors			[+1,000]
		Lightweight Chemical and Biological Detectors			[+3,500]
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**340,026**	**6,000**	**346,026**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	340,026	6,000	346,026
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602110E	7	NEXT GENERATION INTERNET	40,000		40,000
0602173C	8	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - APPLIED RESEARCH	65,328	30,000	95,328
		Wideband Gap Material			[+10,000]
		Innovative Science and Technology			[+20,000]
0602227D8	9	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	9,719	5,300	15,019
		Medical Free Electron Laser			[+5,300]
0602228D8	10	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE	14,329		14,329
0602234D8	11	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	20,774		20,774
0602301E	12	COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	322,874		322,874
0602302E	13	EXTENSIBLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS	70,000		70,000
0602383E	14	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	145,850	(12,000)	133,850
		DARPA Consequence Management			[-12,000]
0602384BP	15	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	64,780	9,500	74,280
		Lightweight Chemical and Biological Detectors			[+5,500]
		Safeguard Program			[+4,000]
0602702E	16	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	137,626		137,626
		Future Combat Vehicle			[18,200]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0602708E	17	INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	31,296	8,700	39,996
		Flat Panel Displays			[+8,700]
0602712E	18	MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	235,321		235,321
0602715BR	19	WMD RELATED TECHNOLOGY	203,512	3,000	206,512
		Thermionics			[+3,000]
0602787D8	20	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	8,903		8,903
0305108K	21	COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH	1,968		1,968
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,372,280**	**44,500**	**1,416,780**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,372,280	44,500	1,416,780
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603002D8	22	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,007		2,007
0603104D8	23	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	11,183	2,000	13,183
		Cyrofracture Landmine Disposal			[+2,000]
0603120D8	24	DEMINING	-		-
0603121D8	25	ALTERNATIVE TO LANDMINES	-		-
0603122D8	26	COUNTERTERROR TECHNICAL SUPPORT	52,223	3,000	55,223
		Facial Recognition Technology			[+3,000]
0603160BR	27	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT - ADV DEV	81,245		81,245
0603160D8	28	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT - ADV DEV	-		-
0603173C	29	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	173,704	25,000	198,704
		Atmospheric Interceptor Technology			[+10,000]
		Exoatmospheric Interceptor Near Term Technology			[+25,000]
		Low Cost Launch Technologies			[+5,000]
		Space Based Laser			[-15,000]
0603225D8	30	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	14,786		14,786
0603232D8	31	AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION	7,775	3,000	10,775
		Hyperspectral Technology			[+3,000]
0603285E	32	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	19,664		19,664
0603384BP	33	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	40,910		40,910
0603704D8	34	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	10,948	5,000	15,948
		Complex Systems Design			[+5,000]
0603711BR	35	VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	58,455		58,455

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603712S	36	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	17,336	3,000	20,336
		Competitive Sustainment Demonstration			[+3,000]
0603716D8	37	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	53,506		53,506
0603727D8	38	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,872		7,872
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	(29,400)	88,569
		Program Reduction			[-29,400]
0603752D8	45	COMMERCIAL TECHNOLOGY INSERTION PROGRAM	-		-
0603753S	46	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE RESOURCE CENTERS	-		-
0603755D8	47	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	159,099		159,099
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
		Future Combat Vehicle			[38,000]
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
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**1,798,006**	**11,600**	**1,809,606**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,798,006	11,600	1,809,606
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION			
0603228D8	62	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	37,107		37,107
0603708D8	63	INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS	-		-
0603709D8	64	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	12,937		12,937
0603714D8	65	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,345		15,345

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603736D8	66	CALS INITIATIVE	1,652		1,652
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 (ASCIET)	-		-
0603861C	71	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - DEM/VAL	34,133		34,133
0603868C	72	NAVY THEATER WIDE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM	329,768		329,768
0603869C	73	MEADS CONCEPTS - DEM/VAL	48,597		48,597
0603870C	74	BOOST PHASE INTERCEPT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL	-		-
0603871C	75	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	836,555	(700)	835,855
		Target Launch Operations and Target Launch Vehicles			[+15,000]
		Transfer to MilCon			[-15,700]
0603872C	76	JOINT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	195,722		195,722
0603873C	77	FAMILY-OF SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION (FOS E&I)	141,821		141,821
0603874C	78	BMD TECHNICAL OPERATIONS	190,650	10,000	200,650
		Development of Wide Bandwidth Information Infrastructure			[+10,000]
0603875C	79	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	36,650	25,000	61,650
		RAMOS			[+25,000]
0603876C	80	THREAT AND COUNTERMEASURES	16,497		16,497
0603XXXC	xxx	SBIRS LOW	-	110,000	110,000
		Transfer from PE 63441F			[+110,000]
0603884BP	81	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL	62,033		62,033
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	-		-
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION	**2,011,708**	**144,300**	**2,156,008**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,011,708	144,300	2,156,008
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT			
0604218C	xxx	UPPER TIER	-	90,000	90,000
		Ballistic Missile Intercept Tests (Transfer from PE 64861C)			[+90,000]
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
0604805D8	91	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	16,976		16,976
0604861C	92	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - EMD	577,493	(105,000)	472,493
		Program Reduction			[-15,000]
		Transfer to Upper Tier [PE 64218C]			[-90,000]
0604865C	93	PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - EMD	29,141	48,500	77,641
		Program Increase			[+48,500]
0604867C	94	NAVY AREA THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - EMD	268,389	55,002	323,391
		SM-2 IVA Development and R&D for TMD specific aspects of AWS			[+55,002]
0604XXXC	xxx	SBIRS HIGH	-	168,653	168,653
		Transfer from PE 64441F			[+168,653]
0305889D8	95	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	-		-
		TOTAL, ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	**1,064,922**	**257,155**	**1,322,077**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	32,148	-	32,148
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,032,774	257,155	1,289,929
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0603858D8	96	UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE	1,226		1,226
0604942D8	97	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	4,900		4,900
0605104D8	98	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	29,506		29,506
0605104T	99	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	588		588
0605110BR	100	USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	2,215		2,215
0605110D8	101	USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	-		-
0605114E	102	BLACK LIGHT	5,000		5,000
0605116D8	103	GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	2,000		2,000
0605117D8	104	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	34,937		34,937
0605122D8	105	INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITIES ASSESSMENTS	3,299		3,299
0605126J	106	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	17,079	3,000	20,079
		Uniform Models and Simulation			[+3,000]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0605128BR	107	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	-		-
0605128D8	108	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	-		-
0605160BR	109	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	5,315		5,315
0605160D8	110	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	-		-
0605384BP	111	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	24,043		24,043
0605502BP	112	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL DEF	-		-
0605502D8	113	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-		-
0605502E	114	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-		-
0605710D8	115	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	627		627
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 CANCELED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**223,725**	**3,000**	**226,725**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	223,725	3,000	226,725
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
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	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	3,799		3,799
0303140G	133	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	232,661	45,000	277,661
		Global Networked Information Enterprise Security			[+10,000]
		Information Assurance			[+35,000]
0303149J	134	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	3,018		3,018
0303149K	135	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	388		388
0303153K	136	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	8,823		8,823

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0305102BQ	138	DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	88,401	5,000	93,401
		National Technology Alliance			[+5,000]
0305127V	139	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	437		437
0305159I	140	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	-		-
0305188J	141	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	-		-
0305190D8	142	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	9,480		9,480
0305204D8	143	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	-		-
0305205D8	144	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	-		-
0305206D8	145	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	-		-
0305206G	146	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	22,074		22,074
0305207D8	147	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	-		-
0305207G	148	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	8,494		8,494
0305208D8	150	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	-		-
0305208L	152	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	1,000		1,000
0305209D8	153	DARP INTEGRATION AND SUPPORT	-		-
0305885G	155	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	109,540	(2,700)	106,840
		Airborne Common Sensor			[-2,700]
0305889G	156	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	-		-
0305898L	157	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (AUXILIARY FORCES)	-		-
0708011S	158	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,665	3,750	10,415
		Aging Aircraft Sustainment Technology			[+3,000]
		Forging Lead Time Technology			[+750]
0902298J	159	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (OJCS)	9,531		9,531
0902740J	160	JOINT SIMULATION SYSTEM	18,421		18,421
0909999S	161	FINANCING FOR CANCELED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
1001017D8	162	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE ACTIVITIES	-		-
1160279BB	163	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PRO	-		-
1160401BB	164	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,093		7,093
1160402BB	165	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,990		7,990
1160404BB	166	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	106,671	21,000	127,671
		CV-22 Osprey			[+9,000]
		Small Craft Propulsion Systems Improvements			[+4,000]
		Advanced Seal Delivery Systems			[+8,000]
1160405BB	167	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,407	2,100	3,507
		SOTVS Digital Underwater Camera			[+2,100]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
1160407BB	168	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,039		2,039
1160408BB	169	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	62,567		62,567
XXXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	1,048,214	128,400	1,176,614
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,798,622**	**202,550**	**2,001,172**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,798,622	202,550	2,001,172
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE WIDE	**8,609,289**	**669,105**	**9,278,394**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	7,576,515	411,950	7,988,465
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,032,774	257,155	1,289,929
ACCOUNT	000	**DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE**	-		
0604940D8	1	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	121,741		121,741
0605130D8	2	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	31,876		31,876
0605804D8	3	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	99,840		99,840
		TOTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE	**253,457**	**-**	**253,457**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	253,457	-	253,457
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
ACCOUNT	000	**OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE**	-		
0605118D8	1	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	14,602		14,602
0605131D8	2	LIVE FIRE TESTING	9,832		9,832
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE	**24,434**	**-**	**24,434**
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	24,434	-	24,434
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-

Items of Special Interest

Advanced concept technology demonstrations

The budget request contained $118.0 million in PE 63750D8Z for advanced concept technology demonstrations (ACTD).

The committee notes that while the budget request proposes to once again reduce the overall Department of Defense research and development budget, funding for ACTDs is proposed to increase by almost $30.0 million.

To maintain fiscal year 1999 funding, the committee recommends $88.6 million in PE 63750D8Z for ACTDs, a decrease of $29.4 million, to hold ACTDs to fiscal year 1999 levels.

Advanced moving target indicator radar

The committee has received the results of a Congressionally mandated study on moving target indicator (MTI) radar developments. This study indicates that MTI radar technology, supported by Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and commercial investments, is rapidly and decisively eclipsing that of U.S. government-funded efforts such as the U–2's advanced synthetic aperture radar system improvement program. These advances promise to provide vastly improved, multi-mode radars at greatly reduced costs. The committee believes this new-generation MTI technology should be pursued as quickly as possible.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to pursue modular, scaleable MTI/SAR radars that have the ability to identify and image moving targets. This technology should be included in the Joint Surveillance, Targeting and Reconnaissance System radar technology improvement program with application for platforms such as the U–2 and Global Hawk.

Aeronautical test facilities

In 1995, the President's National Science and Technology Council issued a report, "Goals for a National Partnership in Aeronautics Research and Technology," which indicated that, "newer European wind tunnels focused on aircraft development testing are generally superior to comparable U.S. facilities in overall capability" and that, as a consequence, there has been increasing utilization of European facilities for U.S. commercial and military aircraft development. In early 1998, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Department of Defense (DOD) established a National Wind Tunnel Alliance and an Air Breathing Propulsion Test Facilities Alliance (under the auspices of the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board (AACB)), to identify, study, and implement measures to strengthen the national infrastructure of aerodynamic and air breathing propulsion test facilities that support NASA and DOD missions and the domestic aeronautics industry.

The committee believes that the United States needs to retain world leadership in aeronautics. To do so means that the United States must optimize the utilization and care of its existing aerospace ground test resources among the Department, NASA, and industry in such a way that properly balances the support of the nation's research and development programs with an efficient and ef-

fective aeronautical test facility infrastructure. The committee believes that sufficient resources must be collectively invested to support existing capabilities, productivity enhancements, and a robust test technology program.

The committee notes that a draft interagency agreement between the Department and NASA is under consideration which would establish a National Aeronautical Test Alliance and an integrated national strategy for management of U.S. aeronautical test facilities. The committee believes that the Department and NASA should establish such a mechanism for the strategic management of government-owned aerodynamic, aerothermodynamic, and aeropropulsion facilities in the United States that would consider military, civilian, and commercial aerospace interests in making decisions and recommendations affecting such facilities. The committee also believes that this mechanism could be used to manage from a national perspective the investment of test infrastructure and technology funding for core national facilities and associated computational capabilities, including the maintenance and modernization of key commercial aeronautical test facilities. The committee believes further that it is desirable that industrial organizations participate with federal agencies in considering such investments.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director, NASA, to report to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request the status of the interagency agreement for establishing a National Aeronautical Test Alliance and plans for its implementation. The committee recommends that among the first priorities for the Alliance should be the development of a report which, building upon the 1997 DOD Core Aeronautical Test Facilities assessment, outlines national requirements for aeronautical testing capabilities. The committee expects that from such a report would come funding recommendations for support and modernization of U.S. aeronautical test facilities in the fiscal year 2002 budget requests for the Department and for NASA.

Airborne common sensor

The budget request contained $109.5 million for tactical cryptologic activities in PE 35885G, including $14.7 million for the Army's aerial common sensor (ACS).

The committee notes that it has received insufficient information on the specific plan, concept of operation, and programmatics for the ACS. Further, the Army has not yet decided on the aircraft it will use for ACS. Since this decision will directly affect the costs of procurement, sensors and their integration, and operations and maintenance, the committee cannot determine the overall value of the program.

Therefore, the committee recommends $106.8 million in PE 35885G, a decrease of $2.7 million for ACS. However, the committee directs that no funds provided for ACS are to be obligated or expended until 30 days after the Congressional defense and intelligence committees have been provided a report that includes the following:

(1) The specific aircraft selected for the ACS;

(2) The specific ACS concept of operations and program plan. The program plan must include the projected funding over the five year defense plan and expected total cost;

(3) Identification of the generic sensor suites and development/acquisition plan to provide these sensors; and

(4) Certification from the Director, National Security Agency, that ACS conforms to the requirements of the 2010 Unified Cryptologic Architecture.

Ballistic missile defense

The budget request contained $3.3 billion for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO).

The committee notes that the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) includes substantial funding increases over what was planned last year for BMDO. However, the committee also notes that the military has no effective defenses to current and rapidly emerging missile threats. The committee believes that ballistic missile defense (BMD) is a critical mission area which continues to suffer from inadequate funds. The committee urges the Department of Defense to allocate more funds for ballistic missile defense in subsequent budget submissions to ensure that critically needed missile defense development and acquisition programs can be completed as expeditiously as possible.

To address this shortfall in the near term, the Congress appropriated an additional $1.0 billion in H.R. 4328, the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–277), for BMD research and development. The committee notes that the President has sought to divert $230.0 million of these funds to implement the Wye River Middle East peace accord. While the committee recognizes the importance of this accord, it opposes such a diversion and continues to support the use of the funds for BMD research and development.

The committee recommends $3.7 billion for BMDO, an increase of $417.2 million.

Advanced technology development

The budget request contained $173.7 million in PE 63173C for ballistic missile defense advanced technology development.

The committee notes that funding for advanced ballistic missile technology has been in steady decline since fiscal year 1992. A robust advanced technology effort is important to meet future threats both by providing the technical basis for next generation systems as well as technologies to improve the capabilities of systems now under development. The committee notes that the technology development budget requested is far short of the goal of 10 to 12 percent of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) budget set by BMDO director.

The committee understands that BMDO has identified funding shortfalls in exoatmospheric interceptor technology (EIT) development. The EIT effort is focused on integration of active and passive sensors to provide greater interceptor accuracy and reliability, optics, propulsion, advanced focal plane arrays, and other risk mitigation activities, and is key to greater capability in the national missile defense system, the Navy theater wide system, and the theater

high altitude area defense (THAAD) system. The committee further notes that BMDO has identified near term technology infusion programs that show the promise of reducing the cost of TMD systems now under development.

To improve the technology base for current and future BMD systems, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 63173C for EIT and near term technology infusion development efforts.

Applied research

The budget request contained $65.3 million in PE 62173C for ballistic missile defense applied research.

The committee remains concerned that funding for innovative ballistic missile technology projects is insufficient to support Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's (BMDO) future needs. Funding for innovative science and technology (IS&T, project 1651) has declined from $52.8 million appropriated in fiscal year 1998 to $7.9 million requested in fiscal year 2000. The committee understands that BMDO has identified a number of high priority technologies for which no funding was available because of the constrained IS&T budget. These include high performance, lightweight, affordable optical correlators; high data rate signal processing using conventional and neural networks; novel focal plane array technologies; coherent laser radar miniaturization; and miniature interceptors with innovative guidance and control enhancements. The committee believes that future BMD technologies must be more adequately funded if BMD systems are to meet future threats.

The committee also understands that BMDO has identified wide-band gap electronic materials for high speed and high temperature device operation as a high priority that is insufficiently funded. The committee notes that significant progress has been made in the development of these materials and believes that additional research offers the opportunity for further progress.

The committee also believes that innovative science and technology is an area in which cooperation with the national security laboratories of the Department of Energy may be fruitful for both BMDO and the Department of Energy. The committee encourages the Secretaries of Defense and Energy to pursue opportunities for such cooperation and the merits of a jointly funded innovative science and technology program.

Therefore, the committee recommends $95.3 million in PE 62173C for innovative science and technology efforts, project 1651, an increase of $20.0 million. The committee also recommends an increase of $10.0 million to be available for the continuation of wide-band gap materials research.

The committee recommends a total of $95.3 million in PE 62173C, an increase of $30.0 million.

Atmospheric interceptor technology

The budget request contained $173.7 million in PE 63173C for ballistic missile defense technologies. Of this amount, $21.1 million was requested in project 1281 for the atmospheric interceptor technology (AIT) program.

The AIT program develops advanced interceptor technologies to support the theater high-altitude area defense, Navy theater wide, and Patriot advanced capability-3 configuration 3 (PAC–3) missile defense systems. The committee understands that additional funding would support a more robust technology effort that could include a continued design of a composite shroud, ground testing of a full scale divert and attitude control system, ground testing of an advanced low cost two-color infrared seeker, and completion of the development of a master frequency generator (MFG) for PAC–3. The committee believes that the MFG will contribute significantly to the effort to control PAC–3 missile costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63173C for project 1281 to complete the development and integration of the MFG and other AIT projects that show promise of improving the performance of theater missile defense systems.

Ballistic missile defense test targets

The committee recognizes the rapidly emerging threat posed by the proliferation of more sophisticated ballistic missile systems and their associated technologies. The committee also recognizes the need to flight test ballistic missile defense systems against affordable, threat-representative targets. Therefore, the committee directs that the development and procurement of ballistic missile targets be managed by the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), Department of Defense's Reliance Lead for ballistic missile targets. As such, the committee notes that BMDO shall be responsible for centrally managing and budgeting the full spectrum of ballistic missile targets, from low-fidelity targets used in training to high fidelity, threat-representative targets used to verify system performance during operational test and evaluation.

International cooperative programs

The budget request contained $36.7 million in PE 63875C for international cooperative ballistic missile defense programs.

The committee notes with concern that no funding for the Russian American Observational Satellites (RAMOS) program was requested. RAMOS is a joint Russian-American project to observe various phenomena from multiple platforms with technologies relevant to early warning and ballistic missile defense applications.

The committee believes that joint missile defense projects are essential to provide Russia with a better understanding of U.S. ballistic missile defense efforts. In light of legislation passed by the House and Senate mandating the deployment of a national missile defense, the committee believes that cooperative missile defense programs with Russia would be an important confidence building measure that could enhance early warning and shared mutual protection benefits for both sides.

Therefore, the committee recommends $61.7 million in PE 63875C, an increase of $25.0 million for RAMOS.

Low cost launch technology

The budget request contained no funding in PE 63401F or PE 63173C for low cost launch technology.

The committee is aware of a number of technologies and concepts that offer the potential to reduce launch costs dramatically. One of these, Scorpius, utilizes simplified launch processes and technologies to achieve streamlined, low cost launch. The committee believes that continued research in this area is important to the long term viability of the U.S. launch industry. The committee is also aware that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) needs a liquid fueled target vehicle to mimic the characteristics of liquid fueled threat missiles during theater ballistic missile defense testing.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63401F and an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63173C for low cost launch technologies, including Scorpius. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the suitability of such launch vehicles to meet BMDO requirements for a liquid surrogate target.

Medium extended air defense system

The budget request contained $48.6 million in PE 63869C for the medium extended air defense system (MEADS).

The committee notes the restructuring of the MEADS program to leverage technology developments in other programs, including PAC–3 and THAAD. This restructuring addresses two of the committee's concerns related to the MEADS program as it was configured in the past. First, it includes a three year commitment by the Department to include funding for the MEADS program. The committee has been critical of the Department's failure to identify outyear funds for MEADS, and believes that such a commitment is a necessary first step toward a serious program. Second, the approach adopted by the Department holds the promise of reducing the overall cost of the MEADS program by leveraging current technology investments. The General Accounting Office, in its recent review of the program, indicated a probable total program cost of $12 to 14 billion, a figure not supportable by the already constrained Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) budget.

The committee understands that the MEADS program, as now planned, envisions the development of prototype hardware to be tested in fiscal year 2003, using the PAC–3 missile, and modifications of THAAD battle management software and the PAC–3 launcher. According to program officials, the development of a 360 degree, mobile radar remains a significant technical challenge. The committee notes that several U.S. weapon systems are currently developing electronically steered radars. The committee encourages the Department to explore means of adapting such radars for use with MEADS, or alternatively, to examine a system architecture that would rely on a set of netted missile defense sensors rather than a system specific radar.

The committee recommends the budget request.

National missile defense

The budget request contained $836.6 million in PE 63871C for national missile defense (NMD).

The committee is encouraged that the Department of Defense has added outyear funding to the NMD program to support deployment. However, the committee is concerned that the Administra-

tion refuses to commit to such a deployment and notes that both the House of Representatives and Senate have passed legislation establishing NMD deployment as national policy. The committee believes that such a commitment is important to provide the ability to effectively focus the funds identified in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) for completion of development and deployment of an effective NMD capability.

The committee understands that the NMD program still entails schedule risk and is aware that past target vehicle failures have caused a number of significant delays in the NMD and other ballistic missile defense programs. The committee notes that the NMD program is supported by only one target launch facility and believes that operation of a second launch facility and contemporaneous preparation of two target launch vehicles is a reasonable and appropriate approach to avoiding costly delays that result from target vehicle failures. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63871C for this purpose.

The committee notes that the NMD lead system integrator (LSI) is contractually obligated to conduct a competitive bid process for the radars that will support an NMD system capable of defeating a larger, more sophisticated ballistic missile attack than the initially deployed system. The committee understands that the LSI is reviewing the radar industrial base and cost and schedule implications to determine whether such a competition is necessary. The committee believes that competition frequently can provide the military better technology at lower cost and that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) must assure that the LSI follows appropriate competitive procedures prior to the award of the NMD radar contract.

Consistent with a request from BMDO, the committee also approves a transfer of $15.7 million in 63871C to military construction for the purpose of supporting early NMD deployment.

The committee recommends $835.9 million in PE 63871C for continued NMD development.

Navy area defense

The budget request included $268.4 million in PE 64867C for the Navy area defense theater missile defense system and $55.0 million for Navy area defense procurement.

The committee understands that the combined technical complexities of upgrading the Aegis weapon system (AWS) computers, integrating multiple platforms through the cooperative engagement capability (CEC), and developing the Standard Missile-2 Block IVA (SM–2 IVA) have led to schedule delays and cost increases in the Navy area defense program. The Navy now indicates that the first unit equipped has been delayed from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2003, and that an additional $537.0 million over five years will be needed to keep the program on this delayed schedule.

The committee recognizes that the Navy area defense program is the Navy's primary capability to defend against rapidly evolving theater ballistic missile threats and that further delay to the program will increase risks for deployed U.S. military personnel. At the same time, the committee is concerned about the dramatic program cost increases the program is experiencing. The Navy and the

Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) maintain that authorization of low rate initial production is needed in fiscal year 2000 to assure that TMD-configured Aegis destroyers can be equipped with an early Navy area defense capability. However, the committee believes that the revised schedule provides inadequate initial operational test and evaluation of the SM–2 IVA prior to low rate initial production. The committee also understands that deferring authority for low rate initial production to fiscal year 2001 will delay Navy area defense deployment by only one to three months. The committee believes that the program as now laid out is not executable, based on both the technical complications and the annual increases that the Navy and BMDO agree must be provided to keep the program on the fiscal year 2003 schedule.

Therefore, the committee recommends no funding in Navy area defense procurement, a decrease of $55.0 million, and $323.4 million in PE 64867C for Navy area defense development, an increase of $55.0 million. The committee believes that this reapportionment will provide the best opportunity for the Navy and BMDO to overcome Navy area defense development challenges and allow a more appropriate alignment of low rate initial production, continued development activities, and initial operational test and evaluation. The committee expects the Department of Defense to come forward in its fiscal year 2001 budget request with a more affordable funding profile for the Navy area defense program.

Patriot advanced capability-3 (PAC–3)

The budget request contained $300.9 million for PAC–3 procurement and $29.1 million in PE 64865C for PAC–3 engineering and manufacturing development (EMD).

The committee believes that progress in the PAC–3, while slow to evolve, has been substantial over the past year. This progress culminated in a successful ballistic missile intercept test of the PAC–3 system in March 1999.

However, the committee is concerned about the substantial growth in the unit procurement cost of the PAC–3 missile and understands that much of the cost growth is attributable to the transfer of procurement funds to offset a cost overrun in the EMD phase of the program and the major reduction in the number of missiles to be procured from 1,200 to 560. The committee believes that the PAC–3 capability will be of major importance and that the number now planned for procurement is insufficient to meet identified requirements. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide details of plans to the Congressional defense committees by February 1, 2000, to reduce the cost of the PAC–3 missile.

The committee is also concerned that the PAC–3 funding profile identified by the Department of Defense is inadequate to sustain continued procurement at a rate that will keep pace with the rapidly evolving short- and medium-range ballistic missile threat. The committee believes that the demonstrated technical success and importance of the program provide more than adequate justification to increase annual procurement funding to correct shortfalls caused by program cost growth.

Therefore, the committee recommends $300.9 million for PAC–3 procurement, the requested amount, and $77.6 million in PE

64865C for PAC–3 engineering and manufacturing development, an increase of $48.5 million.

Space-based laser

The budget request contained $75.0 million in PE 63173C and $63.8 million in PE 63876F for the space based laser (SBL).

The committee understands that the SBL program has been restructured, merging competing contractors into a national team working toward an in-flight experiment in 2012. The committee believes that this restructuring responds to concerns expressed in the committee report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rept. 105–532) that the SBL program, as then planned with a launch of a readiness demonstrator in 2005, was not executable at sustainable funding levels and would unnecessarily restrict technical options. The committee believes that the restructuring will mitigate technical risk, allow for the development and incorporation of advanced technologies, is executable at sustainable funding levels, and provides a potentially effective management structure.

However, the committee is concerned that the program as currently structured does not provide sufficient emphasis on the development and fabrication of laser optics. The committee understands that the current program schedule is driven to a substantial degree by the development of segmented and/or deployable mirrors. The committee believes that the schedule risk can be mitigated by redirecting program funds to development of prototype actively controlled lightweight optics and through a management structure which provides appropriate emphasis on the optical payload element.

The committee notes that the SBL restructuring has resulted in a modest delay in the initiation of program activities. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $15.0 million in PE 63173C without prejudice, and the budget request in PE 63876F for SBL.

Technical operations

The budget request contained $190.7 million in PE 63874C for ballistic missile defense (BMD) technical operations.

The committee understands that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization is leveraging commercial internet technologies to improve the utilization of data that is now dispersed among several data centers. The committee believes that upgrading these centers and establishing a seamless, wide bandwidth information infrastructure between the centers would allow access by the entire BMD community, resulting in significant efficiencies. The committee believes that such a network would allow distributed BMD modeling and simulation, including hardware-in-the-loop simulations, and would enhance flexibility to meet evolving threats more rapidly.

Therefore, the committee recommends $200.7 million in PE 63874C, an increase of $10.0 million for development of a wide bandwidth information infrastructure to link current data centers as well as specific applications to take full advantage of such an infrastructure.

Theater high altitude area defense

The budget request contained $577.5 million in PE 64861C for the theater high altitude area defense (THAAD) system.

The committee notes with concern that the THAAD system failed its sixth consecutive attempt to intercept a ballistic missile target. The committee is encouraged that the last test demonstrated success in missile flight, divert and attitude control system function, seeker function, and end game maneuver, and supports continuation of that THAAD testing through the next four intercept tests.

The committee understands that the cost-sharing arrangement negotiated between the THAAD contractor and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization last year requires the contractor to reimburse the government $15.0 million as a consequence of the failure of flight test nine. The committee is also aware that the recent test failure indicates a continuing need to dedicate budget resources in programs that demonstrate success. The committee recommends that PE 64861C be decreased $15.0 million and that another $90.0 million, the estimated cost for three ballistic missile intercept tests, be transferred to the upper tier program, PE 64218C described elsewhere in this report.

The committee recommends $472.5 million in PE 64861C, a decrease of $105.0 million, and $90.0 million in PE 64218C for Upper Tier intercept testing.

Upper tier

The budget request contained no funding in PE 64218C for a new upper tier program.

The committee notes that the Department intends to provide funds to this program element starting in fiscal year 2002, after evaluating the performance of the Navy Theater Wide System (NTW) and the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system in December 2000. The system that achieves greater success in its intercept test program will be funded to achieve a first unit equipped in fiscal year 2007.

The committee supports the premise that success should be rewarded and that upper tier ballistic missile defense should be deployed as soon as possible. Nevertheless, the committee has serious concerns about the approach adopted by the Department. First, it is symptomatic of the serious fiscal constraints imposed on the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) as it attempts to develop and field systems to address virtually the only mission area in which the growth of the threat is outstripping the military's ability to defend against it. Second, BMDO has always described NTW and THAAD as distinct elements in a coherent theater missile defense architecture. The upper tier strategy adopted by the Department fails to address how accelerating one system while delaying the other will meet the requirements that this coherent architecture is intended to meet. Third, reducing funding to the program with the more serious technical challenges will not address in a timely manner those technical challenges. Fourth, the approach adopted by the Department would compare, as though equal, a limited capability interim NTW that does not meet operational requirements with an objective THAAD design. The appropriate pro-

grammatic outcome of such a comparison has not been adequately clarified to the committee.

To address these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Congressional defense committees by January 15, 2000, that describes: 1) the Department's plan to accommodate success in both NTW and THAAD, 2) how the Department intends to meet the requirements identified in its TMD architecture if it delays one of its upper tier systems, and 3) coordinated timelines associated with THAAD and NTW in the Department's upper tier program.

While the committee remains concerned with the Department's upper tier "neckdown" strategy, the new upper tier program does offer the potential to reinforce robust upper tier intercept testing for the upper tier system most capable of executing additional funds. Consequently the committee recommends a provision (sec. 231) that authorizes the new program element in fiscal year 2000 and transfers $90.0 million in funding, the estimated cost for three ballistic missile intercept tests. The committee directs the Secretary to use this funding to support the upper tier program that demonstrates greater success in intercept tests. The committee expects that this funding would be available to the THAAD program if it achieves success in tests throughout the reminder of fiscal year 1999.

Biological warfare defense program

The budget request contained $145.9 million in PE 62383E for the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency's (DARPA) applied research program in biological warfare defense. The request represents an increase of $68.6 million from the original budget estimate for fiscal year 2000 that was contained in the fiscal year 1999 budget request and includes $12.0 million to continue the development and demonstration of consequence management planning and support systems.

The goal of the DARPA biological warfare defense program is to thwart the use of biological warfare agents (including bacterial, viral, and bio-engineered organisms and toxins) by both military and terrorist opponents through the development of technologies that are applicable to broad classes of pathogens and toxins (rather than the agent specific approaches that are currently in use). The committee is impressed by the progress that has been made through the program by research in medical countermeasures, advanced diagnostics, sensors for detection of biological and chemical warfare agents, and technologies for decontamination, and neutralization for air and water. However, notwithstanding the emphasis by the President and the Congress on responding to threats of the use of weapons of mass destruction, the committee is concerned about the large increase in funding for the DARPA program over such a short period of time. The committee notes the comments regarding "coordination and integration of the DARPA program under program management and oversight" of the Department's chemical and biological defense program in the "Department of Defense Nuclear/Biological/Chemical (NBC) Defense Annual Report to Congress, March 1999." The committee expects that such coordination and integration will be maintained on a continuing basis and

that increased emphasis will also be placed on coordination of the DARPA program with corresponding biological research programs of the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to address these issues in the next annual NBC defense report to the Congress.

The committee understands that DARPA is presently prototyping its consequence management projects with users and intended to complete the project in fiscal year 2001. The committee notes, however, that the budget request continues to fund the program at approximately $10.0 million annually. The project also appears to duplicate ongoing work in consequence management planning and support at the Defense Threat Reduction Agency. The committee does not believe that the consequence management project meets the high risk, high payoff, breakthrough concepts and technologies criteria normally associated with DARPA programs, and directs the transfer of the program to the DOD chemical and biological defense program following completion of the prototype phase.

The committee recommends $133.9 million in PE 62383E for the DARPA biological warfare defense program, a decrease of $12.0 million for the DARPA consequence management project.

Chemical-biological defense program

The budget request contained $716.9 million for the chemical-biological defense program, including $339.5 million in research, development, test, and evaluation, and $337.4 million in procurement. The budget request also included $145.8 million for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) biological warfare (BW defense program (PE 62383E).

The committee notes that for the fiscal year 2000 to 2005 program period, the Department of Defense (DOD) has added $380.0 million to the program for research and development of biological warfare defense and vaccines, to complement earlier increases to the program that totaled almost $1 billion for the fiscal year 1999 to 2003 program. The committee is aware of the progress that has been made in consolidating, coordinating, and integrating the chemical-biological (CB) defense requirements of all the military services into a single DOD CB defense program. Through the Joint Service Agreement on NBC Defense, the Department has established a viable management structure that should ensure that the operational needs of the military services and the major warfighting commanders are fully integrated and coordinated, and that duplication of effort is eliminated from the program.

The committee notes the establishment of the NBC Defense Board within the Office of the Secretary of Defense to provide oversight of the program and fiscal and programming guidance. The committee believes that the membership of the board should be expanded to include the Secretary of the Army (the DOD executive agent for the program) and a senior member of the Joint Staff to represent the views of the major warfighting commanders.

The committee believes that significant progress has been made in the NBC defense capability of U.S. forces, but recognizes that continuing emphasis will be required in development and acquisi-

tions programs, logistics, and training and readiness to realize the goals of the program.

The committee makes the following specific recommendations with respect to the program:

Chemical and biological point detectors

The Congress added $2.0 million in fiscal year 1998 and $7.0 million in fiscal year 1999 for basic and applied research in chemical and biological point detector technology. The committee notes the progress that has been made in the development of thin film sensors for chemical agents and of acoustic and fluorescence-based biological sensors. The committee also notes the promise that these technologies show for the development of small, light-weight, chemical and biological point detectors, and that these technologies should be competitive with other advanced chemical and biological agent detection technologies now in basic and applied research. The committee also notes the potential for using ion mass trap spectrometry in integrated multi-sensor detectors to improve detection rates and reduce false alarms. The committee believes that these technologies should compete for funding within the appropriate program elements of the Department's chemical-biological defense program.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 61384BP and an increase of $5.5 million in PE 62384BP to accelerate basic and applied research in advanced technologies for chemical and biological point detectors.

Optical computing device materials for chemical sensors

The budget request contained $31.4 million in PE 61384BP for basic research in medical and non-medical chemical-biological defense.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 61384BP for basic research in organic and inorganic optical computing device materials for use in standoff sensors for detection and identification of chemical agents.

Safeguard

The budget request contained $64.8 million in PE 62384BP for applied research in non-medical and medical chemical-biological defense.

The committee notes the progress that has been made in the Safeguard technology development and demonstration project for the use of stand-off optical spectroscopy for the detection of chemical agents and other chemical vapor effluents and is aware of its potential use on the battlefield and for counterproliferation surveillance. The committee understands that the establishment of an operational requirements document is being considered and that the Safeguard technology is to be further demonstrated and evaluated in an advanced warfighting experiment during fiscal year 2000. The committee also understands that a funded development program in fiscal year 2001 is being considered.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62384BP to continue the Safeguard technology development and demonstration program.

Small unit biological detector and chemical-biological individual sampler

Section 1701 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–160) requires that the budget of the Department of Defense reflect a coordinated and integrated chemical-biological defense program for the military departments, that shall not be included in the budget accounts of the military departments, but shall be set forth as a separate account in the Department's budget. In the statement of managers which accompanied the conference report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105–132), the conferees directed the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs) to ensure that all research, development, and acquisition for the Department's Chemical Biological Quick Reaction Force (CBQRF) and its components (which at that time was understood to include the Marine Corps' Chemical Biological Incident Response Force (CBIRF)) are fully integrated and coordinated with the Department's chemical-biological defense program. The committee notes recommendations for increased funding in PE 65873M, Marine Corps Program Wide Support, to continue development of a small unit biological detector and of a chemical-biological individual sampler for the CBIRF. The committee also notes that applied research, advanced development, and demonstration of several advanced chemical and biological detector technologies are being conducted in PE 62384BP, PE 63384BP and PE 63884BP.

The committee recommends no separate funding for either the small unit biological detector or the chemical-biological individual sampler and directs that these two projects compete for funding within the appropriate program elements of the Department's chemical-biological defense program.

Complex systems design

The budget request contained $10.9 million in PE 63704D8Z for special technical support, but included no funding for complex systems design.

The Department of Defense currently employs a number of computer based synthesis and analysis tools which 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 $15.9 million for PE 63704D8Z, an increase of $5.0 million to pursue the development of a 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 and other agreements under this program.

Cryofracture disposal of anti-personnel landmines

The budget request contained $11.2 million in PE 63104D8Z for explosives demilitarization technology, but included no funding for cryofracture disposal of personnel landmines.

The committee notes the growing issue of explosive demilitarization and supports use of innovative technology to solve this problem.

The committee recommends $13.2 million in PE 63104D8Z, an increase of $2.0 million for cryofracture landmine disposal.

CV–22 Osprey

The budget request contained $106.7 million in PE 116404BB for special operations tactical systems development.

The CV–22 Osprey will provide critical capability for long-range special operations, contingency operations and special warfare. The committee notes that a pre-planned product improvement (P3I) will add additional capability and refinement to the CV–22 that will give special forces significant advantage in areas critical to mission performance.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 116404BB for the CV–22 Osprey P3I.

Domestic preparedness for response to terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction

The committee has repeatedly emphasized the need for a more coordinated program for domestic emergency preparedness for response to terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The Research and Development subcommittee's hearing in March 1999, which focused on research and development support to WMD domestic emergency preparedness, provided an understanding of the plan and programs of the Department of Defense and other federal agencies that support the domestic emergency preparedness program and how they are coordinated among the federal agencies and with State and local agencies.

The committee notes, as discussed elsewhere in this report, that the Attorney General's "Five-Year Interagency Counterterrorism and Technology Crime Plan" serves as a baseline strategy for coordination of national policy and operational capabilities to combat terrorism in the United States and against American interests overseas. Among the goals addressed in the plan are identification of critical technologies for targeted research and development investments and development of strategies to improve state and local capabilities for responding to terrorist acts, including WMD- and cyber-terrorism. The committee understands that the Weapons of Mass Destruction Preparedness (WMDP) research and development interagency working subgroup, chaired by the President's Office of Science and Technology Policy, is developing a strategic research and development plan that will clarify and coordinate agency responsibilities, identify gaps and overlaps in the WMDP research and development program, and guide the preparation and review of agency WMDP budget requests for fiscal year 2001. The committee expects that fiscal year 2001 budget requests will include the first coordinated WMDP research and development program that complies with the Attorney General's strategic plan.

The committee recognizes that coordination and management of the WMD domestic emergency preparedness program is an evolving process, and supports these initial steps toward developing a more integrated program. The committee emphasizes that the domestic emergency preparedness program will require continuing emphasis at the highest levels of government in order to realize the goal of increasing the effectiveness of Federal, State, and local agencies to respond to the threat of WMD terrorist incidents. The committee expects that a summary of actions taken to increase the overall effectiveness of the program will be included in the domestic emergency preparedness annex to the President's annual report on counterterrorism and antiterrorism expenditures that is submitted to the Congress in accordance with section 1051 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) and section 1403 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261).

Facial recognition technology

The budget request contained $52.2 million for the counter terror technical support (CTTS) program in PE 63122D8Z.

The CTTS is an interagency program for development and demonstration of surveillance, physical security, and infrastructure protection technology.

The committee continues to support development of advanced technology for protection of critical infrastructure and other uses, and recommends $55.2 million in PE 63122D8Z, an increase of $3.0 million for continued development of biometric access control technology.

Flat panel displays

The budget request contained $31.3 million in PE 62708E for the development and demonstration of high definition display technology.

The committee understands that major components of the flat panel display initiative include: development of projection, head mounted and direct view displays, development of equipment and components required for manufacture of advanced display technologies, and prototyping of display systems.

In 1994, the President and the Department of Defense announced a five-year National Flat Panel Display Initiative (NFPDI) to establish a viable domestic industrial capability for the manufacture of high definition displays for use by the military services and to provide the Department with assured access to affordable flat panel display technology for defense applications. The committee notes the progress that has been made in the development of a domestic industrial capability for commercial and military applications of flat panel displays and believes that the program has been successful in meeting the objectives of the initiative.

The committee recommends $40.0 million in PE 62708E, an increase of $8.7 million for the high definition display technology program.

Forging lead time technology

The budget request contained $6.7 million in PE 78011S for the Defense Logistics Agency manufacturing technology research and development program.

Metal forgings are frequently identified as lead time drivers for many weapons systems. Traditional forging processes are characterized by trial and error, and can be very expensive when small quantities of spare parts are needed. In fiscal year 2001, the Department of Defense plans to initiate a Forging Lead Time Technology program to develop ways to make small quantities of forgings for spare parts for land, sea, and air weapon systems, quickly and economically.

The committee recommends an increase of $750,000 in PE 78011S to initiate the Forging Lead Time Technology program in fiscal year 2000.

Ground-based common sensor/prophet

The budget request contained $109.5 million in PE 35885G, including $12.8 million for the ground-based common sensor (GBCS)/Prophet tactical signals intelligence (SIGINT) system.

The committee notes that the Army terminated the GBCS program in November 1999 for lack of performance, and that the service wants to move to the new, less complicated Prophet program. The committee is concerned that the GBCS effort, begun over seven years ago, was unsuccessful because of a lack of achievable requirements and an overly sophisticated technical approach.

The committee has received limited formal explanation of the evolving Prophet concept. However, the Army's approach to Prophet is more simplistic than GBCS, but appears to be inadequate to properly collect and process modern battlefield SIGINT necessary to provide useful tactical intelligence. Furthermore, the committee questions the need for a ground-based tactical SIGINT collection capability to supplement the Army's airborne efforts.

The committee directs that no authorized or appropriated funds be obligated or expended until the Secretary of the Army provides the Congressional defense and intelligence committees a detailed concept of operations for Prophet together with a detailed program definition and technical approach for this ground-based, tactical SIGINT collection system.

The committee recommends the budget request for the ground based common sensor (GBCS)/Prophet tactical signals intelligence (SIGINT) system.

Information systems technology, superiority, and security

The budget request contained $1,003.9 million for information technology research, development, test, and evaluation. The request also included $279.0 million for research and development in support of the Department of Defense (DOD) information systems security program.

The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105–132) and the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept 105–340) directed the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Congress a report on the status of the Department of Defense's information security program and additional actions that

should be taken to assure the increased security and integrity of the defense information infrastructure. The substance of the Secretary's report was addressed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Department of Defense's Senior Civilian for C4I, and the Joint Staff and military services' chief information officers in a committee hearing in February 1999. The committee received testimony on implementation of the Department's information technology and systems architecture, progress in joint information systems interoperability, and measures being taken to protect critical defense information infrastructure. Among the significant issues cited by the witnesses were:

(1) The need for resources that would enable the Department to respond rapidly and flexibly to the dynamic pace of information technology and put emerging and demonstrated information technology into the field quickly;

(2) The need for a flexible and continuous funding mechanism to improve capabilities in critical information systems and technologies identified by the major theater commanders;

(3) Unfunded requirements for critical information technology development and system upgrades through the end of the Future Years Defense Program;

(4) Acquisition and retention of uniformed and civilian information technology professionals in the Department;

(5) Requirements for advanced C4I modeling and simulation;

(6) The need to incentivize private industry to achieve higher levels of information assurance in the private sector;

(7) Accelerated implementation of public key infrastructure in the Department; and

(8) The increased cost and potential degradation in current and future military operational capabilities that result from reallocation of DOD-assigned radio frequency spectrum in accordance with Title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–66).

The committee believes that the Department has established an effective information assurance strategy and taken a number of actions that should improve information assurance for defense information systems. The committee recognizes that a significant and continuing commitment will be required throughout the Department to insure the success of the strategy and the security of the defense information infrastructure.

The committee makes the following specific recommendations with respect to the program:

Global networked information enterprise security

The budget request contained $232.7 million in PE 33140G for the Information Systems Security Program.

The committee notes the creation of the Department of Defense's Global Networked Information Enterprise (GNIE) which will result in the establishment of a wide-spread, secure, available information systems network to support U.S. information superiority objectives.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 33140G to support the development of advanced security measures for elements of the GNIE.

Information assurance

The committee believes that the Department needs to continue its efforts to protect the defense information infrastructure from information attacks and to detect and react to information attacks against the defense information infrastructure through the widespread deployment of intrusion detection capabilities. Continued development of attack sensing/correlation tools should be pursued in order to keep national command authorities apprised of ongoing attacks that could affect national security. The Department should also accelerate the development of improved capabilities to assure the security and integrity of the defense information infrastructure.

The committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million in PE 33140G for the development of enhanced information assurance tools for protection of the defense information infrastructure and for real-time detection, collection, and analysis of attack sensing and warning data.

Information assurance for national critical infrastructures

The committee believes that protection of the nation's critical infrastructure against strategic information warfare (IW) attacks will require new tools and technology for information assurance. The protection of the large-scale telecommunications networks that comprise a critical segment of the U.S. information infrastructure will require highly complex and sophisticated, integrated information assurance solutions that are highly automated and operate in near-real-time. The ability to assess the vulnerability of the domestic electric power grid infrastructure to information attack will require the development of integrated models that possess real-time functionality and can be used to develop strategies and procedures to detect and respond to terrorist attacks on the national electric power grid.

Because the defense information infrastructure is closely linked and dependent upon the domestic information infrastructure, the committee believes that government, industry, and academia should form partnerships to cooperatively develop information assurance solutions to protect the nation's critical information systems infrastructure. The committee further believes that such partnerships should be guided by a shared concern for the need for strategic information assurance and strong incentives for industry participation.

Report on information superiority

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Congressional defense and intelligence committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request, a comprehensive report on the Department's information superiority program. The report shall include, but not be limited to, an assessment of the interoperability, reliability, and security of DOD national and tactical information systems. The report shall identify the critical information superiority challenges confronting the Department, outline DOD strategy for maintaining military information superiority, and identify critical shortfalls, requirements, and related issues, to include any proposed legislation necessary to address perceived problems. The committee requests that measures taken to address the

issues raised in its February 1999 hearing be addressed in the report.

Joint theater air and missile defense organization

The budget request contained $17.1 million in PE 65126J for the joint theater air and missile defense organization (JTAMDO).

The committee is aware that various organizations within the Department use different models and simulation architectures to assess the capabilities and effectiveness of specific air and missile defense systems. The independently derived assumptions and operational parameters built in to these models and simulations make the comparison of their analyses problematic, resulting in an unsatisfactory basis for major decisions involving funding priority or key milestones.

The committee understands that JTAMDO is the organization within the Department of Defense chartered to plan, coordinate, and oversee joint integrated theater air and missile defense requirements, joint operational concepts, and operational architectures. Consequently, the committee believes that JTAMDO is in the best position to determine which of the currently used models has the best fidelity, and that JTAMDO must have the authority to rationalize the use of models and simulations such that the results are accurate and comparable for all systems.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to designate the director of JTAMDO as the DOD executive agent for management of joint models and simulations for air and missile defense programs. The committee directs the director of JTAMDO to establish a uniform and consistent set of models and simulation architectures which JTAMDO, the services, and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) shall use to assess the effectiveness of all air and missile defense programs.

The committee is also concerned that the BMDO may be duplicating some of the functions of JTAMDO in its theater air and missile defense project (project 3155, PE 63873). The committee supports JTAMDO's role in establishing architectures and requirements and BMDO's role as the acquisition agency for missile defense.

The committee recommends $20.1 million in PE 65126J, an increase of $3.0 million to assist JTAMDO in establishing the use of uniform models and simulations.

Logistics sustainment technology

The budget request contained $17.3 million in PE 63712S for generic logistic research and development technology demonstrations and $6.7 million in PE 78011S for the Defense Logistics Agency manufacturing technology research and development program.

The committee notes that an increasing portion of our defense budget is being used to support and manage large inventories of older weapons systems. The committee believes that costs associated with logistics and maintenance must be reduced in order to free resources to develop and procure modern systems. Leveraging the best practices of commercial industry in logistics and maintenance planning and management could permit the Department of Defense to reduce these costs in weapons and supporting systems.

Among the many aging weapon systems, aircraft are being kept in the inventory much longer than originally anticipated, and aircraft parts that were never planned for replacement often must be procured after the technical data, manufacturing processes, and the supplier base that originally provided these items are no longer available. This results in significantly increased costs and unacceptably long logistics response times.

The committee notes that a partnership among the Department of Defense, the manufacturing industries, and academia is developing a new strategy to address this problem. The strategy encompasses the design associated with reengineering such parts and manufacturing techniques that can produce very low quantities of the parts in a cost effective manner. Past models have shown that lead-times can be reduced from 273 days to 97 days for complex parts, new suppliers can be added to the production base, and costs can be significantly reduced. In fiscal year 2001, the Department of Defense plans to begin a program for the development of aging aircraft sustainment technology to address these issues.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 78011S to initiate the Aging Aircraft Sustainment Technology program in fiscal year 2000. The committee also recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63712S to establish a competitive sustainment demonstration aimed at dramatic reductions in sustainment costs and improved logistics efficiency.

Medical free electron laser

The budget request contained $9.7 million in PE 62227D8Z for the medical free electron laser program (MFEL).

The committee is aware that the MFEL, which continues to be managed under rigorous peer review, has demonstrated significant advances enabling new treatments for burns, eye surgery, and bone cutting and also shows promise in the area of brain tumor surgery.

The committee supports the MFEL and recommends $15.0 million in PE 62227D8Z, an increase of $5.3 million for MFEL.

National technology alliance

The budget request contained $88.4 million in PE 35102BQ for Defense Imagery Analysis Program, and included for $8.1 million for National Imagery Mapping Agency (NIMA) technology investment.

The committee is aware that the NIMA National Technology Alliance (NTA) program continues to demonstrate its value within the intelligence community while it has expanded to address the needs of the Department of Defense. NTA innovation in a variety of technologies, with applications that cross department, service and agency boundaries are reducing costs, increasing performance, and saving limited funds.

The committee continues to support the NTA's efforts to provide solutions based on advances in technology for both the Department of Defense and the intelligence community. The committee recommends $93.4 million in PE 35102BQ, an increase of $5.0 million for the NTA.

Pilot program for revitalizing the laboratories and test and evaluation centers of the Department of Defense

The committee notes that section 246 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) authorized the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program for revitalizing laboratories and test and evaluation centers of the Department of Defense. The focus of this pilot program is to prove the effectiveness of cooperative relationships with universities and other private sector entities for the performance of research and development functions.

Under this provision, the Secretary has designated the Aberdeen Test Center as the Army's test and evaluation center to participate as a pilot center because of its critical ties to the research, development, test, and evaluation community.

The committee also notes that the Arnold Engineering and Development Center was selected as the Air Force candidate based on proactive and highly successful efforts to maximize use of its facilities by other government and commercial customers, thereby reducing annual operating costs to the Air Force. The Naval Air Warfare Center has also demonstrated efforts to expand relationships and cooperative ventures with industry and other government agencies and will provide excellent examples of maximizing efficiencies to other Navy activities.

The committee strongly supports these pilot program initiatives and encourages the services to document and report the activities of these pilot centers.

Special operations forces reconnaissance

The budget request contained $1.4 million in PE 116405BB for Special Operations Command (SOCOM) intelligence research and development. No funds were requested for the special operations tactical video system (SOTVS) digital underwater camera.

The committee notes that a commercial camera system for the joint SOTVS digital still-camera requirement is not available and that the commercial market has no intention of providing an off-the-shelf solution.

Further, a digital imagery capability would provide near-real-time information support to special operations forces and would not require a wet-film processing requirement as do the current film-based cameras. The committee believes this is a capability that needs to be provided to the SOF forces as quickly as possible, and that a government-funded digital camera is the only potential near-term solution to this reconnaissance requirement. The committee understands that $4.1 million is required to complete development of a camera that meets all joint requirements.

The committee recommends $3.5 million in PE116405BB, an increase of $2.1 million for the SOTVS digital underwater camera.

Special operations forces small boat improvements

The budget request contained $106.7 million in PE 116404BB for special operations tactical systems improvements.

Special operations forces (SOF) personnel delivery craft are currently powered by gasoline engines coupled to stern drives and are transported to deployment on Navy ships. Early in the next cen-

tury, the Navy will no longer allow gasoline onboard ships, requiring the gasoline engines on SOF craft to be replaced by engines that burn mid-distillate or diesel fuel.

The committee notes that a new commercially available propulsion technology has been developed that offers improved performance, simplifies the drive train, and has been used commercially with a diesel engine. The committee supports evaluation of this innovative propulsion system and diesel engines aboard SOF craft and notes that suitable SOF craft are available for conducting such propulsion tests.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 116404BB for small craft propulsion systems testing.

Special operations tactical systems development

The budget request contained $106.7 million for special operations tactical systems development in PE 116404BB, including $18.3 million for underwater systems.

The committee is aware that the advanced seal delivery systems (ASDS) will provide a significant new capability for special operations forces. The committee notes that the ASDS program has experienced unexpected cost increases and schedule delays that have forced program restructuring and that ASDS is now expected to begin testing and sea trials in the latter part of fiscal year 1999. The committee is aware that the Special Operations Command has fully acknowledged the importance of ASDS and committed to internally reprogram funds in order to support the revised schedule. However, this reprogramming has necessitated the reduction of funds from other important special operations programs.

The committee supports fielding the ASDS as promptly as possible, with a minimum of reprogramming, and recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 116404BB for ASDS.

Strategic environmental research program

The budget request contained $53.5 million in PE 63716D8Z for the strategic environmental research program (SERP).

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has taken steps to reduce the use of hazardous chemicals. The committee supports these efforts and directs the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the use of ethyl lactate, a nontoxic biodegradable solvent as an alternative to toxic solvents for appropriate purposes as part of the SERP.

The committee recommends $53.5 million in PE 63716D8Z for SERP.

Thermionics

The budget request contained $203.5 million in PE 62715BR for development of the technologies relevant to nuclear and other advanced weapons systems, but included no funds to continue the development of thermionic power conversion technology.

The committee notes the requirement for nuclear space power systems that will support long lifetimes for space satellites, deep space missions, and future manned exploration. The objective of the advanced thermionics program is to advance the state of thermionic power conversion, develop high performance and highly

reliable thermionic converters, and demonstrate their feasibility in thermionic power systems. The committee believes that increased emphasis in the program should be placed on the development of components and materials used in thermionic converters, thermionic physics research, and development of coatings to increase surface emissivity.

The committee recommends $206.5 million in PE 62715BR, an increase of $3.0 million to continue the development of thermionic power conversion technology.

University research initiatives

The budget request contained $216.7 million in PE 61103D8Z for university research initiatives (URI), including $10.0 million for the defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research (DEPSCoR).

The committee supports continuation of the DEPSCoR program to strengthen the infrastructure, enhance research, train and motivate scientists and researchers, and to assist the DEPSCoR states in becoming more competitive for research funding and training grants.

The committee also notes the importance of advanced high-yield software development and the rapid pace of software development required to support advancing computer technology.

The committee recommends $218.3 million in PE 61103D8Z, an increase of $1.5 million to continue work by the Department of Defense to develop methods for training and developing high yield software to increase the efficiency of military software programmers. The committee directs that, of the funds authorized in PE 61103D8Z, a total of $25.0 million shall be for DEPSCoR.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SECTION 201—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

This section would authorize Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation (RDT&E) funding for fiscal year 2000.

Section 202—Amount for Basic and Applied Research

This section would specify the amount authorized for fiscal year 2000 for technology base programs.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Collaborative Program To Evaluate And Demonstrate Advanced Technologies For Advanced Capability Combat Vehicles

This provision would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a cooperative program between the Army and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to develop future combat vehicle concepts for the Army.

Section 212—Revisions in Manufacturing Technology Program

This section would amend section 2525 of title 10, United States Code, to include as one of the purposes of the defense manufacturing technology program the development of advanced manufacturing technologies and processes that address broad defense-related manufacturing inefficiencies and requirements. The committee believes that this focus and the focus on the promotion of dual-use manufacturing processes should result in a more effective defense manufacturing technology program. The provision would also remove the requirement that requires the Secretary of Defense to establish percentage goals for cost sharing in the manufacturing technology program. With these recommendations, the committee emphasizes the flexibility that is inherent in the program and available to the Secretary of Defense in establishing program cost-sharing guidelines and cost-sharing waivers for individual manufacturing technology projects.

SUBTITLE C—BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Section 231—Additional Program Elements for Ballistic Missile Defense Programs

This provision would establish three new program elements within the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization for the upper tier, space based infrared system (SBIRS) high, and SBIRS Low.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 241—Designation of the Secretary of the Army as Executive Agent for High Energy Laser Technologies

This provision would direct the Secretary of Defense to designate the Secretary of the Army as the Department of Defense executive agent for oversight of research, development, test and evaluation of specified high energy laser technologies and mandate that functions as executive agent be carried out through the Army Space and Missile Defense Command at the high energy laser test facility at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

The committee's actions throughout the bill reflect a comprehensive legislative and budgetary approach designed to address the systemic decline in the readiness of U.S. armed forces. The combination of an increasing pace of operations—driven largely by the expansive and open-ended nature of peacekeeping, peace-making, peace enforcement and other humanitarian missions—declining defense budgets and shrinking U.S. forces have created a military that is doing too much with too little and is suffering the inevitable consequences.

The fiscal year 2000 budget request for operation and maintenance represents an increase in spending of more than $7 billion over spending levels projected last year for fiscal year 2000. De-

spite the fact that this increase is not all readiness related, it is nonetheless a welcome recognition on the part of the Administration that the military services confront serious readiness shortfalls. It should be noted that in addition to substantial non-readiness related funding contained in the operation and maintenance title, more than $1.2 billion is also included for commissary operations and Pentagon renovation funding. The committee questions why the department continues to include funding for these programs in these accounts despite Congressional direction to fund them elsewhere in the budget.

Despite increased operation and maintenance spending, the budget request falls well short of addressing many of the military services' unfunded readiness requirements. Within weeks of the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request being submitted to Congress, the service chiefs informed the committee that the defense budget was at least $3.3 billion short of meeting minimal readiness requirements. Further, approximately 50 percent of the shortfalls over the next six years, identified by the service chiefs, are readiness related. Compounding the problem, the shortfalls identified by the service chiefs earlier this year did not take into account the billions of dollars of direct and indirect readiness shortfalls being created by the high pace and costs of U.S. operations in the Balkan region.

The committee remains deeply concerned with the continued under-funding of key readiness accounts and believes that shortages in the field are getting worse. For example, the Air Force unfunded priority list identifies a spare parts shortfall of approximately $200.0 million next fiscal year-a shortfall that follows on the heels of Congress adding a total of $194.0 million for Air Force spare parts in the fiscal year 1999 defense authorization bill and last fall's supplemental defense appropriations bill. Despite the addition by Congress of approximately $151.0 million in fiscal year 1999 to arrest the backlog of depot maintenance and repair, the budget request proposes an overall reduction in funding for depot maintenance and repair, the chiefs' unfunded priorities list identifies a shortfall of $340 million and the depot maintenance backlog is more than $1 billion. After the addition by Congress of $300.0 million to the real property maintenance and repair accounts in fiscal year 1999 and the proposal in the budget request for an increase of $245.0 million, the chiefs' unfunded priorities list still identifies a real property and repair shortfall of over $1.3 billion in fiscal year 2000. Despite similar Congressional and Administration increases for base operations funding over the past year, the services unfunded priority requirements list nonetheless identifies a base operations shortfall of over $450.0 million in fiscal year 2000.

This year, the committee once again conducted a number of readiness-related field hearings in the United States and overseas in an effort to obtain a more accurate and detailed assessment of readiness problems. In years past, the overwhelming impression left on the committee was of an overextended force having to accomplish more in an environment of declining human and budgetary resources.

In addition to the common complaints about lack of spare parts, aging equipment, decaying infrastructure and growing equipment

and facilities' backlogs, senior military leaders and even junior front-line supervisors also repeatedly informed the committee of the difficulties of conducting quality training and operational deployments with significant personnel shortages. For example, the aircraft carrier USS Enterprise began a six-month tour with the U.S. Sixth Fleet 464 people short of its authorized billets. Army officers related the difficulties of training at the National Training Center with units that were significantly undermanned. Air Force maintenance personnel told of the difficulties in maintaining equipment without the proper line or supervisory personnel.

In view of the wide range of variables that impact on military readiness, and because the committee continues to doubt the Department's ability to create and consistently implement more meaningful readiness reporting criteria, in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) Congress required that the Secretary of Defense provide a plan to establish a more comprehensive and extensive readiness reporting system. The committee is disappointed that the Department has not yet complied with this requirement. As discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee has nonetheless continued to take constructive action to reform and improve the Department's readiness reporting systems.

One area of particular focus for the committee over the past several years has been the disturbing decline in quality training at the services' combat training centers. Each of the services informed the committee that units were arriving at these premier training facilities less prepared, with fewer personnel, and lower equipment readiness than in the past. Army commanders indicated that personnel turbulence and manpower shortfalls in their units was forcing them to arrive at the training centers without the personnel necessary to conduct proper training. Air Force officers stated that training scenarios at their "Red Flag" exercises were being simplified because pilots were not well enough trained to operate in the more complicated training situations that had formerly been the norm. Aggressor pilots and instructors also expressed their belief that pilots were not as ready when they arrived for training exercises as they had been just a few years ago. The committee believes that training at the major combat training centers should be considered premier events in a servicemembers' training evolution.

Finally, the committee continues to believe that DOD must take more aggressive steps to reduce costs in non-readiness related accounts. At a time when readiness shortfalls are growing almost exponentially, the committee does not believe that funding for administrative and support activities, such as headquarters management, should be increasing. Consistent with past practice, the committee has identified spending that does not directly support readiness and has reprioritized it into areas that do such as combat training, depot maintenance, aircraft spares, base operations, and real property maintenance. In making decisions on how best to apply resources to address readiness problems, the committee relied heavily on lessons learned during extensive oversight hearings and on the unfunded priorities identified by the service chiefs.

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	18,660,994	815,700	19,476,694
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	22,238,715	546,500	22,785,215
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	2,558,929	218,500	2,777,429
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	20,363,203	1,151,755	21,514,958
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	11,419,233	(450,619)	10,968,614
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,369,213	143,300	1,512,513
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	917,647	48,200	965,847
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	123,266	14,000	137,266
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	1,728,437	2,500	1,730,937
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	2,903,549	237,500	3,141,049
OPEATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	3,099,618	86,300	3,185,918
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 SITE	199,214	-	199,214
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES	788,100	23,600	811,700
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES	2,387,600	-	2,387,600
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	138,744	(8,000)	130,744
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	7,621	-	7,621
OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	55,800	(5,800)	50,000
PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND	15,000	-	15,000
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	10,477,687	19,000	10,496,687
FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	475,500	(31,400)	444,100
QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, DEFENSE	1,845,370	-	1,845,370
TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**102,837,780**	**2,811,036**	**105,648,816**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES	3,240,245	42,100	3,282,345
2020A	10	DIVISIONS	1,151,351		1,151,351
2020A	20	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	342,122		342,122
2020A	30	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	341,220		341,220
2020A	40	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	476,924		476,924
2020A	50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	928,628		970,728
		NTC Prepo Fleet Maintenance		28,000	
		JRTC Prepo Fleet Maintenance		2,000	
		FORSCOM Deployments to National Training Center		4,000	
		CMTC Mission Support		4,000	
		Korea Training Area		4,100	
		LAND FORCES READINESS	2,201,441	98,000	2,299,441
2020A	60	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,090,532		1,090,532
2020A	70	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	465,195		465,195
2020A	80	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	645,714	87,000	743,714
		Maintenance Automatic Identification Technology		2,000	
		Ammunition Automatic Identification Technology		9,000	
		LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	3,432,655	0	3,432,655
2020A	90	BASE SUPPORT	2,658,717		2,658,717
2020A	100	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	490,964		490,964
2020A	110	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	126,563		126,563
2020A	120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	78,490		78,490
2020A	130	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	77,921		77,921
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**8,874,341**	**140,100**	**9,014,441**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
		MOBILITY OPERATIONS	**560,041**	**0**	**560,041**
2020A	140	STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	326,228		326,228
2020A	150	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	134,797		134,797
2020A	160	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	69,947		69,947
2020A	170	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	29,069		29,069
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	**560,041**	**0**	**560,041**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING	**328,716**	**22,300**	**351,016**
2020A	180	OFFICER ACQUISITION	65,423		65,423
2020A	190	RECRUIT TRAINING	14,160		14,160
2020A	200	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	13,924		13,924
2020A	210	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	134,842		157,142
		ROTC Marketing and Advertising		5,500	
		ROTC Scholarships		15,000	
		ROTC Operations and Training		1,800	
2020A	220	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMY ONLY)	73,009		73,009
2020A	230	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (ACADEMY ONLY)	27,358		27,358
		BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING	**2,095,535**	**105,000**	**2,200,535**
2020A	240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	230,145		230,145
2020A	250	FLIGHT TRAINING	269,609		269,609
2020A	260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	87,429		87,429
2020A	270	TRAINING SUPPORT	466,975		466,975
2020A	280	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	865,351		865,351
2020A	290	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (OTHER TRAINING)	176,026		176,026

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		DMOSQ/LOR DEVELOPMENT		35,000	35,000
		INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING		70,000	70,000
		RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING	747,591	33,900	781,491
2020A	300	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	255,417	16,400	271,817
2020A	310	EXAMINING	77,464		77,464
2020A	320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,660		87,660
2020A	330	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	65,375		65,375
2020A	340	JUNIOR ROTC	74,282	2,000	76,282
2020A	350	BASE SUPPORT (RECRUITING LEASES)	187,393	15,500	202,893
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	**3,171,842**	**161,200**	**3,333,042**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SECURITY PROGRAMS	426,729	0	426,729
2020A	360	SECURITY PROGRAMS	426,729		426,729
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,648,439	0	1,648,439
2020A	370	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	546,861		546,861
2020A	380	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	419,672		419,672
2020A	390	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	321,696		321,696
2020A	400	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	360,210		360,210
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	3,705,831	(20,400)	3,685,431
2020A	410	ADMINISTRATION	320,944		320,944
2020A	420	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	662,827		662,827
2020A	430	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	154,769		154,769
2020A	440	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	147,606		147,606
2020A	450	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	674,400	(20,400)	654,000
2020A	460	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	116,617		116,617
2020A	470	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	71,312		71,312

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
2020A	480	BASE SUPPORT	1,106,387		1,106,387
2020A	490	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	346,154		346,154
2020A	500	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	104,815		104,815
		SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	273,771	(15,700)	258,071
2020A	510	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	224,685		224,685
2020A	520	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	49,086	(15,700)	33,386
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**6,054,770**	**(36,100)**	**6,018,670**
		UNDISTRIBUTED			
		EXTENDED COLD WEATHER CLOTHING SYSTEM		19,000	19,000
		ULTRA-LIGHTWEIGHT CAMOFLAGE NET SYSTEM		30,000	30,000
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		6,500	6,500
		INFORMATION OPERATIONS		18,000	18,000
		TRAINING AREA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT		32,000	32,000
		FIELD KITCHEN MODERN BURNER UNITS (MBU)		8,000	8,000
		CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OVERSTATEMENT		(5,000)	(5,000)
		MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS		(55,000)	(55,000)
		REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES		(10,000)	(10,000)
		CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		(10,000)	(10,000)
		MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY		253,000	253,000
		BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT		264,000	264,000
		TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		**550,500**	**550,500**
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**18,660,994**	**815,700**	**19,476,694**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS	**3,833,829**	**104,000**	**3,937,829**
1804N	10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	2,232,508		2,232,508
1804N	20	FLEET AIR TRAINING	693,133		745,133
		Aircraft Spares		50,000	
		Naval Air Strike Airwarfare Center		2,000	
1804N	30	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	48,792		48,792
1804N	40	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	91,823		91,823
1804N	50	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	746,924	50,000	796,924
1804N	60	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,649		20,649
1804N	70	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	80	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		UAV FLIGHT HOURS		2,000	2,000
		SHIP OPERATIONS	**6,284,135**	**27,000**	**6,311,135**
1804N	90	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,859,279		1,859,279
1804N	100	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	536,641		538,641
		PCMS support		2,000	
1804N	110	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	379,253		379,253
1804N	120	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,365,144	25,000	2,390,144
1804N	130	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,143,818		1,143,818
1804N	140	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	150	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT	**1,439,555**	**12,500**	**1,452,055**
1804N	160	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	253,524		253,524
1804N	170	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	7,600		7,600

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
1804N	180	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	156,329		156,329
1804N	190	WARFARE TACTICS	121,645		121,645
1804N	200	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	244,484	7,500	251,984
1804N	210	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	486,993		486,993
1804N	220	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	168,216		168,216
1804N	230	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	764		764
1804N	240	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	250	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		JOINT WARFARE ANALYSIS CENTER		5,000	5,000
		WEAPONS SUPPORT	**1,381,477**	**8,500**	**1,389,977**
1804N	260	CRUISE MISSILE	146,555		146,555
1804N	270	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	812,619		812,619
1804N	280	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	47,113		49,613
		Dual-Net Multi-Frequency Link 11 support		500	
		Area Air Defense Commander system support		2,000	
1804N	290	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	375,190		381,190
		NULKA support		3,000	
		CEC land based test sites support		3,000	
1804N	300	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	310	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT	**40,643**	**0**	**40,643**
1804N	320	NWCF SUPPORT	40,643		40,643
		BASE SUPPORT	**2,572,570**	**0**	**2,572,570**
1804N	330	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	391,856		391,856
1804N	340	BASE SUPPORT	2,180,714		2,180,714
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**15,552,209**	**152,000**	**15,704,209**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
		READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES	**434,624**	**0**	**434,624**
1804N	350	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	434,624		434,624
		ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	**284,195**	**0**	**284,195**
1804N	360	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	2,966		2,966
1804N	370	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	281,229		281,229
		MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	**43,082**	**0**	**43,082**
1804N	380	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	23,018		23,018
1804N	390	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,089		1,089
1804N	400	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	18,975		18,975
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	**761,901**	**0**	**761,901**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING	**151,247**	**0**	**151,247**
1804N	410	OFFICER ACQUISITION	79,873		79,873
1804N	420	RECRUIT TRAINING	5,096		5,096
1804N	430	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	66,278		66,278
1804N	440	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	450	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	**869,637**	**0**	**869,637**
1804N	460	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	251,459		251,459
1804N	470	FLIGHT TRAINING	320,486		320,486
1804N	480	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	85,374		85,374

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
1804N	490	TRAINING SUPPORT	212,318		212,318
1804N	500	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	510	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	337,141	0	337,141
1804N	520	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	187,852		187,852
1804N	530	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	79,609		79,609
1804N	540	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	46,632		46,632
1804N	550	JUNIOR ROTC	23,048		23,048
1804N	560	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	570	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		BASE SUPPORT	364,501	0	364,501
1804N	580	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	47,303		47,303
1804N	590	BASE SUPPORT	317,198		317,198
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	**1,722,526**	**0**	**1,722,526**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	1,709,801	9,700	1,719,501
1804N	600	ADMINISTRATION	648,209		648,209
1804N	610	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	16,765		16,765
1804N	620	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	120,677		120,677
1804N	630	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	88,319		88,319
1804N	640	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	203,096		203,096
1804N	650	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	369,665		369,665
1804N	660	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	670	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES	0		0
1804N	680	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
1804N	690	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	263,070		263,070
		PAPERLESS ACQUISITION		4,700	4,700
		NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM		5,000	5,000
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	1,611,719	2,000	1,613,719
1804N	700	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	161,738		161,738
1804N	710	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS	0		0
1804N	710	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	329,808		329,808
1804N	720	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	681,715		681,715
1804N	730	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	271,426		271,426
1804N	740	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	50,073		50,073
1804N	750	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	46,671		48,671
		Integrated Combat Systems Test Facility Support		2,000	
1804N	760	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	70,288		70,288
1804N	770	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	780	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		SECURITY PROGRAMS	584,390	12,000	596,390
1804N	790	SECURITY PROGRAMS	584,390		584,390
1804N	800	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	810	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		ASHORE FORCE PROTECTION		12,000	12,000
		SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	8,431	0	8,431
1804N	820	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	8,431		8,431
		BASE SUPPORT	287,738	0	287,738
1804N	830	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	101,868		101,868
1804N	840	BASE SUPPORT	185,870		185,870
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**4,202,079**	**23,700**	**4,225,779**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		UNDISTRIBUTED			
		CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OVERSTATEMENT		(20,000)	(20,000)
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		4,500	4,500
		GCCS COMPUTER SYSTEMS		(9,200)	(9,200)
		MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS		(35,000)	(35,000)
		REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES		(2,000)	(2,000)
		CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		(10,000)	(10,000)
		MARINE AVIATION PROGRAM RELATED LOGISTICS		35,000	35,000
		MARINE AVIATION PROGRAM RELATED ENGINEERING		12,000	12,000
		MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY		395,500	395,500
		TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		**370,800**	**370,800**
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**22,238,715**	**546,500**	**22,785,215**
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		EXPEDITIONARY FORCES	1,666,173	202,700	1,868,873
1106N	10	OPERATIONAL FORCES	378,762		378,762
1106N	20	FIELD LOGISTICS	231,138		231,138
1106N	30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	96,685	20,000	116,685
1106N	40	BASE SUPPORT	712,187		712,187
1106N	50	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	247,401	86,000	333,401
		MAINTENANCE OF AGING EQUIPMENT		37,200	37,200
		CORROSION CONTROL COATING		13,800	13,800
		INITIAL ISSUE		20,000	20,000
		MCAGCC IMPROVEMENTS		25,700	25,700

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		USMC PREPOSITIONING	85,619	0	85,619
1106N	60	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	81,849		81,849
1106N	70	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	3,770		3,770
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**1,751,792**	**202,700**	**1,954,492**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING	84,101	0	84,101
1106N	80	RECRUIT TRAINING	9,917		9,917
1106N	90	OFFICER ACQUISITION	294		294
1106N	100	BASE SUPPORT	55,333		55,333
1106N	110	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	18,557		18,557
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	206,454	0	206,454
1106N	120	SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	31,443		31,443
1106N	130	FLIGHT TRAINING	162		162
1106N	140	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	8,575		8,575
1106N	150	TRAINING SUPPORT	84,800		84,800
1106N	160	BASE SUPPORT	57,212		57,212
1106N	170	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	24,262		24,262
		RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION	125,817	18,200	144,017
1106N	180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	90,953	8,100	99,053
1106N	190	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	14,879	3,000	17,879
1106N	200	JUNIOR ROTC	9,506	2,000	11,506
1106N	210	BASE SUPPORT	8,032	1,000	9,032

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
1106N	220	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	2,447		2,447
		MARINE SECURITY GUARD INCREASED USE		4,100	4,100
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	**416,372**	**18,200**	**434,572**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	**390,765**	**0**	**390,765**
1106N	230	SPECIAL SUPPORT	229,433		229,433
1106N	240	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	28,632		28,632
1106N	250	ADMINISTRATION	25,241		25,241
1106N	260	BASE SUPPORT	14,569		14,569
1106N	270	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	2,056		2,056
1106N	280	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	90,834		90,834
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**390,765**	**0**	**390,765**
		UNDISTRIBUTED			
		REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES		(2,400)	(2,400)
		TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		**(2,400)**	**(2,400)**
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**2,558,929**	**218,500**	**2,777,429**
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS	**7,973,436**	**324,500**	**8,297,936**
3400F	10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,401,247		2,401,247

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
3400F	20	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	264,665		264,665
3400F	30	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	204,091		204,091
3400F	40	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	657,352		699,652
		Funding for Air Warfare Center Range Support		6,100	
		Funding for Air Warfare Center Fiber Link		4,600	
		Utah Test and Training Range Support		11,700	
		AETC Mission Essential Equipment		14,000	
		AETC Range Improvements		5,900	
3400F	50	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,096,870	87,000	1,183,870
3400F	60	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	936,390		936,390
3400F	70	BASE SUPPORT	1,835,256		1,835,256
3400F	80	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	577,565		577,565
		AIRCRAFT SPARES		195,200	195,200
		COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS	**1,462,451**	**0**	**1,462,451**
3400F	90	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	665,827		665,827
3400F	100	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	136,485		136,485
3400F	110	OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	247,715		247,715
3400F	120	JCS EXERCISES	34,588		34,588
3400F	130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	123,289		123,289
3400F	140	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	254,547		254,547
		SPACE OPERATIONS	**1,114,163**	**0**	**1,114,163**
3400F	150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	218,743		218,743
3400F	160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	112,504		112,504
3400F	170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	259,203		259,203
3400F	180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	52,753		52,753
3400F	190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	90,461		90,461

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
3400F	200	BASE SUPPORT	324,539		324,539
3400F	210	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	55,960		55,960
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**10,550,050**	**324,500**	**10,874,550**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
		MOBILITY OPERATIONS	**2,685,559**	**0**	**2,685,559**
3400F	220	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,359,999		1,359,999
3400F	230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	30,401		30,401
3400F	240	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	142,983		142,983
3400F	250	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	312,062		312,062
3400F	260	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	312,237		312,237
3400F	270	BASE SUPPORT	455,730		455,730
3400F	280	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	72,147		72,147
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	**2,685,559**	**0**	**2,685,559**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING	**205,955**	**0**	**205,955**
3400F	290	OFFICER ACQUISITION	60,067		60,067
3400F	300	RECRUIT TRAINING	4,494		4,494
3400F	310	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	58,012		58,012
3400F	320	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	20,263		20,263
3400F	330	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (ACADEMIES ONLY)	63,119		63,119
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	**1,370,593**	**0**	**1,370,593**
3400F	340	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	240,449		240,449
3400F	350	FLIGHT TRAINING	471,526		471,526

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES	**634,612**	**77,000**	**711,612**
2080A	10	DIVISION FORCES	12,469		12,469
2080A	20	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	26,496		26,496
2080A	30	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	196,704		196,704
2080A	40	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	99,091		99,091
2080A	50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	299,852		299,852
		INCREASED OPTEMPO		77,000	77,000
		LAND FORCES READINESS	**193,643**	**0**	**193,643**
2080A	60	FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	128,297		128,297
2080A	70	LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	32,172		32,172
2080A	80	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	33,174		33,174
		LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**393,950**	**0**	**393,950**
2080A	90	BASE SUPPORT	314,261		314,261
2080A	100	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	78,295		78,295
2080A	110	UNIFIED COMMANDS	40		40
2080A	120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	1,354		1,354
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**1,222,205**	**77,000**	**1,299,205**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**147,008**	**66,300**	**213,308**
2080A	130	ADMINISTRATION	31,108		31,108
2080A	140	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	23,199		23,199

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
1804N	690	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	263,070		263,070
		PAPERLESS ACQUISITION		4,700	4,700
		NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM		5,000	5,000
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	1,611,719	2,000	1,613,719
1804N	700	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	161,738		161,738
1804N	710	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS	0		0
1804N	710	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	329,808		329,808
1804N	720	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	681,715		681,715
1804N	730	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	271,426		271,426
1804N	740	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	50,073		50,073
1804N	750	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	46,671		48,671
		Integrated Combat Systems Test Facility Support		2,000	
1804N	760	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	70,288		70,288
1804N	770	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	780	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		SECURITY PROGRAMS	584,390	12,000	596,390
1804N	790	SECURITY PROGRAMS	584,390		584,390
1804N	800	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1804N	810	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		ASHORE FORCE PROTECTION		12,000	12,000
		SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	8,431	0	8,431
1804N	820	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	8,431		8,431
		BASE SUPPORT	287,738	0	287,738
1804N	830	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	101,868		101,868
1804N	840	BASE SUPPORT	185,870		185,870
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**4,202,079**	**23,700**	**4,225,779**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES		(10,000)	(10,000)
		CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		(10,000)	(10,000)
		RIVET JOINT SUPPORT		12,000	12,000
		TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		**812,155**	**812,155**
		TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**20,363,203**	**1,151,755**	**21,514,958**
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
0100D	10	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	382,269		327,269
		Mobility Enhancement Funds		15,000	
		Reduction in JCS Exercises		(70,000)	
0100D	20	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,219,698		1,217,158
		Reduction in SOF-JCS Exercises		(2,540)	
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**1,601,967**	**(57,540)**	**1,544,427**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
0100D	30	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	38,312		38,312
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	**38,312**	**0**	**38,312**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
0100D	40	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	9,512		9,512
0100D	50	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	100,380		100,380
0100D	60	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	18,000	(18,000)	0
0100D	70	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	58,100	(12,910)	45,190
0100D	80	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	7,254		7,254

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0100D	90	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	913		913
0100D	100	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	44,344		44,344
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	**238,503**	**(30,910)**	**207,593**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
0100D	110	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	95,865		95,865
0100D	120	ANTI-TERRORISM / DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PROGRAMS (NO YEAR)	0		0
0100D	130	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	87,503		87,503
0100D	140	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	4,067,679	94,000	4,161,679
0100D	150	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE (FY 98/99)	0		0
0100D	160	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	340,624		340,624
0100D	170	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	27,138		27,138
0100D	180	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	190,226	(11,347)	178,879
0100D	190	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	822,904	(100,000)	722,904
0100D	200	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	9,483		9,483
0100D	210	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	1,186,236		1,213,236
		CTMA Program		12,000	
		Document Conversion		15,000	
0100D	220	DEFENSE POW /MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	14,505		14,505
0100D	230	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	65,638		55,638
		DSCA Partnership for Peace		(10,000)	
0100D	240	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	84,395		84,395
0100D	250	DEFENSE SPECIAL WEAPONS AGENCY	0		0
0100D	260	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	0		0
0100D	270	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	0		0
0100D	280	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	195,533	(13,500)	182,033
0100D	290	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,376,909		1,376,909
0100D	300	FEDERAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	0		0

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0100D	310	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	158,647		141,325
		JCS Other Contracts		(3,000)	
		JCS Other Purchases		(14,322)	
0100D	320	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	30,940		30,940
0100D	330	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	423,493		418,493
		OSD Contracts and Other Support Services		(5,000)	
0100D	340	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (NO YEAR)	0		0
0100D	350	ON SITE INSPECTION AGENCY	0		0
0100D	360	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	40,263		40,263
0100D	370	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	322,470	(23,000)	246,470
		Defense Travel System		(53,000)	
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**9,540,451**	**(112,169)**	**9,428,282**
		UNDISTRIBUTED			
		MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS REDUCTION		(110,000)	(110,000)
		INTERNATIONAL STUDENT PROGRAM - SENIOR MILITARY COLLEGES		2,000	2,000
		RETIREMENT FLAGS FOR RESERVISTS		5,000	5,000
		IMPACT AID		35,000	35,000
		ARMED FORCES EMERGENCY SERVICES		23,000	23,000
		INNOVATIVE READINESS TRAINING		(15,000)	(15,000)
		CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		(10,000)	(10,000)
		DOCUMENT DECLASSIFICATION		(180,000)	(180,000)
		TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		**(250,000)**	**(250,000)**
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**11,419,233**	**(450,619)**	**10,968,614**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES	**634,612**	**77,000**	**711,612**
2080A	10	DIVISION FORCES	12,469		12,469
2080A	20	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	26,496		26,496
2080A	30	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	196,704		196,704
2080A	40	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	99,091		99,091
2080A	50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	299,852		299,852
		INCREASED OPTEMPO		77,000	77,000
		LAND FORCES READINESS	**193,643**	**0**	**193,643**
2080A	60	FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	128,297		128,297
2080A	70	LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	32,172		32,172
2080A	80	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	33,174		33,174
		LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**393,950**	**0**	**393,950**
2080A	90	BASE SUPPORT	314,261		314,261
2080A	100	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	78,295		78,295
2080A	110	UNIFIED COMMANDS	40		40
2080A	120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	1,354		1,354
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**1,222,205**	**77,000**	**1,299,205**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**147,008**	**66,300**	**213,308**
2080A	130	ADMINISTRATION	31,108		31,108
2080A	140	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	23,199		23,199

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
2080A	150	PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	46,346		46,346
2080A	160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	46,355	26,700	73,055
		MILITARY TECHNICIANS FUNDING		35,000	35,000
		RECRUITING SUPPORT		2,000	2,000
		RTD RETENTION		2,600	2,600
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**147,008**	**66,300**	**213,308**
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	**1,369,213**	**143,300**	**1,512,513**
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS	**409,207**	**0**	**409,207**
1806N	10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	283,792		283,792
1806N	20	FLEET AIR TRAINING	0		0
1806N	30	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	17,232		17,232
1806N	40	AIR OPERATION AND SAFETY SUPPORT	3,829		3,829
1806N	50	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	104,087		104,087
1806N	60	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPS SUPPORT	267		267
1806N	70	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1806N	80	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS	**177,886**	**0**	**177,886**
1806N	90	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	72,200		72,200
1806N	100	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	615		615
1806N	110	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	9,323		9,323

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
1806N	120	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	92,988		92,988
1806N	130	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,760		2,760
		RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	**26,678**	**0**	**26,678**
1806N	140	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	26,678		26,678
1806N	150	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1806N	160	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
		RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT	**5,224**	**0**	**5,224**
1806N	160	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,224		5,224
		BASE SUPPORT	**177,274**	**48,200**	**225,474**
1806N	170	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	21,469	43,200	64,669
1806N	180	BASE SUPPORT	155,805		155,805
		RECRUITING ADVERTIZING		1,000	1,000
		RECRUITING SUPPORT		4,000	4,000
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**796,269**	**48,200**	**844,469**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**121,378**	**0**	**121,378**
1806N	190	ADMINISTRATION	6,768		6,768
1806N	200	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	1,299		1,299
1806N	210	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	24,551		24,551
1806N	220	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	82,260		82,260
1806N	230	BASE SUPPORT	0		0
1806N	240	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	0		0
1806N	250	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,899		5,899
1806N	260	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	601		601

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	0	0	0
1806N	270	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	0		0
		CANCELLED ACCOUNTS			
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**121,378**	**0**	**121,378**
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	**917,647**	**48,200**	**965,847**
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		MISSION FORCES	88,642	14,000	102,642
1107N	10	TRAINING	18,121		18,121
1107N	20	OPERATING FORCES	38,529		38,529
1107N	30	BASE SUPPORT	14,588		14,588
1107N	40	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	6,054	1,000	7,054
1107N	50	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	11,350		11,350
		MAINTENANCE OF AGING EQUIPMENT		1,500	1,500
		CORROSION CONTROL COATING		1,500	1,500
		INITIAL ISSUE		10,000	10,000
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**88,642**	**14,000**	**102,642**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**34,624**	**0**	**34,624**
1107N	60	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	7,841		7,841
1107N	70	SPECIAL SUPPORT	11,116		11,116
1107N	80	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	476		476
1107N	90	ADMINISTRATION	7,441		7,441
1107N	100	BASE SUPPORT	7,750		7,750
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**34,624**	**0**	**34,624**
		TOTAL, O&M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	**123,266**	**14,000**	**137,266**
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS	**1,643,924**	**0**	**1,643,924**
3740F	10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,058,142		1,058,142
3740F	20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	45,972		45,972
3740F	30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	265,429		265,429
3740F	40	BASE SUPPORT	235,907		235,907
3740F	50	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	38,474		38,474
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**1,643,924**	**0**	**1,643,924**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**84,513**	**2,500**	**87,013**
3740F	60	ADMINISTRATION	46,819		46,819
3740F	70	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	20,254		20,254
3740F	80	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	10,418	1,500	11,918
		RECRUITING SUPPORT		1,000	1,000
3740F	90	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,390		6,390
3740F	100	AUDIOVISUAL	632		632
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**84,513**	**2,500**	**87,013**
		TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	**1,728,437**	**2,500**	**1,730,937**
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES	**1,558,514**	**37,000**	**1,595,514**
2065A	10	DIVISIONS	367,379	23,000	390,379
2065A	20	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	773,892		773,892
2065A	30	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	183,763		183,763
2065A	40	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	139,382		139,382
2065A	50	LAND FORCES OPERATION SUPPORT	94,098		94,098
		EXTENDED COLD WEATHER CLOTHING SYSTEM		14,000	14,000
		LAND FORCES READINESS	**193,216**	**41,000**	**234,216**
2065A	60	LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	5,889		5,889
2065A	70	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	187,327	41,000	228,327

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	980,733	72,000	1,052,733
2065A	80	BASE OPERATIONS	468,029		468,029
2065A	90	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	111,716	72,000	183,716
2065A	100	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	400,988		400,988
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**2,732,463**	**150,000**	**2,882,463**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	171,086	87,500	258,586
2065A	110	STAFF MANAGEMENT	58,902		58,902
2065A	120	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	18,981		18,981
2065A	130	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	50,840		50,840
2065A	140	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	42,363	18,000	60,363
		RECRUITING SUPPORT		13,000	13,000
		MILITARY TECHNICIANS FUNDING		56,500	56,500
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**171,086**	**87,500**	**258,586**
		TOTAL, O&M, ARMY NAT. GUARD	**2,903,549**	**237,500**	**3,141,049**
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS	3,087,333	82,200	3,169,533
3840F	10	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	1,977,442		1,977,442
		AIRCRAFT SPARES		26,000	26,000

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
3840F	20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	357,487		357,487
3840F	30	BASE SUPPORT	299,089	4,800	303,889
3840F	40	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	38,130		38,130
3840F	50	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	415,185	29,500	444,685
		F-16 FLIGHT TRAINING HOURS		21,900	21,900
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**3,087,333**	**82,200**	**3,169,533**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**12,285**	**4,100**	**16,385**
3840F	50	ADMINISTRATION	2,656		2,656
3840F	60	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,629	4,100	13,729
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**12,285**	**4,100**	**16,385**
		TOTAL, O&M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	**3,099,618**	**86,300**	**3,185,918**
		O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS			
0810A	10	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	378,170		378,170
0810N	20	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	284,000		284,000
0810F	30	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	376,800		376,800
0810D	40	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	25,370		25,370
0811D	50	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY UTILIZED DEFENSE SIT	199,214		199,214
0105D	60	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES	788,100	23,600	811,700

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0118D	70	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES	2,387,600		2,387,600
0841D	80	PENTAGON RENOVATION			
		TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS:	**4,439,254**	**23,600**	**4,462,854**
		MISCELLANEOUS			
0130D	90	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	10,477,687		10,496,687
		Waiver of Deductibles for deployed Reserve Component		4,000	
		Trauma Center Start-Up Costs		4,000	
		Navy Medical Equipment and Property Maintenance		5,000	
		Automated Clinical Practice Guidelines		5,000	
		Army Maintenance and Repair		1,000	
5336D	100	DEFENSE LOAN GUARANTEE	0		0
0842D	110	DEFENSE VESSELS	0		0
0833D	120	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE			0
0134D	130	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	475,500	(31,400)	444,100
0107D	140	INSPECTOR GENERAL	138,744	(8,000)	130,744
0844D	150	MWR PERSONEL SUPPORT			0
0840D	160	OPPLAN 34A-35	0		0
0819D	170	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	55,800	(5,800)	50,000
1236N	180	PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND	15,000		15,000
0839D	190	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS	1,845,370		1,845,370
0104D	200	U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	7,621		7,621
		TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS:	**13,015,722**	**(26,200)**	**12,989,522**
		TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS AND TRANSFER ACCOUNTS:	**17,454,976**	**(2,600)**	**17,452,376**
		TOTAL O&M TITLE	**102,837,780**	**2,811,036**	**105,648,816**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST INCREASES

Critical Readiness Accounts Increases

Although the committee has significantly increased funding above the President's budget request in key readiness accounts by more than $7 billion during the past four years, readiness continues to decline across the forces. The costs of doing more with less continue to grow. Once again, the committee recommends significant funding increases above the President's budget in an effort to address the most critical unfunded readiness requirements.

The committee's recommendations have focused on problems highlighted throughout the extensive hearings and have been guided by the shortfalls identified by the service chiefs.

Aircraft spare parts

Prolonged contingency air operations in Southwest Asia and the Balkans have added significant unprogrammed flying hours to an already aging fleet of combat aircraft and have nearly depleted on-hand stocks of aircraft spare parts. The service chiefs identified shortfalls in spare parts funding as one of their highest unfunded priorities. Based on the recommendations of the service chiefs, the committee recommends an increase of $271.2 million, the amount contained in the unfunded priority lists, for aircraft spare parts as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Navy	50.0
Air Force	195.2
Air National Guard	26.0

Depot maintenance

Operational tempo is at an all time high and aging military equipment is wearing out. As a consequence, the end of the designed service life for significant elements of the services' combat equipment is rapidly approaching and the maintenance of the equipment is becoming more difficult, time consuming and expensive. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $339.5 million for depot maintenance as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Army	87.0
Navy (Air)	50.0
Navy (Sea)	25.0
Marine Corps	20.0
Air Force	87.0
Army National Guard	41.0
Air National Guard	29.5

Training accounts

As part of its focus on the adequacy of military training, the committee conducted specific hearings on how effectively the major training centers were preparing military units for combat. The committee found that insufficient funding has been a contributing factor in the decline in the quality of training at these important training facilities. Shortages of equipment, parts, decaying infra-

structure, and personnel shortages were identified as serious problems and the training equipment and base facilities at many of the combat training centers is in urgent need of both repair and upgrade. Due to increasing restrictions on the availability of local station training ranges, the committee reiterates its belief that the military service training centers are national assets that must be upgraded and better maintained.

Based on information gathered in committee hearings and other training shortfalls identified by the military services, the committee recommends an increase of $112.1 million to improve training center operations, equipment, and facilities as follows:

[in millions of dollars]

Army:	
National Training Center Prepositioned Equipment Maintenance	28.0
Joint Readiness Training Center Prepositioned Equipment Maintenance	2.0
FORSCOM Deployments to National Training Center	4.0
CMTC Mission Support	4.0
Korea Training Area	4.1
Navy:	
Naval Air Strike Air Warfare Center Facility Improvements	2.0
Marine Corps:	
Air/Ground Combat Center	25.7
Air Force:	
Air Warfare Center Range Support	6.1
Air Warfare Center Fiber Link	4.6
Utah Test and Training Range Support	11.7
AETC Mission Essential Equipment	14.0
AETC Range Improvements	5.9

Real property maintenance and base operations support

The state of the infrastructure at nearly all military facilities has continued to degrade to the point that the current backlog for repair is $9.6 billion and immediate investment must be made to at least keep the problem from getting worse. The committee observes that current funding levels for real property maintenance represent less than one percent of the plant value of our military installations. At such low funding levels, replacement of facilities will take more than 100 years.

The committee also notes that shortfalls in base operations accounts—accounts that are regularly used by commanders to address shortfalls in operations and training accounts during the fiscal year—are at or near the top of the service chiefs unfunded priority lists.

To address the backlog of facility maintenance and shortfalls in base operations funding, the committee recommends an increase of $1,648.5 million, identified in the unfunded priority lists for real property maintenance and base operations support, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Army	517.0
Navy	395.5
Marine Corps	86.0
Air Force	529.0
Army National Guard	72.0
Navy Reserve	43.2
Marine Corps Reserve	1.0
Air National Guard	4.8

Miscellaneous unfunded requirements

The committee also recommends the following $758.4 million in increased funding for unfunded readiness-related requirements identified by the service chiefs.

[In millions of dollars]

Army:	
DMOSQ/Leader Development	35.0
Information Operations	18.0
Institutional Training	70.0
Training Area Environmental Management	32.0
Navy:	
Ashore Force Protection	12.0
Paperless Acquisition	4.7
Marine Aviation Related Logistics	35.0
Marine Aviation Related Engineering	12.0
Marine Corps:	
Maintenance of Aging Equipment	37.2
Corrosion Control Coating	13.8
Initial Issue	20.0
Air Force:	
Real Property Support	49.0
Civil Air Patrol	7.5
NBC High Leverage Programs	18.8
C–130J Logistics	6.1
Sustaining Engineering	95.4
ICBM Prime Contract	16.3
AC21SR Center Programs	32.7
AEF/Joint Experimentation (JFEX)	35.6
Mobility CLS Contract	72.4
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve OPSTEMPO	77.0
Army National Guard:	
Army National Guard OPSTEMPO	23.0
Marine Corps Reserve:	
Maintenance of Aging Equipment	1.5
Corrosion Control Coating	1.5
Initial Issue	10.0
Air National Guard:	
F–16 Flight Training Hours	21.9

Mobility enhancement funding

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million to improve the deployment and mobility of military forces and supplies through investment in en-route infrastructure. These funds are provided to the United States Transportation Command Mobility Enhancement Fund (MEF). The committee is aware that the MEF was established to address strategic mobility shortcomings that revealed themselves during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm. The committee believes that this additional funding will improve the ability of the military services to respond to future contingencies.

Modern Field Kitchen Burner Unit

The committee is aware that the burner unit (M2) that provides all heat used in the Army's field kitchens was originally fielded in 1959. Between 1980 and 1997, 90 accidents resulting in 65 injuries and 2 fatalities involving this unit were reported. M2 units, which are gasoline-powered, cannot be operated closer than 50 feet from each other and must be installed while lit in deployed field kitchens. The committee is also aware that the Army began replacing

these burners at the beginning of fiscal year 1999 with a modern burner unit (MBU) that is more fuel efficient, reliable, can be ignited after installation in deployed field kitchens, and will greatly improve safety. It is estimated that the MBU will save over $100,000 per 800,000 hours of use and has been operated for over 300 hours without a failure. The committee commends the Army for taking action to replace the unsafe, unreliable, and costly M2 burner units; however, the committee is concerned that funding for MBU replacements was not included in the budget request. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for the Army to continue this replacement program.

Army Cold Weather Clothing

The committee is aware that the Army and the Army National Guard is in need of additional funding for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing System (ECWCS), which is designed to provide protection during cold and wet weather. The committee further understands that the Army is equipping only 60 percent of its forces with ECWCS and the Army National Guard is equipping only 20 percent of its forces. The committee believes that ECWCS is a significant contributor to the combat readiness of the individual soldier and would significantly improve their quality of life. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of funding for ECWCS as follows:

[in millions of dollars]

Army	19.0
Army Reserve	14.0

BUDGET REQUEST REDUCTIONS

Administration and Support Accounts

The committee notes that at the same time the budget request contains significantly underfunded readiness accounts, it also proposes spending increases in a number of administrative and support accounts with little or no direct impact on military readiness. For example, as expressed in more detail elsewhere in this report, the committee observes that the Department of Defense continues to not fully comply with section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) which requires an annual five percent reduction in all headquarters and headquarters support activities. In addition, the committee once again questions the necessity of funding certain programs in the support accounts when they are more appropriately funded elsewhere in the budget. For example, the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, a working capital fund agency, request contains nearly $11.9 million for executive and professional training. As it expressed last year, the committee believes that funding for the training of working capital funded employees should be charged against the appropriate working capital fund and managed accordingly.

The committee disagrees with the budget request's priorities in a number of administration and support accounts and, therefore, recommends the following decreases:

[in millions of dollars]

Army Administration	55.0
Navy Administration	35.0
Air Force Administration	20.0
Defense Agencies	110.0

Advisory and Assistance Services

Consistent with the direction elsewhere in this report on Advisory and Assistance Services, the committee recommends the following decreases:

[in millions of dollars]

Army	10.0
Navy	10.0
Air Force	10.0
Defense Agencies	10.0

Civilian Personnel Overstatement Reductions

The committee understands that in order to determine civilian personnel requirements for the budget request, the Department of Defense relied on the actual fiscal year 1998 personnel levels and the estimated personnel levels the Department would have on hand at the end of fiscal year 1999, to forecast civilian personnel levels for fiscal year 2000. Because the Department was unable to accurately estimate the fiscal year 1999 end strength prior to the submission of the budget request, the General Accounting Office (GAO) has determined that the Department will employ fewer civilian personnel at the beginning of fiscal year 2000 than it assumed and budgeted for in the request.

Therefore, to bring the request in line with GAO's estimated civilian endstrength levels for fiscal year 2000, the committee recommends decreases in funding as follows:

[in millions of dollars]

Army	5.0
Navy	20.0

Joint Chiefs of Staff Training Exercises

Based on testimony, both at home and abroad, the committee remains concerned that requirements for Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) training exercises were being levied against units that were already overextended with operational deployments, home station training exercises and training exercises at the services' major combat training centers. The committee questions whether the benefit of all of these JCS exercises is worth the price paid by units already suffering the effects of high operational tempo. Therefore, the committee recommends a 20 percent decrease in the military services' participation in JCS exercises as follows:

[in millions of dollars]

Army	10.0
Navy	2.0
Marine Corps	2.4
Air Force	10.0
Special Operations Command	2.5
Joint Chief's of Staff	70.0

OTHER ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Commercial Activity Studies

The committee endorses the Department of Defense goal of reforming its business practices, and believes there are numerous opportunities to improve the economy and efficiency of the Department's business practices. However, the committee is concerned with the assumptions and estimates of outyear savings that the Department has reported, and indeed, included in its budget requests. Specifically, the committee believes that the Department has over estimated the savings that will be realized through the A–76 commercial activity competitive process. Many of these proposed competitions would represent the first time that a particular business area has been subjected to the A–76 process and, therefore, automatically assuming the realization of potential savings poses significant budget risk in a constrained resource environment. The committee is aware that there are numerous and difficult obstacles that must be overcome in order to achieve anticipated savings. For instance, studies are often delayed; studies can take 18 months to 2 years to complete; and the costs associated with civilian transition or military conversion have not always been included in the proposed savings. In fact, a December 1998 U.S. Army Audit Agency report found that the delay in initiating studies may reduce the Army's estimated gross savings by $219 million or 14 percent. The committee notes that the budget request contains several increases resulting from attempted privatization efforts, where the anticipated savings failed to materialize.

In order to better understand the Department's intentions in this area, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report, no later than February 1, 2000, to the House Committee on Armed Services on the current and proposed commercial activity studies of each of the military services and defense agencies. The report shall include:

(1) the savings identified and budgeted for each fiscal year 1997 through 2003;

(2) the savings actually achieved in each fiscal year 1997 through 1999;

(3) the funds requested in fiscal year 2000 and 2001 for savings not achieved;

(4) an evaluation whether the anticipated and budgeted savings can be achieved through the A–76 commercial process; and

(5) whether other methods of business reform or reengineering will be necessary in order to achieve anticipated and budgeted savings.

Defense Fuel Surcharges

The committee is aware that the Defense Energy Support Center (DESC) applies an annual surcharge to the price of fuel that is provided to the Department of Defense to be used in establishing the fiscal year stabilized fuel price used for the formulation of budget requests. The DESC requires the surcharge in order to cover its annual operational costs. The General Accounting Office has esti-

mated that from fiscal year 1995 through 1999, the budgeted surcharge has exceeded the actual applied surcharge by an average of $1.49 per barrel. Based on budgeted fuel usage for fiscal year 2000, and the five year average surcharge that has actually been applied, the budget request for fuel may be overstated by as much as $108.8 million. The committee is aware of the volatility of fuel prices; however, the committee finds the long standing practice of over-budgeting for the surcharge is inappropriate. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to take corrective steps to ensure that the application of DESC surcharges is more clearly aligned with reality.

Information Technology

Information technology has moved from a specialized support function to becoming the central nervous system of Department of Defense. The need for common defense-wide information technology and seamless interoperability is evident. The committee believes, however, that barriers to joint programs and interoperability cannot be overcome without the unwavering commitment from the most senior Department officials.

The committee has seen evidence of such leadership. For example, the committee notes the personal involvement of the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense which, coupled with the additional funding provided by Congress to aggressively attack the Year 2000 problem, produced an immediate and substantial improvement in Year 2000 preparedness. The committee also notes the progress made by the department to reduce or eliminate unnecessary or duplicative legacy systems and urges the department to increase its efforts to eliminate the remaining unneeded legacy systems. Despite these positive efforts, the committee remains unconvinced that the Department has made the necessary improvements in managing its $26 billion Command, Control, Communications, and Computers (C4) program. This is particularly disturbing, given the increasing role of information technology in the battlefield of today and tomorrow.

The committee believes that the recent top level commitment in this area should be applied to the management of information technology requirements of the entire Department. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to continue to work to overcome efforts by the military services to develop unique information technology systems, instead of single, joint system integrating all logistics, medical, transportation, finance, and personnel systems.

Environmental Issues

Alternative Technologies for Asbestos Treatment and Disposal

The committee is concerned about the cost of temporary storage of asbestos and asbestos-contaminated materials at Aberdeen Proving Ground and other defense facilities. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, no later than June 1, 2000, on alternative technologies for asbestos treatment and disposal, including non-thermal methods, that will

provide environmentally sound and cost effective treatment and disposal options.

Environmental Contamination in Watershed Surrounding the Former Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant at McGregor, Texas

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy is studying potential environmental contamination in and around the perimeter of the former Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant at McGregor, Texas. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to focus this study on the possible presence of perchlorate in the watershed surrounding this facility. The committee is concerned that perchlorate contamination could affect the quality and safety of drinking water in the area.

Navy Environmental Leadership Program

The committee continues to support the Chief of Naval Operation's Navy Environmental Leadership Program (NELP), with two designated sites one on the east coast and one on the west coast of the United States. The primary mission of each site is to identify and demonstrate new technologies that improve the environmental compliance, cleanup, conservation, and pollution prevention efforts within the Navy. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for the Navy Environmental Leadership Program. The committee believes these additional funds are needed to aid the east coast site in developing technologies to separate aqueous fire-fighting foam and other contaminants in oily water and wastewater, reduce waste generated by the de-painting/painting process, and reduce emissions from fire-fighting training facilities.

MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION ISSUES

Overview

The committee is concerned that ever tightening pressures on the operations and maintenance budgets of the military services are causing the Department of Defense to stray from well established principles of support for Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) programs. These principles include a variety of on-base MWR programs, access to recognizable American products, a real commissary benefit, robust appropriated fund support to MWR programs, and a substantial exchange store savings, especially for deployed forces. The committee addresses many of these issues and other concerns below and throughout this report.

Appropriated Fund Support of Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Programs

The committee notes that the military services have not demonstrated a serious commitment to fund Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) programs. Although the committee has seen incremental improvements in the percentage of appropriated fund support provided to category A, mission sustaining programs, these important programs are supported at the 90 percent level by only one service, with another service as low as 70 percent. The com-

mittee is truly dismayed by the funding provided to category B, community support programs. Not one service has achieved the Department of Defense goal of 65 percent appropriated fund support for any of the past four years. Another metric often used is the amount of appropriated fund support provided per individual service member. Here too, the services vary. In this era of joint operations, each service provides support to service members of all the uniformed services. The committee believes that individual service members deserve to find an adequate quality of life infrastructure wherever they may be assigned. In view of the continued lack of commitment from all services and the disparate level of funding among the services, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a plan for the military services to achieve DOD funding goals and parity by individual service member and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 1999, when all services will achieve those objectives.

Combined Stores at Closed Installations

The committee notes that the Department of Defense continues to request additional base realignment and closure (BRAC) authority, yet the Department has done little to ameliorate the impact of lost commissary and exchange stores on retirees residing near closed bases. Section 336 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) authorized the Secretary of Defense to open 10 combined exchange and commissary stores near closed bases. To date, only three such stores are operating, even though military retirees around the country have effectively been denied access to commissaries and exchanges through BRAC action. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the process and criteria used for establishing combined stores, considering such matters as cost to the Defense Commissary Agency, the viability of combined stores, and the views of the military services, retirees, and local communities, and report his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2000.

Commissary Surcharge Fund

The committee is aware that the Defense Commissary Agency's (DECA) surcharge fund has been depleted in recent years. The committee gives special attention to the health of this fund because it is created with patron dollars and because it pays for new commissary construction. With an infrastructure of nearly 300 commissary stores around the world, DECA needs a construction program of at least 10 new stores annually to replace its inventory in a 30 year period. Unfortunately, the Department projects building just 10 stores over the next 3 years. Some of the depletion of the surcharge fund is due to DECA's own actions, such as last year's failed procurement of a new computer system. The surcharge shortfall is a complex issue and is also related to the significant decline of DECA's active and reserve patron base and the addition of other charges to DECA construction, like site demolition costs. The committee believes that action will be needed in the near future to ad-

dress this problem and directs the Secretary of Defense to study the issue and provide recommended solutions to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 1999.

Military Exchange Privileges for Disabled Veterans

The committee believes that exchanges, commissaries, and morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) programs are inextricably linked elements of essential installation support. As a general rule, military patrons who have access to exchanges have substantially equal access to commissaries and MWR programs. Despite that view, the committee believes that there may be room for a limited exception to recognize veterans who were disabled in service to their country. In that regard, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to assess the implications of opening military exchanges to veterans who have been rated by the Department of Veterans Affairs as at least 30 percent disabled. The committee expects that this assessment would address such issues as the ability of these veterans to gain access to military installations, impact on exchange costs and revenue, and local community views. The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, will report the results of this assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2000.

Nonappropriated Fund Retirement Plans

The committee has learned that the Department of Defense (DOD) is reviewing options concerning the several retirement plans that exist for DOD nonappropriated fund employees. The committee understands that DOD generated this review in order to apply sound fiscal principles to all of the retirement plans and realizes that the Secretary of Defense understands the sensitivity of any changes to long established, fiscally solvent, pension plans. Since these plans represent the only income for thousands of currently retired nonappropriated fund employees, the committee believes that any change should be approached with great caution. For that reason, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense not implement any changes to these retirement plans without consulting with the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services.

Restrictions on Patron Access to Overseas Commissaries and Exchange Stores

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has yet to issue regulations implementing section 365 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) dealing with ration control overseas. The committee included this provision because the Department had not exercised oversight in this area, resulting in authorized patrons being denied reasonable access to American goods and services around the world. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to publish the implementing instructions by July 1, 1999, and that the first annual report required by section 365 be provided to the Senate Committee

on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 1999.

Sale of Value Brand Products in Commissary Stores

The committee notes that the Defense Commissary Agency (DECA) is testing customer acceptance of product lines known as value brands. The committee reminds the Secretary of Defense that the commissary benefit is intended to provide recognizable, brand name products to military patrons stationed around the world. Consequently, the committee expects that any products tested adhere strictly to the rigorous definition of brand name products provided by section 373 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). Since shelf space is limited in commissary stores, the committee believes that patron selection of brand name products would diminish if this test were expanded to place significant quantities of value brand products into all stores. Furthermore, the committee has concerns about the validity of the test procedures. In view of these questions, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense not implement the results of this test before consulting with the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Vendor Representatives Overseas

The committee has learned about apparent inconsistencies in the logistical support provided to certain vendor representatives overseas. The committee believes that vendor representatives to the commissaries and exchanges perform services critical to the mission of providing quality American made goods to military families stationed overseas. The committee is concerned that United States Forces, Japan (USFJ) has changed a long standing interpretation of treaty requirements and has directed the withdrawal of logistical support for vendor representatives in Japan. Further, the committee understands that USFJ has determined that other contractor representatives should retain support. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to look into the matter and restore support for vendor representatives in Japan.

OTHER ISSUES

Abrams Integrated Management Program

The budget request contains $72.6 million for the Abrams Integrated Management XXI Program (AIM XXI), an innovative partnership between the manufacturer of the Abrams tank (M–1) and the Department of the Army's maintenance depot to rebuild the early versions of these tanks (M1A1) to a "like new" configuration. The committee is pleased with the Army's commitment to this vital program given that 4,300 M1A1 tanks are expected to remain in the Army for the next 40 years. The committee agrees with the Army's position, stated in its 1999 Armored Systems Modernization Report, that the AIM XXI program is the foundation of a comprehensive recapitalization plan for the Abrams tank, and believes this program will address readiness, operation and support cost reductions, and ultimately, modernization of the M1A1 fleet.

The committee urges the Secretary of the Army to continue to fully fund this important combat vehicle modernization program at a minimum of 90 tanks per year.

Apache Helicopter Support

The committee is concerned that the Department of the Army is proceeding with a Prime Vendor Support (PVS) concept for the Apache helicopter before completing a full and comprehensive evaluation of its impact on the Army's logistics operations. Section 346 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) requires that, prior to entering into any prime vendor contract for the depot-level maintenance of a weapons system, the Secretary of Defense provide a notification to the Congress containing, among other things, an analysis of the costs and benefits of the proposed contract. The committee continues to question whether this concept is a cost-effective solution for improving logistics support for the Apache helicopter.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) conducted a comprehensive review and assessment of the Army's PVS concept for the Apache helicopter and found significant cost and policy uncertainties with this proposal. Preliminary findings from GAO reveal that the Army's June 1998 cost estimate to provide PVS for the Apache could cost approximately $430.9 million more than the best-case government estimate. The committee is aware that the Army is further evaluating the financial impact of the PVC concept, but the Cost and Economic Analysis Center and the Army Audit Agency has also raised questions regarding the cost implications of PVS for the Apache which could be significantly higher than the government's estimate. In addition, the committee is concerned that the Army has not included in its cost analysis the impact PVS would have on the Defense Logistics Agency Working Capital Fund or the impact it would have on the Army Working Capital Fund. The committee is also aware that the Army is considering including in the PVS concept enhanced services that may not be needed to meet flying-hour mission requirements. The committee questions the addition of non-required enhanced services in cost comparison calculations.

The committee is also concerned with operational issues associated with the possible use of a PVS concept for the Apache helicopter. These concerns include: whether Army personnel in the field would be required to operate under two separate logistics and support systems; whether this concept would be acceptable during contingency operations; whether this concept would be compatible with other Army financial and supply systems; and what would be the impact to other weapons systems that remain in the Working Capital Fund.

Based on questions of cost uncertainties and operational issues, the committee believes it would be premature to move forward with the PVS Apache initiative until all of these issues are fully evaluated and resolved.

Army Battery Management Program

The committee is aware of the success of the Department of the Army's battery management program which utilizes pulse technology to extend the life and reduce the cost of batteries. In particular, the committee recognizes the efforts of the Army Forces Command which is expected to produce annual savings of $15.0 million utilizing this new technology, and the Army III Corps battery management program which has produced over $6.9 million in savings in a two year study program. The committee is pleased with the Army's utilization of pulse technology as a means to improve readiness. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to examine the expansion of pulse technology for battery management programs throughout all of the military services.

Army Maintenance and Personnel Systems

The committee continues to be concerned that the Department of the Army lacks a total depot maintenance program for all of its industrial operations, including a rational staffing process. The committee is aware that the Army attempted to develop a total depot maintenance strategic plan in its National Maintenance Program (NMP). It is the committee's understanding that implementation of the NMP has been delayed because of internal confusion over the definition of depot maintenance.

The Army's failure to implement effectively a total depot maintenance program negatively impacts readiness and hinders the service's overall performance in numerous arenas. First, lack of a total maintenance program precludes the development of the appropriate mix of equipment maintenance at public facilities. This causes an unstable workload and staffing system for the industrial base. In addition, without a total depot maintenance program, the Army cannot control the proliferation of depot activities throughout the service.

The committee urges the Secretary of the Army to resolve the issues that impede the National Maintenance Program, and to address the proliferation of depot level maintenance and repair. The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to continue to issue progress reports on these issues.

In addition, the committee is also concerned with problems the Department of the Army has with the industrial staffing requirements determination process. The committee believes that the Army Workload and Performance System (AWPS) has improved the determination process and will facilitate the development of a stabilized workload system and minimize the turbulence in the civilian workforce. The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to consider the General Accounting Office's recommendations to improve the development of AWPS. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to implement AWPS as soon as feasible and believes the Secretary should designate AWPS as the standard functional management system for all industrial operations and fund the program to accomplish this mission, including the Department of the Army Decision Support System, by March 1, 2001.

Automatic Document Conversion Technology

The committee believes that there is potential for significant savings from automatic document conversion software for use in weapons systems engineering drawing digitization, and that the Department of Defense should increase its efforts to digitize all weapons engineering drawings. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for engineering drawings and document storage and retrieval to be directly managed by the Defense Logistics Agency. The committee strongly urges the Department to include funding for document conversion technology in future budget requests.

Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence—Public-Private Partnerships

The committee is concerned that nearly two years after the enactment of Section 2474 of Title 10, United States Code, establishing Department of Defense Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence and promoting public-private partnerships, the Secretary of Defense has failed to implement any policy guidance in this critical area. The committee believes that promoting public-private partnerships at the Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence will improve readiness, reduce costs and help preserve critical core capabilities within the Department. While the Department of Defense continues to provide testimonial support for public-private partnerships and competitions, the lack of implementing guidelines and clear support from the Office of the Secretary of Defense has left each of the military departments to enact a patchwork of very different and often contradictory policies. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a written policy not later than January 1, 2000 implementing the provisions of section 2474 and provide a report, not later than July 1, 2000, to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services detailing the status of all activities conducted pursuant to such policy, including any proposed pilot projects as authorized in section 2474(a)(3).

Civilian Marksmanship Program

The committee is concerned over findings by the General Accounting Office (GAO) concerning the management of the Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety. The Corporation was established by title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106), which also provided for the transition of the Civilian Marksmanship Program from the Army to the Corporation. The committee notes that the GAO found that the Corporation's policies were insufficient to ensure that firearms were not sold to felons. Further, the GAO found that the Army has not issued regulations governing logistical support to the Corporation for the reimbursement of the Army's support of the Corporation. The committee understands that the Corporation revised its background check procedures as a result of GAO's review, and has arranged for periodic independent audits of its procedures. While the committee urges the Secretary of the Army to issue regulations governing support procedures as

required by law, the committee is concerned that the Army will not be reimbursed for all incremental direct costs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review the Army's expenses in support of the Corporation to determine if legislative authority exists for reimbursement of costs such as the lease of real property and storage of ammunition and supplies, and to recommend to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services any legislation necessary to ensure the Army receives reimbursement for other direct costs.

Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities

The Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities (CTMA) program was created by the Department of Defense (DOD) in 1998 and was designed to bring the most modern and advanced manufacturing capabilities used from commercial industry in DOD maintenance depots and related maintenance activities. CTMA programs allow depot activities to participate in manufacturing technology demonstration projects in collaboration with more than 220 of the leading U.S. manufacturers, under the auspices of the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences. The CTMA program is in direct support of section 361 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), which called on the military departments to reengineer industrial processes and adopt best-business practices at their depot-level activities.

The committee is aware that each CTMA project is designed to deploy the latest technology in a particular area of the depot, train depot personnel in its use, and then measure the improvements in cost, time, and efficiency generated by the new technology. Current DOD funding for the CTMA program provides for the operational costs associated with each depot's participation. For every DOD dollar spent, it is matched on a 2-for-1 basis by the industry partner companies. Past DOD funding has allowed all of the military services' depot activities to carry out their missions better, cheaper, and faster.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not requested funding for the CTMA program in the budget request despite the Department's statements that the CTMA is useful in developing commercial technologies in the depots and that full funding for this program is a desirable goal. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for the Defense Logistics Agency specifically for the continuation of the CTMA program. The committee believes that the continuation of this successful program would directly contribute to increased readiness.

Communicator Automated Emergency Notification System

The Committee is pleased that various components of the Department of Defense have begun to implement the Communicator Automated Emergency Notification System in order to improve current mobilization and emergency response notification systems. This state of the art technology is replacing the current antiquated "phone-tree" notification procedures and will provide for an instantaneous and real-time massive mobilization notification response in the event of war or any other national emergency. The committee

believes that the Communicator Automated Emergency Notification System could be a cornerstone for an effective U.S. mobilization notification or emergency management notification situation, and encourages the Secretary of Defense to examine its utility for use throughout the Department.

Corrosion Prevention and Control Program

Recent studies conducted by the Department of Defense (DOD) reveal that corrosion prevention costs the Department roughly $10 billion per year. As an example, the Army's Tank and Automotive Command found that corrosion damage annually costs $850 per truck. The committee is concerned that the cost of damage caused by corrosion to the Department's vehicle fleet needs to be significantly reduced by establishing an effective corrosion and prevention control program. Without such a program, the military services will continue to shoulder an unneeded economic burden which will adversely affect readiness and equipment availability and reliability.

The committee is aware of new technologies in the prevention of corrosion which can significantly reduce high corrosion costs and improve readiness. The committee urges the Department to establish specific corrosion control vehicle service centers that could professionally apply and test all new corrosion control technologies currently available and provide solutions to the military departments as soon as possible. As funding for replacement vehicles continues to be scarce, the committee believes that all efforts must be taken to extend the service life of existing vehicles.

Department of Defense Dependent Schools

The committee firmly believes that high quality dependent schools are an important element of military family quality of life. Indeed, the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–561) requires that Department of Defense Dependent Schools (DODDS) provide "an education of high quality," and the committee recommends funding of over $1.3 billion for these schools in fiscal year 2000. Additionally, the committee strongly supports impact aid payments to school districts in the United States which teach large numbers of military children, and the committee regularly supplements these payments from Department of Defense funding. The committee, however, was dismayed to hear testimony this year from several sources critical of DODDS education. In view of that testimony, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review and assessment of the quality of the primary and secondary schooling provided by the DODDS program. The following factors, as well as other relevant issues, should be included in the review and assessment: student-teacher ratio; adequacy of size and quality of teaching staff; student performance as measured by standardized tests and other indicators; after school and extra-curricular activities; availability of advanced placement programs; vocational training opportunities; and parent satisfaction. The Secretary should provide this report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2000.

Excess Military Property for Law Enforcement Agencies

The committee is aware that not all excess military property is available for transfer to law enforcement agencies under the program established in section 2576a of title 10, United States Code. Specifically, materials that have been requested by law enforcement agencies which are intended to enhance the training and safety of law enforcement officers have been denied because they were considered construction materials. The committee notes that section 2576a requires the Secretary of Defense to determine if materials under this program are suitable for use by the agencies in law enforcement activities. However, the committee believes that the Department should consider materials that would improve training and safety for transfer under this program. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to modify its policy regarding the types of equipment and materials made available in so far as they meet reasonable guidelines set forth in section 2576a. Further, the committee urges the Department to make every effort to satisfy requests for materials intended to improve the training and safety programs of law enforcement agencies directly related to the support of law enforcement activities.

Home Schooled Children Overseas

The committee believes that military families who decide to home school their children should be supported by Department of Defense Overseas Schools (DODDS) to the extent possible. While the committee agrees that a commander's responsibility to manage an overseas community and a family's obligation to observe host nation laws render home schooling overseas more challenging than when conducted in the United States, the committee supports responsible school choice for military families. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense Education Activity (DODEA) claims that it fully supports home schooling. DODEA's published material and the actual experience of some parents belie that claim, however. The committee believes that DODEA should take a more proactive approach in establishing a clear policy and providing parents information about available DODEA support for home schooling overseas, rather than merely directing parents to the overseas commander. To that end, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop clear policy on support for home schooling overseas. That policy, which would officially implement what DODEA representatives state is actual practice, should specify that home schooled students may be supported with library services, music, sports, single classes, and other programs without having to actually enroll in DODDS. The committee directs the Secretary to provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services with the new policy directive by October 1, 1999.

Information Systems Security Education

The increasing dependence by the Department of Defense on computers and computer communications has also increased the vulnerability of attacks on these information systems. This threat to a national critical infrastructure mandates the fostering and on-

going support of well educated professionals that are able to protect our critical information system. The President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection completed a two-year study that concluded, in part, that a significant portion of the nation's infrastructure protection is tied to the development of information security professionals.

The committee is aware that, although there are several postgraduate level educational programs currently available for advanced training in this area, there are no doctorate level programs currently available. The committee believes that the development of a doctoral program in information security is required to provide a flow of individuals with the knowledge and credentials to support the expanding needs of the Department. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to review requirements for doctorate level information systems security professionals within the Department and, if appropriate, consider sponsoring the establishment of doctorate level education programs in educational institutions capable of providing this level of training.

Joint Warfare Analysis Center

The committee is aware that the Joint Warfare Analysis Center (JWAC), a subordinate to the Commander in Chief, Atlantic Command, is currently underfunded in the budget request due to a significant increase in its currently assigned workload. The JWAC, which assess effects of targeting, and provides planning support to the Joint Staff and all Unified Commanders, has nearly doubled its workload due to new, conventional warfare taskings, not envisioned in the original charter for special access programs. The committee is concerned that the present employees assigned to JWAC may be on the verge of early burnout primarily because of a shortage of highly skilled technical employees. Increases in manpower have been caused by the military services growing involvement in contingency operations.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for the JWAC and urges the Secretary of Defense to adequately fund this important activity in the future. The committee expects the Secretary of the Navy, who is the executive agent for resources for this activity, to allocate these additional funds in the appropriate accounts within the JWAC.

Military Affiliate Radio System

The committee reiterates its prior support for the Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS) and the civilian amateur radio operators who provide the Department of Defense (DOD) with an auxiliary means of communications in the event of a local, national, or international emergency. However, the committee is concerned that the benefits of this volunteer communications service are not fully appreciated or utilized by the Department.

In its December 31, 1996 report to the committee on the MARS program, the Secretary of Defense emphasized, "there is no requirement for a change in the MARS mission." Although its main mission is to provide emergency communications support, MARS has been a valuable system for relaying morale and welfare mes-

sages between U.S. service personnel stationed abroad and their families in the United States. This system has operated at virtually no cost to the Department. As the number, scope, and pace of contingency operations in which the United States participates—including peacekeeping operations—continues to grow, the committee encourages the Department to support, where feasible, the deployment of a MARS capability to contingency theaters in order to provide an auxiliary communications means for the use of service personnel. In light of reports that DOD communications networks in Europe are being augmented and improved in connection with the U.S. and NATO military campaign against Yugoslavia, the committee believes that MARS can play an important role in support of the military and humanitarian operations being conducted in support of this mission.

The committee is aware of other existing communications arrangements—including the Defense Switching Network, Mobile Subscriber Equipment, commercial carriers, and e-mail—which have been made available to U.S. troops for morale traffic purposes during limited periods of time. However, the committee notes that these alternate systems may not always be available and may result in out-of-pocket costs to the users. The committee also encourages the Department to make greater efforts to inform U.S. military personnel of the availability of the MARS service.

Tugboat Operations

The committee is aware of the Department of the Navy's initiative to outsource its tugboat capability. The Committee is also aware that private contractors who perform the tugboat mission in peacetime must agree that if they are unwilling to perform this mission during times of emergency, they must relinquish command and control of their tugboats to the Department of Defense to permit the Department to respond to the emergency situation. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide to the House Committee on Armed Services, by February 1, 2000, an assessment of the Department of the Navy's current capability and plan to provide fully trained and qualified military personnel to operate contractor vessels if required.

Urban Warfare Training

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense and the military services are not placing sufficient emphasis on urban warfare training, and believes that recent military operations and deployments to Somalia and Bosnia underscore the need to increase training in urban environments. Over the years, battles across the world have moved from open fields and jungles to city streets and urban areas. As this trend continues, the need for a comprehensive training plan and dedicated operations funding to implement urban training becomes more important. The committee believes that U.S. military forces must be prepared to fight all challenges in the future. Meeting that goal requires dedicated planning and operational funding for urban warfare training.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by Janu-

ary 31, 2000, on the current and proposed efforts to provide urban warfare training for military personnel. Specifically, the report shall include:

(1) Current and proposed plans to provide urban warfare training in each of the military services;

(2) Current capabilities available to train personnel to fight in urban environments; and

(3) Proposed operations funding required to conduct urban warfare training and the priority given to this training within the DOD Five Year Budget plan.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize $1,056.4 million in operations and maintenance funding for the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense.

Section 302—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize $525.0 million for Working Capital Funds of the Department of Defense.

Section 303—Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $68.295 million from the Armed Forces Retirement Trust Fund for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, including the U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home and the Naval Home.

Section 304—Transfer From National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer not more than $150.0 million from the amounts received from sales in the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund to the operation and maintenance accounts of the military services.

Section 305—Transfer to Defense Working Capital Funds to Support Defense Commissary Agency

This section would transfer funding for the Defense Commissary Agency (DECA) from the military services' operations and maintenance accounts into the Defense Working Capital Fund. The committee reminds the Secretary of Defense that section 361 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) requires that DECA be funded through the Office of the Secretary of Defense and not through the military services. The budget request proposed to return the funding of DECA to the military services, without supporting rationale or request for legislative relief. The committee notes that intense competition for operations and maintenance funding throughout the military services could jeopardize the commissary benefit if the funding were left in the

military service accounts and insists that the Secretary of Defense fund DECA through Defense wide accounts as required by law.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 311—Reimbursement of Navy Exchange Service Command for Relocation Expenses

This section would authorize $8.7 million for reimbursement to the Navy Exchange Service Command (NEXCOM) for costs incurred in connection with the relocation of NEXCOM headquarters to Virginia Beach, Virginia, and for the lease of headquarters space.

Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions

Section 321—Remediation of Asbestos and Lead Based Paint

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to use Army Corps of Engineers indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts for the remediation of asbestos material and lead based paint. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense's current process of asbestos and lead paint abatement is wasting scarce readiness funds. The Department is not utilizing existing and competitively awarded Army Corps of Engineers IDIQ contracts to cover such work. Instead, the Department regularly issues contract change orders to cover unanticipated remediation problems, paying significantly higher rates.

Subtitle D—Performance of Functions by Private-Sector Sources

Section 331—Expansion of Annual Report on Contracting for Commercial and Industrial Type Functions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress with a report on the number of work-year equivalents performed by private sector employees who provide services under contract to the Department of Defense, as well as the total dollar value of these services. The section would also require the Department to categorize the information to be included in the report by federal supply class or service code, the appropriation from which the contracts for the services were funded, and the major organizational element of the military department acquiring the services.

Section 332—Congressional Notification of A–76 Cost Comparison Waivers

This section would require the Department of Defense or any of the military services to notify Congress when the procedure set forth in Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A–76 for commercial activities is waived. The committee is aware that the Department and the military services may grant waivers to the procedures of OMB Circular A–76 for commercial activities. Although current law does not require that an A–76 study be performed, the committee believes that the Congress should be noti-

fied when the Department or the military services waive this procedure.

Section 333—Improved Evaluation of Local Economic Effect of Changing Defense Functions to Private Sector Performance

This section would change the requirement for the Department of Defense to provide the Congress with an analysis of the impact of converting a government-performed function to a contractor-performed function if more than 50 DOD employees would be involved, rather than the current requirement of 75 employees. As the Department analyzes whether to convert a government performed function to a contractor performed function, the committee believes that it is important to understand the effect the change will have on the local economy and community.

Section 334—Annual Report on Expenditures for Performance of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair Workloads by Public and Private Sectors

This section would amend section 2466(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to expand the amount of information currently provided to Congress detailing the amount of depot-level maintenance and repair work that is accomplished in the public and the private sector.

Section 335—Applicability of Competition Requirement in Contracting Out Workloads Performed by Depot-Level Activities of Department of Defense

This section would amend section 2469(b) of title 10, United States Code, in order to clarify that the cost of labor and materials is to be used when determining the value of workload that would require a competition if it were to be moved from a public depot.

Section 336—Treatment of Public Sector Winning Bidders for Contracts for Performance of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair Workloads Formerly Performed at Certain Military Installations

This section would amend section 2469(a) of title 10, United States Code, to reduce reporting requirements and management at Department of Defense industrial facilities which are performing work awarded under a public-private competition.

Section 337—Process for Modernization of Computer Systems at Army Computer Centers

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to provide the Department of Defense civilian employees at the Logistics Systems Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri, and the Industrial Logistics Systems Center in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, with the opportunity to establish a most efficient organization for the purpose of establishing a partnership with a private sector entity selected to develop and implement new computer systems at these locations. The purpose of this most efficient organization would be to ensure that the current computer systems remain operational to meet the

needs of the Army until replacement computer systems are fully operational and successfully evaluated.

Section 338—Evaluation of Total System Performance Responsibility Program

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to Congress that would identify all Air Force programs that are currently managed or presently planned to be managed under the Total System Performance Responsibility Program (TSPR). The TSPR program is an emerging Air Force acquisition and support strategy designed to place increased responsibility, accountability, and authority for the performance of a specific weapons system or equipment item in the hands of a single manager. In addition, the report would include a determination whether or not the TSPR program would support core maintenance capabilities.

The committee is concerned that the Air Force has chosen an ill-defined and unclear policy to support important weapons systems. While the TSPR program intends to streamline and comprehensively integrate the sustainment responsibility for weapons systems, the committee is concerned that this sustainment concept has not sufficiently taken into account the long-term implications for privatizing the sustainment support for major weapons systems or the implication on the readiness and war fighting capabilities of the Air Force.

Section 339—Identification of Core Logistics Capability Requirements for Maintenance and Repair of C–17 Aircraft

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report, not later than February 1, 2000, to Congress that would identify the core logistics capability requirements for depot-level maintenance and repair for the C–17 aircraft. The section would preclude the Secretary of the Air Force from extending the contract for the C–17 aircraft Flexible Sustainment Program until 60 days after the report is received by Congress. In addition, the provision would require the General Accounting Office to review the report once it is submitted and report to Congress with an evaluation of the report and other related issues.

The committee continues to believe that maintaining an in-house depot maintenance capability is critical for mission essential systems and for other maintenance where it is shown to be more cost effective. Section 351 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) required the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan detailing the core logistics capabilities of the C–17 aircraft. The committee believes that the report submitted by the Department did not adequately respond to the requirements of section 351. The Department of the Air Force has stated that the core requirements for the C–17 aircraft will not be considered until 2002, 8 years after the C–17, a key mission essential unique aircraft, achieves initial operational capability. The committee notes that section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, requires that the core logistics capabilities for mission essential

weapons systems are to be established not later than four years after a weapons systems achieving initial operational capability.

Subtitle E—Defense Dependents Education

Section 341—Assistance to Local Education Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would authorize $35.0 million for educational assistance to local education agencies where the standard for the minimum level of education within the state could not be maintained because of the large number of military connected students. This section would also modify the procedures used to distribute funds to local education agencies in order to speed a process much delayed by legal and policy impediments. The operation of current policy, which is intended to ensure less prosperous local education agencies receive their fair share of these funds, actually causes these districts to receive less funding than intended. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the policy by which funds are distributed to local education agencies and make adjustments necessary to ensure that funds are distributed equitably and expeditiously. The committee's commitment to military children has provided much needed boosts to the education of military children around the country. Even so, the committee notes that the Department of Education impact aid program provides supplementary funds to eligible school districts nationwide, and believes that the Department of Education bears the principal responsibility for providing support for the education needs of the nation's children.

Section 342—Continuation of Enrollment at Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools

This section would permit a student who is enrolled in his or her junior year at a Department of Defense domestic secondary school to complete the student's senior year at that same school even if the student would be otherwise ineligible to attend the school because of a change in the status of the student's sponsor. With few exceptions, students whose sponsors move away from the installation or complete their military or civilian service cannot remain in a Department of Defense domestic school for completion of their senior year. This provision would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to make exceptions for the completion of high school. The committee notes that the Secretary would retain the authority to disenroll these students for good cause, and would expect that students completing their high school career separated from their parents under this provision would remain productive, disciplined members of their respective senior classes.

Section 343—Technical Amendments to Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments to the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (title XIV of Public Law 95–561).

SUBTITLE F—MILITARY READINESS ISSUES

Section 351—Independent Study of Department of Defense Secondary Inventory and Parts Shortages

Since 1990, the General Accounting Office (GAO) has identified the Department of Defense's (DOD) management of secondary inventories as a high-risk area because levels of inventory are too high and management systems and procedures are ineffective. GAO has also reported that: approximately 60 percent of the Department's inventory exceeds current requirements the accuracy of inventory requirements is questionable; the Department lacks adequate visibility over operating materials and supplies; and the Department has been slow in adopting best management practices in this area. In response to GAO reports, the Department has asserted that much of its current inventory is needed to support operations or that it is economically prudent to retain in stock.

In testimony before the committee, the military departments testified that due to a lack of funding, in part, significant spare part shortages exist and continue to have a negative impact on readiness. The committee is concerned that the cost to store large quantities of old and inactive secondary supply items limits funding that could be used to purchase parts that would improve readiness by reducing maintenance times and increasing mission capable rates. The committee believes that an analysis of the Department's secondary inventory and parts shortages should be conducted to identify the actual causes and the extent of parts shortages, as well as to determine the impact on current readiness.

Therefore, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide for an independent analysis of current secondary inventory levels, including wholesale and retail inventories. This analysis should determine how much of DOD inventory, retained for economic, contingency, and potential reutilization over the past five years, has actually been used, and how much should be classified as excess to the Department's needs. The analysis would also include recommendations that the Department should consider for the disposal or other disposition of excess inventory. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to review the results of the independent analysis and provide to the Congress an assessment of the analysis. In addition, the Secretary of Defense would be required to provide to the Congress a plan that would address:

(1) The elimination of excess inventory;

(2) The issues of inactive inventory;

(3) Chronic part shortages; and

(4) Recommendations for improvement to the department-wide inventory management system.

Section 352—Independent Study of Adequacy of Department Restructured Sustainment and Reengineered Logistics Product Support Practices

Based on extensive testimony received and from visits to the field, the committee is aware of severe and chronic spare parts shortages in all services. For instance, the Air Force has testified that fighter squadrons are deploying with less than 50 percent of

the deployment parts needed to sustain themselves. Repair parts stocks are at extremely low levels throughout the military services. The committee understands that the ability of U.S. forces to successfully conduct a large, focused air campaign and other relatively small contingency type operations, actually masks the difficulty of sustaining a force capable of fighting two major regional contingencies. The committee has heard from the military services that they are increasingly resorting to cannibalization of equipment for repair parts to sustain ongoing operations, which increases costs in terms of equipment and manpower. Based on testimony by the service chief's concerning their current and future unfunded requirements, and the current high pace of military contingency operations, the committee is concerned that national emergency sustainment stocks may not currently exist, and there may not be sufficient funding in the future years defense budget projections for sufficient stocks to be purchased.

The committee understands that the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) currently has funding authority sufficient to meet only 85 percent of expected yearly requisitions. This equates to nearly 300,000 requisitions each year being refused or placed on "back order" until funding is provided. During a time of national emergency, it is expected that parts will be made available when it comes time to mobilize. Based in part by the current high use of parts due to contingency operations in the Balkans, particularly aviation parts, the committee has little confidence that there will be sufficient stocks of parts and supplies to support the necessary mobilization for one major theater war much less the two required by the National Military Strategy.

Department of Defense agencies and the service components are all working hard to use better business practices to sustain logistical support to operational units. The committee commends these efforts to cut costs and become more efficient but has concerns that these practices are driven by funding constraints without adequate consideration of the operational units' needs during war.

Therefore, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide for an independent study of the Department's current efforts to restructure sustainment of required inventory and the impact these efforts will have on the logistics community's ability to provide adequate logistical support during the conduct of two major theater wars.

Section 353—Independent Study of Military Readiness Reporting System

This section would provide for an independent study of requirements for a comprehensive readiness reporting system for the Department of Defense. The Secretary of Defense was directed to establish such a system by section 117 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 373 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). The committee is concerned by the Department of Defense's delays in implementing provisions of the law, and believes that there is a need for an independent study to provide a benchmark against which to

measure the Department of Defense's efforts at reform of the readiness reporting system.

As indicators of declining readiness increase, the urgency for an improved readiness reporting system, capable of measuring the complex variety of factors that influence unit readiness, also has increased. In fact, even had the Department of Defense implemented the provisions of the law in a timely way, the committee believes an independent assessment of the requirements for such a readiness reporting system is warranted. The committee has been discouraged to learn that bureaucratic intransigence, opposition to reform, and the persistence of outmoded practices are placing the prospects for improving the readiness reporting system in doubt.

Section 354—Review of Real Property Maintenance and its Effect on Readiness

Based on testimony received by the committee, reports from the field, and other information provided, the committee is concerned that the backlog of real property maintenance has continued to grow with no apparent overall strategic plan for its elimination in the foreseeable future. The committee is encouraged that the Administration and the military service chiefs finally admit that there is a problem and recognize the need to stop the growth in the maintenance backlog. However, the additional funding included in the budget request would only stop the backlog from increasing but would not reduce the real property maintenance backlog.

This section would require the Department of Defense to assess what the impact of the continued lack of adequate funding for real property maintenance in all of the military services is having on readiness. The assessment should determine the funding required, by service, to eliminate the real property maintenance backlog, and to improve facilities to acceptable standards for optimum utilization to support readiness and quality of life requirements.

Section 355—Establishment of Logistics Standards for Sustained Military Operations

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish standards for spare parts and other logistics needs of deployable units of the armed forces in order to allow these units to sustain themselves adequately in performing their assigned missions. This section would further direct the Secretary of Defense to consider these standards when establishing the Department of Defense's budget, with the expectation that these standards will be considered as the minimum requirement for spare parts. Finally, the Secretary of Defense would be directed to include an analysis of the logistics and sustainment requirements of the armed forces in his annual report to the Congress.

The committee believes these measures are essential to improving the sustainment capabilities needed to execute the missions assigned to the armed forces under the National Military Strategy. Through its hearings and oversight activities, the committee learned that many units lack the spare parts and other logistics equipment required to conduct sustained operations, including the

combat missions assigned to these units by the theater commanders-in-chiefs in their war plans. In some cases, units currently expected to sustain themselves in a combat environment, under austere conditions, are reporting an inability to fully perform their assigned missions beyond a week to 10 days rather than the expected 30 days.

Absent a realistic reevaluation of the support standards required of units—matched by a sufficient level of funding for spare parts and similar needs—in the current strategic environment, the inability to adequately sustain deploying units in contingency and combat operations may prove to be a serious shortcoming for U.S. armed forces. The committee believes the Secretary of Defense must move rapidly to establish sustainment standards, provide sufficient funding to eliminate sustainment shortfalls, and quantify and highlight these standards in the annual report to the Congress.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 361—Discretionary Authority to Install Telecommunication Equipment for Persons Performing Voluntary Services

This section would provide the service secretaries with the authority to install telephone lines and necessary telecommunication equipment in the private residences of unit volunteer coordinators and pay usage fees. Currently, no such authority exists in law. Although the committee expects that service secretaries would exercise this authority sparingly and would apply appropriate control measures on the use of this equipment, the committee recognizes that selected volunteers have become critical links to maintaining communication between families and deployed units and vessels.

Section 362—Contracting Authority for Defense Working Capital Funded Industrial Facilities

This section would amend section 2208(j) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the requirements for working capital funded industrial facilities to manufacture articles and sell these articles to persons outside the Department of Defense.

Section 363—Clarification of Condition on Sale of Articles and Services of Industrial Facilities to Persons Outside Department of Defense

This section would amend section 2553(g) of title 10, United States Code, to define the term "not available" with respect to goods or services sold by Department of Defense industrial facilities.

Section 364—Special Authority of Disbursing Officials Regarding Automated Teller Machines on Naval Vessels

This section would amend section 3342 of title 31, United States Code, relating to disbursing officials check cashing authority to allow the Department of Defense to provide operating funds to automated teller machines (ATM) on naval vessels, and to accept for safekeeping deposits made through these ATMs to shipboard ac-

counts. The provision supports the Department of the Navy's "ATM-On-Line" and "ATMs-At-Sea" programs which will result in a significant quality of life enhancement for service members serving on navel vessels.

The committee believes that the Secretary of the Navy should evaluate the most efficient means to maintain and update the automated teller machines (ATM) necessary for the ATM-at-Sea program. This includes considering whether the banking industry, which benefits from this program, should pay a portion of the funds needed to maintain and update the needed ATMs on the Naval vessels.

Section 365—Preservation of Historic Buildings and Grounds at United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, District of Columbia

This section would permit the Chairman of the Retirement Home Board and the Director of the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home to apply and accept a direct grant from the Secretary of the Interior under section 101(e)(3) of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 United States Code 470a(e)(3)) for the purpose of maintaining, repairing, and preserving the historic buildings and grounds of the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home included on the National Register of Historic Places. The committee is aware that four buildings located on six acres at the Soldiers' and Airmen's Retirement Home in Washington, D.C. are included on the National Register of Historic places. Currently, amounts in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, which consists primarily of deductions from the pay of members of the armed forces, are insufficient to maintain, repair, and preserve these historic buildings and grounds.

Section 366—Clarification of Land Conveyance Authority, United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home

This section would clarify section 1053 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201), concerning the authorization for the United States Soldiers' and Airman's Home, located in the District of Columbia, to sell approximately 49 acres of excess land. The section would establish the specific manner, terms and conditions for the conveyance of this land by sale or lease within 12 months of enactment of the provision. The section would also preclude the conveyance of this excess property through any public/private partnership, and would give the Catholic University of America, located adjacent to the excess land in the District of Columbia, the right to match any bona fide offer received for the sale or lease of the property.

Section 367—Treatment of Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam in Defense Household Goods Moving Programs

This section would exclude the states of Alaska and Hawaii, and the territory of Guam from being included as points of origin in any test or demonstration program of the Department of Defense (DOD) regarding the moving of household goods of members of the armed forces. The provision would also establish Hawaii and Guam

as international destinations for the purpose of household goods shipments by the DOD.

MILITARY PERSONNEL OVERVIEW

In mid-1998, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Chiefs concluded that the Armed Forces were fighting, and losing, two-front war to recruit and retain sufficient people. That war continues today, and much of what is provided for in the military personnel titles of this bill is directed at reversing the losing fight.

On the retention front, all the services for several years have incurred unsustainable losses among pockets of highly qualified, experienced personnel. More recently, the most severe retention problems are in the Navy and the Air Force where officers, non-commissioned officers and enlisted persons across the force are leaving at rates that threaten the future viability of each service. In the Army and Marine Corps, although retention problems remain localized—principally among pilots—they are, nonetheless, of concern. Adding to the debilitating effects of the unanticipated losses of experienced personnel, the Army, Navy and Air Force also are encountering sharp increases above historical levels in the attrition of new personnel who fail to complete their first term of enlistment. As threatening as are the downward retention rates and increased attrition, military leaders within each of the services are even more concerned about their inability to develop responses to effectively reverse the trends. For example, no matter what the Air Force has tried, unacceptable pilot retention rates continue.

On the recruiting front, three of the services, beginning with the Army, then the Navy, and finally the Air Force, have failed, or expect to fail, to meet production goals for new recruits. Not only do these recruiting shortfalls exist among most of the active components, but they also are appearing among the reserve components—most notably in the Army and Naval Reserves. In addition, some sources of officer commissions, specifically Army and Air Force Senior Reserve Officer Training (ROTC) programs, are failing to produce the required numbers of new officers. Furthermore, despite compelling testimony from mid-grade enlisted leaders that the low quality of new recruits has already reached a level that threatens the readiness of the force, the civilian leadership within the services refuse to commit adequate resources to recruiting. Rather, the Army and the Navy moved to reduce their quality standards by enlisting fewer high school graduates; and some services continue to surface new strategies for reducing recruit quality. These trends alarm the committee.

As a result of continuing recruiting shortfalls and reduced retention, senior military leaders find themselves compelled to deploy forces to crises and contingencies at manning levels well below the 100 percent or better standard that heretofore had been their goal. With reduced manning levels among deployed forces, senior leaders are reluctantly accepting higher operational risks, reduced readiness, and increased stress on both deployed and non-deployed forces.

Reflecting the December 1998 commitment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense to address the retention and re-

cruiting problems in the services, the Budget request proposed a range of pay and retirement reforms, as well as new bonus and special pays authority, and increased funding for recruiting. The committee commends the Secretary and the Joint Chiefs for their forceful, public resolve to advocate for these reforms and initiatives. The Committee is convinced that without the unanimous support of these initiatives by the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary, they would not have been included in the budget request, nor politically supported by the Congress.

Using the pay and retirement reforms of the budget request as a starting point, the committee undertook an in-depth assessment of the underlying causes of the services' retention and recruiting problems in an effort to determine the adequacy of the Department's budget proposals.

With regard to retention the committee found numerous and complex factors that determined why people and their families either remain in the military or return to civilian life. Clearly, as emphasized by the proposed Department of Defense's pay and retirement reforms, dissatisfaction with military basic pay and retirement was found to be a factor influencing retention. However, the committee also found that the Department's proposals addressed only a narrow range of the actual pay and compensation concerns of service members. Based on what men and women, officer and enlisted, told the committee, further reforms were needed to help relieve the financial stress experienced by most enlisted personnel with families. Some flexibility and choice in retirement options was desired, including the option to participate in a thrift savings plan. They also sought improvements in their ability to afford adequate housing and to reduce out-of-pocket housing costs. Finally, service members' testimony made clear to the committee that enhanced bonus and special pays were a critical factor for many military personnel, not only as recognition of their training and skills, but also as a way to reduce the attractiveness of salary and bonus offers being made to them by civilian employers.

Notwithstanding the testimony the committee heard about the need for pay, compensation and retirement reform that was broader, more diverse, and more focused than that contained in the budget request, the committee also understood from that testimony that if the services were going to solve their retention problems, then a broad range of reforms outside those of military pay and compensation and retirement would also be required. For example, the committee repeatedly heard about the damaging impact on retention caused by unrelieved high operations tempo and the tension and disruptions to families resulting from the unpredictability of no-notice, last minute deployments. Equally damaging to retention was the corrosive effect on a highly professional military due to their inability, and the inability of their leaders to obtain the required resource to train and maintain themselves, their equipment and their units at a level of readiness they know is required to be successful in war. Such frustration, the result, in part, of significantly underfunded operations and maintenance accounts, will not be relieved by any amount of increased spending in the military personnel accounts.

With regard to the recruiting proposals contained in the budget request, the committee's assessment found an increased level of effort being made by each service to achieve recruiting goals. In general, the committee is pleased with the effort. However, given the current and growing interdependability of the active and reserve components, the committee is concerned that the budget request did nothing to address the recruiting shortfalls in some of the reserve components. The budget request neither did anything to correct the officer production shortfalls in the Senior Reserve Officer Training Program nor did it provide new ways to address manning shortfalls that exist in all the services.

Based on its in-depth assessment, the committee recommends a broad range of initiatives to address the retention and recruiting issues that are confronting the military services. These initiatives, which build upon and expand those proposed in the budget request, are reported in detail in the military personnel titles below. In summary, however, the committee recommendations contained in the military personnel titles:

(1) Directly and aggressively address many of the causes of recruiting and retention shortfalls, but balance the cost of addressing those problems against the reality that pay and retirement reform are only a part of what is required to improve recruiting and retention. Resources, in a constrained defense budget, must remain available this year and in subsequent years to address readiness and modernization, which also are keys to fixing recruiting and retention.

(2) Provide a 4.8 percent basic military pay raise, compared to the 4.4 per cent raise in the budget request; halt the growing pay gap for all by mandating that future basic pay raises are based on the full employment cost index (ECI), not ECI minus .5 percent; and provide targeted pay raises above 4.8 percent for mid-grade officers and non-commissioned officers, as part of a reform of the pay tables to ensure pay increases are tied more to promotion than to years of service.

(3) Reform the military retirement system by providing service members the option of choosing either the pre-1986 retirement, or remain in the post-1986 retirement system and receive a $30,000 payment at 15 years of service.

(4) Extend current pay and bonus authorities, create new bonus authorities, and expand recruiting and retention bonus and special pay authorities to address poor retention and shortages in specific skills. These skills include aviators, Navy surface warfare officers, Navy special warfare officers, Navy nuclear trained officers, reserve components critical skills, Air Force air battle managers, career enlisted flyers, linguists, divers, first-team members with families, and judge advocates.

(5) Reduce service member out-of-pocket housing costs by 3 per cent, and accelerate by three years the full implementation of new Basic Allowance for Housing rates, by adding $442.5 million to the services' military personnel accounts.

(6) Direct the Secretary of Defense to begin paying the Women, Infants and children (WIC) program benefits overseas.

(7) Maintain active end strength floors; provide $91.5 million to fully fund the Army National Guard and Army Reserve mili-

tary technicians requested in the budget; and increase by 800 the full time manning in the Army National Guard,

(8) Provide creative new ways to address the services' manning shortfalls by expanding the number of military retirees who can voluntarily return to active duty; authorizing the Air Force to test the use of voluntarily recalled retirees in critical staff positions, thereby returning aviators to flying duties; and delegating to the Secretary of Defense authority to waive, on a case-by-case basis, the requirement that military retirees forfeit a portion of their retired pay when re-employed in the Department of Defense.

(9) Eliminate the services' recruiting resource shortfalls by adding nearly $200 million to the budget request for both active and reserve component needs, and encourage state and local officials to provide military recruiters the same access to high school students that is provided to other prospective employers.

(10) Address the officer recruiting shortfall by adding nearly $24.0 million to the Army Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) funding, and increasing the monthly subsistence allowance paid to Senior ROTC cadets of all services from $150 to $200.

(12) Modify the framework for training and integrating reservists into the active force by providing adequate per diem to military technicians supporting contingency operations, authorizing recalled reservists to continue to hold civil offices for a full active duty tour, authorizing unit funding of housing during training tours, adding new options for active duty medical care for reservists, and authorizing reservists priority transportation when transportation options are limited.

(13) Attend to key retiree and veterans issues by guaranteeing veterans' burial benefits, providing retirement flags for reservists and all the uniformed services, restoring equity to widows entitlements, and directing that the Secretary of Defense pay severely disabled military retirees a monthly stipend to offset reductions in military retired pay.

(14) Continue the reform of Department of Defense pharmacy system.

The committee believes that these and other initiatives it is recommending will help to address the severe retention and recruiting challenges facing the military services. The committee also believes, however, that the severe retention and recruiting problems of the military services will not be solved by a one year's effort. Rather, several years effort, at least, will be needed to restore the manpower readiness of the armed services. Therefore, the committee strongly urges the senior military and civilian leadership of the Department of Defense to continue to advocate for the additional resources to sustain and win the two-front war of retention and recruiting. To that end, the committee pledges its support.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

This section would authorize the following end strengths for active duty personnel of the armed forces as of September 30, 2000.

Service	FY 1999 authorized and floor	FY 2000 request	FY 2000 committee recommendation	Change from FY 2000 request
Army	480,000	480,000	480,000	0
Navy	372,696	371,781	372,037	256
USMC	172,200	172,148	172,518	370
USAF	370,882	360,877	360,877	0
DOD	1,395,778	1,384,806	1,385,432	626

Based on a critical unfunded requirement identified by the Chief of Naval Operations, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million and 256 personnel over the requested end strength for the Navy. This additional funding and strength would preclude anticipated undermanning in naval underway replenishment ships. The committee also recommends an increase of 370 over the requested end strength of the United States Marine Corps to meet an unfunded need identified by the Commandant of the Marine Corps for additional guards at U.S. embassies. To support the increased manpower, the committee recommends an additional $6.6 million for the Marine Corps personnel account, and an additional $4.1 million for the Marine Corps operations and maintenance account.

Section 402—Revision in Permanent End Strength Minimum Levels

The committee believes that it remains necessary to retain end strength floors, not only because of a long-standing concern, reinforced by widespread testimony of witnesses appearing before the committee that forces are inadequate to support the national military strategy, but also because of the propensity of the services to accelerate manpower reductions to achieve savings, regardless of the actual manning requirements of the operational forces. This section, therefore, would amend section 691 of title 10, United States Code, to establish end strength floors for the active forces at the end strengths contained in the budget request.

In addition, the committee is disturbed to learn that the Army and Air Force are projected to end fiscal year 1999 with nearly

11,500 personnel less than required by the floor established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). In the case of the Air Force, the shortfall will significantly exceed the statutory flexibility. These shortfalls are illustrated below.

Service	FY 1999			Projected actual FY 1999 end strength	Change from FY 1999 floor
	DOD request	Authorized and floor	Floor with flex		
Army	480,000	480,000	477,600	478,050	−1,950
Navy	372,696	372,696	370,883	372,700	+4
USMC	172,200	172,200	171,339	172,200	0
USAF	370,882	370,882	369,028	361,331	−9,551
DOD	1,395,778	1,395,778	1,388,850	1,384,281	−11,497

These projected shortfalls are surprising since the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–262) provided the full funding requested by the Department of Defense to sustain active end strength at the requested levels. While continuing recruiting challenges contribute in part to the projected shortfalls, the committee believes that the fundamental cause of the projected fiscal year 1999 end strength shortfall is an inadequate commitment by the Army and the Air Force to sustain required manpower levels with adequate resources.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to ensure that future budget requests comply with the requirements of section 691 of title 10, United States Code, and provide the full funding required to sustain the active end strengths at the required levels. The committee estimates that because the active manpower will end fiscal year 1999 below statutory levels, there will be $152.9 million in fiscal year 2000 end strength underexecution savings that the committee has reallocated to support a range of high priority initiatives that were not included in the budget request.

Section 403—Appointments to Certain Senior Joint Officer Positions

Section 525(b)(5) of title 10, United States Code, provides a temporary exemption for general and flag officers who are serving in certain senior joint officer positions from being counted against the statutory limits on the numbers of three- and four-star general and flag officers. This section would make permanent the exemption which expires September 30, 2000. The section would also prohibit the use of the exemption from increasing the total numbers of general officers on active duty, and from increasing the numbers of four-star general officers by mandating that the exemptions be used to fill joint three-star positions that, without the exemption, would otherwise not be filled. Finally, the section would make permanent the requirement that each service secretary nominate a candidate to the Secretary of Defense to fill vacancies in four-star joint officer command positions. The current requirement expires on September 30, 2000.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for the selected reserve personnel, including the end strength for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves, as of September 30, 2000:

Service	FY 1999 authorized	FY 2000 request	FY 2000 committee recommendation	Change from FY 2000 request
Army National Guard	357,223	350,000	350,000	0
Army Reserve	208,003	205,000	205,000	0
Naval Reserve	90,843	90,288	90,288	0
Marine Corps Reserve	40,018	39,624	39,624	0
Air National Guard	106,992	106,678	106,678	0
Air Force Reserve	74,243	73,708	73,708	0
Coast Guard Reserve	8,000	8,000	8,000	0
Total	885,322	873,298	873,298	0

Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves as of September 30, 2000:

Service	FY 1999 authorized	FY 2000 request	FY 2000 committee recommendation	Change from FY 2000 request
Army National Guard	21,986	21,807	22,563	+756
Army Reserve	12,807	12,804	12,804	0
Naval Reserve	15,590	15,010	15,010	0
Marine Corps Reserve	2,362	2,272	2,272	0
Air National Guard	10,931	11,091	11,025	−66
Air Force Reserve	992	1,078	1,078	0
Total	64,668	64,062	64,752	+690

The committee recommends an increase of 800 active guard and reserve personnel (AGRs) in the Army National Guard to recognize a validated shortfall in Army National Guard AGRs. The increase reflects the committee's belief that such full time personnel make a direct contribution to the readiness of the selected reserve. Furthermore, the increase enhances the ability of the national guard to assist, supplement, and in many cases substitute for, the active components in meeting peacetime contingency requirements. To provide for the AGR increase, the committee recommends an increase of $26.0 million in the national guard military personnel accounts.

The committee notes that the budget request neither sought to increase the limit on the number of AGRs who can serve in assignments related to the weapons of mass destruction program (a limit imposed by section 511 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, Public Law 105–261), nor did the budget request provide the justification for such an increase that is required by section 511. For that reason, the committee's recommendation on AGR end strength does not recognize the 110 additional AGRs (44 in the Army National Guard and 66 in the Air National Guard)

included in the budget request to support new requirements connected with the weapons of mass destruction program. The committee looks 'forward to receiving the Department of Defense's subsequent request to justify the increase.

Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strength floors for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2000:

Service	FY 1999 authorized (floor)	FY 2000 request	FY 2000 committee recommendation (floor)	Change from FY 2000 request
Army National Guard	23,125	21,361	23,125	+1,764
Army Reserve	5,395	5,179	6,474	+1,295
Air National Guard	22,408	22,247	22,247	0
Air Force Reserve	9,761	9,785	9,785	0
Total	60,689	58,572	61,631	+3,059

The committee's recommendation for higher end strengths than contained in the budget request reflects the requirements of section 10216 of title 10, United States Code, that provides that military technician (dual status) end strength authorizations shall only be reduced in connection with military force structure reductions, and a recognition that in the Army Reserve all technician positions must be filled by military technicians (dual status).

The committee is disturbed to learn that, for the second year in a row, the Secretary of the Army, contrary to law, sought reductions in military technicians (dual status) that were not justified by force structure reductions. Moreover, the Secretary of the Army appears to have ignored the committee's admonishment, contained in the committee report on H.R. 3616 (H. Rpt. 105–532), that he ensure that future budget requests complied with the law when proposing reductions in military technicians (dual status). Such disregard for Congressional guidance is incomprehensible. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to report to the committee, by December 30, 1999, the reasons why the Army failed to comply with the law regarding military technician (dual status) end strength reductions, and to report the measures he has taken to prevent a reoccurrence of such a violation. In addition, the committee urges the Secretary of the Army to fully cooperate with the study by the Secretary of Defense that would be required by section 526 of this bill. The purpose of that study is to reform the Army's methodology and process for costing civilian personnel and technician requirements to ensure those requirements are fully resourced. Finally, in an effort to restore some of the military technician (dual status) funding and end strength shortfalls in the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve, the committee recommends an increase of $56.5 million to Army National Guard operations and maintenance accounts, and $35.0 million to Army Reserve operations and maintenance accounts.

Section 414—Increase in Number of Army and Air Force Members in Certain Grades Authorized to Serve on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize increases in the grades of reserve members authorized to serve on active duty or on full-time national guard duty for the administration of the reserves or the national guard. The provision would authorize 33 additional lieutenant colonels, 52 additional majors, 8 additional E–9s, and 32 additional E–8s in the Air Force. The provision would also authorize 33 additional colonels, 71 additional lieutenant colonels, and 22 additional E–9s in the Army. The committee believes these increases are necessary to support the additional missions now being performed by the reserve components.

Section 415—Selected Reserve End Strength Flexibility

This section would permit the Secretary of Defense to vary by not more than two percent the selected reserve end strength authorized in a fiscal year for any of the reserve components.

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Authorization of Appropriations for Military Personnel

This section would authorize $72,115.8 million to be appropriated for military personnel.

This authorization of appropriations reflects both reductions and increases to the President's budget request.

[In millions of dollars]

	Military personnel accounts	O&M Accounts
RECOMMENDED INCREASES		
Active End Strength:		
Navy AOE–1 End Strength Buyback	5.0	.....
USMC Increased Security Guard Battalion Detachments End Strength	6.6	4.1
Reserve Component End Strength		
Army National Guard Military Technician Underfunding	.....	56.5
Army National Guard 800 Additional AGR's	26.0	.....
Army Reserve Military Technician Underfunding	.....	35.0
Compensation:		
4.8% Military Basic Pay Raise	156.0	.....
Overseas Military WIC program	2.0	.....
Accelerate Phase-in of New BAH Rates	225.0	.....
Buy-down Out-of-Pocket Housing Costs (3%)	217.5	.....
Adjust General and Flag Officer Pay Cap	1.0	.....
Judge Advocate General Career Continuation Pay	10.0	.....
Concurrent Receipt	45.0	.....
Army Recruiting:		
Enlistment Bonus	15.0	.....
Selective Reenlistment Bonus	21.4	.....
Advertising	.....	16.4
Recruiter Support	.....	15.5
Army National Guard Recruiting:		
Advertising	.....	18.0
Recruiter Support	.....	13.0
Army Reserve Recruiting:		
Non-Prior Service Enlistment Bonus	2.2	.....
Prior Service Enlistment Bonus	1.0	.....

[In millions of dollars]

	Military personnel accounts	O&M Accounts
Montgomery GI Bill—Selected Reserve Kicker	6.7	.....
Student Loan Repayment Program	1.5	.....
Health Professions Loan Repayment	15.9	.....
Retention & Transition Division Retention	1.9	2.6
Recruiter Support	.....	2.0
Advertising	.....	26.7
Naval Reserve Recruiting		
Enlistment/Reenlistment Bonuses	6.2	.....
Montgomery GI Bill Kicker	1.5	.....
Selected Reenlistment Bonus for Full-time Support	0.7	.....
Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship	3.9	.....
Additional Recruiters	5.2	.....
Advertising	.....	1.0
Recruiter Support	.....	4.0
USMC Recruiting:		
Advertising	.....	8.1
Recruiting Operations and Support	.....	1.0
Air National Guard Recruiting:		
Advertising	.....	4.1
Air Force Reserve Recruiting:		
Advertising	.....	1.5
Recruiter Support	.....	1.0
Senior ROTC: Increase Monthly Stipend ($150-$200) (Reserve Personnel Accounts):		
Army	5.9	
Navy	2.2	
Air Force	3.3	
Army Senior ROTC:		
Marketing & Advertising	.....	5.5
Scholarships	.....	15.0
Operations and Training	1.4	1.8
Junior ROTC:		
Army	1.4	2.0
USMC	.....	2.0
Air Force	.....	19.0
Defense Health Program:		
Waive CHAMPUS Deductibles for Dependents of Mobilized Reservists	.....	4.0
Start-up Cost for Trauma Center	.....	4.0
Navy Medical Equipment & Property Maintenance	.....	5.0
Automated Clinical Practice Guidelines	.....	5.0
Army Maintenance & Repair	.....	1.0
Other:		
International Student Program for Senior Military Colleges	.....	2.0
Retirement Flags for Reservists	.....	5.0
USMC Voluntary Education Tuition Assistance	.....	3.0
Total Increase	791.4	284.8
RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS		
Retirement Reform	392.0	.....
Active 1999 End Strength Underexecution:		
Army	31.9	.....
Navy	9.0	.....
Air Force	112.0	.....
USMC Reprogramming	16.0	.....
Innovative Readiness Training	.....	15.0
Total Reduction	560.9	15.0

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Backlog in Requests for Replacement of Military Awards and Decorations

The committee is aware of delays in fulfilling requests from veterans for replacement awards and decorations within each of the armed services. For example, the Army estimates the backlog for requests from veterans to be 98,000 going back over 2 years. The committee believes that our veterans deserve more timely responses to their requests.

The committee understands that the armed services are hopeful that new agreements authorizing the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) to verify entitlement of veterans to awards and decorations will expedite the process and eliminate backlogs. The committee desires to accelerate the recovery process and allocate the resources necessary to provide timely service to veterans.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments, to study the process by which veterans are provided replacement awards and decorations and determine what resources and procedures are required to provide veterans more timely responses. The Secretary shall submit a report with the findings and recommendations resulting from this study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2000.

Commissioning of Ms. Ella E. Gibson

The committee notes that when the First Wisconsin Heavy Artillery Regiment selected Ms. Ella E. Gibson to be their chaplain in 1864, the Army denied the request. Notwithstanding that disapproval, Ms. Gibson faithfully performed her duties as chaplain for the unit without pay. Although the Congress enacted private relief legislation in 1869 that provided her full pay and emoluments of a chaplain, she was never commissioned as an officer. The committee does not understand why Ms. Gibson was denied a commission that she appears to have earned.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review the request for Ms. Ella Gibson to be commissioned and determine if the request was properly disapproved and whether that disapproval would be sustained today. The Secretary shall submit a report with the findings and recommendations resulting from this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2000. The report should include the Secretary's judgment as to whether he possesses the authority and justification to commission Ms. Gibson a captain,

and any recommendations concerning the need for legislation to authorize a commission for Ms. Gibson.

Electronic Transmission of Certificates of Release or Discharge from Active Duty

The committee is aware that Certificates of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) are not transmitted by direct electronic means from the armed services to the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) or the Department of Veterans Affairs. Although procedures governing the preparation of the DD Form 214 authorize computer generation and electronic transfer of the DD Form 214, the armed services do not employ electronic transfer.

The committee believes that manual preparation and transmission of DD Forms 214 increases errors, wastes resources, and contributes to delays in the transmission of information vital to the welfare of veterans.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments, to study the electronic transfer of DD Forms 214 and determine the reasons why electronic transfer is presently not being implemented. The Secretary shall submit a report with the findings and recommendations resulting from this study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2000.

Enlisted Promotions

The committee is concerned that the inability of enlisted members to be promoted in a timely manner has become a disincentive for service members to remain in the military for a career. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments, to study enlisted promotion rates within the services. The study should include analysis of historical data, future projections, service promotion goals, and factors that influence promotion rates. The Secretary shall submit a report with the findings and recommendations resulting from this study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2000. The committee is particularly interested in recommendations for legislation to improve the timeliness of promotions.

Junior Reserve Officer Training Program (JROTC)

The committee understands from testimony provided by Department of Defense witnesses that 40 percent of the graduates of the JROTC program eventually join the military services. Although the committee understands that the JROTC program is not a military recruitment program and has no desire to turn it into one, the committee strongly believes that additional funding provided to the program will serve well the long term manpower interests of the Department of Defense. For that reason, the committee recommends an increase of $24.4 million for the JROTC program. The details of the recommended increase are contained in the report language for section 421 of this bill.

Merchant Marine Academy Midshipmen

The committee is aware that the Navy has begun to issue reserve identification cards to midshipmen at the Merchant Marine Academy. The committee believes that it is appropriate and beneficial for midshipmen to serve as members of the Naval Reserve while attending the Merchant Marine Academy. The committee hopes that the initial issue of reserve identification cards to midshipmen will be expedited and that future midshipmen will be issued reserve identification cards routinely when entering the Merchant Marine Academy.

Recruiting

The committee continues to be concerned that the services are not able to attract sufficient high quality recruits to maintain the quality force so critical to readiness. The committee recognizes that the services face a difficult recruiting environment. The lowest unemployment rate since the creation of the all volunteer force, higher college enrollments and reduced awareness of the advantages of military service have all contributed to a decline in the inclination for America's youth to choose the military as their first employer. As a result, the services must work very hard to remain competitive.

During the last two years, the committee has added over $300.0 million to recruiting operations, advertising and incentives. The committee asked the services to identify recruiting requirements not funded in the fiscal year 2000 budget request. To the committee's surprise despite long-standing, well-known, and continuing recruiting challenges that the committee believes should have been better anticipated, the services' recruiting programs are underfunded in fiscal year 2000 by $198.0 million. The size of this shortfall suggests that either the estimating process used by the services is highly inaccurate, or the services are only marginally funding, perhaps even underfunding, their recruiting efforts. In any case, the committee urges the services to take corrective action to ensure recruiting resources presented in the budget more closely match requirements. With regard to the fiscal year 2000 shortfall, the committee recommends increases, detailed in the report language to accompany section 421 of this bill, to eliminate the shortfall.

During the last two years, the services have reduced recruit quality standards. The Army and the Navy have reduced their respective goals for accession of high school diploma graduates. The Air Force and Marine Corps have experienced a steady erosion in the quality of recruits.

The committee believes that further reductions to recruit quality standards present a very costly and dangerous risk to military readiness. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments, to study the minimum quality standards established by the Department of Defense for new recruits and determine if those standards remain valid. The Secretary shall submit a report with the findings and recommendations resulting from this study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2000. If the Secretary determines

that a reduction in recruit quality standards is appropriate, the report should include a discussion of the implications of such a reduction for personnel training costs, retention, and force readiness.

The committee is concerned that the growth in funding allocated to recruiting advertising over the past three years has resulted in increased advertising competition between the services and a wasteful escalation in advertising costs. The committee is also concerned that the effectiveness of advertising programs has not been evaluated to confirm that advertising resources are employed in the most efficient manner possible. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments, to study the competitive nature of recruiting advertising and determine if advertising funds have been increased due to competition between the services. In this regard, the Secretary should examine the need to centrally manage recruiting advertising spending by the services to avoid wasteful competition. The Secretary should also review all advertising programs and confirm that each program is an efficient use of resources within the context of the total advertising budget in each service. The Secretary shall submit a report with the findings and recommendations resulting from this study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2000.

Senior Reserve Officers Training Program (SROTC)

The committee is concerned that the SROTC programs of two services are projected to fall short of their officer production quotas. The Army will miss its goal by 513 officers, or 14 percent, and the Air Force will miss its goal by 95 officers, or 4 percent. Such shortfalls are symptomatic of broad recruiting difficulties that exist across the military services. Within the SROTC program, the shortfalls appear to be related to two major issues: an inadequate subsistence allowance provided to students enrolled in the SROTC program, and insufficient resources for the Army program, especially with regard to scholarship funding. To help reverse the shortfalls, the committee recommends an increase from $150 to $200 in the monthly SROTC subsistence allowance, and recommends, as detailed in the report language for section 421 of this bill, an increase of $23.7 million for the Army SROTC program.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY

Section 501—Recommendations for Promotion by Selection Boards

This section would authorize at least one below the promotion zone promotion for warrant officer competitive categories where the entitlement to a below the promotion opportunity is calculated as less than one. The section would align warrant officer procedures with the procedures already in place for officers.

Section 502—Technical Amendments Relating to Joint Duty Assignments

Section 619a of title 10, United States Code, requires that an officer serve a full tour of duty in a joint duty assignment as a prerequisite to promotion to brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half). Section 619a also provided authority to the Secretary of Defense until January 1, 1999, to waive this requirement for some officers under certain conditions, and waived the requirement, until January 1, 1997, for nuclear propulsion officers. This section would amend section 619a to reflect the expired status of this waiver authority, but would retain the requirement that officers who received waivers before January 1, 1997 and January 1, 1999 must complete a full tour of duty in a joint duty assignment as a prerequisite for appointment to lieutenant general or vice admiral.

SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO RESERVE COMPONENTS

Section 511—Continuation on Reserve Active Status List to Complete Disciplinary Action

This section would authorize the service secretaries to retain a reserve officer in an active status until completion of a court-martial action.

Section 512—Authority to Order Reserve Component Members to Active Duty to Complete a Medical Evaluation

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, to order a reserve member to active duty to receive medical care, to be medically evaluated for disability or other purpose, or to complete a required Department of Defense health care study. The section would require the member to consent to the recall.

Section 513—Eligibility for Consideration for Promotion

This section would authorize reserve officers serving in an educational delay status due to government sponsored attendance at institutions of higher education to be made ineligible for promotion during the period of educational delay. The section would also authorize promotion nonselections to be expunged when nonselection occurred while the officer served in an educational delay status after October 1, 1996.

Section 514—Retention until Completion of 20 Years of Service for Reserve Component Majors and Lieutenant Commanders Who Twice Fail of Selection for Promotion

This section would authorize reserve officers with more than 20 years of service to remain in an active status for 6 months after being notified of their second nonselection for promotion.

Section 515—Computation of Years of Service Exclusion

This section would exclude time served in a college student commissioning status from the computation of years of service for reserve officers. The section would align the procedures used to com-

pute years of service for reserve officers with the procedures used to compute years of service for active duty officers.

Section 516—Authority to Retain Reserve Component Chaplains until Age 67

This section would authorize reserve chaplains in the Army and the Air Force to be retained 7 additional years to age 67 to address manning shortages in certain religious denominations.

Section 517—Expansion and Codification of Authority for Space-Required Travel for Reserves

This section would authorize reserve members to travel in a space required status on military aircraft between the member's home and place of reserve duty when there is no road or railroad transportation between those locations.

Section 518—Financial Assistance Program for Specially Selected Members of the Marine Corps Reserve

This section would reform the financial inducements used in the Platoon Leaders Class (PLC) program, the principal source for United States Marine Corps officers. As currently operated, a college graduate who completes the PLC program and is commissioned as a second lieutenant gets longevity credit, for purposes of calculating military basic pay, for the years spent in the PLC program. The new Marine lieutenant also incurs an 8 year service commitment, with at least 42 months of that time served on active duty. This section would abolish the longevity credit for lieutenants commissioned after the date of enactment. Instead, the Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to provide $5,200 per academic year for a maximum of three years to a college student enrolled in the PLC program who continues to meet certain prerequisites while in college, and who agrees to be commissioned with an eight-year service commitment, five of which must be served on active duty.

Section 519—Options to Improve Recruiting for the Army Reserve

The committee is concerned that the Army Recruiting Command, which provides new enlistees for both the Army and Army Reserve, will miss its Army Reserve fiscal year 1999 recruiting objectives by as much as 9,500 soldiers. Such a shortfall, if it occurs, would mark the second consecutive year that the Army Recruiting Command has failed to produce the required number of Army Reserve recruits. Reversing such trends is critical to the health of the Army Reserve. Consequently, the committee believes that an in-depth review of the Army's system of recruiting for the Army Reserve is required. This section would direct the Secretary of the Army to conduct such a review, to include examining, as a possible course of corrective action, whether the responsibility for Army Reserve recruiting should be placed under the control of the Chief, Army Reserve.

SUBTITLE C—MILITARY TECHNICIANS

Section 521—Revision to Military Technician (Dual Status) Law

This section would clarify section 10216 of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to military technicians (dual status), and extend the time from 6 months to up to 12 months that a person may remain employed as a technician in the Army and Air Force Reserve following loss of status as a military technician (dual status).

Section 522—Civil Service Retirement of Technicians

Beginning with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106), and continuing through the National Defense Authorization Act for 1997 (Public Law 104–201), and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), the Congress has given repeated direction to the secretaries of the military departments to transform the technician workforce. Among other objectives, the Congress directed the military services to make maximum use of military technicians (dual status) and to reduce the numbers of non-dual status technicians.

To that latter end, this section would require the retirement of retirement-eligible Army or Air Force Reserve military technicians (dual status) upon loss of dual status. The section would also establish procedures for the continued employment of certain non-retirement eligible technicians in the Army or Air Force Reserve who had been hired on or before February 10, 1996, as well as for the re-employment and separation of non dual-status technicians hired subsequently.

The section also would make a non-dual status technician in the Army or Air Force Reserve ineligible for a voluntary personnel action involving a military technician (dual status) position. The section would define "voluntary personnel action" as one involving the hiring, entry, appointment, reassignment, or transfer into a military technician (dual status) position other than the one occupied by the non-dual status technician; or promotion in grade in a current position, if the non-dual status technician occupies a position which the Secretary of the Army or Air Force, as appropriate, has designated as requiring a military technician (dual status). The section would take effect one year after the date of enactment of this bill.

The section would create a new early retirement criteria for any technician hired after February 10, 1996 who becomes a non-dual status technician. The new criteria would make a military technician (dual status) eligible for immediate retirement after completing 25 years of service, or after becoming 50 years of age and completing 20 years of service. The committee believes that such revised retirement criteria will help to ensure the sustainment of the youthful, vigorous technician force that will be required in the 21st Century.

The section would also permit Army and Air Force Reserve technicians who qualify for the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) to be provided a disability retirement—something that, heretofore, only national guard technicians under CSRS were qualified for.

Section 523—Revision to Non-Dual Status Technicians Statute

The committee recognizes that the national guard, as well as the Army and Air Force Reserves, require a limited number of non-dual status technicians to operate effectively. Therefore, this section would limit the total number of non-dual status technicians in the national guard to no more than 1,950 on and after October 1, 2001, and the total in the Army and Air Force Reserves to no more than 175, on or after October 1, 2007. If at any time after the effective dates the numerical limits are exceeded, the section would require that the Secretary of Defense take action to require the appropriate secretaries of the military services to immediately reduce the excess.

Section 524—Revision to Authorities Relating to National Guard Technicians

This section would amend section 709 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to employ non-dual status technicians in the national guard.

Section 525—Effective Date

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) required the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Congress by May 1998, a plan for the elimination of all non-dual status technicians by September 30, 2007. For reasons that the committee is unable to understand, the Secretary of Defense has failed to provide the required plan. This section would delay the non-dual status technician employment authority provided to the Department in sections 523 and 524 in this bill until 180 days after the Secretary of Defense meets the fiscal year 1998 requirement or provides an alternative plan for non-dual status technicians.

Section 526—Secretary of Defense Review of Army Technician Costing Process

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review, and if necessary direct revisions to, the procedures and processes employed by the Army to develop budget estimates of the required annual authorizations and appropriations for civilian personnel, and especially Army National Guard and Army Reserve military technicians (dual status).

Section 527—Fiscal Year 2000 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians

This section would establish numerical limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2000.

SUBTITLE D—SERVICE ACADEMIES

Section 531—Waiver of Reimbursement of Expenses for Instruction at Service Academies of Persons from Foreign Countries

Current law permits the Secretary of Defense to waive the full cost of attendance for international students admitted to the service academies, for up to 5 students at a time at each academy, and to waive up to 35 percent of the cost of attendance for all other international students. This section would increase the Secretary's authority by allowing the full cost waivers for up to 20 students at a time at each academy, and by permitting the waiver of up to 50 percent of the cost of attendance for all other international students.

Section 532—Compliance by United States Military Academy with Statutory Limit on Size of Corps of Cadets

Section 511 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1992 (Public Law 102–190) limits to 4,000 the authorized strength of cadets at the United States Military Academy, as well as the other service academies, for class years beginning after 1994. The number of cadets at the United States Military Academy has exceeded the authorized number since September 30, 1997. This section would require the Secretary of the Army to bring the academy into compliance with the law by the day prior to the graduation date of the first, or senior class, in June 2002. The section would also provide authority for the Secretary of the Army in 1999, 2000 and 2001 to vary the cadet end strengths from the statutory limit. The section would also repeal section 511, add the strength limitations of that section to title 10, United States Code, and require that compliance with the cadet and midshipmen strength limitations will be measured annually as of the day before graduation for each of the service academies.

Section 533—Dean of Academic Board, United States Military Academy, and Dean of the Faculty, United States Air Force Academy

This section would authorize the Dean of the Academic Board, United States Military Academy, and Dean of the Faculty, United States Air Force Academy to hold the rank of brigadier general. The section would also require that these two general officers be counted against and not increase either the statutory limits on the total number of general officers.

Section 534—Exclusion from Certain General and Flag Officer Grade Strength Limitations for the Superintendents of the Service Academies

This section would exempt officers while serving as the superintendents of the service academies, when serving in the grades of lieutenant general or vice admiral, from counting against the limits imposed by section 525(b) of title 10, United States Code. That section limits the number of generals and admirals serving above the grade of major general or rear admiral in each service to no more

than 15 percent of the total number of generals and admirals for that service.

SUBTITLE E—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Section 541—Establishment of a Department of Defense International Student Program at the Senior Military Colleges

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in furtherance of the objectives of the Department of Defense's existing international student and military-to-military programs' objectives, to establish and fund a program to facilitate the enrollment and instruction of international students at the Senior Military Colleges (SMC). The Secretary of Defense would also be authorized to underwrite, in whole or in part, the cost of the international students' attendance at the SMCs.

Section 542—Authority for Army War College to Award Degree of Master of Strategic Studies

This section would authorize the commandant of the United States Army War College, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, to confer the degree of master of strategic studies upon graduates of the college who meet the requirements for the degree.

Section 543—Authority for Air University to Award Graduate-Level Degrees

This section would authorize the commander of the Air War College to confer the degree of master of strategic studies upon graduates of the Air War College, and to confer the degree of master of airpower art and science upon graduates of the Air Command and Staff College.

Section 544—Correction of Reserve Credit for Participation in Health Professional Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program

Section 2126(b) of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to award reserve retirement credit to a person for time spent in an educational program under the Health Professions Scholarship Program (HPSP). This provision would amend that section by requiring a person to complete satisfactory service in the selected reserve in order to gain the retirement credit. In addition, the provision would repeal the authority of the Secretary to award years of service credit for the purposes of calculating military basic pay to a person for time spent in the HPSP.

Section 545—Permanent Expansion of ROTC Program to Include Graduate Students

This section would make permanent the authority of the service secretaries to provide financial assistance to graduate students who participate in a senior Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program. The current authority, which enabled the service secretaries to test the desirability and effectiveness of an ROTC scholarship program for graduate students, expires September 30, 1999.

Section 546—Increase in Monthly Subsistence Allowance for Senior ROTC Cadets Selected for Advanced Training

This section would increase the monthly subsistence allowance of senior ROTC cadets from $150 per month to $200 per month.

Section 547—Contingent Funding Increase for Junior ROTC Program

This section would require that any funds appropriated annually for the National Guard Youth Challenge Program in excess of $62.5 million would be provided to the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program.

Section 548—Change from Annual to Biennial Reporting under the Reserve Component Montgomery GI Bill

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the reserve component Montgomery GI Bill on a biennial basis in lieu of the current requirement to submit the report on an annual basis.

Section 549—Recodification and Consolidation of Statutes Denying Federal Grants and Contracts by Certain Departments and Agencies to Institutions of Higher Education that Prohibit Senior ROTC Units or Military Recruiting on Campus

This section would consolidate and recodify three provisions of law related to colleges and universities that prohibit senior Reserve Officers Training Corps units or military recruiting on campus.

SUBTITLE F—DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

Section 551—Waiver of Time Limitations for Award of Certain Decorations to Certain Persons

This section would waive the statutory time limitations for the award of military decorations to individuals who have been recommended for award of the decorations by the secretaries of the military departments.

Section 552—Sense of Congress Concerning Presidential Unit Citation for Crew of the U.S.S. Indianapolis

The committee believes that the courageous and skilled performance of the crew of the USS Indianapolis throughout World War II prior to the tragic sinking of the cruiser on July 30, 1945 is deserving of the award of the Presidential Unit Citation. From her participation in the earliest offensive actions in the Pacific in World War II, to her pivotal role in delivering the weapon that brought the war to an end, the USS Indianapolis and her crew left an indelible imprint on our nation's struggle to eventual victory.

Accordingly, this section would express the sense of Congress that the President should award a Presidential Unit Citation to the crew of the USS Indianapolis.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 561—Revision in Authority to Order Retired Members to Active Duty

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) severely curtailed both the numbers of military retirees that the Secretary of Defense might recall to active duty, as well as the period of time recalled retirees might serve. Having considered the current significant manning shortfalls in all the armed forces, the committee believes that an expansion of the Secretary's authority to employ additional recalled retirees is necessary. Therefore, this section would permit the Secretary to recall up to 150 retired officers to active duty, and permit a recalled officer to serve up to 36 months. The committee believes that judicious use of this expanded authority could provide each of the military services with critical manpower resources to help address personnel shortfalls.

Section 562—Temporary Authority for Recall of Retired Aviators

The committee is concerned that recent pilot shortages have caused vacancies in staff positions requiring aviation expertise. Accordingly, this section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to conduct a pilot program to recall to active duty officers with aviation expertise to serve in aviation staff billets. The section would authorize a maximum of 500 officers throughout the Department of Defense to be recalled to active duty during the period October 1, 1999 through September 30, 2002. The section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the results of the pilot program to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 31, 2002. The section would require the Secretary of Defense to include in the report his recommendation concerning extension of the authority.

Section 563—Service Review Agencies Covered by Professional Staffing Requirement

This section would clarify that the requirement for legal and medical professional staff specified in section 1555 of title 10, United States Code, apply to the Navy Council of Personnel Boards and the Board for Correction of Naval Records as if the staff of those organizations were combined.

Section 564—Conforming Amendment to Authorize Reserve Officers and Retired Regular Officers to Hold a Civil Office while Serving on Active Duty for Not More than 270 Days

This section would increase the number of days that reserve members and retired regular officers may serve on active duty and continue to hold a civil office from not more than 180 to not more than 270 days. The section would align the limit on the number of days that can be served on active duty while continuing to hold a civil office to the number of days that the President may call a re-

serve member to active duty under section 12304 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 565—Revision to Requirement for Honor Guard Details at Funerals of Veterans

Section 567 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) required the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to convene a conference to determine means of improving and increasing the availability of military burial honors for veterans, and to report the findings and recommendations resulting from the conference to the Congress. The section also required the secretaries of the military departments to provide, upon request, honor guard details for the funerals of the veterans comprised of not less than three persons with the capability to play a recording of Taps for funerals after December 31, 1999.

The conferees intended that the requirement to provide a three-person burial detail upon request of a veteran to be effective only if the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs did not recommend an acceptable alternative proposal in the required report. This section would implement the alternative plan submitted by the Secretary of Defense. The section would require the secretaries of the military departments to provide, upon request, honor guard details for the funerals of veterans. The section would specify that the honor guard details be comprised of not less than two persons with the capability to play a recording of Taps. At least one member of the honor guard detail would be a member of the same service as the deceased veteran. The Secretary of Defense would be required to establish procedures for coordinating and responding to requests for honor guard details, establishing standards and protocol, and providing training and quality control. The Secretary would also be authorized to provide financial support, material, equipment, and training to support nongovernmental organizations, as necessary to support honor guard activities.

The section would also provide incentives to facilitate the participation of reservists by providing retirement credit, reimbursement for transportation costs, and a $50 stipend to reservists who volunteer to provide funeral honors.

The Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments would be authorized to waive the requirements of this section only to meet the demands of contingency operations or other military requirements, and only after the Congress has been advised that a waiver has been granted.

The committee believes that the alternative outlined in this section would meet the high standard for providing appropriate honors to those Americans who unselfishly answered the call to arms.

Section 566—Purpose and Funding Limitations for National Guard Challenge Program

This section would clarify that the National Guard Challenge Program must consist of a 22-week residential program, and a 12-month post residential mentoring period. The section would also

expand the range of supervised work experience that Challenge students might experience, in addition to the community service work experience currently provided. Finally, the section would increase the limit on the annual amount of federal funds that can be spent on the program from $50.0 million to $62.5 million.

Section 567—Access to Secondary School Students for Military Recruiting Purposes

The committee strongly believes that military recruiters should not be disadvantaged, compared to other prospective employers, with regard to access to secondary school students. Therefore, this section would emphasize the committee's position by requesting that each local educational entity with responsibility for secondary school education provide military recruiters the same access to students as is provided to other prospective employers.

Section 568—Survey of Members Leaving Military Service on Attitudes Toward Military Service

Increasingly, the services are experiencing difficulty retaining career officer and enlisted personnel. In testimony before the committee, service personnel cited pay, reduced benefits, increased operations and deployment tempo, and a good economy as reasons they are leaving the military. The committee is concerned about the decreasing retention rates and feels it is imperative to get beyond the anecdotes contained in testimony to better understand the reasons for such trends. Therefore, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a one-time survey of military personnel leaving the services between January 1, 2000 and June 30, 2000 to determine military members' attitudes on a variety of subjects which may be affecting retention. Among the topics to be surveyed are: service members' attitudes toward civilian and military leadership, the effect of a constrained fiscal environment on the force, and military members' views on overall job satisfaction. The Secretary of Defense would be required to provide a report of the survey results to the Congress by October 1, 2000.

Section 569—Improvement in System for Assigning Personnel to Warfighting Units

This section would require the secretaries of the military departments to review the military personnel assignment system under their jurisdiction and identify those policies which prevent warfighting units from being fully manned. It also requires the service secretaries change or modify those policies in order to raise the priority of warfighting units in the manpower manning system and report on the changes to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2000.

The committee continues to be concerned about the shortage of manpower in combat units throughout the force. In almost every hearing held, service leaders told the committee that one of the most serious readiness problems facing the military was a lack of personnel in combat units. The committee heard testimony about aircraft carriers deploying with over 400 billets vacant. At the

Army's National Training Center, the opposing force commander testified that undermanned units participating in training rotations were not able to handle the high intensity scenarios and did not receive the maximum benefit from the exercise.

The committee is concerned that the service personnel systems do not make manning combat units a priority. The constant requirement to man billets in the supporting establishment and external agencies often means that combat units are not manned to the levels necessary for maximum combat effectiveness. The committee understands the importance of the services manning billets on the Joint Staff, recruit training battalions, drill instructor duty, White House support duty and other high-visibility, non-combat units. However, the committee also believes that the manpower systems should be modified so that combat units receive a higher priority in allocating critical manpower resources.

Section 570—Requirement for Department of Defense Regulations to Protect the Confidentiality of Communications Between Dependents and Professionals Providing Therapeutic or Related Services Regarding Sexual or Domestic Abuse

This section would require the Comptroller General to conduct a study of the policies regarding confidentiality between military dependents and their psychotherapists. The Secretary of Defense would be required to prescribe regulations to protect confidentiality 90 days after receiving the Comptroller General's report.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

The committee remains deeply concerned about the level of compensation provided to service members and their families. The committee believes that enhanced compensation, to include military retirement, is pivotal to reversing the negative retention trends that plagued the services as the drawdown of military forces came to an end. By spring of 1998, retention problems that had alarmed the committee since 1995 had developed into serious retention shortfalls that commanded the attention of senior military and civilian leaders in the Department of Defense.

The committee notes that the budget request included a number of initiatives that respond to the committee's previous recommendations for improving compensation programs to address the retention challenges confronting the military. The committee is pleased to support the following triad of major compensation initiatives that have finally been included in the budget request after years of delay:

(1) Full Employment Cost Index (ECI) pay raises.

(2) Pay table reform to recognize individual effort and increase retention.

(3) Reform of the military retirement system.

While the committee is generally impressed with the comprehensive compensation package included in the budget request, the committee is disappointed that the military pay raise was limited to 4.4 percent. Accordingly, the committee recommends that an additional $156.0 million be allocated to increase the pay raise to 4.8 percent.

The committee is also concerned that future pay raises remain sufficient to preclude further erosion of military pay when compared to pay raise trends in the private sector. Accordingly, the committee would require that future pay raises be calculated using the full ECI.

The committee recognizes that retention of a quality force requires a competitive retirement system. Accordingly, the committee would enhance military retirement and offer mid-career service members choices to give them more control over their retirement plan. The committee would also require the Secretary of Defense to examine tax deferred savings plan options that could be used to expand the list of retirement options available to service members in the future.

The committee recognizes that this bill does not address all military compensation concerns. However, the committee remains committed to improving the compensation programs that are critical to retaining a quality force. The committee hopes the budget request

reflects a new commitment by the Administration to properly support service members and their families that will be reflected in future budget requests.

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Tax Deferred Savings Plans

The committee believes that tax deferred savings plans offer the military services cost effective opportunities for enhancing retention that should be explored. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments, to examine the potential for implementing a variety of options for tax deferred savings plans as supplements and alternatives to current military retirement systems. The Secretary should consider options that include government matching contributions, time-delayed vesting schemes, and plans designed to increase retention within select segments of the force, to include those members with more that 20 years of service. For each of the options being evaluated, the Secretary should consider authorizing the participation of members of the reserve components. The Secretary shall submit a report with the findings and recommendations resulting from this study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2000.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Fiscal Year 2000 Increase in Military Basic Pay and Reform of Basic Pay Rates

This section would provide a 4.8 percent military pay raise effective January 1, 2000. This is four-tenths of one percent more than the pay raise called for in the budget request. To provide for this enhanced pay raise, the committee recommends an increase of $156.0 million over the amount requested in the President's request.

This section would also restructure the pay tables to reduce pay compression between grades, eliminate inconsistencies in the pay table, and increase incentives for promotion effective July 1, 2000. This section would also adjust the cap on military pay levels to level III of the Executive Schedule to bring the standards for maximum pay in line with the standards established for federal civilian employees.

Section 602—Pay Increases for Fiscal Years after Fiscal Year 2000

This section would require that the rate of military pay increases for fiscal years after fiscal year 2000 be calculated using the full Employment Cost Index. The committee believes it is critical that military members know that they can expect future military pay increases to keep pace with the rate of pay increases in the private sector.

Section 603—Additional Amount Available for Fiscal Year 2000 Increase in Basic Allowance for Housing Inside the United States

The committee is concerned that military families are not receiving sufficient reimbursement for housing and that many families are electing to live in less than adequate housing in an effort to save money. The committee has had a long standing interest in reducing the out-of-pocket cost of housing for service members to correct the problem. The committee was disappointed that the Secretary of Defense abandoned a multi-year strategy to restore out-of-pocket housing costs to the Congressionally established standard of 15 percent after just one year following its introduction in the fiscal year 1996 budget request. The committee continued the program for one additional year until the basic allowance for housing (BAH) program was reformed in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). Now that the new basic allowance for housing system is operational, the committee desires to resume a program to reduce out-of-pocket housing costs for military families.

The committee also desires to accelerate the schedule set by the Secretary of Defense for achieving market based BAH rates as required by the BAH reform legislation cited above. The committee believes that adopting the higher rates immediately will provide much needed relief to military families in high cost areas.

Accordingly, this section would increase the funding available for basic allowance for housing by $442.5 million. The committee recommends that $217.5 million be allocated for the purpose of reducing out-of-pocket housing costs for service members, and that $225.0 million be allocated to accelerate implementation of market-based BAH rates.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for health care professionals who serve in the selected reserve in critically short wartime specialties, the selected reserve reenlistment bonus, the selected reserve enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members of the selected reserve assigned to certain high priority units, the selected reserve affiliation bonus, the ready reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, and the prior service enlistment bonus until December 31, 2000. The provision would also extend the authority for repayment of educational loans for certain health care professionals who serve in the selected reserve until January 1, 2001.

Section 612—Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Nurse Officer Candidates, Registered Nurses, and Nurse Anesthetists

This section would extend the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, the accession bonus for registered nurses, and the incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists until December 31, 2000.

Section 613—Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Bonuses and Special Pays

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, reenlistment bonus for active members, enlistment bonus for persons with critical skills, Army enlistment bonus, special pay for nuclear qualified officers extending the period of active service, nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus to December 31, 2000.

Section 614—Aviation Career Incentive Pay for Air Battle Managers

This section would authorize air battle managers to be paid either aviation career incentive pay (ACIP) or hazardous duty pay under section 301(a)(11) of title 37, United States Code, whichever is greater.

Section 615—Expansion of Authority to Provide Special Pay to Aviation Career Officers Extending Period of Active Duty

This section would expand the authority to pay Aviation Continuation Pay (ACP) to aviation officers in grades below 0–7 through their twenty-fifth year of service. The section would also extend the $25,000 maximum annual amount of the bonus to all contracts, regardless of length.

Section 616—Diving Duty Special Pay

This section would increase the maximum amount of monthly pay for diving duty from $200 to $240 for officers, and from $300 to $340 for enlisted members. The section would also repeal the restriction limiting recipients of diving duty pay to one additional hazardous duty pay under section 301 of title 37, United States Code. Service members performing diving duty would be authorized to receive two hazardous duty pays under section 301 of title 37, United State Code.

Section 617—Reenlistment Bonus

This section would reduce the number of months of service required before reaching eligibility to receive a reenlistment bonus from 21 to 17. The section would also increase the formula for determining the amount of the bonus from 10 to 15 times the rate of monthly basic pay and the maximum bonus authorized from $45,000 to $60,000.

Section 618—Enlistment Bonus

This section would increase the maximum enlistment bonus authorized from $12,000 to $20,000 and authorize the payment of the bonus to be a single lump sum or periodic installments.

Section 619—Revised Eligibility Requirements for Reserve Component Prior Service Enlistment Bonus

This section would expand the eligibility for the payment of a reserve component prior service enlistment bonus to service members

who achieve a level of qualification commensurate with their grade and years of service following training or retraining in a critically short specialty skill.

Section 620—Increase in Special Pay and Bonuses for Nuclear-Qualified Officers

This section would increase the maximum amount of annual special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service from $15,000 to $25,000; the maximum amount of the nuclear career accession bonus from $10,000 to $20,000; the maximum amount of the nuclear career annual incentive bonus for officers who received naval nuclear power plant training as officers from $12,000 to $22,000; and the maximum amount of the nuclear career annual incentive bonus for officers who received naval nuclear power plant training as enlisted members from $5,500 to $10,000.

Section 621—Increase in Authorized Monthly Rate of Foreign Language Proficiency Pay

This section would increase the maximum amount of monthly foreign language proficiency pay from $100 to $300.

Section 622—Authorization of Retention Bonus for Special Warfare Officers Extending Period of Active Duty

This section would authorize the annual payment of a maximum retention bonus of $15,000 to special warfare qualified officers in the grades of 0–3 or 0–4 (not selected for promotion) for each year the officer agrees to serve on active duty from the sixth through the fourteenth year of service.

Section 623—Authorization of Surface Warfare Officer Continuation Pay

This section would authorize the payment of a maximum retention bonus of $50,000 in prorated annual payments to qualified surface warfare officers who agree to serve on active duty to complete tours of duty to which the officers may be ordered as department heads afloat. The section would require that officers must be selected for assignments as department heads on surface ships and must complete any service commitment incurred through the officer's original commissioning program before being eligible for the retention bonus.

Section 624—Authorization of Career Enlisted Flyer Incentive Pay

This section would authorize continuous payment of a maximum monthly incentive pay of $400 to enlisted members who serve in skills that require career-long operational flying duties. The section would require the service members to perform flying duties for 6 of the first 10, 9 of the first 15, and 14 of the first 20 years of aviation service up to a maximum of 25 years of aviation service.

Section 625—Authorization of Judge Advocate Continuation Pay

The committee has observed a growing problem in recruiting and retaining judge advocates in the armed services.

Accordingly, this section would authorize the service secretaries to pay officers serving as judge advocates a career continuation pay of up to $60,000 over the course of a career. The service secretaries would establish the payment schedules and amounts.

The section would also require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries concerned, to study the need for additional incentives to improve the recruitment and retention of judge advocates. At a minimum, the Secretary would be required to include in the study assessments of constructive service credit for basic pay, educational loan repayment, and federal student loan relief initiatives. The Secretary shall submit a report with the findings and recommendations resulting from this study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2000.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Section 631—Provision of Lodging in Kind for Reservists Performing Training Duty and Not Otherwise Entitled to Travel and Transportation Allowances

This section would authorize the use of operations and maintenance funds to provide lodging in kind to reservists performing active duty or inactive duty for training when transient government housing is not available.

Section 632—Payment of Temporary Lodging Expenses for Members Making their First Permanent Change of Station

This section would authorize the payment of temporary lodging expenses to enlisted members upon assignment to their first permanent duty station from the member's home of record or training installation.

Section 633—Emergency Leave Travel Cost Limitations

This section would expand the authority for members and dependents stationed overseas to return at government expense during family emergencies. In addition to providing transportation to the closest airport of embarkation, the section would authorize transportation to any airport in the continental United States to which travel can be arranged at the same or lower cost as transportation provided to the closest airport of embarkation.

SUBTITLE D—RETIRED PAY REFORM

Sections 641–644—Redux Retired Pay System Applicable Only to Members Electing New 15-Year Career Status Bonus

The committee is concerned that the retirement plan adopted in the Military Retirement Reform Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–348), commonly referred to as the Redux plan, is inadequate to attract mid-career members to remain in the armed services for a 20-year

career. The committee believes that a successful strategy to reverse current unfavorable retention trends must include a modification of the Redux retirement plan.

Accordingly, this subtitle would authorize members covered by Redux the option to elect to retire under the pre-1986 military retirement plan with the same cost-of-living adjustment mechanism used under the Federal Employees Retirement System, or to accept a one-time $30,000 lump sum bonus and remain under the Redux retirement plan. Service members who elect to accept the lump sum bonus would be obligated to serve the remaining five years to become retirement eligible.

The committee believes that providing members the option to select the cash bonus or the pre-1986 retirement plan is an effective way to restore the power of the retirement system as an important positive factor in the decision of service members to remain in the armed services.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER RETIRED PAY AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS MATTERS

Section 651—Effective Date of Disability Retirement for Members Dying in Civilian Medical Facilities

The committee notes that there have been cases where the benefits paid to survivors of members who die on active duty have been reduced because civilian medical facilities have determined a date and time of death that is different from that that would have been determined in a military treatment facility. The committee notes that military treatment facilities are sensitive to the increased survivor benefits derived when the member dies in retired status and will prolong life, when possible, to allow the member to be medically retired. This section would authorize service secretaries to specify a later time of death for disability retirement purposes for members of the armed services who die in civilian medical facilities. The section would require that the time of death determined by the service secretary be consistent with the time of death that would be determined if the member had died in a military facility. The section would require that the time of death determined by the service secretary not be later than 48 hours after the time of death determined by the civilian medical facility.

Section 652—Extension of Annuity Eligibility for Surviving Spouses of Certain Retirement Eligible Reserve Members

This section would authorize surviving spouses of reserve retirees who died prior to October 1, 1978 to receive the annuity authorized for surviving spouses by section 644 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). The section would align the entitlement provided to reserve surviving spouses with the entitlement provided to similarly situated surviving spouses of active duty members.

Section 653—Presentation of United States Flag to Retiring Members of the Uniformed Services Not Previously Covered

This section would authorize the presentation of a United States flag upon retirement to uniformed members of the reserve components, the Public Health Service, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The section would align the entitlement concerning the uniformed service members indicated above with the entitlement authorized for active duty members by section 644 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261).

Section 654—Accrual Funding for Retirement System for Commissioned Corps of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

This section would convert the present pay-as-you-go retirement system for the NOAA officer corps to an accrual accounting methodology. This would be achieved by integrating the NOAA officer corps retirement system into the military retirement system and requiring the Department of Commerce to make annual payments into the Military Retirement Fund representing the future cost of retirement for those officers currently serving in NOAA. The committee believes this initiative is a cost effective method to account for future retirement costs.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 671—Payments for Unused Accrued Leave as Part of Reenlistment

This section would authorize enlisted members to receive payment for unused accrued leave when reenlisting, regardless of the timing of that reenlistment.

Section 672—Clarification of Per Diem Eligibility for Military Technicians Serving on Active Duty Without Pay Outside the United States

This section would clarify that military technicians serving on active duty without pay while in civilian leave status, as provided by section 1039 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106), may be paid a per diem allowance in lieu of commutation for subsistence and quarters.

Section 673—Overseas Special Supplemental Food Program

Section 1060a of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide supplemental food benefits similar to those provided under the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program to members of the armed forces, their families, and civilian employees of the armed forces residing at overseas locations. The committee is disappointed that the Secretary has not elected to implement a supplemental food program at overseas locations.

This section would mandate that the Secretary of Defense implement the program and allocate Department of Defense funds to carry out the program. The section would require the Secretary of

Agriculture to provide technical assistance to the Secretary of Defense.

Section 674—Special Compensation for Severely Disabled Uniformed Services Retirees

This section would authorize the service secretaries to pay a monthly allowance to military retirees with service connected disabilities rated at 70 percent or greater. The section would authorize the payment of $300 a month to retirees with disabilities rated as 100 percent, $200 a month to retirees with disabilities rated as 90 percent, and $100 a month to retirees with disabilities rated as 80 percent or 70 percent.

Section 675—Tuition Assistance for Members Deployed in a Contingency Operation

This section would authorize members serving in a contingency operation and participating in an education program to receive full payment of tuition expenses under the tuition assistance program.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE MATTERS

OVERVIEW

For the past two years, the committee has worked aggressively to put into place a wide range of legislative authorities and demonstration projects designed to stop the erosion of health care benefits available to military beneficiaries. Generally speaking, the committee is pleased with the efforts undertaken by the Department of Defense to take advantage of these authorities or to implement directed changes.

The committee, however, is disturbed by the trend on the part of the Department to ignore Congressional report due dates. As a result, the committee is limited in its ability to address some of the Department's most vexing problems. The committee is particularly concerned that the Department failed to produce a required report on the redesign of the Department's pharmacy program by March 1, 1999. As a result, the Department's pharmacy program remains uncoordinated, potential savings are forfeited, portions of the beneficiary population remain underserved, and the Department's at-risk contractors continue to accrue unexpectedly high, and to date unreimbursed, pharmacy costs. The Department's failure to provide the required report in a timely manner notwithstanding, the committee believes strongly that the status quo approach to the TRICARE pharmacy benefit can no longer be tolerated. Therefore, the committee provides specific direction to the Department to begin improving the pharmacy system.

The committee also recognizes the need for some measure of stability in the dynamic and continually evolving TRICARE program. In the last two years in particular, the committee has directed the Department to initiate several important demonstration projects designed to improve access, control costs, or otherwise improve the management of the military health care system. These demonstrations continue apace. Other demonstration projects are nearing their evaluation phase and the committee awaits the prompt arrival of the reports on their performance in meeting the intended goals.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Automated Clinical Practice Guidelines

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is currently developing automated clinical practice guidelines which proactively present information to caregivers, measure guideline compliance and patient outcomes, and examine cost benefits. This collaborative initiative has identified diabetes management as its first focus of activity. Additional guidelines will be automated for clinical conditions with the potential to significantly reduce the cost

of military and civilian health care, and could substantially assist the Department's prevention and health promotion programs. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to provide for the funding of a collaborative automated clinical practice guideline program.

Defense Health Program Unfunded Requirements

The committee recommends the following increases to provide for unfunded requirements in the Defense Health Program: Army, $1.0 million for real property maintenance; Navy, $5.0 million for medical equipment and real property maintenance; and Air Force, $4.0 million for private sector care.

Report on Portability of TRICARE Prime Benefits

A common theme among military health services beneficiaries enrolled in the Prime option of the Department of Defense TRICARE program is the lack of portability of their TRICARE Prime benefits when they are temporarily out of their own TRICARE provider network area and must seek care from a different TRICARE contractor. While the committee appreciates the need for actuarial stability in the management of the TRICARE program, it is concerned that the Department has taken little action to remedy this problem. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report by March 31, 2000 to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on plans to improve the portability of the TRICARE Prime benefit for those enrollees who are only temporarily out of the TRICARE network in which they are enrolled, but need to exercise their TRICARE Prime benefits.

Report on Preventive Healthcare Services

The committee is encouraged by the Department of Defense's emphasis on Force Health Protection as a strategy for maintaining the health of its uniformed service members. These same strategies might help prevent many of the diseases and injuries experienced by other military health services beneficiaries and especially military family members. The committee is disappointed that the Department cannot clearly articulate the scope of preventive services programs available to military health services beneficiaries.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by March 1, 2000, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services which describes the scope of preventive health care benefits provided to all eligible TRICARE beneficiaries. The report should include a comparison of the Department of Defense preventive health service benefit to the preventive health service programs recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Family Physicians and the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. The report should also:

(1) Explain the Department's progress on implementing the "Put Prevention into Practice" initiative set forth in March 1998 for all military treatment facilities;

(2) Describe the programs in place and those planned for instructing the Department's health care providers on the preventive health services benefits available to TRICARE beneficiaries; and

(3) Describe the mechanisms for recording a beneficiary's receipt of age-appropriate preventive benefits, including electronic medical records, and any improvements planned for these records.

Study on the Effect of TRICARE Cost Sharing on the Financial Status of Enlisted Service Members in Pay Grades E–1 Through E–4

The committee is concerned that the cost sharing requirements of the Department of Defense TRICARE program may be creating or exacerbating financial burdens for some high risk military families. However, the anecdotal evidence the committee has received to date has not been supported by any serious analysis of this potentially significant problem. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2000, the report of a study on the effect of TRICARE cost sharing through annual deductible amounts and co-payments on the financial status of enlisted members of the armed forces in pay grades E–1 through E–4. At a minimum, the study should address:

(1) Whether it costs more to administer the system of co-pays for the E–4 and below population than the collected revenues from these co-pays themselves generate;

(2) The effect on demand for health care services if cost shares were reduced or eliminated for enlisted personnel and their families in pay grades E1 to E4;

(3) The extent to which E–4s and below with family members are at greater risk for financial problems as a result of these cost sharing arrangements than other similarly ranked enlisted personnel without families;

(4) The extent to which the Department of Defense uses grade-differentiated payments for other, non-health care services;

(5) The number of E4's and below on food stamps and whether relief from cost sharing arrangements would reduce that number; and

(6) Programs the services employ to assist financially at risk families with paying the cost sharing associated with use of some TRICARE services.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Section 701—Provision of Health Care to Members on Active Duty at Certain Remote Locations

This section would expand the provisions of the Department of Defense TRICARE Remote program by allowing active duty service members assigned to duties in areas remote from military treatment facilities to receive care from designated providers.

Section 702—Provision of Chiropractic Health Care

The chiropractic health care demonstration program being conducted by the Department of Defense at 13 locations is scheduled to end September 30, 1999. This section would direct the Department to terminate the demonstration phase of the program, complete data collection and analysis, submit the report to the Congress as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). This section would also accelerate the date the report is required from May 1, 2000 to January 31, 2000. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Oversight Advisory Committee, established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337), shall be full participants in the collection and analysis of data and preparation of the final report. The committee expects the Department to make provisions for a minority report to be forwarded as part of its final report if the Oversight Advisory Committee deems it necessary. Additionally, this section would direct the Department to maintain, as a minimum, the current level and scope of chiropractic care services at the present locations until at least September 30, 2000.

This section would also direct the Secretary of Defense to prepare and submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2000, a plan to implement chiropractic health services throughout the military health services system beginning in fiscal year 2001 if this course of action is recommended in the final report on the Chiropractic Health Care Demonstration Project. The plan should also address other chiropractic service options the Secretary may recommend. The committee expects the Oversight Advisory Committee would be full participants in the development of the implementation plan.

Section 703—Continuation of Provision of Domiciliary and Custodial Care for Certain CHAMPUS Beneficiaries

The Department of Defense has conducted a wide range of health care demonstration programs under the general authority provided in section 1092 of title 10, United States Code. Since domiciliary and custodial care services are specifically excluded as covered benefits by section 1076 of title 10, United States Code, the Department has exercised this demonstration authority to experiment with alternate strategies for providing care to beneficiaries requiring those services. Based on the results of several demonstration projects, the Department has implemented a case management program which will provide for the medical management of most persons who need custodial or domiciliary care, while not establishing a de facto benefit currently excluded in law. This section would provide for the equitable treatment and protection of approximately 25 beneficiaries who have been receiving custodial care services through demonstration programs which are due to expire and who will not be eligible for that care under the Department's case management program.

Section 704—Removal of Restriction on Use of Funds for Abortions in Cases of Rape or Incest

Under current law, funds available to the Department of Defense may not be used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term. This section would include among the abortions funded by the Department those in which the pregnancy is the result of an act of forcible rape or incest which has been reported to a law enforcement agency.

SUBTITLE B—TRICARE PROGRAM

Section 711—Improvements to Claims Processing under the TRICARE Program

The committee received testimony from TRICARE contractors and the General Accounting Office (GAO) which highlighted significant provider and institutional claims processing problems. While the Department of Defense's claims processing contractors are doing a respectable job with small claims like those for pharmacy prescriptions, the larger and more costly claims from providers and institutions take too long to process and often result in questionable payments. This section would seek to correct such problems, and others, by directing the Secretary of Defense to implement changes to the TRICARE claims processing system recommended by GAO. The changes directed by this section would also bring TRICARE claims processing more in line with commercial best business practices and the procedures used by Medicare. Additionally, when contracts are re-awarded to other than the existing managed care support contractor, this section would require additional contract start-up time to ensure a smoother phase in of the new contract.

Section 712—Authority to Waive Certain TRICARE Deductibles

TRICARE eligible individuals and families are required to pay certain amounts each year before TRICARE begins sharing the cost of medical care. This payment, called the TRICARE deductible, is accumulated on an annual basis without regard to the amount of time spent on active duty by the sponsor. This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive the TRICARE deductible requirement for the families of guardsmen and reservists recalled to active duty for less than one year.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 721—Pharmacy Benefits Program

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) directed the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan by March 1, 1999, to the Congress that would provide for a system-wide redesign of the Department of Defense military and contractor retail and mail-order pharmacy system by incorporating "best business practices" from the private sector. The committee expected this report to describe how the Department intended to implement a uniform formulary for military medical treatment facili-

ties, TRICARE contractors' retail pharmacies, and the national mail-order pharmacy program. Moreover, and despite committee cautions against it, the Department proposed, as part of its fiscal year 2000 legislative proposal, extending Defense Acquisition and Purchasing Agreement prices to pharmaceuticals dispensed by the TRICARE contractors. In light of the Department's failure to produce the requested report on comprehensive pharmacy reform in a timely manner, the committee cannot agree to the Department's request. Unfortunately, the report did not arrive in time to serve any useful purpose to the committee this year. However, the Department has moved forward with installation of the Pharmacy Data Transaction Service. The committee is pleased with this action and looks forward to similar action on the other important parts of pharmacy reform including adoption of a uniform formulary for all elements of the military health system's pharmacy benefit. To that end, this section would improve the committee's ability to oversee the Department's pharmacy reform by requiring the Department to report periodically on its efforts to improve management of the military pharmacy system.

The committee is also disappointed to note that the Secretary of Defense did not fully comply with Section 703 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) which required a plan for redesign of the military pharmacy system. Within this redesign, the Secretary was to include a system-wide drug benefit for certain beneficiaries who were entitled to care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, and under Part A and Part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, otherwise known as Medicare-eligible beneficiaries. However this plan was not transmitted to the Congress. It was the committee's intention that the pharmacy redesign required by Section 721 of this bill is a necessary precursor to any system-wide pharmacy benefit for the Medicare-eligible beneficiaries. Therefore, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a design of a comprehensive pharmacy benefit for these beneficiaries to the Congress by April 15, 2001.

Section 722—Improvements to Third-Party Payer Collection Program

This section would make two changes to the third party collection program under section 1095 of title 10, United States Code, which allows military treatment facilities to collect from health insurance carriers and other third party payers. First, this section would allow Department of Defense facilities to bill third party payers on reasonable charges. These reasonable charges would be based on current payments rates under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS), which uses diagnosis related group (DRG) based rates for inpatient care and CHAMPUS maximum allowable charge (CMAC) rates for professional services. This change would be consistent with similar changes implemented for the Veterans Health Administration in 1997. The change would also simplify and improve claims processing by permitting the Department to bill for outpatient care on the same medical procedure basis prevalent in the health insurance industry.

The second change made by this section would expand the definition of "third party payer" to match the definition of "other insurance" in the CHAMPUS double coverage program. This action would further coordinate military treatment facility third party collection provisions and procedures with those of the CHAMPUS counterpart.

Section 723—Authority of Armed Forces Medical Examiner to Conduct Forensic Pathology Investigations

This section would clarify authorities of the Armed Forces Medical Examiner (AFME) to conduct forensic pathology investigations, including autopsies, in cases of deaths for which the Department of Defense, or a supported agency, has investigative responsibility. Sections 4711 and 9711 of title 10, United States Code, provide for investigations when a person is found dead in a place garrisoned by Army or Air Force personnel and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. No similar authorities exist for the Navy or Marine Corps. There also is no express authority for access to evidence in the case of a military dependent overseas. This section also ensures access by the AFME to evidence that might not be available under current law and clarifies the jurisdictional hierarchy in those cases in which primary authority does not rest with the AFME.

Section 724—Trauma Training Center

Section 742 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) authorized the Department of the Army to establish a Level 1 Trauma Training Center. The committee is disappointed that the budget request did not include funds to provide the Army with this much needed trauma training capability. This section would once again recommend an increase of $4.0 million in the Defense Health Program to support the Army Medical Department in establishing a Trauma Training Center up to Level 1.

Section 725—Study on Joint Operations for the Defense Health Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of areas where the Defense Health Program could improve its joint operations. This study shall be submitted to the Congress by October 1, 2000.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 801—Sale, Exchange, and Waiver Authority for Coal and Coke

The committee is aware that section 2404 of title 10, United States Code, provides the Secretary of Defense authority to sell, exchange, or waive provisions of law in the purchase of petroleum and natural gas when it would be in the public interest to do so. The committee believes the rationale for such authority equally applies to coal and coke. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 801) that would amend section 2404 of title 10, United States Code, to include coal and coke.

Section 802—Extension of Authority to Issue Solicitations for Purchases of Commercial Items in Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold

This section would extend by three years the expiring pilot authority to allow the application of simplified acquisition procedures to commercial items below a $5 million threshold.

Section 803–Expansion of Applicability of Requirement to Make Certain Procurements From Small Arms Production Industrial Base

This section would amend section 2473(d) of title 10, United States Code, by adding the M2 and M60 machine guns to the list of weapon systems included in the small arms industrial base.

Section 804—Repeal of Termination of Provision of Credit Towards Subcontracting Goals for Purchases Benefiting Severely Handicapped Persons

This section would make permanent existing authority to credit purchases from qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or the severely handicapped toward meeting subcontracting goals for defense contractors.

Section 805—Extension of Test Program for Negotiation of Comprehensive Small Business Subcontracting Plans

This section would extend by three years the expiring pilot authority to allow Department of Defense prime contractors to negotiate small and disadvantaged business subcontract plans that establish goals for their participation in subcontracts awarded by the prime contractor on a company-wide basis.

Section 806—Facilitation of National Missile Defense System

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense with the needed flexibility to proceed with production of a National Missile Defense (NMD) system prior to the completion of formal operational, test and evaluation requirements. The provision would also require the Secretary to successfully complete operational, test and evaluation of this system as soon as practicable following the application of any such exemption.

The committee believes that the rapidly evolving long-range missile threat demands expeditious deployment of a national missile defense, and that authorizing the Secretary of Defense to allow NMD production would provide the flexibility to respond to these emerging threats. The committee expects that any national missile defense system would undergo sufficient ground and flight testing prior to a deployment decision to provide the Department of Defense high confidence that the system would perform effectively, whether or not initial operational test and evaluation had been completed.

Section 807—Options for Accelerated Acquisition of Precision Munitions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congressional defense committees existing inventories of precision munitions against the requirements of each of these munitions for two Major Theater Wars (MTW). For those precision munitions whose inventories fall short of the two-MTW requirement, the section would also direct the Secretary to create teams of experts to recommend to him options for accelerating their acquisition. Finally, the section would further require the Secretary to report to the Congressional defense committees his selected options for acceleration and the Department's plan to implement these options.

Section 808—Program to Increase Opportunity for Small Business Innovation in Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a program to increase the opportunities for small business companies with innovative technology to participate in acquisition programs of the Department of Defense.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND REFORM

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 901—Limitation on Amount Available for Contracted Advisory and Assistance Services

The committee is aware the Department of Defense has partially implemented section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) and made significant efforts to improve the management of both Advisory and Assistance Services (A&AS) and miscellaneous contract services object classifications. However, the committee notes with concern that the report required by section 911 has not been submitted. The committee is concerned that prior year erroneous reporting of A&AS as miscellaneous services has resulted in underreporting of A&AS and has frustrated Congress' ability to fulfill its oversight responsibilities in this area. The committee notes the dramatic reductions within the budget request for fiscal year 2000 in miscellaneous contract services at the same time A&AS has increased $1.4 billion over last year's request.

While the committee continues to believe the Department's acquisition structure is too large and costly, the committee maintains its support for a technically proficient workforce. Specifically, section 912 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) directed the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the opportunities to improve the capability of the acquisition system in fulfilling the needs of the military services and agencies.

The committee contends many of the functions currently performed by A&AS contracts can and should be performed within the Department's acquisition structure. The committee further believes such an approach would yield similar results with less cost overall to the government. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 901) that would reduce A&AS funding by $100.0 million in fiscal year 2000 and withhold an additional 10 percent of A&AS funding until the Department complies with the previously mentioned reporting requirement.

Section 902–Responsibility for Logistics and Sustainment Functions of the Department of Defense

The committee is aware that the costs associated with equipment logistics and sustainment support represents one of the largest and fastest growing categories of expenditures within the Department of Defense. During fiscal year 1999, these types of logistics costs are estimated to exceed $80 billion. The committee believes that

several factors, including an aging inventory of weapons systems, increased operational tempo, and underfunded modernization accounts will continue to demand increased attention to the issues of logistics, maintenance, materiel readiness, and sustainment support across the Department.

To provide appropriate emphasis to this important functional area, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 902) that would establish and clarify responsibility for logistics and sustainment functions within the Office of the Secretary of Defense. First, the provision would rename the current position of Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology to Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, reflecting the increased importance of the logistics function. The provision would also create the new position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness to provide this function the organizational stature and visibility that it deserves. The new position would be subject to confirmation by the United States Senate, a requirement intended to enhance the quality of the individuals nominated for this job and increase congressional oversight of this critical area.

The committee believes that, among other duties assigned by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, the Deputy Under Secretary for Logistics and Material Readiness must address such critical areas as establishing policies regarding life-cycle, sustainment support of weapons systems and combat support equipment, as well as policies regarding the logistics systems and facilities necessary to provide such support. The committee strongly believes that competition and public-private partnerships are important tools for reducing costs and improving efficiency. As such, the Deputy Under Secretary for Logistics and Material Readiness would be responsible for policies regarding the acquisition of services to support the above requirements and to promote a competitive environment for the provision of sustainment services, while preserving a cost efficient, core capability within the Department of Defense that ensures the military readiness of weapons systems, combat support equipment and other critical materiel. In addition, the Deputy Under Secretary for Logistics and Material Readiness would fill a vital role in the review and approval of logistics support and sustainment plans for current and future weapon systems and combat support equipment, including necessary materiel acquisition and modifications to ensure cost effectiveness while protecting military readiness.

Section 903—Management Headquarters and Headquarters Support Activities

The committee remains troubled by the lack of compliance of the Department of Defense with section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) that mandates annual reductions in management headquarters personnel. The General Accounting Office (GAO), in a February 1999 report, stated that "DOD does not have a plan to reduce management headquarters and headquarters support personnel DOD-wide by 25 percent by the end of fiscal year 2002, as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998." The com-

mittee reiterates its strong support for the statutorily required personnel reductions.

The committee notes that the Department has made progress in complying with the submission of reports on management headquarters as required in section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) and section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). Furthermore, the committee is aware that the Department has recognized the current management headquarters personnel directive is inadequate and that proposed revisions to the directive in question have been drafted. The committee believes the existing directive dramatically understates the actual size of the Department's management headquarters. In its February 1999 report on management headquarters, GAO stated "In our review of selected subordinate organizations, nearly three of every four of them were primarily performing management or headquarters support functions and should have been reported to Congress by DOD."

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 903) that would require the Department to implement a revised directive, to be applied uniformly throughout the Department, that accounts for management headquarters personnel by function rather than organization.

Section 904—Further Reductions in Defense Acquisition and Support Workforce

The committee continues to believe that the Department of Defense must significantly reorganize and streamline its acquisition structure for the purposes of reducing overhead and improving interoperability and jointness among the military services. The committee has pressed the Department for years to produce an implementation plan to achieve the aforementioned objectives but has been disappointed with the result. While the Defense Science Board (DSB), in response to section 912 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), produced a report that identified a variety of opportunities for realignment of the defense acquisition system, the Department has committed only to study the DSB's findings rather than to implement any of its recommendations. The committee strongly believes the Department must make broad organizational changes to its acquisition structure, including adoption of a smaller, more flexible workforce. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 904) that would reduce the defense acquisition workforce, as defined in section 931(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261), by a total of 25,000 in fiscal year 2000.

Section 905—Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs

This section would establish a Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs at the National Defense University. In the committee's judgment, the establishment of such a center is an essential element for assessing what will be a central strategic relationship for the United States in the coming century. China's sustained eco-

nomic growth, expanding security interests, growing military power, and historical importance would make it a worthy subject of constant Department of Defense study under any conditions. However, the increasingly tense relations between the People's Republic of China and the United States in recent years seems to underscore the requirement for such a center.

Currently, the Department of Defense lacks an organization whose primary mission is to provide comprehensive analysis and promote broader understanding of Chinese military affairs and strategy. The primary mission of the Asia-Pacific Center, by contrast, is to engage with the officer corps of Asian military forces and to help inculcate American values such as civilian control of the military. In the committee's judgment, the Asia-Pacific Center is not structured to provide the needed perspectives on Chinese military affairs, has a broader purpose, and is not well sited to provide senior policy-makers with timely analysis. Moreover, few in the academic or intelligence community combine knowledge of military affairs and strategy with a genuine expertise in Chinese language, history, and culture. The committee intends that the establishment of a Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs should begin to provide the Department of Defense with a critical capability not currently available.

Section 906—Responsibility Within Office of the Secretary of Defense for Monitoring OPTEMPO and PERSTEMPO

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to monitor personnel tempo and operations tempo of the armed services. It also directs the Secretary work toward a common definition to measure personnel tempo and operations tempo to the maximum extent practicable in order to have a more accurate measurement system.

The committee notes that that to date, there has been no single standard within the Department of Defense (DOD) used to measure personnel tempo (PERSTEMPO) and operations tempo (OPTEMPO). Currently, service cultures, mission characteristics, deployment timelines, and sustainment requirements account for most of the differences in service definitions and hamper efforts to establish a universal definition. Difficulties arise in evaluating PERSTEMPO measurements because each service defines levels of unit and individual activity differently and they each have a different definition of what constitutes high activity. Deployments are also defined differently by each service; for example training rotations to the National Training Center do not figure in the Army's measurement of deployments yet are clearly an activity that contributes to PERSTEMPO. According to a 1996 Government Accounting Office report titled Military Readiness: A Clear Policy is Needed to Guide Management of Frequently Deployed Units:

> It is difficult for DOD to determine the actual time that either military personnel or their units are deployed. This information is important to planning and managing contingency operations. Although all services now have systems to measure PERSTEMPO, each service has different (1) definitions of what constitutes a deployment, (2) policies or

guidance for the length of time units or personnel should be deployed, and (3) systems for tracking deployments.

The committee believes that a common definition is essential to present a more accurate evaluation and management of the PERSTEMPO and OPTEMPO problem.

Section 907—Report on Military Space Issues

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the House Armed Services Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee by March 1, 2000 a report on U.S. military space policy.

The committee believes that the future security environment will be marked by profound technological change that will transform the conduct of war. This transformation will necessitate a fuller integration of land, air, sea, and space operations. The committee believes that the Department of Defense must be appropriately organized to exploit fully the opportunities offered by this transformation, and directs the Secretary to address in this report current and projected U.S. efforts to fully exploit space in preparation for possible conflicts in 2010 and beyond.

Section 908—Employment and Compensation of Civilian Faculty Members of Department of Defense African Center for Strategic Studies

This section would authorize the Department of Defense to hire civilian faculty members for the EUCOM African Center for Strategic Studies.

Section 909—Additional Matters for Annual Report on Joint Warfighting Experimentation

This section would add to the matters to be discussed in the annual report on joint warfighting experimentation established section 435(b) of title 10, United States Code. The committee believes that it is appropriate to take recommendations gleaned from insights resulting from joint warfighting experimentation into consideration when joint requirements are established.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Overview

The committee notes with concern the many challenges confronting the Department of Defense counter-drug program in fiscal year 2000. With the planned closure of Howard Air Force Base in Panama as a result of the 1977 Panama Canal Treaty, the United States will lose a premier airfield for conducting counter-drug aerial detection and monitoring missions. To ensure the Department of Defense complies with its tasking by the National Drug Control Strategy to provide detection and monitoring support to U.S. law enforcement, U.S. Southern Command has spearheaded an initiative to base reconnaissance and support aircraft at four locations throughout the source and transit zones, notably Ecuador, Curacao, Aruba, and eventually Costa Rica. The implementation of the Canal Treaty has additionally necessitated the realignment of the Joint Interagency Task Force—South, previously located in Panama, to Key West, Florida where it has merged with the Joint Interagency Task Force—East. Notwithstanding these challenges, the committee is hopeful that the near-term initial operating capability of the Relocatable Over-The-Horizon Radar based in Puerto Rico will greatly enhance the effectiveness of the interagency effort to curtail the flow of illegal narcotics into the United States.

The committee remains deeply concerned that the eastern Pacific Ocean continues to be an under-resourced transit area for detection and monitoring assets despite its increased usage by drug traffickers. To address this problem, last year the committee recommended the restoration of a promising program known as Caper Focus intended to disrupt the eastern Pacific drug flow. While $10.5 million was authorized and $6.0 million appropriated in fiscal year 1999 for Caper Focus, implementation has unfortunately been slow and no maritime patrol aircraft have been dedicated to the program in fiscal year 1999 as required in section 1023(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). The committee finds this lack of progress unacceptable and directs the Department to execute this program as expeditiously and effectively as possible.

The Department of Defense budget request for fiscal year 2000 contained $788.1 million for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $166.5 million for operational tempo which is included within the operating budgets of the military services. This represents a net increase of $60.5 million from the fiscal year 1999 budget request of $727.6 million, and an increase of $11.2

million for operational tempo from the fiscal year 1999 request of $155.3 million. The committee understands that the increase is attributed to realignment activities required by implementation of the Panama Canal Treaty and specifically the establishment of forward operating locations.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

FY99 Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Request	788,100
Educate America's Youth	16,800
Increase Safety of Citizens	82,900
Reduce Health & Social Costs	72,200
Shield America's Frontiers	327,400
Break Drug Sources of Supply	288,800
Recommended Decreases:	
Tethered Aerostat Radar System (Project #4110)	8,800
Air National Guard Fighter Operations (Project #7404)	4,000
Costa Rica FOL (Project #9500)	6,700
Recommended Increases:	
Operation Caper Focus	6,000
Wide Aperture Radar Facility	17,500
Southwest Border Fence	6,000
Joint Interagency Task Force-West	1,000
Other Joint Military Intelligence Programs	8,000
P–3 Forward Looking Infrared Radars	2,700
Observation Aircraft	8,000
Ground Based Radar in Tres Esquinas, Colombia	10,000
Mothership Operations	5,000
C–130 Sensor Packages	15,000
Program Transfers:	
Forward Operating Locations (Military Construction)	36,100
Recommendation	811,700

Items of Special Interest

Air National Guard fighter operations

The committee is concerned with the usage of Air National Guard F–16s in support of the counter-drug mission. While the committee recognizes the value of forward deployed alert interceptors for quick reaction and early identification of suspected drug trafficking aircraft, the committee does not believe premier tactical fighter aircraft are appropriate for such missions. Rather, the committee supports the transfer of the intercept mission to the United States Customs Service which operates aircraft more optimally suited to the mission. The committee notes the high operational tempo throughout the fighter community in part due to ongoing world-wide contingencies. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.0 million in this program.

Colombian detection and monitoring

The committee recognizes the value of increased airborne surveillance over Colombia, the world's leading producer of cocaine, in the overall effort to reduce the flow of narcotics into the United States. Through enhanced monitoring of coca fields and production sites in Colombia, timely and actionable intelligence can be relayed to Colombian government forces for seizure and eradication purposes. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for the operation of leased observation aircraft to be based and operated in Colombia. Additionally, the committee notes the need to

improve aerial surveillance in the vicinity of Tres Esquinas, Colombia, a major coca cultivation area. The committee supports the establishment of a ground based radar in Tres Esquinas to assist in Colombia's interdiction program and recommends an increase of $10.0 million for this purpose.

Joint interagency task force-West

The committee is aware that the Joint Interagency Task Force-West (JIATF-West) retains an insufficient intelligence capability focused on narcotics and money laundering in Southwest Asia, notably Afghanistan and Pakistan, and Southeast Asia, specifically Burma and China. In addition, the committee recognizes that JIATF-West is significantly under-resourced to provide adequate tactical and strategic intelligence with regard to its increased responsibility for counter-drug and interdiction activities in the Eastern Pacific and Mexico. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $1.0 million to support these intelligence shortfalls.

Other joint military intelligence programs

The committee is aware that the effectiveness of operation Caper Focus has been degraded by the shortage of maritime patrol aircraft in the eastern Pacific transit zone. The committee understands that a fully operational Wide Aperture Radar Facility could provide the same radar capability against low altitude light aircraft as approximately five P–3B's with radar domes. The committee notes the many pressing world-wide demands placed upon DOD aircraft and flight crews and strongly believes that any defense resources used in the counter-drug effort should be used to their fullest potential. However, the committee is aware that many of the Department's detection and monitoring flights yield little, if any, actionable information on narcotics production and transportation. The committee contends DOD assets can and should be more optimally utilized in the war on drugs and believes enhanced signals intelligence and collections programs could improve the overall effectiveness of the DOD counter-drug effort. The budget request contained $12.9 million for four valuable signals intelligence, collections, and translation support programs designed to assist in the disruption of drug flow within source and transit zones. The committee believes these programs are funded below the levels necessary to achieve their stated objectives. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for programs within the Joint Military Intelligence Program. A discussion of these programs is located in the classified annex accompanying this report.

Requirement for report on forward operating locations

The committee remains concerned about the effectiveness of counter-drug detection and monitoring activities in the source and transit zones in light of the cessation of U.S. military operations in Panama. Accordingly, the committee directs the Department of Defense to submit to Congress, no later than July 1, 2000, a report detailing the status of negotiations regarding the formal agreements on each of the proposed Forward Operating Locations (FOL) and the infrastructure and operational requirements of each FOL. The report shall also include an analysis of the feasibility and ef-

fectiveness of resuming, after fiscal year 2000, the counter-narcotics mission from bases in Panama, should the government of Panama consent to renewed U.S. military presence in its country.

Southwest border fence

The committee remains concerned with the continued smuggling of narcotics across the Southwest border in the San Diego County, California region. Recognizing the continuing presence and operations of a major drug cartel located in proximity to the border, the committee believes that existing fence and road-building operations must continue. The committee notes the success of the previous fence projects in preventing much of the unimpeded, vehicular drug-smuggling that prevailed in the region as recently as five years ago. Therefore, the committee recommends $6.0 million for the continuation of the construction of a 14 mile, multiple-barrier fence and primary border fence in addition to patrol roads immediately adjacent to the Southwest border in the vicinity of San Diego County, California.

Tethered aerostat radar system

The committee has long been aware of the operational difficulties involved with the aerostat program. Specifically, the committee understands that minimal counter-drug detection and monitoring capability is provided by the aerostat program along the Southwest border. The committee is aware that the budget request for the aerostat program contains an increase of $8.8 million over the previous year for purposes of upgrading existing aerostats as well as purchasing spares. The committee believes such decisions should be postponed pending the review by the Secretary of Defense of the Wide Aperture Radar Facility capability that would be required by April 15, 2000 pursuant to section 1021 of this bill. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $8.8 million in the aerostat program.

Transfer of military construction funding for forward operating locations

The committee notes the budget request for Department of Defense counter-drug activities contained $36.1 million for military construction for forward operating locations at Manta, Ecuador and Curacao, Netherlands Antilles. Consistent with the established statutory framework for military construction, the committee recommends the transfer of $36.1 million from the Central Transfer Account to Military Construction, Defense-Wide.

Transit zone detection and monitoring

The committee is concerned with the continued exploitation of the Caribbean Sea corridor by narcotics traffickers. The committee is aware that 32 percent of the cocaine destined for the United States in 1998 was shipped through the Caribbean, of which 85 percent moved by maritime means. The committee supports a strong maritime detection and monitoring program in the Caribbean and recommends $15.0 million to operate and configure two C–130 aircraft for ocean surveillance purposes. Additionally, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for so-called

Mothership Operations and $2.7 million for upgrading the forward looking infrared radar capability of three Navy P–3 aircraft.

OTHER MATTERS

Counterterrorism and Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction

The committee continues to recognize that the threat of terrorist activity within the United States, including the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), is a potentially serious one and continues to support efforts to enhance domestic preparedness against this threat. Numerous federal agencies have a role to play in combating this threat, including the Department of Defense (DOD).

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2000 budget request for counterterrorism activities across the federal government exceeds the fiscal year 1999 levels by 14 percent, excluding additional amounts provided in the fiscal year 1999 Omnibus Appropriations bill. Likewise, the requested amount for combating WMD terrorism reflects a 13 percent increase, excluding supplemental funding, above the fiscal year 1999 appropriated base levels. For the national security community, including the Department, the budget request reflects a 7 percent increase for counterterrorism activities and a 40 percent increase in WMD counterterrorism efforts over the fiscal year 1999 base amounts. This increase is intended largely for domestic preparedness capabilities such as training and equipment for state and local "first responders," and research and development efforts that have potential applications to civilian domestic preparedness. The committee addresses the research and development portion of the request elsewhere in this report.

The committee recalls that Presidential Decision Directive 62 stresses the need for greater coordination of federal efforts to deal with the consequences of WMD terrorism. To this end, the Congress mandated the creation of a National Coordinator for Security, Infrastructure Protection and Counterterrorism to oversee this effort as part of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (title XIV of Public Law 104–201). Unfortunately, despite the federal government's attempts to consolidate and better coordinate counterterrorism efforts among the various federal, state, and local agencies involved in this mission, substantial confusion remains over the appropriate agency roles. As a November 1998 report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) concluded, the individual efforts among federal agencies to coordinate an effective approach to consequence management "are not guided by an overarching strategy." The result has been an apparent piecemeal, uncoordinated approach to this issue.

Congress has taken several actions to improve the coordination and integration of the domestic preparedness program. As part of "The Domestic Emergency Preparedness Act of 1998" of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261), the Congress required the President to increase the effectiveness of domestic emergency response preparedness programs at the federal, state, and local levels and to report to the Congress on the actions taken to develop an integrated program to respond to terrorist incidents involving weapons of mass destruction. Section

1051 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as amended by section 1403 of Public Law 105–261, required the President to provide a report on government expenditures to combat terrorism and terrorist incidents involving WMD. In addition, the committee notes that the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the fiscal year 1999 Omnibus Appropriations bill (H. Rept. 105–405) required the Attorney General in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the FBI, and the Director of Central Intelligence to develop and submit to the Congress a Five-Year Interagency Counterterrorism and Technology Crime Plan, which would be updated annually and serve as a baseline strategy for coordination of national policy and operational capabilities to combat terrorism in the United States and against American interests overseas. These reports have provided the Congress with greater insight into the government's overall plan for combating terrorism and appear to reflect a good-faith effort to address the lack of an overarching strategy identified by GAO.

In its support role to other federal agencies, the Department of Defense has provided expertise, equipment, and training to first responders in communities nationwide, and has assumed the role of lead federal agency with respect to this program since its inception as part of its responsibilities under Public Law 104–201. The committee notes the Department's intention to transfer this program to the Department of Justice by October 1, 2000, which will at that time assume lead federal agency funding and program responsibilities.

Although the committee has encouraged the Department of Defense to accelerate its efforts to build a comprehensive and coordinated plan for integrating its program into the overall federal counterterrorism effort, progress has been slow. The Department is examining ways to improve its support to civil authorities in response to a WMD-related terrorist incident. One option being considered is standing up a Joint Task Force to plan, fund, and coordinate DOD support for consequence management activities. However, a number of issues related to implementation of such an option remain to be decided within the Department. Moreover, the committee notes that the Department's budget includes funding to support five National Guard Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams, in addition to the 10 RAID teams already previously authorized. Consistent with section 511 of Public Law 105–261, the committee would expect to receive a separate legislative request from the Department to increase the statutory limit on the number of National Guard full-time personnel in support of the RAID teams. Finally, the committee notes that although the Congress mandated that the report required by section 1402 of Public Law 105–261 be a Presidential report, authority for its preparation was delegated to the Department by the National Coordinator for Security, Infrastructure Protection and Counterterrorism. This suggests additional confusion over the role of the National Coordinator and the overall federal government coordination effort.

The committee believes that the Department should continue to play a critical support role in the overall counterterrorism effort,

but remains troubled by the difficulties in coordination and implementation noted above. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to make greater efforts to ensure that the Department's support to this effort is thoroughly coordinated and effective.

Department of Defense Responsiveness to Congressional Questions for the Record

The committee is concerned over the Department of Defense's inadequate responsiveness to questions for the record submitted as a result of hearings. The committee finds the Department's current level of compliance with the request to provide timely and complete answers to be unacceptable and a serious impediment to the committee's commitment to produce timely, complete, and accurate records of these proceedings for public and official use. The committee also notes that attempts to address this matter with the Department have not led to any perceptible improvement. In fact, this problem has persisted for several years without regard to the committee's continued interest in resolving it.

The committee reminds the Department that a continued lack of confidence in the ability of the committee to secure requested information that may be not immediately available to a Department witnesses could lead to a need to resort to a more formal process for securing information from the Department. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to closely examine how the Department currently tracks and manages the committee's questions for the record with the intent of making the necessary changes to ensure more timely and complete compliance. The committee stands ready to work with the Secretary to arrive at a mutually acceptable process that ensures that the information requested is provided in a manner that addresses the committee's needs without unduly increasing the Department's administrative burden.

Illegal Immigration to Guam

The committee is aware that Guam faces an increasing influx of illegal immigrants from the People's Republic of China. While 600 illegal aliens were apprehended in Guam last year, this year, in the past four months alone, over 700 have been apprehended and detained. Through May 1999, sixteen ships have made their way to Guam carrying an average of 50 to 100 illegal immigrant passengers each. The United States Coast Guard, with the assistance of the United States Navy, has interdicted less than half of these ships. The Coast Guard has led this effort despite having a single C–130 aircraft and two boats. The committee notes that the Navy has managed to provide assistance to this mission despite the diversion of military assets to the Balkans. The committee commends both of these services for their response to this difficult problem and supports and encourages continued cooperation in this effort.

Pentagon Reservation Renovation Security Upgrades

The Department of Defense has brought to the attention of the committee the need for improved physical security at the Pentagon Reservation. Given recent world events as well as the physical dimensions, geographic location and size of the workforce of the Pen-

tagon, increasing the level of security poses significant challenges. The committee believes that in addition to ongoing initiatives being undertaken to increase security in and around the Pentagon, two additional initiatives identified by the Department should be incorporated into ongoing renovation efforts. Accordingly, the committee supports the construction of more secure secretarial office and support facilities and security related changes to the Pentagon Reservation subway entrance. The committee recommends that these new security upgrades be incorporated in the Pentagon Renovation and Maintenance Program and understands that the Department plans to pay for these two initiatives from within existing Pentagon renovation funds. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees revised cost adjustments for the planning, design, construction and installation of equipment for the Pentagon by January 1, 2000.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—Transfer Authority

This section would permit the transfer of amounts of authorizations made available in Division A of the bill for any fiscal year to any other authorization made available in Division A upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such a transfer would be in the national interest. The provision would provide the authorization for reprogramming involving the transfer of authorization between amounts authorized as set out in bill language.

The authority to transfer could only be used to provide authorization for higher priority items than the items from which authorization was transferred and could not be used to provide authorization for an item that was denied authorization by the Congress. The Secretary of Defense would be required to notify the Congress promptly of transfers. The total amount of transfers would be limited to $2.0 billion. Historically, the transfer authority authorized has changed as follows:

[By fiscal years; in billions of dollars]

1985–88	$2.00
1989–91	3.00
1992	2.25
1993	1.50
1994–99	2.00

Section 1002—Incorporation of Classified Annex

This section would incorporate the classified annex prepared by the Committee on Armed Services into the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

Section 1003—Authorization of Prior Emergency Military Personnel Appropriations

This section would extend authorization to prior emergency military pay and benefits appropriations provided in section 2012 of the fiscal year 1999 emergency supplemental appropriations act.

Section 1004—Repeal of Requirement for Two-Year Budget Cycle for the Department of Defense

This section would repeal the requirement for the Department of Defense to submit a detailed two-year budget in the first session of each Congress.

Section 1005—Consolidation of Various Department of the Navy Trust and Gift Funds

This section would amend certain sections of title 10, United States Code, to allow consolidation of five Department of the Navy gift and trust funds into two funds, in order to manage the funds more efficiently and reduce administrative costs.

Section 1006—Budgeting for Operations in Yugoslavia

The committee has long been concerned with the significant drain that the conduct of under or unbudgeted contingency operations has had and continues to have on the Department of Defense's resources and budgets. Beginning with Somalia and continuing to present day operations in the Former Yugoslavia, the Administration continues to deploy military forces at an unprecedented rate, while often failing to properly budget for such operations in advance. This unfortunate practice has exacerbated already serious quality of life, readiness, and modernization shortfalls in the President's defense budgets and has also led to the diversion of a significant percentage of additional funds the Congress has authorized and appropriated for critical defense shortfalls over the past four years to pay for unbudgeted contingency and peacekeeping operations.

The committee and the Congress have repeatedly attempted to address this problem over the past several years and have adopted a number of provisions designed to induce the Administration to more properly manage the costs and budgeting of unplanned or unbudgeted contingency operations. In 1995, the House-passed version of H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, contained a number of provisions restricting the ability of the Department of Defense to use funds authorized for the Department's baseline operations to pay for contingency operations, requiring instead that the President seek supplemental appropriations to pay for such operations. In 1997, the Congress approved and the President enacted in two different bills, section 1203 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) and section 8132 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–56), provisions restricting the use of the Department's baseline operations funds to pay for the costs of the then-anticipated commitment of U.S ground forces for peacekeeping operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Both provisions required the President to submit a supplemental appropriations request to pay for any unbudgeted costs of Bosnia peacekeeping operations. In 1998, the Congress once again included and the President enacted a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (section 1004 of Public Law 105–261) that was likewise intended to protect the baseline operations budget of the Department from being used

to pay for any unbudgeted costs of contingency and peacekeeping operations. This provision recognized that the budget request for the coming fiscal year (fiscal year 1999) contained funds necessary to conduct such operations, but restricted the Department's ability to exceed the requested amount and required the submission of a supplemental appropriations request if the costs of the operation were determined to exceed the authorized amount.

At present, the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are entering the third month of hostilities against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The committee notes that the Administration's declared policy is quite likely to result in continued military operations—either combat or peacekeeping—in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia next fiscal year. However, the committee further notes that the budget request contains no funds for either combat or peacekeeping operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia next fiscal year.

Consistent with the committee's longstanding efforts to protect the Department's baseline operations budget from being used to pay for unbudgeted operations, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1006) that would prohibit the use of the funds authorized for appropriation by this bill for the conduct of combat or peacekeeping operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia during fiscal year 2000. In the event that military operations are conducted in Yugoslavia next fiscal year, the provision would require that the President submit to the Congress a supplemental appropriations request to pay for the costs of any such operations. The committee notes, consistent with current and past direction on how the Administration should budget and account for the costs of contingency operations, that the provision's limitation applies only to incremental costs and not to costs for which the Department would otherwise already be obligated or programmed to pay.

The committee recommends this provision as a matter of fiscal management and is not rendering judgment on the merit of the Administration's current Yugoslavia policy or on the merit of any potential combat or peacekeeping operation in Yugoslavia in the future. With this provision the committee intends only to ensure that the funds authorized by this bill are applied against the Department's baseline operations as provided in the President's budget request and as subsequently authorized by the committee. The committee believes that the spending authorized in this bill to address serious quality of life, readiness, and modernization shortfalls that continue to plague the U.S. military must be spent for the intended purposes and not diverted to pay for the costs of unbudgeted operations. Consistent with a number of previous initiatives, the committee believes that the incremental costs associated with military operations in Yugoslavia during fiscal year 2000 should be paid for with funds that are in addition to those authorized by this bill.

The committee notes that senior Administration officials have, on numerous occasions, indicated an intent to submit an amendment to the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request to pay for the costs of any future military operations in Yugoslavia. In the event that combat or peacekeeping operations are likely to occur next fiscal year, the committee urges the President to submit a budget amendment in time for the Congressional defense committees to

address any policy and budgetary issues as part of their deliberations on the fiscal year 2000 defense authorization and appropriations bills.

Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

Section 1011—Revision to Congressional Notice-and-Wait Period Required Before Transfer of a Vessel Stricken from Naval Vessel Register

This section would modify the requirement that sixty days of continuous session of Congress transpire before transfer of a naval vessel to thirty days.

Section 1012—Authority to Consent to Retransfer of Former Naval Vessel

This section would permit the President to consent to the retransfer of a former U.S. naval vessel from the government of Greece to the USS LST Memorial, Inc., a not-for-profit organization, for use as a memorial.

Section 1013—Report on Naval Vessel Force Structure Requirements

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the naval vessel force structure required to carry out the National Military Strategy and the force structure that is provided for in the President's budget for fiscal year 2001.

Section 1014—Auxiliary Vessels Acquisition Program for the Department of Defense

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the long-term lease or charter of newly constructed surface vessels. Such leases or charters would apply to the Navy's combat logistics force and strategic sealift programs, as well as other auxiliary support vessels of the Department of Defense.

Section 1015—Authority to Provide Advance Payments for the National Defense Features Program

This section would amend section 2218 of title 10, United States Code, to permit advance payments for the modification and life-cycle maintenance costs of National Defense Features (NDF) program vessels. This change would make the financing practices of the NDF consistent with those of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program.

SUBTITLE C—MATTERS RELATING TO COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1021—Support for Detection and Monitoring Activities in the Eastern Pacific Ocean

The committee remains deeply concerned with the lack of detection and monitoring assets in the eastern Pacific Ocean despite the large volume of cocaine that moves through the area. The committee notes the continuing lack of adequate maritime patrol aircraft to implement operation Caper Focus in fiscal year 1999 as re-

quired. The committee continues to support an aggressive program to disrupt narcotics trafficking in the eastern Pacific area and therefore recommends a provision (sec. 1021) that would provide $6.0 million to continue this valuable program.

The committee understands that an additional Over-The-Horizon Radar (OTHR) located in the United States could provide adequate coverage of the eastern Pacific transit area. The committee is aware that a test bed OTHR facility known as the Wide Aperture Radar Facility (WARF) exists in southern California that could be operationalized for use in detecting and tracking both air and maritime targets in the eastern Pacific and Mexico. The committee believes this capability will greatly enhance the ability of law enforcement agencies of both the United States and Mexico to interdict and disrupt shipments of narcotics destined for the United States.

The committee is aware that the effectiveness of operation Caper Focus has been degraded by the shortage of maritime patrol aircraft in the eastern Pacific transit zone. The committee understands that a fully operational Wide Aperture Radar Facility could provide the same radar capability against low altitude light aircraft as approximately five P–3B's with radar domes. Moreover, an operational WARF is approximately five times more cost-effective than maritime patrol aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1021) that would provide $17.5 million to modify WARF from research to operational status and perform all-weather, 24-hour-a-day coverage of light aircraft movements in the eastern Pacific, Mexico, and along the Southwest border. In addition, the provision would direct WARF to conduct testing to validate its capability against "go fast" boats and other maritime craft. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on the effectiveness of the WARF in these areas by April 15, 2000. Finally, the provision would direct the Department of the Air Force to make available the use of two currently mothballed Over-The-Horizon-Backscatter (OTH–B) Continental 100 KW transmitters and available spare parts for use at the WARF facility. The committee notes that two such transmitters were located at the southern California facility from 1986–1988 for purposes of cruise missile tests and that significant structural modifications were made to the facility at that time.

Section 1022—Condition on Development of Forward Operating Locations for United States Southern Command Counter-Drug Detection and Monitoring Flights

The committee remains concerned by the loss of Howard Air Force Base in Panama as a premier staging area for the conduct of counter-drug detection and monitoring flights. While the committee generally supports the U.S. Southern Command's forward operating location (FOL) concept to forward base aircraft in the region, the committee is concerned that the budget request does not accurately represent the costs associated with the establishment of the four proposed FOLs. Specifically, the committee is aware that the U.S. Southern Command and the Department of the Air Force have undertaken a series of site surveys but have not reached a consensus as to the total costs to improve the capabilities of the

airfield facilities in Ecuador, Curacao, or Aruba to necessary specifications. In addition, the committee is aware that FOL discussions with the government of Costa Rica were significantly delayed pending the signing of a bilateral maritime counter-drug agreement with the United States. Accordingly, it appears highly unlikely that the budget request for $6.7 million for infrastructure improvements to the airfield at Liberia, Costa Rica can be executed in fiscal year 2000. Therefore, the committee recommends redirecting the funding in question to higher priority counter-drug programs and has included a provision (sec. 10X) that would prohibit the expenditure of funds for the purpose of improving physical infrastructure at any forward operating location until a formal agreement is signed by both the host nation and the United States.

The committee strongly believes the forward operating location concept should remain expeditionary in nature and involve minimal infrastructure improvements except as necessary to ensure mission requirements, adequate quality of life and force protection for U.S. military personnel. Therefore, to the extent practicable, the Department of Defense should endeavor to maximize the local host nation facilities in the way of housing, food service, medical care, and aircraft service support. Implementation of an effective National Drug Control Strategy requires the full cooperation of all involved U.S. agencies and the committee expects that the United States Customs Service can and should play a larger role in the source zone detection and monitoring mission as it expands its fleet of P–3 reconnaissance aircraft.

Section 1023—United States Military Activities in Colombia

The committee is aware of the growing presence of U.S. military personnel in Colombia as part of a coordinated bilateral counter-drug program. The Secretary of Defense recently committed the Department of Defense to train and partially equip an unusually large Colombian army battalion of up to 950 soldiers with the stated intention of conducting counter-drug operations. The committee understands that the number of U.S. military personnel associated with training Colombian counter-drug forces is projected to increase. While the committee supports more direct involvement by the Colombian government in the war on drugs, the committee is concerned with the expanding role of the U.S. military in domestic Colombian affairs. The committee notes that Colombia has become a major recipient of military hardware assistance and training ostensibly for counter-drug purposes at the same time the government of Colombia is engaged in a protracted war against a wide-scale guerrilla insurgency. The committee is concerned that counter-drug training and assistance provided by the Department of Defense to Colombian forces may be redirected or used for non-counter-drug activities.

The committee supports continued U.S. cooperation with the government of Colombia to stem the flow of illegal drugs into the United States but remains concerned over the prospect of U.S. military personnel being drawn into Colombia's civil war. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1023) that would require the Department of Defense to provide an annual report to the Congress detailing the number of U.S. military personnel deployed

or otherwise assigned to duty in Colombia at any time during the preceding year, the length and purpose of the deployment or assignment, and the costs and force protection risks associated with such deployments and assignments.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1031—Identification in Budget Materials of Amounts for Declassification Activities and Limitation on Expenditures For Such Activities

This section would require that any future budget request submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense (DOD) specifically identify as a budgetary line item funds being requested that would be used to declassify records to carry out Executive Order 12958, or to comply with any subsequent statutory declassification requirements. This section would also limit the expenditure of funds by the Department of Defense for declassification of records during fiscal year 2000 to no more than $20 million.

Executive Order 12958, signed by President Clinton on April 17, 1995, requires the automatic declassification of documents after 25 years, subject to narrow exceptions such as the inclusion of nuclear weapon design information. The documents must be reviewed before they are declassified to determine if any of the exceptions apply. Presently, the Department of Defense holds millions of pages of classified documents that will need to be reviewed for declassification.

The Department of Defense recently reported to the committee that DOD declassification activities related to Executive Order 12958 are costing the Department approximately $200 million per year, and will continue at this rate through fiscal year 2002. The Department projects that at this rate of expenditures, the backlog of classified documents over 25 years old will be eliminated some time during fiscal year 2003, and after that, the declassification effort will continue to cost $100 million per year as more documents reach the 25 year point.

The committee is concerned over the significant drain on operation and maintenance resources resulting from the planned annual expenditure of $200 million due to this accelerated declassification process. The operation and maintenance accounts and key readiness accounts in particular have been dramatically underfunded for years, a serious problem that it exacerbated by unbudgeted contingency operations. The committee believes that record declassification is a significantly lower priority for already scarce O&M funds and believes these funds should be spent addressing shortfalls in higher priority areas such as maintenance, training, spare parts, and other key readiness activities. The committee understands that the services have not been explicitly budgeting for this declassification effort, and vital readiness requirements have therefore had to compete with records declassification for funding.

Consequently, this section would also limit the amount of funds available for the Department's fiscal year 2000 records declassification effort to $20 million. The committee has redirected the resulting $180 million savings to a number of critical readiness related

accounts identified as suffering from unfunded requirements by the military service chiefs.

Section 1032—Notice to Congressional Committees of Compromise of Classified Information within Defense Programs of the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives whenever the Secretary receives information that indicates that classified information relating to U.S. defense operations, systems, or technologies has been disclosed in an unauthorized manner to a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power.

This section extends to the Department of Defense the same congressional notification requirement that section 31xx mandates for the Department of Energy. Since the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives are the congressional committees responsible for the authorization and oversight of the defense programs and operations of the Department of Defense, its associated agencies, and the military services, it is necessary that these committees be kept informed of any compromise of classified information to foreign powers through espionage, or willful or accidental release by U.S. citizens. This information is essential so that these oversight committees can determine if the source of the unauthorized disclosure has been identified and closed, if a damage assessment has been conducted, and if remedial action is necessary and is being carried out. If such a disclosure of classified information caused significant damage to a U.S. defense program or operation, it would be vital for these authorizing committees be made aware of the damage, so that program redirection or remedial actions could be authorized in a timely manner.

Section 1033—Revision to Limitation on Retirement or Dismantlement of Strategic Nuclear Delivery Systems

The committee understands that the Department of Defense seeks relief from existing statutory limitations on the retirement of strategic nuclear delivery systems in order to have greater flexibility in structuring U.S. nuclear forces and to allow for the retirement of up to four Trident ballistic missile submarines. Even though Russia has not yet ratified the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty II (START II), the Department's position is driven primarily by concern about the cost of sustaining delivery systems at current START I force levels.

The committee believes that while cost issues are important, security and wider strategic and arms control issues ought to be paramount in determining strategic nuclear force levels and force structure. The committee has been, and remains, concerned that any significant restructuring of U.S. strategic nuclear forces prior to Russian ratification of the second Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START II) could reduce the effectiveness of U.S. deterrent forces while also undermining pending arms control agreements. The committee notes that reductions in strategic nuclear delivery systems will almost certainly also reduce flexibility with respect to

the operation and deployment of U.S. strategic forces and potentially reduce the number of warheads on alert at any given time.

The committee is convinced that maintaining a robust triad of strategic nuclear forces remains in the vital national security interest. Although overall Russian nuclear force levels have declined, Russia continues to aggressively modernize its strategic forces with newer, more capable systems. China is also modernizing its strategic forces, North Korea recently tested a missile with intercontinental range, and Iran seeks to develop long range missiles. The committee believes that, as the strategic threat diversifies, deterrence becomes more complex and deterrence requirements harder to assess. Accordingly, the committee notes that under such conditions, reducing strategic delivery systems simply to reduce fiscal costs is far from a cost-free option for the United States.

To address these concerns, this section would amend section 1302 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201), as amended, by permanently extending the prohibition on the obligation of funds for the retirement of strategic nuclear delivery systems. The provision would allow the President to waive the prohibition provided he first certifies that any proposed reduction of strategic nuclear delivery systems would still allow U.S. strategic requirements to be met and that such reductions would not be detrimental to U.S. arms control objectives. The provision would require the President, if he exercises this waiver, to nonetheless sustain a force structure of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles such that it would be capable of employing at least 98 percent of the 6,000 warhead limit imposed by the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Consistent with current law, the provision would give the President the authority to waive the prohibition on retirement of U.S. strategic nuclear delivery systems or warheads if Russia ratifies START II.

Section 1034—Annual Report by Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Risks in Executing the Missions Called for Under the National Military Strategy

This section would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to assess the strategic and military risks involved in executing the full range of missions called for under the National Military Strategy and to submit that assessment to the Secretary of Defense not later than January 1 each year. In addition, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to review the assessment, comment upon it and forward the assessment and comments to the Congress along with plans to mitigate the risks enumerated in the assessment.

Since September, 1998, the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified repeatedly to the committee and the Congress that the ability of the armed forces to execute the missions required under the National Military Strategy of the United States carries with it "moderate to high" risk. In testimony before the committee this year, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the military service chiefs of staff, and several regional commanders-in-chief have confirmed that assessment and elaborated on the nature of the risks involved. These senior leaders have stated that scarcities of "low-density, high-demand" personnel and equipment are likely to mean increased num-

bers of U.S. and allied casualties in the event of war, delays in achieving the deployment and other timelines established by the theater commanders-in-chief in their war plans, and increased threats to U.S. national security interests. Marine Commandant Gen. Charles Krulak summarized the situation in his testimony to the committee February 24, 1999, saying, "In terms of risk to [the ability to execute] the National Military Strategy, I think we've gone too far; I think we're there now. If we don't do something about this, we're going to be back into the hollow armed forces and this nation can't have that, can't take that, because the world is changing so rapidly, is so dangerous, the we need to stop this now."

The committee also has noted a disturbing trend to these statements. The risks assessed are no longer couched solely in terms of risks related to the ability to rapidly and decisively win two nearly simultaneous major theater wars. Although the capability to perform such a mission remains at the core of U.S. National Military Strategy, senior officers now speak of increased risk in conducting smaller-scale contingencies. In addition, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have yet to conduct a formal risk assessment accounting for the massive deployment of U.S. forces in support of Operation "Allied Force" in Yugoslavia.

In sum, the committee has long believed that the gap between strategic ends and military means has grown dangerously large. While the committee commends the effort by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to come to grips with the nature and extent of the risk through the Joint Monthly Readiness Review, the committee believes that the mismatch between ends and means must be considered at the same time that U.S. National Military Strategy is articulated, and that a "high-risk" strategy—one lacking sufficient military force to execute—is not a credible strategy, nor one befitting the critical security interests of the United States.

Section 1035—Requirement To Address Unit Operations Tempo and Personal Tempo in Department of Defense Annual Report

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to report on various aspects of operations tempo (OPTEMO) and personnel tempo (PERSTEMO) in his Annual Report to Congress. The committee understands that the services have different definitions as to what constitutes a deployment and have different policies or regulations limiting these deployments. In order to gain a better understanding of how the services address OPTEMPO and PERSTEMPO, this section would request the Secretary to outline individual service polices in the report. In addition, the department is to report by service a comparison of the average number of personnel on active duty during the period covered by the report against the average number of personnel deployed as defined by that service.

The committee is also concerned about increases in the number of officially designated exercises and contingencies that the services are required to support. In addition, the committee is concerned about the average number of days service personnel are deployed and whether the services are meeting their OPTEMPO/PERSTEMPO goals. The committee is also concerned about those units listed by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as high

demand, low density units. Traditionally, these units have experienced higher OPTEMPO/PERSTEMPO rates than other units.

Section 1036—Preservation of Certain Defense Reporting Requirements

The committee notes that section 3003 of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–66) provides that all statutory requirements for annual, semi-annual, or periodic reports by federal agencies to the Congress that are contained in a 1993 report issued by the Clerk of the House shall cease to be effective as of December 21, 1999. The committee has been aware of this impending requirement and has identified those reports within its jurisdiction subject to termination under section 3003. Furthermore, the committee has conducted an extensive review of the merits of each report in question. As a result of this examination, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1036) that would authorize the continuation of specific reports that are essential in the execution of the committee's oversight responsibilities.

Section 1037—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments to existing law of a non-substantive basis.

Section 1038—Contributions for Spirit of Hope Endowment Fund of United Service Organizations, Incorporated

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide a grant of $25.0 million to the United Service Organizations, Incorporated (USO) for the purposes of helping to capitalize the Spirit of Hope Endowment Fund. The provision would require that the release of the authorized funds be contingent on the ability of the USO to match the authorized funds with funds raised from private sector sources. The committee recognizes the valuable and lengthy service that the USO has provided to members of the Armed Services and is concerned about the long-term financial health of the USO. This provision is intended to help ensure that the USO remains a viable service organization by assisting in its transition to a more established financial base.

Section 1039—Chemical Defense Training Facility

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to transfer non-stockpile quantities of chemical agent to the Attorney General to support first responder training at the Department of Justice Center for Domestic Preparedness at Ft. McClellan, Alabama. It would also require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to report annually to the Congress regarding the disposition of these agents.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—Increase of Pay Cap for Nonappropriated Fund Senior Executive Employees

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to fix the pay of Senior Executive Service (SES) nonappropriated fund employees at the same level as that of appropriated fund SES employees. Currently, nonappropriated fund SES employees are capped at Executive Level IV, while appropriated fund SES employees are capped at Executive Level III. This section would rectify this pay inequity.

Section 1102—Restoration of Leave for Certain Department of Defense Employees who Deploy to a Combat Zone Outside the United States

This section would restore excess annual leave lost by certain Department of Defense employees deployed in support of the armed forces during hostilities. Section 6304 of title 5, United States Code, sets limits on the accumulation of annual leave by civilian employees, and does not except emergency essential civilian employees deployed in support of the armed forces during hostilities. This section would provide an exception to those limits in recognition of the increased support provided our deployed forces by Department of Defense civilian employees.

Section 1103—Expansion of Guard-and-Reserve Purposes for which Leave under Section 6323 of Title 5, United States Code, May be Used

This section would expand the permitted uses of military leave by members of the reserve components who are also federal civilian employees. Currently, section 6323 of title 5, United States Code, provides that federal civilian employees may use military leave for periods of active duty or field or coastal defense training. This section would add periods of inactive duty for training to the categories for which military leave could be used. This change would recognize the increased and varied contributions made by today's reserve members and would allow them the flexibility to use this leave within the current 15 day annual ceiling to further the military readiness of their reserve units.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Arms Control Implementation

The fiscal year 2000 budget request contained $249.7 million for arms control implementation programs, representing an increase from the fiscal year 1999 level of $227.3 million. The committee recommends $236.2 million, a decrease of $13.5 million from the budget request.

As in past years, the Department of Defense's requested level of funding is predicated in large measure on optimistic assumptions regarding the entry into force of a number of treaties, including START II, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and the Open Skies Treaty. For example, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) operation and maintenance budget request for START II implementation is $2.9 million, compared to only $0.2 million in fiscal year 1999. Moreover, the justification documents submitted with the budget request assume START II entry into force during the first or second quarter of fiscal year 1999. However, the second quarter of fiscal year 1999 has already passed, the Russian Duma shows no sign of ratifying the treaty anytime soon, and the Department has stated that the Protocol to the START II Treaty signed by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin in September 1997 must be ratified by the Senate prior to the treaty's entry into force—a development that does not appear likely in the near future. Consequently, the committee recommends a reduction of $2.0 million for START II implementation activities.

In addition, the Department's planning assumption regarding entry into force of the Open Skies Treaty is the second or third quarter of fiscal year 1999. As Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus have yet to ratify the treaty, this assumption also appears optimistic. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $1.5 million for Open Skies Treaty implementation.

Finally, the CTBT is unlikely to enter into force anytime soon. Among the 44 countries whose ratification is required for the treaty to take effect, 28 have not yet ratified it and three of those 28—North Korea, India, and Pakistan—have not even signed it. Consequently, the committee recommends a reduction of $1.0 million for CTBT-related implementation activities.

The budget request also includes $9.0 million to reimburse the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) for costs associated with inspections and escort activities at DOD facilities under the terms of the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). The committee notes that the Department currently does not have the legal authority to pay the salary and other costs of

CWC inspectors, and that this cost—as well as other CWC-related costs—has previously been assumed by the State Department. The committee also recalls that the Congress disapproved a similar DOD request last year. Accordingly, the committee does not believe that these costs are appropriately borne by the Department of Defense and recommends no funds for this activity.

Ballistic Missile Defense Discussions With Russia

The committee believes that discussions between the United States and Russia outside the framework of the 1972 U.S.-Soviet Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty would be useful in managing a transition from a strategic relationship based exclusively on offensive deterrence to a more stable one that includes ballistic missile defenses. The committee notes that such discussions have been held in the past but were suspended by the United States in January 1993. The committee also notes that in 1998, the United States engaged in early discussions with Russia concerning the possible deployment of a U.S. national missile defense. These discussions occurred outside the Standing Consultative Commission, the structure set up by the ABM Treaty to deal with questions of treaty compliance and to "consider possible changes in the strategic situation which have a bearing on the provisions of the Treaty."

The committee notes that the ABM Treaty was signed in 1972 when the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States was adversarial. In the intervening 27 years, the strategic relationship that gave rise to the treaty has changed profoundly, rendering many of its underlying assumptions obsolete and opening up the possibility of a cooperative transition to a new strategic relationship. Moreover, while some maintain that the treaty still rests on a legitimate legal basis, the committee notes that several recent legal analyses conclude that the treaty legally lapsed when the Soviet Union ceased to exist in 1991. In light of the changed strategic situation and the emergence of ballistic missile threats posed by regional nuclear powers such as North Korea, Iran, Pakistan, and India, the committee believes that the United States and Russia can mutually benefit from missile defenses.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to renew, broaden, and deepen discussions with the Russian Ministry of Defense intended to facilitate a cooperative transition to a strategic relationship that meets the requirements of both nations for active defenses against emerging missile and nuclear threats. The committee believes that such discussions would be an important confidence-building measure during the development and deployment of ballistic missile defense systems, help maintain strategic stability, and enable further opportunities for Russian-American cooperation.

Department of Defense Review of Satellite Licenses

The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) established a process for ensuring that the licensing and export of satellites does not undermine United States national security. Section 1513 of Public Law 105–261 transferred the licensing jurisdiction for satellite ex-

ports from the Commerce Department back to the State Department and required the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretaries of Defense and Commerce, to submit a report to the Congress on the steps taken to implement the transfer in a manner that would permit the timely and orderly processing of license applications. That report was submitted on January 21, 1999.

The report notes that the Departments of State and Defense "have agreed on the goal of providing a timely and transparent process" for satellite export licensing, within existing statutory and regulatory frameworks and "the constraints of each department's available resources." The committee believes that the Department of Defense should review all satellite license applications in an expeditious fashion in order to avoid unnecessary delays in the licensing process and urges the Department to continue exploring opportunities to ensure that this goal is realized as rapidly as possible.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1201—Report on Strategic Stability Under START III

Nuclear deterrence continues to be a cornerstone of United States national security. Key to the credibility of that deterrent is strategic stability: an assured United States capability to maintain robust nuclear options under a broad range of scenarios. Over the past decade, the nuclear posture of the United States has changed significantly as a consequence of a number of factors, including: deep reductions under the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) and pending reductions under START II; the de-alerting of United States strategic bombers and half of the United States force of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs); the unilateral and virtual elimination by the United States of its arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons; and unilateral downsizing by the United States of its strategic command and control capabilities. Although the Russian Duma has not yet ratified the START II treaty, it is anticipated that Russia and the United States will both meet the terms of that treaty, and that a START III treaty will be negotiated requiring additional significant reductions and alterations in the nuclear posture of the United States.

While the committee recognizes that the end of the Cold War afforded the opportunity to streamline nuclear force structure, it nevertheless views a robust nuclear deterrent capable of maintaining strategic stability as indispensable to the national security of the United States. The emerging threat environment, characterized by an unstable and unpredictable Russia that retains thousands of nuclear weapons, China's rapid modernization of its nuclear forces, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons and technology to rogue states and Third World nations, makes maintaining nuclear deterrence both imperative and more complicated than during the Cold War.

The committee also views a robust nuclear deterrent capable of maintaining strategic stability as a critical prerequisite for further nuclear arms reductions under any START III regime. Strategic stability would not be possible if a potential adversary, or combination of adversaries, could gain a significant advantage from striking

first or from exploiting asymmetries in the strategic balance resulting from a START III treaty.

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, to be prepared by the Defense Science Board in cooperation with the Director of Central Intelligence in classified and unclassified forms, on the strategic stability of the future nuclear balance between the United States and Russia and other potential nuclear adversaries.

Section 1202—One-Year Extension of Counterproliferation Authorities for Support of United Nations Weapons Inspection Regime in Iraq

This section would extend the authority through fiscal year 2000 of the Department of Defense to provide support to the UN Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM), or any successor weapons monitoring and inspection regime in Iraq, under the Weapons of Mass Destruction Control Act of 1992.

The committee notes with growing concern that Iraq continues to conceal and develop weapons of mass destruction (WMD). In response to the crisis last year over weapons inspections conducted by UNSCOM, precipitated by Iraq's continued refusal to grant UNSCOM complete and unfettered access to suspected WMD related facilities, the United States carried out a series of air strikes against Iraq (Operation Desert Fox) in December, 1998 with the intent of degrading Iraq's capacity to produce weapons of mass destruction and to threaten its neighbors. The committee notes that despite these strikes, Iraq has succeeded in stymieing all internationally-sanctioned efforts to monitor its ongoing WMD programs. In the wake of Iraq's expulsion of all UNSCOM inspectors and its cessation of cooperation with the UN monitoring regime, no significant WMD monitoring and inspection program has existed since October 1998.

The committee believes that preventing Iraq from possessing ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction must remain a high national priority. The committee is also troubled that ongoing military operations against Iraq in enforcing the northern and southern "no-fly zones"—conducted under expanded rules of engagement—have neither diminished Iraq's WMD capability nor had any effect in coercing Saddam Hussein's regime to accept a resumption of the weapons monitoring and inspection regime.

The committee supports continued DOD participation in any international effort to monitor and verify Iraq's ongoing WMD programs. Consequently, the committee agrees to a one-year extension of DOD's authority to provide support to UNSCOM, or its successor, for the purposes of monitoring, inspecting, verifying, and eliminating Iraq's proscribed weapons and delivery systems.

Section 1203—Military-to-Military Contacts with Chinese People's Liberation Army

This section would establish the policy for the conduct of military-to-military contacts between the U.S. armed forces and the People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China. First, the section would provide that such policy be governed by the prin-

ciples of reciprocity and transparency. Second, the section would establish limits that would prevent members of the People's Liberation Army from inappropriate access to advanced technologies and capabilities of the U.S. armed forces. Third, the section would require the Secretary of Defense to certify prior to the start of any year that military-to-military contacts with the People's Liberation Army will be conducted in accordance with such principles of reciprocity and transparency, that such contacts are in the national security interest of the United States, and would prohibit members of the U.S. armed forces from participating in any military-to-military contacts until such a certification was given to the Congress. Finally, the section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a detailed annual report to the Congress that provides an assessment of the military-to-military contacts with the People's Liberation Army.

The committee strongly believes that such policies and limitations are warranted by the pattern of Chinese efforts to improve the strength of its armed forces by acquiring advanced technologies and developing advanced military operational concepts and organizations based upon the model established by the U.S. armed forces over the past two decades. Through a coordinated pattern of activities ranging from official, high-level visits through outright espionage, it is clear to the committee that the People's Liberation Army is embarked upon a broad modernization effort that has the potential to compromise the advantages enjoyed by U.S. forces, not merely in relation to Chinese forces but other armed forces as well. Past Department of Defense reports demonstrate to the committee that the Chinese seek to develop capabilities for force projection, nuclear operations, space operations and other advanced military operations in large part through understanding and emulating American practices.

In addition, the committee has been increasingly concerned by the pattern of military-to-military contacts between U.S. forces and members of the People's Liberation Army. In the committee's judgment, the Administration has not taken adequate steps to protect U.S. operational practices and technological advantages. In general, the U.S. pattern of openness contrasts markedly with the restrictions placed upon American access to Chinese facilities and installations, personnel and units, and events such as major exercises. The committee is also disturbed to learn that U.S. policy for military-to-military contacts between U.S. armed forces and members of the People's Liberation Army has not been controlled by the Department of Defense, but rather by other elements of the Administration, and that military objections to such policy have been overruled in deference to the Administration's larger policy of strategic engagement with the People's Republic of China. In sum, the committee believes that the principles of transparency and reciprocity have not been observed by the Chinese and that programs of military exchange have been one-sided, to the detriment of U.S. national security interests.

Section 1204—Report on Allied Capabilities to Contribute to Major Theater Wars

It has long been a tenet of U.S. national military strategy and defense planning to acknowledge that American military forces are most likely to operate as members of coalition forces. This tenet has been reinforced by the strategic reviews conducted by the Department of Defense since the end of the Cold war, including the 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review, which assumes in its analysis of the core mission of U.S. armed forces that major theater wars will be fought "in concert with regional allies."

However, the Quadrennial Defense Review also postulates a "changing strategic environment" that "requires that we reassess . . . the degree to which we rely on allies . . . in major theater wars." In the committee's view, such a reassessment is overdue. Like U.S. armed forces, the armed forces of our major allies have been significantly reduced through the post-Cold War period. Also like U.S. armed forces, the pace of contingency operations for our major allies has been high. The French and British, for example, who provided supporting formations during the Persian Gulf War, including participating in the main ground attack of that conflict, are "doing more with less" as are U.S. armed forces. After undergoing substantial force reductions over the past decade, both French and British forces are today operating in the air campaign against Yugoslavia, provide substantial ground forces in Bosnia, and would play a large role in any ground operations in Kosovo, either in a combat or peacekeeping role. In addition to ongoing operations in the Gulf and in the Balkans, both France and Britain have been involved in substantial contingency operations that are solely in their own security interests such as in Africa and Northern Ireland. In sum, the ability of France and Britain, perhaps the United States' most militarily capable allies, to surge large forces in the event of a major theater war, is increasingly open to question.

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to prepare a report, in both classified and unclassified form, describing the current capabilities and commitment of the allied forces anticipated to support U.S. operations in major theater wars and to determine the risk to the successful conduct of those wars resulting from any shortfalls in anticipated allied forces.

Section 1205—Limitation on Funds for Bosnia Peacekeeping Operations for Fiscal Year 2000

This section would limit the amount of funds available for peacekeeping operations in Bosnia to the amounts contained in the budget request, $1,824.4 million. The provision would also permit the President to waive this limitation by submitting to the Congress a certification of national security interest, a report, and a request for supplemental appropriations to cover the associated additional costs.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF FORMER SOVIET UNION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $475.5 million for cooperative threat reduction (CTR) activities, representing an increase of $35.1 million over the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1999. The request included $330.0 million for destruction and dismantlement, $119.7 million for fissile materials and nuclear weapons safety and storage, $20.0 million for reactor core conversion in Russia, $2.0 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention in Russia, and $3.8 million for other program support, including defense and military contacts.

The committee recommends a total of $444.1 million for CTR activities in fiscal year 2000, a decrease of $31.4 million from the budget request and an increase of $3.7 million over the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends the request of $9.3 million for warhead dismantlement processing in Russia; $15.2 million for weapons transportation security in Russia; $20 million for reactor core conversion in Russia; $2.0 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention activities in Russia; and $1.8 million for other program support. The committee recommends the following decreases to the budget request: $105.8 million for chemical weapons destruction; $3.6 million for a fissile material storage facility in Russia; and $2.0 million for defense and military contacts. The committee recommends the following increases to the budget request: $20.0 million for strategic offensive arms elimination activities in Russia; $10.0 million for strategic nuclear arms elimination in Ukraine; and $50.0 million for weapons storage security in Russia. The discussion below provides the rationale for these recommendations and raises other matters of interest and concern to the committee.

In general, the committee notes that the Congress' consistent support for the CTR program since its inception has been predicated upon certain assumptions and assurances by the Department of Defense that are increasingly subject to challenge. These include a belief that the effort to assist in the elimination of former Soviet weapons would be cooperative in a fiscal as well as a practical sense—with the costs of the effort being shared by the parties concerned and not borne exclusively by the United States.

Eight years after the CTR program was inaugurated, the committee notes that the economic decline of the states of the former Soviet Union—in particular, Russia—has resulted in a reduced financial commitment by those states to a variety of CTR projects. This situation has placed the Department in the position of having to absorb significant additional costs that previously were not planned to be borne by the United States. While the committee un-

derstands and has supported the national security rationale underlying the Department's CTR efforts, current economic conditions suggest that this assistance will cost the United States billions of dollars more than previously anticipated. Moreover, the committee is concerned that the United States' willingness to absorb these additional costs may, in turn, further dampen any incentive for the recipient countries to invest their own resources in weapons dismantlement and destruction activities.

For these reasons, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1308) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by December 31, 1999 that explains the Department's strategy for encouraging CTR recipient states to contribute financially to the threat reduction effort, that prioritizes the Department's CTR projects on the basis of their national security benefit to the United States, and that identifies any limitations that the United States has imposed or will seek to impose, either unilaterally or through negotiations, on the U.S. level of assistance for each of these projects.

In addition, the committee notes that the scope of the CTR program has expanded since its inception into areas beyond its original focus of reducing the nuclear threat to the United States. As a result, the committee questions whether some CTR activities are appropriately the responsibility of the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1307) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report no later than December 31, 1999 explaining why the Department of Defense is the appropriate funding authority for each of the CTR projects for which funding is requested, identifying those activities that might be more appropriately funded by other agencies, and presenting a plan to migrate these projects to other non-DOD agencies.

Finally, the committee notes that the seven-year "umbrella" agreement that provides the authority under which CTR projects are implemented in Russia will expire on June 17, 1999. Without its extension or renewal, all CTR work in Russia will cease after that date. According to the Department, Russia has been unwilling so far to renew the agreement without modifications that could affect taxation, audits and examinations, and other aspects of the CTR program. The committee strongly urges the Department not to agree to any modifications that would compromise the protections granted the CTR program under the original umbrella agreement.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Arms Elimination Projects in Russia

The budget request contained $157.3 million for strategic offensive arms elimination projects in Russia, a ten percent increase from the fiscal year 1999 appropriated amount of $142.2 million.

The committee reiterates its support for the accelerated elimination of strategic offensive weapons in Russia in accordance with the START I Treaty, notwithstanding the concerns mentioned above, and recommends an additional $20.0 million for this task. However, the committee remains concerned with Russia's continuing non-ratification of the 1993 START II Treaty and its apparent inability or unwillingness to move forward with START I Treaty-mandated reductions in the absence of additional U.S. CTR assistance. In the committee's view, Russia is legally obligated to reduce its strategic offensive forces according to the provisions of START I. This obligation is not conditioned upon the receipt of U.S. assistance. For Russia to refuse to carry out these reductions without CTR assistance places the United States in the position of having to buy Russian compliance with its arms control commitments and sets an objectionable precedent.

In particular, the committee notes that the budget request includes more than $15.0 million to support the complete elimination of 26 SS–18 ICBM silo launcher sites. However, although Russia is legally obligated under START I to eliminate at least 22 SS–18 ICBM launchers each year, it has failed to do so on the grounds that it could not afford the cost of these dismantlements. The committee is concerned that the Department's willingness to relieve Russia of some of the financial burden associated with its treaty-mandated reductions will allow Russia to devote a greater proportion of its scarce resources to the development of newer and more sophisticated strategic offensive arms. In fact, the committee notes that Russia continues to invest in the production and deployment of the new SS–27 "Topol–M" ICBM.

In this regard, the committee notes that the Russian government has acknowledged a linkage between the elimination of older systems through the CTR program and the development of newer missile systems. Yuri Maslyukov, First Vice Premier of the Russian Federation, stated in December 1998 that "the funding of arms elimination under Nunn-Lugar [the CTR program] is now comparable with our annual expenditure on modernizing the strategic nuclear forces and deploying the grouping of Topol–M missiles. In other words, since the present missiles will anyhow have to be dismantled. the absence of the Nunn-Lugar program. will compel Russia to take for these purposes the money currently planned for the deployment of new missile complexes, since there is simply nowhere to obtain any more money." The committee does not believe that the CTR program should relieve Russia of the necessity to choose between funding its legally-binding disarmament obligations and its strategic modernization program.

Because of the concerns noted above, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by December 31, 1999 that identifies:

(1) the number of SS–18 missile and launcher eliminations that have occurred since the START I Treaty entered into force in 1991;
(2) the Department's assumptions regarding Russia's willingness and ability to eliminate at least 22 SS–18 ICBM launchers per year with the CTR assistance currently being provided and proposed for this task and in the absence of such assistance;
(3) whether additional CTR assistance for SS–18 eliminations establishes a precedent whereby the United States will pay for Russian arms control compliance; and
(4) what Russia has spent and is expected to spend on the strategic offensive arms elimination effort, including the value of any "in-kind" Russian contribution to the elimination process.

In addition, the report should discuss under what circumstances the Department might consider using CTR funds to eliminate Russia's stockpile of tactical nuclear weapons.

Arms Elimination Projects in Ukraine

The budget request contained $33.0 million for strategic nuclear arms elimination projects in Ukraine, a reduction of $14.5 million from the fiscal year 1999 appropriated level. This decline reflects the achievement of certain project objectives. The budget request would support the elimination in Ukraine of ICBMs, ICBM silos, and heavy bombers. The committee supports this effort and recommends an additional $10 million for strategic nuclear arms elimination in Ukraine.

Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention in Russia

The budget request contained $2.0 million for collaborative research projects with scientists at Russian institutes where biological weapons work has been carried out. The request is identical to the fiscal year 1999 appropriated level. The Department has justified this project as an effort to employ in civilian-oriented research Russian scientists formerly involved in biological weapons work and to keep them from selling their expertise to potentially hostile countries such as Iran.

The committee notes that this effort is part of the multi-agency "Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative" initially announced by President Clinton in his January 1999 State of the Union address. Although the Department proposes to fund its share of this effort at $2.0 million in fiscal year 2000, Administration projections forecast an increase in the DOD CTR budget for these activities to $34.8 million in fiscal year 2004. In addition, significant funding for similar initiatives is being proposed within the State Department budget.

The committee approves the requested amount for this purpose. The committee recognizes the threat posed by the proliferation of biological weapons and supports efforts to counter that threat. However, those efforts are complicated by the magnitude and expansiveness of the former Soviet Union's biological weapons activi-

ties, the continuing lack of transparency with respect to Russia's military biological weapons research and development programs, and the ambiguous line that separates civilian research from military research. The committee does not believe that increased funding and collaborative efforts with Russian scientists should be a prerequisite for greater Russian transparency. In addition, the committee is troubled by the prospect that such collaborative programs could result in the perpetuation of a knowledge base and a set of skills among Russian scientists that could be useful for biological weapons production and that might actually make them more attractive candidates for recruitment by states seeking a biological weapons capability in the future.

With these concerns in mind, the committee notes that section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit, prior to the obligation of any fiscal year 1999 CTR funds for biological weapons proliferation prevention projects, a report on the use of CTR funds at biological institutes in Russia and on the development of any new strains of anthrax. Moreover, section 1308 of Public Law 105–261 required the Secretary to submit by March 1, 1999 a report on biological weapons programs in Russia. The committee has not received either of these reports and therefore recommends a provision (sec. 1306) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of any fiscal year 2000 CTR funds for biological weapons proliferation prevention activities in Russia until the requirements of Public Law 105–261 have been met.

Chemical Weapons Destruction in Russia

The budget request contained $130.4 million for chemical weapons destruction activities in Russia, a 47 percent increase over the fiscal year 1999 appropriated level of $88.4 million. The request would be used to support continued optimization of the chemical agent elimination process, procurement of equipment, and design and construction activities for a chemical weapons destruction facility to be built near Shchuch'ye, Russia. This project has fallen more than two years behind schedule.

CTR officials have justified funding for the Shchuch'ye project on three grounds: that it would assist Russia in meeting the chemical weapons elimination deadlines established by the CWC; that it would encourage other countries to contribute to Russia's chemical weapons destruction effort; and that it would advance U.S. nonproliferation objectives. The committee believes that these arguments do not stand up well under scrutiny.

The committee recommends $24.6 million for chemical weapons-related activities in Russia—a decrease of $105.8 million from the request—and directs that these funds be used to initiate security enhancement projects at Russian chemical weapons storage sites. In addition, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1305) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of any fiscal year 2000 CTR funds for activities related to the planning, design, or construction of the Shchuch'ye chemical weapons destruction facility. Further, the committee directs the Department to use unobligated prior year balances to provide for an orderly close-out of existing

planning and design activity and not to use these funds for construction activity at Shchuch'ye.

There are a number of long-standing concerns that lead the committee to this recommendation. First, according to the Department, the United States is not prepared to fund completion of this project until Russia makes significant improvements to the local community infrastructure, including roads, worker housing, public service facilities, and other social development projects. These infrastructure improvements have been estimated by CTR officials to cost at least $200.0 million. Russia is unlikely to be able to pay for these improvements and the United States has stated that it has no intention of absorbing these costs.

Second, only 14 percent of Russia's declared stockpile of chemical weapons is located at Shchuch'ye. Moreover, these munitions are ground-launched, not air-launched, and, consequently, pose a lesser threat to the United States and the West due to their shorter deliverable range.

Third, Russia's desire for CTR assistance to help eliminate aging chemical weapons owes more to the fact that these weapons pose an environmental problem for Russia than a security threat to the United States.

Fourth, as a pilot project, the Shchuch'ye facility would have an initial destruction capacity of 500 metric tons annually. In an April 1999 report, the General According Office (GAO) concluded that "the Shchuch'ye pilot facility's limited capacity and delayed start of operations will prevent Russia from destroying the Shchuch'ye depot's nerve agent stocks before Russia's Chemical Weapons Convention deadline of 2007." The facility is expected to begin destroying nerve agents by 2006 and at the initial elimination rate would not finish destroying most of the Shchuch'ye depot's stockpile until "10 years after the expiration of Russia's Convention deadline and 5 years after the expiration of an extension to that deadline." The United States has stated that it does not plan to pay the estimated $250.0 million costs associated with increasing the facility's capacity to 1,200 metric tons annually, and the Russians are unlikely to do so. This raises doubt as to whether the facility will ever reach its full elimination potential.

Fifth, Russia has chemical weapons stored at at least six other sites and would need to build at least six additional destruction facilities to destroy the 40,000 tons of chemical weapons in its declared stockpile. Although the total cost of eliminating Russia's declared arsenal of 40,000 tons of chemical weapons has been estimated at between $5.0 and $7.5 billion, Russia reduced its fiscal year 1998 budget for chemical weapons elimination from $83 million to approximately $13 million. In fiscal year 1999, Russia has budgeted $63.0 million for all chemical weapons elimination activities and is expected to actually spend only a fraction of that amount. The total non-U.S. international contribution to Russia's chemical weapons elimination effort amounts to only $18 million. For a number of reasons, the GAO concludes that "the Shchuch'ye project cannot achieve its broader national security objectives unless Russia receives a large infusion of additional funding."

Sixth, the U.S. share of the costs to build the Shchuch'ye facility has been estimated by DOD at approximately $750.0 million, yet

there is no indication that Russia will be willing or able to absorb the annual costs of operating the facility, which are likely to be substantial and which the United States may be asked to assume.

Finally, even the Department apparently believes this project to be a lower priority than other initiatives, as it reduced its planned budget for Shchuch'ye by approximately $85 million in fiscal years 2000 and 2001 in order to reallocate the funds elsewhere. The committee believes that there are higher priority CTR efforts that are likely to provide a greater security return on investment and encourages the Department to focus its attention and resources on such efforts. These include efforts to enhance security at Russia's existing chemical weapons depots, which will contribute to U.S. non-proliferation objectives.

Fissile Material Storage Facility

The budget request contained $64.5 million for equipment and construction of a fissile material storage facility in Russia to house materials from dismantled strategic nuclear weapons. This is an increase from the $60.9 million appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

The committee recommends a decrease of $3.6 million for this project. Although the committee reiterates its support for the safe and secure storage of fissile materials removed from Russian nuclear weapons, the construction of the facility at Mayak, Russia has been marked by significant schedule delays and mounting costs. The completion of the facility has been delayed by at least three years, from 1999 to 2002.

According to an April 1999 GAO report, "Russian reluctance to share critical information with the United States may limit Mayak's national security benefits . . ." In addition, GAO noted that it "will cost more than previously estimated and take longer than previously scheduled. Unless Russia and other foreign nations take certain steps, [the facility] will not provide the United States with all the national security benefits that it sought."

The committee continues to have concerns over the total cost of the Mayak facility, and the appropriate U.S. share of these costs. In Congressional testimony in 1995 and 1996, DOD officials stated: "The United States is willing to provide up to half the cost of the facility." This would have capped the U.S. share of Mayak costs at approximately $275.0 million. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), the Congress reinforced this cost cap by requiring a cost-sharing agreement with Russia. However, last year Russia indicated that it does not plan to provide the funds for its share of the costs to complete this project. Consequently, the Department agreed to pay for most of Russia's costs for the Mayak facility. The committee notes that this decision was taken without Congressional consultation. In January 1999, the Department concluded an agreement with Russia's Ministry of Atomic Energy to cap U.S. funding at $412.6 million—a $137.6 million increase in the U.S. cost with the United States now estimated to be paying for roughly 90 percent of the project's total cost.

Moreover, while the United States has agreed to absorb this substantial cost increase, the facility itself will be only one half the size it was originally intended to be. According to GAO, completion

of the second wing of the Mayak facility—which was originally included in the Department's $275.0 million cost cap—"would cost the United States another $230 million—raising total U.S. Mayak design and construction costs to about $642 million"—roughly 125 percent more than the Department's 1996 cap. Additional costs may raise the U.S. costs for this project to more than $1.2 billion.

The committee is also concerned by the lack of a transparency agreement with Russia that will allow the United States to verify that the fissile materials stored at Mayak have been removed from dismantled nuclear weapons. The committee notes that the Congress' prior support for this project was predicated on the Department's position that the Mayak facility would house fissile materials removed from former Soviet nuclear weapons (so-called "weapons-origin" materials) and not simply weapons-grade fissile materials previously stored elsewhere. The committee notes that section 1407 of Public Law 105–85 required the Secretary of Defense to notify the Congress once a transparency agreement had been reached with Russia. In requiring this notification, the Congress specifically intended to encourage the Department to negotiate a written agreement containing specific measures and procedures for verifying the weapons origin of the materials to be stored at Mayak. On April 8, 1999, the Secretary notified the committee that "the Department of Defense and the [Russian] Ministry of Atomic Energy have also reached agreement incorporating the principle of transparency with respect to the storage facility." However, the Secretary's notification references a 1996 agreement on the "requirement for transparency measures" and a transparency "Protocol" that has not yet been finalized. No written agreement with the Russians has been concluded to date that specifies the transparency measures and procedures that will be used, in accordance with the clear intent of the section 1407 limitation.

The committee strongly encourages the Department to continue to seek an agreement that would ensure the ability of the United States to verify the weapons origin of any fissile materials stored at Mayak. However, the committee reminds the Department that as construction of the facility continues without such an agreement, U.S. negotiating leverage diminishes.

As a result of these concerns, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1304) that would prohibit funding for construction of the second wing at Mayak until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that the additional storage capacity is required and submits a detailed cost estimate for the second wing. In addition, this provision would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2000 CTR funds for construction of the second wing and would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of these funds until 15 days after the Congress is notified that a written agreement detailing the specific transparency measures to be implemented has been reached.

Nuclear Reactor Core Conversion

The budget request included $20.0 million for nuclear reactor core conversion projects in Russia, a reduction of $9.8 million from the level appropriated in fiscal year 1999. This activity is intended to support of goal of eliminating Russian plutonium production by 2000. However, the core conversion project has been restructured

in light of a lack of Russian funding and will take longer and cost more than previously planned. As a result, DOD funding for this activity is expected to increase steadily through fiscal year 2003.

The committee recommends the requested amount for this project. However, the Department of Energy (DOE) initiated nuclear reactor core conversion efforts several years ago and remains the agency of primary responsibility for its execution. The committee believes that nuclear reactor core conversion is an activity that is more appropriately the responsibility of DOE and urges the Secretary of Defense to migrate funding and oversight responsibility for this effort back to DOE.

Nuclear Warhead Dismantlement Processing in Russia

The budget request contained $9.3 million to assist Russia in processing the fissile components of dismantled nuclear warheads in preparation for long-term storage. This is slightly less than last year's appropriated amount of $9.4 million. The committee recommends the budget request.

Nuclear Weapons Storage Security in Russia

The budget request included $40.0 million for nuclear weapons storage security in Russia, a slight decrease from the appropriated level of $41.7 million in fiscal year 1999.

The committee supports the objective of ensuring the safe and secure storage of Russian nuclear weapons. However, the committee continues to have concerns regarding Russia's willingness to allow the United States access to certain nuclear weapons storage sites for the purposes of auditing U.S. CTR assistance. Moreover, Russia recently indicated that there are at least 70 additional sites requiring security enhancements than the United States previously believed.

To assist Russia with security enhancements at these additional sites and to encourage Russian cooperation in agreeing to effective audit and examination procedures, the committee recommends $90.0 million for this activity, an increase of $50.0 million.

Nuclear Weapons Transportation Security

The budget request contained $15.2 million for nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia, roughly a 50 percent increase from the level appropriated in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends the budget request.

The committee has previously expressed concern over U.S. funding for these initiatives, which until last year had been Russia's responsibility. The committee reiterates its belief that the Department should seek to resolve transportation security issues with Russia in a manner that does not commit the United States to pay the future costs of rail transportation of nuclear weapons from operational deployment sites to storage facilities.

Other Support Programs and Assessments

The budget request included $2.0 million for defense and military contacts with the states of the former Soviet Union and $1.8 mil-

lion for other assessments, including management and administrative costs, project development, and audits and examinations, a reduction of $4.2 million from the appropriated levels in fiscal year 1999.

The committee recommends no funds for defense and military contacts. The committee notes that the Department has more than $25.0 million available in prior-year unobligated balances for such initiatives. The committee recommends the request of $1.8 million for other assessments.

Prohibition of Specified Activities

The committee reiterates its belief that the focus of the CTR program should be on facilitating the elimination of former Soviet weapons of mass destruction and their delivery vehicles. For this reason, the committee has consistently resisted attempts to expand the program beyond its core objectives. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1303) that would make permanent long-standing prohibitions on the use of CTR funds for peacekeeping-related activities, housing, environmental restoration, job retraining, and defense conversion, and would prohibit the use of CTR funds for the elimination of conventional weapons or their delivery vehicles.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would specify the kinds of programs to be funded under this title and would make fiscal year 2000 CTR funds available for obligation for three years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate fiscal year 2000 funding for various CTR purposes and activities.

Section 1303—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Specified Purposes

This section would prohibit the use of CTR funds for specified activities, including peacekeeping-related, housing, environmental restoration, job retraining, and defense conversion purposes. It would also prohibit the use of CTR funds for conventional weapons elimination purposes.

Section 1304—Limitations on Use of Funds for Fissile Material Storage Facility

This section would prohibit the use of certain CTR funds for construction of an additional fissile material storage facility until various reports and certifications are submitted to Congress and would restrict fiscal year 2000 CTR funding for this purpose until a transparency agreement with Russia is signed.

Section 1305—Limitation on Use of Funds for Chemical Weapons Destruction

This section would prohibit the use of funds for activities related to a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia.

Section 1306—Limitation on Use of Funds for Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention Activities

This section would limit the use of funds for this purpose until the Secretary submits to the Congress reports required by Public Law 105–261.

Section 1307—Limitation on Use of Funds Until Submission of Report and Multiyear Plan

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of any fiscal year 2000 CTR funds until the Secretary submits the update to the multiyear plan required by section 1205 of Public Law 103–337 and a report detailing the appropriate role of the Department in funding CTR programs.

Section 1308—Requirement to Submit Report

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the fiscal and cost-sharing aspects of the CTR program.

Section 1309—Report on Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative

This section would require the President to submit a report by December 31, 1999 describing the multi-agency Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative and how interagency coordination will be achieved to eliminate program redundancies.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

PURPOSE

The purpose of Division B is to provide military construction authorizations and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2000. As approved by the committee, Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $8,590,243,000 for construction in support of the active forces, reserve components, defense agencies for fiscal year 2000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW

The military construction authorization request for fiscal year 2000 was introduced by request as division B of H.R. 1401 on April 14, 1999.

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $5,438,443,333 for fiscal year 2000 for military construction, including $705,911,000 for activities associated with base closure and realignment, and $3,115,687,000 for family housing construction and support. The committee reallocated $51,800,000 within the budget request of the Department of Defense to support military construction requirements related to the drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense and planning and design activities for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization. The committee recommends $4,988,012,000 for military construction, including $705,911,000 for activities associated with base closure and realignment, and $3,602,231,000 for family housing construction and support for fiscal year 2000.

The committee restates its deepening concern about the condition of the Nation's military installations and facilities and continues to be troubled by the continuing and persistent underinvestment by the Administration in military facilities and infrastructure. The budget request for the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for the military construction and military family housing programs of the Department of Defense, if enacted, would represent a 36 percent reduction from current spending levels and a 38 percent reduction from the budget estimates for the coming fiscal year presented to the Congress one year ago.

To address the serious shortfalls in the Administration's budget request, the committee recommends an increase in new budget authority for these programs of $3,100,000,000. The committee notes that the increase in new budget authority would not address completely the funding deficit created by the budget request. The committee considers the full funding of justified military construction and military family housing projects, with a particular emphasis upon housing for unaccompanied military personnel and military families, facilities that enhance the quality of life for military per-

sonnel, and facilities to enhance the training and readiness of the Armed Forces, to be a critical readiness priority. Additionally, the committee recommends a limited number of additional military construction projects with a special emphasis on facilities that enhance the training and readiness of the Armed Forces. In limited instances, where large construction projects could be funded in phases, consistent with the well-established statutory and regulatory framework for such projects, the committee recommends such a funding approach.

The committee recommends funding for the base closure and realignment activities of the Department of Defense at the amount requested for authorization of appropriations for the coming fiscal year. The committee notes the assurances of the Department of Defense that the requested amount of $705,911,000 is adequate to address requirements in fiscal year 2000. Consistent with those assurances, the committee expects no delay in the timely environmental remediation of realigning or closing installations and no deferral in the reuse of affected military installations.

In an effort to improve the quality of life for military personnel and their families, the committee reiterates its support for the authorities provided in subchapter IV, chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code. The Military Housing Privatization Initiative remains a central component of the ultimate resolution of the military housing crisis. The committee, however, reiterates its view that this initiative should not be viewed by the military departments as a substitute for military family housing construction projects where those projects are necessary to alleviate immediate housing problems or in those locations where the privatization initiative is not economically or otherwise feasible.

In that context, the committee is deeply concerned about the budget request of the Department of the Army for military family housing construction. The Army requested no funds for military family housing construction at military installations in the United States. While the committee strongly supports the requirement to improve living conditions for military families outside the United States, the committee does not believe divestment in military family housing construction is appropriate given the scope of the housing crisis and the slow pace of execution under the initiative. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to ensure that future budget requests for the military family housing programs of the military departments adequately address current and anticipated requirements.

STRUCTURE OF THE BUDGET REQUEST

The committee is concerned about the structure of the budget request for fiscal year 2000. The Administration proposed two significant changes in the management of the military construction and military family housing programs.

First, the Administration requested $3,060,830,000 in authorization of advance appropriations for fiscal year 2001 to support military construction projects contained in the budget request for the coming fiscal year. The committee notes that every military construction and military family housing project, with the exception of projects affecting certain classified programs and the programs of

the defense agencies, were subject to incremental funding on an outlay-rate basis. Second, the Administration requested the separation of funds for supervision, overhead, and inspection (SIOH) charges totaling $154,281,000 from specific military construction projects and to annualize those charges over a five-year period. The committee strongly opposes both changes to the management of the Department's military construction and military family housing programs.

The committee notes that no precedent exists for the broad-based, incremental funding of military construction as proposed by the Administration. The committee is concerned that the Administration's proposal would negatively affect the timely execution of the military construction program for the coming fiscal year. Execution would be dependent upon the development of new, possibly costly, business practices. Management uncertainty and the spread of project costs over multiple fiscal years would likely lead to increased costs and a delay in the delivery of needed facilities. The committee is also concerned that extensive incremental funding on an outlay-rate basis would reduce the flexibility of the military departments to meet unforeseen requirements or address contract difficulties due to a lack of funds. There is no evidence to suggest that either proposal would benefit the taxpayer, and both proposals would, over the long term, likely cost the taxpayer more.

A tabular summary of the authorizations provided in Division B for fiscal year 2000 follows:

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
Military Construction, Army	656,003	558,402	1,214,405
Military Construction, Navy	319,786	613,236	933,022
Military Construction, Air Force	179,479	533,686	713,165
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	193,005	599,803	792,808
NATO Security Investment Program	191,000	0	191,000
BRAC IV	705,911	0	705,911
Military Construction, Army National Guard	16,045	107,833	123,878
Military Construction, Air National Guard	21,319	129,851	151,170
Military Construction, Army Reserve	23,120	69,395	92,515
Military Construction, Navy Reserve	4,933	16,641	21,574
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	12,155	36,409	48,564
SUBTOTAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	**2,322,756**	**2,665,256**	**4,988,012**
Family Housing Construction, Army	14,003	66,197	80,200
Family Housing Support, Army	1,098,080	(8,268)	1,089,812
Family Housing Construction, Navy	64,605	191,410	256,015
Family Housing Support, Navy	895,070	0	895,070
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	101,791	237,205	338,996
Family Housing Support, Air Force	821,892	0	821,892
Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide	50	0	50
Family Housing Support, Defense-Wide	41,440	0	41,440
Family Housing Improvement Fund	78,756	0	78,756
SUBTOTAL MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING	**3,115,687**	**486,544**	**3,602,231**
TOTAL	**5,438,443**	**3,151,800**	**8,590,243**

NOTE: Includes $51.8 million in transfers from RDT&E, Defense-wide and Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense.

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
1	Alabama	Army	Anniston Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase VII)	7,000	(7,000)	0
2	Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Test Measurement Lab/Support Facility	0	9,800	9,800
3	Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	OTS Cadet Dormitory	0	10,600	10,600
4	Alabama	Chemical Demilitarization	Anniston Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase VII)	0	7,000	7,000
5	Alabama	Air National Guard	Birmingham ANGB	Base Engineer Maintenance Complex	0	4,200	4,200
6	Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	2,200	12,400	14,600
7	Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Emission Reduction Facility	2,300	13,200	15,500
8	Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	MOUT Collective Training Facility	0	17,000	17,000
9	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Repair KC-135 Parking Ramp	941	3,059	4,000
10	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Repair Runway	3,334	10,666	14,000
11	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Weapons Release Systems Facility	1,451	4,649	6,100
12	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Construct C-130 Parking Ramp	3,995	13,005	17,000
13	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Dormitory	3,727	12,073	15,800
14	Alaska	Defense Logistics Agency	Eielson AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	9,000	17,000	26,000
15	Alaska	Defense Logistics Agency	Elmendorf AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	4,700	18,800	23,500
16	Alaska	Tri-Care Management Agency	Fort Wainwright	Hospital Replacement (Phase I)	18,000	0	18,000
17	Alaska	Army National Guard	Anchorage	CSMS/MATES	2,940	10,910	13,850
18	Alaska	Air National Guard	Kulis	Composite Support Complex	2,170	7,830	10,000
19	Arizona	Navy	Camp Navajo Navy Detachment	Magazines Modernization	1,910	5,650	7,560
20	Arizona	Navy	Yuma MCAS	Child Development Center Addition	640	1,980	2,620
21	Arizona	Navy	Yuma MCAS	Land Acquisition	3,650	17,950	21,600
22	Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Aircraft Processing Ramp	1,847	5,953	7,800
23	Arizona	Tri-Care Management Agency	Davis-Monthan AFB	Add/Alter Ambulatory Health Care Center	2,400	7,600	10,000
24	Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase IV)	61,800	(61,800)	0
25	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	C-130 Squad Ops/AMU	0	7,800	7,800
26	Arkansas	Chemical Demilitarization	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase IV)	0	61,800	61,800
27	Arkansas	Air National Guard	Little Rock AFB	Vehicle/Base Engineer Maintenance Complex	1,881	6,818	8,699
28	Arkansas	Air Force Reserve	Little Rock AFB	Alter Aerial Port Training Facility	209	591	800
29	California	Army	Fort Irwin	Rotational Unit Facility Maintenance Area	3,300	10,100	13,400
30	California	Army	Fort Irwin	Land Acquisition (Phase I)	0	19,000	19,000
31	California	Army	Presidio of Monterey	General Instruction Facility	0	7,100	7,100
32	California	Navy	Barstow MCLB	Test Track/Test Pond Facility	1,150	3,520	4,670
33	California	Navy	Camp Pendleton MCB	Armory	660	1,960	2,620
34	California	Navy	Camp Pendleton MCB	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	2,390	7,350	9,740
35	California	Navy	Camp Pendleton MCB	MEF Ops/CMD Center	0	6,800	6,800
36	California	Navy	Camp Pendleton MCB	Integrated Communication Hub	960	2,850	3,810
37	California	Navy	Camp Pendleton MCB	Staff Non-Commissioned Officer's Academy	1,640	4,840	6,480

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
38	California	Navy	Camp Pendleton MCB	Tactical Vehicle Maintenance Facility	2,210	6,800	9,010
39	California	Navy	China Lake NAWC	Control Tower	0	4,000	4,000
40	California	Navy	Corona NWAC	Measurement Science Laboratory	0	7,070	7,070
41	California	Navy	Lemoore NAS	Aircraft Ordinance Loading Facility	3,010	8,890	11,900
42	California	Navy	Lemoore NAS	Aviation Armament Facility	1,460	4,340	5,800
43	California	Navy	Lemoore NAS	Engine Maintenance Shop Addition	600	1,760	2,360
44	California	Navy	Lemoore NAS	Strike Fighter Weapons Training Facility	1,000	2,960	3,960
45	California	Navy	Naval Postgraduate School	Gymnasium	0	5,100	5,100
46	California	Navy	North Island NAS	Berthing Wharf (Phase I)	40,760	0	40,760
47	California	Navy	Point Mugu NAWC	Surface Transportation Facilities (Phase I)	0	6,190	6,190
48	California	Navy	San Diego Naval Medical Center	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Modernization	5,470	16,120	21,590
49	California	Navy	San Diego MCRD	Physical Fitness Center Addition	810	2,390	3,200
50	California	Navy	Twentynine Palms MCAGCC	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	4,840	14,290	19,130
51	California	Navy	Twentynine Palms MCAGCC	Cast Trainer Addition	420	1,250	1,670
52	California	Navy	Twentynine Palms MCAGCC	Tactical Vehicle Maintenance Facility	3,420	10,540	13,960
53	California	Navy	Twentynine Palms Naval Hospital	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	1,930	5,710	7,640
54	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Flightline Fire Station	2,086	6,814	8,900
55	California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Construct Spurs South Base	0	5,500	5,500
56	California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Add To Physical Fitness Center	1,754	5,746	7,500
57	California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Support Facility	0	3,700	3,700
58	California	Defense Manpower Data Center	Presidio of Monterey Annex	DOD Center-Monterey Bay Renovation	6,712	21,288	28,000
59	California	Special Operations Command	Coronado NAB	Naval Special Warfare C2 Addition	2,272	3,728	6,000
60	California	Tri-Care Management Agency	Los Angeles AFB	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	2,400	11,200	13,600
61	California	Tri-Care Management Agency	Travis AFB	WRM Warehouse/Engineering Support Facility	2,000	5,500	7,500
62	California	Air National Guard	Moffett Federal Airfield	Replace Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	3,033	10,967	14,000
63	California	Navy Reserve	Camp Pendleton MCRC	Reserve Training Complex	1,649	8,291	9,940
64	Colorado	Army	Fort Carson	Mobilization Material Warehouse	0	4,400	4,400
65	Colorado	Army	Peterson AFB	US Army Space Command Headquarters	3,700	21,300	25,000
66	Colorado	Army	Pueblo Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase I)	11,800	(11,800)	0
67	Colorado	Chemical Demilitarization	Pueblo Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase I)	0	11,800	11,800
68	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	0	7,000	7,000
69	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	USSPACECOM/NORAD Headquarters	7,887	25,113	33,000
70	Colorado	Air Force	Schriever AFB	Child Development Center	0	6,700	6,700
71	Colorado	Air Force	Schriever AFB	Physical Fitness Center	929	2,971	3,900
72	Colorado	Air Force	Schriever AFB	Sanitary Sewer Line	1,296	4,204	5,500
73	Colorado	Air Force	US Air Force Academy	Upgrade Academic Facility	4,056	13,444	17,500
74	District of Columbia	Army	Fort McNair	Chapel	380	870	1,250

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
75	District of Columbia	Army	Walter Reed	Physical Fitness Training Center	1,020	5,780	6,800
76	Florida	Navy	Mayport NS	Harbor Ops/Small Craft Berth	0	9,560	9,560
77	Florida	Navy	Whiting Field NAS	Power Check Pad/Apron Modifications	0	600	600
78	Florida	Navy	Whiting Field NAS	JPATS T-6A Trainer Facility	1,200	3,550	4,750
79	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Dining Facility	0	4,700	4,700
80	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Dormitory	1,635	5,365	7,000
81	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Squadron Operations Facility	1,566	5,034	6,600
82	Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Dormitory	2,161	6,939	9,100
83	Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Runway Repair/Taxiway	2,269	7,431	9,700
84	Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Add/Alter Physical Fitness Center	1,302	4,198	5,500
85	Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Air Freight/Passenger Terminal Facility	1,967	6,333	8,300
86	Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Base Supply/Traffic Management Complex	2,238	7,262	9,500
87	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Upgrade Airfield	0	10,800	10,800
88	Florida	Tri-Care Management Agency	Jacksonville NAS	Add/Alter Branch Medical/Dental Clinic	780	3,000	3,780
89	Florida	Tri-Care Management Agency	Patrick AFB	Medical Logistics Facility Replacement	200	1,550	1,750
90	Florida	Tri-Care Management Agency	Pensacola NAS	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,300	3,000	4,300
91	Florida	Army National Guard	Pensacola	Readiness Center	0	4,628	4,628
92	Florida	Army Reserve	Orlando	Land Acquisition, Joint Reserve Complex	690	0	690
93	Florida	Air Force Reserve	Homestead AFB	Fire Fighter Training Facility	524	1,476	2,000
94	Florida	Air Force Reserve	Homestead ARB	Fire Station	0	4,950	4,950
95	Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Ammunition Holding Area	420	980	1,400
96	Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	7,100	39,900	47,000
97	Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Contingency Logistics Facility	0	18,500	18,500
98	Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Multi-Purpose Training Range	1,100	6,100	7,200
99	Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal w/Dining	7,000	39,000	46,000
100	Georgia	Navy	Albany MCLB	Engineering Equipment Shop	1,540	4,720	6,260
101	Georgia	Air Force	Fort Benning	Air Support Operations Squadron Facility	911	2,989	3,900
102	Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Squadron Operation Facility	763	2,437	3,200
103	Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Taxiway	0	2,750	2,750
104	Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	KC-135 Flight Simulator Facility	789	2,561	3,350
105	Georgia	Special Operations Command	Fort Benning	Regimental Command and Control Facility	2,272	7,928	10,200
106	Georgia	Tri-Care Management Agency	Moody AFB	WRM Warehouse/BEE Facility	200	1,050	1,250
107	Georgia	Air National Guard	Savannah International Airport	Composite Support Complex	2,116	7,684	9,800
108	Georgia	Air National Guard	Savannah International Airport	Regional Fire Training Facility	368	1,332	1,700
109	Georgia	Army Reserve	Fort Gillem	USAR Ctr/Org Maint Shop/Direct Support/Warehouse	3,610	18,511	22,121
110	Georgia	Air Force Reserve	Dobbins AFB	Add/Alter Facility For C-130H Aircrew Training	558	1,572	2,130
111	Georgia	Air Force Reserve	Robins AFB	Add/Alter AFR Cmd HQ and Alternate Tanker Airlift Control Ctr	3,666	10,334	14,000

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
112	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	14,200	34,800	49,000
113	Hawaii	Navy	Kaneohe Bay MCAS	Control Tower and Air Traffic Control Facility	1,460	4,330	5,790
114	Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard	Abrasive Blast and Paint Facility	2,690	7,920	10,610
115	Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor Naval Station	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Modernization	4,720	13,880	18,600
116	Hawaii	Navy	Camp H. M. Smith	CINCPAC Headquarters (Phase I)	15,870	(15,870)	0
117	Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor NSB	Berthing Wharf	7,470	21,990	29,460
118	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickham AFB	Fire Training Facility	785	2,515	3,300
119	Hawaii	Army National Guard	Bellows AFS	Regional Training Institute (Phase II)	0	12,105	12,105
120	Idaho	Navy	Bayview NSWC	Underwater Equipment Laboratory	2,540	7,500	10,040
121	Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Enhanced Training Range (Phase II)	3,487	11,113	14,600
122	Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Defense Access Road	564	1,836	2,400
123	Idaho	Air National Guard	Boise Airport	A-10 Expand Arm/Disarm Apron	350	1,250	1,600
124	Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes NTC	Drill Hall Replacement	2,830	8,360	11,190
125	Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes NTC	Recruit In-Process Barrack	3,370	9,940	13,310
126	Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes NTC	All Weather Running Track	354	1,026	1,380
127	Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes NTC	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters ("A" School)	7,700	23,710	31,410
128	Illinois	Army National Guard	Marseilles	Battalion Training Complex	2,325	8,627	10,952
129	Indiana	Army	Newport Army Ammunition Plant	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase II)	61,200	(61,200)	0
130	Indiana	Navy	Crane NSWC	Strategic Weapons Systems Engineering Facility	0	7,270	7,270
131	Indiana	Chemical Demilitarization	Newport Army Ammunition Plant	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase II)	0	61,200	61,200
132	Indiana	Army National Guard	Camp Atterbury	Water System Improvements	0	7,598	7,598
133	Indiana	Air Force Reserve	Grissom ARB	Services Complex (Phase I)	0	10,800	10,800
134	Iowa	Air National Guard	Sioux City	Vehicle Maintenance Complex	0	3,600	3,600
135	Kansas	Army	Fort Leavenworth	US Disciplinary Barracks (Phase III)	18,800	0	18,800
136	Kansas	Army	Fort Leavenworth	Water Treatment Plant	1,200	6,900	8,100
137	Kansas	Army	Fort Leavenworth	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	3,900	22,100	26,000
138	Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Modified Record Fire/Combat Pistol Range	0	3,900	3,900
140	Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	KC-135 Squad Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit	2,280	7,320	9,600
141	Kansas	Tri-Care Management Agency	Fort Riley	Consolidated Troop Medical Clinic	1,060	4,940	6,000
139	Kansas	Air National Guard	McConnell AFB	B-1 Aircraft Live Munitions Loading Ramp	0	9,300	9,300
142	Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase I)	11,800	(11,800)	0
143	Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Support	11,000	(11,000)	0
144	Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Surveillance Facility	900	5,100	6,000
145	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	MOUT Training Complex	2,150	12,250	14,400
146	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Physical Fitness Training Center	900	5,100	6,000
147	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Sabre Heliport Improvements	2,475	17,025	19,500
148	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal (Phase II)	4,800	27,200	32,000

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
149	Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Multi-Purpose Digital Training Range (Phase II)	2,400	13,600	16,000
150	Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Automated Record Fire Range	0	1,300	1,300
151	Kentucky	Chemical Demilitarization	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase I)	0	11,800	11,800
152	Kentucky	Chemical Demilitarization	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Support	0	11,000	11,000
153	Kentucky	Air Force	Fort Campbell	Air Support Operations Squadron Facility	1,472	4,828	6,300
154	Louisiana	Army	Fort Polk	Consolidated Range Operations/Warehouse Facility	0	6,700	6,700
155	Maine	Navy	Brunswick NAS	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Replacement	4,270	12,620	16,890
156	Maryland	Army	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase II)	66,600	(66,600)	0
157	Maryland	Army	Fort Meade	Military Entrance Processing Station	1,350	3,100	4,450
158	Maryland	Army	Fort Meade	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	2,700	15,300	18,000
159	Maryland	Navy	Indian Head NSWC	Sewage Treatment Plant	2,550	7,520	10,070
160	Maryland	Navy	Patuxent River NAWC	Aircraft/Ships Systems Integration Labs	0	3,060	3,060
161	Maryland	Navy	Patuxent River NAWC	Indoor Firing Range	0	1,500	1,500
162	Maryland	Chemical Demilitarization	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase II)	0	66,600	66,600
163	Maryland	National Security Agency	Fort Meade	Perimeter Fence (East)	903	0	903
164	Maryland	National Security Agency	Fort Meade	Reconfigure Ops1 Chilled Water	2,043	0	2,043
165	Maryland	Tri-Care Management Agency	Andrews AFB	Add/Alter Medical Logistics Facility	2,000	1,000	3,000
166	Maryland	Tri-Care Management Agency	Patuxent River NAS	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,200	2,950	4,150
167	Maryland	Army Reserve	Curtis Bay	ADD/ALT USARC/Marine AMSA	0	5,000	5,000
168	Massachusetts	Army	Westover ARB	Military Entrance Processing Station	1,200	2,800	4,000
169	Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Barnes ANGB	Base Supply Complex	0	5,900	5,900
170	Massachusetts	Air Force Reserve	Westover ARB	Control Tower	0	4,250	4,250
171	Mississippi	Navy	Gulfport NCBC	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Modernization	3,260	9,600	12,860
172	Mississippi	Navy	Gulfport NCTC	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Renovation	1,600	4,710	6,310
173	Mississippi	Navy	Meridian NAS	Administrative Building	0	7,280	7,280
174	Mississippi	Air Force	Columbus AFB	Corrosion Control Facility	0	5,100	5,100
175	Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Student Dining Facility	1,686	5,414	7,100
176	Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Student Dormitory	4,679	15,221	19,900
177	Mississippi	Special Operations Command	Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant	Small Craft Training Complex	9,600	0	9,600
178	Mississippi	Army National Guard	Camp Shelby	Multi-Purpose Range Complex, Heavy (Phase III)	0	14,800	14,800
179	Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Access Road	0	16,500	16,500
180	Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Wolverine/Grizzly Simulator Facility	1,600	9,000	10,600
181	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Low Observable Restoration Facility	5,428	17,572	23,000
182	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	Physical Fitness Center	447	1,453	1,900
183	Missouri	Army National Guard	Sedalia	Readiness Center	0	3,774	3,774
184	Montana	Air National Guard	Great Falls IAP	Base Supply Warehouse	0	1,450	1,450
185	Nebraska	Air Force	Offutt AFB	Dormitory	1,941	6,359	8,300

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
186	Nevada	Navy	Fallon NAS	Corrosion Control Hangar	0	7,000	7,000
187	Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	F-22 Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	1,859	5,941	7,800
188	Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	F-22 Composite and Fabrication Shop	1,756	5,744	7,500
189	Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	F-22 Parts Warehouse and Operations Addition	773	2,527	3,300
190	New Jersey	Navy	Lakehurst NAWC	Aircraft/Platform Interface Laboratory	3,970	11,740	15,710
191	New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Visiting Quarters	2,765	9,035	11,800
192	New Jersey	Army National Guard	Fort Dix	Training/Training Technology Battle Lab (Phase II)	0	10,015	10,015
193	New Jersey	Army Reserve	Fort Dix	Centralized Tactical Vehicle Wash Facility	1,607	4,017	5,624
194	New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Repair Aprons (Phase II)	0	14,000	14,000
195	New York	Army	Fort Drum	Consolidated Soldier/Family Support Center	0	23,000	23,000
196	New York	Army	United States Military Academy	Cadet Physical Development Center (Phase II)	28,500	0	28,500
197	New York	Air Force	Rome Research Site	Consolidated Intelligence and Reconnaissance Laboratory	3,002	(3,002)	0
198	New York	Air National Guard	Hancock Field ANGB	Comm-Electronics Training/ASE Complex	0	8,900	8,900
199	New York	Army Reserve	Fort Wadsworth	Add/Alt USAR Ctr/Org Maint Shop/Area Maint Sppt Act (Phase II)	2,066	3,720	5,786
200	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Heavy Drop Rigging Facility	4,500	25,500	30,000
201	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	MOUT Training Complex (Phase II)	5,600	1,400	7,000
202	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Upgrade Barracks/D-Area (Phase III)	0	14,400	14,400
203	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal (Phase I)	16,508	35,492	52,000
204	North Carolina	Army	Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal	Ammunition Surveillance Facility	550	3,250	3,800
205	North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune MCB	Maintenance and Operations Facility	2,120	6,280	8,400
206	North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune MCB	Physical Fitness Center	1,070	3,160	4,230
207	North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune MCB	Road and Utility Construction	2,140	6,610	8,750
208	North Carolina	Navy	New River MCAS	Aircraft Taxiway Addition	130	390	520
209	North Carolina	Navy	New River MCAS	Family Services Center	330	1,010	1,340
210	North Carolina	Navy	New River MCAS	Property Control Facility	910	2,700	3,610
211	North Carolina	Air Force	Fort Bragg	Air Support Operations Group Facility	1,076	3,524	4,600
212	North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Dangerous Cargo Pad	1,802	5,898	7,700
213	North Carolina	Defense Education Activity	Camp Lejeune MCB	Tarawa Terrace II Elementary School	2,387	8,183	10,570
214	North Carolina	Special Operations Command	Fort Bragg	Battalion Operations Complex	2,272	16,328	18,600
215	North Carolina	Special Operations Command	Fort Bragg	Deployable Equipment Facility	1,500	0	1,500
216	North Carolina	Tri-Care Management Agency	Cherry Point MCAS	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,000	2,500	3,500
217	North Carolina	Army National Guard	Charlotte	Organizational Maintenance Shop	912	3,385	4,297
218	North Carolina	Army National Guard	Charlotte	Readiness Center	1,504	5,583	7,087
219	North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Add to Missile Maintenance Facility	0	3,000	3,000
220	Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Consolidate Avionics Research Laboratory	3,230	10,370	13,600
221	Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Control Tower	934	3,066	4,000
222	Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Consolidate Aerospace Structures Research Lab	0	17,500	17,500

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
223	Ohio	Tri-Care Management Agency	Wright-Patterson AFB	Occupational Health Clinic/BEE Replacement	2,800	1,100	3,900
224	Oklahoma	Army	Fort Sill	Rail and Containerization Facility	2,000	11,200	13,200
225	Oklahoma	Army	Fort Sill	Tactical Equipment Shop (Phase I)	0	9,900	9,900
226	Oklahoma	Army	McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	Ammunition Road Infrastructure	1,020	5,780	6,800
227	Oklahoma	Army	McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	Fire Station	900	2,100	3,000
228	Oklahoma	Army	McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	Railyard Infrastructure	2,000	4,800	6,800
229	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Air Driven Accessories Overhaul and Test Facility	4,001	12,999	17,000
230	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Dormitory	1,602	5,198	6,800
231	Oklahoma	Air Force	Vance AFB	Upgrade Center Runway	0	12,600	12,600
232	Oregon	Army	Umatilla Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase V)	35,900	(35,900)	0
233	Oregon	Chemical Demilitarization	Umatilla Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase V)	0	35,900	35,900
234	Pennsylvania	Army	Carlisle Barracks	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	750	4,250	5,000
235	Pennsylvania	Army	Letterkenny Army Depot	Ammunition Containerization Complex	570	3,080	3,650
236	Pennsylvania	Navy	Mechanicsburg Naval Inventory Control Point	Water Distribution System Improvements	760	2,230	2,990
237	Pennsylvania	Navy	Norfolk NSY Detachment Philadelphia	Foundary Casting Pits Modernization	0	13,320	13,320
238	Pennsylvania	Defense Logistics Agency	Defense Industrial Supply Center	Public Safety Center	867	4,133	5,000
239	Pennsylvania	Air National Guard	Johnstown ANGS	Air Traffic Control Training Complex	0	6,200	6,200
240	Pennsylvania	Army Reserve	Johnstown	Consolidate AMSA	0	6,300	6,300
241	Pennsylvania	Navy Reserve	Willow Grove NAS	Hazardous Material Storage Facility	320	1,610	1,930
242	South Carolina	Army	Fort Jackson	Emergency Services Center	1,100	6,300	7,400
243	South Carolina	Navy	Beaufort MCAS	Armory Facility	450	1,340	1,790
244	South Carolina	Navy	Beaufort MCAS	Corrosion Control Facility	2,200	6,500	8,700
245	South Carolina	Navy	Beaufort MCAS	Jet Engine Test Cell	0	7,800	7,800
246	South Carolina	Navy	Charleston NWS	Air Traffic Control Engineering Center	1,930	5,710	7,640
247	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 Corrosion Control Facility	4,389	13,811	18,200
248	South Carolina	Defense Education Activity	Laurel Bay Island	Intermediate School Addition	642	2,232	2,874
249	South Carolina	Air National Guard	McEntire ANGS	Control Tower	0	8,000	8,000
250	South Dakota	Army National Guard	Sioux Falls	Consolidated Barracks/Education Facility	0	4,818	4,818
251	Tennessee	Air Force	Arnold AFB	Upgrade Jet Engine Air Induction System (Phase III)	1,851	5,949	7,800
252	Tennessee	Air National Guard	McGhee-Tyson ANGB	KC-135 Hydrant Refueling System	0	9,500	9,500
253	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Air Deployment Facility Complex	2,550	14,450	17,000
254	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Aircraft Loading Apron	3,300	18,700	22,000
255	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Ammunition Hot Load Facility	1,700	9,700	11,400
256	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Tactical Equipment Shop	0	1,950	1,950
257	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Deployment Ready Reactive Field and Trails	2,000	6,000	8,000
258	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Fixed Wing Aircraft Parking Apron	4,600	26,400	31,000
259	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Force XXI, Soldier Development Center (Phase II)	14,000	0	14,000

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
260	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Rail Head Facility (Phase II)	14,800	0	14,800
261	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Soldier Service Center	0	16,500	16,500
262	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	4,350	24,650	29,000
263	Texas	Navy	Ingleside NS	Operational Support Facility	0	11,780	11,780
264	Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Child Development Center	0	5,400	5,400
265	Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Dormitory	1,257	4,043	5,300
266	Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Security Forces Center	1,893	6,207	8,100
267	Texas	Air Force	Laughlin AFB	Add/Alter JPATS Beddown Various Facilities	766	2,484	3,250
268	Texas	Air Force	Randolph AFB	Control Tower (West)	0	3,600	3,600
269	Texas	Tri-Care Management Agency	Fort Sam Houston	Veterinary Instructional Facility	600	5,200	5,800
270	Texas	Air National Guard	Kelly AFB	F-16 ADD/ALT Squad Ops/Flight Training Facility	0	9,700	9,700
271	Texas	Army Reserve	Fort Hood	Area Maint Support Activity/Equipment Concentration Site	2,684	6,747	9,431
272	Texas	Navy Reserve	Fort Worth JRB	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	0	6,000	6,000
273	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	CAD/PAD Spares Storage Facility	1,081	3,519	4,600
274	Utah	Air National Guard	Salt Lake City IAP	Ops/Training/Squad Ops Complex	0	10,400	10,400
275	Utah	Navy Reserve	Camp Williams	Marine Corps Reserve Training Center Addition	150	740	890
276	Virginia	Army	Fort Belvoir	Fire Station	500	1,200	1,700
277	Virginia	Army	Fort Belvoir	Military Police Station	640	1,510	2,150
278	Virginia	Army	Fort Eustis	Education Center	0	4,800	4,800
279	Virginia	Army	Fort Eustis	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	5,800	33,200	39,000
280	Virginia	Army	Fort Myer	Public Safety Center	870	2,030	2,900
281	Virginia	Army	Fort Story	Offshore Breakwater System	0	8,000	8,000
282	Virginia	Navy	Dam Neck Fleet Combat Training Center	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	2,610	7,700	10,310
283	Virginia	Navy	Norfolk NSY	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Replacement	4,460	13,170	17,630
284	Virginia	Navy	Norfolk NS	Berthing Wharf (Phase II)	12,690	0	12,690
285	Virginia	Navy	Norfolk NS	Pier Electrical Upgrades (Phase II)	4,720	13,940	18,660
286	Virginia	Navy	Norfolk NS	Pier Replacement	8,600	31,400	40,000
287	Virginia	Navy	Norfolk NS	Waterfront Athletic Complex	2,760	8,130	10,890
288	Virginia	Navy	Oceana NAS	Aircraft Acoustical Enclosure	2,910	8,580	11,490
289	Virginia	Navy	Quantico MCCDC	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	5,270	15,550	20,820
290	Virginia	Navy	Yorktown NWS	Trestle Replacement and Pier Upgrade	6,330	18,710	25,040
291	Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Dormitory	1,486	4,814	6,300
292	Virginia	Special Operations Command	Dam Neck	Mission Support Facility	2,273	2,427	4,700
293	Virginia	Tri-Care Management Agency	Cheatham Annex	Fleet Hospital Support OFC Container Holding Yard	500	1,150	1,650
294	Virginia	Tri-Care Management Agency	Norfolk NAS	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,150	2,900	4,050
295	Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Ammunition Supply Point	1,560	3,640	5,200
296	Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Physical Fitness Training Center	1,850	4,350	6,200

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
297	Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Tank Trail Erosion Mitigation-Yakima (Phase V)	2,000	0	2,000
298	Washington	Navy	Bangor Strategic Weapons Facility	D5 Missile Support Facility	1,600	4,700	6,300
299	Washington	Navy	Keyport NUWC	Pier Replacement	0	6,700	6,700
300	Washington	Navy	Port Hadlock Naval Ordnance Center (Pacific)	Tomahawk Magazine	870	2,570	3,440
301	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound Naval Shipyard	Dredging	3,950	11,660	15,610
302	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Runway Centerline Lighting	0	1,950	1,950
303	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Flightline Support Facility	0	9,100	9,100
304	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Survival Training Logistics Complex	1,071	3,429	4,500
305	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit	1,858	6,042	7,900
306	Washington	Defense Logistics Agency	Fairchild AFB	Add To Hydrant Fuel System	1,500	10,900	12,400
307	Washington	Tri-Care Management Agency	Fort Lewis	North Dental Clinic Replacement	4,950	550	5,500
308	Washington	Tri-Care Management Agency	Whidbey Island NAS	Aircrew Water Survival Training Facility	1,300	3,400	4,700
309	Washington	Army National Guard	Yakima	Maneuver Area Training Equipment Site (Phase I)	3,464	12,852	16,316
310	Washington	Air Force Reserve	McChord AFB	Add/Alter C-17 Squadron Operations Aircraft Maint Unit Fac	864	2,436	3,300
311	Wisconsin	Air National Guard	Volk Field	Replace Troop Training Quarters	1,923	6,977	8,900
312	CONUS Classified	Air Force	Classified	Special Tactical Unit Detachment Facility	244	733	977
313	CONUS Classified	Air Force	Classified	Air Control Squadron Operations Complex	1,200	3,900	5,100
314	CONUS Classified	Air Force	Classified	Classified Project	9,700	0	9,700
315	CONUS Classified	Air Force	Classified	Classified Project	1,093	0	1,093
316	CONUS Various	Army	CONUS Various	Classified Project	36,400	0	36,400
317	Ascension Island	Air Force	Ascension Island Auxiliary Air Field	GPS Satellite Control Station	512	1,638	2,150
318	Bahrain	Navy	Administrative Support Unit (Southwest Asia)	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (Security Force)	6,230	18,320	24,550
319	Bahrain	Navy	Administrative Support Unit (Southwest Asia)	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (Transient)	5,840	17,930	23,770
320	Bahrain	Navy	Administrative Support Unit (Southwest Asia)	Operations Control Center	8,550	26,220	34,770
321	Diego Garcia	Navy	Diego Garcia Naval Support Facility	Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Facility	2,070	6,080	8,150
322	Ecuador	Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	Manta	Various (Transfer From Drug Interdict & Counter-Drug Activities, Def)	0	25,000	25,000
323	Germany	Army	Ansbach	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	3,150	17,850	21,000
324	Germany	Army	Bamberg	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	1,230	6,970	8,200
325	Germany	Army	Bamberg	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	1,400	7,900	9,300
326	Germany	Army	Bamberg	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	860	4,840	5,700
327	Germany	Army	Mannheim	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	675	3,825	4,500
328	Germany	Tri-Care Management Agency	Ramstein AFB	Add/Alter Dental Clinic	2,550	4,550	7,100
329	Greece	Navy	Souda Bay Crete NSA	Operational Support Facilities	1,620	4,760	6,380
330	Guam	Air Force	Andersen AFB	Landfill Closure	2,097	6,803	8,900
331	Guam	Defense Education Activity	Andersen AFB	Anderson Elementary School	10,026	34,144	44,170
332	Guam	Defense Logistics Agency	Def Fuel Support Point Guam	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	2,600	21,700	24,300

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
333	Guam	Army National Guard	Barrigada	Readiness Center (Phase I)	0	8,238	8,238
334	Guam	Army Reserve	Barrigada	USAR Ctr/Org Maint Shop/Area Maint Support Activity	1,116	16,430	17,546
335	Italy	Navy	Naples Naval Support Activity	Operational Support Facility	7,370	19,380	26,750
336	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Radar Approach Control Facility	966	2,734	3,700
337	Korea	Army	Camp Casey	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	4,650	26,350	31,000
338	Korea	Army	Camp Howze	Water System Upgrade	920	2,130	3,050
339	Korea	Army	Camp Stanley	Electrical System Upgrade	1,100	2,550	3,650
340	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Add/Alter Physical Fitness Center	2,229	5,371	7,600
341	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Dormitory	3,482	8,518	12,000
342	Korea	Tri-Care Management Agency	Yongsan	Add/Alter Hospital	9,570	29,000	38,570
343	Korea	Tri-Care Management Agency	Yongsan	Medical Supply/Equipment Storage Warehouse Replacement	2,300	250	2,550
344	Kwajalein	Army	Kwajalein Atoll	Power Plant-Roi Namur Island (Phase II)	35,400	0	35,400
345	Netherlands Antilles	Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	Curacao	Various (Transfer From Drug Interdict & Counter-Drug Activities, Def)	0	11,100	11,100
346	Portugal	Air Force	Lajes Field (Azores)	Apron Security Lighting	479	1,321	1,800
347	Puerto Rico	Tri-Care Management Agency	NSGA Sabana Seca	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	1,120	2,880	4,000
348	Puerto Rico	Air National Guard	Puerto Rico International Airport	C-130 Add to Aircraft Parking Apron	490	1,760	2,250
349	Puerto Rico	Air National Guard	Puerto Rico International Airport	C-130 Fuel Cell and Corrosion Control Facility	1,212	4,388	5,600
350	Puerto Rico	Air National Guard	Puerto Rico International Airport	C-130 Upgrade Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	825	2,975	3,800
351	Puerto Rico	Army Reserve	Fort Buchanan	USAR Center	1,431	8,670	10,101
352	Spain	Defense Logistics Agency	Moron Air Base	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	4,100	11,100	15,200
353	Spain	Defense Education Activity	Rota Naval Station	Rota Elementary School	3,854	13,166	17,020
354	United Kingdom	Air Force	Royal Air Force Feltwell	Wastewater Treatment Plant	786	2,214	3,000
355	United Kingdom	Air Force	Royal Air Force Lakenheath	Child Development Center	1,519	4,281	5,800
356	United Kingdom	Air Force	Royal Air Force Lakenheath	Consolidated Support Complex	3,221	9,179	12,400
357	United Kingdom	Air Force	Royal Air Force Mildenhall	Consolidated Corrosion Control/Maintenance Complex	2,693	7,507	10,200
358	United Kingdom	Air Force	Royal Air Force Mildenhall	Hazardous Material Storage Facility	267	733	1,000
359	United Kingdom	Air Force	Royal Air Force Mildenhall	KC-135 Flight Simulator Facility	600	1,700	2,300
360	United Kingdom	Air Force	Royal Air Force Mildenhall	Operations Facility	1,076	3,024	4,100
361	United Kingdom	Air Force	Royal Air Force Molesworth	Wastewater Treatment Plant	445	1,255	1,700
362	United Kingdom	National Security Agency	Menwith Hill Station	Medical Center Expansion	500	0	500
363	United Kingdom	Defense Education Activity	Royal Air Force Feltwell	Construct Multi-Purpose Facility	1,023	3,547	4,570
364	United Kingdom	Defense Education Activity	Lakenheath Middle School	Construct Gymnasium Building	841	2,929	3,770
365	United Kingdom	Tri-Care Management Agency	Royal Air Force Lakenheath	Add/Alter Dental Clinic	1,000	6,100	7,100
366	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Inspection and Overhead - MilCon	30,689	(30,689)	0
367	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	9,500	0	9,500
368	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Host Nation	21,300	0	21,300

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
369	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	60,705	5,200	65,905
370	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(30,689)	30,689	0
371	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	General Reduction	0	(7,750)	(7,750)
372	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(6,178)	6,178	0
373	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,342	0	7,342
374	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	65,630	4,380	70,010
375	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Inspection and Overhead - MilCon	6,178	(6,178)	0
376	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	General Reduction	0	(19,300)	(19,300)
377	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Inspection and Overhead - MilCon	3,376	(3,376)	0
378	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(3,376)	3,376	0
379	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	28,004	4,100	32,104
380	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	8,741	0	8,741
381	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	General Reduction	0	(6,600)	(6,600)
382	Worldwide Unspecified	Office Secretary of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design (Defense Level)	18,000	0	18,000
383	Worldwide Unspecified	Office Secretary of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction (Defense Level)	2,900	0	2,900
384	Worldwide Unspecified	Special Operations Command	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	5,700	0	5,700
385	Worldwide Unspecified	Special Operations Command	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,300	0	2,300
386	Worldwide Unspecified	Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	124	0	124
387	Worldwide Unspecified	Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design (Transfer From RDT&E, Defense Wide)	0	15,700	15,700
388	Worldwide Unspecified	Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,248	0	1,248
389	Worldwide Unspecified	OSD Contingencies	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	938	0	938
390	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Wide	Unspecified Worldwide	General Reduction	0	(20,000)	(20,000)
391	Worldwide Unspecified	NATO Security Investment Program	Unspecified Worldwide	NATO Security Investment Program	191,000	0	191,000
392	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	4,129	500	4,629
393	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	771	0	771
394	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	4,951	720	5,671
395	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000	0	2,000
396	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Inspection and Overhead - MilCon	712	(712)	0
397	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	8,500	0	8,500
398	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,416	0	1,416
399	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(712)	712	0
400	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Inspection and Overhead - MilCon	32	(32)	0
401	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,778	0	1,778
402	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(32)	32	0
403	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,036	0	1,036
404	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Inspection and Overhead - MilCon	407	(407)	0
405	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,467	0	4,467

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
406	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - MilCon	(407)	407	0
407	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,867	0	1,867
408	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,500	0	1,500
409	Worldwide Unspecified	Base Closure IV	BRAC IV	Base Realignment and Closure	705,911	0	705,911
410	Worldwide Unspecified	Joint Chiefs of Staff	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,083	0	6,083
411	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Education Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,000	0	1,000
412	Worldwide Unspecified	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	6,558	0	6,558
413	Worldwide Unspecified	Tri-Care Management Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,587	0	3,587
414	Worldwide Unspecified	Tri-Care Management Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	9,500	0	9,500
415	Worldwide Various	Army	Various Worldwide	Financial Adjustment	0	0	0
416	Worldwide Various	Defense Logistics Agency	Various Worldwide	Conforming Storage Facilities	1,300	0	1,300
417	Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 5 (64 units)	2,707	7,293	10,000
418	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 3 (60 units)	2,301	6,199	8,500
419	California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Family Housing (90 units)	4,472	12,048	16,520
420	California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Area B Housing, Phase 5 (98 units)	4,404	11,866	16,270
421	California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 7 (91 units)	4,548	12,252	16,800
422	District of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 5 (72 units)	2,537	6,838	9,375
423	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 1 (130 units)	3,812	10,268	14,080
424	Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 4 (54 units)	2,446	6,588	9,034
425	Hawaii	Navy	Marine Corps Air Station (Kaneohe Bay)	Replacement (100 Homes)	5,320	21,295	26,615
426	Hawaii	Navy	Naval Complex (Pearl Harbor)	Replacement (96 Homes)	3,831	15,336	19,167
427	Hawaii	Navy	Naval Complex (Pearl Harbor)	Replacement (133 Homes)	6,031	24,137	30,168
428	Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	Improve Family Housing Area Safety	0	1,363	1,363
429	Mississippi	Air Force	Columbus AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 2 (100 units)	3,327	8,963	12,290
430	Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Replace Family Housing (34 units)	2,050	5,520	7,570
431	Nebraska	Air Force	Offutt AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 5 (72 units)	3,343	9,009	12,352
432	New Mexico	Air Force	Holloman AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase (76 units)	0	9,800	9,800
433	North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 5 (78 units)	3,300	8,887	12,187
434	North Dakota	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase A (42 units)	2,720	7,330	10,050
435	North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 6 (72 units)	2,912	7,844	10,756
436	Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 3 (48 units)	2,030	5,470	7,500
437	Virginia	Army	Fort Lee	Replace Family Housing, Phase 3 (97 units)	0	16,500	16,500
438	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Family Housing New Construction (60 units)	4,400	19,600	24,000
439	Portugal	Air Force	Lajes Field (Azores)	Replace Family Housing, Phase 1 (75 units)	3,509	9,455	12,964
440	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	482	0	482
441	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	4,300	0	4,300
442	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	5,303	30,097	35,400

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
443	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Improvements	(345)	345	0
444	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	92,453	(8,268)	84,185
445	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	47,715	0	47,715
446	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	44,970	0	44,970
447	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	222,294	0	222,294
448	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	469,211	0	469,211
449	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Interest Payments	3	0	3
450	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	220,952	0	220,952
451	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Inspection and Overhead - FH	631	(631)	0
452	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Construction	(286)	286	0
453	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	170,991	0	170,991
454	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	397,723	0	397,723
455	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	31,708	130,642	162,350
456	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,180	0	1,180
457	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	17,715	0	17,715
458	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Inspection and Overhead - FH	2,805	(2,805)	0
459	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	63,589	0	63,589
460	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	82,925	0	82,925
461	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	145,953	0	145,953
462	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	73	0	73
463	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Improvements	(1,897)	1,897	0
464	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Construction	(908)	908	0
465	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	32,636	0	32,636
466	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	36,997	0	36,997
467	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Construction	(1,033)	1,033	0
468	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	33	0	33
469	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	415,733	0	415,733
470	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	118,509	0	118,509
471	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	34,280	90,212	124,492
472	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	2,640	0	2,640
473	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	160,117	0	160,117
474	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Supervision, Inspection and Overhead - FH	1,161	(1,161)	0
475	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	56,413	0	56,413
476	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	17,093	0	17,093
477	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Financing Adjustment - FH Improvements	(128)	128	0
478	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	31,450	0	31,450
479	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	75	0	75

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - FY 2000 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line No.	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2000 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2000 Committee Recommendation
480	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	370	0	370
481	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	21	0	21
482	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	414	0	414
483	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	247	0	247
484	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	50	0	50
485	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	244	0	244
486	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	1,029	0	1,029
487	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	13,374	0	13,374
488	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	3,401	0	3,401
489	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	22,265	0	22,265
490	Worldwide Unspecified	Family Housing Improvement Fund	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvement Fund	78,756	0	78,756

A tabular summary of the military construction projects included with the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for the BRAC IV account follows:

FY 2000 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(Dollars in Thousands)

Army: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Alabama	Fort McClellan	Alabama ARNG Enclave	11,000
	Fort McClellan	Ammunition Tranfser 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**

Navy: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
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

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
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**

Defense Logistics Agency: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2000

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Utah	Defense Distribution Region West, Depot Hill AFB	Contract Hardstand	1,100
		Total DLA-BRAC IV Construction	**1,100**

TITLE XXI—ARMY

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $656,003,000 for Army military construction and $1,112,083,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $1,214,405,000 for military construction and $1,170,012,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Improvements to Military Family Housing

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for improvements to military family housing and facilities, the Secretary of the Army execute the following project: $2,800,000 for Whole Neighborhood Revitalization, Phase V (26 units) at Fort Campbell, Kentucky.

Environmental Remediation at Volunteer Army Ammunition Plant, Chattanooga, Tennessee

The committee notes the efforts of the Department of the Army to implement expeditiously the conveyance of the Volunteer Army Ammunition Plant, Chattanooga, Tennessee, authorized by section 2844 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (division B of Public Law 105–261). The committee recognizes recent management practices of the Army in dedicating funds deposited into the special account established pursuant to section 485(h)(2) of title 40, United States Code, for the environmental remediation of real property at specific locations beyond the 50 percent of such deposits as required by law. The committee urges the Secretary of the Army to continue this practice where such funds are required to complete remediation in a timely manner. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to report on the schedule for completion of remediation activities at the Volunteer Army Ammunition Plant concurrent with the submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2001.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

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.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2000.

Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2000.

Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

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 budget request contained $319,786,000 for Navy military construction and $959,675,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $933,022,000 for military construction and $1,151,085,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Headquarters, Commander-in-Chief, Pacific

The budget request contained $15,870,000 for the first increment of an $86,050,000 military construction project to develop a headquarters to support the Commander-in-Chief, Pacific, and associated command elements at Camp H.M. Smith, Hawaii. The committee recommends deferral of this project. The committee notes the authority recommended in section 2802 of this bill to further the development of Ford Island, Hawaii, for the support of the military activities of the Department of the Navy and other military activities of the Department of Defense. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to study the viability of the relocation of the headquarters, Commander-in-Chief, Pacific, to Ford Island and to assess the adequacy of those authorities provided in section 2802 of this bill to support the development of appropriate headquarters facilities on Ford Island. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Navy to complete the study and assessment as part of the master plan for the development of Ford Island, Hawaii, required by that section.

Acquisition of Prepositioned Equipment Maintenance Facilities, Blount Island, Jacksonville, Florida

The committee notes the recent approval by the Secretary of Defense of a waiver of the current moratorium on land acquisition for the purchase of the afloat prepositioning maintenance facilities at Blount Island, Jacksonville, Florida, currently operated under lease by the Marine Corps. The committee notes that these facilities are critical to the prepositioning support of the Marine Corps. The committee has noted previously that ownership of these facilities could save the Department of the Navy between six and seven million dollars annually. The committee acknowledges again the analysis of studies previously required by law which concluded that the Army and the Marine Corps should maintain and operate separate, but complementary, prepositioning facilities in Charleston, South Carolina, and Blount Island, Jacksonville, Florida, respectively. In

an effort to ensure the continued readiness of the Marine Corps, the need for strategic placement of prepositioning facilities, and the desire to obtain the most cost-effective solution to prepositioning operations, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with those actions necessary to bring this acquisition to completion at the earliest possible time.

Improvements to Military Family Housing

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for improvements to military family housing and facilities, the Secretary of the Navy execute the following project: $9,100,000 for Whole House Revitalization (91 units) at Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

Unspecified Minor Construction

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Navy execute the following project: $950,000 for an aircraft parts staging facility at Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville, Florida.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

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.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2000.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2000.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

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.

Section 2205—Authorization to Accept Electrical Substation Improvements, Guam

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept electrical utility system improvements valued at $610,000 from the Guam Power Authority at Agana Substation and Harmon Substation at Public Works Center, Guam.

Section 2206—Correction in Authorized Use of Funds, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia

This section would correct the authorized use of funds authorized for appropriation for fiscal year 1997 for a military construction project at Marine Corps Command Development Command, Quantico, Virginia. This section would permit the use of previously authorized funds to carry out a military construction project involving infrastructure development at that installation.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $179,479,000 for Air Force military construction and $923,683,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $713,165,000 for military construction and $1,160,888,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

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.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2000.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2000.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

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.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $193,005,000 for defense agencies military construction, $705,911,000 for activities associated with base closure and realignment, and $120,246,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $792,808,000 for military construction, $705,911,000 for activities associated with base closure and realignment, and $120,246,000 for family housing.

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Military Construction in Support of Base Closure and Realignment Activities

The committee is concerned that the total cost of military construction projects in support of the base closure and realignment activities of the Department of the Navy were not included in the budget request. The committee is concerned that less than full funding of such projects may place at risk the requirement to meet statutory deadlines for the beddown of operational and other missions at Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton, California, Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, and Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia. The committee directs that, within amounts authorized for base closure and realignment activities, the Secretary of Defense ensure the timely execution of each of the military construction projects in support of the base closure and realignment activities of the military departments specified in this report. The list is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

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.

Section 2402—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

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 $50,000,000.

Section 2403—Military Housing Improvement Program

This section would authorize appropriations of $78,756,000 for credit to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund.

Section 2404—Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Section 2405—Authorization Of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

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.

Section 2406—Increase in Fiscal Year 1997 Authorization for Military Construction Projects at Pueblo Chemical Activity, Colorado

This section would amend the table in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (division B of Public Law 104–201) to provide for an increase in the amount authorized for military construction projects to support chemical weapons and munitions destruction at Pueblo Chemical Activity, Colorado.

Section 2407—Condition on Obligation of Military Construction Funds for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities

This section would prohibit the obligation of funds authorized for appropriation for military construction to support the development of forward operating locations for the drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense in Manta, Ecuador, and Curacao, Netherlands Antilles, until after the end of the 30–day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the Congress a report describing in detail the purposes for which such funds will be obligated and expended.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit future requests for specific military construction projects for the support of the drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense on a line-item basis, consistent with the requirements for major military construction projects, as part of the budget request for the military construction and military family housing programs of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year in which such military construction projects are required.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $191,000,000 for the NATO infrastructure fund (NATO Security Investment Program) for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends authorization of $191,000,000.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization 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.

Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize appropriations of $191,000,000 as the U.S. contribution to the NATO security investment program.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $77,572,000 for fiscal year 2000 for guard and reserve facilities. The committee recommends authorization of $437,701,000 to be distributed as follows:

Army National Guard	$123,878,000
Air National Guard	151,170,000
Army Reserve	92,515,000
Air Force Reserve	48,564,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	21,574,000
Total	$437,701,000

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for the 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

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law

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 guard and reserve projects will expire on October 1, 2000 or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2001, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2000 or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for these projects, whichever is later.

Section 2702—Extensions of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1997 Projects

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.

Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1996 Projects

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 the Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2001, whichever is later.

Section 2704—Effective Date

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

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Contributions for North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment

This section would amend section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that contributions by the Secretary of Defense to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program may be made for construction projects in support of the actual implementation of an approved military operations plan.

Section 2802—Development of Ford Island, Hawaii

This section would authorize a series of special authorities for the development of Ford Island, Hawaii, by the Secretary of the Navy. The authorities would authorize the Secretary to convey or lease excess real or personal property in the State of Hawaii for the purpose of facilitating such development and would authorize the Secretary to accept a lease of any facility constructed under this authority in lieu of cash payment for the sale or lease of real property under this authority. In general, no lease entered into by the Secretary under this section could exceed ten years and, upon the termination of any lease, the Secretary would have the right of first refusal to acquire the property. This section would require the Secretary to use competitive procedures when exercising any of the authorities provided by this section.

As consideration for the sale or lease of real or personal property, the Secretary may accept cash, real property, personal property, services, or any combination thereof, and in no case shall the amount received be less than the fair market value of the real or personal property conveyed or leased. This section would establish an account on the books of the Treasury known as the Ford Island Improvement Account to carry out improvements and obtain property support services for property or facilities on Ford Island.

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a master plan for the development of Ford Island to the appropriate committees of Congress not later than 30 days prior to exercising any of the authorities provided by this section. The section would also require the Secretary, 30 days prior to the commencement of any lease, sale, or exchange of real property, to submit to the Congressional defense committees a report detailing the terms and conditions of any transaction. This section would prohibit the Secretary from acquiring, constructing, or improving military family housing or unaccompanied personnel housing under this author-

ity in lieu of the authority provided by subchapter IV, chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code. The provision would authorize the Secretary to transfer funds from the Ford Island Improvement Account to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund and the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing fund for such purposes.

Section 2803—Restriction on Authority to Acquire or Construct Ancillary Supporting Facilities for Housing Units

This section would amend section 2881 of title 10, United States Code, to restrict the development of ancillary supporting facilities in military housing projects undertaken under the authority of subchapter IV, chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, which may be in direct competition with any resale activities provided by the Defense Commissary Agency or the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, the Navy Exchange Service Command, Marine Corps exchanges, or any other nonappropriated fund instrumentality which is conducted for the benefit of the morale, welfare, and recreation of members of the armed forces.

Section 2804—Planning and Design for Military Construction Projects for Reserve Components

This section would amend section 18233 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Defense to contribute to the States funds for the design of facilities to support the Federal mission of the reserve components.

Section 2805—Limitation on Authority to Carry Out Small Projects for Acquisition of Facilities for Reserve Components

This section would amend section 18233 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the threshold for unspecified minor construction projects for the support of the reserve components from $1,500,000 to $3,000,000 and the threshold for projects funded with operations and maintenance funds from $300,000 to $1,000,000 solely for construction and maintenance projects to remediate serious life, health, and safety deficiencies. The section would not increase the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Section 2806—Expansion of Entities Eligible to Participate in Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing

This section would amend subchapter IV, chapter 169, of title 10, United States Code, to expand the entities eligible to participate in the alternative authorities for the acquisition and improvement of military housing to include any individual, corporation, firm, partnership, company, State or local government, or housing authority of a State or local government.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Extension of Authority for Lease of Land for Special Operations Activities

This section would amend section 2680 of title 10, United States Code, to extend, until September 30, 2005, the authority of the Secretary of Defense to lease real property to support special operations activities.

Section 2812—Utility Privatization Authority

This section would amend section 2688 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the secretaries of the military departments to enter into a contract for the receipt of utility services in connection with the conveyance of a utility system for a period not to exceed 50 years. The Section would further amend section 2688 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the secretaries of the military department may convey associated real property, in addition to easements and rights-of-way, if such property is required to further the privatization of a utility system. The section would further amend section 2688 of title 10, United States Code, to permit the secretaries of the military departments, in lieu of carrying out a military construction project to construct, repair, or replace a utility system, to use funds authorized and appropriated for such a project to make a contribution toward the cost of construction, repair, or replacement of the utility system by the entity to which the utility system is being conveyed.

Section 2813—Acceptance of Funds to Cover Administrative Expenses Relating to Certain Real Property Transactions

This section would authorize the secretary of a military department to accept reimbursement from non-federal entities for the cost of administrative expenses relating to the disposal of real property of the United States for which the secretary will be the disposal agent.

Section 2814—Study and Report on Impacts to Military Readiness of Proposed Land Management Changes on Public Lands in Utah

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to evaluate the impact upon military training, testing, and operational readiness of any proposed changes in land management on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management in the State of Utah that are adjacent to or near the Utah Test and Training Range and Dugway Proving Ground or beneath the military operating areas, restricted areas, and airspace that make up the Utah Test and Training Area. The Secretary of Defense would conduct the study in cooperation with the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Army and coordinate the study with the Secretary of the Interior.

SUBTITLE C—DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT

Section 2821—Continuation of Authority to Use Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 for Activities Required to Close or Realign Military Installations

This section would amend section 2906 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (division B of Public Law 101–510), as amended, to extend the Treasury account known as the "Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990." The account would be the sole source of funds to carry out environmental restoration and mitigation activities and other caretaker activities associated with real property resulting from the closure or realignment of a military installation pursuant to the a base closure law after the termination of the authority of the Secretary of Defense to carry out a closure or realignment under such authority.

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

Part I—Army Conveyances

Section 2831—Transfer of Jurisdiction, Fort Sam Houston, Texas

This section would authorize the transfer of, and exchange of jurisdiction on, a parcel of unimproved real property consisting of approximately 152 acres at Fort Sam Houston, Texas, between the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. The parcel is to be incorporated into the Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery.

Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Kankakee, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements to the City of Kankakee, Illinois. The property is to be used for the economic development and other public purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the City.

Section 2833—Land Conveyance, Fort Des Moines, Iowa

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements to the Fort Des Moines Black Officers Memorial, Inc., a nonprofit corporation organized in the State of Iowa. The property is to be used for the purpose of a memorial and for educational purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Corporation.

Section 2834—Land Conveyance, Army Maintenance Support Activity (Marine) Number 84, Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately five acres, to the Borough of Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania. The property is to be used for rec-

reational or economic development purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Borough. The section would also provide for the reversionary interest of the United States in the conveyed real property and any improvements thereon in the event the Secretary determines that the conveyed property is not used in accordance with the condition of conveyance.

Section 2835—Land Conveyances, Army Docks and Related Property, Alaska

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of less than one-tenth of an acre, to the City and Borough of Juneau, Alaska. The property is to be used for the furtherance of navigation-related commerce. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the City. The section would also authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 6.13 acres in Whittier, Alaska, to the Alaska Railroad Corporation. The property is to be used for economic development purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Corporation.

Section 2836—Land Conveyance, Fort Huachuca, Arizona

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 130 acres at Fort Huachuca, Arizona, to the Veterans Services Commission of the State of Arizona. The property is to be used for the establishment of a State-run veterans' cemetery. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Commission.

Section 2837—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Cannon Falls, Minnesota

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements to the Cannon Falls Area Schools, Minnesota, Independent School District Number 252. The property is to be used for educational purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the District.

Section 2838—Land Conveyance, Nike Battery 80 Family Housing Site, East Hanover Township, New Jersey

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 13.88 acres near East Hanover, New Jersey, to the Township Council of East Hanover. The property is to be used for the development of affordable housing and for recreational purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Township.

Section 2839—Land Exchange, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately one-third of an acre at the Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, to the City of Moline, Illinois. The property is to be used for the purpose of construction by the City of an entrance and exit ramp for the bridge crossing the southeast end of the island containing the Arsenal. As consideration for the conveyance, the City would convey to the United States a parcel of real property consisting of approximately two-tenths of an acre located in the vicinity of the real property to be conveyed by the Secretary. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the City.

Section 2840—Modification of Land Conveyance, Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois

This section would amend section 2922 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106) to place additional conditions on the conveyance of certain real property at Joliet Army Ammunition Plant to Will County, Illinois, for a landfill. The section would require that the landfill may only contain waste generated in Will County or waste generated in municipalities located at least in part in Will County. The section would also require that the landfill be closed and capped after 23 years of operation.

Section 2841—Land Conveyances, Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, Minnesota

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately four acres, at the Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, Minnesota, to the City of Arden Hills, Minnesota. The property is to be used for the purpose of permitting the City to construct a city hall complex. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the City. The section would also authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 35 acres, at the Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, Minnesota, to Ramsey County, Minnesota. The property is to be used for the purpose of permitting the County to construct a maintenance facility. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the County. As consideration for the conveyances, both the City and the County would make the facilities to be constructed available for use by the Minnesota National Guard at no cost.

Part II—Navy Conveyances

Section 2851—Land Conveyance, Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant No. 387, Dallas, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey a parcel of real property with improvements consisting of approximately 314 acres and including the Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant No. 387, Dallas, Texas, to the City of Dallas. The prop-

erty is to be used for economic development or other public purposes. The Secretary would be authorized to convey other fixtures located on the property if the Secretary determines such fixtures are not required by the Navy for other purposes. The section would authorize the Secretary to make the conveyance without consideration if determined to be in the best interest of the United States. If the City conveys any portion of the parcel to a private entity, the City shall pay the United States an amount equal to the fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the portion conveyed at the time of its initial conveyance.

Section 2852—Land Conveyance, Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Orange County, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 2.4 acres in Orange County, Texas, to the Orange County Navigation and Port District. The property is to be used for economic development, educational purposes, and the furtherance of navigation-related commerce. The section would also provide for the reversionary interest of the United States in the conveyed real property and any improvements thereon in the event the Secretary determines that the conveyed property is not used in accordance with the condition of conveyance.

Section 2853—Land Conveyance, Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, a parcel of unimproved real property, consisting of approximately 20 acres at Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, to the State of North Carolina. The property is to be used for educational purposes. The conveyance would be subject to the condition that the State grant easements and rights-of-way necessary to ensure that the use of the parcel is compatible with the operations of Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the State.

Part III—Air Force Conveyances

Section 2861—Conveyance of Fuel Supply Line, Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 14.87 acres at the former Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire and containing a deactivated fuel supply line, to the Pease Development Authority. The property is to be used for the support of the New Hampshire Air National Guard. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Authority.

Section 2862—Land Conveyance, Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of

approximately 33.07 acres, to the City of Panama City, Florida. The property is to be used for economic development or other purposes. As consideration for the conveyance, the City would pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary. The Secretary would use the funds paid by the City for the improvement or maintenance of military family housing units at Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the City.

Section 2863—Land Conveyance, Port of Anchorage, Alaska

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Interior to convey, without consideration, two parcels of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 14.22 acres in Anchorage, Alaska, to the Port of Anchorage. The property is to be used for economic development purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Port.

Section 2864—Land Conveyance, Forestport Test Annex, New York

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements of approximately 164 acres in Herkimer County, New York, and approximately 18 acres in Oneida County, New York, to the Town of Ohio, New York. The property is to be used for economic development purposes and for other public purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Town.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2871—Expansion of Arlington National Cemetery

This section would authorize the transfer of real property, and exchange of jurisdiction, between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army to provide for the expansion of Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia. The property to be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army consists of three parcels, totaling approximately 36.5 acres, located at the Navy Annex of the Pentagon. The provision would also require the Secretary of the Army to modify the boundary of Arlington National Cemetery to include two parcels of real property, totaling approximately eight acres, situated in Fort Myer, Virginia, contiguous to the Cemetery.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATION AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $12.4 billion for Department of Energy national security programs, including $4.5 billion for weapons activities, $5.8 billion for defense environmental restoration and waste management, $1.8 billion for other defense activities, and $73.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal. The committee recommends $12.3 billion, a decrease of $75.5 million. The following table summarizes the request and the committee recommendations:

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Weapons Activities	4,531,000	10,500	4,541,500
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management	4,514,376	1,137,992	5,652,368
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,054,492	(1,054,492)	-
Environmental Management Privatization	228,000	-	228,000
Other Defense Activities	1,792,000	(19,541)	1,772,459
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	73,000	-	73,000
Formerly Used Sites Remedial Action Program	150,000	(150,000)	-
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	12,342,868	(75,541)	12,267,327

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Stockpile stewardship			
Core stockpile stewardship			
Operation and maintenance	1,635,355	5,000	1,640,355
Construction:			
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	8,000	-	8,000
00-D-105, Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	26,000	-	26,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	1,800	-	1,800
99-D-102 Rehabilitation of maintenance facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	3,900	-	3,900
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	-	2,000
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA.	2,400	-	2,400
99-D-105 Central health physics calibration facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	1,000	-	1,000
99-D-106 Model validation & system			

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
certification center, SNL Albuquerque, NM	6,500	-	6,500
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	7,005	-	7,005
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	61,000	-	61,000
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	2,640	-	2,640
96-D-104 Processing and environmental technology laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	10,900	-	10,900
Stockpile stewardship construction general reduction	-	(10,000)	(10,000)
Total, Construction	**133,145**	**(10,000)**	**123,145**
Total, Core stockpile stewardship	**1,768,500**	**(5,000)**	**1,763,500**
Inertial fusion			
Operation and maintenance	217,600	10,000	227,600
Construction:			
96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF), LLNL, Livermore, CA	248,100	-	248,100
Total, Inertial fusion	**465,700**	**10,000**	**475,700**

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Technology partnerships and education			
Technology partnership	22,200	(7,700)	14,500
Education	29,800	(24,800)	5,000
Total, Technology partnerships and education	**52,000**	**(32,500)**	**19,500**
Total, Stockpile stewardship	**2,286,200**	**(27,500)**	**2,258,700**
Stockpile management			
Operation and maintenance	1,839,621	58,000	1,897,621
Construction:			
99-D-122 Rapid reactivation, various locations	11,700	-	11,700
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	17,000	-	17,000
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	3,429	-	3,429
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material S&S upgrade project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	11,300	-	11,300
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium facility modernization and consolidation, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	21,800	-	21,800
98-D-124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y-12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	3,150	-	3,150

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	33,000	-	33,000
98-D-126 Accelerator production of tritium (APT), various locations	31,000	-	31,000
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	4,800	-	4,800
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	18,000	-	18,000
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	3,500	-	3,500
Stockpile management construction general reduction	-	(10,000)	(10,000)
Total, Construction	**158,679**	**(10,000)**	**148,679**
Total, Stockpile management	**1,998,300**	**48,000**	**2,046,300**
Program direction	**246,500**	**(10,000)**	**236,500**
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	**4,531,000**	**10,500**	**4,541,500**
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	892,629	25,500	918,129

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Construction:			
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	3,100	-	3,100
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEL, ID	7,200	-	7,200
98-D-401 H-tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River, SC	2,977	-	2,977
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	16,860	-	16,860
98-D-700 INEL road rehabilitation, INEL, ID	2,590	-	2,590
97-D-450 Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	4,000	-	4,000
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay lab, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	12,220	-	12,220
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	24,441	-	24,441
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	11,971	-	11,971
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	931	-	931

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	-	2,000
Total, Construction	**88,290**	**-**	**88,290**
Total, Site/project completion	**980,919**	**25,500**	**1,006,419**
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,898,997	52,300	2,951,297
Construction:			
00-D-401 SNF treatment and storage facility Title I & II, SR	7,000	-	7,000
99-D-403 Privatization phase I infrastrucure support, Richland, WA	13,988	-	13,988
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	20,516	-	20,516
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	4,060	-	4,060
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	8,987	-	8,987
Total, Construction	**54,551**	**-**	**54,551**
Total, Post 2006 completion	**2,953,548**	**52,300**	**3,005,848**

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Science and technology	230,500	10,000	240,500
Program direction	349,409	(22,300)	327,109
Subtotal, Def. environmental restoration & waste management	**4,514,376**	**65,500**	**4,579,876**
Defense Facilities Closure Projects - Site Closure	-	1,092,492	1,092,492
General Reduction to Post 2006 Completion & Site/Project Completion (O&M)	-	(20,000)	(20,000)
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MGMT.	**4,514,376**	**1,137,992**	**5,652,368**
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS			
Site Closure	1,054,492	(1,054,492)	-
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Tank waste remediation system Privatization Phase I, Richland	106,000	-	106,000
Advanced mixed waste treatment project, Idaho	110,000	-	110,000
Spent nuclear fuel dry storage, Idaho	5,000	-	5,000
Transuranic waste treatment, Oak Ridge	12,000	-	12,000
Environmental management/waste management disposal, Oak Ridge	20,000	-	20,000
General Reduction	(25,000)	-	(25,000)
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION	**228,000**	**-**	**228,000**

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Nonproliferation and national security			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operation and maintenance	215,000	-	215,000
Construction:			
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	6,000	-	6,000
Arms control	296,000	(63,000)	233,000
Nuclear safeguards and security	59,100	-	59,100
Security investigations	30,000	(20,000)	10,000
Emergency management	21,000	-	21,000
HEU transparency implementation	15,750	-	15,750
International nuclear safety	34,000	(18,700)	15,300
Program direction	90,450	(7,400)	83,050
Total, Nonproliferation and national security	**767,300**	**(109,100)**	**658,200**
Intelligence	36,059	-	36,059
Counterintelligence	31,200	-	31,200
Worker and community transition			
Worker and community transition	26,500	-	26,500
Program direction	3,500	-	3,500
General reduction		(10,000)	(10,000)
Total, Worker and community transition	**30,000**	**(10,000)**	**20,000**

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Fissile materials control and disposition			
Operation and maintenance	129,766	39,000	168,766
Construction			
00-D-142, Immobilization and associated processing facility, various locations	21,765	-	21,765
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Various locations	28,751	-	28,751
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Various locations	12,375	-	12,375
Total, Construction	**62,891**	-	**62,891**
Program direction	7,343	-	7,343
Total, Fissile materials control and disposition	**200,000**	**39,000**	**239,000**
Environment, safety & health			
Office of environment, safety and health (defense)	67,231	12,000	79,231
Program direction	24,769	-	24,769
Total, Environment, safety and health	**92,000**	**12,000**	**104,000**
Office of hearings and appeals	3,000	-	3,000
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance	620,400	16,000	636,400

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Construction:			
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	9,000	-	9,000
98-D-200 Site laboratory/facility upgrade, various locations	3,000	-	3,000
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	12,000	-	12,000
Total, Construction	**24,000**	**-**	**24,000**
Total, Naval reactors development	**644,400**	**16,000**	**660,400**
Program direction	20,600	-	20,600
Total, Naval reactors	**665,000**	**16,000**	**681,000**
Subtotal, Other defense activities	**1,824,559**	**(52,100)**	**1,772,459**
Adjustments:			
Offset to user organizations	(20,000)	20,000	-
Contribution from labs	(12,559)	12,559	-
Total, Adjustments	**(32,559)**	**32,559**	**-**
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	**1,792,000**	**(19,541)**	**1,772,459**

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2000 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 2000 REQUEST	FY 2000 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	112,000	(39,000)	73,000
Transfer to nuclear waste disposal	(39,000)	39,000	-
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	**73,000**	**-**	**73,000**
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM	**150,000**	**(150,000)**	**-**
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	**12,342,868**	**(75,541)**	**12,267,327**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative

The budget request contained $341.0 million for the Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI).

ASCI is an effort to develop a computer capable of 100 trillion operations a second by 2004. This computer will be powerful enough to conduct three dimensional simulations of nuclear explosions as a means of assuring the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of U.S. nuclear weapons in the absence of actual testing. The committee understands the significance of ASCI for science-based stockpile stewardship and is encouraged by the technical progress demonstrated to date. However, the committee remains concerned by the very aggressive program schedule. The committee notes that the program request is 14 percent higher than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999. The budget request also includes $34.0 million in new ASCI-related construction and $67.3 million for the Numeric Environment for Weapons Simulation (NEWS), a 138 percent increase compared to the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. Directly related to ASCI, NEWS is an effort to develop visualization tools to allow nuclear weapons scientists to understand the vast amounts of data generated by ASCI simulations.

The committee is also concerned with ASCI's pace compared to other science tools the Department of Energy needs to support science based stockpile stewardship. Ignition experiments in the National Ignition Facility, for example, are projected to start in 2006. Also, advanced radiographic images of the initial phases of a nuclear weapon explosion will not be available under current planning until 2005.

The Department justifies ASCI's aggressive schedule in part on the fact that nuclear weapons designers with the testing experience needed to interpret the results of ASCI simulations are aging and retiring. However, the most recent data provided by the Department shows that the decline in this population is expected to level out from 2004 to 2007. Further, the committee believes that the Department could have access to such expertise if they sought it.

In light of these considerations, the committee believes that an aggressive but more moderately paced ASCI program is justified. Therefore, the committee recommends $316.0 million for ASCI, a decrease of $25.0 million.

Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative Construction Projects

The budget request contained $8.0 million for construction of a terascale simulation facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and $26.0 million for the strategic computing complex at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Both of these facilities will house supercomputers being developed in the ASCI program. They are very similar in size, scope, and purpose yet the total estimated cost of the Los Alamos facility is 20 percent higher than the Lawrence Livermore facility. Although the committee recommends the requested amounts, it directs the Secretary of Energy not to obligate any of the funds for the Los Alamos strategic computing complex until a full and inde-

pendent review of the cost and schedule of this project has been completed and the results of the review have been transmitted to the Congressional defense committees.

Arms Control and Nonproliferation

The budget request contained $296.0 million for arms control, a $39.1 million increase to the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

The committee notes that the Department of Energy was not able to expend all fiscal year 1998 appropriated funds for arms control and, as a result, $144.1 million of these funds were brought forward into fiscal year 1999. The fiscal year 1999 appropriation of $256.9 million was added to this amount, totaling $401.0 million of funds available for arms control during fiscal year 1999. Based on this program's expenditure rate for the first half of fiscal year 1999 and the program's historical expenditure rate for the second half of prior fiscal years, the General Accounting Office (GAO) projects that the carryover balance for this program will increase to $162.5 million and will exceed the Department's 15 percent target carryover balance going into fiscal year 2000.

Consequently, the committee recommends $206.0 million, a decrease of $90.0 million. The committee further recommends that $20.0 million of this decrease should be assessed to the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention program and the Nuclear Cities Initiative. The committee believes that the carryover balance for arms control is excessive and that, before initiating new projects with fiscal year 2000 funds, the Department should complete ongoing programs with prior year funds.

Commercializing Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention

The Department of Energy's Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP) program was established to develop employment opportunities for Russian scientists to avoid risking the marketing of their weapons of mass destruction knowledge to countries of proliferation concern or terrorist organizations. The objectives of the IPP program are initially to engage these weapons scientists in productive nonmilitary work and to then transition this work into long-term employment in the high-technology commercial marketplace. This long-term employment would be self-sustaining and not dependent on continued U.S. financial assistance.

According to a February, 1999 report by the General Accounting Office (GAO), none of the 79 IPP projects has been a commercial success. The first step in a IPP process is the identification and verification of technologies and skills possessed by the institutes and scientists that can have commercial applications. However, most of the IPP projects never progress past this stage. As acknowledged by the director of the IPP program, commercializing science and engineering projects is very difficult in the United States and much more difficult in Russia.

The committee believes that due to the lack of commercial success of the IPP projects, the program has been, and will be reliant on financial support by the U.S. government. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to prepare a report on ef-

forts of the Department to make IPP projects commercially viable. The report should discuss projects the Department is pursuing within the IPP program that utilize more commonly held production technologies with the major emphasis on the manufacture of commercially marketable products, versus current attempts at utilizing high technology. The report should also contain information on the Department's criteria and timetable for terminating IPP projects that have shown little chance of commercial success. The report should be submitted to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives by April 1, 2000.

Commission to Review Nuclear Policy and Management

The committee believes a broad, high level review of issues pertaining to the management and oversight of nuclear weapons policy is timely. Since the last such review in the 1980s, the Cold War has ended, U.S. nuclear forces have been reshaped and resized, the nuclear weapons programs at the Department of Energy (DOE) have changed in scope and structure, and nuclear weapons budgets have declined dramatically. Several studies, including those by the Commission on Sustaining U.S. Nuclear Weapons Expertise in 1999 and the Institute for Defense Analyses in 1997, have noted a need for better coordination between the Department of Defense (DOD) and DOE. The recent reorganization of the Office of Secretary of Defense also suggests a lack of focus on nuclear matters within DOD. Consequently, a top level commission to review the management and oversight of nuclear policy, requirements, forces, and budgets in the context of these changed circumstances would be very useful.

Therefore, the committee recommends a series of provisions (sections 3151–3159) that would establish a commission to conduct such a review and report its results to the Congressional defense committees by January 1, 2001.

Comptroller General Audit of Department of Energy Contract Management Practices

The committee is aware of the results of the February 1999 Defense Contract Audit Agency report to the Congress which indicated that the cost accounting practices of the prime contractor at the Hanford site were within acceptable standards. However, the committee is also aware of additional allegations of possible fraud and abuse regarding subcontractor management practices at the Hanford site.

Consequently, the committee continues to be concerned about the Department of Energy's management of contract activities, particularly at the Hanford site. Therefore, the committee requests that the Comptroller General conduct an investigation of these activities and report the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Construction Projects

The budget request contained $61.0 million for core stockpile stewardship construction projects and $94.7 million for core stockpile management construction projects.

The conference report for the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1999 (Rept. 105–749) forbade the obligation of funding for new construction starts authorized in fiscal year 1999 until an independent assessment validated the cost and schedule for those specific projects. Most of these independent assessments have not been completed, and those that are complete have identified some difficulties that should be addressed before the projects proceed. Given these early results, the committee believes that the remaining independent assessments could find similar difficulties that would lead to delays in the release of fiscal year 1999 funds, and thus would reduce the fiscal year 2000 requirement. Consequently, the committee recommends $51.0 million for core stockpile stewardship construction, a decrease of $10.0 million, and $84.7 million for core stockpile management construction, a decrease of $10.0 million.

The committee notes that the budget request contained no funds in Stockpile Management designated for infrastructure construction but that such a request was made in Stockpile Stewardship, providing a more stable foundation for sustaining infrastructure at the national laboratories. The committee recommends that the Department include funding for Stockpile Management infrastructure construction in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Education

The budget request contained $29.8 million for educational activities, including funding for math and science education for local schools near the national weapons laboratories, the National Atomic Museum, the Los Alamos County School District, and the Northern New Mexico Educational Enrichment Foundation.

The committee understands the importance of primary and secondary education in math and science, but believes that funding of these activities by the Defense Programs account provides no direct benefit to the Department's core national security mission. Consequently, the committee recommends no funding for these education programs.

However, the committee notes that the Commission on Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise recommended that the Department's laboratories and production plants "establish and implement plans on a priority basis for replenishing essential personnel." The commission noted that significant downsizing of the nuclear weapons complex has led to an aging workforce, a trend that will lead to "a crisis of talent within the next 15 years" unless reversed.

The committee believes that encouraging talented young Americans to contribute to the nuclear weapons effort is important to the nation's long term security. Therefore, the committee recommends amendments to revitalize the Department of Energy fellowship program for graduate and post doctoral students who are specializing in physical sciences relevant to the needs of the nuclear weapons

complex authorized in section 3140 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106). The committee recommends $5.0 million for this fellowship program.

Eligibility to Bid on Excess Department of Energy Equipment at the Savannah River Site

The committee understands that McDuffie County, Georgia, is currently not on the list of counties whose residents are eligible to submit bids for the purchase of surplus Department of Energy equipment at the Savannah River Site. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Department add McDuffie County to that list.

Environmental Management Science Program

The budget request contained $32.0 million for the Environmental Management Science Program, a decrease of $15.0 million from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

The committee recognizes the importance of developing advanced environmental cleanup and remediation technologies that can both reduce long-term costs and lessen the damage resulting from nuclear waste. Consequently, the committee recommends $42.0 million, an increase of $10.0 million to maintain a more robust environmental management science program.

Environmental Management, Environmental, Safety and Health

The budget request contained $20.0 million for public health activities for the Department's Office of Environmental Management, an $8.0 million increase to the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999. The committee believes that this increase has not been adequately justified and, therefore, recommends $12.0 million, a decrease of $8.0 million. In addition, the committee directs that the $12.0 million be transferred to the Department's Office of Environment, Safety and Health in order to provide more effective oversight of these programs.

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)

The national defense budget function (budget function 050) request contained $150.0 million for the FUSRAP. The committee acknowledges the importance of remediating these former Manhattan Project sites and notes that the Army Corps of Engineers has been tasked to perform this service. However, because the sites are commercially owned, the committee believes it is more appropriate for this program to be funded by the civil Army Corps of Engineers portion of the budget (budget function 301).

Accordingly, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) contained a Sense of Congress provision recommending that this program be funded within the Army Corps of Engineers budget. Since the Department chose to ignore this recommendation, the committee recommends no funding for FUSRAP within budget function 050, a decrease of $150.0 million.

Hanford Site Tri-Party Agreement Compliance

The budget request contained $376.3 million for environmental management at the Hanford site. The committee recommends an increase of $3.9 million in order to achieve four compliance deadlines established by the tri-party agreement among the Department, the State of Washington's Department of Ecology, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Hanford Plutonium Finishing Plant Deactivation

The budget request contained $136.2 million to stabilize, repackage, and remove all remaining plutonium materials from the Hanford Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) and to deactivate the plant complex. The committee understands that the large quantity of plutonium stored at the PFP is a significant safety hazard and, therefore, recommends $146.4 million, an increase of $10.2 million to accelerate the stabilization and repackaging of the plutonium for permanent storage.

Hanford Reactor Decontamination and Decommissioning

The budget request contained $10.8 million for facility decommissioning at the Hanford Site. The committee recommends $22.2 million, an increase of $11.4 million to accelerate progress on the cocooning of the reactor cores. The committee believes that safe storage of these reactor cores on an interim basis will permit the Department of Energy to more effectively use its remediation funds for decontaminating and decommissioning ancillary buildings at Hanford, thereby saving millions of dollars in annual maintenance and surveillance costs.

Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) Post 2006 Completion

The budget request contained $291.3 million for the INEEL Post 2006 Completion account, including $7.0 million for the Idaho Waste Management Complex (IWMC) project. The committee understands the funding requested for the IWMC is to be augmented by $43.0 million in prior year carryover balances from the Pit Nine project within this account and notes that the resultant $50.0 million in available funds would represent a $26.3 million increase to the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

The committee believes that the available prior year carryover balance from the Pit Nine project is excessive and, therefore, recommends a decrease of $26.3 million from the INEEL Post 2006 Completion account. The committee makes this reduction without prejudice and believes that it should not have a negative impact on this project.

Inertial Confinement Fusion

The budget request contained $217.6 million for inertial confinement fusion (ICF) operations and maintenance, including $30.5 million for the University of Rochester's Laboratory for Laser Energetics (LLE).

The ICF program includes the development and construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF), which will use a large array of lasers focused to achieve a fusion reaction in a small quantity of hydrogen. The program will provide experimental data to scientists, allowing them to confirm computer models on the behavior of nuclear weapons explosions.

The committee understands that the budget request does not include sufficient funding to initiate design work for a cryogenic target needed to achieve hydrogen ignition or to provide diagnostics that will allow NIF to measure the physical results of testing. The committee believes that additional funding would reduce schedule and technical risk for these important aspects of the NIF effort, and therefore recommends $227.6 million for ICF operations and maintenance, an increase of $10.0 million. Further, the committee believes that LLE's Omega laser continues to make important contributions to the ICF program and directs that the Department fund this facility at the requested level.

In-Tank Precipitation Process

The budget request contained $42.1 million for the high-level waste treatment at the Savannah River Site. The committee notes that as a result of equipment problems associated with the release of explosive benzene that occurred in start-up testing, the Salt Processing Plant must be redesigned. Accordingly, the committee recommends $92.1 million, an increase of $50.0 million to initiate redesign and avoid further delays to the vitrification program.

International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting

The budget request contained $145.0 million for International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting (MPC&A), a $4.9 million increase to the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999. The objective of this program is to improve the protection of nuclear weapons-usable materials at facilities and institutions in the former Soviet Union. The committee believes that the MPC&A program is one of the most important of the Department's arms control efforts.

Therefore, the committee recommends $172.0 million for International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting, an increase of $27.0 million.

International Nuclear Safety

The budget request contained $34.0 million for International Nuclear Safety, a $4.0 million increase to the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999. The objective of this program is to improve the safety of Soviet-designed nuclear reactors in countries of the former Soviet Union.

The committee notes that the Department was not able to expend all fiscal year 1998 appropriated funds for International Nuclear Safety and, as a result, $93.6 million of these funds were brought forward into fiscal year 1999. Adding the fiscal year 1999 appropriation of $30.0 million to this amount, a total of $123.6 million of funds are available for International Nuclear Safety during fiscal year 1999. Based on this program's expenditure rate for the

first half of fiscal year 1999 and the program's historical expenditure rate for the second half of prior fiscal years, the General Accounting Office projects that the carryover balance for this program will exceed the Department's 15 percent target carryover balance by $23.7 million going into fiscal year 2000.

Therefore, the committee recommends $15.3 million, a decrease of $18.7 million. The committee believes that the carryover balance for International Nuclear Safety is excessive and that, before initiating new projects with fiscal year 2000 funds, the Department should complete ongoing programs with prior year funds. In addition, the committee understands that the Agency for International Development may supplement the Department's fiscal year 2000 International Nuclear Safety program by amounts that have not yet been identified.

Naval Reactors

The budget request contained $665.0 million for the naval reactors program.

The committee believes that the program office has done an excellent job of managing the development, construction, maintenance, and disposal of naval nuclear reactors. However, the committee is concerned that the budget request appears insufficient to fully support planned non-pressure vessel removal at the Kesselring site in New York and remediation efforts at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. Therefore, the committee recommends $681.0 million, an increase of $16.0 million to fund these activities.

Nuclear Weapons Industrial Complex

On December 21, 1998, the Secretary of Energy announced that he was deferring for a year a decision on whether to consolidate existing stockpile management contracts for the Kansas City, Pantex, and Y–12 plants. While the committee supports the motivation underlying the consolidation proposal, the committee believes that the decision to defer resolution of this issue is justified.

The Department expressed interest in contract consolidation based on the belief that it would offer greater efficiencies in coordinating plant activities, cleaner lines of authority and responsibility, reduced personnel levels, and cost savings. However, the committee notes that a consolidated contract could undermine competition for plant management in the future; few savings have been identified, the costs of implementing the modified contract structure could be considerable, and Departmental oversight of and leverage over a single contractor managing virtually the entire production complex could be problematic. While remaining open to the idea of consolidation where it makes sense, the committee believes that these issues must be thoroughly addressed and presented to the Congress before any decision to consolidate the production complex contracts is made.

Nuclear Weapons Personnel Reserve

The Commission on Sustaining U.S. Nuclear Weapons Expertise, in its March 1999 report, noted that the nuclear weapons workforce

is aging rapidly and that expertise in a number of technical areas is in dangerously short supply. The commission also pointed out that, as these experts retire and leave the nuclear workforce, the Department of Energy is doing an inadequate job of transferring specific and detailed knowledge related to the nuclear weapons stockpile to a new generation of experts. Further, the commission argued that the nuclear weapons complex is deficient in its ability to reconstitute the expertise required in the event of an emergency or an urgent need to resume testing.

The committee concurs with the commission's conclusion that personnel with critical skills who leave the nuclear weapons program represent an unexploited national asset, and endorses the commission's recommendation that the Department establish a nuclear weapons personnel reserve to be composed of current or former employees of the nuclear complex with skills critical to the Department's mission. Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary to establish such a reserve.

Oak Ridge Operations Compliance Obligations

The budget request contained $530.6 million for the Oak Ridge Operations site. The committee notes that several environmental cleanup and remediation project milestones that have been missed or delayed due to insufficient funding. Consequently, the committee recommends $539.2 million, an increase of $8.6 million to ensure that these compliance requirements are met.

Office of Counterintelligence

The budget request contained $18.6 million for the Office of Counterintelligence to be augmented by an additional $12.6 million contributed by the DOE nuclear weapons laboratories.

The committee recommends $31.2 million for the Office of Counterintelligence, an increase of $12.6 million. The committee is very concerned over reports of espionage activities at the DOE laboratories and believes that the Director of the Office of Counterintelligence needs to have the full $31.2 million available for obligation at the beginning of the fiscal year rather than waiting for 40 percent of the requirement to become available at some later date, if at all.

Pit Production

The committee understands that substantial progress has been made to reestablish a near-term plutonium pit production capability at the Los Alamos National Laboratory and to define the longer-term pit production capacity required to support the nuclear weapons stockpile. The committee also notes that the pit production manufacturing process has been designed, established by, and, in the current production plan, will be performed at Los Alamos.

Based on Department of Energy analysis, the committee believes that the requirement for additional pit production capacity in the future is unambiguous. However, the committee also believes that a science oriented laboratory is not the best institution to retain responsibility for pit manufacture or to expand pit manufacturing capacity. The committee strongly urges the Secretary of Energy to

maximize the ability of industry to manage both the production process and the expansion effort by planning to transition pit production from laboratory to industrial operations prior to expansion of pit production capacity.

Program Direction for Defense Programs

The budget request contained $246.5 million for Defense Programs program direction.

The committee notes that the request includes a $10.0 million increase in salaries, benefits, travel, and advisory and support services compared to funding appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

The committee recommends $236.5 million, a decrease of $10.0 million. Of this amount, the committee directs that $15.0 million may only be obligated for voluntary separation incentive payments.

Program Direction for Environmental Management

The budget request contained $349.4 million for environmental management program direction, which includes salaries, personnel, contractor support, and advisory and assistance funding. This amount represents a $12.3 million increase to the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999. The committee finds no justification for such an increase, and notes that the program direction request for defense programs has been reduced from fiscal year 1999 levels. Consequently, the committee recommends $327.1 million, a decrease of $22.3 million.

Records Declassification

The budget request contained $15.9 million for records declassification, a $7.4 million increase to the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

The committee believes that there are more compelling uses for national defense funds than for declassifying historical records. Therefore, the committee recommends $8.5 million, a decrease of $7.4 million.

Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Closure Project

The budget request contained $657.2 million for the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Closure Project. For the last three years, the committee has emphasized the importance of providing adequate funding for the cleanup efforts at sites that are nearing closure. The Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site was originally scheduled to close in 2010, but the Department of Energy is working to accelerate its closure by 2006. The committee notes that the Department and the associated contractors have confidence in the accelerated closure schedule, which would save an estimated $1.3 billion. The committee supports the accelerated closure plan and, therefore, recommends $695.2 million, an increase of $38.0 million for this purpose.

Savannah River Site Infrastructure Investment

The budget request contained $14.5 million for operating projects at the Savannah River Site. The committee is concerned that both

capital equipment and safety and security systems equipment needs at this site have gone unmet due to funding shortfalls. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million to upgrade fire protection and security systems, to replace domestic water and telephone systems, and to support engineering facilities for health physics, analytical chemistry, and environmental monitoring.

Security Investigations

The budget request contained $30.0 million for security investigations.

The Security Investigations Program funds background investigations for Department of Energy (DOE) federal staff and DOE contractors at the Department's headquarters. The committee notes that the budget request assumes that DOE program offices will offset or contribute $20.0 million of this expense for background investigations of their staff members and headquarters contractors resulting in a total of $30.0 million in available funds to execute the fiscal year 2000 security investigation program. Therefore, the committee recommends $10.0 million, a decrease of $20.0 million and assumes the transfer of $20.0 million from DOE program offices to the Security Investigations Program.

Stockpile Management

The budget request contained $2.0 billion for stockpile management, including $240.8 million for the Pantex plant, $287.5 million for the Kansas City plant, $374.2 million for the Y–12 plant, and $127.4 million for the Savannah River Site.

The committee notes that the request represents a decrease of four percent compared to the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999. This decrease was imposed even though the required workload at the nuclear weapons production complex has been increased. While greater efficiencies and intelligent planning at the plants can meet some of the increased demand at lower funding levels, the committee believes that serious problems in the complex will remain. The Committee on Sustaining U.S. Nuclear Weapons Expertise identified multiple "fragile skill areas" and a limited ability of the plants to retain and replenish personnel with the proper skills as overall employment levels continue to fall. The plants must also continue to reduce their size and modernize their physical infrastructure. The committee notes that while stable funding for infrastructure improvements to the national laboratories has been identified, no such funding has been programmed for the plants. Finally, advanced technologies will be required to improve processes, increase efficiency, and meet future workload requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends $270.8 million for the Pantex plant, an increase of $30.0 million to meet increased surveillance, assembly and disassembly workload demands, to fund the Enhanced Surveillance Program and the Advanced Manufacturing, Design and Production Technologies (ADAPT) initiatives, and to support necessary infrastructure improvements and recapitalization projects.

The committee also recommends $317.5 million for the Kansas City plant, an increase of $30.0 million to support increased workload, ADAPT initiatives and necessary infrastructure improvements and recapitalization projects.

The committee further recommends $404.2 million for the Y–12 plant, an increase of $30.0 million to support a site-wide environmental impact statement necessary to modernize Y–12 facilities and necessary infrastructure improvements and recapitalization projects.

Finally, the committee recommends $134.4 million for the Savannah River Site, an increase of $7.0 million to support additional tritium reservoir testing and necessary capital investments.

Stockpile Management Fissile Material Storage and Disposition

The budget request contained $200.0 million for fissile materials control and disposition. It also contained, within Stockpile Management, $22.0 million for storage of excess special nuclear material at Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Y–12 plant; $10.0 million for storage and surveillance of excess plutonium pits at the Pantex plant; $3.0 million for a pit disassembly conversion demonstration project at Los Alamos National Laboratory; and $4.0 million for the Parallax Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Based on discussions with senior Department of Energy officials, the committee believes these projects fall outside of the Stockpile Management mission of production and surveillance and are more appropriately funded within the Other Defense accounts for fissile materials control and disposition. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $39.0 million to the Stockpile Management account, and $239.0 million for fissile materials control and disposition, an increase of $39.0 million.

Technology Partnerships

The budget request contained $22.2 million for technology partnerships.

Technology partnerships are intended to provide Defense Programs expertise to a variety of commercial partners through projects that enhance Defense Programs capabilities. The Department of Energy believes, and the committee concurs, that the projects funded in this program are of lower priority than activities funded in the core stockpile stewardship mission.

However, the committee is mindful that the Department has made certain commitments in the past to its commercial partners concerning shared funding responsibilities in joint projects. One such commitment is with the American Textile (AMTEX) Partnership; however, no funding for AMTEX is contained in the budget request. The committee believes that another year of funding for this project would satisfy the Department's obligation to its partners in the commercial textile industry. Another such commitment is with the Amarillo Plutonium Research Center and the committee believes that the Secretary of Energy should consider continuation of this cooperative effort beyond fiscal year 2000.

Consequently, the committee recommends $14.5 million for technology partnerships, a decrease of $7.7 million. Of this amount,

$5.0 million is for AMTEX and $5.0 million is for the Amarillo Plutonium Research Center.

Worker and Community Transition

The budget request contained $30.0 million for Worker and Community Transition, a $1.8 million increase to the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

The committee notes that the Department of Energy was not able to expend all fiscal year 1998 appropriated funds for Worker and Community Transition, and, as a result, $72.1 million of these funds were carried forward into fiscal year 1999. Adding the fiscal year 1999 appropriation of $28.2 million to this amount leaves a total of $100.3 million available for Worker and Community Transition during fiscal year 1999. Based on this program's expenditure rate for the first half of fiscal year 1999 and the program's historical expenditure rate for the second half of prior fiscal years, the General Accounting Office projects that the carryover balance for this program will exceed the Department's 15 percent target carryover balance by $53.0 million going into fiscal year 2000.

Therefore, the committee recommends $20.0 million, a decrease of $10.0 million. The committee further recommends that none of this decrease should come from the amounts specifically requested for fiscal year 2000 for the Idaho Operations Office, the Ohio Field Office, the Oak Ridge Operations Office, and the Richland Operations Office. The committee believes that the carryover balance for Worker and Community Transition is excessive and that, before initiating new projects with fiscal year 2000 funds, the Department should complete ongoing programs with prior year funds.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101—Weapons Activities

This section would authorize Department of Energy weapons activity funding for fiscal year 2000.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management

This section would authorize funds for Department of Energy environmental restoration and waste management activities for fiscal year 2000.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize funds for Department of Energy other defense activities for fiscal year 2000.

Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

This section would authorize funds for defense nuclear waste disposal activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2000.

Section 3105—Defense Environmental Management Privatization

This section would authorize funds for privatization initiatives in carrying out environmental restoration and waste management activities necessary for Department of Energy national security programs.

SUBTITLE B—RECURRING GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 3121—Reprogramming

This section 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 has notified the Congressional defense committees and a period of 60 days has elapsed after the date on which the notification is received.

Section 3122—Limits on General Plant Projects

This section would limit the initiation of "general plant projects" authorized by the bill if the current estimated cost for any project exceeds $5.0 million. However, if the Secretary of Energy finds that the estimated cost of any project will exceed $5.0 million, the Congressional defense committees must be notified of the reasons for the cost variation.

Section 3123—Limits on Construction Projects

This section would permit any construction project to be initiated and continued only if the estimated cost for the project does not exceed 125 percent of the higher of: (1) the amount authorized for the project, or (2) the most recent total estimated cost presented to the Congress as justification for such project. To exceed such limits, the Secretary of Energy must report in detail to the Congressional defense committees and the report must be before the committees for 30 legislative days. This section would also specify that the 125 percent limitation would not apply to projects estimated to cost under $5.0 million.

Section 3124—Fund Transfer Authority

This section would permit funds authorized by the bill 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 funds with the authorizations of the agency to which they are transferred. This section would also limit to no more than five percent the amount of funds that may be transferred between accounts in the Department of Energy that were authorized by the bill.

Section 3125—Authority for Conceptual and Construction Design

This section would limit the Secretary of Energy's authority to request construction funding until the Secretary has certified a conceptual design has been completed, except in the case of emergencies.

Section 3126—Authority for Emergency Planning, Design and Construction Activities

This section would permit, in addition to any advance planning and construction design otherwise authorized by the bill, the Secretary of Energy to perform planning and design utilizing available funds for any Department of Energy national security program construction project 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.

Section 3127—Funds Available for All National Security Programs of the Department of Energy

This section would authorize, subject to section 3121 of this bill, amounts for management and support activities and for general plant projects to be made available for use, when necessary, in connection with all national security programs of the Department of Energy.

Section 3128—Availability of Funds

This section would allow amounts appropriated for operation and maintenance or for plant projects to remain available until expended. This section would provide an exception for program direction funding which would remain available until the end of fiscal year 2000.

Section 3129—Transfers of Defense Environmental Management Funds

This section would provide the manager of each field office of the Department of Energy with the limited authority to transfer defense environmental management funds from a program or project under the jurisdiction of the office to another such program or project.

SUBTITLE C—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3131—Limitation on Use at Department of Energy Laboratories of Funds Appropriated for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention Program

This section would establish a limitation that not more than 25 percent of the funds appropriated for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP) program for any fiscal year could be spent at Department of Energy laboratories.

The IPP program was established to provide employment for the thousands of unemployed and underemployed Russian nuclear weapons scientists in projects with commercial applications, thereby providing them with an incentive to remain in Russia and resist the temptation to emigrate to countries of proliferation concern.

The committee notes that the Department of Energy's laboratories are involved in the IPP program to assist in designing and monitoring IPP research projects. However, the General Accounting Office has reported that 51 percent of IPP funds are consumed by

the laboratories and that a majority of those expenditures are used for administrative support fees. The committee believes that the amount of IPP funds spent at the laboratories should be limited so that more funds are spent in Russia for the intended purpose of the program.

Section 3132—Prohibition on Use for Payment of Russian Government Taxes and Customs Duties of Funds Appropriated for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention Program

This section would prohibit the payment of Russian taxes or customs duties with funds appropriated for the Department of Energy's Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP) program.

The IPP program was established to provide employment for the thousands of unemployed and underemployed Russian nuclear weapon scientists. The intent of the program is to provide salaries to these scientists for working on commercial research projects, thereby persuading them to remain in Russia and to refrain from emigrating to countries or projects of proliferation concern.

However, the effectiveness of the program is severely diminished by the amount of IPP funds that are taxed by the Russian government. According to a November 1998 DOE report, 53 percent of the IPP funds that are sent to Russia are extracted by the Russian government in the form of a variety of taxes, customs duties, and fees. As a result, the Russian scientists receive less than 50 percent of those IPP funds actually spent in Russia.

Section 3133—Modification of Laboratory Directed Research and Development to Provide Funds for Theater Ballistic Missile Defense

This provision would amend section 3132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510) by reducing the maximum laboratory directed research and development (LDRD) surcharge from six percent to three percent. It would also establish a three percent surcharge to fund theater ballistic missile defense (TMD) development projects at the national weapons laboratories. The provision would require that such projects be established and executed consistent with the memorandum of understanding between the Secretaries of Energy and Defense that was required by section 3131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). For fiscal year 2000, the provision would direct funds available for TMD to the development and test of kinetic energy theater ballistic missile defense warheads based on advanced explosive technology.

The committee strongly believes that the development of effective ballistic missile defenses remains a critical national security requirement. The committee recognizes the national laboratories as a valuable, multi-mission, national security resource and believes that the high priority of meeting ballistic missile defense requirements dictates the use of their technical expertise.

The committee believes that kinetic energy warheads based on advanced explosive technology could be a valuable technical adjunct to hit-to-kill technology and notes that such a program would take advantage of the Department of Energy's expertise and pre-

vious research in advanced explosive technology. The committee expects that this effort would focus on liquid metal jets produced by precisely initiated explosives, multiple pellet generation aimed by phased initiation, and a smart pellet projector.

Section 3134—Support of Theater Ballistic Missile Defense Activities of the Department of Defense

This section would authorize $30.0 million for stockpile stewardship for theater ballistic missile defense technology development, concept demonstration, and integrated testing to improve reliability and reduce risk in hit-to-kill interceptors for theater ballistic missile defenses; for science and engineering teams to address technical problems identified by the Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) which are critical to the acquisition of a theater ballistic missile defense capability; and for other research, development, and demonstration activities that support the mission of BMDO. The section would also require that any such activities conform to the memorandum of understanding between the Secretaries of Energy and Defense required by section 3131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) and be funded either through direct contributions or through a waiver of a federal administrative charge, overhead costs, or other indirect costs of the Department of Energy or its contractors.

The budget request contained no funds for research related to ballistic missile defense. The committee continues to believe that the Department of Energy's national weapons laboratories possess substantial technical expertise relevant to the challenge of theater ballistic missile defenses and that the laboratories can enhance the core competencies required to sustain the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile.

The committee understands that a memorandum of understanding (MOU) has been signed by the Secretaries of Energy and Defense on cooperative research and development activities between the DOE laboratories and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) and that funds for specific projects based on this MOU have been requested by BMDO for fiscal year 2000. The committee believes that an expansion of this effort is justified.

SUBTITLE D—COMMISSION ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS MANAGEMENT

Sections 3151–3159—Commission to Examine Nuclear Weapons Policy Management and Oversight

These sections would establish a "Commission on Nuclear Weapons Management," the procedures by which members of the commission would be selected, general rules governing the operation of the commission, the duties of the commission, the commission's reporting requirements, and the commission's powers.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 3161—Procedures for Meeting Tritium Production Requirements

Tritium is a radioactive isotope of hydrogen necessary for the proper functioning of U.S. nuclear weapons and due to a short half life, must be periodically replenished. Despite the fact that U.S. tritium production ceased in 1988, the committee notes that a new source of tritium is required by 2005 to meet tritium requirements imposed by nuclear warhead levels consistent with Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty I force levels. In December 1998, the Secretary of Energy designated commercial light water reactor technology to be the Department's primary tritium production technology and designated accelerator production of technology (APT) as the backup production technology.

The committee notes that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) will have to issue amended licenses to the Tennessee Valley Authority's Watts Bar and Sequoya light water reactors, selected by the Secretary as the preferred facilities for tritium production. The committee understands that the NRC licensing process is often very lengthy and is concerned that delays in issuing amended licenses to the preferred tritium production facilities could jeopardize the ability of the Department to meet tritium requirements. The Department's tritium production implementation plan indicates that the amended licenses will be granted by the first quarter of fiscal year 2003, and senior Department of Energy officials have informed the committee that they expect the amended licenses will be issued at an earlier date. Because the committee strongly believes that renewed production of tritium is essential to U.S. security requirements, it directs the Department to initiate the licensing process promptly.

To mitigate the risks inherent in a potentially lengthy licensing process, this provision would require the Secretary of Energy to prepare a plan to expedite APT design completion and construction. If amended licenses for the operation of commercial light water reactors for tritium production have not been completed by December 31, 2002, the provision would also require that the Secretary designate APT as the primary technology for tritium production and implement the APT plan.

Section 3162—Extension of Authority of Department of Energy to Pay Voluntary Separation Payments

This provision would extend the Department of Energy's authority to pay voluntary separation incentive payments for one year beyond its current authority and would require the Department to submit a report on the Department's use of this authority. The committee believes that this authority is a key tool available to Defense Programs to shape its future workforce as it downsizes.

The committee notes that several recent reports, including "The Organization and Management of the Nuclear Weapons Program," issued by the Institute for Defense Analyses in February 1997, and the report of the Commission on Sustaining U.S. Nuclear Weapons Expertise, issued March 15, 1999, have concluded that the Depart-

ment of Energy Weapons Activities program is overstaffed in its management and oversight functions. In spite of these conclusions, Defense Programs personnel levels have remained steady since fiscal year 1998 and are projected to remain steady through fiscal year 2000.

Section 3163—Fellowship Program for Development of Skills Critical to the Department of Energy Nuclear Weapons Complex

This provision would amend section 3140 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) by authorizing the establishment of a fellowship program for graduate and postdoctoral students who are U.S. citizens specializing in physical sciences with relevance to the nuclear weapons complex; requiring recipients to accept a postdoctoral-level appointment of at least one year, if offered, at one of national weapons laboratories or plants of the nuclear weapons complex; and requiring the Secretary of Energy to submit to the congressional defense committees by January 1, 2000 a plan that would establish criteria for the awarding of fellowships and a description of service obligations to be incurred by fellowship recipients. The provision would also authorize $5.0 million for the fellowship program.

Section 3164—Department of Energy Records Declassification

This section would require that any future budget request submitted to the Congress by the Department of Energy continue to specifically identify as a budgetary line item funds that would be used to declassify records pursuant to Executive Order 12958 or to comply with any subsequent statutory declassification requirements. This section would also limit the expenditure of funds by the Department of Energy for declassification of records during fiscal year 2000 to no more than $8.5 million.

Section 3165—Management of Nuclear Weapons Production Facilities and National Laboratories

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to assign to the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs direct authority over, and responsibility for, the nuclear weapons production facilities and national laboratories with respect to strategic management, policy development and guidance, budget guidance and formulation, resource requirements determinations and allocations, administration of contracts, environmental safety and health operations, integrated safety and management, safeguard and security operations, and relations with government agencies. It would also establish that the nuclear weapons production facilities, national laboratories, and operations offices report directly to the Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs. Finally, it would allow the Assistant Secretary to delegate to the operations offices a number of support functions, including operational activities, program execution, personnel, contracting and procurement, facility operations oversight, and integration of production and research activities.

The committee notes that a 1997 study, entitled "The Organization and Management of the Nuclear Weapons Program (120 Study)," found that Defense Programs suffers from confused lines

of authority and weak integration of programs, budgets, and functions. The Commission on Sustaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise, established by section 3162 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201), recently completed its report and repeated those conclusions. This provision would address these concerns by clarifying the lines of authority for the national laboratories, nuclear weapons production facilities, and operations offices.

Section 3166—Notice to Congressional Committees of Compromise of Classified Information within Nuclear Energy Defense Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to notify the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives whenever the Secretary has any knowledge that classified information relating to military applications of nuclear energy has been disclosed in an unauthorized manner to a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power.

Since the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives are the congressional committees responsible for the authorization of the nuclear energy defense programs of the Department of Energy, it is necessary that these committees be kept informed of any compromise of classified information to foreign powers either through espionage or through willful or accidental release by U.S. citizens. This information is essential so that these oversight committees can determine if such a disclosure of classified information caused significant damage to U.S. nuclear energy defense programs, so that program redirection or remedial actions can be authorized in a timely manner.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize $17.5 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board during fiscal year 2000.

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3301—Definitions

This section would provide specific definitions of the National Defense Stockpile and the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.

Section 3302—Authorized Uses Of Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $78.7 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2000. The provision would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions after a notification to the Congress.

Section 3303—Elimination of Congressionally Imposed Disposal Restrictions on Specific Stockpile Materials

This section would repeal sections 3303 and 3304 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) pertaining to restrictions on the disposal of manganese ferro from the National Defense Stockpile.

TITLE XXXIV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Great Lakes Maritime Academy

The budget request contained $7.161 million for State Maritime Schools, representing an increase of $411,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999. The committee understands that the training simulator at the Great Lakes Maritime Academy (GLMA) requires maintenance upgrades in order to continue to support cadet training and certification. The committee is concerned that the GLMA, the only State school without a federally supported training vessel, may not be able to continue to train its cadets to international maritime standards without the use of this simulator. Therefore, the committee directs that $190,000 of the $411,000 increase requested for State maritime schools be used to upgrade and repair the GLMA simulator.

Merchant Marine Academy

The budget request contained $34.1 million for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA). The committee is concerned about the deteriorating material condition of the physical plant and campus infrastructure at the USMMA. The plant and facilities are in such need of repair and replacement that they have become a health and safety hazard to the midshipmen and the staff. The budget request contained $150,000 for a feasibility study for the design of a replacement utility system. The committee directs the Secretary of Transportation to provide by October 31, 1999, a report to the House Committee on Armed Services summarizing the findings of this feasibility study as well as a detailed outline of estimated costs necessary to repair and restore the facilities at the USMMA. In addition, the committee recommends $41.7 million, an increase of $7.6 million, for deferred capital maintenance projects for fiscal year 2000.

Repair and Maintenance of Maritime Administration Vessels

The committee understands that Ready Reserve Force vessels managed by the Maritime Administration (MARAD) but operated under the Military Sealift Command when activated for exercises or crisis, must be maintained according to U.S. Coast Guard standards. The committee expects that non-emergency repairs and maintenance to these vessels will be made in U.S. shipyards, except in cases of national emergency or unless the national security readiness of the vessel may be adversely affected. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Transportation to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Com-

mittee on Armed Services, by February 1, 2000, detailing the type, cost, and location of all non-emergency maintenance or repairs to these vessels since 1990. The report should also define "emergency repairs" and indicate the official reason for any repairs or maintenance performed in a shipyard outside of the Unites States or Guam.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Short Title

This Section would establish the Act as "The Maritime Administration Act for Fiscal Year 2000."

Section 3402—Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2000

This section would authorize $213.4 million for fiscal year 2000. Of the funds authorized, $98.7 million is for the Maritime Security Program and $79.8 million is for operations and training programs, including $41.7, an increase of $7.6 million, for capital maintenance at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. In addition, $31.0 million, an increase of $25.0 million, is for the costs, as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of loan guarantees authorized by Title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 App. U.S.C. 1271 et seq.) and $3.9 million is for administrative expenses related to these loan guarantee commitments.

Section 3403—Amendments to Title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936

This section would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to place all Title XI bond proceeds in escrow to protect the government's interest during vessel construction. In addition, this section would prohibit the Secretary from releasing funds from the escrow account until the Secretary determines that the obligor has paid its portion of the actual cost of construction or reconstruction and that the funds to be released are needed to cover payments to the shipyard or other approved vessel related costs.

This section would also authorize the Secretary of Transportation to deposit funds into the Treasury which are earned by an obligor and required to be paid into such an account by the terms of the obligor's agreement with the Secretary under a reserve fund or other collateral account agreement. The Secretary shall have a security interest in such deposits. In addition, this section would authorize the Secretary to invest and reinvest the funds on deposit with the Treasury in obligations of the United States with income from the account to be paid to the obligor in the absence of a default by the obligor. In the event of a default, the Secretary could retain and offset all of the funds in the account for the benefit of the United States. In no event could funds be withdrawn for this without the consent of the Secretary.

Section 3404—Extension of War Risk Insurance Authority

This section would extend through June 30, 2005, the current authority provided to the Secretary of Transportation, under Title XII

of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to provide policies for vessel war risk insurance to vessel operators, without premium, at the request of the Secretary of Defense whenever it appears that such insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from commercial underwriters.

Section 3405—Ownership of the JEREMIAH O'BRIEN

This section would amend the Federal Maritime Commission Act of 1990 (46 U.S.C. Sec. 3302) to clarify the ownership status of the JEREMIAH O'BRIEN. The Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–324) authorized the conveyance of title of the JEREMIAH O'BRIEN to a nonprofit corporation for use as a merchant marine memorial. Under this authority, the National Liberty Ship Memorial, Inc. received title to the ship on October 10, 1998. Nothing in this section would amend or alter the terms and conditions set forth in either the Federal Maritime Commission Act of 1990 or the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996 as they relate to this vessel.

TITLE XXXV—PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Short Title

This section would establish the Act as the "Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000."

Section 3502—Authorization of Expenditures

This section would authorize the Panama Canal Commission (the Commission) to make expenditures from the Panama Canal Commission Revolving Fund within existing statutory limits for the final period of U.S. operation of the Panama Canal, from the beginning of fiscal year 2000 to noon on December 31, 1999. The Commission does not draw from U.S. taxpayer funds for the operation of the Canal, but receives funding to cover its operating, administrative, and capital improvement expenses from tolls and other revenues collected. The Commission's total operating costs, including depreciation and interest payments, in fiscal year 2000 are estimated to be $156.9 million. Due to the numerous official activities that will precede and accompany the transfer in this final period, the committee is recommending the same amount that was authorized for fiscal year 1999.

Section 3503—Purchase of Vehicles

This section would authorize the Commission to purchase passenger motor vehicles built in the United States provided that the purchase price is less than $26,000 per vehicle.

Section 3504—Office of Transition Administration

This section would authorize the Office of Transition Administration (OTA), established by section 1305 of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3714a) to expend or obligate funds from the Panama Canal Commission Dissolution Fund established by that same provision. This authority would be in effect from enactment until the Fund terminates by law on October 24, 2004. This section would also set forth certain operating parameters of OTA. Specifically, it would deem the director of OTA as the head of the agency for purposes of the exercise of procurement authority, clarify that the relevant provisions of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 will govern OTA's operation, and establish Panama and Washington, D.C. as OTA's locations. Finally, this section would confirm that the OTA office in Panama will be subject to normal Chief of Mission authority exercised by the United States Embassy in Panama.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Department of Defense proposes the enclosed draft of 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."

This legislative proposal is part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for the First Session of the 106th Congress and is necessary to carry out the President's budget plans for fiscal years 2000 and 2001. The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress, and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

The bill proposes several important initiatives needed for the efficient operation of the Department of Defense. It contains two additional rounds of base closures that would provide a fair process for eliminating unnecessary infrastructure while saving billions of dollars needed for increased modernization costs to replace aging weapon systems. It also would authorize appropriations for construction at certain military installations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other military construction activities of the Department.

The bill's 4.4 percent increase in basic pay, targeted pay increases, restoration of retirement pay, and extensions and increases in certain special pays and bonuses, would enable the Department to recruit and retain qualified members in the uniformed services. Finally, the bill would contribute to the smooth management of the Department by providing many other improvements and additions to the authorities under which we operate.

Sincerely,

JUDITH A. MILLER.

Enclosures.

COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 19, 1999 the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 1401, as amended, by a vote of 55 to 1.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, May 20, 1999.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPENCE: Thank you for working with me in your development of H.R. 1401, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001, specifically:

1. Section 341, Assistance to Local Education Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees;
2. Section 343; Technical Amendments to Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978;
3. Section 549, Re-codification and Consolidation of Statutes Denying Federal Grants and Contracts by certain Departments and Agencies to Institutions of Higher Education that Prohibit Senior ROTC Units or Military Recruiting on Campus;
4. Section 567, Access to Secondary School Students for Military Recruiting Purposes; and
5. Section 673, Overseas Special Supplemental Food Program.

As you know, these provisions are within the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

While I do not intend to seek sequential referral of H.R. 1401, the Committee does hold an interest in preserving its future jurisdiction with respect to issues raised in the aforementioned provisions and its jurisdictional prerogatives should the provisions of this bill or any Senate amendments thereto be considered in a conference with the Senate. We would expect to be appointed as conferees on these provisions should a conference with the Senate arise.

Again, I thank you for working with me in developing the amendments to H.R 1401 and look forward to working with you on these issues in the future.

Sincerely,

BILL GOODLING, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1999.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Government Reform has decided not to assert its jurisdiction over the following provisions in H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform.

Title V—Military Personnel Policy

Section 521: Revision to Military Technician (Dual Status) Law.
Section 522: Civil Service Retirement of Technicians.
Section 523: Revision to Non-Dual Status Technicians Statute.
Section 524: Revision to Authorities Relating to National Guard Technicians.

Title VI—Compensation and other Personnel Benefits

Section 672: Clarification of per diem eligibility for military technicians serving on active duty without pay outside the United States.

Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters

Section 802: Extension of Authority to issue solicitations for purposes of commercial items in excess of simplified acquisition threshold.

Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management

Section 902: Responsibility for logistics and sustainment functions of the DOD.

Title XI—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel

Section 1101: Increase of pay cap for non-appropriated fund senior executive employees.
Section 1102: Restoration of leave for certain DOD employees who deploy to combat zone outside U.S.
Section 1103: Expansion of Guard & Reserve purposes for which leave may be used.

Title XXVIII—General Provisions

Section 2802: Development of Ford Island, Hawaii.

Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs

Section 3156: Personnel matters.
Section 3157: Miscellaneous Administrative Provisions.
Section 3162: Extension of authority of DOE to pay voluntary separation incentive payments.

As you know, House Rule X, Establishment and Jurisdiction of Standing Committees, grants the Government Reform Committee wide jurisdiction over government management issues including

matters related to Federal civil service, procurement policy, and property disposal.

This committee also oversees legislation regarding holidays and celebrations. This waiver is not intended or designed to limit our jurisdiction over any future consideration of related matters.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate your consultation with the Government Reform Committee to ensure that these provisions address the legislative goals of both Committees as well as the American taxpayer.

I look forward to working with you in the on this and other issues throughout the 106th Congress.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1999.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that on Wednesday, May 19, 1999, the Committee on Armed Services ordered favorably reported H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. The bill includes a number of provisions that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations pursuant to Rule X(k) of the House of Representatives.

The specific provisions within our committee's jurisdiction are: (1) Section 1023, United States Military Activities in Colombia; (2) Section 1201, Report on Strategic Stability under START III; (3) Section 1202, One-Year Extension of Counter-Proliferation Authorities for Support of United Nations Weapons Inspection Regime in Iraq; and (4) Title XIII, Cooperative Threat Reduction with States of the Former Soviet Union.

With respect to Section 1006, Limitation on Operations in Yugoslavia, and Section 1206, Limitation on Funds for Bosnia Peacekeeping Operations for Fiscal Year 2000, it is my understanding that the Parliamentarians have not made a final determination regarding our jurisdictional claim on these provisions. Because of our Committee's strong interest in these provisions, which we believe are at the heart of our Committee's jurisdiction regarding decisions governing intervention abroad, we will continue to seek jurisdiction over these provisions as we move toward conference committee on H.R. 1401.

Pursuant to Chairman Dreier's announcement that the Committee on Rules will move expeditiously to consider a rule for H.R. 1401 and your desire to have the bill considered on the House floor next week, the Committee on International Relations will not seek a sequential referral of the bill as a result of including these provisions, without waiving or ceding now or in the future this committee's jurisdiction over the provisions in question. I will seek to have conferees appointed for these provisions during any House-Senate conference committee.

I would appreciate your including this letter as a part of the report on H.R. 1401 and as part of the record during consideration of the bill by the House of Representatives.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1999.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have reviewed H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, as reported by the Committee on Armed Services for provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources. Based on my reading, I believe the Committee on Resources has a jurisdictional interest in sections 365, 601, 653, 654, 2814 and 2863, all dealing with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Corps, public lands or historic preservation.

Because I have no objection to these provisions and because of the excellent working relationship our committees have enjoyed these last three Congresses, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill based on their inclusion. However, I do ask that you support my request to have the Committee on Resources represented on any conference on this measure or any similar measure for those provisions, and that you include this letter in the report for the bill.

Thank you for keeping me and my staff apprized of the progress of H.R. 1401; Robert Rangel, Philip Grone, Peter Steffes and Michael Higgins of your Committee staff were especially helpful. I look forward to seeing H.R. 1401 enacted soon.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1999.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in matters being considered in H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1401 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over a number of provisions of the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, re-

duces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that every effort will be made to include any agreements worked out by staff of our two Committees in amendments as the bill is taken to the House Floor, and that a copy of this letter and of your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the record during consideration of this bill by the House. In addition, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee reserves the right to be included as conferees on any matter within its jurisdiction should this legislation go to a House-Senate conference.

Pursuant to Rule X, clause 1 (q), of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Transportation and Infrastructure has jurisdiction over oil and other pollution of navigable waters, the nonmilitary activities of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, as well as the Coast Guard. Our environmental jurisdiction includes provisions which amend or affect the Clean Water Act, the Ocean Dumping Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships, the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, (including the double hull phase-out schedule), and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

In particular, our Committee has a jurisdictional interest in Section 321, "Remediation of asbestos and lead-based paint", which requires the Secretary of Defense to use the Army Corps of Engineers to remediate asbestos and lead-based paint at military installations. Nonmilitary activities of the Corps are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and this additional program will impact the Corps' ability to carry out its existing missions. Similarly, our Committee has jurisdiction over the Tennessee Valley Authority, and accordingly, the Committee has a jurisdictional interest in Section 3161, "Procedures for Meeting Tritium Production Requirements."

Furthermore, the Committee has an interest in the following sections, as well as any other section in the reported version of the bill, affecting Coast Guard pay or personnel matters:

361. Discretionary Authority to install telecommunications equipment for persons performing voluntary services.

367. Treatment of Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam in defense household goods moving programs.

411. End Strengths for Selected Reserve.

511. Continuation on Reserve active status list to complete disciplinary action.

515. Computation of years of service exclusion.

517. Expansion and codification of authority for space-required travel for Reserves.

601. Fiscal year 2000 increase in military basic pay and reform of basic pay rates.

602. Pay increase for fiscal years after fiscal year 2000.

611. Extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for reserve forces.

613. Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays.

614. Aviation career incentive pay for air battle managers.

615. Expansion of authority to provide special pay to aviation career officers extending period of active duty.
616. Diving duty special pay.
617. Reenlistment bonus.
618. Enlistment bonus.
619. Revised Eligibility requirements for reserve component prior service enlistment bonus.
621. Increase in authorized monthly rate of foreign lanuage proficiency pay.
622. Authorization of retention bonus for special warfare officers extending period of active duty.
624. Authorization of career enlisted flyer incentive pay.
625. Authorization of judge advocate continuation pay.
631. Provision of lodging in kind for Reservists performing training duty and not otherwise entitled to travel and transportation allowances.
632. Payment of temporary lodging expenses for members making their first permanent change of station.
633. Emergency leave travel cost limitations.
641. Redux retired pay system applicable only to members electing new 15–year career status bonus.
642. Authorization of 15–year career status bonus.
651. Effective date of disability retirement for members dying in civilian medical facilities.
653. Preservation of United States flag to retiring members of the uniformed services not previously covered.
654. Accrual funding for retirement system for commissioned corps of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
671. Payments for unused accrued leave as part of reenlistment.
672. Clarification of per diem eligibility for military technicians serving on active duty without pay outside the United States.
674. Special compensation for severely disabled uniformed serviced retirees.
721. Pharmacy benefits program.
722. Improvements to third-party payer collection program.
3404. Extension of war risk insurance authority.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. I look forward to continuing to work with you on H.R. 1401 and other matters of mutual interest to our two Committees.

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1999.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 21, 1999 regarding H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, as you requested, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE, *Chairman.*

FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2000 and the four years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the cost estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(c)(3).

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

MAY 21, 1999.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Earlier today, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. Please note, that for a variety of reasons, the estimates contained in the transmittal are not directly comparable with the total for the national defense function specified in the budget resolution. For example, H.R. 1401 contains a few items that do not fall under the national defense function. If appropriate adjustments were made to place the cost estimate of H.R. 1401 on a comparable basis with the amounts contained in the budget resolution, the budget authority for H.R. 1401 would be $288,800 million (compared to $288,812 million in the budget resolution), and the outlays would be $274,534 million (compared to $276,567 million in the budget resolution).

I hope this clarifies the information provided in CBO's cost estimate of H.R. 1401.

Sincerely,

DAN L. CRIPPEN.

MAY 21, 1999.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. Also enclosed are

two tables with comparisons among the budget request, the bill, and the budget resolution.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

DAN L. CRIPPEN.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

Summary: H.R. 1401 would authorize appropriations totaling $291.0 billion for fiscal year 2000 for the military functions of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of Energy (DOE). It also would prescribe personnel strengths for each active duty and selected reserve component of the U.S. armed forces. CBO estimates that appropriation of the authorized amounts for 2000 would result in additional outlays of $287 billion over the 2000–2004 period. In addition, the bill contains provisions that would raise the costs of discretionary defense programs over the 2001–2004 period by about $2.6 billion.

The bill contains provisions that would affect direct spending, primarily through changes to military retirement programs. We estimate that the direct spending resulting from provisions of H.R. 1401 would total about $7 million over the 2000–2004 period and $186 million over the 2000–2009 period. Over the long run, the provisions to change the military retirement system would raise the costs of that entitlement program by about 6 percent. Under current law, spending for that program will amount to about $32 billion in 1999. Because it would affect direct spending, the bill would be subject to pay-as-you-go procedures.

One section of the bill may contain an intergovernmental and private-sector mandate, but the costs of the mandate would not exceed thresholds established by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). UMRA excludes from application of the act legislative provisions that are necessary for the national security or for the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that all other provisions of this bill either fit within that exclusion or do not contain private-sector or intergovernmental mandates as defined by UMRA.

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 1401 is shown in Table 1, assuming that the bill will be enacted by October 1, 1999.

Basis of Estimate:

Authorizations of Appropriations

The bill would authorize specific appropriations totaling $291.0 billion in 2000 for military programs of DOD and DOE (see Table 2). These costs would fall within budget function 050 (national defense). The estimate assumes that the amounts authorized will be appropriated for 2000. Outlays are estimated based on historical spending patterns. In addition, H.R. 1401 would authorize appropriations of $80 million for the Maritime Administration (function 400) and $68 million for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (function 700).

TABLE 1.—BUDGETARY IMPACT OF H.R. 1401 AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Spending Under Current Law for Defense Programs:						
Budget Authority [1]	279,421	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	273,507	93,107	34,029	13,420	5,808	2,850
Proposed Changes:						
Authorization Level	0	291,031	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	192,959	61,061	21,367	7,880	3,462
Spending Under H.R. 1401 for Defense Programs:						
Authorization Level [1]	279,421	291,031	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	273,507	286,066	95,090	34,787	13,688	6,312
DIRECT SPENDING						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	1	2	0	2	2
Estimated Outlays	0	1	2	0	2	2

[1] The 1999 level is the amount appropriated for programs authorized by the bill.

Note.—Costs of the bill would fall under budget function 050 (national defense), except for certain items noted in the text.

TABLE 2.—SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000, AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Military Personnel:					
Authorization Level	72,116	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	69,520	1,587	505	144	0
Operation and Maintenance:					
Authorization Level	106,008	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	79,667	20,598	3,202	1,324	545
Procurement:					
Authorization Level	55,599	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	13,122	18,995	13,158	5,229	2,438
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation:					
Authorization Level	35,836	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	19,638	13,332	2,012	547	142
Military Construction and Family Housing:					
Authorization Level	8,590	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	2,488	3,173	1,716	653	324
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:					
Authorization Level	12,285	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	7,903	3,336	835	11	10
Other Accounts:					
Authorization Level	523	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	274	93	59	32	23
General Transfer Authority:					
Authorization Level	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	280	−60	−120	−60	−20
Total:					
Authorization Level	290,957	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	192,892	61,054	21,367	7,880	3,462

The bill also contains provisions that would affect various costs, mostly for personnel, that would be covered by the fiscal year 2000 authorization and by authorizations in future years. Table 3 contains estimates of these amounts. In addition to the costs covered by the authorizations in the bill for 2000, these provisions would raise estimated costs by $2.6 billion over the 2001–2004 period.

The following sections describe the estimated authorizations shown in Table 3 and provide information about CBO's cost estimates.

Multiyear Procurement Programs. In most cases, purchases of weapon systems are authorized annually, and as a result DoD negotiates a separate contract for each annual purchase. In a small number of cases, the law permits multiyear procurement; that is, it allows DoD to enter into a contract to buy specified annual quantities of a system for up to five years. In those cases DoD can negotiate lower prices because its commitment to purchase the weapons gives the contractor an incentive to find more economical ways to manufacture the weapon, including cost-saving investments. Funding would continue to be provided on an annual basis for these multiyear contracts, but termination costs would be covered by an initial appropriation.

H.R. 1401 would authorize DoD to enter into multiyear contracts for six weapon systems: Javelin missiles, Bradley fighting vehicles, Apache Longbow attack helicopters, upgrades to the Abrams main battle tank, Wolverine heavy assault bridges, and F/A–18 E/F aircraft. The Javelin missile and Bradley fighting vehicle contracts would cover four years of production while contracts for the F/A–18E/F, Apache Longbow helicopters, Abrams tank upgrades, and Wolverine bridges would cover five years.

CBO estimates savings from buying the five Army systems with multiyear contracts would total $870 million, an average of $174 million a year, over the 2000–2004 period. Funding requirements through 2004 would total $7.2 billion instead of the $8.0 billion needed under annual contracts. Multiyear procurement of the Javelin would raise costs in 2000 because that system did not receive advance procurement funding in 1999 in anticipation of multiyear procurement starting in 2000. Similarly, CBO estimates that the Navy would save $706 million, or about $140 million a year, through 2004 under a multiyear contract for the F/A–18E/F, which under current law would cost about $15.8 billion over that period. Those estimates are based on the assumption that annual production will be at the levels planned by the Administration for each of the six programs.

TABLE 3.—ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SELECTED PROVISIONS IN H.R. 1401 AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Multiyear Procurement:					
Javelin Missile System	33	−106	−73	−84	−9
Bradley Fighting Vehicle	−1	−31	−36	−33	0
Apache Longbow Helicopters	−2	−77	−97	−112	−96
Tank Upgrades	0	−29	−29	−30	−19
Wolverine Bridge	0	−7	−8	−9	−16
F/A–18 E/F Aircraft	−148	−163	−166	−124	−106
Military Endstrengths:					
Department of Defense	−511	−531	−551	−570	−589
Coast Guard Reserve	74	0	0	0	0
Grade Structure	1	1	1	1	1
Compensation and Benefits (DoD):					
Military Pay Raise in 2000	204	278	287	297	306
Pay Table Reform	195	809	838	864	893
Enlistment/Reenlistment Bonuses (active)	266	182	91	59	35

TABLE 3.—ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SELECTED PROVISIONS IN H.R. 1401 AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—Continued

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Aviation and Nuclear Special Pay	40	43	33	25	20
Various Bonuses (Reserve)	45	52	37	26	18
Special Pay for Nurses	7	3	0	0	0
Increases in Special Pays	34	55	50	45	43
New Special Pays	52	53	54	55	55
Travel and Transportation Allowances	21	21	22	22	22
Reserve Components	5	5	6	6	6
Military Academies and Education Benefits	15	15	15	15	15
Other Military Benefits	22	22	22	22	22
Military Retirement:					
Changes to REDUX System	443	596	1,136	1,137	1,187
Payments to Disabled Retirees	45	45	45	45	46
Other Provisions:					
Acquisition Workforce	−28	−492	−1,047	−1,146	−1,184
Agency Retirement Contributions	2	3	3	4	4
DOE Separation Incentives	0	0	6	0	0
Domiciliary and Custodial Care	7	7	7	7	7
Bill Total:					
Estimated Authorizations	821	754	646	523	663

Notes.—For every item in this table except one, the 2000 impacts are included in the amounts specifically authorized to be appropriated in the bill. Those amounts are shown in Table 2. Only the authorization of endstrength for the Coast Guard Reserve is additive to the amounts in Table 2.

Endstrength. The bill would authorize active and reserve endstrengths for 2000 and would lower the minimum endstrength authorization under permanent law. The authorized endstrengths for active-duty personnel and personnel in the Selected Reserve would total 1,385,432 and 865,298, respectively. The bill would specifically authorize appropriations of $72.1 billion for military pay and allowances in 2000. Current law sets the minimum endstrength for active-duty personnel at 1,395,698 but the bill would lower that figure for future years to 1,384,806. The reduction in authorized personnel would decrease future costs by more than $500 million annually.

Also the bill would authorize an endstrength of 8,000 in 2000 for the Coast Guard Reserve. This authorization would cost about $74 million and would fall under budget function 400, transportation.

Grade Structure. Section 414 would change the grade structure of active duty personnel in support of the reserves. This change would not increase the overall endstrength, but would result in more promotions. The provision would cost about $1 million a year.

Compensation and Benefits. H.R. 1401 contains several provisions that would affect military compensation and benefits.

Pay Raises. Section 601 would raise basic pay by 4.8 percent at a total cost of about $2.0 billion in 2000. Because this pay raise would be 0.5 percent above what is projected under current law, CBO estimates that the incremental costs would be $204 million in 2000 and average about $290 million over the next four years.

In addition to the across-the-board pay raise, section 601 would authorize additional pay raises for individuals with specific ranks and years of service. These raises would become effective after July 1, 2000. They would cost $196 million in 2000 and about $900 million annually by 2004.

Expiring Bonuses and Allowances. Several sections would extend for one year DoD's authority to pay certain bonuses and allowances to current personnel. Under current law, these authorities are scheduled to expire in December 1999, or three months into fiscal year 2000. The bill would extend these authorities through December 2000. CBO estimates that payment of enlistment and reenlistment bonuses for active duty personnel would cost $266 million in 2000 and $182 million in 2001. The cost of extending special payments for aviators and nuclear-qualified personnel would be $40 million in 2000 and $43 million in 2001. Payment authorities for various bonuses for the Selected and Ready Reserve would cost $45 million in 2000 and $52 million in 2001. We estimate that authorities to make special payments to nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists would cost $7 million in 2000 and $3 million in 2001. Most of these changes would result in additional, smaller costs in subsequent years because payments are made in installments.

Increases in Special Pays and Bonuses. Sections 614 through 621 would revise certain eligibility criteria and pay rates for personnel with special skills. Under those provisions, pay would be increased for aviators, nuclear-qualified naval officers, servicemembers performing diving duty, and individuals with proficiency in foreign languages. In addition, the maximum payments for enlistment and reenlistment bonuses for personnel on active duty would increase and limits on receiving only one hazardous duty incentive pay would be removed. Those changes would cost $34 million in 2000 and larger amounts in subsequent years.

New Special Pays. Sections 622 through 625 would authorize four new special compensation categories. These include a retention bonus for special warfare officers, continuation pay for surface warfare officers, and incentive pay for career enlisted flyers, which would replace a similar pay for certain enlisted personnel. Continuation pay would also be extended to personnel serving as judge advocates. Additional costs for these provisions would total $52 million in 2000 and similar amounts in subsequent years.

Travel and Transportation Allowances. Section 631 would require DoD to cover the lodging expenses of reservists on training duty when they are not otherwise entitled to travel and transportation allowances and when government housing is not available. Because the services have already been providing lodging as needed, CBO attributes minimal additional costs to this provision. Section 632 would allow enlisted personnel reporting to their first permanent duty station to receive temporary lodging expenses. Estimated costs for increased lodging expenses would total about $21 million annually.

Reserve Components. Several provisions would affect servicemembers in the reserves. Section 512 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to order a member of the reserves to active duty for the purpose of receiving authorized medical care, receiving a disability evaluation, or participating in a health care study. Costs would total about $1 million a year. Section 518 would authorize a financial assistance program for certain members of the Marine Corps Reserves at an estimated cost of $4 million annually.

Military Academies and Education Benefits. Section 531 would increase DoD's authority to waive some of the reimbursement that it receives for the expenses for foreign students to attend the military academies. CBO estimates additional waivers would total $3 million a year. Section 546 would increase the monthly subsistence allowance for senior ROTC cadets selected for advanced training. The estimated costs are $12 million annually.

Other Military Benefits. The bill contains several additional provisions pertaining to pay and benefits.

Overseas Special Supplemental Food Program. The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), operated by the Food and Nutrition Service of the Department of Agriculture, provides food assistance and nutrition services to pregnant and post-partum women and children up to five years of age who meet income and nutrition eligibility guidelines. The bill would require DoD to operate a similar program for personnel living overseas. CBO estimates that about 5,100 women and children would participate in an average month under the program, increasing discretionary costs by $2 million each year.

The bill would require DoD to use the eligibility criteria that apply to the WIC program, to the extent practicable, with the specific exception that the value of in-kind housing benefits be included in calculating a household's income. Based on data from DoD on personnel living overseas, CBO assumes that about 4,800 children under the age of five would meet the requirements for age and household income. Assuming that 1,400 of the eligible children are up to one year old, program data suggest that 1,900 pregnant, post-partum, and breast-feeding women would be eligible based on income. Thus, a total of 6,700 women and children would meet the income criteria for assistance. CBO estimates that about 80 percent of those 6,700 individuals would be determined to be at nutritional risk, and assumes that 95 percent of those eligible would participate. We therefore project a total of 5,100 participants in an average month.

CBO estimates that the average monthly food cost would be about $28 for each participant, based on a DoD estimate of the cost of an average WIC food package in military commissaries, adjusted for inflation. In addition to supplemental foods, participants would receive nutrition services. Nutrition services and other administrative costs are typically about 25 percent of the total cost in WIC. Based on the estimated food costs, administrative costs would be about $7 per month per participant.

Other Provisions. Section 566 would increase funding limitations for the National Guard Challenge Program. Section 671 would allow payment of accrued leave to servicemembers upon immediate reenlistment. Section 675 would allow the Secretaries of the military departments to waive tuition charges for servicemembers deployed in a contingency operation. CBO estimates the cost of these increased authorities would total about $20 million a year.

Military Retirement. H.R.1401 contains provisions that would increase retirement benefits for various military retirees.

Changes to the REDUX System. The bill would increase retirement benefits for members who entered the service after July 31, 1986, and are covered under the system known as REDUX.

Background. The Military Retirement Reform Act of 1986 (REDUX) governs the retirement of military personnel who initially entered the armed forces after July 31, 1986. Under REDUX a retiree's initial annuity ranges from 40 percent to 75 percent of the individual's highest three years of basic pay. Retirees with 20 years of service will receive 40 percent, and the fraction will grow with each additional year of service and reach the maximum at 30 years of service. When the retiree is 62 years old, the annuity is raised in most cases to equal 2.5 percent of the average of the highest 36 months of basic pay for each year of service up to a maximum of 75 percent. Also, under REDUX, retirees receive annual cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs) equal to the change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) less 1 percentage point. When the retiree reaches age 62, the annuity is raised to reflect all of the CPI growth until that point, but thereafter annual COLAs continue to equal the CPI less one percentage point.

Current law provides two different formulas for other individuals who become eligible for a nondisability retirement benefit but are not covered by REDUX. Military personnel who first became members of the armed forces before September 8, 1980, receive retired pay equal to a multiple of their highest amount of basic pay; the multiple is 2.5 percent for every year of service up to 75 percent. Retirees who first became members of the armed forces between September 8, 1980, and July 31, 1986, receive retired pay based on the average of the highest 36 months of basic pay and the multiplier of 2.5 percent for each year of service (the so-called high three plan). Annuities for both of these groups are fully adjusted for changes in the CPI.

Changes Under H.R. 1401. Under section 642, members who under current law would retire under REDUX would face a choice upon reaching 15 years of service. They could elect to receive a lump-sum bonus of $30,000 and retire under the REDUX plan or they could forgo that payment and upon retirement receive annuities under the high three plan. Section 641 would establish a floor for COLAs under both of those options—1 percent for those retiring under REDUX and 2 percent for those selecting the other option.

Accrual Costs. Prior to 2009 the primary budgetary impact would stem from the payments that DoD would make to the military retirement trust fund. The military retirement system is financed in part by payments from appropriated funds to the military retirement trust fund based on an estimate of the system's accruing liabilities. Repealing REDUX would increase payments from the military personnel accounts to the military retirement fund (a DoD outlay in budget function 050) to finance the increased liability to the fund resulting from additional years of service under a more generous system. CBO estimates that the resulting increase in discretionary spending from the accrual payments would be $443 million in 2000 and would average about $600 million by 2004. The costs to DoD would increase annually by projected increases in basic pay. Accrual charges are reestimated by DoD every year depending upon endstrengths, projected years of service at the time of retirement, grade structures, and projected rates of military pay raises, inflation, and interest rates. CBO's assumption about these factors are consistent with the ones currently used by the DoD's ac-

tuaries. These estimates assume that annual pay raises are between 3 and 4 percent, the CPI grows at 3.5 percent a year over the long term, and the trust fund's holdings of Treasury securities earn interest at a rate of 6.5 percent annually.

Lump-Sum Payments. In addition to the higher accrual charges, CBO estimates that DoD would spend about $500 million a year for lump-sum bonuses, assuming 50 percent of enlisted personnel and about 40 percent of officers would elect to receive the lower annuity in retirement. That estimate is based on DoD's experience with two buyout programs in recent years and the distribution of years of service among military personnel. Those expecting to retire with long terms of service and a relatively high REDUX annuity would tend to take the bonus. Those who expect to retire with 20 years of service would be more likely to take the other option. The members who would be affected by this provision entered service in 1986; thus, they would not be eligible for the lump-sum payment until 2001.

Direct Spending. These provisions would raise direct spending for annuities by about $185 million over the 2000–2009 period, as discussed below with other provisions affecting direct spending.

Payments to Disabled Retirees. Under current law, disabled veterans who are retired from the military, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service (PHS), or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) cannot receive both full retirement annuities and disability compensation. Such veterans usually forgo a portion of their retirement annuity equal to the nontaxable veterans' benefit. Section 674 would allow retirees to receive additional payments if they receive nondisability annuities, completed at least 20 years of service, and have service-connected disabilities rated as 70 percent or greater within four years of their retirement.

The potential costs of section 674 depend on the number of beneficiaries, their disability levels, and the benefit amounts. CBO estimates that in 1999 about 20,000 retirees meet the criteria under the bill, assuming that 80 percent of the estimated 25,000 retirees who meet the other criteria had their disability rated as at least 70 percent within four years of retirement. Nearly all beneficiaries would be military retirees, but about 300 retired members of the Coast Guard, NOAA, and PHS would be eligible for payments.

CBO projects the potential caseload for future years using expected mortality rates and expected rates of growth in the population of new beneficiaries. On this basis, we expect that the number of beneficiaries would change only slightly over the next several years.

CBO estimated the distribution of those beneficiaries among disability levels using data from a report prepared by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in 1995. According to information from the Department of Veterans Affairs, veterans with disabilities rated 70 percent or greater generally receive that rating soon after leaving military service. Veterans with service-connected disabilities may have their ratings reevaluated over time, but those veterans whose ratings are increased usually have low-rated disabilities. Also, veterans with psychiatric disabilities may have highly rated disabilities, but most reevaluations of their disabilities lead to reductions rather than increases.

The bill would define the additional benefit as follows: $300 per month for a retiree whose disability is rated as total, $200 per month for a retiree whose disability is rated as 90 percent, and $100 per month for a retiree whose disability is rated as 70 percent or 80 percent.

CBO estimates that the provision would cost about $45 million in 2000 and $226 million over the 2000–2004 period, assuming that the bill would be enacted and implemented by October 1, 1999. The benefits would be paid out of discretionary appropriations for pay and benefits, and the bill specifies how each Secretary would allocate funding that is insufficient to pay all eligible beneficiaries.

Reductions in Defense Acquisition Workforce. The bill would limit the size of the acquisition workforce and would require a reduction of 50,000 military and civilian personnel during fiscal years 2000 and 2001. Because the total number of military personnel is determined by endstrength requirements, CBO assumes that the provision would lead to their transfer to other activities rather than separation from the services. Separations of civilian personnel, who comprise about 80 percent of the acquisition workforce, would account for the remaining reductions. CBO estimates that these changes in the acquisition workforce would save $28 million in 2000, $492 million in 2001, and over $1.1 billion a year once the reduction is fully accomplished. Savings would be relatively small during the first few years because the cost of separation payments offsets most of the initial savings in salaries. Savings accumulate more rapidly once employees are off the payroll for a full year and the government no longer pays separation costs.

Agency Retirement Contributions. Section 522 of the bill would change the early retirement provisions that apply to dual status military technicians who are covered by the Federal Employees' Retirement System (FERS) and lose their membership in the Selected Reserve. Under current law, these technicians can retire early if they are at least 50 years old and have at least 25 years of service. The bill would allow technicians hired after February 10, 1996, to retire early if they are at least 50 years old and have 20 years of service, or at any age if they have 25 years of service.

Under FERS, combined employee and agency retirement contributions to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (CSRDF) are equal to the normal cost of providing retirement benefits. The current normal cost for dual status military technicians is 11.9 percent of basic pay. The technicians contribute 0.8 percent of basic pay, and DoD pays the rest. According to the Office of Personnel Management, section 522 would increase the normal cost for affected technicians to 12.6 percent of basic pay by allowing additional technicians to take early retirement. Since employee contributions would be unchanged, DoD's contribution for these technicians would increase from 11.1 to 11.8 percent of basic pay.

According to DoD, about 60,000 technicians are also members of the Selected Reserve. Based on information from the National Guard and the Reserves, CBO estimates that the number of technicians that would be affected by this provision would rise from about 10,000 in 2000 to 15,000 by 2004. CBO estimates that the additional DoD retirement contributions for these technicians would total $16 million over the 2000–2004 period.

DOE Separation Incentives. Under current law, the Department of Energy (DOE) has the authority to offer buyouts to employees who voluntarily retire or resign. Section 3162 of the bill would extend this authority, which is scheduled to expire at the end of calendar year 2000, through calendar year 2001. DOE would be required to make two payments for each employee who accepts a buyout: a lump-sum payment to the employee of up to $25,000 and a deposit into the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (CSRDF) equal to 26 percent of the employee's final pay.

Because DOE plans to use this buyout authority between October and December 2001, the payment of the separation incentives would occur in fiscal year 2002. According to DOE, approximately 150 employees are projected to accept a buyout. Based on past buyout experience at DOE, CBO assumes that each employee would receive a buyout payment of $25,000. CBO estimates that total DOE payments for separation incentives, including the deposits to the CSRDF, would total $6 million in 2002.

Military Health Care Programs and Benefits. Title VII contains several provisions that would affect DoD health care and benefits, although only a few would have a budgetary impact.

Domiciliary and Custodial Care. Section 703 would authorize DoD to continue to waive the custodial care exclusion under TRICARE for certain individuals. The beneficiaries would be those who were receiving coverage for ongoing custodial care when the benefit was reduced significantly under a new program. According to DoD, this provision would not affect more than 25 people. CBO estimates that the average annual cost of the provision would be about $300,000 per person and that section 703 would cost about $7 million a year.

Other Health Care Provisions. The bill contains two other health care provisions that could have budgetary impacts that CBO cannot estimate. Section 721 would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a uniform formulary of pharmaceutical agents by October 1, 2000. Although savings from economies of scale in purchasing drugs and other efficiencies are possible, CBO cannot estimate the budgetary impact of a uniform formulary because it has no information about how the new formulary would compare with the system DoD operates under current law.

Section 722 would alter the criteria used by DoD to calculate charges to third-party insurers. Although CBO cannot estimate the precise budgetary impact of this provision, it expects the impact would be relatively small because of offsetting effects of the provision. This change could raise some of DoD's charges and consequent receipts, but it could also increase the likelihood that third-party insurers would deny claims from DoD.

Long-Term Charter of Naval Vessels. Section 1014 would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into long-term commitments to lease newly built surface vessels. The contract may include an option for the Navy to purchase the vessel. Contracts under this section would have to be specifically authorized in subsequent legislation. Under current practices, a contract authorized under this section would probably be considered either a capital lease or a lease-purchase arrangement. As a result, the subsequent authorization would be scored with a large amount of budget authority in

the first year. If the arrangement is a lease purchase, the budget would record all outlays over the expected construction period.

Direct spending

The bill contains provisions that would affect direct spending primarily through changes to military retirement programs. We estimate that the direct spending from provisions of H.R. 1401 would total about $186 million over the 2000–2009 period.

Military Retirement. Sections 641 and 642 (see the discussion above) would increase direct spending from the military retirement trust fund by $1 million in 2000 and by about $185 million over the 2000–2009 period. The outlay impact before 2006 is primarily due to higher cost-of-living allowances for individuals who receive a disability annuity. Starting in 2006 the impact is almost all due to regular retirements. In the long run, direct spending for military retirement would be about 6 percent higher than under current law for a program that costs about $32 billion in 1999.

Property Transactions. The bill contains various provisions that would authorize property transactions involving both large and small parcels of real estate.

Ford Island. The bill would provide the Navy with a variety of means to develop Ford Island, which is located in Pearl Harbor. Under section 2802, the Navy could sell and lease its excess Hawaiian property in exchange for cash and services. But because the use of cash proceeds would require appropriation action, the Navy would probably enter into barter arrangements and enhanced-use leases that would allow it to obtain construction and maintenance services that could have a cash value up to about $500 million.

Direct spending would increase to the extent that the Navy would sell its excess property under current law. In that case, the bill would result in forgone receipts to the Treasury. If the land was formally declared excess and sold through normal procedures that govern property disposal, the receipts could total tens of millions of dollars or more. But because the Navy has no incentive under current law to formally declare that its valuable real estate is excess to its needs, CBO believes that the property is unlikely to be sold under current law.

Forgone Receipts from Other Provisions. Section 2832 would convey an Army Reserve Center to the City of Kankakee, Illinois. The Army has declared that property excess to its needs. Thus, under current law, it would likely be transferred to the General Services Administration and sold. Based on information from the Army, CBO estimates that forgone receipts would total about $1 million in 2001.

Sections 2851 and 2863 would convey land that is being leased to nongovernmental entities. Under current law, receipts from these lease payments are deposited in the Treasury. The loss of receipts from enactment of these provisions would total less than $500,000 annually.

Other Land Transactions. Title XXVIII contains a variety of other provisions that would authorize DoD to convey land at no cost to the recipient. These conveyances would affect both small and large properties, ranging from six acres of docks and facilities

in Whittier, Alaska, to 314 acres of land that contain a naval weapons industrial plant near Dallas, Texas.

Some of the property that would be conveyed in title XXVIII has been declared excess by DoD. Under current law, this property is likely to be given to state or local governments. Therefore, CBO estimates these conveyances would not affect receipts. Other parcels—some worth up to several million dollars each—have not been declared excess. Because it is unclear if or when these parcels would be declared excess and sold under current law, CBO has no basis for estimating whether these conveyances would affect receipts.

Still other parcels that would be conveyed by the bill are excess land from prior rounds of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). Under current law, DoD can use proceeds from the sale of BRAC properties to offset base closure costs. Thus, the conveyance of these properties would have no net effect on spending. The conveyances would, however, increase the need for future appropriations.

DOE Separation Incentives. As noted previously, section 3162 would extend DOE's authority to offer buyout payments to employees who voluntarily retire or resign. These payments would induce some employees to retire—and begin receiving federal retirement benefits—earlier than they would otherwise. These additional payments would represent direct spending. In later years, annual federal retirement outlays would be lower than under current law because the employees who retire earlier would receive a smaller annuity.

Based on information from DOE, CBO assumed that buyouts under this extended authority would be offered at the beginning of fiscal year 2002, and that 150 employees would accept them. CBO assumes that these buyouts would induce about 40 percent of these employees to retire a year or two earlier. We estimate that the resulting increase in federal retirement benefits would be $2 million in 2002 and $1 million in 2003. In addition, DOE would make $3 million in payments in 2002 to the CSRDF for the employees who accept buyouts. These additional payments would be treated as offsetting receipts, resulting in a net decrease in direct spending of $1 million in 2002.

Waiver of Certain TRICARE Deductibles. Section 712 would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the TRICARE deductibles for family members of certain reservists and National Guardsmen who are recalled to active duty. Based on the current authority of the Secretary of Defense to call about 33,000 members of the Selected Reserve to active duty to support operations in Kosovo, CBO believes this provision could affect approximately 10,000 families. This estimate assumes that 45 percent of the reservists have other insurance and would not use TRICARE and that 50 percent of the remainder would have dependents who would benefit from this provision, based on data from the 1996 Survey of Retired Military Personnel and the Defense Manpower Data Center, respectively. The current annual deductible for these families is $300. CBO estimates that this provision would reduce collections in fiscal year 2000 by about $3 million. DoD has the authority to spend much of those collections; thus, lower spending would offset most of the forgone collections. However, DoD's needs for discretionary funding

may rise by a like amount. Although it is impossible to predict the extent, frequency, and duration of reserve call-ups, CBO expects the budgetary effects of this provision would be insignificant in most years.

Per Diem for Certain Military Technicians. Section 672 would authorize the Department of Defense to pay a per diem allowance to military technicians serving on active duty without pay outside the United States. The per diem allowance would substitute for the provision of subsistence and housing. Because the provision would be effective as of February 10, 1996, payment of any retroactive allowances would constitute direct spending. CBO cannot estimate the cost of this provision because no accounting of eligible personnel is currently available.

Stockpile Sales. Section 3303 would eliminate two mandated restrictions on the disposal of certain manganese and chromium materials. These restrictions were included in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106). The first restriction would require the manager of the National Defense Stockpile to give a right of first refusal on all such sales to domestic suppliers of those materials. CBO estimates that the repeal of this restriction would have little or no budgetary impact because, even under current law, domestic suppliers were required to pay market prices for the materials. The second restriction would delay the sale of high-carbon manganese ferro alloy until all lower carbon grades are disposed. CBO estimates that the repeal of this restriction would have no budgetary impact because there are no lower carbon grades of manganese ferro alloy remaining in the stockpile inventory.

Other Provisions. The following provisions would have an insignificant budgetary impact:

Section 801 would allow DoD to sell holdings of coke and coal and to spend the proceeds of those sales.

Section 522 of the bill would impose mandatory retirement rules for certain military technicians in the Reserves and would allow other technicians to retire early; CBO estimates that this provision would have no impact on the federal budget during the 2000–2009 period.

Section 652 would extend eligibility for limited survivor annuities to surviving spouses of reserve members who died before September 21, 1977, and had met all the requirements for retirement except reaching their 60th birthday.

Section 655 would allow members with over eight years active duty or 15 years reserve service to receive a disability retirement or separation if they are separated from the service due to a pre-existing condition. Costs would be insignificant in the short run and would amount to approximately $10 million a year after 23 years, as certain reservists reach 60 years of age.

Pay-as-you-go considerations

Section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts. The net changes in direct spending that would result from H.R. 1401 are shown in the following

table. For the purposes of enforcing pay-as-you-go procedures, only the effects in the current year, the budget year, and the succeeding four years are counted.

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars										
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Changes in outlays	0	1	2	0	2	2	2	3	17	54	103
Changes in receipts	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Not applicable.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact

Section 722 of the bill would allow the Department of Defense to bill third-party insurers at "reasonable charges" for care provided at a facility of the uniformed services, rather than what current law refers to as "reasonable costs." That provision may impose a private-sector and intergovernmental mandate on insurers and health care plans because they would be required to pay charges for health care above those that are currently charged by the government. The costs of the provision would exceed neither the private-sector threshold ($100 million in 1996, adjusted annually for inflation) nor the intergovernmental threshold ($50 million in 1996, adjusted annually for inflation) specified in UMRA.

STATUS OF AUTHORIZATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE (FUNCTION 050) FOR 2000
(In millions of dollars)

	President's Request (Reestimated)		HASC: Reported (BA Implication)		HASC less Request	
Appn Subcmte/Category	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Natl. Security/Defense (NS/Def.)						
Military Personnel	73,724	75,553	72,116	74,003	-1,608	-1,550
Operation & Maintenance	103,281	102,199	106,090	104,381	2,809	2,182
Procurement	53,021	48,696	55,599	49,178	2,578	482
Research & Development	34,374	35,704	35,836	36,470	1,462	766
Revolving & Management	362	869	375	824	13	-45
CIA Retirement/Intel. Mgmt	332	324	332	324	0	0
Other	-176	52	-181	48	-5	-4
Unspecified Cancellations	-1,650	-404	-1,650	-404	0	0
Subtotal-Def./NS	263,267	262,994	268,516	264,824	5,249	1,830
Military Construction						
Military Construction	2,297	5,124	4,963	5,005	2,666	-119
Family Housing	3,141	3,743	3,627	3,745	486	2
Subtotal-Milcon	5,438	8,867	8,590	8,750	3,152	-117
Energy-Water	12,361	11,965	12,285	11,925	-76	-38
VA-Housing & Urban Devel.	138	133	88	97	-51	-36
Commerce-Justice	393	390	393	390	0	0
Transportation	334	326	334	326	0	0
Offsetting Receipts, etc.	-1,406	-1,414	-1,406	-1,414	0	0
Subtotal Function 050	280,525	283,261	288,800	284,897	8,275	1,636
FY99 Supplemental (see note)			0	170		
HBC/SBC Scoring Adjustment (see note)			0	-10,533		
Total			288,800	274,534		
Budget Resolution			288,812	276,567		
Over(+)/Under(-) Budget Resolution			-12	-2,033		

NOTES:

This table shows how the HASC's FY00 Defense Authorization bill (H.R. 1401), as reported, would change the Administration's budget request assuming that the items not within the jurisdiction of the HASC are unchanged.

At the direction of the House and Senate Budget Committees, the scorekeeping estimate for national defense outlays will be $10,533 million lower than CBO's estimate. This adjustment can be divided between the NS/Defense Subcommittee ($10,473 million) and the Energy-Water Subcommittee ($60 million). For purposes of this table, outlays from authorized levels have been lowered by that amount.

The outlays shown above include the effect of "supplementals" requested as part of the 2/99 budget submission The effect of the non-emergency portions of the conference report to H.R. 1127, the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, is shown at the bottom of the table as a $170 million delta to the request.

Totals do not include $1,838 million in BA and $1,774 million in outlays from emergency FY00 authorizations in the HASC bill and emergency FY00 appropriations in H.R. 1127. Totals also do not include $4,554 million in outlays from emergency FY99 appropriations in that bill.

BA = Budget Authority; HBC = House Budget Committee; SBC = Senate Budget Committee
HASC = House Armed Services Committee

Kent Christensen (x62640) Summary Page (categorized by Appropriation Subcommitte 5/21/99

UMRA excludes from application of the act legislative provisions that are necessary for the national security or the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that all other provisions of this bill either fit within that exclusion or do not contain private-sector or intergovernmental mandates as defined by UMRA.

Estimate Prepared By.—Federal Cost: (Supplemental Food Program) Valerie Baxter, (Military Construction and Other Defense) Kent Christensen, (Military and Civilian Personnel) Jeannette Deshong, (Stockpile Sales and Atomic Energy Defense Activities) Raymond Hall, (Military Retirement) Sarah Jennings, (Civilian Retirement and Separation) Eric Rollins, (Health Programs) Dawn Sauter, (Multiyear Procurement) Jo Ann Vines, (Maritime Administration) Deborah Reis. Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Leo Lex. Impact on the Private Sector: R. William Thomas.

Estimate Approved By.—Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee generally concurs with the estimates as contained in the report of the Congressional Budget Office.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X.

With respect to clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this legislation does not include any new spending or credit authority, nor does it provide for any increase or decrease in tax revenues or expenditures. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations. Other fiscal features of this legislation are addressed in the estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee has not received a report from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight pertaining to the subject matter of H.R. 1401.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to Rule XIII, clause 3 (d)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee finds the authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104–4, this legislation contains no federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal

governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no federal intergovernmental mandates.

RECORD VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record and voice votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 1401. The record of these votes is attached to this report.

The committee ordered H.R. 1401 reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 55–1, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 1 **Date: 5/19/99**

Strike provision removing restriction on use of DOD medical Facilities for abortion **Offered by: Mr. Buyer**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt		X	
Mr. Kasich	X			Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman	X			Mr. Pickett		X	
Mr. Hansen	X			Mr. Evans		X	
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie		X	
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan		X	
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler		X		Mr. Kennedy		X	
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. Blagojevich		X	
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Allen		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Snyder		X	
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Turner		X	
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Maloney		X	
Mr. Chambliss	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Rodriguez		X	
Mr. Scarborough				Ms. McKinney		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Tauscher		X	
Mr. Graham	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Ryun	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Riley	X			Mr. Hill		X	
Mr. Gibbons	X			Mr. Thompson		X	
Ms. Bono		X		Mr. Larson		X	
Mr. Pitts	X						
Mr. Hayes	X						
Mr. Kuykendall		X					
Mr. Sherwood	X						

Roll Call Vote Total **33 Aye** **26 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 5 **Date: 5/19/99**

Strike rape and incest exemption for abortion funding limitation **Offered by: Mr. Bartlett**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton		X	
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt		X	
Mr. Kasich	X			Mr. Ortiz		X	
Mr. Bateman	X			Mr. Pickett		X	
Mr. Hansen	X			Mr. Evans		X	
Mr. Weldon				Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie			
Mr. Saxton				Mr. Meehan		X	
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood		X	
Mrs. Fowler		X		Mr. Kennedy		X	
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Blagojevich		X	
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Allen		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Snyder		X	
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Turner		X	
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Maloney		X	
Mr. Chambliss	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Rodriguez		X	
Mr. Scarborough	X			Ms. McKinney		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Tauscher		X	
Mr. Graham	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Ryun	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Riley	X			Mr. Hill		X	
Mr. Gibbons				Mr. Thompson		X	
Ms. Bono		X		Mr. Larson		X	
Mr. Pitts							
Mr. Hayes	X						
Mr. Kuykendall		X					
Mr. Sherwood							

Roll Call Vote Total **25 Aye** **29 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 32 **Date: 5/19/99**

Modificiation of rape and incest exemption from abortion limitation **Offered by: Mr. Buyer**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton		X	
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt		X	
Mr. Kasich	X			Mr. Ortiz		X	
Mr. Bateman	X			Mr. Pickett		X	
Mr. Hansen	X			Mr. Evans		X	
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie		X	
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan		X	
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood		X	
Mrs. Fowler		X		Mr. Kennedy		X	
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. Blagojevich		X	
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Allen		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Snyder		X	
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Turner		X	
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Maloney		X	
Mr. Chambliss	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hilleary				Mr. Rodriguez		X	
Mr. Scarborough	X			Ms. McKinney		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Tauscher		X	
Mr. Graham	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Ryun	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Riley	X			Mr. Hill		X	
Mr. Gibbons	X			Mr. Thompson		X	
Ms. Bono		X		Mr. Larson		X	
Mr. Pitts	X						
Mr. Hayes	X						
Mr. Kuykendall		X					
Mr. Sherwood	X						

Roll Call Vote Total **30 Aye** **29 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 42 **Date: 5/19/99**

Strike Funding limitation for operations in Yugoslavia **Offered by: Mr. Taylor**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump		X		Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman		X		Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen				Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer		X		Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler		X		Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Blagojevich	X		
Mr. Talent		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Allen			
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Watts		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Chambliss		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hilleary		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Scarborough		X		Ms. McKinney		X	
Mr. Jones		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Graham		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Ryun		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Riley		X		Mr. Hill	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Mr. Thompson	X		
Ms. Bono		X		Mr. Larson	X		
Mr. Pitts		X					
Mr. Hayes		X					
Mr. Kuykendall		X					
Mr. Sherwood		X					

Roll Call Vote Total **27 Aye** **31 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Final Passage of H.R. 1401 **Date: 5/19/99**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich	X			Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman	X			Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen				Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler	X			Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. Blagojevich	X		
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Allen			
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Chambliss	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hilleary				Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Scarborough				Ms. McKinney		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Graham	X			Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Ryun	X			Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Riley	X			Mr. Hill	X		
Mr. Gibbons	X			Mr. Thompson	X		
Ms. Bono	X			Mr. Larson	X		
Mr. Pitts	X						
Mr. Hayes	X						
Mr. Kuykendall	X						
Mr. Sherwood	X						

Roll Call Vote Total **55 Aye** **1 Nay** **Present**

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 141. PILOT PROGRAM ON SALES OF MANUFACTURED ARTICLES AND SERVICES OF CERTAIN ARMY INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES WITHOUT REGARD TO AVAILABILITY FROM DOMESTIC SOURCES.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—During [fiscal years 1998 and 1999] *fiscal years 1998 through 2001*, the Secretary of the Army shall carry out a pilot program to test the efficacy and appropriateness of selling manufactured articles and services of Army industrial facilities under section 4543 of title 10, United States Code, without regard to the availability of the articles and services from United States commercial sources. In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary may use articles manufactured at, and services provided by, not more than three Army industrial facilities.

(b) TEMPORARY WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR DETERMINATION OF UNAVAILABILITY FROM DOMESTIC SOURCE.—Under the pilot program, the Secretary of the Army is not required under section 4543(a)(5) of title 10, United States Code, to determine whether an article or service is available from a commercial source located in the United States in the case of any of the following sales for which a solicitation of offers is issued during [fiscal year 1998 or 1999] *the period during which the pilot program is being conducted*:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) UPDATE OF REPORT.—Not later March 1, 2001, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall submit to Congress an update of the report required to be submitted under subsection (c) and an assessment of the success of the pilot program.

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

* * * * * * *

Subtitle E—Military Education and Training

* * * * * * *

PART III—TRAINING OF ARMY DRILL SERGEANTS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 557. TRAINING IN HUMAN RELATIONS MATTERS FOR ARMY DRILL SERGEANT TRAINEES.

(a) * * *

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 4318 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect *to* drill sergeant trainee classes that begin after the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle F—Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues

* * * * * * *

SEC. 563. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.

(a) * * *

(b) AUTHORITY OF INDIVIDUALS TO ACT FOR COMMISSION.—Any member or agent of the commission may, if authorized by the commission, take any action which the commission is authorized to take under this [title] *subtitle*.

* * * * * * *

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle D—Retired Pay, Survivor Benefits, and Related Matters

* * * * * * *

SEC. 644. ANNUITIES FOR CERTAIN MILITARY SURVIVING SPOUSES.

(a) SURVIVOR ANNUITY.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall pay an annuity to the qualified surviving spouse of each member of the uniformed services who—

* * * * * * *

(A) died before March 21, 1974, and was entitled to retired or retainer pay on the date of death; or

(B) was a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces [during the period beginning on September 21, 1972, and ending on] *before* October 1, 1978, and at the time of his death would have been entitled to retired pay under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code (as in effect before December 1, 1994), but for the fact that he was under 60 years of age.

* * * * * * *

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) * * *

(2) The term "surviving spouse" has the meaning given the terms "widow" and "widower" in paragraphs [(3) and (4)] *(7) and (8)* of section 1447 of title 10, United States Code.

* * * * * * *

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Department of Defense Schools and Centers

* * * * * * *

SEC. 934. POW/MIA INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS.

(a) * * *

(b) USE OF INTELLIGENCE IN ANALYSIS OF POW/MIA CASES IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Defense Prisoner of War/Missing Personnel Office of the Department of Defense takes into full account all intelligence regarding matters concerning [of] prisoners of war and missing persons (as defined in chapter 76 of title 10, United States Code) in analyzing cases involving such persons.

* * * * * * *

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Counter-Drug Activities

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1033. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES OF PERU AND COLOMBIA.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) CONDITION ON PROVISION OF SUPPORT.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) Not later than January 1 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional committees a report detailing the number of United States military personnel deployed or otherwise assigned to duty in Colombia at any time during the preceding year, the length and purpose of the deployment or assignment, and the costs and force protection risks associated with such deployments and assignments.

[(4)] *(5)* For purposes of this subsection, the term "congressional committees" means the following:

(A) The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(B) The Committee on National Security and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

* * * * * * *

TITLE XIII—ARMS CONTROL AND RELATED MATTERS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1302. LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT OR DISMANTLEMENT OF STRATEGIC NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS.

[(a) FUNDING LIMITATION.—Funds available to the Department of Defense may not be obligated or expended during fiscal year 1998 for retiring or dismantling, or for preparing to retire or dismantle, any of the following strategic nuclear delivery systems below the specified levels:

[(1) 71 B–52H bomber aircraft.

[(2) 18 Trident ballistic missile submarines.

[(3) 500 Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles.

[(4) 50 Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missiles.

[(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—If the START II Treaty enters into force during fiscal year 1998, the Secretary of Defense may waive the application of the limitation under subsection (a) to the extent that the Secretary determines necessary in order to implement the treaty.]

(a) FUNDING LIMITATION.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), funds available to the Department of Defense may not be obligated or expended for retiring or dismantling, or for preparing to retire or dismantle, any of the following strategic nuclear delivery systems below the specified levels:

(A) 76 B–52H bomber aircraft.

(B) 18 Trident ballistic missile submarines.

(C) 500 Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(D) 50 Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(2) The limitation in paragraph (1) shall cease to apply upon a certification by the President to Congress of the following:

(A) That the effectiveness of the United States strategic deterrent will not be decreased by reductions in strategic nuclear delivery systems.

(B) That the requirements of the Single Integrated Operational Plan can be met with a reduced number of strategic nuclear delivery systems.

(C) That reducing the number of strategic nuclear delivery systems will not, in the judgment of the President, provide a disincentive for Russia to ratify the START II treaty or serve to undermine future arms control negotiations.

(3) If the President submits the certification described in paragraph (2), then effective upon the submission of that certification, funds available to the Department of Defense may not be obligated or expended to maintain a United States force structure of strategic nuclear delivery systems with a total capacity in warheads that is less than 98 percent of the 6,000 warhead limitation applicable to the United States and in effect under the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty.

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—If the START II treaty enters into force, the President may waive the application of the limitation in effect under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a), as the case may be, to the extent that the President determines such a waiver to be necessary in order to implement the treaty.

(c) FUNDING LIMITATION ON EARLY DEACTIVATION.—(1) * * *

(2) For purposes of this subsection and subsection (d), a substantial early deactivation is an action [during the strategic delivery systems retirement limitation period] *during the fiscal year during which the START II Treaty enters into force* to deactivate a substantial number of strategic nuclear delivery systems specified [in subsection (a)] by—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *
* * * * * * *

[(e) CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR SUSTAINMENT OF SYSTEMS.—(1) Not later then February 15, 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a plan for the sustainment beyond October 1, 1999, of United States strategic nuclear delivery systems and alternative Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty force structures in the event that a strategic arms reduction agreement subsequent to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty does not enter into force before 2004.

[(2) The plan shall include a discussion of the following matters:

[(A) The actions that are necessary to sustain the United States strategic nuclear delivery systems, distinguishing between the actions that are planned for and funded in the future-years defense program and the actions that are not planned for and funded in the future-years defense program.

[(B) The funding necessary to implement the plan, indicating the extent to which the necessary funding is provided for in the future-years defense program and the extent to which the necessary funding is not provided for in the future-years defense program.]

(e) STRATEGIC NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "strategic nuclear delivery systems" means the following:

(1) B–52H bomber aircraft.
(2) Trident ballistic missile submarines.
(3) Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles.
(4) Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missiles.

* * * * * * *

[(g) STRATEGIC DELIVERY SYSTEMS RETIREMENT LIMITATION PERIOD.—For purposes of this section, the term "strategic delivery systems retirement limitation period" means the period of fiscal years 1998 and 1999.]

* * * * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

TITLE XIV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 1405. TWO-YEAR BUDGET CYCLE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

[(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the programs and activities of the Department of Defense could be more effectively and efficiently planned and managed if funds for the Department were provided on a two-year cycle rather than annually.

[(b) REQUIREMENT FOR TWO-YEAR BUDGET PROPOSAL.—The President shall include in the budget submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 1998 a single proposed budget for the Department of Defense and related agencies for fiscal years 1988 and 1989. Thereafter, the President shall submit a proposed two-year budget for the Department of Defense and related agencies every other year.

[(c) REPORTS.—Not later than April 1, 1986, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a report containing the Secretary's views on the following:

[(1) The advantages and disadvantages of operating the Department of Defense and related agencies on a two-year budget cycle.

[(2) The Secretary's plans for converting to a two-year budget cycle.

[(3) A description of any impediments (statutory or otherwise) to converting the operations of the Department of Defense and related agencies to a two-year budget cycle beginning with fiscal year 1988.]

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1412. DESTRUCTION OF EXISTING STOCKPILE OF LETHAL CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND USE OF FACILITIES.—(1) * * *

[(2) Facilities constructed to carry out this section may not be used for any purpose other than the destruction of lethal chemical

weapons and munitions, and when no longer needed to carry out this section, such facilities shall be cleaned, dismantled, and disposed of in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.]

(2) Facilities constructed to carry out this section shall, when no longer needed for the purposes for which they were constructed, be disposed of in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and mutual agreements between the Secretary of the Army and the Governor of the State in which the facility is located.

(3)(A) Facilities constructed to carry out this section may not be used for a purpose other than the destruction of the stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions that exists on November 8, 1985.

(B) The prohibition in subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to items designated by the Secretary of Defense as lethal chemical agents, munitions, or related materials after November 8, 1985, if the State in which a destruction facility is located issues the appropriate permit or permits for the destruction of such items at the facility.

[(3)] *(4)* In order to carry out subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), the Secretary may make grants to State and local governments (either directly or through the Federal Emergency Management Agency) to assist those governments in carrying out functions relating to emergency preparedness and response in connection with the disposal of the lethal chemical agents and munitions referred to in subsection (a). Funds available to the Department of Defense for the purpose of carrying out this section may be used for such grants. Additionally, the Secretary may provide funds through cooperative agreements with State and local governments for the purpose of assisting them in processing, approving, and overseeing permits and licenses necessary for the construction and operation of facilities to carry out this section. The Secretary shall ensure that funds provided through such a cooperative agreement are used only for the purpose set forth in the preceding sentence.

[(4)] *(5)*(A) In coordination with the Secretary of the Army and in accordance with agreements between the Secretary of the Army and the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Director shall carry out a program to provide assistance to State and local governments in developing capabilities to respond to emergencies involving risks to the public health or safety within their jurisdictions that are identified by the Secretary as being risks resulting from—

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) IDENTIFICATION OF FUNDS.—(1) * * *

(2) Amounts appropriated to the Secretary for the purpose of carrying out subsection [(c)(4)] *(c)(5)* shall be promptly made available to the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(g) PERIODIC REPORTS.—(1) * * *

(2) Each annual report shall include the following:

(A) * * *

(B) A site-by-site description of actions taken to assist State and local governments (either directly or through the Federal Emergency Management Agency) in carrying out functions re-

lating to emergency preparedness and response in accordance with subsection [(c)(3)] *(c)(4)*.

* * * * * * *

STROM THURMOND NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 142. ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES FOR DESTRUCTION OF ASSEMBLED CHEMICAL WEAPONS.

[(a) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—The program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment shall continue to manage the development and testing (including demonstration and pilot-scale testing) of technologies for the destruction of lethal chemical munitions that are potential or demonstrated alternatives to the baseline incineration program. In performing such management, the program manager shall act independently of the program manager for Chemical Demilitarization and shall report to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology.]

(a) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—(1) The program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program shall manage the development and testing of technologies for the destruction of lethal chemical munitions that are potential or demonstrated alternatives to the baseline incineration program.

(2) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology and the Secretary of the Army shall jointly submit to Congress, not later than December 1, 1999, a plan for the transfer of oversight of the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program from the Under Secretary to the Secretary.

(3) Oversight of the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program shall be transferred from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology to the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the plan submitted under paragraph (2) not later than 90 days after the date of the submission of the notice required under section 152(f)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 50 U.S.C. 1521).

(4) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology and the Secretary of the Army shall ensure coordination of the activities and plans of the program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program and the program manager

for Chemical Demilitarization during the demonstration and pilot plant facility phase for an alternative technology.

(5) For those baseline demilitarization facilities for which the Secretary decides that implementation of an alternative technology may be recommended, the Secretary may take those measures necessary to facilitate the integration of the alternative technology.

* * * * * * *

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle A—Active Forces

SEC. 402. REVISION IN PERMANENT END STRENGTH LEVELS.

(a) * * *

(b) REVISION TO FLEXIBILITY AUTHORITY FOR THE ARMY.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking out "1 percent or, in the case of the Army, by not more than 1.5 percent**[**,**]**." and inserting in lieu thereof "0.5 percent.".

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

* * * * * * *

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Matters

SEC. 511. USE OF RESERVES FOR EMERGENCIES INVOLVING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

(a) * * *

(b) USE OF ACTIVE GUARD AND RESERVE PERSONNEL.—(1) * * *

(2) The Secretary of Defense may not submit to Congress earlier than 90 days after the date of the receipt by Congress of the report required by section **[**1411**]** *1402* of this Act a request for the enactment of legislation to modify the requirements of paragraph (3), or to increase the number of personnel authorized by paragraph (4), of section 12310(c) of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

* * * * * * *

SEC. 513. REDUCED TIME-IN-GRADE REQUIREMENT FOR RESERVE GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS INVOLUNTARILY TRANSFERRED FROM ACTIVE STATUS.

(a) MINIMUM SERVICE IN ACTIVE STATUS.—Section 1370(d)(3) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section **[**511**]** *512(a)*,

is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Military Education and Training

* * * * * * *

SEC. 525. IMPROVED OVERSIGHT OF INNOVATIVE READINESS TRAINING.

(a) * * *

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Defense may not initiate any project under section 2012 of title 10, United States Code, after October 1, 1998, until the program required by subsection **[**(i)**]** *(j)* of that section (as added by subsection (a)) has been established.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle G—Other Matters

* * * * * * *

SEC. 568. STATUS IN THE NAVAL RESERVE OF CADETS AT THE MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.

Section 1303(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. **[**1295(c)**]** *1295b(c)*), is amended—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Health Care Services for Medicare-Eligible Department of Defense Beneficiaries

* * * * * * *

SEC. 722. TRICARE AS SUPPLEMENT TO MEDICARE DEMONSTRATION.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—(1) An individual is eligible to participate under this section if the individual is a member or former member of the uniformed services described in section 1074(b) of title 10, United States Code, a dependent of the member described in section 1076(a)(2)(B) or 1076(b) of that title, or a dependent of a member of the uniformed services who died while on active duty for a period of more than 30 days, who—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(D) resides in an area selected by the Secretary under subsection [(c)] *(d)*.

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 742. AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH A LEVEL 1 TRAUMA TRAINING CENTER.

[The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to establish a Level 1 Trauma Training Center (as designated by the American College of Surgeons) in order to provide the Army with a trauma center capable of training forward surgical teams.]

SEC. 742. AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH A TRAUMA TRAINING CENTER.

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to establish a Trauma Training Center in order to provide the Army with a trauma center capable of training forward surgical teams.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 1053 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

SEC. 1053. DISPOSAL OF TRACT OF REAL PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) DISPOSAL AUTHORIZED.—(1) Notwithstanding title II the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 481 et seq.), title VIII of such Act (40 U.S.C. 531 et seq.), section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411), or any other provision of law relating to the management and disposal of real property by the United States, the Armed Forces Retirement Home Board shall [convey by sale] *convey, by sale or lease,* all right, title, and interest of the United States in a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 49 acres located in Washington, District of Columbia, east of North Capitol Street, and recorded as District Parcel 121/19.

[(2) The sale under paragraph (1) may not occur before April 30, 1999.]

(2) The Armed Forces Retirement Home Board shall sell or lease the property described in subsection (a) within 12 months after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

(b) MANNER, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF DISPOSAL.—[(1) The sale under subsection (a) shall be made to a neighboring nonprofit organization from whose extensive educational and charitable services the public benefits and has benefited from for more than 100 years, or an entity or entities related to such organization, and whose substantial investment in the neighborhood is consistent with the continued existence and purpose of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.] *(1) The Armed Forces Retirement Home Board shall determine the manner, terms, and conditions for the sale or lease of the real property under subsection (a), except as follows:*

(A) Any lease of the real property under subsection (a) shall include an option to purchase.

(B) The conveyance may not involve any form of public/private partnership, but shall be limited to fee-simple sale or long-term lease.

(C) Before conveying the property by sale or lease to any other person or entity, the Board shall provide the Catholic University of America with the opportunity to match or exceed the highest bona fide offer otherwise received for the purchase or lease of the property, as the case may be, and to acquire the property.

(2) As consideration for the real property conveyance under subsection (a), the purchaser selected under paragraph (1) shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the real property at its highest and best economic use, as determined by the Armed Forces Retirement Home Board, based on an independent appraisal. *In no event shall the sale or lease of the property be for less than the appraised value of the property in its existing condition and on the basis of its highest and best use.*

* * * * * * *

TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

Subtitle A—General Military Law

* * * * * * *

PART I—ORGANIZATION AND GENERAL MILITARY POWERS

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 2—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

* * * * * * *

§ 115. Personnel strengths: requirement for annual authorization

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the Secretary may—

(1) increase the end strength authorized pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A) for a fiscal year for any of the armed forces by a number equal to not more than 1 percent of that end strength; **[**and**]**

(2) increase the end strength authorized pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(B) for a fiscal year for any of the armed forces by a number equal to not more than 2 percent of that end strength**[**.**]***; and*

(3) vary the end strength authorized pursuant to subsection (a)(2) for a fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of any of the re-

serve components by a number equal to not more than 2 percent of that end strength.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 3—GENERAL POWERS AND FUNCTIONS

Sec.
121. Regulations.
* * * * * * *
130b. Authority of armed forces medical examiner to conduct forensic pathology investigations.
* * * * * * *

§ 130b. Authority of armed forces medical examiner to conduct forensic pathology investigations

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Armed Forces Medical Examiner may conduct a forensic pathology investigation, including an autopsy, to determine the cause or manner of death of an individual in any case in which—

(1) the individual was killed, or from any cause died an unnatural death;

(2) the cause or manner of death is unknown;

(3) there is reasonable suspicion that the death was by unlawful means;

(4) the death appears to be from an infectious disease or the result of the effects of a hazardous material that may have an adverse effect on the installation or community in which the individual died or was found dead; or

(5) the identity of the deceased individual is unknown.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY.—(1) The authority provided under subsection (a) may only be exercised with respect to an individual in a case in which—

(A) the individual died or is found dead at an installation garrisoned by units of the armed forces and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States;

(B) the individual was, at the time of death, a member of the armed forces on active duty or inactive duty for training or a member of the armed forces who recently retired under chapter 61 of this title and died as a result of an injury or illness incurred while on active duty;

(C) the individual was a civilian dependent of a member of the armed forces and died or was found dead at a location outside the United States;

(D) the Armed Forces Medical Examiner determines, pursuant to an authorized investigation by the Department of Defense of matters involving the death of an individual or individuals, that a factual determination of the cause or manner of the death of the individual is necessary; or

(E) pursuant to an authorized investigation being conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Transportation Safety Board, or other Federal agency, an official of such agency with authority to direct a forensic pathology investigation requests that an investigation be conducted by the Armed Forces Medical Examiner.

(2) The authority provided in subsection (a) shall be subject to the primary jurisdiction, to the extent exercised, of a State or local government with respect to the conduct of an investigation or, if outside the United States, of authority exercised under any applicable Status-of-Forces or other international agreement between the United States and the country in which the individual died or was found dead.

(c) DESIGNATION OF PATHOLOGIST.—The Armed Forces Medical Examiner may designate any qualified pathologist to carry out the authority provided in subsection (a).

CHAPTER 4—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Sec.
131. Office of the Secretary of Defense.

* * * * * * *

[133. Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology.]
133. Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.
133a. Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology.
133b. Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness.

* * * * * * *

§ 131. Office of the Secretary of Defense

(a) * * *

(b) The Office of the Secretary of Defense is composed of the following:

(1) The Deputy Secretary of Defense.

(2) The [Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology] *Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics*.

* * * * * * *

[§ 133. Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology]

§ 133. Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics

(a) There is an [Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology] *Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics*, appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Under Secretary shall be appointed from among persons who have an extensive management background in the private sector.

(b) Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, the [Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology] *Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics* shall perform such duties and exercise such powers relating to acquisition as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, including—

(1) supervising Department of Defense acquisition;

(2) establishing policies for acquisition (including procurement, research and development, [logistics,] developmental testing, and contract administration) for all elements of the Department of Defense;

(3) establishing policies for logistics, maintenance, and sustainment support for all elements of the Department of Defense;

[(3)] *(4)* establishing policies of the Department of Defense for maintenance of the defense industrial base of the United States; and

[(4)] *(5)* the authority to direct the Secretaries of the military departments and the heads of all other elements of the Department of Defense with regard to matters for which the Under Secretary has responsibility.

* * * * * * *

(e)(1) With regard to all matters for which he has responsibility by law or by direction of the Secretary of Defense, the [Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology] *Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics* takes precedence in the Department of Defense after the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

* * * * * * *

§ 133b. Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness

(a) There is a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness, appointed from civilian life by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Deputy Under Secretary shall be appointed from among persons with an extensive background in the sustainment of major weapon systems and combat support equipment.

(b) The Deputy Under Secretary is the principal adviser to the Secretary and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics on logistics and materiel readiness in the Department of Defense and is the principal logistics official within the senior management of the Department of Defense.

(c) The Deputy Under Secretary shall perform such duties relating to logistics and materiel readiness as the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics may assign, including—

(1) prescribing, by authority of the Secretary of Defense, policies and procedures for the conduct of logistics, maintenance, materiel readiness, and sustainment support in the Department of Defense;

(2) advising and assisting the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, and providing guidance to and consulting with the Secretaries of the military departments, with respect to logistics, maintenance, materiel readiness, and sustainment support in the Department of Defense; and

(3) monitoring and reviewing all logistics, maintenance, materiel readiness, and sustainment support programs in the Department of Defense.

§ 134. Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) The Under Secretary takes precedence in the Department of Defense after the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the [Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology] *Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics*, and the Secretaries of the military departments.

* * * * * * *

§ 136. Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness

(a) There is an Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the *advice and* consent of the Senate.

* * * * * * *

(d) The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness is responsible, subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, for the monitoring of the operations tempo and personnel tempo of the armed forces. The Under Secretary shall establish, to the extent practicable, uniform standards within the Department of Defense for terminology and policies relating to deployment of units and personnel away from their assigned duty stations (including the length of time units or personnel may be away for such a deployment) and shall establish uniform reporting systems for tracking deployments.

§ 137. Director of Defense Research and Engineering

(a) * * *

(b) Except as otherwise prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering shall perform such duties relating to research and engineering as the [Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology] *Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics* may prescribe.

* * * * * * *

§ 139. Director of Operational Test and Evaluation

(a) * * *

(b) The Director is the principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense and the [Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology] *Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics* on operational test and evaluation in the Department of Defense and the principal operational test and evaluation official within the senior management of the Department of Defense. The Director shall—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

§ 143. Office of the Secretary of Defense personnel: limitation

(a) PERMANENT LIMITATION ON OSD PERSONNEL.—[Effective October 1, 1999, the] *The* number of OSD personnel may not exceed [75 percent of the baseline number] *3,767*.

[(b) PHASED REDUCTION.—The number of OSD personnel—

[(1) as of October 1, 1997, may not exceed 85 percent of the baseline number; and

[(2) as of October 1, 1998, may not exceed 80 percent of the baseline number.

[(c) BASELINE NUMBER.—For purposes of this section, the term "baseline number" means the number of OSD personnel as of October 1, 1994.]

[(d)] *(b)* OSD PERSONNEL DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "OSD personnel" means military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense who are assigned to, or employed in, functions in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (including Direct Support Activities of that Office and the Washington Headquarters Services of the Department of Defense).

[(e)] *(c)* LIMITATION ON REASSIGNMENT OF FUNCTIONS.—In carrying out reductions in the number of personnel assigned to, or employed in, the Office of the Secretary of Defense in order to comply with this section, the Secretary of Defense may not reassign functions solely in order to evade the requirements contained in this section.

[(f) FLEXIBILITY.—If the Secretary of Defense determines, and certifies to Congress, that the limitation in subsection (b) with respect to any fiscal year would adversely affect United States national security, the Secretary may waive the limitation under that subsection with respect to that fiscal year. If the Secretary of Defense determines, and certifies to Congress, that the limitation in subsection (a) during fiscal year 1999 would adversely affect United States national security, the Secretary may waive the limitation under that subsection with respect to that fiscal year. The authority under this subsection may be used only once, with respect to a single fiscal year.]

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 5—JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

* * * * * * *

§ 153. Chairman: functions

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) RISKS UNDER NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY.—(1) Not later than January 1 each year, the Chairman shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report providing the Chairman's assessment of the nature and magnitude of the strategic and military risks associated with executing the missions called for under the current National Military Strategy.

(2) The Secretary shall forward the report received under paragraph (1) in any year, with the Secretary's comments thereon (if

any), to Congress with the Secretary's next transmission to Congress of the annual Department of Defense budget justification materials in support of the Department of Defense component of the budget of the President submitted under section 1105 of title 31 for the next fiscal year. If the Chairman's assessment in such report in any year is that risk associated with executing the missions called for under the National Military Strategy is significant, the Secretary shall include with the report as submitted to Congress the Secretary's plan for mitigating that risk.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 7—BOARDS, COUNCILS, AND COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

§ 180. Service academy athletic programs: review board

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—(1) Each member of the board who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for **[**grade GS–18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5**]** *Executive Schedule Level IV under section 5376 of title 5*, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the board. Members of the board who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(2) The members of the board shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the board.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 8—DEFENSE AGENCIES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FIELD ACTIVITIES

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—COMMON SUPPLY AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES

* * * * * * *

§ 192. Defense Agencies and Department of Defense Field Activities: oversight by the Secretary of Defense

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY.—Notwithstanding the results of any periodic review under subsection (c) with regard to the Defense Commissary Agency, the Secretary of Defense may not transfer to the Secretary of a military department

the responsibility to manage and fund the provision of services and supplies provided by the Defense Commissary Agency unless the transfer of the management and funding responsibility is specifically authorized by a law enacted after [the date of the enactment of this subsection] *October 17, 1998*.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 9—DEFENSE BUDGET MATTERS

Sec.
221. Future-years defense program: submission to Congress; consistency in budgeting.

* * * * * * *

229. Amounts for declassification of records.

§ 223. Ballistic missile defense programs: program elements

(a) PROGRAM ELEMENTS SPECIFIED.—In the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Defense budget for any fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31), the amount requested for activities of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization shall be set forth in accordance with the following program elements:

(1) The Patriot system.
(2) The Navy Area system.
(3) The Theater High-Altitude Area Defense system.
(4) The Navy Theater Wide system.
(5) Upper Tier.
[(5)] *(6)* The Medium Extended Air Defense System.
[(6)] *(7)* Joint Theater Missile Defense.
[(7)] *(8)* National Missile Defense.
[(8)] *(9)* Support Technologies.
[(9)] *(10) Family of Systems Engineering and Integration.*
[(10)] *(11)* Ballistic Missile Defense Technical Operations.
[(11)] *(12)* Threat and Countermeasures.
[(12)] *(13)* International Cooperative Programs.
(14) Space Based Infrared System Low.
(15) Space Based Infrared System High.

* * * * * * *

§ 229. Amounts for declassification of records

(a) SPECIFIC IDENTIFICATION IN BUDGET.—The Secretary of Defense shall include in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Defense budget for any fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31) specific identification, as a budgetary line item, of the amounts required to carry out programmed activities during that fiscal year to declassify records pursuant to Executive Order 12958 (50 U.S.C. 435 note), or any successor Executive order, or to comply with any statutory requirement to declassify Government records.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 18—MILITARY SUPPORT FOR CIVILIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

* * * * * * *

§ 374. Maintenance and operation of equipment

(a) * * *

(b)(1) Subject to paragraph (2) and in accordance with other applicable law, the Secretary of Defense may, upon request from the head of a Federal law enforcement agency, make Department of Defense personnel available to operate equipment (including equipment made available under section 372 of this title) with respect to—

(A) a criminal violation of a provision of law specified in paragraph (4)(A);

(B) assistance that such agency is authorized to furnish to a State, local, or foreign government which is involved in the enforcement of similar laws;

(C) a foreign or domestic counter-terrorism operation; or

(D) a rendition of a suspected terrorist from a foreign country to the United States to stand trial.

(2) Department of Defense personnel made available to a civilian law enforcement agency under this subsection may operate equipment for the following purposes:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(F) Subject to joint approval by the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General (and the Secretary of State in the case of a law enforcement operation outside of the land area of the United States)—

(i) the transportation of civilian law enforcement personnel along with any other civilian or military personnel who are supporting, or conducting, a joint operation with civilian law enforcement personnel;**[**;**]**

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 23—MISCELLANEOUS STUDIES AND REPORTS

Sec.
481. Race relations, gender discrimination, and hate group activity: annual survey and report.

* * * * * * *

486. Unit operations tempo and personnel tempo: annual report.

* * * * * * *

§ 485. Joint warfighting experimentation

(a) * * *

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—Each report under this section shall include, for the fiscal year covered by the report, the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) With respect to interoperability of equipment and forces, any recommendations that the commander considers appropriate, developed on the basis of joint warfighting experimentation, for reducing unnecessary redundancy of equipment and forces, including guidance regarding the synchronization of the fielding of advanced technologies among the armed forces to enable the development and execution of joint operational concepts.

(6) Recommendations for mission needs statements and operational requirements related to the joint experimentation and evaluation process.

(7) Recommendations based on the results of joint experimentation for the relative priorities for acquisition programs to meet joint requirements.

* * * * * * *

§ 486. Unit operations tempo and personnel tempo: annual report

(a) INCLUSION IN ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall include in the annual report required by section 113(c) of this title a description of the operations tempo and personnel tempo of the armed forces.

(b) SPECIFIC REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—To satisfy subsection (a), the report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the methods by which each of the armed forces measures operations tempo and personnel tempo.

(2) A description of the personnel tempo policies of each of the armed forces and any changes to these policies since the preceding report.

(3) A table depicting the active duty end strength for each of the armed forces for each of the preceding five years and also depicting the number of members of each of the armed forces deployed over the same period, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

(4) An identification of the active and reserve component units of the armed forces participating at the battalion, squadron, or an equivalent level (or a higher level) in contingency operations, major training events, and other exercises and contingencies of such a scale that the exercises and contingencies receive an official designation, that were conducted during the period covered by the report and the duration of their participation.

(5) For each of the armed forces, the average number of days a member of that armed force was deployed away from the member's home station during the period covered by the report as compared to recent previous years for which such information is available.

(6) For each of the armed forces, the number of days that high demand, low density units (as defined by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) were deployed during the period covered by the report, and whether these units met the force goals for limiting deployments, as described in the personnel tempo policies applicable to that armed force.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "operations tempo" means the rate at which units of the armed forces are involved in all military activities, including contingency operations, exercises, and training deployments.

(2) The term "personnel tempo" means the amount of time members of the armed forces are engaged in their official duties, including the rate at which members are required, as a result of these duties, to spend nights away from home.

(3) The term "armed forces" does not include the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Department of the Navy.

* * * * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 31—ENLISTMENTS

* * * * * * *

§ 503. Enlistments: recruiting campaigns; compilation of directory information

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) Each local educational agency is requested to provide to the Department of Defense, upon a request made for military recruiting purposes, the same access to secondary school students, and to directory information concerning such students, as is provided generally to post-secondary educational institutions or to prospective employers of those students.

* * * * * * *

§ 525. Distribution of commissioned officers on active duty in general officer and flag officer grades

(a) * * *

(b)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5)(A) An officer while serving in a position specified in section 604(b) of this title, if serving in the grade of general or admiral, is in addition to the number that would otherwise be permitted for that officer's armed force for officers serving on active duty in grades above major general or rear admiral, as the case may be, under the first sentence of paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable. *Any increase by reason of the preceding sentence in the number of officers of an armed force serving on active duty in grades above major general or rear admiral may only be realized by an increase in the number of lieutenant generals or vice admirals, as the case maybe, serving on active duty, and any such increase may not be construed as authorizing an increase in the limitation on the total number of general or flag officers for that armed force under section 526(a) of*

this title or in the number of general and flag officers that may be designated under section 526(b) of this title.

* * * * * * *

[(C) This paragraph shall cease to be effective at the end of September 30, 2000.]

* * * * * * *

(7) An officer of the Army while serving as Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, if serving in the grade of lieutenant general, is in addition to the number that would otherwise be permitted for the Army for officers serving on active duty in grades above major general under paragraph (1). An officer of the Navy or Marine Corps while serving as Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, if serving in the grade of vice admiral or lieutenant general, is in addition to the number that would otherwise be permitted for the Navy or Marine Corps, respectively, for officers serving on active duty in grades above major general or rear admiral under paragraph (1) or (2). An officer while serving as Superintendent of the United Air Force Academy, if serving in the grade of lieutenant general, is in addition to the number that would otherwise be permitted for the Air Force for officers serving on active duty in grades above major general under paragraph (1).

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 33A—APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATION AND RETIREMENT FOR MEMBERS ON THE WARRANT OFFICER ACTIVE-DUTY LIST

* * * * * * *

§ 575. Recommendations for promotion by selection boards

(a) * * *

(b)(1) * * *

(2) The number of officers recommended for promotion from below the promotion zone may not exceed 10 percent of the total number recommended, except that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation, when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, may authorize such percentage to be increased to not more than 15 percent. *If the number determined under this subsection within a grade (or grade and competitive category) is less than one, the board may recommend one such officer from within that grade (or grade and competitive category).*

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 36—PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS ON THE ACTIVE-DUTY LIST

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—PROMOTIONS

* * * * * * *

§ 619a. Eligibility for consideration for promotion: joint duty assignment required before promotion to general or flag grade; exceptions

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(g) TRANSITION WAIVER AUTHORITIES.—(1)(A) Until January 1, 1999, the Secretary of Defense may waive subsection (a) in the case of an officer who served in an assignment (other than a joint duty assignment) that began before October 1, 1986, and that involved significant experience in joint matters (as determined by the Secretary) if the officer served in that assignment for a period of sufficient duration (which may not be less than 12 months) for the officer's service to have been considered a full tour of duty under the policies and regulations in effect on September 30, 1986.

[(B) Of the total number of appointments to the grades of brigadier general and rear admiral (lower half) for officers on the active-duty lists of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps during each of the years 1995 through 1999, the number in any such year that are made using a waiver under subparagraph (A) may not exceed the applicable percentage of such total determined as follows:

[Year:	Applicable Percentage:
1995	20
1996	15
1997	10
1998	5.

[(C) The provisions of subsections (c) and (e) apply to waivers under this paragraph in the same manner as to waivers under subsection (b).

[(2) Until January 1, 1999, the Secretary of Defense may waive subsection (d) in the case of an officer granted a waiver of subsection (a) under the authority of subsection (b)(1).

[(3)(A) An officer described in subparagraph (B) may not be appointed to the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral until the officer completes a full tour of duty in a joint duty assignment.

[(B) Subparagraph (A) applies to an officer—

[(i) who is promoted after January 1, 1994, to the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half) and who receives a waiver of subsection (a) under the authority of paragraph (1) of this subsection; or

[(ii) who receives a waiver of subsection (d) under the authority of paragraph (2) of this subsection.]

(g) LIMITATION FOR GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS PREVIOUSLY RECEIVING JOINT DUTY ASSIGNMENT WAIVER.—A general officer or flag officer who before January 1, 1999, received a waiver of subsection (a) under the authority of this subsection (as in effect before that date) may not be appointed to the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral until the officer completes a full tour of duty in a joint duty assignment.

(h) SPECIAL TRANSITION RULES FOR NUCLEAR PROPULSION OFFICERS.—[(1) Until January 1, 1997, an] *An* officer of the Navy designated as a qualified nuclear propulsion officer [may be] *who before January 1, 1997, is* appointed to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) without regard to subsection (a)[. An officer so ap-

pointed may not be appointed] to the grade of rear admiral until the officer completes a full tour of duty in a joint duty assignment.

[(2) Not later than March 1 of each year from 1994 through 1997, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation during the preceding calendar year of the transition plan developed by the Secretary pursuant to section 1305(b) of Public Law 100–180 (10 U.S.C. 619a note) with respect to service by qualified nuclear propulsion officers in joint duty assignments.]

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 38—JOINT OFFICER MANAGEMENT

* * * * * * *

§ 664. Length of joint duty assignments

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(i) JOINT DUTY CREDIT FOR CERTAIN JOINT TASK FORCE ASSIGNMENTS.—(1) * * *

(2)(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), a qualifying temporary joint task force assignment of an officer is a temporary assignment, any part of which is performed by the officer on or after [the date of the enactment of this subsection] *February 10, 1996*—

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 39—ACTIVE DUTY

* * * * * * *

§ 688. Retired members: authority to order to active duty; duties

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) LIMITATION OF PERIOD OF RECALL SERVICE.—(1) A member ordered to active duty under subsection (a) may not serve on active duty pursuant to orders under that subsection [for more than 12 months within the 24 months] *for more than 36 months within 48 months* following the first day of the active duty to which ordered under that subsection.

* * * * * * *

§ 690. Retired members ordered to active duty: limitation on number

(a) GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS.—Not more than 15 retired general officers of the Army, Air Force, or Marine Corps, and not more than 15 retired flag officers of the Navy, may be on active duty at any one time. [For the purposes of this subsection a retired officer ordered to active duty for a period of 60 days or less is not counted.]

(b) LIMITATION BY SERVICE.—(1) [Not more than 25 officers] *In addition to the officers subject to subsection (a), not more than 150 officers* of any one armed force may be serving on active duty concurrently pursuant to orders to active duty issued under section 688 of this title.

(2) In the administration of paragraph (1), the following officers shall not be counted:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(D) Any officer assigned to duty as a member of the Army, Navy, or Air Force Retiree Council for the period of active duty to which ordered.

(c) EXCLUSION FROM LIMITATIONS OF OFFICERS RECALLED FOR 60 DAYS OR LESS.—A retired officer ordered to active duty for a period of 60 days or less shall not be counted for the purposes of subsection (a) or (b).

[(c)] *(d)* WAIVER FOR PERIODS OF WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—Subsection (a) does not apply in time of war or of national emergency declared by Congress or the President after November 30, 1980. Subsection (b) does not apply in time of war or of national emergency declared by Congress or the President.

§ 691. Permanent end strength levels to support two major regional contingencies

(a) * * *

(b) Unless otherwise provided by law, the number of members of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) on active duty at the end of any fiscal year shall be not less than the following:

(1) For the Army, 480,000.

(2) For the Navy, [372,696] *371,781.*

(3) For the Marine Corps, [172,200] *172,148.*

(4) For the Air Force, [370,802] *360,877.*

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 45—THE UNIFORM

* * * * * * *

§ 777. Wearing of insignia of higher grade before promotion (frocking): authority; restrictions

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS FROCKED TO SPECIFIED GRADES.—(1) The total number of colonels and Navy captains on the active-duty list who are authorized as described in subsection (a) to wear the insignia for the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half), as the case may be, [may not exceed the following:

[(A) During fiscal years 1996 and 1997, 75.

[(B) During fiscal year 1998, 55.

[(C) After fiscal year 1998, 35.] *may not exceed 35.*

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 49—MISCELLANEOUS PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES

* * * * * * *

Sec.
971. Service credit: officers may not count service performed while serving as cadet or midshipman.

* * * * * * *

[983. Institutions of higher education that prohibit Senior ROTC units: denial of Department of Defense grants and contracts.]
983. Institutions of higher education that prevent ROTC access or military recruiting on campus: denial of grants and contracts from Department of Defense, Department of Education, and certain other departments and agencies.

* * * * * * *

§ 973. Duties: officers on active duty; performance of civil functions restricted

(a) * * *

(b)(1) This subsection applies—

(A) to a regular officer of an armed force on the active-duty list (and a regular officer of the Coast Guard on the active duty promotion list);

(B) to a retired regular officer of an armed force serving on active duty under a call or order to active duty for a period in excess of [180] *270* days; and

(C) to a reserve officer of an armed force serving on active duty under a call or order to active duty for a period in excess of [180] *270* days.

* * * * * * *

§ 977. Operation of commissary stores: assignment of active duty members generally prohibited

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may assign to the Defense Commissary Agency a member of the Navy on active duty whose assignment afloat is part of the operation of a ship's food service or a ship's store. Any such assignment shall be on a nonreimbursable basis.

(2) The number of such members assigned to the Defense Commissary Agency during any period may not exceed [the lesser of (A) the number of members so assigned on October 1, 1993, and (B)].

* * * * * * *

[§ 983. Institutions of higher education that prohibit Senior ROTC units: denial of Department of Defense grants and contracts

[(a) DENIAL OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—(1) No funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense may be made obligated by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to any institution of higher education that, as determined by the

Secretary of Defense, has an anti-ROTC policy and at which, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary would otherwise maintain or seek to establish a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps or at which the Secretary would otherwise enroll or seek to enroll students for participation in a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at another nearby institution of higher education.

[(2) In the case of an institution of higher education that is ineligible for Department of Defense grants and contracts by reason of paragraph (1), the prohibition under that paragraph shall cease to apply to that institution upon a determination by the Secretary that the institution no longer has an anti-ROTC policy.

[(b) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—Whenever the Secretary makes a determination under subsection (a) that an institution has an anti-ROTC policy, or that an institution previously determined to have an anti-ROTC policy no longer has such a policy, the Secretary—

[(1) shall transmit notice of that determination to the Secretary of Education and to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives; and

[(2) shall publish in the Federal Register notice of that determination and of the effect of that determination under subsection (a)(1) on the eligibility of that institution for Department of Defense grants and contracts.

[(c) SEMIANNUAL NOTICE IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register once every six months a list of each institution of higher education that is currently ineligible for Department of Defense grants and contracts by reason of a determination of the Secretary under subsection (a).

[(d) ANTI-ROTC POLICY.—In this section, the term "anti-ROTC policy" means a policy or practice of an institution of higher education that—

[(1) prohibits, or in effect prevents, the Secretary of Defense from maintaining or establishing a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at that institution, or

[(2) prohibits, or in effect prevents, a student at that institution from enrolling in a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at another institution of higher education.]

§ 983. Institutions of higher education that prevent ROTC access or military recruiting on campus: denial of grants and contracts from Department of Defense, Department of Education, and certain other departments and agencies

(a) DENIAL OF FUNDS FOR PREVENTING ROTC ACCESS TO CAMPUS.—No funds described in subsection (d) may be provided by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to a covered educational entity if the Secretary of Defense determines that the covered educational entity has a policy or practice (regardless of when implemented) that either prohibits, or in effect prevents—

(1) the Secretary of a military department from maintaining, establishing, or operating a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer

Training Corps (in accordance with section 654 of this title and other applicable Federal laws) at the covered educational entity; or

(2) a student at the covered educational entity from enrolling in a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at another institution of higher education.

(b) DENIAL OF FUNDS FOR PREVENTING MILITARY RECRUITING ON CAMPUS.—No funds described in subsection (d) may be provided by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to a covered educational entity if the Secretary of Defense determines that the covered educational entity has a policy or practice (regardless of when implemented) that either prohibits, or in effect prevents—

(1) the Secretary of a military department from gaining entry to campuses, or access to students (who are 17 years of age or older) on campuses, for purposes of military recruiting; or

(2) access by military recruiters for purposes of military recruiting to the following information pertaining to students (who are 17 years of age or older) enrolled at the covered educational entity:

(A) Names, addresses, and telephone listings.

(B) Date and place of birth, levels of education, academic majors, degrees received, and the most recent educational institution enrolled in by the student.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation established in subsection (a) or (b) shall not apply to a covered educational entity if the Secretary of Defense determines that—

(1) the covered educational entity has ceased the policy or practice described in that subsection; or

(2) the institution of higher education involved has a longstanding policy of pacifism based on historical religious affiliation.

(d) COVERED FUNDS.—The limitations established in subsections (a) and (b) apply to the following:

(1) Any funds made available for the Department of Defense.

(2) Any funds made available in a Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

(e) NOTICE OF DETERMINATIONS.—Whenever the Secretary of Defense makes a determination under subsection (a), (b), or (c), the Secretary—

(1) shall transmit a notice of the determination to the Secretary of Education and to Congress; and

(2) shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of the determination and the effect of the determination on the eligibility of the covered educational entity for contracts and grants.

(f) SEMIANNUAL NOTICE IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—The Secretary of Defense shall publish in the Federal Register once every six months a list of each covered educational entity that is currently ineligible for contracts and grants by reason of a determination of the Secretary under subsection (a) or (b).

(g) COVERED EDUCATIONAL ENTITY.—In this section, the term "covered educational entity" means an institution of higher education, or a subelement of an institution of higher education.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 53—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

§ 1060a. Special supplemental food program

(a) [AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may] *PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall* carry out a program to provide special supplemental food benefits to members of the armed forces on duty at stations outside the United States (and its territories and possessions) and to eligible civilians serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces outside the United States (and its territories and possessions).

[(b) FEDERAL PAYMENTS AND COMMODITIES.—For the purpose of obtaining Federal payments and commodities in order to carry out the program referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture shall make available to the Secretary of Defense the same payments and commodities as are made for the special supplemental food program in the United States under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786). The Secretary of Defense may use funds available for the Department of Defense to carry out the program under subsection (a).]

(b) FUNDING MECHANISM.—The Secretary of Defense shall use funds available for the Department of Defense to carry out the program under subsection (a).

(c) PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.—(1)(A) The Secretary of Defense shall administer the program referred to in subsection (a) and, except as provided in subparagraph (B), shall determine eligibility for program benefits under the criterion published by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786).

[(B) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations governing computation of income eligibility standards for families of individuals participating in the program under this section.]

(B) In determining income eligibility standards for families of individuals participating in the program under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall, to the extent practicable, use the criterion described in subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall also consider the value of housing in kind provided to the individual when determining program eligibility.

(2) The program benefits provided under the program shall be similar to benefits provided by State and local agencies in the United States*, particularly with respect to nutrition education and counseling*.

(3) The Secretary of Agriculture shall provide technical assistance to the Secretary of Defense, if so requested by the Secretary of Defense, for the purpose of carrying out the program under subsection (a).

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 55—MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE

Sec.
1071. Purpose of this chapter.

* * * * * * *

1074f. Medical tracking system for members deployed overseas.
1074g. Pharmacy benefits program.

* * * * * * *

1095b. TRICARE program: contractor payment of certain claims.
1095c. TRICARE program: facilitation of processing of claims.
1095d. TRICARE: program waiver of certain deductibles.

* * * * * * *

§ 1073. Administration of this chapter

Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, the Secretary of Defense shall administer this chapter for the armed forces under his jurisdiction, the Secretary of Transportation shall administer this chapter for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall administer this chapter for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Public Health Service. This chapter shall be administered consistent with the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act of 1997 *(42 U.S.C. 14401 et seq.)*.

* * * * * * *

§ 1074g. Pharmacy benefits program

(a) PHARMACY BENEFITS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the other administering Secretaries, shall establish an effective, efficient, integrated pharmacy benefits program under this chapter (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "pharmacy benefits program").

(2)(A) The pharmacy benefits program shall include a uniform formulary of pharmaceutical agents, which shall assure the availability of pharmaceutical agents in a complete range of therapeutic classes. The selection for inclusion on the uniform formulary of particular pharmaceutical agents in each therapeutic class shall be based on the relative clinical and cost effectiveness of the agents in such class.

(B) The Secretary shall establish procedures for the selection of particular pharmaceutical agents for the uniform formulary, and shall begin to implement the uniform formulary not later than October 1, 2000.

(C) Pharmaceutical agents included on the uniform formulary shall be available to eligible covered beneficiaries through—

(i) facilities of the uniformed services, consistent with the scope of health care services offered in such facilities;

(ii) retail pharmacies designated or eligible under the TRICARE program or the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services to provide pharmaceutical agents to eligible covered beneficiaries; or

(iii) the national mail order pharmacy program.

(3) The pharmacy benefits program shall assure the availability of clinically appropriate pharmaceutical agents to members of the

armed forces, including, if appropriate, agents not included on the uniform formulary described in paragraph (2).

(4) The pharmacy benefits program may provide that prior authorization be required for certain categories of pharmaceutical agents to assure that the use of such agents is clinically appropriate. Such categories shall be the following:

(A) High-cost injectable agents.

(B) High-cost biotechnology agents.

(C) Pharmaceutical agents with high potential for inappropriate use.

(D) Pharmaceutical agents otherwise determined by the Secretary to require prior authorization.

(5)(A) The pharmacy benefits program shall include procedures for eligible covered beneficiaries to receive pharmaceutical agents not included on the uniform formulary. Such procedures shall include peer review procedures under which the Secretary may determine that there is a clinical justification for the use of a pharmaceutical agent that is not on the uniform formulary, in which case the pharmaceutical agent shall be provided under the same terms and conditions as an agent on the uniform formulary.

(B) If the Secretary determines that there is not a clinical justification for the use of a pharmaceutical agent that is not on the uniform formulary under the procedures established pursuant to subparagraph (A), such pharmaceutical agent shall be available through at least one of the means described in paragraph (2)(C) under terms and conditions that may include cost sharing by the eligible covered beneficiary in addition to any such cost sharing applicable to agents on the uniform formulary.

(6) The Secretary of Defense shall, after consultation with the other administering Secretaries, promulgate regulations to carry out this subsection.

(7) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as authorizing a contractor to penalize an eligible covered beneficiary with respect to, or decline coverage for, a maintenance pharmaceutical that is not on the list of preferred pharmaceuticals of the contractor and that was prescribed for the beneficiary before the date of the enactment of this section and stabilized the medical condition of the beneficiary.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, establish a pharmaceutical and therapeutics committee for the purpose of developing the uniform formulary of pharmaceutical agents required by subsection (a), reviewing such formulary on a periodic basis, and making additional recommendations regarding the formulary as the committee determines necessary and appropriate. The committee shall include representatives of pharmacies of the uniformed services facilities, contractors responsible for the TRICARE retail pharmacy program, contractors responsible for the national mail order pharmacy program, providers in facilities of the uniformed services, and TRICARE network providers. Committee members shall have expertise in treating the medical needs of the populations served through such entities and in the range of pharmaceutical and biological medicines available for treating such populations.

(2) Not later than 90 days after the establishment of the pharmaceutical and therapeutics committee by the Secretary, the committee shall submit a proposed uniform formulary to the Secretary.

(c) ADVISORY PANEL.—(1) Concurrent with the establishment of the pharmaceutical and therapeutics committee under subsection (b), the Secretary shall establish a Uniform Formulary Beneficiary Advisory Panel to review and comment on the development of the uniform formulary. The Secretary shall consider the comments of the panel before implementing the uniform formulary or implementing changes to the uniform formulary.

(2) The Secretary shall determine the size and membership of the panel established under paragraph (1), which shall include members that represent nongovernmental organizations and associations that represent the views and interests of a large number of eligible covered beneficiaries.

(d) INAPPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the committee established under subsection (b) or the panel established under subsection (c).

(e) PROCEDURES.—In the operation of the pharmacy benefits program under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall assure through management and new contractual arrangements that financial resources are aligned such that the cost of prescriptions is borne by the organization that is financially responsible for the health care of the eligible covered beneficiary.

(f) PHARMACY DATA TRANSACTION SERVICE.—Not later than April 1, 2000, the Secretary of Defense shall implement the use of the Pharmacy Data Transaction Service in all fixed facilities of the uniformed services under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, the TRICARE network retail pharmacy program, and the national mail order pharmacy program.

(g) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE COVERED BENEFICIARY.—As used in this section, the term "eligible covered beneficiary" means a covered beneficiary for whom eligibility to receive pharmacy benefits through the means described in subsection (a)(2)(C) is established under this chapter or another provision of law.

* * * * * * *

§ 1076a. Dependents' dental program

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(j) LIMITATION ON REDUCTION OF BENEFITS.—The Secretary of Defense may not reduce benefits provided under this section until—

(1) * * *

(2) **[**1**]** *one* year has elapsed following the date of such notice.

* * * * * * *

§ 1093. Performance of abortions: restrictions

(a) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds available to the Department of Defense may not be used to perform abortions except

where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term *or in a case in which the pregnancy is the result of an act of forcible rape or incest which has been reported to a law enforcement agency*.

* * * * * * *

§ 1095. Health care services incurred on behalf of covered beneficiaries: collection from third-party payers.

(a)(1) In the case of a person who is a covered beneficiary, the United States shall have the right to collect from a third-party payer **[**the reasonable costs of**]** *reasonable charges for* health care services incurred by the United States on behalf of such person through a facility of the uniformed services to the extent that the person would be eligible to receive reimbursement or indemnification from the third-party payer if the person were to incur **[**such costs**]** *such charges* on the person's own behalf. If the insurance, medical service, or health plan of that payer includes a requirement for a deductible or copayment by the beneficiary of the plan, then the amount that the United States may collect from the third-party payer is **[**the reasonable cost of**]** *a reasonable charge for* the care provided less the appropriate deductible or copayment amount.

* * * * * * *

[(f) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the other administering Secretaries, shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section. Such regulations shall provide for computation of the reasonable cost of health care services. Computation of such reasonable cost may be based on—

[(1) per diem rates;

[(2) all-inclusive per visit rates;

[(3) diagnosis-related groups; or

[(4) such other method as may be appropriate.**]**

(f) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the other administering Secretaries, shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section. Such regulations shall provide for the computation of reasonable charges for inpatient services, outpatient services, and other health care services. Computation of such reasonable charges may be based on—

(1) per diem rates;

(2) all-inclusive per visit rates;

(3) diagnosis-related groups;

(4) rates prescribed under the regulations prescribed to implement sections 1079 and 1086 of this title; or

(5) such other method as may be appropriate.

(g)(1) Amounts collected under this section from a third-party payer or under any other provision of law from any other payer for **[**the costs of**]** health care services provided at or through a facility of the uniformed services shall be credited to the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation of the facility and shall not be taken into consideration in establishing the operating budget of the facility.

* * * * * * *

(h) In this section:

(1) [The term "third-party payer" means an entity that provides an insurance, medical service, or health plan by contract or agreement, including an automobile liability insurance or no fault insurance carrier.] *The term "third-party payer" means an entity that provides an insurance, medical service, or health plan by contract or agreement, including an automobile liability insurance or no fault insurance carrier, and any other plan or program that is designed to provide compensation or coverage for expenses incurred by a beneficiary for health care services or products.* Such term also includes entities described in subsection (j) under the terms and to the extent provided in such subsection and a workers' compensation program or plan.

* * * * * * *

§ 1095c. TRICARE program: facilitation of processing of claims

(a) REDUCTION OF PROCESSING TIME.—(1) With respect to claims for payment for medical care provided under the TRICARE program, the Secretary of Defense shall implement a system for processing of claims under which—

(A) 95 percent of all mistake-free claims must be processed not later than 30 days after the date that such claims are submitted to the claims processor; and

(B) 100 percent of all mistake-free claims must be processed not later than 100 days after the date that such claims are submitted to the claims processor.

(2) The Secretary may, under the system required by paragraph (1) and consistent with the provisions in chapter 39 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Prompt Payment Act"), require that interest be paid on claims that are not processed within 30 days.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE START-UP TIME FOR CERTAIN CONTRACTORS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall not require that a contractor described in paragraph (2) begin to provide managed care support pursuant to a contract to provide such support under the TRICARE program until at least nine months after the date of the award of the contract. In such case the contractor may begin to provide managed care support pursuant to the contract as soon as practicable after the award of the contract, but in no case later than one year after the date of such award.

(2) A contractor under this paragraph is a contractor who is awarded a contract to provide managed care support under the TRICARE program—

(A) who has not previously been awarded such a contract by the Department of Defense; or

(B) who has previously been awarded such a contract by the Department of Defense but for whom the subcontractors have not previously been awarded the subcontracts for such a contract.

§ 1095d. TRICARE program: waiver of certain deductibles

(a) WAIVER AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the deductible payable for medical care provided under the TRICARE program to an eligible dependent of—

(1) a member of a reserve component on active duty pursuant to a call or order to active duty for a period of less than one year; or

(2) a member of the National Guard on full-time National Guard duty pursuant to a call or order to full-time National Guard duty for a period of less than one year.

(b) ELIGIBLE DEPENDENT.—As used in this section, the term "eligible dependent" means a dependent described subparagraphs (A), (D), or (I) of section 1072(2) of this title.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 61—RETIREMENT OR SEPARATION FOR PHYSICAL DISABILITY

Sec.
1201. Regulars and members on active duty for more than 30 days: retirement.

* * * * * * *

1220. Members dying in civilian medical facilities: authority for determination of later time of death to allow disability retirement.

* * * * * * *

§ 1220. Members dying in civilian medical facilities: authority for determination of later time of death to allow disability retirement

(a) AUTHORITY FOR LATER TIME-OF-DEATH DETERMINATION TO ALLOW DISABILITY RETIREMENT.—In the case of a member of the armed forces who dies in a civilian medical facility in a State, the Secretary concerned may, solely for the purpose of allowing retirement of the member under section 1201 or 1204 of this title and subject to subsection (b), specify a date and time of death of the member later than the date and time of death determined by the attending physician in that civilian medical facility.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—A date and time of death may be determined by the Secretary concerned under subsection (a) only if that date and time—

(1) are consistent with the date and time of death that reasonably could have been determined by an attending physician in a military medical facility if the member had died in a military medical facility in the same State as the civilian medical facility; and

(2) are not more than 48 hours later than the date and time of death determined by the attending physician in the civilian medical facility.

(c) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and any Commonwealth or possession of the United States.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 69—RETIRED GRADE

* * * * * * *

§ 1370. Commissioned officers: general rule; exceptions

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) RESERVE OFFICERS.—(1) Unless entitled to a higher grade, or to credit for satisfactory service in a higher grade, under some other provision of law, a person who is entitled to retired pay under chapter [1225] *1223* of this title shall, upon application under section 12731 of this title, be credited with satisfactory service in the highest grade in which that person served satisfactorily at any time in the armed forces, as determined by the Secretary concerned in accordance with this subsection.

* * * * * * *

(5) The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of a military department to reduce the 3-year period required by paragraph (3)(A) to a period not less than 2 years in the case of retirements effective during the period beginning on [the date of the enactment of this paragraph] *October 17, 1998,* and ending on September 30, 2001. The number of reserve commissioned officers of an armed force in the same grade for whom a reduction is made during any fiscal year in the period of service-in-grade otherwise required under this paragraph may not exceed the number equal to 2 percent of the strength authorized for that fiscal year for reserve commissioned officers of that armed force in an active status in that grade.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 71—COMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY

Sec.
1401. Computation of retired pay.

* * * * * * *

1413. Special compensation for certain severely disabled uniformed services retirees.

* * * * * * *

§ 1401a. Adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index

(a) * * *

(b) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS BASED ON CPI INCREASES.—

(1) [IN GENERAL.—] *INCREASE REQUIRED.*—Effective on December 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall increase the retired pay of members and former members entitled to that pay in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3).

(2) PRE-AUGUST 1, 1986 [MEMBERS.—

[(A) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary shall] *MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall* increase the retired pay of each member and former member who first became a member of a uniformed service before August 1, 1986, by the percent (adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent) by which—

[(i)] *(A)* the price index for the base quarter of that year, exceeds

[(ii)] *(B)* the base index.

[(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.—In the case of the increase in retired pay that, pursuant to paragraph (1), becomes effective on December 1, 1995, the initial month for which such increase is payable as part of such retired pay shall (notwithstanding such December 1 effective date) be March 1996.

[(C) INAPPLICABILITY TO DISABILITY RETIREES.—Subparagraph (B) does not apply with respect to the retired pay of a member retired under chapter 61 of this title.

[(3) POST-AUGUST 1, 1986 MEMBERS.—If the percent determined under paragraph (2) is greater than 1 percent, the Secretary shall increase the retired pay of each member and former member who first became a member on or after August 1, 1986, by the difference between—

[(A) the percent determined under paragraph (2); and

[(B) 1 percent.]

(3) POST-AUGUST 1, 1986 MEMBERS.—

(A) MEMBERS ELECTING 15-YEAR CAREER STATUS BONUS.—In the case of a member or former member who first became a member on or after August 1, 1986, and who elected to receive a bonus under section 321 of title 37, the Secretary shall increase the retired pay of the member or former member (unless the percent determined under paragraph (2) is less than 1 percent) by the difference between—

(i) the percent determined under paragraph (2); and

(ii) 1 percent.

(B) MEMBERS NOT ELECTING 15-YEAR CAREER STATUS BONUS.—In the case of a member or former member who first became a member on or after August 1, 1986, and who did not elect to receive a bonus under section 321 of title 37, the Secretary shall increase the retired pay of the member or former member—

(i) if the percent determined under paragraph (2) is equal to or greater than 3 percent, by the difference between—

(I) the percent determined under paragraph (2); and

(II) 1 percent; and

(ii) if the percent determined under paragraph (2) is less than 3 percent, by the lesser of—

(I) the percent determined under paragraph (2); or

(II) 2 percent.

* * * * * * *

§ 1406. Retired pay base for members who first became members before September 8, 1980: final basic pay

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(i) SPECIAL RULE FOR FORMER CHAIRMEN AND VICE CHAIRMEN OF THE JCS, CHIEFS OF SERVICE, AND SENIOR ENLISTED MEMBERS.—

(1) * * *

(2) EXCEPTION FOR MEMBERS REDUCED IN GRADE OR WHO DO NOT SERVE SATISFACTORILY.—Paragraph (1) does not apply in the case of a member who, while or after serving in a position specified in that paragraph and by reason of conduct occurring [on or after the date of the enactment of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999] *after October 16, 1998*—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

§ 1409. Retired pay multiplier

(a) RETIRED PAY MULTIPLIER FOR REGULAR-SERVICE NONDISABILITY RETIREMENT.—In computing—

(b) PERCENTAGE.—

(1) * * *

(2) REDUCTION APPLICABLE TO *CERTAIN* NEW-RETIREMENT MEMBERS WITH LESS THAN 30 YEARS OF SERVICE.—In the case of a member who first became a member of a uniformed service after July 31, 1986, *has elected to receive a bonus under section 321 of title 37,* has less than 30 years of creditable service, and is under the age of 62 at the time of retirement, the percentage determined under paragraph (1) shall be reduced by—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

§ 1410. Restoral of full retirement amount at age 62 for members entering on or after August 1, 1986

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a member or former member who first became a member of a uniformed service on or after August 1, 1986, and who becomes entitled to retired pay before the age of 62, *in accordance with subsection (b) or (c), as applicable.*

(b) MEMBERS RECEIVING CAREER STATUS BONUS.—In the case of a member or former member described in subsection (a) who received a bonus under section 321 of title 37, the retired pay of the member or former member shall be recomputed under subsection (a) the retired pay of such member or former member shall be recomputed, effective on the first day of the first month beginning after the member or former member attains 62 years of age, so as to be the amount equal to the amount of retired pay to which the member or former member would be entitled on [that date] *the effective date of the recomputation* if—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) MEMBERS NOT RECEIVING CAREER STATUS BONUS.—In the case of a member or former member described in subsection (a) who did not receive a bonus under section 321 of title 37, the retired pay of the member or former member shall be recomputed under subsection (a) so as to be the amount equal to the amount of retired pay to which the member or former member would be entitled on the ef-

fective date of the recomputation if increases in the retired pay of the member or former member under section 1401a(b) of this title had been computed as provided in paragraph (2) of that section (rather than under paragraph (3)(B) of that section).

* * * * * * *

§ 1413. Special compensation for certain severely disabled uniformed services retirees

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary concerned shall, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, pay to each eligible disabled uniformed services retiree a monthly amount determined under subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNT.—The amount to be paid (subject to the availability of appropriations) to an eligible disabled uniformed services retiree in accordance with subsection (a) is the following:

(1) For any month for which the retiree has a qualifying service-connected disability rated as total, $300.

(2) For any month for which the retiree has a qualifying service-connected disability rated as 90 percent, $200.

(3) For any month for which the retiree has a qualifying service-connected disability rated as 80 percent or 70 percent, $100.

(c) ELIGIBLE DISABLED UNIFORMED SERVICES RETIREE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "eligible disabled military retiree" means a member of the uniformed services in a retired status (who is retired under a provision of law other than chapter 61 of this title) who—

(1) completed at least 20 years of service in the uniformed services that are creditable for purposes of computing the amount of retired pay to which the member is entitled; and

(2) has a qualifying service-connected disability.

(d) QUALIFYING SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term "qualifying service-connected disability" means a service-connected disability that—

(1) was incurred or aggravated in the performance of duty as a member of a uniformed service, as determined by the Secretary concerned; and

(2) is rated as not less than 70 percent disabling—

(A) by the Secretary concerned as of the date on which the member is retired from the uniformed services; or

(B) by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs within four years following the date on which the member is retired from the uniformed services.

(e) STATUS OF PAYMENTS.—Payments under this section are not retired pay.

(f) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—(1) Payments under this section for any fiscal year shall be paid out of funds appropriated for pay and allowances payable by the Secretary concerned for that fiscal year.

(2) If the amount of funds available to the Secretary concerned for any fiscal year for payments under this section is less than the amount required to make such payments to all eligible disabled uniformed services retirees for that year, the Secretary shall make such payments first to retirees described in paragraph (1) of subsection (b), then (to the extent funds are available) to retirees described in

paragraph (2) of that subsection, and then (to the extent funds are available) to retirees described in paragraph (3) of that subsection.

(g) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The terms "compensation" and "service-connected" have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of title 38.

(2) The term "disability rated as total" means—

(A) a disability that is rated as total under the standard schedule of rating disabilities in use by the Department of Veterans Affairs; or

(B) a disability for which the schedular rating is less than total but for which a rating of total is assigned by reason of inability of the disabled person concerned to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation as a result of service-connected disabilities.

(3) The term "retired pay" includes retainer pay, emergency officers' retirement pay, and naval pension.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 73—ANNUITIES BASED ON RETIRED OR RETAINER PAY

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN

* * * * * * *

§ 1448. Application of Plan

(a) * * *

(b) INSURABLE INTEREST AND FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE.—

(1) * * *

(3) FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE BY PERSONS ALREADY PARTICIPATING IN PLAN.—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(E) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ELECTION.—An election under this paragraph is effective as of—

(i) * * *

(ii) in the case of a person required (as described in section 1450(f)(3)(B) of this title) to make the election by reason of a court order or filing the date of which is ⟦on or after the date of the enactment of the subparagraph⟧ *after October 16, 1998*, the first day of the first month which begins after the date of that court order or filing.

* * * * * * *

§ 1451. Amount of annuity

(a) * * *

(h) ADJUSTMENTS TO BASE AMOUNT.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) DISREGARDING OF RETIRED PAY REDUCTIONS FOR RETIREMENT *OF CERTAIN MEMBERS* BEFORE 30 YEARS OF SERVICE.—Computation of a member's retired pay for purposes of this section shall be made without regard to any reduction under section 1409(b)(2) of this title.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 74—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY RETIREMENT FUND

* * * * * * *

§ 1461. Establishment and purpose of Fund; definition

(a) There is established on the books of the Treasury a fund to be known as the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the "Fund"), which shall be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Fund shall be used for the accumulation of funds in order to finance on an actuarially sound basis liabilities of the Department of Defense *and the Department of Commerce* under military retirement and survivor benefit programs.

(b) In this chapter, the term "military retirement and survivor benefit programs" means—

(1) the provisions of this title *and the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers' Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 853a et seq.)* creating entitlement to, or determining the amount of, retired or retainer pay;

(2) the programs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense providing annuities for survivors of members and former members of the armed forces, including chapter 73 of this title, section 4 of Public Law 92–425, and section 5 of Public Law 96–402; **[**and**]**

(3) the authority provided in section 1408(h) of this title**[**.**]***; and*

(4) the programs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce providing annuities for survivors of members and former members of the NOAA Corps.

(c) In this chapter, the term "NOAA Corps" means the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Corps and its predecessors.

* * * * * * *

§ 1463. Payments from the Fund

(a) There shall be paid from the Fund—

(1) retired pay payable to members on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Air Force, **[**and Marine Corps**]** *Marine Corps, and the NOAA Corps*;

* * * * * * *

(4) benefits payable under programs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense *and the Department of Commerce* that provide annuities for survivors of members and former members of the **[**armed forces**]** *uniformed services*, including

chapter 73 of this title, section 4 of Public Law 92–425, and section 5 of Public Law 96–402; and

* * * * * * *

§ 1464. Board of Actuaries

(a) * * *

(b) The Board shall report to the Secretary of Defense *and the Secretary of Commerce with respect to the NOAA Corps* annually on the actuarial status of the Fund and shall furnish its advice and opinion on matters referred to it by the Secretary.

* * * * * * *

§ 1465. Determination of contributions to the Fund

(a)*(1)* Not later than six months after the Board of Actuaries is first appointed, the Board shall determine the amount that is the present value (as of October 1, 1984) of future benefits payable from the Fund that are attributable to service in the armed forces performed before October 1, 1984. That amount is the original unfunded liability of the Fund. The Board shall determine the period of time over which the original unfunded liability should be liquidated and shall determine an amortization schedule for the liquidation of such liability over that period. Contributions to the Fund for the liquidation of the original unfunded liability in accordance with such schedule shall be made as provided in section 1466(b) of this title.

(2) Not later than January 1, 2000, the Secretary of Commerce shall provide to the Board the amount that is the present value (as of October 1, 1999) of future benefits payable from the Fund that are attributable to service in the NOAA Corps performed before October 1, 1999. That amount is the NOAA Corps original unfunded liability of the Fund. The Board shall determine the period of time over which that unfunded liability should be liquidated and shall determine an amortization schedule for the liquidation of such liability over that period. Contributions to the Fund for the liquidation of the original unfunded liability in accordance with that schedule shall be made as provided in section 1466(b) of this title.

* * * * * * *

(b)(1) The Secretary of Defense *and the Secretary of Commerce* shall determine each year, in sufficient time for inclusion in budget requests for the following fiscal year, the total amount of Department of Defense contributions *and the Department of Commerce contributions with respect to the NOAA Corps* to be made to the Fund during that fiscal year under section 1466(a) of this title. That amount shall be the sum of the following:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) The product of—

(i) the current estimate of the value of the single level percentage of basic pay to be determined under subsection (c)(1)(C) at the time of the next actuarial valuation under subsection (c); and

(ii) the total amount of basic pay expected to be paid during that fiscal year to members of the NOAA Corps.

(2) The amount determined under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year is the amount needed to be appropriated to the Department of Defense *and the Department of Commerce* for that fiscal year for payments to be made to the Fund during that year under section 1466(a) of this title. The President shall include not less than the full amount so determined in the budget transmitted to Congress for that fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31 *and shall include separate amounts for the Department of Defense and the Department of Commerce*. The President may comment and make recommendations concerning any such amount.

(c)(1) Not less often than every four years, the Secretary of Defense *and the Secretary of Commerce with respect to the NOAA Corps* shall carry out an actuarial valuation of Department of Defense military retirement and survivor benefit programs. Each actuarial valuation of such programs shall include—

(A) a determination (using the aggregate entry-age normal cost method) of a single level percentage of basic pay for members of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) on active duty (other than active duty for training) or full-time National Guard duty (other than full-time National Guard duty for training only); **[**and**]**

(B) a determination (using the aggregate entry-age normal cost method) of a single level percentage of basic pay and of compensation (paid pursuant to section 206 of title 37) for members of the Ready Reserve of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard and other than members on full-time National Guard duty other than for training) who are not otherwise described by subparagraph (A)**[**.**]***; and*

(C) a determination (using the aggregate entry-age normal cost method) of a single level percentage of basic pay for members of the NOAA Corps.

Such single level percentages shall be used for the purposes of subsection (b) and section 1466(a) of this title.

§ 1466. Payments into the Fund

(a) The Secretary of Defense *and the Secretary of Commerce with respect to the NOAA Corps* shall pay into the Fund at the end of each month as the **[**Department of Defense**]** contribution to the Fund for that month the amount that is the sum of the following:

(1) The product of—

(A) the level percentage of basic pay determined using all the methods and assumptions approved for the most recent (as of the first day of the current fiscal year) actuarial valuation under section 1465(c)(1)(A) *and 1465(c)(1)(C)* of this title (except that any statutory change in the military retirement and survivor benefit systems that is effective after the date of that valuation and on or before the first day of the current fiscal year shall be used in such determination); and

(B) the total amount of basic pay accrued for that month by members of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) on active duty (other than active duty for training)

or full-time National Guard duty (other than full-time National Guard duty for training only) *and by members of the NOAA Corps*.

(2) The product of—

(A) the level percentage of basic pay and of compensation (paid pursuant to section 206 of title 37) determined using all the methods and assumptions approved for the most recent (as of the first day of the current fiscal year) actuarial valuation under section 1465(c)(1)(B) of this title (except that any statutory change in the military retirement and survivor benefit systems that is effective after the date of that valuation and on or before the first day of the current fiscal year shall be used in such determination); and

(B) the total amount of basic pay and of compensation (paid pursuant to section 206 of title 37) accrued for that month by members of the Ready Reserve of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard and other than members on full-time National Guard duty other than for training) who are not otherwise described in paragraph (1)(B).

Amounts paid into the Fund under this subsection shall be paid from funds available for the pay of members of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of a military department *or by members of the NOAA Corps.*

(b)(1) At the beginning of each fiscal year the Secretary of the Treasury shall promptly pay into the Fund from the General Fund of the Treasury the amount certified to the Secretary by the Secretary of Defense under paragraph (3). Such payment shall be the contribution to the Fund for that fiscal year required by sections 1465(a) and 1465(c) of this title.

(2) At the beginning of each fiscal year the Secretary of Defense shall determine the sum of the following:

(A) The amount of the payment for that year under the amortization schedule determined by the Board of Actuaries under section 1465(a) of this title for the amortization of the original unfunded liability *and the NOAA original unfunded liability* of the Fund.

(B) The amount (including any negative amount) for that year under the most recent amortization schedule determined by the Secretary of Defense under section 1465(c)(2) of this title for the amortization of any cumulative unfunded liability (or any gain) to the Fund resulting from changes in benefits.

(C) The amount (including any negative amount) for that year under the most recent amortization schedule determined by the Secretary of Defense under section 1465(c)(3) of this title for the amortization of any cumulative actuarial gain or loss to the Fund.

(c)(1) The Secretary of Transportation shall process, on behalf of the Fund, payments under section 1463 of this title to members on the retired list of the NOAA Corps and to survivors of members and former members of the NOAA Corps.

(2) Payments made by the Secretary of Transportation under paragraph (1) shall be charged against the Fund.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 75—DEATH BENEFITS

§ 1491. Honor guard details at funerals of veterans

(a) * * *

(b) COMPOSITION OF HONOR GUARD DETAILS.—The Secretary of each military department shall ensure that an honor guard detail for the funeral of a veteran [consists of not less than three persons and (unless a bugler is part of the detail) has the capability to play a recorded version of Taps.] *consists of not less than two persons, who shall, at a minimum, perform a ceremony to fold and present a United States flag to the deceased veteran's family and who shall (unless a bugler is part of the detail) have the capability to play a recorded version of Taps. At least one member of an honor guard detail provided in response to a request to the Department of Defense shall be a member of the same armed force as the deceased veteran.*

* * * * * * *

(d) SUPPORT FOR NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary of a military department may provide material, equipment, and training to support nongovernmental organizations, as necessary for the support of honor guard activities.

[(d)] *(e)* REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall by regulation establish a system for selection of units of the armed forces and other organizations to provide honor guard details. [The system shall place an emphasis on balancing the funeral detail workload among the units and organizations providing honor guard details in an equitable manner as they are able to respond to requests for such details in terms of geographic proximity and available resources. The Secretary shall provide in such regulations that the armed force in which a veteran served shall not be considered to be a factor when selecting the military unit or other organization to provide an honor guard detail for the funeral of the veteran.] *The Secretary shall require that procedures be established by the Secretaries of the military departments for coordinating and responding to requests for honor guard details, for establishing standards and protocols for, responding to requests for and conducting military funeral honors, and for providing training and quality control.*

[(e)] *(f)* ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report not later than January 31 of each year beginning with 2001 and ending with 2005 on the experience of the Department of Defense under this section. Each such report shall provide data on the number of funerals supported under this section, the cost for that support, shown by manpower and other cost factors, and the number and costs of funerals supported by each participating organization. The data in the report shall be presented in a standard format, regardless of military department or other organization.

(g) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may waive any of the provisions of this section when the Secretary determines that such a waiver is necessary because of a contingency operation or when the Secretary otherwise considers such a waiver to be nec-

essary to meet military requirements. The authority to make such a waiver may not be delegated to any official of a military department other than the Secretary of the military department and may not be delegated within the Office of the Secretary of Defense to an official at a level below Under Secretary of Defense.

(2) Whenever a waiver is granted under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall promptly submit notice of the waiver to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

[(f)**]** *(h)* VETERAN DEFINED.—In this section, the term "veteran" has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38**[**.**]** *and includes a deceased member or former member of the Selected Reserve described in section 2301(f) of title 38.*

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 76—MISSING PERSONS

* * * * * * *

§ 1501. System for accounting for missing persons

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) PRIMARY NEXT OF KIN.—The individual who is primary next of kin of any person **[**prescribed**]** *described* in subsection (c) may for purposes of this chapter designate another individual to act on behalf of that individual as primary next of kin. The Secretary concerned shall treat an individual so designated as if the individual designated were the primary next of kin for purposes of this chapter. A designation under this subsection may be revoked at any time by the person who made the designation.

* * * * * * *

§ 1509. Preenactment cases

(a) REVIEW OF STATUS.—(1) * * *

(2) For purposes of this subsection, new information is information that is credible and that—

(A) is found or received after **[**the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998**]** *November 18, 1997,* by a United States intelligence agency, by a Department of Defense agency, or by a person specified in section 1504(g) of this title; or

(B) is identified after **[**the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998**]** *November 18, 1997,* in records of the United States as information that could be relevant to the case of one or more unaccounted for persons described in subsection (b).

* * * * * * *

§ 1513. Definitions

In this chapter:

(1) The term "missing person" means—

(A) a member of the armed forces on active duty who is in a missing status; or

(B) a civilian employee of the Department of Defense or an employee of a contractor of the Department of Defense who serves in direct support of, or accompanies, the armed forces in the field under orders and who is in a missing status.

Such term includes an unaccounted for person described in section 1509(b) of this title[, under the circumstances specified in the last sentence of section 1509(a) of this title] *who is required by section 1509(a)(1) of this title to be considered a missing person*.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 79—CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

* * * * * * *

§ 1555. Professional staff

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) In this section, the term "service review agency" means—

(1) with respect to the Department of the Army, the Army Review Boards Agency;

(2) with respect to the Department of the Navy, *the Navy Council of Personnel Boards and* the Board for Correction of Naval Records; and

(3) with respect to the Department of the Air Force, the Air Force Review Boards Agency.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 80—MISCELLANEOUS INVESTIGATION REQUIREMENTS AND OTHER DUTIES

Sec.
1561. Complaints of sexual harassment: investigation by commanding officers.
1562. Confidentiality of communications between dependents and professionals providing therapeutic or related services regarding sexual or domestic abuse.

* * * * * * *

§ 1562. Confidentiality of communications between dependents and professionals providing therapeutic or related services regarding sexual or domestic abuse

(a) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe in regulations such policies and procedures as the Secretary considers necessary to provide the maximum possible protection for the confidentiality of communications described in subsection (b) relating to misconduct described in that subsection. Those regulations shall be consistent with—

(1) the standards of confidentiality and ethical standards issued by relevant professional organizations;

(2) applicable requirements of Federal and State law;

(3) the best interest of victims of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or intrafamily abuse; and

(4) such other factors as the Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, considers appropriate.

(b) COVERED COMMUNICATIONS.—Subsection (a) applies to communications between—

(1) a dependent of a member of the armed forces who—

(A) is a victim of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or intrafamily abuse; or

(B) has engaged in such misconduct; and

(2) a therapist, counselor, advocate, or other professional from whom the dependent seeks professional services in connection with effects of such misconduct.

CHAPTER 81—CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

* * * * * * *

§ 1588. Authority to accept certain voluntary services

(a) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT SERVICES.—Subject to subsection (b) and notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, the Secretary concerned may accept from any person the following services:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) Voluntary services as a member of an honor guard detail under section 1491 of this title.

* * * * * * *

(f) AUTHORITY TO INSTALL EQUIPMENT.—(1) The Secretary concerned may install telephone lines and any necessary telecommunication equipment in the private residences of designated persons providing voluntary services accepted under subsection (a)(3) and pay the charges incurred for the use of the equipment for authorized purposes.

(2) Notwithstanding section 1348 of title 31, the Secretary concerned may use appropriated or nonappropriated funds of the military department under the jurisdiction of the Secretary or, with respect to the Coast Guard, the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, to carry out this subsection.

(3) The Secretary of Defense and, with respect to the Coast Guard, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection.

* * * * * * *

§ 1595. Civilian faculty members at certain Department of Defense schools: employment and compensation

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) COVERED INSTITUTIONS.—This section applies with respect to the following institutions of the Department of Defense:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(6) The African Center for Strategic Studies.

* * * * * * *

(e) APPLICABILITY TO DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR AT CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.—In addition to the persons specified in subsection (a), this section also applies with respect to the Director and the Deputy Director of the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) The African Center for Strategic Studies.

* * * * * * *

PART III—TRAINING AND EDUCATION

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 101—TRAINING GENERALLY

* * * * * * *

§ 2007. Payment of tuition for off-duty training or education

(a) The Secretary of a military department may not pay more than 75 percent of the charges of an educational institution for the tuition or expenses of a member of the armed forces enrolled in such institution for education or training during his off-duty periods, except that—

(1) * * *

(2) in the case of a member enrolled in a high school completion program, all of the charges may be paid; **[**and**]**

(3) in the case of a commissioned officer on active duty, no part of the charges may be paid unless the officer agrees to remain on active duty for a period of at least two years after the completion of the training or education**[**.**]***; and*

(4) in the case of a member serving in a contingency operation or similar operational mission (other than for training) designated by the Secretary concerned, all of the charges may be paid.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 102—JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Sec.
2031. Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.
2032. Responsibility of the Secretaries of the military departments to maximize enrollment and enhance efficiency.
2033. Contingent funding increase.

* * * * * * *

§ 2033. Contingent funding increase

If for any fiscal year the amount appropriated for the National Guard Challenge Program under section 509 of title 32 is in excess of $62,500,000, the Secretary of Defense shall (notwithstanding any other provision of law) make the amount in excess of $62,500,000 available for the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program

under section 2031 of this title, and such excess amount may not be used for any other purpose.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 103—SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Sec.
2101. Definitions.
* * * * * * *
2111a. Support for senior military colleges.
2111b. Senior military colleges: Department of Defense international student program.

§ 2101. Definitions

In this chapter:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) The term "advanced training" means the training and instruction offered in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps to *students enrolled in an advanced education program beyond the baccalaureate degree level or to* students enrolled in an advanced education program beyond the baccalaureate degree level or to students in the third and fourth years of a four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course, or the equivalent period of training in an approved two-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course (except that, in the case of a student enrolled in an academic program which has been approved by the Secretary of the military department concerned and which requires more than four academic years for completion of baccalaureate degree requirements, including elective requirements of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course, such term includes a fifth academic year or a combination of a part of a fifth academic year and summer sessions).

* * * * * * *

§ 2107. Financial assistance program for specially selected members

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c)(1) * * *

[(2) The Secretary of Defense shall authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to carry out a test program to determine the desirability of enabling graduate students to participate in the financial assistance program under this section. As part of such test program, the Secretary of a military department may provide financial assistance, as described in paragraph (1), to a student enrolled in an advanced education program beyond the baccalaureate degree level if the student also is a cadet or midshipman in an advanced training program. Not more than 15 percent of the total number of scholarships awarded under this section in any year may be awarded under the test program. No scholarship may be awarded under the test program after September 30, 1999.**]**

(2) The Secretary concerned may provide financial assistance, as described in paragraph (1), to a student enrolled in an advanced education program beyond the baccalaureate degree level if the student also is a cadet or midshipman in an advanced training program. Not more than 15 percent of the total number of scholarships awarded under this section in any year may be awarded under the program.

* * * * * * *

§ 2111a. Support for senior military colleges

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) ASSIGNMENT TO ACTIVE DUTY.—(1) The Secretary of the Army shall ensure that a graduate of a senior military college who desires to serve as a commissioned officer on active duty upon graduation from the college, who is medically and physically qualified for active duty, and who is recommended for such duty by the professor of military science at the college, shall be assigned to active duty. **[**This paragraph shall apply to a member of the program at a senior military college who graduates from the college after March 31, 1997.**]**

* * * * * * *

§ 2111b. Senior military colleges: Department of Defense international student program

(a) PROGRAM REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program to facilitate the enrollment and instruction of persons from foreign countries as international students at the senior military colleges.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the program shall be—

(1) to provide a high-quality, cost-effective military-based educational experience for international students in furtherance of the military-to-military program objectives of the Department of Defense; and

(2) to enhance the educational experience and preparation of future United States military leaders through increased, extended interaction with highly qualified potential foreign military leaders.

(c) COORDINATION WITH THE SENIOR MILITARY COLLEGES.—Guidelines for implementation of the program shall be developed in coordination with the senior military colleges.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMISSION OF STUDENTS UNDER THE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall annually identify to the senior military colleges the international students who, based on criteria established by the Secretary, the Secretary recommends be considered for admission under the program. The Secretary shall identify the recommended international students to the senior military colleges as early as possible each year to enable those colleges to consider them in a timely manner in their respective admissions processes.

(e) DOD FINANCIAL SUPPORT.—An international student who is admitted to a senior military college under the program under this

section is responsible for the cost of instruction at that college. The Secretary of Defense may, from funds available to the Department of Defense other than funds available for financial assistance under section 2107a of this title, provide some or all of the costs of instruction for any such student.

CHAPTER 105—ARMED FORCES HEALTH PROFESSIONS FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—HEALTH PROFESSIONS SCHOLARSHIP AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR ACTIVE SERVICE

* * * * * * *

§ 2126. Members of the program: service credit

(a) * * *

(b) SERVICE CREDITABLE FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—(1) * * *

(2) Service credited under paragraph (1) counts [only for the following purposes:

[(A) Award of] *only for the award of* retirement points for computation of years of service under section 12732 of this title and for computation of retired pay under section 12733 of this title.

[(B) Computation of years of service creditable under section 205 of title 37.]

(3) For purposes of [paragraph (2)(A), a member] *paragraph (2), a member who completes a satisfactory year of service in the Selected Reserve* may be credited in accordance with paragraph (1) with not more than 50 points for each year of participation in a course of study that the member satisfactorily completes as a member of the program.

(4) Service may not be counted under paragraph (1) for more than four years of participation in a course of study as a member of the program.

(5) A member of the Selected Reserve who is awarded points or service credit under this subsection shall not be considered to have been in an active status, by reason of the award of the points or credit, while pursuing a course of study under this subchapter for purposes of any provision of law other than sections 12732(a) and 12733(3) of this title.

[(5)] *(6)* A member is not entitled to any retroactive award of, or increase in, pay or allowances under title 37 by reason of an award of service credit under paragraph (1).

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—NURSE OFFICER CANDIDATE ACCESSION PROGRAM

* * * * * * *

§ 2130a. Financial assistance: nurse officer candidates

(a) BONUS AUTHORIZED.—(1) A person described in subsection (b) who, during the period beginning on November 29, 1989, and end-

ing on December 31, [1999] *2000*, executes a written agreement in accordance with subsection (c) to accept an appointment as a nurse officer may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid an accession bonus of not more than $5,000. The bonus shall be paid in periodic installments, as determined by the Secretary concerned at the time the agreement is accepted, except that the first installment may not exceed $2,500.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 108—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCHOOLS

Sec.
2161. Joint Military Intelligence College: academic degrees.
* * * * * * *
2166. National Defense University: Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs.

* * * * * * *

§ 2164. Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) ELIGIBILITY OF DEPENDENTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(3) A dependent of a Federal employee may continue enrollment in a program under this subsection for the remainder of a school year notwithstanding a change during such school year in the status of the Federal employee that, except for this paragraph, would otherwise terminate the eligibility of the dependent to be enrolled in the program. The preceding sentence does not limit the authority of the Secretary to remove the dependent from enrollment in the program at any time for good cause determined by the Secretary.]

* * * * * * *

(h) CONTINUATION OF ENROLLMENT DESPITE CHANGE IN STATUS.—(1) A dependent of a member of the armed forces or a dependent of a Federal employee may continue enrollment in an educational program provided by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (a) for the remainder of a school year notwithstanding a change during such school year in the status of the member or Federal employee that, except for this paragraph, would otherwise terminate the eligibility of the dependent to be enrolled in the program.

(2) A dependent of a member of the armed forces, or a dependent of a Federal employee, who was enrolled in an educational program provided by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) while a junior in that program may be enrolled as a senior in that program in the next school year, notwithstanding a change in the enrollment eligibility status of the dependent that, except for this paragraph, would otherwise terminate the eligibility of the dependent to be enrolled in the program.

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) do not limit the authority of the Secretary to remove a dependent from enrollment in an educational

program provided by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) at any time for good cause determined by the Secretary.

* * * * * * *

§ 2166. National Defense University: Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Center") as part of the National Defense University. The Center shall be organized as an independent institute under the University.

(2) The Director of the Center shall be appointed by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary shall appoint as the Director an individual who is a distinguished scholar of proven academic, management, and leadership credentials with a superior record of achievement and publication regarding Chinese political, strategic, and military affairs.

(b) MISSION.—The mission of the Center is to study the national goals and strategic posture of the People's Republic of China and the ability of that nation to develop, field, and deploy an effective military instrument in support of its national strategic objectives.

(c) AREAS OF STUDY.—The Center shall conduct research relating to the People's Republic of China as follows:

(1) To assess the potential of that nation to act as a global great power, the Center shall conduct research that considers the policies and capabilities of that nation in a regional and world-wide context, including Central Asia, Southwest Asia, Europe, and Latin America, as well as the Asia-Pacific region.

(2) To provide a fuller assessment of the areas of study referred to in paragraph (1), the Center shall conduct research on—

(A) economic trends relative to strategic goals and military capabilities;

(B) strengths and weaknesses in the scientific and technological sector; and

(C) relevant demographic and human resource factors on progress in the military sphere.

(3) The Center shall conduct research on the armed forces of the People's Republic of China, taking into account the character of those armed forces and their role in Chinese society and economy, the degree of their technological sophistication, and their organizational and doctrinal concepts. That research shall include inquiry into the following matters:

(A) Concepts concerning national interests, objectives, and strategic culture.

(B) Grand strategy, military strategy, military operations, and tactics.

(C) Doctrinal concepts at each of the four levels specified in subparagraph (B).

(D) The impact of doctrine on China's force structure choices.

(E) The interaction of doctrine and force structure at each level to create an integrated system of military capabilities

through procurement, officer education, training, and practice and other similar factors.

(d) FACULTY OF THE CENTER.—(1) The core faculty of the Center should comprise scholars capable of providing diverse perspectives on Chinese political, strategic, and military thought. Center scholars shall demonstrate the following competencies and capabilities:

(A) Analysis of national strategy, military strategy, and doctrine.

(B) Analysis of force structure and military capabilities.

(C) Analysis of—

(i) issues relating to weapons of mass destruction, military intelligence, defense economics, trade, and international economics; and

(ii) the relationship between those issues and grand strategy, science and technology, the sociology of human resources and demography, and political science.

(2) A substantial number of Center scholars shall be competent in the Chinese language. The Center shall include a core of junior scholars capable of providing linguistics and translation support to the Center.

(e) ACTIVITIES OF THE CENTER.—The activities of the Center shall include other elements appropriate to its mission, including the following:

(1) The Center should include an active conference program with an international reach.

(2) The Center should conduct an international competition for a Visiting Fellowship in Chinese Military Affairs and Chinese Security Issues. The term of the fellowship should be for one year, renewable for a second.

(3) The Center shall provide funds to support at least one trip per analyst per year to China and the region and to support visits of Chinese military leaders to the Center.

(4) The Center shall support well defined, distinguished, signature publications.

(5) Center scholars shall have appropriate access to intelligence community assessments of Chinese military affairs.

(f) STUDIES AND REPORTS.—The Director may contract for studies and reports from the private sector to supplement the work of the Center.

* * * * * * *

PART IV—SERVICE, SUPPLY, AND PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 131—PLANNING AND COORDINATION

* * * * * * *

§ 2208. Working-capital funds

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(j) The Secretary of a military department may authorize a working capital funded industrial facility of that department to manufacture or remanufacture articles and sell these articles, as well as manufacturing [or remanufacturing], *remanufacturing, and engineering* services provided by such facilities, to persons outside the Department of Defense if—

(1) the person purchasing the article or service is fulfilling a Department of Defense contract *or a subcontract under a Department of Defense contract*; and

(2) the [Department of Defense solicitation for such contract] *solicitation for the contract or subcontract* is open to competition between Department of Defense activities and private firms.

(l)(1) * * *

(2) The Secretary of Defense may waive the notification requirements of paragraph (1)—

(A) during a period *of* war or national emergency; or

* * * * * * *

§ 2212. Obligations for contract services: reporting in budget object classes

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) * * *

(2) The term "advisory and assistance services object class" means those contract services constituting the budget object class that is denominated "Advisory and Assistance Service" and designated ([as of the date of the enactment of this section] *as of October 17, 1998*) as Object Class 25.1 (or any similar object class established [after the date of the enactment of this section] *after October 17, 1998,* for the reporting of obligations for advisory and assistance contract services).

(3) The term "miscellaneous services object class" means those contract services constituting the budget object class that is denominated "Other Services (services not otherwise specified in the 25 series)" and designated ([as of the date of the enactment of this section] *as of October 17, 1998*) as Object Class 25.2 (or any similar object class established [after the date of the enactment of this section] *after October 17, 1998,* for the reporting of obligations for miscellaneous or unspecified contract services).

(4) The term "authorized exemptions" means those exemptions authorized ([as of the date of the enactment of this section] *as of October 17, 1998*) under Department of Defense Directive 4205.2, captioned "Acquiring and Managing Contracted Advisory and Assistance Services (CAAS)" and issued by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology on February 10, 1992, such exemptions being set forth in Enclosure 3 to that directive (captioned "CAAS Exemptions").

* * * * * * *

§ 2218. National Defense Sealift Fund

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(k)(1) The Secretary of Defense, after making a determination of economic soundness for any proposed offer, may provide advance payments to a contractor by lump sum or annual payments (or a combination thereof) for the following costs associated with inclusion or incorporation of defense features in a commercial vessel:

(A) Costs to build, procure, and install the defense features in the vessel.

(B) Costs to periodically maintain and test the defense features on the vessel.

(C) Any increased costs of operation or any loss of revenue attributable to the inclusion or incorporation of the defense feature on the vessel.

(D) Any additional costs associated with the terms and conditions of the contract to install and incorporate defense features.

(2) For any contract under which the United States provides advance payments under paragraph (1) for the costs associated with incorporation or inclusion of defense features in a commercial vessel, the contractor shall provide to the United States such security interests, which may include a preferred mortgage under section 31322 of title 46, on the vessel as the Secretary may prescribe to project the interests of the United States relating to all costs associated with incorporation or inclusion of defense features in such vessel or vessels.

(3) The functions of the Secretary under this subsection may not be delegated to an officer or employee in a position below the head of the procuring activity, as defined in section 2304(f)(6)(A) of this title.

[(k)**]** *(l)* DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "Fund" means the National Defense Sealift Fund established by subsection (a).

(2) The term "Department of Defense sealift vessel" means any ship owned, operated, controlled, or chartered by the Department of Defense **[**that is—**]** *that is any of the following:*

(A) **[**a**]** *A* fast sealift ship, including any vessel in the Fast Sealift Program established under section 1424 of Public Law 101–510 (104 Stat. 1683)**[**;**]**.

(B) **[**a**]** *A* maritime prepositioning ship**[**;**]**.

(C) **[**an**]** *An* afloat prepositioning ship**[**;**]**.

(D) **[**an**]** *An* aviation maintenance support ship**[**; or**]**.

(E) **[**a**]** *A* hospital ship.

(F) A large medium-speed roll-on/roll-off ship.

(G) A combat logistics force ship.

(H) Any other auxiliary support vessel.

(3) The term "national defense sealift vessel" means—

(A) a Department of Defense sealift vessel; and

(B) a national defense reserve fleet vessel, including a vessel in the Ready Reserve Force maintained under section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744).

(4) The term "congressional defense committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on National Security and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 136—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SPECIFIC PROGRAMS

Sec.
2281. Global Positioning System.
2282. Purchase or lease of communications services: limitation.

* * * * * * *

§ 2282. Purchase or lease of communications services: limitation

The Secretary of Defense may not obligate any funds after September 30, 2000, to buy a commercial satellite communications system or to lease a communications service, including mobile satellite communications, unless the Secretary determines that the system or service to be purchased or leased has been proven through independent testing—

(1) not to cause harmful interference to, or to disrupt the use of, colocated commercial or military Global Positioning System receivers used by the Department of Defense; and

(2) to be safe for use with such receivers in all other respects.

CHAPTER 137—PROCUREMENT GENERALLY

* * * * * * *

§ 2302c. Implementation of electronic commerce capability

(a) * * *

(b) DESIGNATION OF AGENCY OFFICIAL.—The head of each agency named in paragraph (5) or (6) of section [2303] *2303(a)* of this title shall designate a program manager to implement the electronic commerce capability for that agency. The program manager shall report directly to an official at a level not lower than the senior procurement executive designated for the agency under section 16(3) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414(3)).

* * * * * * *

§ 2325. Restructuring costs

(a) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT OF RESTRUCTURING COSTS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not pay, under section 2324 of this title, a defense contractor for restructuring costs associated with a business combination of the contractor *that occurs after November 18, 1997,* unless the Secretary determines in writing either—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 141—MISCELLANEOUS PROCUREMENT PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

Sec.
2381. Contracts: regulations for bids.

* * * * * * *

[2404. Acquisition of petroleum and natural gas: authority to waive contract procedures; acquisition by exchange; sales.] authority
2404. Acquisition of certain fuel sources: authority to waive contract procedures; acquisition by exchange; sales authority.

* * * * * * *

[§ 2404. Acquisition of petroleum and natural gas: authority to waive contract procedures; acquisition by exchange; sales authority]

§ 2404. Acquisition of certain fuel sources: authority to waive contract procedures; acquisition by exchange; sales authority

(a) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may, for any purchase of [petroleum or natural gas] *a defined fuel source*, waive the application of any provision of law prescribing procedures to be followed in the formation of contracts, prescribing terms and conditions to be included in contracts, or regulating the performance of contracts if the Secretary determines—

(1) that [petroleum market conditions or natural gas market conditions, as the case may be,] *market conditions for the defined fuel source* have adversely affected (or will in the near future adversely affect) the [acquisition of petroleum or acquisition of natural gas, respectively,] *acquisition of that defined fuel source* by the Department of Defense; and

(2) the waiver will expedite or facilitate the acquisition of [petroleum or natural gas, as the case may be,] *that defined fuel source* for Government needs.

(b) SCOPE OF WAIVER.—A waiver under subsection (a) may be made with respect to a particular contract or with respect to classes of contracts. Such a waiver that is applicable to a contract for the purchase of [petroleum or natural gas] *a defined fuel source* may also be made applicable to a subcontract under that contract.

(c) EXCHANGE AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire [petroleum, petroleum-related services, natural gas, or natural gas-related services by exchange of petroleum, petroleum-related services, natural gas, or natural gas-related services.] *a defined fuel source or services related to a defined fuel source by exchange of a defined fuel source or services related to a defined fuel source.*

(d) AUTHORITY TO SELL.—The Secretary of Defense may sell [petroleum or natural gas] *a defined fuel source* of the Department of Defense if the Secretary determines that the sale would be in the public interest. The proceeds of such a sale shall be credited to appropriations of the Department of Defense for the acquisition of [petroleum, petroleum-related services, natural gas, or natural gas-related services. Amounts so credited shall be available for obligation for the same period as the appropriations to which the

amounts are credited.] *a defined fuel source or services related to a defined fuel source.*

* * * * * * *

(f) DEFINED FUEL SOURCES.—In this section, the term "defined fuel source" means any of the following:

(1) Petroleum.

(2) Natural gas.

(3) Coal.

(4) Coke.

* * * * * * *

§ 2410d. Subcontracting plans: credit for certain purchases

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(c) TERMINATION.—Subsection (a) shall cease to be effective at the end of September 30, 1999.]

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 146—CONTRACTING FOR PERFORMANCE OF CIVILIAN COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL TYPE FUNCTIONS

Sec.
2460. Definition of depot-level maintenance and repair.

* * * * * * *

[2467. Cost comparisons: requirements with respect to retirement costs and consultation with employees.]

2467. Cost comparisons: inclusion of retirement costs; consultation with employees; waiver of comparison.

* * * * * * *

§ 2461. Commercial or industrial type functions: required studies and reports before conversion to contractor performance

(a) * * *

(b) NOTIFICATION AND ELEMENTS OF ANALYSIS.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) An analysis of a commercial or industrial type function for possible change to performance by the private sector shall include the following:

(A) * * *

(B) An examination of the potential economic effect of performance of the function by the private sector on the following:

(i) Employees of the Department of Defense who would be affected by such a change in performance.

[(ii) The local community and the Government, if more than 75 employees of the Department of Defense perform the function.]

(ii) The local community and the local economy, identifying and taking into consideration any unique circumstances affecting the local community or the local econ-

omy, if more than 50 employees of the Department of Defense perform the function.

* * * * * * *

(g) ANNUAL REPORTS.—(1) Not later than February 1 of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a written report describing the extent to which commercial and industrial type functions were performed by Department of Defense contractors during the preceding fiscal year. [The Secretary shall]

(2) The Secretary shall include in each such report a summary of the number of work year equivalents performed by employees of private contractors in providing services to the Department (including both direct and indirect labor attributable to the provision of the services) and the total value of the contracted services. The work year equivalents and total value of the services shall be categorized by Federal supply class or service code (using the first character of the code), the appropriation from which the services were funded, and the major organizational element of the Department procuring the services.

(3) The Secretary shall also include in each such report an estimate of the percentage of commercial and industrial type functions of the Department of Defense that will be performed by Department of Defense civilian employees, and the percentage of such functions that will be performed by private contractors, during the fiscal year during which the report is submitted.

* * * * * * *

§ 2466. Limitations on the performance of depot-level maintenance of materiel

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(e) REPORT.—(1) Not later than February 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report identifying, for each military department and Defense Agency, the percentage of the funds referred to in subsection (a) that were expended during the preceding fiscal year for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors as required by section 2466 of this title.

[(2) Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the annual report under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the Comptroller General's views on whether the Department of Defense has complied with the requirements of subsection (a) for the fiscal year covered by the report.]

(e) ANNUAL REPORTS.—(1) Not later than February 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report identifying, for each of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) and each Defense Agency, the percentage of the funds referred to in subsection (a) that were expended during the preceding two fiscal years for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors, as required by this section.

(2) Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report identifying, for each of the armed

forces (other than the Coast Guard) and each Defense Agency, the percentage of the funds referred to in subsection (a) that are projected to be expended during each of the next five fiscal years for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors, as required by this section.

(3) Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary submits a report under this subsection, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the Comptroller General's views on whether—

(A) in the case of a report under paragraph (1), the Department of Defense has complied with the requirements of subsection (a) for the fiscal years covered by the report; and

(B) in the case of a report under paragraph (2), the expenditure projections for future fiscal years are reasonable.

[§ 2467. Cost comparisons: requirements with respect to retirement costs and consultation with employees]

§ 2467. Cost comparisons: inclusion of retirement costs; consultation with employees; waiver of comparison

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF COST COMPARISON WAIVER.—(1) Not later than 10 days after a decision is made to waive the cost comparison study otherwise required under Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 as part of the process to convert to contractor performance any commercial activity of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report describing the commercial activity subject to the waiver and the rationale for the waiver.

(2) The report shall also include the following:

(A) The total number of civilian employees or military personnel adversely affected by the decision to waive the cost comparison study and convert the commercial activity to contractor performance.

(B) An explanation of whether the contractor was selected, or will be selected, on a competitive basis or sole source basis.

(C) The anticipated savings to result from the waiver and resulting conversion to contractor performance.

* * * * * * *

§ 2469. Contracts to perform workloads previously performed by depot-level activities of the Department of Defense: requirement of competition

(a) * * *

(b) SCOPE.—Subsection (a) applies to any depot-level maintenance and repair workload that has a value of not less than $3,000,000 *(including the cost of labor and materials)* and is being performed by a depot-level activity of the Department of Defense.

* * * * * * *

§ 2469a. Use of competitive procedures in contracting for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads formerly performed at certain military installations

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply with respect to—

(1) a depot-level maintenance and repair workload that is to be consolidated to another military installation (other than a closed or realigned military installation) as a result of a base closure or realignment action or a decision made by the Secretary concerned or the Defense Depot Maintenance Council;

(2) a workload necessary to maintain a core logistics capability identified under section 2464 of this title; or

(3) any contract originally entered into before [the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998] *November 18, 1997*.

* * * * * * *

(i) OVERSIGHT OF CONTRACTS AWARDED PUBLIC ENTITIES.—The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary concerned may not impose on a public sector entity awarded a contract for the performance of any depot-level maintenance and repair workload described in subsection (b) any requirements regarding management systems, reviews, oversight, or reporting different from the requirements used in the performance and management of other depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the entity, unless specifically provided in the solicitation for the contract.

* * * * * * *

§ 2473. Procurements from the small arms production industrial base

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies only to procurements of covered property and services involving the following small arms:

(1) M16 series rifle.
(2) MK19 grenade machine gun.
(3) M4 series carbine.
(4) M240 series machine gun.
(5) M249 squad automatic weapon.
(6) M2 machine gun.
(7) M60 machine gun.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 147—COMMISSARIES AND EXCHANGES AND OTHER MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION ACTIVITIES

* * * * * * *

§ 2486. Commissary stores: merchandise that may be sold; uniform surcharges and pricing

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) UNIFORM SALES PRICE SURCHARGE OR ADJUSTMENT.—An adjustment of or surcharge on sales prices in commissary stores under section 2484(b) or 2685(a) of this title or for any other purpose shall be applied as a uniform percentage of the sales price of all merchandise sold in, at, or by commissary stores. Effective on **[**the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998,**]** *November 18, 1997,* the uniform percentage shall be equal to five percent and may not be changed except by a law enacted after such date.

* * * * * * *

§ 2492. Overseas commissary and exchange stores: access and purchase restrictions

(a) * * *

(b) CONTROLLED ITEM LISTS.—For each location outside the United States that is served by the commissary system or the exchange system, the Secretary of Defense may maintain a list of controlled merchandise items, except that, after **[**the date of the enactment of this section**]** *October 17, 1998*, the Secretary may not change the list to add a merchandise item unless, before making the change, the Secretary submits to Congress a notice of the proposed addition and the reasons for the addition of the item.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 148—NATIONAL DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE, DEFENSE REINVESTMENT, AND DEFENSE CONVERSION

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER IV—MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY

* * * * * * *

§ 2525. Manufacturing Technology Program

(a) * * *

(b) PURPOSE OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall use the program—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) to address broad defense-related manufacturing inefficiencies and requirements;

[(4)**]** *(5)* to promote dual-use manufacturing processes;

[(5)**]** *(6)* to disseminate information concerning improved manufacturing improvement concepts, including information on such matters as best manufacturing practices, product data exchange specifications, computer-aided acquisition and logistics support, and rapid acquisition of manufactured parts;

[(6)] *(7)* to sustain and enhance the skills and capabilities of the manufacturing work force;

[(7)] *(8)* to promote high-performance work systems (with development and dissemination of production technologies that build upon the skills and capabilities of the work force), high levels of worker education and training; and

[(8)] *(9)* to ensure appropriate coordination between the manufacturing technology programs and industrial preparedness programs of the Department of Defense and similar programs undertaken by other departments and agencies of the Federal Government or by the private sector.

* * * * * * *

(d) COMPETITION AND COST SHARING.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(3) As a goal, at least 25 percent of the funds available for the program each fiscal year should be used for awarding grants and entering into contracts, cooperative agreements, and other transactions on a cost-share basis under which the ratio of recipient cost to Government cost is two to one. The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments and upon recommendation of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, shall establish annual objectives to meet such goal.]

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER V—MISCELLANEOUS TECHNOLOGY BASE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

§ 2539b. Availability of samples, drawings, information, equipment, materials, and certain services

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense and the [secretaries] *Secretaries* of the military departments, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and when determined by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary concerned to be in the interest of national defense, may each—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 152—ISSUE OF SUPPLIES, SERVICES, AND FACILITIES

* * * * * * *

§ 2553. Articles and services of industrial facilities: sale to persons outside the Department of Defense

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) * * *

(2) The term "not available", with respect to an article or service proposed to be sold under this section, means that the

article or service is unavailable from a commercial source in the required quantity and quality, within the time required, or at prices less than the price available through an industrial facility of the armed forces.

[(2)] *(3)* The term "variable costs", with respect to sales of articles or services, means the costs that are expected to fluctuate directly with the volume of sales and—

(A) in the case of articles, the volume of production necessary to satisfy the sales orders; or

(B) in the case of services, the extent of the services sold.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 157—TRANSPORTATION

* * * * * * *

§ 2641a. Transportation of American Samoa veterans on Department of Defense aircraft for certain medical care in Hawaii

(a) * * *

(b) VETERANS ELIGIBLE FOR TRANSPORT.—A veteran eligible for transport under subsection (a) is any veteran who—

(1) resides in and is located in American Samoa; and

(2) as determined by an official of the Department of Veterans Affairs designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, must be transported to the State of Hawaii in order to receive hospital care to which such veteran is entitled under chapter 17 of title 38[, United States Code,] in facilities of such Department in the State of Hawaii.

* * * * * * *

[(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

[(1) The term "veteran" has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code.

[(2) The term "hospital care" has the meaning given that term in section 1701(5) of title 38, United States Code.]

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 159—REAL PROPERTY; RELATED PERSONAL PROPERTY; AND LEASE OF NONEXCESS PROPERTY

* * * * * * *

§ 2680. Leases: land for special operations activities

(a) * * *

(d) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary of Defense to acquire a leasehold interest in real property under this section shall expire on September 30, [2000] *2005*. The expiration of that authority shall not affect the validity of any contract entered into under this section on or before that date.

* * * * * * *

§ 2688. Utility systems: conveyance authority

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) CONSIDERATION.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) A contract for the receipt of utility services as consideration under paragraph (1), or any other contract for utility services entered into by the Secretary concerned in connection with the conveyance of a utility system under this section, may be for a period not to exceed 50 years.

* * * * * * *

(g) ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, OR REPLACEMENT OF UTILITY SYSTEMS.—In lieu of carrying out a military construction project to construct, repair, or replace a utility system, the Secretary concerned may use funds authorized and appropriated for the project to facilitate the conveyance of the utility system under this section by making a contribution toward the cost of construction, repair, or replacement of the utility system by the entity to which the utility system is being conveyed. The Secretary concerned shall consider any such contribution in the economic analysis required under subsection (e).

[(g)**]** *(i)* UTILITY SYSTEM DEFINED.—(1) In this section, the term "utility system" means any of the following:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(2) The term "utility system" includes the following:

(A) Equipment, fixtures, structures, and other improvements utilized in connection with a system referred to in paragraph (1).

(B) **[**Easements**]** *Real property, easements,* and rights-of-way associated with a system referred to in that paragraph.

[(h)**]** *(j)* LIMITATION.—This section shall not apply to projects constructed or operated by the Army Corps of Engineers under its civil works authorities.

* * * * * * *

§ 2692. Storage, treatment, and disposal of nondefense toxic and hazardous materials

(a) * * *

(b) Subsection (a) does not **[**apply to—**]** *apply to the following:*

(1) **[**the**]** *The* storage, treatment, or disposal of materials that will be or have been used in connection with an activity of the Department of Defense or in connection with a service to be performed on an installation of the Department for the benefit of the Department**[**;**]**.

(2) **[**the**]** *The* storage of strategic and critical materials in the National Defense Stockpile under an agreement for such storage with the Administrator of General Services**[**;**]**.

(3) **[**the**]** *The* temporary storage or disposal of explosives in order to protect the public or to assist agencies responsible for Federal, State, or local law enforcement in storing or disposing

of explosives when no alternative solution is available, if such storage or disposal is made in accordance with an agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the head of the Federal, State, or local agency concerned**[**;**]**.

(4) **[**the**]** *The* temporary storage or disposal of explosives in order to provide emergency lifesaving assistance to civil authorities**[**;**]**.

(5) **[**the**]** *The* disposal of excess explosives produced under a Department of Defense contract, if the head of the military department concerned determines, in each case, that an alternative feasible means of disposal is not available to the contractor, taking into consideration public safety, available resources of the contractor, and national defense production requirements**[**;**]**.

(6) **[**the**]** *The* temporary storage of nuclear materials or nonnuclear classified materials in accordance with an agreement with the Secretary of Energy**[**;**]**.

(7) **[**the**]** *The* storage of materials that constitute military resources intended to be used during peacetime civil emergencies in accordance with applicable Department of Defense regulations**[**;**]**.

(8) **[**the**]** *The* temporary storage of materials of other Federal agencies in order to provide assistance and refuge for commercial carriers of such material during a transportation emergency**[**;**]**.

(9) **[**the**]** *The* storage of any material that is not owned by the Department of Defense if the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that the material is required or generated in connection with the authorized and compatible use of a facility of the Department of Defense, including the use of such a facility for testing materiel or training personnel**[**;**]**.

(10) **[**the**]** *The* treatment and disposal of any material that is not owned by the Department of Defense if the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that the material is required or generated in connection with the authorized and compatible use of a facility of that military department and the Secretary enters into a contract or agreement with the prospective user that—

(A) is consistent with the best interest of national defense and environmental security; and

(B) provides for the prospective user's continued financial and environmental responsibility and liability with regard to the material**[**; and**]**.

(11) **[**the**]** *The* storage of any material that is not owned by the Department of Defense if the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that the material is required or generated in connection with the use of a space launch facility located on an installation of the Department of Defense or on other land controlled by the United States.

* * * * * * *

§ 2695. Acceptance of funds to cover administrative expenses relating to certain real property transactions

(a) * * *

(b) COVERED TRANSACTIONS.—Subsection (a) applies to the following transactions *involving real property under the control of the Secretary of a military department*:

(1) The exchange of real property.

(2) The grant of an easement over, in, or upon real property of the United States.

(3) The lease or license of real property of the United States.

(4) The disposal of real property of the United States for which the Secretary will be the disposal agent.

§ 2696. Screening of real property for further Federal use before conveyance

(a) SCREENING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary concerned may not convey real property that is authorized or required to be conveyed, whether for or without consideration, by any provision of law *enacted after December 31, 1997,* unless the Administrator of General Services has screened the property for further Federal use in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.).

(b) TIME FOR SCREENING.—(1) Before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of a provision of law authorizing or requiring the conveyance of a parcel of real property by the Secretary concerned, the Administrator of General Services shall complete the screening [required by paragraph (1)] *referred to in subsection (a)* with regard to the real property and notify the Secretary concerned of the results of the screening. The notice shall include—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) EXCEPTED CONVEYANCE AUTHORITIES.—The screening requirements of this section shall not apply to real property authorized or required to be conveyed under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) Any provision of law authorizing the closure or realignment of a military installation that is enacted after [the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998] *November 18, 1997*.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 160—ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

* * * * * * *

§ 2703. Environmental restoration accounts

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) BUDGET REPORTS.—In proposing the budget for any fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, [United States Code,] the President shall set forth separately the amounts requested for environmental restoration programs of the Department of Defense and of each of the military departments under this chapter and under any other Act.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 169—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec.
2801. Scope of chapter; definitions.
* * * * * * *
2814. Special authority for development of Ford Island, Hawaii.
* * * * * * *

§ 2806. Contributions for North Atlantic Treaty Organizations Security Investment

(a) Within amounts authorized by law for such purpose, the Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area*, including support for the actual implementation of a military operations plan approved by the North Atlantic Council*.

* * * * * * *

§ 2814. Special authority for development of Ford Island, Hawaii

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Navy may exercise any authority or combination of authorities in this section for the purpose of developing or facilitating the development of Ford Island, Hawaii, to the extent that the Secretary determines the development is compatible with the mission of the Navy.

(2) The Secretary of the Navy may not exercise any authority under this section until—

(A) the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a master plan for the development of Ford Island, Hawaii; and

(B) a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed following the date on which the notification is received by those committees.

(b) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may convey to any public or private person or entity all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any real property (including any improvements thereon) or personal property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in the State of Hawaii that the Secretary determines—

(A) is excess to the needs of the Navy and all of the other armed forces; and

(B) will promote the purpose of this section.

(2) A conveyance under this subsection may include such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) LEASE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may lease to any public or private person or entity any real property or personal property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in the State of Hawaii that the Secretary determines—

(A) is excess to the needs of the Navy and all of the other armed forces; and

(B) will promote the purpose of this section.

(2) A lease under this subsection shall be subject to section 2667(b)(1) of this title and may include such others terms as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) A lease of real property under this subsection may provide that, upon termination of the lease term, the lessee shall have the right of first refusal to acquire the real property covered by the lease if the property is then conveyed under subsection (b).

(4)(A) The Secretary may provide property support services to or for real property leased under this subsection.

(B) To the extent provided in appropriations Acts, any payment made to the Secretary for services provided under this paragraph shall be credited to the appropriation, account, or fund from which the cost of providing the services was paid.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LEASEHOLD INTEREST BY SECRETARY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may acquire a leasehold interest in any facility constructed under subsection (f) as consideration for a transaction authorized by this section upon such terms as the Secretary considers appropriate to promote the purpose of this section.

(2) The term of a lease under paragraph (1) may not exceed 10 years, unless the Secretary of Defense approves a term in excess of 10 years for purposes of this section.

(3) A lease under this subsection may provide that, upon termination of the lease term, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to acquire the facility covered by the lease.

(4) The Secretary of the Navy may enter into a lease under this subsection only if the lease is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of the enactment of this section.

(e) REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITION.—The Secretary of the Navy shall use competitive procedures for purposes of selecting the recipient of real or personal property under subsection (b) and the lessee of real or personal property under subsection (c).

(f) CONSIDERATION.—(1) As consideration for the conveyance of real or personal property under subsection (b), or for the lease of real or personal property under subsection (c), the Secretary of the Navy shall accept cash, real property, personal property, or services, or any combination thereof, in an aggregate amount equal to not less than the fair market value of the real or personal property conveyed or leased.

(2) Subject to subsection (i), the services accepted by the Secretary under paragraph (1) may include the following:

(A) The construction or improvement of facilities at Ford Island.

(B) The restoration or rehabilitation of real property at Ford Island.

(C) The provision of property support services for property or facilities at Ford Island.

(g) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Navy may not carry out a transaction authorized by this section until—

(1) the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a notification of the transaction, including—

(A) a detailed description of the transaction; and

(B) a justification for the transaction specifying the manner in which the transaction will meet the purposes of this section; and

(2) a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed following the date on which the notification is received by those committees.

(h) FORD ISLAND IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNT.—(1) There is established on the books of the Treasury an account to be known as the "Ford Island Improvement Account".

(2) There shall be deposited into the account the following amounts:

(A) Amounts authorized and appropriated to the account.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (c)(4)(B), the amount of any cash payment received by the Secretary for a transaction under this section.

(i) USE OF ACCOUNT.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts, funds in the Ford Island Improvement Account may be used as follows:

(A) To carry out or facilitate the carrying out of a transaction authorized by this section.

(B) To carry out improvements of property or facilities at Ford Island.

(C) To obtain property support services for property or facilities at Ford Island.

(2) To extent that the authorities provided under subchapter IV of this chapter are available to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary may not use the authorities in this section to acquire, construct, or improve family housing units, military unaccompanied housing units, or ancillary supporting facilities related to military housing.

(3)(A) The Secretary may transfer funds from the Ford Island Improvement Account to the following funds:

(i) The Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(1) of this title.

(ii) The Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(2) of this title.

(B) Amounts transferred under subparagraph (A) to a fund referred to in that subparagraph shall be available in accordance with the provisions of section 2883 of this title for activities authorized under subchapter IV of this chapter at Ford Island.

(j) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROPERTY MANAGEMENT LAWS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, transactions under this section shall not be subject to the following:

(1) Sections 2667 and 2696 of this title.

(2) Section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411).

(3) Sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483, 484).

(k) SCORING.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive the applicability to any lease entered into under this section of the budget scorekeeping guidelines used to measure compliance with the Balanced Budget Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(l) PROPERTY SUPPORT SERVICE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "property support service" means the following:

(1) Any utility service or other service listed in section 2686(a) of this title.

(2) Any other service determined by the Secretary to be a service that supports the operation and maintenance of real property, personal property, or facilities.

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

* * * * * * *

§ 2837. Limited partnerships with private developers of housing

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) ACCOUNT.—(1) There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury an account to be known as the "Defense Housing Investment Account".

(2) There shall be deposited into the Account—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) any unobligated balances which remain in the Navy Housing Investment Account as of the date of the enactment of [the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996] *this section*.

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER IV—ALTERNATIVE AUTHORITY FOR ACQUISITION AND IMPROVEMENT OF MILITARY HOUSING

* * * * * * *

Sec.
2871. Definitions.

* * * * * * *

[2875. Investments in nongovernmental entities.]
2875. Investments.

* * * * * * *

§ 2871. Definitions

In this subchapter:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) The term "eligible entity" means any individual, corporation, firm, partnership, company, State or local government, or housing authority of a State or local government.

[(5)] *(6)* The term "Fund" means the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund or the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund established under section 2883(a) of this title.

[(6)] *(7)* The term "military unaccompanied housing" means military housing intended to be occupied by members of the armed forces serving a tour of duty unaccompanied by dependents.

[(7)] *(8)* The term "United States" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

§ 2872. General authority

In addition to any other authority provided under this chapter for the acquisition or construction of military family housing or military unaccompanied housing, the Secretary concerned may exercise any authority or any combination of authorities provided under this subchapter in order to provide for the acquisition or construction by [private persons] *eligible entities* of the following:

(1) Family housing units on or near military installations within the United States and its territories and possessions.

(2) Military unaccompanied housing units on or near such military installations.

§ 2873. Direct loans and loan guarantees

(a) DIRECT LOANS.—(1) Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary concerned may make direct loans to [persons in the private sector] *an eligible entity* in order to provide funds to [such persons] *the eligible entity* for the acquisition or construction of housing units that the Secretary determines are suitable for use as military family housing or as military unaccompanied housing.

(2) The Secretary concerned shall establish such terms and conditions with respect to loans made under this subsection as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, including the period and frequency for repayment of such loans and the obligations of the obligors on such loans upon default.

(b) LOAN GUARANTEES.—(1) Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary concerned may guarantee a loan made to [any person in the private sector] *an eligible entity* if the proceeds of the loan are to be used by [the person] *the eligible entity* to acquire, or construct housing units that the Secretary determines are suitable for use as military family housing or as military unaccompanied housing.

* * * * * * *

[§ 2875. Investments in nongovernmental entities]

§ 2875. Investments

(a) INVESTMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary concerned may make investments in [nongovernmental entities] *an eligible entity* carrying out projects for the acquisition or construction of housing

units suitable for use as military family housing or as military unaccompanied housing.

* * * * * * *

(c) LIMITATION ON VALUE OF INVESTMENT.—(1) The cash amount of an investment under this section in [a nongovernmental entity] *an eligible entity* may not exceed an amount equal to 33⅓ percent of the capital cost (as determined by the Secretary concerned) of the project or projects that [the entity] *the eligible entity* proposes to carry out under this section with the investment.

(2) If the Secretary concerned conveys land or facilities to [a nongovernmental entity] *an eligible entity* as all or part of an investment in [the entity] *the eligible entity* under this section, the total value of the investment by the Secretary under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 45 percent of the capital cost (as determined by the Secretary) of the project or projects that [the entity] *the eligible entity* proposes to carry out under this section with the investment.

(3) In this subsection, the term "capital cost", with respect to a project for the acquisition or construction of housing, means the total amount of the costs included in the basis of the housing for Federal income tax purposes.

(d) COLLATERAL INCENTIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary concerned shall enter into collateral incentive agreements with [nongovernmental] *eligible* entities in which the Secretary makes an investment under this section to ensure that a suitable preference will be afforded members of the armed forces and their dependents in the lease or purchase, as the case may be, of a reasonable number of the housing units covered by the investment.

(e) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Amounts in the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund or the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund may be used to make a cash investment under this section in [a nongovernmental entity] *an eligible entity* only after the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the Secretary of Defense submits written notice of, and justification for, the investment to the appropriate committees of Congress.

§ 2876. Rental guarantees

The Secretary concerned may enter into agreements with [private persons] *eligible entities* that acquire or construct military family housing units or military unaccompanied housing units under this subchapter in order to assure—

(1) the occupancy of such units at levels specified in the agreements; or

(2) rental income derived from rental of such units at levels specified in the agreements.

§ 2877. Differential lease payments

Pursuant to an agreement entered into by the Secretary concerned and a [private] lessor of military family housing or military unaccompanied housing to members of the armed forces, the Secretary may pay the lessor an amount in addition to the rental payments for the housing made by the members as the Secretary de-

termines appropriate to encourage the lessor to make the housing available to members of the armed forces as military family housing or as military unaccompanied housing.

§ 2878. Conveyance or lease of existing property and facilities

(a) CONVEYANCE OR LEASE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary concerned may convey or lease property or facilities (including ancillary supporting facilities) to [private persons] *eligible entities* for purposes of using the proceeds of such conveyance or lease to carry out activities under this subchapter.

* * * * * * *

§ 2881. Ancillary supporting facilities

(a) AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE OR CONSTRUCT.—Any project for the acquisition or construction of military family housing units or military unaccompanied housing units under this subchapter may include the acquisition or construction of ancillary supporting facilities for the housing units concerned.

(b) RESTRICTION.—The ancillary supporting facilities authorized by subsection (a) may not be in direct competition with any resale activities provided by the Defense Commissary Agency or the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, the Navy Exchange Service Command, Marine Corps exchanges, or any other nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the United States under the jurisdiction of the armed forces which is conducted for the morale, welfare and recreation of members of the armed forces.

* * * * * * *

§ 2883. Department of Defense Housing Funds

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) CREDITS TO FUNDS.—(1) There shall be credited to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund the following:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(E) Any amounts that the Secretary of the Navy transfers to that Fund pursuant to section 2814(i)(3) of this title, subject to the restrictions on the use of the transferred amounts specified in that section.

(2) There shall be credited to the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund the following:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(E) Any amounts that the Secretary of the Navy transfers to that Fund pursuant to section 2814(i)(3) of this title, subject to the restrictions on the use of the transferred amounts specified in that section.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle B—Army

* * * * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 353—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

§ 3681. Presentation of United States flag upon retirement

(a) * * *

(b) MULTIPLE PRESENTATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED.—A member is not eligible for a presentation of a flag under subsection (a) if the member has previously been presented a flag [under this section or section 6141 or 8681 of this title or section 516 of title 14.] *under this section or any other provision of law providing for the presentation of a United States flag incident to release from active service for retirement.*

* * * * * * *

PART III—TRAINING

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 401—TRAINING GENERALLY

Sec.
4301. Members of Army: detail as students, observers, and investigators at educational institutions, industrial plants, and hospitals.

* * * * * * *

4320. Recruit basic training: privacy.
4321. United States Army War College: master of strategic studies degree.

* * * * * * *

§ 4321. United States Army War College: master of strategic studies degree

Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Commandant of the United States Army War College, upon the recommendation of the faculty and dean of the college, may confer the degree of master of strategic studies upon graduates of the college who have fulfilled the requirements for that degree.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 403—UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

* * * * * * *

§ 4335. Dean of Academic Board

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) While serving as Dean of the Academic Board, an officer of the Army who holds a grade lower than brigadier general shall hold the grade of brigadier general, if appointed to that grade by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The retirement age of an officer so appointed is that of a permanent professor of the Academy. An officer so appointed is counted for purposes of the limitation in section 526(a) of this title on general officers of the Army on active duty.

* * * * * * *

§ 4342. Cadets: appointment; numbers, territorial distribution

(a) The authorized strength of the Corps of Cadets of the Academy [is as follows:] *(determined for any year as of the day before the last day of the academic year) is 4,000. Subject to that limitation, cadets are selected as follows:*

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(i) For purposes of the limitation under subsection (a), the last day of an academic year is graduation day.

* * * * * * *

§ 4344. Selection of persons from foreign countries

(a) * * *

(b)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) The amount of reimbursement waived under paragraph (2) may not exceed [35] *50* percent of the per-person reimbursement amount otherwise required to be paid by a foreign country under such paragraph, except in the case of not more than [five] *20* persons receiving instruction at the Academy under this section at any one time.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Navy and Marine Corps

* * * * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 561—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

§ 6141. Presentation of United States flag upon retirement

(a) * * *

(b) MULTIPLE PRESENTATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED.—A member is not eligible for a presentation of a flag under subsection (a) if the member has previously been presented a flag [under this section or section 3681 or 8681 of this title or section 516 of title 14.]

under this section or any other provision of law providing for the presentation of a United States flag incident to release from active service for retirement.

* * * * * * *

PART III—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 603—UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

* * * * * * *

Sec.
6951. Location.

* * * * * * *

[6974. Gifts and bequests: acceptance for benefit of museum.]

* * * * * * *

§ 6954. Midshipmen: number

[(a) There may be at the Naval Academy at any one time midshipmen as follows:]

(a) The authorized strength of the Brigade of Midshipmen (determined for any year as of the day before the last day of the academic year) is 4,000. Subject to that limitation, midshipmen are selected as follows:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g) For purposes of the limitation under subsection (a), the last day of an academic year is graduation day.

* * * * * * *

§ 6957. Selection of persons from foreign countries

(a) * * *

(b)(1) A person receiving instruction under this section is entitled to the pay, allowances, and emoluments of a midshipman appointed from the United States, and from the same appropriations.

* * * * * * *

(3) The amount of reimbursement waived under paragraph (2) may not exceed [35] *50* percent of the per-person reimbursement amount otherwise required to be paid by a foreign country under such paragraph, except in the case of not more than [five] *20* persons receiving instruction at the Naval Academy under this section at any one time.

* * * * * * *

§ 6973. Gifts and bequests: acceptance for benefit of Naval Academy

[(a) The Secretary of the Navy may accept, hold, administer, and spend gifts and bequests of personal property made on the condition that it be used for the benefit of, or for use in connection with, the Naval Academy. Gifts and bequests of money and the proceeds

from the sales of property received as gifts shall be deposited in the Treasury in the fund called "United States Naval Academy general gift fund". The Secretary may disburse funds deposited under this subsection for the benefit or use of the Naval Academy subject to the terms of the gift or bequest.]

(a)(1) The Secretary of the Navy may accept, hold, administer, and spend gifts and bequests of personal property, and loans of personal property other than money, made on the condition that the personal property be used for the benefit of, or in connection with, the Naval Academy or the Naval Academy Museum, its collection, or its services.

(2) Gifts or bequests of money, and the proceeds from the sales of property received as a gift or bequest, shall be deposited in the Treasury in the fund called "United States Naval Academy Gift and Museum Fund". The Secretary may disburse funds deposited under this paragraph for the benefit or use of the Naval Academy or the Naval Academy Museum subject to the terms of the gift or bequest.

* * * * * * *

(c) Upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury may invest, reinvest, or retain investments of money or securities comprising any part of the [United States Naval Academy general gift fund] *United States Naval Academy Gift and Museum Fund* in securities of the United States or in securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. The interest and benefits accruing from those securities shall be deposited to the credit of the [United States Naval Academy general gift fund] *United States Naval Academy Gift and Museum Fund* and may be disbursed as provided in this section.

(d) The Secretary shall develop written guidelines to be used in determining whether the acceptance of money, personal property, or loans of personal property under subsection (a) would—

(1) reflect unfavorably upon the ability of the Department of the Navy to carry out its responsibilities in a fair and objective manner;

(2) reflect unfavorably upon the ability of any employee of the Department of the Navy to carry out the employee's official duties in a fair and objective manner; or

(3) compromise the integrity, or the appearance of the integrity, of Navy programs or any employee involved in such programs.

[§ 6974. Gifts and bequests: acceptance for benefit of museum

[(a) The Secretary of the Navy may accept, hold, administer, and spend gifts and bequests of personal property, and loans of personal property other than money, for the benefit of the Naval Academy Museum, its collection, or its services. Gifts or bequests of money shall be deposited in the Treasury in the fund called "United States Naval Academy Museum Fund". The Secretary may disburse funds so deposited for the purposes specified in this section.

[(b) For the purpose of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, property that is accepted under this section is considered as a gift or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

[(c) Upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury may invest, reinvest, or retain investments of the money or securities comprising any part of the United States Naval Academy Museum Fund in securities of the United States or in securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. The interest and benefits accruing from those securities shall be deposited to the credit of the United States Naval Academy Museum Fund and may be disbursed as provided in this section.]

* * * * * * *

PART IV—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 631—SECRETARY OF THE NAVY: MISCELLANEOUS POWERS AND DUTIES

Sec.
7204. Schools near naval activities: financial aid.
* * * * * * *
[7222. Naval Historical Center Fund.]
* * * * * * *
7233. Auxiliary vessels: extended lease authority.
* * * * * * *

[§ 7222. Naval Historical Center Fund

[(a) The Secretary of the Navy may accept, hold, and administer gifts and bequests of personal property, and loans of personal property other than money, for the benefit of the Naval Historical Center, its collection, or its services. Gifts or bequests of money shall be deposited in the Treasury in a trust fund called "Naval Historical Center Fund."

[(b) For the purpose of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, property that is accepted under this section is considered as a gift or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

[(c) Upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury may invest or reinvest all or any part of the funds deposited under this section in securities of the United States or in securities guaranteed by the United States. The interest accruing from these securities shall be deposited to the credit of the Naval Historical Center Fund.]

§ 7233. Auxiliary vessels: extended lease authority

(a) AUTHORIZED CONTRACTS.—After September 30, 1999, the Secretary of the Navy, subject to subsection (b), may enter into contracts with private United States shipyards for the construction of new surface vessels to be long-term leased by the United States from the shipyard or other private person for any of the following:

(1) The combat logistics force of the Navy.

(2) The strategic sealift force of the Navy.

(3) Other auxiliary support vessels for the Department of Defense.

(b) CONTRACTS REQUIRED TO BE AUTHORIZED BY LAW.—A contract may be entered into under subsection (a) with respect to a specific vessel only if the Secretary is specifically authorized by law to enter into such a contract with respect to that vessel.

(c) FUNDS FOR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may make payments for contracts entered into under subsection (a) and under subsection (g) using funds available for obligation from operation and maintenance accounts during the fiscal year for which the payments are required to be made. Any such contract shall provide that the United States is not required to make a payment under the contract (other than a termination payment, if required) before October 1, 2001.

(d) TERM OF CONTRACT.—In this section, the term "long-term lease" means a lease, bareboat charter, or conditional sale agreement with respect to a vessel the term of which (including any option period) is for a period of 20 years or more.

(e) OPTION TO BUY.—A contract entered into under subsection (a) may include options for the United States to purchase one or more of the vessels covered by the contract at any time during, or at the end of, the contract period (including any option period) upon payment of an amount equal to the lesser of (1) the unamortized portion of the cost of the vessel plus amounts incurred in connection with the termination of the financing arrangements associated with the vessel, or (2) the fair market value of the vessel.

(f) DOMESTIC CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary shall require in any contract entered into under this section that each vessel to which the contract applies—

(1) shall have been constructed in a shipyard within the United States; and

(2) upon delivery, shall be documented under the laws of the United States.

(g) VESSEL OPERATION.—(1) The Secretary shall operate a vessel held by the Secretary under a long-term lease under this section through a contract with a United States domiciled corporation with experience in the operation of vessels for the United States. Any such contract shall be for a term as determined by the Secretary.

(2) The Secretary may provide a crew for any such vessel using civil service mariners only after an evaluation and competition taking into account—

(A) the fully burdened cost of a civil service crew over the expected useful life of the vessel;

(B) the effect on the private sector manpower pool; and

(C) the operational requirements of the Department of the Navy.

(h) CONTINGENT WAIVER OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—A contract authorized by this section may be entered into without regard to section 2401 or 2401a of this title if the Secretary of Defense makes the following findings with respect to that contract:

(1) The need for the vessels or services to be provided under the contract is expected to remain substantially unchanged during the contemplated contract or option period.

(2) There is a reasonable expectation that throughout the contemplated contract or option period the Secretary of the Navy (or, if the contract is for services to be provided to, and funded by, another military department, the Secretary of that military department) will request funding for the contract at the level required to avoid contract cancellation.

(3) The use of such contract or the exercise of such option is in the interest of the national defense.

(i) SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR TERMINATION LIABILITY.—If a contract entered into under this section is terminated, the costs of such termination may be paid from—

(1) amounts originally made available for performance of the contract;

(2) amounts currently available for operation and maintenance of the type of vessels or services concerned and not otherwise obligated; or

(3) funds appropriated for those costs.

CHAPTER 633—NAVAL VESSELS

* * * * * * *

§ 7306. Vessels stricken from Naval Vessel Register; captured vessels: transfer by gift or otherwise

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(d) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—(1) No transfer under this section takes effect unless—

[(A) notice of the proposal to make the transfer is sent to Congress; and

[(B) 60 days of continuous session of Congress have expired following the date on which such notice is sent to Congress.

[(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), the continuity of a session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of such 60-day period.]

(d) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE-AND-WAIT PERIOD.—(1) A transfer under this section may not take effect until—

(A) the Secretary submits to Congress notice of the proposed transfer; and

(B) 30 days of session of Congress have expired following the date on which the notice is sent to Congress.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) the period of a session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die at the end of the final session of a Congress; and

(B) any day on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain, or because of an adjournment sine die at the end of the first session of a Congress, shall be excluded in the computation of such 30-day period.

* * * * * * *

§ 7315. Preservation of Navy shipbuilding capability

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) APPLICABILITY.—(1) * * *

(2) In a shipbuilding capability preservation agreement applicable to a shipbuilder, the Secretary may agree to apply the cost reimbursement rules set forth in subsection (b) to allocations of indirect costs to private sector work performed by the shipbuilder only with respect to costs that the shipbuilder incurred on or after **[**the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998**]** *November 18, 1997,* under a contract between the shipbuilder and a private sector customer of the shipbuilder that became effective on or after January 26, 1996.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 665—NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

* * * * * * *

§ 7902. National Ocean Research Leadership Council

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Council shall submit to Congress a report on the National Oceanographic Partnership Program. The report shall contain the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) The amounts requested, in the budget submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31**[**, United States Code,**]** for the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the report is prepared, for the programs, projects, and activities of the program and the estimated expenditures under such programs, projects, and activities during such following fiscal year.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle D—Air Force

* * * * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 853—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

§ 8681. Presentation of United States flag upon retirement

(a) * * *

(b) MULTIPLE PRESENTATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED.—A member is not eligible for a presentation of a flag under subsection (a) if the member has previously been presented a flag [under this section or section 3681 or 6141 of this title or section 516 of title 14.] *under this section or any other provision of law providing for the presentation of a United States flag incident to release from active service for retirement.*

* * * * * * *

PART III—TRAINING

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 901—TRAINING GENERALLY

Sec.
9301. Members of Air Force: detail as students, observers, and investigators at educational institutions, industrial plants, and hospitals.

* * * * * * *

[9317. Air University: master of airpower art and science.]
9317. Air University: graduate-level degrees.

* * * * * * *

[§ 9317. Air University: master of airpower art and science

[(a) AUTHORITY.—Upon the recommendation of the faculty of the School of Advanced Airpower Studies of the Air University, the Commander of the university may confer the degree of master of airpower art and science upon graduates of the school who fulfill the requirements for the degree.]

§ 9317. Air University: graduate-level degrees

(a) AUTHORITY.—Upon recommendation of the faculty of the appropriate school, the commander of the Air University may confer—

(1) the degree of master of strategic studies upon graduates of the Air War College who fulfill the requirements for that degree;

(2) the degree of master of military operational art and science upon graduates of the Air Command and Staff College who fulfill the requirements for that degree; and

(3) the degree of master of airpower art and science upon graduates of the School of Advanced Air power Studies who fulfill the requirements for that degree.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 903—UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

§ 9335. Dean of the Faculty

(a) The Dean of the Faculty shall be appointed as an additional permanent professor from the permanent professors who have served as heads of departments of instruction at the Academy.

(b) While serving as Dean of the Faculty, an officer of the Air Force who holds a grade lower than brigadier general shall hold the grade of brigadier general, if appointed to that grade by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The retire-

ment age of an officer so appointed is that of a permanent professor of the Academy An officer so appointed is counted for purposes of the limitation in section 526(a) of this title on general officers of the Air Force on active duty.

* * * * * * *

§ 9342. Cadets: appointment; numbers, territorial distribution

(a) The authorized strength of Air Force Cadets of the Academy [is as follows:] *(determined for any year as of the day before the last day of the academic year) is 4,000. Subject to that limitation, Air Force Cadets are selected as follows:*

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(i) For purposes of the limitation under subsection (a), the last day of an academic year is graduation day.

* * * * * * *

§ 9344. Selection of persons from foreign countries

(a) * * *

(b)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) The amount of reimbursement waived under paragraph (2) may not exceed [35] *50* percent of the per-person reimbursement amount otherwise required to be paid by a foreign country under such paragraph, except in the case of not more than [five] *20* persons receiving instruction at the Air Force Academy under this section at any one time.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle E—Reserve Components

* * * * * * *

PART I—ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1007—ADMINISTRATION OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

Sec.

10201. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs.

* * * * * * *

10217. Non-dual status [military] technicians.

10218. Army and Air Force Reserve Technicians: conditions for retention; mandatory retirement under civil service laws.

* * * * * * *

§ 10216. Military technicians (dual status)

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) For purposes of this section and any other provision of law, a military technician (dual status) is a Federal civilian employee who—

(A) is employed under section 3101 of title 5 or section [709] *709(b)* of title 32;

(B) is required as a condition of that employment to maintain membership in the Selected Reserve; and

(C) is assigned to a *civilian* position as a technician in the administration and training of the Selected Reserve or in the maintenance and repair of supplies or equipment issued to the Selected Reserve or the armed forces.

* * * * * * *

(e) DUAL STATUS REQUIREMENT.—(1) Funds appropriated for the Department of Defense may not (except as provided in paragraph (2)) be used for compensation as a military technician of any individual hired as a military technician *(dual status)* after February 10, 1996, who is no longer a member of the Selected Reserve.

(2) [The Secretary] *Except as otherwise provided by law, the Secretary* concerned may pay compensation described in paragraph (1) to an individual described in that paragraph who is no longer a member of the Selected Reserve for a period not to exceed [six months] *up to 12 months* following the individual's loss of membership in the Selected Reserve if the Secretary determines that such loss of membership was not due to the failure of that individual to meet military standards.

* * * * * * *

§ 10217. Non-dual status [military] technicians

(a) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section and any other provision of law, a non-dual status [military] technician is a civilian employee of the Department of Defense serving in a military technician position who—

[(1) was hired as a military technician before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 under any of the authorities specified in subsection (c); and

[(2) as of the date of the enactment of that Act is not a member of the Selected Reserve or after such date ceased to be a member of the Selected Reserve.]

(1) was hired as a technician before November 18, 1997, under any of the authorities specified in subsection (b) and as of that date is not a member of the Selected Reserve or after such date has ceased to be a member of the Selected Reserve; or

(2) is employed under section 709 of title 32 in a position designated under subsection (c) of that section and when hired was not required to maintain membership in the Selected Reserve.

* * * * * * *

(c) PERMANENT LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER.—(1) Effective October 1, 2007, the total number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve may not exceed 175. If

at any time after the preceding sentence takes effect the number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve exceeds the number specified in the limitation in the preceding sentence, the Secretary of Defense shall require that the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, or both, take immediate steps to reduce the number of such technicians in order to comply with such limitation.

(2) Effective October 1, 2001, the total number of non-dual status technicians employed by the National Guard may not exceed 1,950. If at any time after the preceding sentence takes effect the number of non-dual status technicians employed by the National Guard exceeds the number specified in the limitation in the preceding sentence, the Secretary of Defense shall require that the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, or both, take immediate steps to reduce the number of such technicians in order to comply with such limitation.

§ 10218. Army and Air Force Reserve Technicians: conditions for retention; mandatory retirement under civil service laws

(a) SEPARATION AND RETIREMENT OF MILITARY TECHNICIANS (DUAL STATUS).—(1) An individual employed by the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a military technician (dual status) who after the date of the enactment of this section loses dual status is subject to paragraph (2) or (3), as the case may be.

(2) If a technician described in paragraph (1) is eligible at the time dual status is lost for an unreduced annuity, the technician shall be separated, subject to subsection (e), not later than 30 days after the date on which dual status is lost.

(3)(A) If a technician described in paragraph (1) is not eligible at the time dual status is lost for an unreduced annuity, the technician shall be offered the opportunity to—

(i) reapply for, and if qualified be appointed to, a position as a military technician (dual status); or

(ii) apply for a civil service position that is not a technician position.

(B) If such a technician continues employment with the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a non-dual status technician, the technician—

(i) shall not be permitted, after the end of the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, to apply for any voluntary personnel action; and

(ii) shall, subject to subsection (e), be separated or retired—

(I) in the case of a technician first hired as a military technician (dual status) on or before February 10, 1996, not later than 30 days after becoming eligible for an unreduced annuity; and

(II) in the case of a technician first hired as a military technician (dual status) after February 10, 1996, not later than one year after the date on which dual status is lost.

(4) For purposes of this subsection, a military technician is considered to lose dual status upon—

(A) being separated from the Selected Reserve; or

(B) ceasing to hold the military grade specified by the Secretary concerned for the position held by the technician.

(b) NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS.—(1) An individual who on the date of the enactment of this section is employed by the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a non-dual status technician and who on that date is eligible for an unreduced annuity shall, subject to subsection (e), be separated not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this section.

(2)(A) An individual who on the date of the enactment of this section is employed by the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a non-dual status technician and who on that date is not eligible for an unreduced annuity shall be offered the opportunity to—

(i) reapply for, and if qualified be appointed to, a position as a military technician (dual status); or

(ii) apply for a civil service position that is not a technician position.

(B) If such a technician continues employment with the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a non-dual status technician, the technician—

(i) shall not be permitted, after the end of the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, to apply for any voluntary personnel action; and

(ii) shall, subject to subsection (e), be separated or retired—

(I) in the case of a technician first hired as a technician on or before February 10, 1996, and who on the date of the enactment of this section is a non-dual status technician, not later than 30 days after becoming eligible for an unreduced annuity; and

(II) in the case of a technician first hired as a technician after February 10, 1996, and who on the date of the enactment of this section is a non-dual status technician, not later than one year after the date on which dual status is lost.

(3) An individual employed by the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a non-dual status technician who is ineligible for appointment to a military technician (dual status) position, or who decides not to apply for appointment to such a position, or who, within six months of the date of the enactment of this section is not appointed to such a position, shall for reduction-in-force purposes be in a separate competitive category from employees who are military technicians (dual status).

(c) UNREDUCED ANNUITY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, a technician shall be considered to be eligible for an unreduced annuity if the technician is eligible for an annuity under section 8336, 8412, or 8414 of title 5 that is not subject to a reduction by reason of the age or years of service of the technician.

(d) VOLUNTARY PERSONNEL ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term "voluntary personnel action", with respect to a non-dual status technician, means any of the following:

(1) The hiring, entry, appointment, reassignment, promotion, or transfer of the technician into a position for which the Secretary concerned has established a requirement that the person occupying the position be a military technician (dual status).

(2) Promotion to a higher grade if the technician is in a position for which the Secretary concerned has established a requirement that the person occupying the position be a military technician (dual status).

(e) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON MANDATORY RETIREMENTS.—Until October 1, 2004, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force may not during any fiscal year approve a total of more than 25 mandatory retirements under this section. A technician who is subject to mandatory separation under this section in any fiscal year and who, but for this subsection, would be eligible to be retired with an unreduced annuity shall, if not sooner separated under some other provision of law, be eligible to be retained in service until mandatorily retired consistent with the limitation in this subsection.

PART II—PERSONNEL GENERALLY

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1201—AUTHORIZED STRENGTHS AND DISTRIBUTION IN GRADE

Sec.
12001. Authorized strengths: reserve components.
* * * * * * *
12003. Authorized strengths: commissioned officers *in an* active status.
* * * * * * *

§ 12011. Authorized strengths: reserve officers on active duty or on full-time National Guard duty for administration of the reserves or the National Guard

(a) The number of reserve officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps who may be on active duty or full-time National Guard duty in each of the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel, and of the Navy who may be on active duty in each of the grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain, as of the end of any fiscal year for duty described in subclauses (B) and (C) of section 523(b)(1) of this title or full-time National Guard duty (other than for training) under section 502(f) of title 32 may not exceed the number for that grade and armed force in the following table:

[Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
Major or Lieutenant Commander	3,219	1,071	791	140
Lieutenant Colonel or Commander	1,524	520	713	90
Colonel or Navy Captain	438	188	297	30]

Grade	*Army*	*Navy*	*Air Force*	*Marine Corps*
Major or Lieutenant Commander	*3,219*	*1,071*	*843*	*140*
Lieutenant Colonel or Commander	*1,595*	*520*	*746*	*90*
Colonel or Navy Captain	*471*	*188*	*297*	*30*

* * * * * * *

§ 12012. Authorized strengths: senior enlisted members on active duty or on full-time National Guard duty for administration of the reserves or the National Guard

(a) The number of enlisted members in pay grades E–8 and E–9 who may be on active duty (other than for training) or on full-time National Guard duty under the authority of section 502(f) of title 32 (other than for training) as of the end of any fiscal year in connection with organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components or the National Guard may not exceed the number for that grade and armed force in the following table:

[Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E–9	623	202	395	20
E–8	2,585	429	997	94]

Grade	*Army*	*Navy*	*Air Force*	*Marine Corps*
E–9	*645*	*202*	*403*	*20*
E–8	*2,585*	*429*	*1,029*	*94*

(b) Whenever the number of members serving in pay grade E–9 for duty described in subsection (a) is less than the number authorized for that grade under subsection (a), the difference between the two numbers may be applied to increase the number authorized under such subsection for pay grade E–8.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1205—APPOINTMENT OF RESERVE OFFICERS

Sec.
12201. Reserve officers: qualifications for appointment.

* * * * * * *

12216. Financial assistance for members of the Marine Corps platoon leader's class program.

* * * * * * *

§ 12216. Financial assistance for members of the Marine Corps platoon leader's class program

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Navy may provide payment of not more than $5,200 per year for a period not to exceed three consecutive years of educational expenses (including tuition, fees, books, and laboratory expenses) to an eligible enlisted member of the Marine Corps Reserve for completion of—

(1) baccalaureate degree requirements in an approved academic program that requires less than five academic years to complete; or

(2) doctor of jurisprudence or bachelor of laws degree requirements in an approved academic program which requires not more than three years to complete.

(b) ELIGIBLE RESERVISTS.—To be eligible for receipt of educational expenses as authorized by subsection (a), an enlisted member of the Marine Corps Reserve must—

(1) either—

(A) be under 27 years of age on June 30 of the calendar year in which the member is eligible for appointment as a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps for such persons in a baccalaureate degree program described in subsection (a)(1), except that any such member who has served on active duty in the armed forces may exceed such age limitation on such date by a period equal to the period such member served on active duty, but only if such member will be under 30 years of age on such date; or

(B) be under 31 years of age on June 30 of the calendar year in which the member is eligible for appointment as a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps for such persons in a doctor of jurisprudence or bachelor of laws degree program described in subsection (a)(2), except that any such member who has served on active duty in the armed forces may exceed such age limitation on such date by a period equal to the period such member served on active duty, but only if such member will be under 35 years of age on such date;

(2) be satisfactorily enrolled at any accredited civilian educational institution authorized to grant baccalaureate, doctor of jurisprudence or bachelor of law degrees;

(3) be selected as an officer candidate in the Marine Corps Platoon Leader's Class Program and successfully complete one increment of military training of not less than six weeks' duration; and

(4) agree in writing—

(A) to accept an appointment as a commissioned officer in the Marine Corps, if tendered by the President;

(B) to serve on active duty for a minimum of five years; and

(C) under such terms and conditions as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, to serve in the Marine Corps Reserve until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of such appointment.

(c) APPOINTMENT.—Upon satisfactorily completing the academic and military requirements of the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class Program, an officer candidate may be appointed by the President as a Reserve officer in the Marine Corps in the grade of second lieutenant.

(d) LIMITATION ON NUMBER.—Not more than 1,200 officer candidates may participate in the financial assistance program authorized by this section at any one time.

(e) REMEDIAL AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.—An officer candidate may be ordered to active duty in the Marine Corps by the Secretary of the Navy to serve in an appropriate enlisted grade for such period

of time as the Secretary prescribes, but not for more than four years, when such person—

(1) accepted financial assistance under this section; and

(2) either—

(A) completes the military and academic requirements of the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class Program and refuses to accept a commission when offered;

(B) fails to complete the military or academic requirements of the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class Program; or

(C) is disenrolled from the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class Program for failure to maintain eligibility for an original appointment as a commissioned officer under section 532 of this title.

(d) PERSONS NOT QUALIFIED FOR APPOINTMENT.—Except under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, a person who is not physically qualified for appointment under section 532 of this title and subsequently is determined by the Secretary of the Navy under section 505 of this title to be unqualified for service as an enlisted member of the Marine Corps due to a physical or medical condition that was not the result of misconduct or grossly negligent conduct may request a waiver of obligated service of such financial assistance.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1209—ACTIVE DUTY

Sec.
12301. Reserve components generally.
* * * * * * *
12323. Space-required travel for Reserves.
* * * * * * *

§ 12301. Reserve components generally

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(h)(1) When authorized by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the military department concerned may order a member of a reserve component to active duty, with the consent of that member, to receive authorized medical care, to be medically evaluated for disability or other purposes, or to complete a required Department of Defense health care study, which may include an associated medical evaluation of the member.

(2) A member ordered to active duty under this subsection may be retained with the member's consent, when the Secretary concerned considers it appropriate, for medical treatment for a condition associated with the study or evaluation, if that treatment of the member otherwise is authorized by law.

(3) A member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States may not be ordered to active duty under this subsection without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State concerned.

* * * * * * *

§ 12323. Space-required travel for Reserves

A member of a reserve component is authorized to travel in a space-required status on aircraft of the armed forces between home and place of inactive duty training, or place of duty in lieu of unit training assembly, when there is no road or railroad transportation (or combination of road and railroad transportation) between those locations. A member traveling in that status on a military aircraft pursuant to the authority provided in this section is not authorized to receive travel, transportation, or per diem allowances in connection with that travel.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1213—SPECIAL APPOINTMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, DETAILS, AND DUTIES

Sec.
12501. Reserve components: detail of members of regular and reserve components to assist.
12502. Chief and assistant chief of staff of National Guard divisions and wings in Federal service: detail.
12503. Ready Reserve: funeral honors duty.

* * * * * * *

§ 12503. Ready Reserve: funeral honors duty

(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of the Ready Reserve may be ordered to funeral honors duty, with the consent of the member, in preparation for or to perform funeral honors functions at the funeral of a veteran (as defined in section 1491 of this title). However, a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States may not be ordered to perform funeral honors functions under this section without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State concerned.

(b) A member ordered to funeral honors duty under this section shall be required to perform a minimum of two hours of such duty in order to receive service credit under section 12732(a)(2)(E) of this title and compensation under section 435 of title 37 if authorized by the Secretary concerned.

(c) Funeral honors duty (and travel directly to and from that duty) under this section shall be treated as the equivalent of inactive-duty training (and travel directly to and from that training) for the purposes of this title, title 37, and title 38, including provisions relating to the determination of eligibility for and receipt of benefits and entitlements provided under those titles for Reserves performing inactive-duty training and for their dependents and survivors, except that a member is not entitled by reason of performance of funeral honors duty to any pay, allowances, or other compensation provided for in title 37 other than that provided in section 435 of that title and in subsection (d).

(d) A member who performs funeral honors duty under this section is entitled to reimbursement for travel and transportation expenses incurred in conjunction with such duty as authorized under

chapter 7 of title 37, if such duty is performed at a location 50 miles or more from the member's residence.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1215—MISCELLANEOUS PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES

Sec.
12551. Prohibition of use of Air Force Reserve AGR personnel for Air Force base security functions.
[12552. Funeral honor guard functions: prohibition of treatment as drill or training.]
12552. Funeral honors functions at funerals for veterans.

* * * * * * *

[§ 12552. Funeral honor guard functions: prohibition of treatment as drill or training

[Performance by a Reserve of honor guard functions at the funeral of a veteran may not be considered to be a period of drill or training otherwise required.]

§ 12552. Funeral honors functions at funerals for veterans

Performance by a Reserve of funeral honors functions at the funeral of a veteran (as defined in section 1491 of this title) may not be considered to be a period of drill or training, but may be performed as funeral honors duty under section 12503 of this title.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1217—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

Sec.
12601. Compensation: Reserve on active duty accepting from any person.
* * * * * * *
12602. Members of Army National Guard of United States and Air National Guard of United States: credit for service as members of National Guard.
12603. Attendance at inactive-duty training assemblies: commercial travel at Federal supply schedule rates.
12605. Presentation of United States flag: members transferred from an active status or discharged after completion of eligibility for retired pay.

* * * * * * *

§ 12605. Presentation of United States flag: members transferred from an active status or discharged after completion of eligibility for retired pay

(a) PRESENTATION OF FLAG.—Upon the transfer from an active status or discharge of a Reserve who has completed the years of service required for eligibility for retired pay under chapter 1223 of this title, the Secretary concerned shall present a United States flag to the member.

(b) MULTIPLE PRESENTATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED.—A member is not eligible for presentation of a flag under subsection (a) if the member has previously been presented a flag under this section or any provision of law providing for the presentation of a United States flag incident to release from active service for retirement.

(c) NO COST TO RECIPIENT.—The presentation of a flag under this section shall be at no cost to the recipient.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1223—RETIRED PAY FOR NON-REGULAR SERVICE

* * * * * * *

§ 12732. Entitlement to retired pay: computation of years of service

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), for the purpose of determining whether a person is entitled to retired pay under section 12731 of this title, the person's years of service are computed by adding the following:

(1) * * *

(2) Each one-year period, after July 1, 1949, in which the person has been credited with at least 50 points on the following basis:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(E) One point for each day in which funeral honors functions were performed under section 12503 of this title or section 115 of title 32.

For the purpose of clauses (A), (B), (C), [and (D)] *(D), and (E)*, service in the National Guard shall be treated as if it were service in a reserve component, if the person concerned was later appointed in the National Guard of the United States, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, or as a Reserve of the Army or the Air Force, and served continuously in the National Guard from the date of his Federal recognition to the date of that appointment.

* * * * * * *

PART III—PROMOTION AND RETENTION OF OFFICERS ON THE RESERVE ACTIVE-STATUS LIST

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1405—PROMOTIONS

* * * * * * *

§ 14301. Eligibility for consideration for promotion: general rules

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g) A reserve component brigadier general of the Army or the Air Force who is in an inactive status is eligible (notwithstanding subsection (a)) for consideration for promotion to major general by a

promotion board convened under section 14101(a) of this title if the officer—

(1) has been in an inactive status for less than [1] *one* year as of the date of the convening of the promotion board; and

(2) had continuously served for at least [1] *one* year on the reserve active status list or the active duty list (or a combination of both) immediately before the officer's most recent transfer to an inactive status.

(h) OFFICERS ON EDUCATIONAL DELAY.—A Reserve officer who is in an educational delay status for the purpose of attending an approved institution of higher education for advanced training, subsidized by the military department concerned in the form of a scholarship or stipend, is ineligible for consideration for promotion while in that status. The officer shall remain on the Reserve active status list while in such an educational delay status.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1407—FAILURE OF SELECTION FOR PROMOTION AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATION

Sec.
14501. Failure of selection for promotion.

* * * * * * *

14518. Continuation on reserve active status list to complete disciplinary action.

* * * * * * *

§ 14506. Effect of failure of selection for promotion: reserve majors of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps and reserve lieutenant commanders of the Navy

Unless retained as provided in section 12646, 12686, 14701, or 14702 of this title, each reserve officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps who holds the grade of major or lieutenant commander who has failed of selection to the next higher grade for the second time and whose name is not on a list of officers recommended for promotion to the next higher grade shall, if not earlier removed from the reserve active-status list, be removed from that list in accordance with section [14513 of this title on the first day of the month after the month in which the officer completes 20 years of commissioned service.] *section 14513 of this title on the later of—*

(1) the first day of the month after the month in which the officer completes 20 years of commissioned service; or

(2) the first day of the seventh month after the month in which the President approves the report of the board which considered the officer for the second time.

* * * * * * *

§ 14518. Continuation on reserve active status list to complete disciplinary action

When an action is commenced against a Reserve officer with a view to trying the officer by court-martial, as authorized by section 802(d) of this title, the Secretary concerned may delay the separa-

tion or retirement of the officer under this chapter until the completion of the disciplinary action under chapter 47 of this title.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1409—CONTINUATION OF OFFICERS ON THE RESERVE ACTIVE-STATUS LIST AND SELECTIVE EARLY REMOVAL

* * * * * * *

§ 14703. Authority to retain chaplains and officers in medical specialties until specified age

(a) * * *

(b) SEPARATION AT SPECIFIED AGE.—An officer may not be retained in active status under this section later than the date on which the officer becomes 67 years of age [(or, in the case of a reserve officer of the Army in the Chaplains or a reserve officer of the Air Force designated as a chaplain, 60 years of age)].

* * * * * * *

§ 14706. Computation of total years of service

[For the purpose of this chapter and chapter 1407 of this title, a reserve officer's years of service include all service, other than constructive service, of the officer as a commissioned officer of any uniformed service (other than service as a warrant officer).]

(a) For the purpose of this chapter and chapter 1407 of this title, a Reserve officer's years of service include all service of the officer as a commissioned officer of a uniformed service other than—

(1) service as a warrant officer;

(2) constructive service; and

(3) service after appointment as a commissioned officer of a reserve component while in a program of advanced education to obtain the first professional degree required for appointment, designation, or assignment as an officer in the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Veterinary Corps, the Medical Service Corps, the Nurse Corps, the Army Medical Specialists Corps, or as an officer designated as a chaplain or judge advocate, provided such service occurs before the officer commences initial service on active duty or initial service in the Ready Reserve in the specialty that results from such a degree.

(b) The exclusion under subsection (a)(3) does not apply to service performed by an officer who previously served on active duty or participated as a member of the Ready Reserve in other than a student status for the period of service preceding the member's service in a student status.

* * * * * * *

PART IV—TRAINING FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS AND EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1606—EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE

Sec.
16131. Educational assistance program: establishment; amount.
* * * * * * *
[16137. Reports to Congress.]
16137. Biennial report to Congress.

* * * * * * *

§ 16131. Educational assistance program: establishment; amount

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b)(1) Except as provided *in* subsections (d) through (f), each educational assistance program established under subsection (a) shall provide for payment by the Secretary concerned, through the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to each person entitled to educational assistance under this chapter who is pursuing a program of education of an educational assistance allowance at the following rates:

* * * * * * *

[§ 16137. Report to Congress

[The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report not later than March 1 of each year concerning the operation of the educational assistance program established by this chapter during the preceding fiscal year. Each such report shall include the number of members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each armed force receiving, and the number entitled to receive, educational assistance under this chapter during the preceding fiscal year.]

§ 16137. Biennial report to Congress

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report not later than March 1 of each odd-numbered year concerning the operation of the educational assistance program established by this chapter during the preceding two fiscal years. Each such report shall include the number of members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each armed force receiving, and the number entitled to receive, educational assistance under this chapter during those fiscal years.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1609—EDUCATION LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

§ 16302. Education loan repayment program: health professions officers serving in Selected Reserve with wartime critical medical skill shortages

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) The authority provided in this section shall apply only in the case of a person first appointed as a commissioned officer before January 1, [2000] *2001*.

* * * * * * *

PART V—SERVICE, SUPPLY, AND PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1803—FACILITIES FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS

* * * * * * *

§ 18233. Acquisition

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f)(1) Authority provided by law to construct, expand, rehabilitate, convert, or equip any facility under this section includes authority to expend funds for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, *design,* and supervision incident to any such activity.

§ 18233a. Limitation on certain projects; authority to carry out small projects with operation and maintenance funds

(a)(1) * * *

(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to expenditures or contributions for the following:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) An unspecified minor construction project intended solely to correct a deficiency that is life-threatening, health-threatening, or safety-threatening, except that the expenditure or contribution for the project may not exceed $3,000,000.

(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, a project authorized under section 18233(a) of this title that costs $500,000 or less *(or $1,000,000 or less if the project is intended solely to correct a deficiency that is life-threatening, health-threatening, or safety-threatening),* may be carried out with funds available for operations and maintenance.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 386 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

* * * * * * *

Subtitle G—Other Matters

* * * * * * *

SEC. 386. ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES THAT BENEFIT DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) ELIGIBLE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—A local educational agency is eligible for assistance under subsection (b) for a fiscal year if—

(1) at least 20 percent (as rounded to the nearest whole percent) of the students in average daily attendance in the schools of that agency [in that fiscal year are] *during the preceding school year were* military dependent students counted under section 8003(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(a)(1));

* * * * * * *

DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION ACT OF 1978

* * * * * * *

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION SYSTEM

SEC. 1402. (a) * * *

(b)(1) The Secretary shall ensure that individuals eligible to receive a free public education under subsection (a) [recieve] *receive* an education of high quality.

* * * * * * *

[OFFICE OF DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION

SEC. [1403. (a)(1) There is established within the Department of Defense an office to be known as the Office of Dependents' Education.

[(2) The Office of Dependents' Education shall be headed by a Director of Dependents' Education (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Director"), who shall be a civilian and who shall be selected by the Secretary of Defense and shall report to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics.]

ADMINISTRATION OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION SYSTEM

SEC. 1403. (a) The defense dependents' education system is operated through the field activity of the Department of Defense known as the Department of Defense Education Activity. That activity is headed by a Director, who is a civilian and is selected by the Secretary of Defense. The Director reports to an Assistant Secretary of Defense designated by the Secretary of Defense for purposes of this title.

(b) Except with respect to the authority to prescribe regulations, the Secretary of Defense may carry out his functions under [this Act] *this title* through the Director.

(c) The Director shall—

(1) establish personnel policies, consistent with the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act *(20 U.S.C. 901 et seq.)*, for employees in the defense dependents' education system,

(2) have authority to transfer professional employees in the defense dependents' education system from one position to another[.]*,*

* * * * * * *

(6) perform such other functions as may be required or delegated by the Secretary of Defense or the [Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics] *the Assistant Secretary of Defense designated under subsection (a)*.

(d)(1) The Director shall establish appropriate regional or area offices [for the Office of Dependents' Education] in order to provide for thorough and efficient administration of the defense dependents' education system.

(2) [Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report (A) describing the organization of the Office of Dependents' Education in accordance with paragraph (1), (B) describing the assignment of personnel to the central office of the Office of Dependents' Education and to such regional or area offices as are established pursuant to paragraph (1), and (C) detailing the personnel requirements of the defense dependents' education system.] [Whenever the Office of Dependents' Education] *Whenever the Department of Defense Education Activity* is reorganized [after the submission of the report required under the preceding sentence] *in a manner that affects the defense dependents' education system*, the Secretary of Defense shall submit [an additional report] *a report* to the Congress describing the reorganization.

(3) Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, [the Office of Dependents' Education] *the Department of Defense Education Activity* is authorized an appropriate number of civilian employees in its central office and such regional or area office as are established pursuant to paragraph (1).

* * * * * * *

ALLOTMENT FORMULA

SEC. 1409. (a) * * *

(b) Any regulation under subsection (a) shall be issued, and shall become effective, in accordance with the procedures applicable to regulations required to be issued by the [Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in accordance with section 431 of the General Education Provisions Act] *Secretary of Education in accordance with section 437 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232)*.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—

(1) CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1402(b)(3), the provisions of part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, other than the funding and reporting provisions, shall apply to all schools operated by the Department of Defense under this title, including the requirement that children with disabilities, aged 3 to 5, inclu-

sive, receive a free appropriate public education [by academic year 1993–1994].

* * * * * * *

(3) [IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINES.—In carrying out the provisions of paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

[(A) in academic year 1991–1992 and the 2 succeeding academic years, plan and develop a comprehensive] *IMPLEMENTATION.—In carrying out paragraph (2), the Secretary shall have in effect a comprehensive*, coordinated, multidisciplinary program of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities among Department of Defense entities involved in the provision of such services to such individuals[;].

[(B) in academic year 1994–1995, implement the program described in subparagraph (A), except the Secretary need only conduct multidisciplinary assessments, develop individualized family service plans, and make available case management services; and

[(C) in academic year 1995–1996 and succeeding academic years, have in effect the program described in subparagraph (A).]

* * * * * * *

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION

SEC. 1411. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) Members of the Council who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Council or otherwise engaged in the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at the daily equivalent of the rate specified at the time of such service for [grade GS–18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code] *level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code*, including traveltime, and while so serving on the business of the Council away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

* * * * * * *

STUDY OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION SYSTEM

SEC. 1412. (a)(1) [As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act [Nov. 1, 1978], the Director shall provide for] *The Director may from time to time, but not more frequently than once a year, provide for* a comprehensive study of the entire defense dependents' education [system, which] *system. Any such study* shall include a detailed analysis of the education programs and the facilities of the system.

(2) [The study required by this subsection] *Any study under paragraph (1)* shall be conducted by a contractor selected by the Di-

rector after an open competition. After conducting such study, the contractor shall submit a report to the Director [not later than two years after the effective date of this title] describing the results of the study and giving its assessment of the defense dependents' education system.

(b) In designing the specifications for [the] *any* study to be conducted pursuant to subsection (a)(1), and in selecting a contractor to conduct such study under subsection (a)(2), the Director shall consult with the Advisory Council on Dependents' Education established under section 1411 of this title.

(c) The Director shall submit to the Congress [not later than one year after the effective date of this title the report] *any report* submitted to him under subsection (a)(2) describing the results of [the study] *a study* carried out pursuant to subsection (a)(1), together with the recommendations, if any, of the contractor for legislation or any increase in funding needed to improve the defense dependents' education system. Notwithstanding any law, rule, or regulation to the contrary, such report shall not be submitted to any review before its transmittal to the Congress, but the Secretary of Defense shall, at the time of the transmittal of such report, submit to the Congress such recommendations as he may have with respect to legislation or any increase in funding needed to improve the defense dependents' education system.

[(d) The Director may provide for additional studies of the defense dependents' education system to be conducted in accordance with the provisions of this section, but such studies shall not be conducted more frequently than once a year. A report of each study shall be submitted to the Congress in accordance with subsection (c), and the second sentence of such subsection shall apply with respect to the transmission of each such report.]

REGULATIONS

SEC. 1413. [Not later than 180 days after the effective date of this title, the] *The* Secretary of Defense shall issue regulations to carry out this title. Such regulations shall—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 1414. For purposes of this title:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(6) The term "Director" means the Director of the Department of Defense Education Activity.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 3342 OF TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 3342. Check cashing and exchange transactions

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) With respect to automated teller machines on naval vessels of the Navy, the authority of a disbursing official of the United States Government under subsection (a) also includes the following:

(1) The authority to provide operating funds to the automated teller machines.

(2) The authority to accept, for safekeeping, deposits and transfers of funds made through the automated teller machines.

SECTION 1523 OF THE ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME ACT OF 1991

SEC. 1523. PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS AT UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' AND AIRMEN'S HOME.

(a) HISTORIC NATURE OF FACILITY.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Four buildings located on six acres of the establishment of the Retirement Home known as the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home are included on the National Register of Historic Places maintained by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) Amounts in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, which consists primarily of deductions from the pay of members of the Armed Forces, are insufficient to both maintain and operate the Retirement Home for the benefit of the residents of the Retirement Home and adequately maintain, repair, and preserve these historic buildings and grounds.

(3) Other sources of funding are available to contribute to the maintenance, repair, and preservation of these historic buildings and grounds.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Retirement Home Board and the Director of the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home may apply for and accept a direct grant from the Secretary of the Interior under section 101(e)(3) of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a(e)(3)) for the purpose of maintaining, repairing, and preserving the historic buildings and grounds of the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home included on the National Register of Historic Places.

(c) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—Amounts received as a grant under subsection (b) shall be deposited in the Fund, but shall be kept separate from other amounts in the Fund. The amounts received may only be used for the purpose specified in subsection (b).

TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 3—BASIC PAY

* * * * * * *

§ 205. Computation: service creditable

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a commissioned officer appointed under sections 12209 and 12216 of title 10 may not count in computing basic pay a period of service after January 1, 2000,

that the officer performed concurrently as a member of the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class Program and the Marine Corps Reserve, except that service after that date that the officer performed before commissioning while serving as an enlisted member on active duty or as a member of the Selected Reserve may be so counted.

* * * * * * *

§ 209. Members of precommissioning programs

(a) Except when on active duty, a member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps who is selected for advanced training under section 2104 of title 10 is entitled to a subsistence allowance of [$150] *$200* a month beginning on the day he starts advanced training and ending upon the completion of his instruction under that section, but in no event shall any member receive such pay for more than 30 months. Subsistence allowance under this section may not be considered financial assistance requiring additional service within the meaning of the third sentence of section 6(d)(1) of the Military Selective Act (50 U.S.C App. 456(d)(1)).

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 5—SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Sec.
301. Incentive pay: hazardous duty.

* * * * * * *

318. Special pay: special warfare officers extending period of active duty.
319. Special pay: surface warfare officer continuation pay.
320. Incentive pay: career enlisted flyers.
321. Special pay: judge advocate continuation pay.
322. Special pay: 15-year career status bonus for members entering service on or after August 1, 1986.

* * * * * * *

§ 301a. Incentive pay: aviation career

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) An officer serving as an air battle manager who is entitled to aviation career incentive pay under this section and who, before becoming entitled to aviation career incentive pay, was entitled to incentive pay under section 301(a)(11) of this title, is entitled to monthly incentive pay at a rate equal to the greater of the following:

(A) The rate applicable under this subsection.

(B) The rate at which the member was receiving incentive pay under section 301(c)(2)(A) of this title immediately before the member's entitlement to aviation career incentive pay under this section.

§ 301b. Special pay: aviation career officers extending period of active duty

(a) BONUS AUTHORIZED.—An aviation officer described in subsection (b) who, during the period beginning on January 1, 1989,

and ending on December 31, [1999] *2000*, executes a written agreement to remain on active duty in aviation service for at least one year may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid a retention bonus as provided in this section.

* * * * * * *

(b) COVERED OFFICERS.—An aviation officer referred to in subsection (a) is an officer of a uniformed service who—

(1) * * *

[(2) is in an aviation specialty designated by the Secretary concerned (with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of the Secretary of a military department) as a critical aviation specialty;]

[(3)] *(2)* is in a pay grade below pay [grade 0–6] *grade 0–7*;

[(4)] *(3)* is qualified to perform operational flying duty; *and*

[(5) has completed at least six but less than 13 years of aviation service; and]

[(6)] *(4)* has completed any active duty service commitment incurred for undergraduate aviator training.

(c) AMOUNT OF BONUS.—The amount of a retention bonus paid under this section may not be more [than—

[(1) $25,000 for each year covered by the written agreement, if the officer agrees to remain on active duty to complete 14 years of commissioned service; or

[(2) $12,000 for each year covered by the written agreement, if the officer agrees to remain on active duty for one, two, or three years.] *than $25,000 for each year covered by the written agreement to remain on active duty.*

(d) PRORATION.—The term of an agreement under subsection (a) and the amount of the bonus under subsection (c) may be prorated as long as such agreement does not extend beyond the date on which the officer making such agreement would complete [14 years of commissioned service] *25 years of aviation service*.

* * * * * * *

(g) REPAYMENT OF BONUS.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered less than 5 years after the termination of a written agreement entered into under subsection (a) does not discharge the officer signing the agreement from a debt arising under such agreement or under paragraph (1). [This paragraph applies to any case commenced under title 11 after January 1, 1989.]

* * * * * * *

(i) REPORTS.—(1) Not later than February 15 of each year, the Secretaries concerned shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report analyzing the effect of the provision of retention bonuses to aviation officers during the preceding fiscal year on the retention of qualified aviators. [Each report shall include—

[(A) a comparison of the cost of paying bonuses to officers who enter into an agreement for the period referred to in subsection (c)(1) with the cost of paying bonuses to officers who

enter into an agreement for a period referred to in subsection (c)(2); and

[(B) a description of the increase in the retention of qualified aviators as a result of the program.]

* * * * * * *

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "aviation service" means service performed by an officer (except a flight surgeon or other medical officer) while holding an aeronautical rating or designation or while in training to receive an aeronautical rating or designation.

[(2) The term "aviation specialty" means a specific community of pilots identified by type of aircraft or weapon system or a specific community of other designated aeronautical officers so identified.

[(3) The term "critical aviation specialty" means an aviation speciality in which there exists a shortage of officers on the date of designation under subsection (b).]

[(4)] *(2)* The term "operational flying duty" has the meaning given such term in section 301a(a)(6)(A) of this title.

* * * * * * *

§ 302d. Special pay: accession bonus for registered nurses

(a) ACCESSION BONUS AUTHORIZED.—(1) A person who is a registered nurse and who, during the period beginning on November 29, 1989, and ending on December 31, [1999] *2000*, executes a written agreement described in subsection (c) to accept a commission as an officer and remain on active duty for a period of not less than four years may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid an accession bonus in an amount determined by the Secretary concerned.

* * * * * * *

§ 302e. Special pay: nurse anesthetists

(a) SPECIAL PAY AUTHORIZED.—(1) An officer described in subsection (b)(1) who, during the period beginning on November 29, 1989, and ending on December 31, [1999] *2000*, executes a written agreement to remain on active duty for a period of one year or more may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid incentive special pay in an amount not to exceed $15,000 for any 12-month period.

* * * * * * *

§ 302g. Special pay: Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AGREEMENT AUTHORITY.—No agreement under this section may be entered into after December 31, [1999] *2000*.

* * * * * * *

§ 304. Special pay: diving duty

(a) * * *

(b) Special pay payable under subsection (a) shall be paid at a rate of not more than [$200] *$240* a month, in the case of an officer, and at a rate of not more than [$300] *$340* a month, in the case of an enlisted member.

[(c) A member may be paid special pay under this section and incentive pay under section 301 of this title for the same period of service only if the member is assigned by orders to a hazardous duty described in section 301(a) of this title in addition to diving duty. However, if a member is paid special pay under this section, the member is not entitled to more than one payment of incentive pay under section 301 of this title.]

(c) If, in addition to diving duty, a member is assigned by orders to one or more hazardous duties described in section 301 of this title, the member may be paid, for the same period of service, special pay under this section and incentive pay under such section 301 for each hazardous duty for which the member is qualified.

* * * * * * *

§ 308. Special pay: reenlistment bonus

(a)(1) A member of a uniformed service who—

(A) has completed at least [twenty-one months] *17 months* of continuous active duty (other than for training) but not more than fourteen years of active duty;

* * * * * * *

(2) The bonus to be paid under paragraph (1) may not exceed the lesser of the following amounts:

(A) The amount equal to the product of—

(i) [ten] *15* times the monthly rate of basic pay to which the member was entitled at the time of the discharge or release of the member; and

* * * * * * *

(B) [$45,000] *$60,000*.

* * * * * * *

(g) No bonus shall be paid under this section with respect to any reenlistment, or voluntary extension of an active-duty reenlistment, in the armed forces entered into after December 31, [1999] *2000*.

§ 308a. Special pay: enlistment bonus

(a) *Bonus Authorized; Bonus Amount.*—Notwithstanding section 514(a) of title 10 or any other law, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, or by the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, a person who enlists in an armed force for a period of at least four years in a skill designated as critical, or who extends his initial period of active duty in that armed force to a total of at least four years in a skill designated as critical, may be paid a bonus in an amount prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, but not more than [$12,000] *$20,000*. [The bonus shall be paid in periodic installments, as determined by the appropriate

Secretary, except that the first installment may not exceed $7,000 and the remainder shall be paid in equal periodic installments which may not be paid less frequently than once every 3 months.]

(b) PAYMENT METHODS.—A bonus under this section may be paid in a single lump sum, or in periodic installments, to provide an extra incentive for a member to successfully complete the training necessary for the member to be technically qualified in the skill for which the bonus is paid.

[(b)] *(c) REPAYMENT OF BONUS.*—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, or by the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, a person who voluntarily, or because of his misconduct, does not complete the term of enlistment for which a bonus was paid to him under this section or a member who is not technically qualified in the skill for which a bonus was paid to him under this section (other than a person who is not qualified because of injury, illness, or other impairment not the result of his own misconduct) shall refund that percentage of the bonus that the unexpired part of his enlistment is of the total enlistment period for which the bonus was paid.

[(c)] *(d) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.*—No bonus shall be paid under this section with respect to any enlistment or extension of an initial period of active duty in the armed forces made after December 31, [1999] *2000*.

§ 308b. Special pay: reenlistment bonus for members of the Selected Reserve

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No bonus may be paid under this section to any enlisted member who, after December 31, [1999] *2000*, reenlists or voluntarily extends his enlistment in a reserve component.

§ 308c. Special pay: bonus for enlistment in the Selected Reserve

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) No bonus may be paid under this section to any enlisted member who, after December 31, [1999] *2000*, enlists in the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of an armed force.

* * * * * * *

§ 308d. Special pay: enlisted members of the Selected Reserve assigned to certain high priority units

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) Additional compensation may not be paid under this section for inactive duty performed after December 31, [1999] *2000*.

§ 308e. Special pay: bonus for reserve affiliation agreement

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) No bonus may be paid under this section to any person for a reserve obligation agreement entered into after December 31, **[**1999**]** *2000*.

* * * * * * *

§ 308f. Special pay: bonus for enlistment in the Army

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) No bonus may be paid under this section with respect to an enlistment in the Army after December 31, **[**1999**]** *2000*.

* * * * * * *

§ 308h. Special pay: bonus for reenlistment, enlistment, or voluntary extension of enlistment in elements of the Ready Reserve other than the Selected Reserve

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g) A bonus may not be paid under this section to any person for a reenlistment, enlistment, or voluntary extension of an enlistment after December 31, **[**1999**]** *2000*.

§ 308i. Special pay: prior service enlistment bonus

(a) AUTHORITY AND ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(2) A bonus may only be paid under this section to a person who—

[(A) has completed his military service obligation but has less than 14 years of total military service;

[(B) has received an honorable discharge at the conclusion of military service;

[(C) is not being released from active service for the purpose of enlistment in a reserve component;

[(D) is projected to occupy a position as a member of the Selected Reserve in a specialty in which—

[(i) the person successfully served while a member on active duty; and

[(ii) the person attained a level of qualification while a member on active duty commensurate with the grade and years of service of the member; and

[(E) has not previously been paid a bonus (except under this section) for enlistment, reenlistment, or extension of enlistment in a reserve component.**]**

(2) A bonus may only be paid under this section to a person who meets each of the following requirements:

(A) The person has completed a military service obligation, but has less than 14 years of total military service, and received

an honorable discharge at the conclusion of that military service obligation.

(B) The person was not released, or is not being released, from active service for the purpose of enlistment in a reserve component.

(C) The person is projected to occupy, or is occupying, a position as a member of the Selected Reserve in a specialty in which the person—

(i) successfully served while a member on active duty and attained a level of qualification while on active duty commensurate with the grade and years of service of the member; or

(ii) has completed training or retraining in the specialty skill that is designated as critically short and attained a level of qualification in the specialty skill that is commensurate with the grade and years of service of the member.

(D) The person has not previously been paid a bonus (except under this section) for enlistment, reenlistment, or extension of enlistment in a reserve component.

* * * * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No bonus may be paid under this section to any person for an enlistment after December 31, **[**1999**]** *2000*.

* * * * * * *

§ 312. Special pay: nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active duty

(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, an officer of the naval service who—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

may, upon the acceptance by the Secretary or his designee of the written agreement, in addition to all other compensation to which he is entitled, be paid a sum of money not to exceed **[**$15,000**]** *$25,000* for each year of the active-service agreement. The Secretary of the Navy shall determine annually the necessity for continuance of the special pay and the rate of special pay per year for such active-service agreements accepted within each 12-month period. Upon acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary or his designee, the total amount payable shall be paid in equal annual installments over the length of the contract, commencing at the expiration of any existing period of obligated active service. The Secretary (or his designee) may accept an active service agreement under this section not more than one year in advance of the end of an officer's existing period of obligated active service under such an agreement. In such a case, the amount of the special pay may be paid commencing with the date of acceptance of the agreement, with the number of installments being equal to the number of years covered by the contract plus one.

* * * * * * *

(e) The provisions of this section shall be effective only in the case of officers who, on or before December 31, [1999] *2000*, execute the required written agreement to remain in active service.

* * * * * * *

§ 312b. Special pay: nuclear career accession bonus

(a)(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, an individual who is selected for officer naval nuclear power training and who executes a written agreement to participate in a program of training for duty in connection with the supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants may be paid a bonus of [$10,000] *$20,000* upon acceptance by the Secretary of the written agreement. Upon acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary, the amounts payable upon selection for training and upon completion of training, respectively, as determined under subsection (b), shall become fixed.

* * * * * * *

(c) The provisions of this section shall be effective only in the case of officers who, on or before December 31, [1999] *2000*, have been accepted for training for duty in connection with the supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants.

§ 312c. Special pay: nuclear career annual incentive bonus

(a)(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, an officer of the naval service who—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

may, in addition to all other compensation to which he is entitled, be paid an annual bonus in an amount not to exceed [$12,000] *$22,000* for each nuclear service year.

* * * * * * *

(b)(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, an officer of the naval service who—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

may, in addition to all other compensation to which he is entitled, be paid an annual bonus in an amount not to exceed [$5,500] *$10,000* for each nuclear service year.

* * * * * * *

(d) For the purposes of this section, a "nuclear service year" is any fiscal year beginning before [October 1, 1998, and the 15-month period beginning on that date and ending on December 31, 1999.] *December 31, 2000.*

* * * * * * *

§ 316. Special pay: foreign language proficiency pay

(a) * * *

(b) The monthly rate for special pay under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Secretary concerned and may not exceed [$100] *$300*.

* * * * * * *

§ 318. Special pay: special warfare officers extending period of active duty

(a) SPECIAL WARFARE OFFICER DEFINED.—In this section, the term "special warfare officer" means an officer of a uniformed service who—

(1) is qualified for a military occupational specialty or designator identified by the Secretary concerned as a special warfare military occupational specialty or designator; and

(2) is serving in a position for which that specialty or designator is authorized.

(b) RETENTION BONUS AUTHORIZED.—A special warfare officer who meets the eligibility requirements specified in subsection (c) and who executes a written agreement, on or after October 1, 1999, to remain on active duty in special warfare service for at least one year may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid a retention bonus as provided in this section.

(c) ELIGIBLE OFFICERS.—A special warfare officer may apply to enter into an agreement referred to in subsection (b) if the officer—

(1) is in pay grade O–3, or is in pay grade O–4 and is not on a list of officers recommended for promotion, at the time the officer applies to enter into the agreement;

(2) has completed at least 6, but not more than 14, years of active commissioned service; and

(3) has completed any service commitment incurred to be commissioned as an officer.

(d) AMOUNT OF BONUS.—The amount of a retention bonus paid under this section may not be more than $15,000 for each year covered by the agreement.

(e) PRORATION.—The term of an agreement under subsection (b) and the amount of the retention bonus payable under subsection (d) may be prorated as long as the agreement does not extend beyond the date on which the officer executing the agreement would complete 14 years of active commissioned service.

(f) PAYMENT METHODS.—(1) Upon acceptance of an agreement under subsection (b) by the Secretary concerned, the total amount payable pursuant to the agreement becomes fixed.

(2) The amount of the retention bonus may be paid as follows:

(A) At the time the agreement is accepted by the Secretary concerned, the Secretary may make a lump sum payment equal to half the total amount payable under the agreement. The balance of the bonus amount shall be paid in equal annual installments on the anniversary of the acceptance of the agreement.

(B) The Secretary concerned may make graduated annual payments under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, with the first payment being payable at the time the agreement is accepted by the Secretary and subsequent payments being payable on the anniversary of the acceptance of the agreement.

(g) ADDITIONAL PAY.—A retention bonus paid under this section is in addition to any other pay and allowances to which an officer is entitled.

(h) REPAYMENT.—(1) If an officer who has entered into an agreement under subsection (b) and has received all or part of a retention bonus under this section fails to complete the total period of active duty in special warfare service as specified in the agreement, the Secretary concerned may require the officer to repay the United States, on a pro rata basis and to the extent that the Secretary determines conditions and circumstances warrant, all sums paid the officer under this section.

(2) An obligation to repay the United States imposed under paragraph (1) is for all purposes a debt owed to the United States.

(3) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered less than five years after the termination of an agreement entered into under subsection (a) does not discharge the officer signing the agreement from a debt arising under such agreement or under paragraph (1).

(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretaries concerned shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section, including the definition of the term "special warfare service" for purposes of this section. Regulations prescribed by the Secretary of a military department under this section shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

§ 319. Special pay: surface warfare officer continuation pay

(a) ELIGIBLE SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER DEFINED.—In this section, the term "eligible surface warfare officer" means an officer of the Regular Navy or Naval Reserve on active duty who—

(1) is qualified and serving as a surface warfare officer;

(2) has been selected for assignment as a department head on a surface vessel; and

(3) has completed any service commitment incurred through the officer's original commissioning program.

(b) SPECIAL PAY AUTHORIZED.—An eligible surface warfare officer who executes a written agreement, on or after October 1, 1999, to remain on active duty to complete one or more tours of duty to which the officer may be ordered as a department head on a surface ship may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary of the Navy, be paid an amount not to exceed $50,000.

(c) PRORATION.—The term of the written agreement under subsection (b) and the amount payable under the agreement may be prorated.

(d) PAYMENT METHODS.—Upon acceptance of the written agreement under subsection (b) by the Secretary of the Navy, the total amount payable pursuant to the agreement becomes fixed. The Secretary shall prepare an implementation plan specifying the amount of each installment payment under the agreement and the times for payment of the installments.

(e) ADDITIONAL PAY.—Any amount paid under this section is in addition to any other pay and allowances to which an officer is entitled.

(f) REPAYMENT.—(1) If an officer who has entered into a written agreement under subsection (b) and has received all or part of the amount payable under the agreement fails to complete the total pe-

riod of active duty as a department head on a surface ship specified in the agreement, the Secretary of the Navy may require the officer to repay the United States, to the extent that the Secretary of the Navy determines conditions and circumstances warrant, any or all sums paid under this section.

(2) An obligation to repay the United States imposed under paragraph (1) is for all purposes a debt owned to the United States.

(3) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered less than five years after the termination of an agreement entered into under subsection (b) does not discharge the officer signing the agreement from a debt arising under such agreement or under paragraph (1).

(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

§ 320. Incentive pay: career enlisted flyers

(a) ELIGIBLE CAREER ENLISTED FLYER DEFINED.—In this section, the term "eligible career enlisted flyer" means an enlisted member of the armed forces who—

(1) is entitled to basic pay under section 204 of this title, or is entitled to pay under section 206 of this title as described in subsection (e) of this section;

(2) holds an enlisted military occupational specialty or enlisted military rating designated as a career enlisted flyer specialty or rating by the Secretary concerned, performs duty as a dropsonde system operator, or is in training leading to qualification and designation of such a specialty or rating or the performance of such duty;

(3) is qualified for aviation service under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned; and

(4) satisfies the operational flying duty requirements applicable under subsection (c).

(b) INCENTIVE PAY AUTHORIZED.—(1) The Secretary concerned may pay monthly incentive pay to an eligible career enlisted flyer in an amount not to exceed the monthly maximum amounts specified in subsection (d). The incentive pay may be paid as continuous monthly incentive pay or on a month-to-month basis, dependent upon the operational flying duty performed by the eligible career enlisted flyer as prescribed in subsection (c).

(2) Continuous monthly incentive pay may not be paid to an eligible career enlisted flyer after the member completes 25 years of aviation service. Thereafter, an eligible career enlisted flyer may still receive incentive pay on a month-to-month basis under subsection (c)(4) for the frequent and regular performance of operational flying duty.

(c) OPERATIONAL FLYING DUTY REQUIREMENTS.—(1) An eligible career enlisted flyer must perform operational flying duties for 6 of the first 10, 9 of the first 15, and 14 of the first 20 years of aviation service, to be eligible for continuous monthly incentive pay under this section.

(2) Upon completion of 10, 15, or 20 years of aviation service, an enlisted member who has not performed the minimum required operational flying duties specified in paragraph (1) during the prescribed period, although otherwise meeting the definition in sub-

section (a), may no longer be paid continuous monthly incentive pay except as provided in paragraph (3). Payment of continuous monthly incentive pay if the member meets the minimum operational flying duty requirement upon completion of the next established period of aviation service.

(3) For the needs of the service, the Secretary concerned may permit, on a case-by-case basis, a member to continue to receive continuous monthly incentive pay despite the member's failure to perform the operational flying duty required during the first 10, 15, or 20 years of aviation service, but only if the member otherwise meets the definition in subsection (a) and has performed at least 5 years of operational flying duties during the first 10 years of aviation service, 8 years of operational flying duties during the first 15 years of aviation service, or 12 years of operational flying duty during the first 20 years of aviation service. The authority of the Secretary concerned under this paragraph may not be delegated below the level of the Service Personnel Chief.

(4) If the eligibility of an eligible career enlisted flyer to continuous monthly incentive pay ceases under subsection (b)(2) or paragraph (2), the member may still receive month-to-month incentive pay for subsequent frequent and regular performance of operational flying duty. The rate payable is the same rate authorized by the Secretary concerned under subsection (d) for a member of corresponding years of aviation service.

(d) MONTHLY MAXIMUM INCENTIVE PAY.—The monthly rate for incentive pay under this section may not exceed the amounts specified in the following table for the applicable years of aviation service:

Years of aviation service:	*Monthly rate*
4 or less	*$150*
Over 4	*$225*
Over 8	*$350*
Over 14	*$400*

(e) ELIGIBILITY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS WHEN PERFORMING INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, when a member of a reserve component or the National Guard, who is entitled to compensation under section 206 of this title, meets the definition of eligible career enlisted flyer, the Secretary concerned may increase the member's compensation by an amount equal to 1/30 of the monthly incentive pay authorized by the Secretary concerned under subsection (d) for a member of corresponding years of aviation service who is entitled to basic pay under section 204 of this title. The reserve component member may receive the increase for as long as the member is qualified for it, for each regular period of instruction or period of appropriate duty, at which the member is engaged for at least two hours, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, duty or appropriate duties, as the Secretary may prescribe under section 206(a) of this title.

(f) RELATION TO HAZARDOUS DUTY INCENTIVE PAY OR DIVING DUTY SPECIAL PAY.—A member receiving special pay under section 301(a) or 304 of this title may not be paid incentive pay under this section for the same period of service.

(g) SAVE PAY PROVISION.—If, immediately before a member receives incentive pay under this section, the member was entitled to incentive pay under section 301(a) of this title, the rate at which the member is paid incentive pay under this section shall be equal to the higher of the monthly amount applicable under subsection (d) or the rate of incentive pay the member was receiving under subsection (b) or (c)(2)(A) of section 301 of this title.

(h) SPECIALTY CODE OF DROPSONDE SYSTEM OPERATORS.—Within the Air Force, the Secretary of the Air Force shall assign to members who are dropsonde system operators a specialty code that identifies such members as serving in a weather specialty.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "aviation service" means participation in aerial flight performed, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, by an eligible career enlisted flyer.

(2) The term "operational flying duty" means flying performed under competent orders while serving in assignments, including an assignment as a dropsonde system operator, in which basic flying skills normally are maintained in the performance of assigned duties as determined by the Secretary concerned, and flying duty performed by members in training that leads to the award of an enlisted aviation rating or military occupational specialty designated as a career enlisted flyer rating or specialty by the Secretary concerned.

§ 321. Special pay: judge advocate continuation pay

(a) ELIGIBLE JUDGE ADVOCATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "eligible judge advocate" means an officer of the armed forces on full-time active duty who—

(1) is qualified and serving as a judge advocate, as defined in section 801 of title 10; and

(2) has completed any service commitment incurred through the officer's original commissioning program.

(b) SPECIAL PAY AUTHORIZED.—An eligible judge advocate who executes a written agreement, on or after October 1, 1999, to remain on active duty for a period of obligated service specified in the agreement may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid an amount not to exceed $60,000.

(c) PRORATION.—The term of the written agreement under subsection (b) and the amount payable under the agreement may be prorated.

(d) PAYMENT METHODS.—Upon acceptance of the written agreement under subsection (b) by the Secretary concerned, the total amount payable pursuant to the agreement becomes fixed. The Secretary shall prepare an implementation plan specifying the amount of each installment payment under the agreement and the times for payment of the installments.

(e) ADDITIONAL PAY.—Any amount paid under this section is in addition to any other pay and allowances to which an officer is entitled.

(f) REPAYMENT.—(1) If an officer who has entered into a written agreement under subsection (b) and has received all or part of the amount payable under the agreement fails to complete the total period of active duty specified in the agreement, the Secretary con-

cerned may require the officer to repay the United States, to the extent that the Secretary determines conditions and circumstances warrant, any or all sums paid under this section.

(2) An obligation to repay the United States imposed under paragraph (1) is for all purposes a debt owned to the United States.

(3) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered less than five years after the termination of an agreement entered into under subsection (b) does not discharge the officer signing the agreement from a debt arising under such agreement or under paragraph (1).

(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

§ 322. Special pay: 15-year career status bonus for members entering service on or after August 1, 1986

(a) ELIGIBLE CAREER BONUS MEMBER DEFINED.—In this section, the term "eligible career bonus member" means a member of a uniformed service serving on active duty who—

(1) first became a member on or after August 1, 1986; and

(2) has completed 15 years of active duty in the uniformed services (or has received notification under subsection (e) that the member is about to complete that duty).

(b) AVAILABILITY OF BONUS.—The Secretary concerned shall pay a bonus under this section to an eligible career bonus member if the member—

(1) elects to receive the bonus under this section; and

(2) executes a written agreement (prescribed by the Secretary concerned) to remain continuously on active duty until the member has completed 20 years of active-duty service creditable under section 1405 of title 10, if the member is not already obligated to remain on active duty for a period that would result in at least 20 years of active-duty service.

(c) ELECTION METHOD.—The election under subsection (b)(1) shall be made in such form and within such period as the Secretary concerned may prescribe. An election under such subsection is irrevocable.

(d) AMOUNT OF BONUS; PAYMENT.—(1) A bonus under this section shall be paid in one lump sum of $30,000.

(2) The bonus shall be paid to an eligible career bonus member not later than the first month that begins on or after the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Secretary concerned receives from the member the election required under subsection (b)(1) and the written agreement required under subsection (b)(2), if applicable.

(e) NOTIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall transmit to each member who satisfies the definition of eligible career bonus member a written notification of the opportunity of the member to elect to receive a bonus under this section. The Secretary shall provide the notification not later than 180 days before the date on which the member will complete 15 years of active duty.

(2) The notification shall include the following:

(A) The procedures for electing to receive the bonus.

(B) An explanation of the effects under sections 1401a, 1409, and 1410 of title 10 that such an election has on the computa-

tion of any retired or retainer pay that the member may become eligible to receive.

(f) REPAYMENT OF BONUS.—(1) If a person paid a bonus under this section fails to complete the total period of active duty specified in subsection (b)(2), the person shall refund to the United States the amount that bears the same ratio to the amount of the bonus payment as the unserved part of that total period bears to the total period.

(2) Subject to paragraph (3), an obligation to reimburse the United States imposed under paragraph (1) is for all purposes a debt owed to the United States.

(3) The Secretary concerned may waive, in whole or in part, a refund required under paragraph (1) if the Secretary concerned determines that recovery would be against equity and good conscience or would be contrary to the best interests of the United States.

(4) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered less than five years after the termination of an agreement under this section does not discharge the member signing such agreement from a debt arising under the agreement or this subsection.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 7—ALLOWANCES

Sec.
401. Definitions.

* * * * * * *

435. Funeral honors duty: flat rate allowance.

* * * * * * *

§ 404. Travel and transportation allowances: general

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(i)(1) In the case of a member of a reserve component performing active duty for training or inactive-duty training who is not otherwise entitled to travel and transportation allowances in connection with such duty under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may reimburse the member for housing service charge expenses incurred by the member in occupying transient government housing during the performance of such duty. *If transient government housing is unavailable, the Secretary concerned may provide the member with lodging in kind in the same manner as members entitled to such allowances under subsection (a).*

* * * * * * *

(3) The Secretary may pay service charge expenses under paragraph (1) *and expenses of providing lodging in kind under such paragraph* out of funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the reserve component concerned. *Use of Government charge cards is authorized for payment of these expenses.*

* * * * * * *

§ 404a. Travel and transportation allowances: temporary lodging expenses

(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member of a uniformed service who is ordered to make a change of permanent station—

(1) from any duty station to a duty station in the United States (other than Hawaii or Alaska); [or]

(2) from a duty station in the United States (other than Hawaii or Alaska) to a duty station outside the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska; *or*

(3) in the case of an enlisted member who is reporting to the member's first permanent duty station, from the member's home of record or initial technical school to that first permanent duty station;

shall be paid or reimbursed for subsistence expenses actually incurred by the member and the member's dependents while occupying temporary quarters incident to that change of permanent station. In the case of a change of permanent station described in [clause (1)] *paragraph (1) or (3)*, the period for which such expenses are to be paid or reimbursed may not exceed 10 days. In the case of a change of permanent station described in [clause (2)] *paragraph (2)*, the period for which such expenses are to be paid or reimbursed may not exceed five days and such payment or reimbursement may be provided only for expenses incurred before leaving the United States (other than Hawaii or Alaska).

* * * * * * *

§ 411d. Travel and transportation allowances: transportation incident to personal emergencies for certain members and dependents

(a) * * *

(b)(1) In the case of a member stationed outside the continental United States and the dependents of such a member, transportation under this section may be provided from the location of the member or dependents, at the time notification of the personal emergency is received, or the member's permanent duty station (and if the member's dependents reside at another overseas location and receive a station allowance, from that location)—

(A) to the international airport in the continental United States closest to the location from which the member and his dependents departed; [or]

(B) to any airport in the continental United States to which travel can be arranged at the same or a lower cost as travel obtained under subparagraph (A); or

[(B)] *(C)* to an airport in Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, or any other location outside the continental United States, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

* * * * * * *

§ 435. Funeral honors duty: flat rate allowance

(a) ALLOWANCE AUTHORIZED.—Under uniform regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of the Ready Reserve

of an armed force may be paid an allowance of $50, at the discretion of the Secretary concerned, for funeral honors duty performed pursuant to section 12305 of title 10 or section 115 of title 32, if the member is engaged in the performance of that duty for at least two hours.

(b) RELATION TO PERFORMANCE OF FUNERAL HONORS DUTY.—The allowance under this section shall constitute the single, flat-rate monetary allowance authorized for the performance of funeral honors duty pursuant to section 12503 of title 10 or section 115 of title 32 and shall constitute payment in full to the member, regardless of grade in which serving.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 9—LEAVE

* * * * * * *

§ 501. Payments for unused accrued leave

(a) In this section, the term "discharge" means—

(1) in the case of an enlisted member, separation or release from active duty under honorable [conditions or] *conditions,* appointment as an officer*, or a reenlistment of the member (regardless of when the reenlistment occurs)*;

* * * * * * *

(b)(1) * * *

(2) Payment may not be made under this subsection to a member who is discharged for the purpose of accepting an appointment or a warrant[, or entering into an enlistment,] in any uniformed service.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 19—ADMINISTRATION

* * * * * * *

§ 1002. Additional training or duty without pay: Reserves and members of National Guard

(a) * * *

(b)*(1)* A member who performs training or other duty without pay under subsection (a) may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be authorized the travel and transportation allowances prescribed by section 404 (a)–(d), and (f), of this title for travel performed to and from that training or duty, and, during the performance of that training or duty, be furnished with subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary concerned.

(2) If a military technician (dual status), as described in section 10216 of title 10, is performing active duty without pay while on leave from technician employment, as authorized by section 6323(d) of title 5, the Secretary concerned may authorize the payment of a per diem allowance to the military technician in lieu of commutation for subsistence and quarters under paragraph (1).

* * * * * * *

§ 1007. Deductions from pay

(a) * * *

(b) An amount due the United States from an enlisted member of the Army or the Air Force for articles sold to him on credit under section 4621(a)(1) or 9621(a)(1) of title 10, as the case may be, shall be deducted from the next pay due him after the sale is reported. **[**An amount due the United States from an enlisted member of the Army or the Air Force for tobacco sold to him by the United States under section 4623 or 9623 of title 10 shall be deducted from his pay in the manner provided for the settlement of clothing accounts.**]**

* * * * * * *

§ 1009. Adjustments of monthly basic pay

(a) ADJUSTMENT REQUIRED.—*(1)* Whenever the General Schedule of compensation for Federal classified employees, as contained in section 5332 of title 5, is adjusted upward as provided in section 5303 of such title, the President shall immediately make an upward adjustment in the monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services by section 203(a) of this title.

(2) On and after April 30, 1999, the actual basic pay for commissioned officers in grades O–7 through O–10 may not exceed the rate of pay for level III of the Executive Schedule, and the actual basic pay for all other officers and enlisted members may not exceed the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.

* * * * * * *

[(c) EQUAL PERCENTAGE INCREASE FOR ALL MEMBERS.—Subject to subsection (d), an adjustment under this section shall provide all eligible members with an increase in the monthly basic pay which is of the same percentage as the overall average percentage increase in the General Schedule rates of both basic pay and locality pay for civilian employees.**]**

(c) PERCENTAGE INCREASE FOR ALL MEMBERS.—(1) Subject to subsection (d), an adjustment taking effect under this section during a fiscal year shall provide all eligible members with an increase in the monthly basic pay by the percentage equal to the sum of—

(A) 0.5 percent; plus

(B) the percentage calculated as provided under section 5303(a) of title 5.

(2) The calculation required by paragraph (1)(B) shall be made without regard to whether rates of pay under the statutory pay systems (as defined in section 5302 of title 5) are actually increased during that fiscal year under section 5303 of such title by the percentage so calculated.

* * * * * * *

TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * * * *

PART III—EMPLOYEES

* * * * * * *

Subpart D—Pay and Allowances

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 53—PAY RATES AND SYSTEMS

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE PAY RATES

* * * * * * *

§ 5313. Positions at level II

Level II of the Executive Schedule applies to the following positions, for which the annual rate of basic pay shall be the rate determined with respect to such level under chapter 11 of title 2, as adjusted by section 5318 of this title:

Deputy Secretary of Defense.

* * * * * * *

[Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology.]

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics

* * * * * * *

§ 5314. Positions at level III

Level III of the Executive Schedule applies to the following positions, for which the annual rate of basic pay shall be the rate determined with respect to such level under chapter 11 of title 2, as adjusted by section 5318 of this title:

Solicitor General of the United States.

* * * * * * *

Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology.

Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Material Readiness.

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

§ 5373. Limitation on pay fixed by administrative action

[Except as provided] *(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and* by the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 400) and notwithstanding the provisions of other statutes, the head of an Executive agency or military department who is authorized to fix by administrative action the annual rate of basic pay for a position or employee may not fix the rate at more than the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule. This section does not impair the authorities provided by—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) Subsection (a) shall not affect the authority of the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to fix the pay of a civilian employee paid from nonappropriated funds, except that the annual rate of basic pay (including any portion of such pay attributable to comparability with private-sector pay in a locality) of such an employee may not be fixed at a rate greater than the rate for level III of the Executive Schedule.

* * * * * * *

Subpart E—Attendance and Leave

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 63—LEAVE

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE

* * * * * * *

§ 6304. Annual leave; accumulation

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4)(A) For purposes of this subsection, the deployment of an emergency essential employee of the Department of Defense to a combat zone outside the United States shall be deemed an exigency of the public business, and any leave that is lost by an employee as a result of such deployment (regardless of whether such leave was scheduled) shall be—

(i) restored to the employee; and

(ii) credited and available in accordance with paragraph (2).

(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term "Department of Defense emergency essential employee"—

(i) means a civilian employee of the Department of Defense, including a nonappropriated fund instrumentality employee (as defined by section 1587(a)(1) of title 10) whose assigned duties and responsibilities would be necessary during a period that follows the evacuation of nonessential personnel during a declared emergency or the outbreak of combat operations or war; and

(ii) includes an employee who is hired on a temporary or permanent basis.

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—OTHER PAID LEAVE

§ 6323. Military leave; Reserves and National Guardsmen

(a)(1) Subject to paragraph (2) of this subsection, an employee as defined by section 2105 of this title or an individual employed by the government of the District of Columbia, permanent or tem-

porary indefinite, is entitled to leave without loss in pay, time, or performance or efficiency rating for active duty*, inactive-duty training (as defined in section 101 of title 37),* or engaging in field or coast defense training under sections 502–505 of title 32 as a Reserve of the armed forces or member of the National Guard. Leave under this subsection accrues for an employee or individual at the rate of 15 days per fiscal year and, to the extent that it is not used in a fiscal year, accumulates for use in the succeeding fiscal year until it totals 15 days at the beginning of a fiscal year.

* * * * * * *

(d)(1) A military reserve technician described in section 8401(30) is entitled at such person's request to leave without loss of, or reduction in, pay, leave to which such person is otherwise entitled, credit for time or service, or performance or efficiency rating for each day, not to exceed 44 workdays in a calendar year, in which such person is on active duty without pay, as authorized pursuant to section 12315 of title 10, under section 12301(b) or 12301(d) of title 10 (other than active duty during a war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress) for participation in [noncombat] operations outside the United States, its territories and possessions.

* * * * * * *

Subpart G—Insurance and Annuities

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 83—RETIREMENT

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER III—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

§ 8334. Deductions, contributions, and deposits

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) Each employee or Member credited with civilian service after July 31, 1920, for which retirement deductions or deposits have not been made, may deposit with interest an amount equal to the following percentages of his basic pay received for that service:

	Percentage of basic pay	Service period
Employee	2½	August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926.
	3½	July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942.
	5	July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1948.
	6	July 1, 1948, to October 31, 1956.
	6½	November 1, 1956, to December 31, 1969.
* * * *	* *	*
Nuclear materials courier	7	October 1, 1977 [to the day before the date of the enactment of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999] *to October 16, 1998.*

Percentage of basic pay	Service period
7.5	[The date of the enactment of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999] *October 17, 1998* to December 31, 1998.
7.75	January 1, 1999 to December 31, 1999.
7.9	January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000.
8	January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2002.
7.5	After December 31, 2002.

Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection and any provision of section 206(b)(3) of the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983, the percentage of basic pay required under this subsection in the case of an individual described in section 8402(b)(2) shall, with respect to any covered service (as defined by section 203(a)(3) of such Act) performed by such individual after December 31, 1983, and before January 1, 1987, be equal to 1.3 percent, and, with respect to any such service performed after December 31, 1986, be equal to the amount that would have been deducted from the employee's basic pay under subsection (k) of this section if the employee's pay had been subject to that subsection during such period.

* * * * * * *

§ 8337. Disability retirement

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(h)(1) As used in this subsection, the term "technician" means an individual employed under section 709(a) of title 32 *or section 10216 of title 10,* who, as a condition of the employment, is required under section 709(b) of [such title to be a member of the National Guard and to hold a specified military grade.] *title 32 or section 10216 of title 10, respectively, to be a member of the Selected Reserve.*

(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, an individual shall be retired under this section if the individual—

(i) is separated from employment as a technician under section 709(e)(1) of title 32 *or section 10216 of title 10* by reason of a disability that disqualifies the individual from membership in the [National Guard or from holding the military grade required for such employment] *Selected Reserve*;

* * * * * * *

(3) Any individual applying for or receiving any annuity pursuant to this subsection shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Office, be considered by any agency of the Government before any vacant position in the agency is filled if—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) the position is at the same grade or equivalent level as the position from which the individual was separated under section 709(e)(1) of title 32 *or section 10216 of title 10*.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 84—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—BASIC ANNUITY

* * * * * * *

§ 8414. Early retirement

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(c) A military reserve technician who is separated from technician service, after becoming 50 years of age and completing 25 years of service, by reason of ceasing to satisfy the condition described in section 8401(30)(B) is entitled to an annuity.]

(c) PERMANENT LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER.—(1) Effective October 1, 2007, the total number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve may not exceed 175. If at any time after the preceding sentence takes effect the number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve exceeds the number specified in the limitation in the preceding sentence, the Secretary of Defense shall require that the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, or both, take immediate steps to reduce the number of such technicians in order to comply with such limitation.

(2) Effective October 1, 2001, the total number of non-dual status technicians employed by the National Guard may not exceed 1,950. If at any time after the preceding sentence takes effect the number of non-dual status technicians employed by the National Guard exceeds the number specified in the limitation in the preceding sentence, the Secretary of Defense shall require that the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, or both, take immediate steps to reduce the number of such technicians in order to comply with such limitation.

* * * * * * *

§ 8422. Deductions from pay; contributions for military service

(a)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) The applicable percentage under this paragraph for civilian service shall be as follows:

* * * * * * *

Employee	7	January 1, 1987, to December 31, 1998.
	7.25	January 1, 1999, to December 31, 1999.
	7.4	January 1, 2000, to December 31, 2000.
	7.5	January 1, 2001, to December 31, 2002.
	7	After December 31, 2002.

Nuclear materials courier	7	January 1, 1987 [to the day before the date of the enactment of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.] *to October 16, 1998*
	7.5	[The date of the enactment of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999] *October 17, 1998* to December 31, 1998.]
	7.75	January 1, 1999 to December 31, 1999.
	7.9	January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000.
	8	January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001.
	7.5	After December 31, 2002.

* * * * * * *

TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1—ORGANIZATION

Sec.
101. Definitions.

* * * * * * *

[114. Honor guard functions at funerals for veterans.]
114. Funeral honors functions at funerals for veterans.
115. Funeral honors duty performed as a Federal function.

* * * * * * *

§ 113. Federal financial assistance for support of additional duties assigned to the Army National Guard

(a) * * *

(b) COVERED ACTIVITIES.—(1) * * *

(2) Paragraph (1)(B) does not apply to an activity that, on [the date of the enactment of this subsection] *October 17, 1998*, was performed for the Federal Government by employees of the Federal Government or employees of a State.

* * * * * * *

[§ 114. Honor guard functions at funerals for veterans]

§ 114. Funeral honors functions at funerals for veterans

Subject to such regulations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, the performance of [honor guard] *funeral honors* functions by members of the National Guard at funerals for veterans of the armed forces may be treated by the Secretary concerned as a Federal function for which appropriated funds may be used. Any such performance of [honor guard] *funeral honors* functions at such a funeral may not be considered to be a period of drill or training [otherwise required]*, but may be*

performed as funeral honors duty as prescribed in section 115 of this title.

§ 115. Funeral honors duty performed as a Federal function

(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States may be ordered to funeral honors duty, with the consent of the member, to prepare for or perform funeral honors functions at the funeral of a veteran (as defined in section 1491 of title 10).

(b) A member ordered to funeral honors duty under this section shall be required to perform a minimum of two hours of such duty in order to receive service credit under section 1273(a)(2)(E) of title 10 and compensation under section 435 of title 37 if authorized by the Secretary concerned.

(c) Funeral honors duty (and travel directly to and from that duty) under this section shall be treated as the equivalent of inactive-duty training (and travel directly to and from that training) for the purposes of this section and the provisions of title 10, title 37, and title 38, including provisions relating to the determination of eligibility for and the receipt of benefits and entitlements provided under those titles for Reserves performing inactive-duty training and for their dependents and survivors, except that a member is not entitled by reason of performance of funeral honors duty to any allowances, or other compensation provided for in title 37 other than that provided in section 435 of that title and in subsection (d).

(d) A member who performs funeral honors duty under this section is entitled to reimbursement for travel and transportation expenses incurred in conjunction with such duty as authorized under chapter 7 of title 37, if such duty is performed at a location 50 miles or more from the member's residence.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 5—TRAINING

* * * * * * *

§ 509. National Guard Challenge Program of opportunities for civilian youth

[(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, may conduct a National Guard civilian youth opportunities program (to be known as the "National Guard Challenge Program") to use the National Guard to provide military-based training, including supervised work experience in community service and conservation projects, to civilian youth who cease to attend secondary school before graduating so as to improve the life skills and employment potential of such youth.]

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, may use the National Guard to conduct a civilian youth opportunities program, to be known as the "National Guard Challenge Program", which shall consist of at least a 22-week residential program and a 12-month post-residential mentoring period. The National Guard

Challenge Program shall seek to improve life skills and employment potential of participants by providing military-based training and supervised work experience, together with the core program components of assisting participants to receive a high school diploma or its equivalent, leadership development, promoting fellowship and community service, developing life coping skills and job skills, and improving physical fitness and health and hygiene.

(b) CONDUCT OF THE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the conduct of the National Guard Challenge Program in such States as the Secretary considers to be appropriate, except that Federal expenditures under the program may not exceed **[**$50,000,000**]** *$62,500,000* for any fiscal year.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 7—SERVICE, SUPPLY, AND PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

[§ 709. Technicians: employment, use, status

[(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and subject to subsection (b) of this section persons may be employed as technicians in—

[(1) the administration and training of the National Guard; and

[(2) the maintenance and repair of supplies issued to the National Guard or the armed forces.

[(b) A technician employed under subsection (a) shall, while so employed—

[(1) be a member of the National Guard;

[(2) hold the military grade specified by the Secretary concerned for that position; and

[(3) wear the uniform appropriate for the member's grade and component of the armed forces while performing duties as a technician.

[(c) The Secretary concerned shall designate the adjutants general referred to in section 314 of this title, to employ and administer the technicians authorized by this section.

[(d) A technician employed under subsection (a) is an employee of the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force, as the case may be, and an employee of the United States. However, a position authorized by this section is outside the competitive service if the technician employed therein is required under subsection (b) to be a member of the National Guard.

[(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned—

[(1) a technician who is employed in a position in which National Guard membership is required as a condition of employment and who is separated from the National Guard or ceases to hold the military grade specified for his position by the Secretary concerned shall be promptly separated from his technician employment by the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned;

[(2) a technician who is employed in a position in which National Guard membership is required as a condition of employment and who fails to meet the military security standards established by the Secretary concerned for a member of a reserve component of the armed force under his jurisdiction may be separated from his employment as a technician and concurrently discharged from the National Guard by the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned;

[(3) a technician may, at any time, be separated from his technician employment for cause by the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned;

[(4) a reduction in force, removal, or an adverse action involving discharge from technician employment, suspension, furlough without pay, or reduction in rank or compensation shall be accomplished by the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned;

[(5) a right of appeal which may exist with respect to clause (1), (2), (3), or (4) shall not extend beyond the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned; and

[(6) a technician shall be notified in writing of the termination of his employment as a technician and, unless the technician is serving under a temporary appointment, is serving in a trial or probationary period, or has voluntarily ceased to be a member of the National Guard when such membership is a condition of employment, such notification shall be given at least 30 days before the termination date of such employment.

[(f) Sections 2108, 3502, 7511, and 7512 of title 5 do not apply to any person employed under this section.

[(g)(1) Notwithstanding sections 5544(a) and 6101(a) of title 5 or any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned may, in the case of technicians assigned to perform operational duties at air defense sites—

[(A) prescribe the hours of duties;

[(B) fix the rates of basic compensation; and

[(C) fix the rates of additional compensation;

to reflect unusual tours of duty, irregular additional duty, and work on days that are ordinarily nonworkdays. Additional compensation under this subsection may be fixed on an annual basis and is determined as an appropriate percentage, not in excess of 12 percent, of such part of the rate of basic pay for the position as does not exceed the minimum rate of basic pay for GS–10 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5.

[(2) Notwithstanding sections 5544(a) and 6101(a) of title 5 or any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned may, for technicians other than those described in paragraph (1), prescribe the hours of duty for technicians. Notwithstanding sections 5542 and 5543 of title 5 or any other provision of law, such technicians shall be granted an amount of compensatory time off from their scheduled tour of duty equal to the amount of any time spent by them in irregular or overtime work, and shall not be entitled to compensation for such work.

[(i) The Secretary concerned may not prescribe for purposes of eligibility for Federal recognition under section 301 of this title a qualification applicable to technicians employed under subsection

(a) that is not applicable pursuant to that section to the other members of the National Guard in the same grade, branch, position, and type of unit or organization involved.]

§ 709. Technicians: employment, use, status

(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and subject to subsections (b) and (c), persons may be employed as technicians in—

(1) the administration and training of the National Guard; and

(2) the maintenance and repair of supplies issued to the National Guard or the armed forces.

(b) Except as authorized in subsection (c), a person employed under subsection (a) must meet each of the following requirements:

(1) Be a military technician (dual status) as defined in section 10216(a) of title 10.

(2) Be a member of the National Guard.

(3) Hold the military grade specified by the Secretary concerned for that position.

(4) While performing duties as a military technician (dual status), wear the uniform appropriate for the member's grade and component of the armed forces .

(c)(1) A person may be employed under subsection (a) as a non-dual status technician (as defined by section 10217 of title 10) if the technician position occupied by the person has been designated by the Secretary concerned to be filled only by a non-dual status technician.

(2) The total number of non-dual status technicians in the National Guard is specified in section 10217(c)(2) of title 10.

(d) The Secretary concerned shall designate the adjutants general referred to in section 314 of this title to employ and administer the technicians authorized by this section.

(e) A technician employed under subsection (a) is an employee of the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force, as the case may be, and an employee of the United States. However, a position authorized by this section is outside the competitive service if the technician employed in that position is required under subsection (b) to be a member of the National Guard.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned—

(1) a person employed under subsection (a) who is a military technician (dual status) and otherwise subject to the requirements of subsection (b) who—

(A) is separated from the National Guard or ceases to hold the military grade specified by the Secretary concerned for that position shall be promptly separated from military technician (dual status) employment by the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned; and

(B) fails to meet the military security standards established by the Secretary concerned for a member of a reserve component under his jurisdiction may be separated from employment as a military technician (dual status) and concurrently discharged from the National Guard by the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned;

(2) a technician may, at any time, be separated from his technician employment for cause by the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned;

(3) a reduction in force, removal, or an adverse action involving discharge from technician employment, suspension, furlough without pay, or reduction in rank or compensation shall be accomplished by the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned;

(4) a right of appeal which may exist with respect to paragraph (1), (2), or (3) shall not extend beyond the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned; and

(5) a technician shall be notified in writing of the termination of his employment as a technician and, unless the technician is serving under a temporary appointment, is serving in a trial or probationary period, or has voluntarily ceased to be a member of the National Guard when such membership is a condition of employment, such notification shall be given at least 30 days before the termination date of such employment.

(g) Sections 2108, 3502, 7511, and 7512 of title 5 do not apply to a person employed under this section.

(h) Notwithstanding sections 5544(a) and 6101(a) of title 5 or any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned may prescribe the hours of duty for technicians. Notwithstanding sections 5542 and 5543 of title 5 or any other provision of law, such technicians shall be granted an amount of compensatory time off from their scheduled tour of duty equal to the amount of any time spent by them in irregular or overtime work, and shall not be entitled to compensation for such work.

(i) The Secretary concerned may not prescribe for purposes of eligibility for Federal recognition under section 301 of this title a qualification applicable to technicians employed under subsection (a) that is not applicable pursuant to that section to the other members of the National Guard in the same grade, branch, position, and type of unit or organization involved.

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992 AND 1993

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

PART B—RESERVE FORCES

* * * * * * *

SEC. 414. [PILOT] PROGRAM FOR ACTIVE COMPONENT SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES.

(a) [PILOT] PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army shall carry out a [pilot] program to provide active component advisers to combat units, combat support units, and combat service support units in the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve that have a high priority for deployment on a time-phased troop deployment list or have another contingent high priority for deployment. The advisers shall be assigned to full-time duty in connection with organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training such units.

* * * * * * *

(c) PERSONNEL TO BE ASSIGNED.—(1) The Secretary shall assign not less than [2,000] *5,000* active component personnel to serve as advisers under the program. [After September 30, 1996, the number under the preceding sentence shall be increased to not less than 5,000.]

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

* * * * * * *

PART B—SERVICE ACADEMIES

[SEC. 511. LIMITATION ON THE NUMBER OF CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN AUTHORIZED TO ATTEND THE SERVICE ACADEMIES.

[(a) REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZED STRENGTHS.—The authorized strength of the Corps of Cadets of the United States Military Academy, the Air Force Cadets of the United States Air Force Academy, and the brigade of midshipmen of the United States Naval Academy may not exceed 4,000 for each service academy for class years beginning after 1994.

[(b) CLASS REDUCTIONS NOT TO AFFECT CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS.—Any reduction in the number of appointments to the class of a service academy required as a result of subsection (a) may not be achieved by reducing the number of appointments under section 4342(a), 6954(a), or 9342(a) of title 10, United States Code, as applicable.

[(c) GAO REPORT.—(1) The Comptroller General of the United States shall determine for each of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps the percentage for each benchmark year of the commissioned officers receiving an original appointment during that year who were graduates of a service academy. The Comptroller General shall also determine the average of those annual percentages for each of those Armed Forces.

[(2) The Comptroller General shall select the benchmark years (including the number of years to be used as benchmark years) for purposes of paragraph (1). The Comptroller General may select different benchmark years for each of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Each year selected as a benchmark year shall be one for which the active duty strength of the Armed Force concerned was approximately the authorized end strength established by law

for that Armed Force for members on active duty for fiscal year 1995.

[(3) Not later than February 15, 1992, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report describing the results of the determinations of the Comptroller General under paragraph (1).

[(d) SERVICE ACADEMY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "service academy" means the United States Military Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, or the United States Naval Academy.

[(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 531 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (104 Stat. 1563; 10 U.S.C. 4342 note) is repealed.]

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle D—Other Matters

731. Chiropractic health care demonstration program.
731. Chiropractic health care.

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

* * * * * * *

Subtitle E—Other Matters

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 558. MILITARY RECRUITING ON CAMPUS.

[(a) DENIAL OF FUNDS.—(1) No funds available to the Department of Defense or the Department of Transportation may be provided by grant or contract to any institution of higher education that has a policy of denying, or which effectively prevents, the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Transportation from obtaining for military recruiting purposes—

[(A) entry to campuses or access to students on campuses; or

[(B) access to directory information pertaining to students.

[(2) Students referred to in paragraph (1) are individuals who are 17 years of age or older.

[(b) PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINATION.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Transportation, shall prescribe regulations that contain procedures for determining if and when an educational institution has denied or prevented access to students or information described in subsection (a).

[(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "directory information" means, with respect to a student, the student's name, address, telephone listing, date and place of birth, level of education, degrees received, and the most recent previous educational institution enrolled in by the student.]

* * * * * * *

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 731. CHIROPRACTIC HEALTH CARE [DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM].

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PROGRAM.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) During fiscal year 2000, the Secretary shall continue to furnish the same chiropractic care in the military medical treatment facilities designated pursuant to paragraph (2)(A) as the chiropractic care furnished during the demonstration program.

* * * * * * *

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) Not later than January 30, 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the [Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives] *Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives* a report that identifies the additional treatment facilities designated to furnish chiropractic care under the program that were not so designated before the report required by paragraph (1) was prepared, together with the plan for the conduct of the program at the additional treatment facilities.

* * * * * * *

(5) Not later than [May 1, 2000] *January 31, 2000*, the Secretary shall submit to the committees referred to in paragraph (3) a final report in accordance with the plan submitted pursuant to paragraph (2).

(d) OVERSIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) The oversight advisory committee shall assist the Secretary of Defense regarding—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) the preparation of the reports required under subsection (c); [and]

(D) the evaluation of the program[.]*; and*

(E) if the Secretary submits an implementation plan pursuant to subsection (e), the preparation of such plan.

* * * * * * *

(5) The Secretary shall—

(A) make full use of the oversight advisory committee in preparing—

(i) the final report on the demonstration program conducted under this section; and

(ii) the implementation plan described in subsection (e); and

(B) provide opportunities for members of the committee to provide views as part of such final report and plan.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—If the Secretary of Defense recommends in the final report submitted under subsection (c) that chiropractic health care services should be offered in medical care facilities of the Armed Forces or as a health care service covered under the TRICARE program, the Secretary shall, not later than March 31, 2000, submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate an implementation plan for the full integration of chiropractic health care services into the military health care system of the Department of Defense, including the TRICARE program. Such implementation plan shall include—

(1) a detailed analysis of the projected costs of fully integrating chiropractic health care services into the military health care system;

(2) the proposed scope of practice for chiropractors who would provide services to covered beneficiaries under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code;

(3) the proposed military medical treatment facilities at which such services would be provided;

(4) the military readiness requirements for chiropractors who would provide services to such covered beneficiaries; and

(5) any other relevant factors that the Secretary considers appropriate.

[(e)] *(f)* DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term base closure law" means each of the following:

(1) The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(2) Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(3) Section 2687 of title 10, United States Code.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 514 OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

[SEC. 514. (a) DENIAL OF FUNDS FOR PREVENTING ROTC ACCESS TO CAMPUS.—None of the funds made available in this or any other Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Edu-

cation, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for any fiscal year may be provided by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to a covered educational entity if the Secretary of Defense determines that the covered educational entity has a policy or practice (regardless of when implemented) that either prohibits, or in effect prevents—

[(1) the maintaining, establishing, or operation of a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps (in accordance with section 654 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable Federal laws) at the covered educational entity; or

[(2) a student at the covered educational entity from enrolling in a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at another institution of higher education.

[(b) DENIAL OF FUNDS FOR PREVENTING FEDERAL MILITARY RECRUITING ON CAMPUS.—None of the funds made available in this or any other Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for any fiscal year may be provided by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to a covered educational entity if the Secretary of Defense determines that the covered educational entity has a policy or practice (regardless of when implemented) that either prohibits, or in effect prevents—

[(1) entry to campuses, or access to students (who are 17 years of age or older) on campuses, for purposes of Federal military recruiting; or

[(2) access by military recruiters for purposes of Federal military recruiting to the following information pertaining to students (who are 17 years of age or older) enrolled at the covered educational entity:

[(A) student names, addresses, and telephone listings; and

[(B) if known, student ages, levels of education, and majors.

[(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation established in subsection (a) or (b) shall not apply to a covered educational entity if the Secretary of Defense determines that—

[(1) the covered educational entity has ceased the policy or practice described in such subsection;

[(2) the institution of higher education involved has a longstanding policy of pacifism based on historical religious affiliation; or

[(3) the institution of higher education involved is prohibited by the law of any State, or by the order of any State court, from allowing Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps activities or Federal military recruiting on campus, except that this paragraph shall apply only during the one-year period beginning on the effective date of this section.

[(d) NOTICE OF DETERMINATIONS.—Whenever the Secretary of Defense makes a determination under subsection (a), (b), or (c), the Secretary—

[(1) shall transmit a notice of the determination to the Secretary of Education and to the Congress; and

[(2) shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of the determination and the effect of the determination on the eligi-

bility of the covered educational entity for contracts and grants.

[(e) SEMIANNUAL NOTICE IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—The Secretary of Defense shall publish in the Federal Register once every 6 months a list of each covered educational entity that is currently ineligible for contracts and grants by reason of a determination of the Secretary under subsection (a) or (b).

[(f) COVERED EDUCATIONAL ENTITY.—For purposes of this section, the term "covered educational entity" means an institution of higher education, or a subelement of an institution of higher education.

[(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, by which date the Secretary of Defense shall have published final regulations in consultation with the Secretary of Education to carry out this section.]

SECTION 213 OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

PRESENTATION OF UNITED STATES FLAG UPON RETIREMENT

SEC. 213. (a) Upon the release of an officer of the commissioned corps of the Service from active commissioned service for retirement, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall present a United States flag to the officer.

(b) MULTIPLE PRESENTATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED.—An officer is not eligible for presentation of a flag under subsection (a) if the officer has previously been presented a flag under this section or any other provision of law providing for the presentation of a United States flag incident to release from active service for retirement.

(c) NO COST TO RECIPIENT.—The presentation of a flag under this section shall be at no cost to the recipient.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 25 OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS' ACT OF 1948

SEC. 25. (a) Upon the release of a commissioned officer from active commissioned service for retirement, the Secretary of Commerce shall present a United States flag to the officer.

(b) MULTIPLE PRESENTATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED.—An officer is not eligible for presentation of a flag under subsection (a) if the officer has previously been presented a flag under this section or any other provision of law providing for the presentation of a United States flag incident to release from active service for retirement.

(c) NO COST TO RECIPIENT.—The presentation of a flag under this section shall be at no cost to the recipient.

SECTION 516 OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 516. Presentation of United States flag upon retirement

(a) * * *

(b) MULTIPLE PRESENTATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED.—A member is not eligible for a presentation of a flag under subsection (a) if the member has previously been presented a flag [under this section or section 3681, 6141, and 8681 of title 10.] *under this section or any other provision of law providing for the presentation of a United States flag incident to release from active service for retirement.*

* * * * * * *

SECTION 17 OF THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN

SEC. 17. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(q) The Secretary of Agriculture shall provide technical assistance to the Secretary of Defense, if so requested by the Secretary of Defense, for the purpose of carrying out the overseas special supplemental food program established under section 1060a(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SECTION 4202 OF THE CLINGER–COHEN ACT OF 1996

SEC. 4202. APPLICATION OF SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURES TO CERTAIN COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The authority to issue solicitations for purchases of commercial items in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold pursuant to the special simplified procedures authorized by section 2304(g)(1) of title 10, United States Code, section 303(g)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and section 31(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, as amended by this section, shall expire [three years after the date on which such amendments take effect pursuant to section 4401(b)] *January 1, 2002*. Contracts may be awarded pursuant to solicitations that have been issued.

SECTION 834 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1990 AND 1991

SEC. 834. TEST PROGRAM FOR NEGOTIATION OF COMPREHENSIVE SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLANS

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) TEST PROGRAM PERIOD.—The test program authorized by subsection (a) shall begin on October 1, 1990, unless Congress adopts a resolution disapproving the test program. The test program shall terminate on September 30, [2000.] *2003*.

SECTION 845 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

SEC. 845. AUTHORITY OF THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.

(a) * * *

(b) EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—(1) Subsections [(e)(2) and (e)(3) of such section 2371] *(e)(1)(B) and (e)(2) of such section 2371* shall not apply to projects carried out under subsection (a).

* * * * * * *

SECTION 1505 OF THE WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION CONTROL ACT OF 1992

SEC. 1505. INTERNATIONAL NONPROLIFERATION INITIATIVE.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance under this section terminates at the close of fiscal year [1999] *2000*.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

* * * * * * *

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 2401. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2406(a)(1), and, in the case of the projects described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2406(b), other amounts appropriated pursuant to authorizations enacted after this Act for the projects, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States

Agency	Installation or location	Amount
Chemical Demilitarization Program	Pueblo Chemical Activity, Colorado	[$179,000,000] *$203,500,000*
Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Charleston, South Carolina	$6,200,000
	Total:	[$525,454,000] *$549,954,000*

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2406. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) * * *

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variation authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2401 of this Act may not exceed—

(1) * * *

(2) [$179,000,000] *$203,500,000* (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of this Act for the construction of a chemical demilitarization facility at Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado); and

* * * * * * *

SECTION 2906 OF THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACT OF 1990

SEC. 2906. ACCOUNT

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) The Account shall be closed at the time and in the manner provided for appropriation accounts under section 1555 of title 31, United States Code. Unobligated funds which remain in the Account upon closure shall be held by the Secretary of the Treasury until transferred by law after the congressional defense committees receive the final report transmitted under subsection (c)(2).

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—(1) The Secretary may use the funds in the Account only for the purposes described in section 2905 or, after September 30, 1995, for environmental restoration and property management and disposal at installations closed or realigned under title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note). *After July 13, 2001, the Account shall be the sole source of Federal funds for environmental restoration, property management, and other caretaker costs associated with any real property at military installations closed or realigned under this part or such title II.*

* * * * * * *

(c) REPORTS.—(1)(A) * * *

[(2) Unobligated funds which remain in the Account after the termination of the authority of the Secretary to carry out a closure or realignment under this part shall be held in the Account until transferred by law after the congressional defense committees receive the report transmitted under paragraph (3).]

[(3)] *(2)* No later than 60 days after the termination of the authority of the Secretary to carry out a closure or realignment under this part *and no later than 60 days after the closure of the Account under subsection (a)(3)*, the Secretary shall transmit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an accounting of—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) ACCOUNT EXCLUSIVE SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.—Except for funds deposited into the Account under subsection (a), funds appropriated to the Department of Defense may not be used for purposes described in section 2905(a)(1)(C). The prohibition in this subsection shall expire upon [the termination of the authority of the Secretary to carry out a closure or realignment under this part] *the closure of the Account under subsection (a)(3)*.

SECTION 2922 OF THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

SEC. 2922. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AT ARSENAL FOR A COUNTY LANDFILL.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) CONDITION ON CONVEYANCE.—*(1)* The conveyance shall be subject to the condition that the Department of the Army, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Agriculture (or their agents or assigns) may use the landfill established on the real property conveyed under subsection (a) for the disposal of construction debris, refuse, and other materials related to any restoration and cleanup of Arsenal property. Such use shall be subject to applicable environmental laws and at no cost to the Federal Government.

(2) The landfill established on the real property conveyed under subsection (a) may contain only waste generated in the county in which the landfill is established and waste generated in municipalities located at least in part in that county. The landfill shall be closed and capped after 23 years of operation.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

* * * * * * *

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 2401. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2406(a)(1), and, in the case of the projects described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2406(b), other amounts appropriated pursuant to authorizations enacted after this Act for the projects, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States

Agency	Installation or location	Amount
Chemical Demilitarization Program	Pueblo Chemical Activity, Colorado	[$179,000,000] *$203,500,000*
Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Charleston, South Carolina	$6,200,000
* * * * * * *		
	Total:	[$525,454,000] *$549,954,000*

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2406. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) * * *

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variation authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2401 of this Act may not exceed—

(1) * * *

(2) [$179,000,000] *$203,500,000* (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of this Act for the construction of a chemical demilitarization facility at Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado); and

* * * * * * *

SECTION 3132 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

SEC. 3132. LABORATORY–DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) FUNDING.—Of the funds provided by the Department of Energy to such laboratories for national security activities, the Secretary shall provide a specific amount, not to exceed [6 percent]

3 percent of such funds, to be used by such laboratories for laboratory-directed research and development.

* * * * * * *

DIVISION C OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

* * * * * * *

SEC. 3140. FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SKILLS CRITICAL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NUCLEAR WEAPONS COMPLEX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall conduct a fellowship program for the development of skills critical to the ongoing mission of the Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex. Under the fellowship program, **[**the Secretary shall—

[(1) provide educational assistance**]** *the Secretary shall provide educational assistance* and research assistance to eligible individuals to facilitate the development by such individuals of skills critical to maintaining the ongoing mission of the Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex**[**;**]**.

[(2) employ eligible individuals at the facilities described in subsection (c) in order to facilitate the development of such skills by these individuals; or

[(3) provide eligible individuals with the assistance and the employment.**]**

(b) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—Individuals eligible for participation in the fellowship program *are United States citizens who* are the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) COVERED FACILITIES.—The Secretary shall carry out the fellowship program at or in connection with the following facilities:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) The Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California.

(6) The Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico.

(7) The Sandia National Laboratory, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

* * * * * * *

[(f) FUNDING.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1996 under section 3101(b), $10,000,000 may be used for the purpose of carrying out the fellowship program under this section.]

(f) AGREEMENT.—(1) The Secretary may allow an individual to participate in the program only if the individual signs an agreement described in paragraph (2).

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) shall be in writing, shall be signed by the participant, and shall include the participant's agreement to serve, after completion of the course of study for which the assistance was provided, as a full-time employee in a position in the Department of Energy for a period of time to be established by the Secretary of Energy of not less than one year, if such a position is offered to the participant.

* * * * * * *

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Disposals and Use of Funds

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 3303. DISPOSAL OF CHROMITE AND MANGANESE ORES AND CHROMIUM FERRO AND MANGANESE METAL ELECTROLYTIC.

[(a) DOMESTIC UPGRADING.—In offering to enter into agreements pursuant to any provision of law for the disposal from the National Defense Stockpile of chromite and manganese ores or chromium ferro and manganese metal electrolytic, the President shall give a right of first refusal on all such offers to domestic ferroalloy upgraders.

[(b) DOMESTIC FERROALLOY UPGRADER DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "domestic ferroalloy upgrader" means a company or other business entity that, as determined by the President—

[(1) is engaged in operations to upgrade chromite or manganese ores of metallurgical grade or chromium ferro and manganese metal electrolytic; and

[(2) conducts a significant level of its research, development, engineering, and upgrading operations in the United States.

[SEC. 3304. RESTRICTIONS ON DISPOSAL OF MANGANESE FERRO.

[(a) DISPOSAL OF LOWER GRADE MATERIAL FIRST.—The President may not dispose of high carbon manganese ferro in the National Defense Stockpile that meets the National Defense Stockpile classification of Grade One, Specification 30(a), as revised on May 22,

1992, until completing the disposal of all manganese ferro in the National Defense Stockpile that does not meet such classification. The President may not reclassify manganese ferro in the National Defense Stockpile after the date of the enactment of this Act.

[(b) REQUIREMENT FOR REMELTING BY DOMESTIC FERROALLOY PRODUCERS.—Manganese ferro in the National Defense Stockpile that does not meet the classification specified in subsection (a) may be sold only for remelting by a domestic ferroalloy producer unless the President determines that a domestic ferroalloy producer is not available to acquire the material.

[(c) DOMESTIC FERROALLOY PRODUCER DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "domestic ferroalloy producer" means a company or other business entity that, as determined by the President—

[(1) is engaged in operations to upgrade manganese ores of metallurgical grade or manganese ferro; and

[(2) conducts a significant level of its research, development, engineering, and upgrading operations in the United States.]

* * * * * * *

MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

TITLE XI—FEDERAL SHIP MORTGAGE INSURANCE

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1108. [(a) If the proceeds of an obligation guaranteed under this title are to be used to finance the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of a vessel or vessels which will serve as security for the guarantee of the Secretary, the Secretary is authorized to accept and hold, in escrow under an escrow agreement with the obligor, a portion of the proceeds of all obligations guaranteed under this title whose proceeds are to be so used which is equal to: (i) the excess of the principal amount of all obligations whose proceeds are to be so used over 75 per centum, or 87½ per centum, whichever is applicable under section 1104 of this title, of the amount paid by or for the account of the obligor for the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of the vessel or vessels; (ii) with such interest thereon, if any, as the Secretary may require: *Provided,* That in the event the security for the]

(a) *AUTHORITY TO HOLD OBLIGATION PROCEEDS IN ESCROW.—(1) If the proceeds of an obligation guaranteed under this title are to be used to finance the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of a vessel that will serve as security for the guarantee, the Secretary may accept and hold, in escrow under an escrow agreement with the obligor—*

(A) the proceeds of that obligation, including such interest as may be earned thereon; and

(B) if required by the Secretary, an amount equal to 6 month's interest on the obligation.

(2) The Secretary may release funds held in escrow under paragraph (1) only if the Secretary determines that—

(A) the obligor has paid its portion of the actual cost of construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning; and

(B) the funds released are needed—

(i) to pay, or make reimbursements in connection with payments previously made for work performed in that construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning; or

(ii) to pay for other costs approved by the Secretary, with respect to the vessel or vessels.

(3) If the security for the guarantee of an obligation by the Secretary relates both to a vessel or vessels to be constructed, reconstructed or reconditioned and to a delivered vessel or vessels, the principal amount of such obligation shall be prorated for purposes of this subsection (a) under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 1109. DEPOSIT FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPOSIT FUND.—There is established in the Treasury a deposit fund for purposes of this section. The Secretary may, in accordance with an agreement under subsection (b), deposit into and hold in the deposit fund cash belonging to an obligor to serve as collateral for a guarantee under this title made with respect to the obligor.

(b) AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and an obligor shall enter into a reserve fund or other collateral account agreement to govern the deposit, withdrawal, retention, use, and reinvestment of cash of the obligor held in the deposit fund established by subsection (a).

(2) TERMS.—The agreement shall contain such terms and conditions as are required under this section and such additional terms as are considered by the Secretary to be necessary to protect fully the interests of the United States.

(3) SECURITY INTEREST OF UNITED STATES.—The agreement shall include terms that grant to the United States a security interest in all amounts deposited into the deposit fund.

(c) INVESTMENT.—The Secretary may invest and reinvest any part of the amounts in the deposit fund established by subsection (a) in obligations of the United States with such maturities as ensure that amounts in the deposit fund will be available as required for purposes of agreements under subsection (b). Cash balances of the deposit fund in excess of current requirements shall be maintained in a form of uninvested funds and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay interest on these funds.

(d) WITHDRAWALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The cash deposited into the deposit fund established by subsection (a) may not be withdrawn without the consent of the Secretary.

(2) USE OF INCOME.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary may pay any income earned on cash of an obligor deposited into the deposit fund in accordance with the terms of the agreement with the obligor under subsection (b).

(3) RETENTION AGAINST DEFAULT.—The Secretary may retain and offset any or all of the cash of an obligor in the deposit fund, and any income realized thereon, as part of the Sec-

retary's recovery against the obligor in case of a default by the obligor on an obligation.

* * * * * * *

TITLE XII—WAR RISK INSURANCE

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1214. The authority of the Secretary to provide insurance and reinsurance under this title shall expire June 30, [2000] *2005*.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 3302 OF TITLE 46, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 3302. Exemptions

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(l)(1) The Secretary may issue a permit exempting the following vessels from the requirements of this part for passenger vessels so long as the vessels are owned by nonprofit organizations and operated as nonprofit memorials to merchant mariners:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) The steamship Jeremiah O'Brien (United States official number 243622), [owned by the United States Maritime Administration.] *owned by the National Liberty Ship Memorial, Inc.*

* * * * * * *

SECTION 1305 OF THE PANAMA CANAL ACT OF 1979

DISSOLUTION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 1305. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5)*(A)* Amounts in the Fund may not be obligated or expended in any fiscal year unless the obligation or expenditure is specifically authorized by law.

(B) The office established by subsection (b) is authorized to expend or obligate funds from the Fund for the purposes enumerated in clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (2)(A) until October 1, 2004.

* * * * * * *

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF ROSCOE BARTLETT, GENE TAYLOR AND JOSEPH R. PITTS

We strongly support the committee's action to improve modernization, quality of life and readiness deficiencies that are so desperately needed. There are however, two issues which we believe deserve special attention.

First, the committee rejected an amendment that would have stricken the section of the bill that permits the use of taxpayer dollars for the purpose of killing preborn babies conceived through rape or incest.

Abortion services are already available to Servicewomen and dependents at military hospitals. However, the Department of Defense has had a long standing policy of only using taxpayer dollars to finance an abortion if the life of the mother was in danger. This policy has been in effect since 1984 and no one has asked that it be changed, not the President, not the Under Secretary for health affairs, not the Senate, no one. The policy has worked well and their is no need for change.

There are also cost concerns. We have no idea what the cost implications of this are. We do know that each dollar spent on aborting unborn babies is a dollar not spent on quality of life, health care, modernization or other funding priorities for our troops. We made a commitment to our veterans that they would have health care for life. Now we are telling those veterans who are over 65 that we can not help them. It is just too expensive. What message does this send to them? You were willing to fight and die for your country and we have no money for you, but we do have plenty of money to kill preborn children. In fact, under this new policy Department of Defense dollars can even be used to perform partial birth abortions but not to keep our promise to America's veterans.

Babies conceived in rape or incest are babies nonetheless. They should not be executed because of the crime of a parent and taxpayers should not be forced to pay for a service that they find morally repugnant. Furthermore, there is no demonstrated need for taxpayer funded abortion in cases of rape or incest. The public has long supported the use of taxpayer dollars for abortion only in life-endangerment cases. This section of the bill must be stricken during the House/Senate Conference committee.

Secondly, we are pleased that the committee authorized the National Guard Youth Challenge program at the level requested by the President. During the FY99 Defense Authorization bill the committee hastily placed a $50 million cap on the program. The amount requested for Challenge this year was $62.5 million. The committee wisely increased the cap on the program to that $62.5 million figure. It is our sincere hope that the House/Senate con-

ference committee will authorize Challenge at the $62 million without any restrictions on future funding.

The Challenge program is designed to improve the life skills and employment potential of high school dropouts. Challenge is a 22 week program that is conducted in a disciplined and quasi-military environment. In its six years since the program began, the Challenge program has yielded tremendous success. Challenge participants perform an average of 78 hours of community service while in the program. The average Challenge participant experienced a 1.1 grade level increase in reading and a 1.65 increase in math grade level. The retention rate for the Challenge program is higher than the national high school retention rate. And finally, at graduation from the Challenge program 24% of the participants were placed in jobs, 23% were going to post secondary education programs, 10% had enlisted in the military, 6% were heading to VOTECH program and 26% were pending notification of acceptance from employers, the military and education institutions. Taken together, 96% of graduates had made positive steps to overcome the potential hardships they were facing as high school dropouts.

The Challenge program is a very important program that continues to be an investment in young people with positive potential to continue to return dividends over the long term. It is a great example of how the military can have a positive effect over the community. The Challenge program currently operates in 26 states and seven additional states have applied to participate in the program next year. Those states are Indiana, Nebraska, Florida, South Dakota, Kansas, Washington and New Mexico. In order to allow these states to participate in the successes of Challenge, we can not allow a funding cap to remain in place.

ROSCOE BARTLETT.
GENE TAYLOR.
JOSEPH PITTS.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF PATRICK J. KENNEDY

The Joint Tactical Combat Training System (JTCTS), is a joint U.S Navy and Air Force program that will provide worldwide, real time coordinated combat readiness/proficiency training of all air and sea-based forces using a combination of simulated and real targets.

I view with grave concern the consequences of any action taken that causes unnecessary taxpayer expenditures and further disrupts the deployment of JTCTS training capability to the warfighter. The JTCTS program was funded as requested in the President's Budget, however I supported the requirement to add $14.0 million to the FY2000 budget.

It is imperative that an increase of $6.0 million for research and devlopment is provided to accelerate the overall fielding schedule for fixed ranges and battle group exercises. Likewise, $8.0 million is required to support production specifically to manufacture one additional JTCTS mobile system.

As HR 1401 continues on its legislative course, I hope the JTCTS is funded to accelerate the overall fielding schedule for fixed ranges and battle group exercises in the FY00 budget. Production charges will also assist getting the JTCTS to the warfighters in the Navy and Air Force.

PATRICK J. KENNEDY,
Member of Congress.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON THE FY 2000 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

We regret the Committee's failure to follow the recommendation of the Military Personnel Subcommittee to repeal the statutory prohibition on abortions in overseas military hospitals and restore the law to what it was for many years. If enacted, women stationed overseas would be permitted to use their own funds to obtain abortion services. No federal funds would have been used and health care professionals who are opposed to performing abortions as a matter of conscience or moral principle would not be required to do so.

This is an issue of fundamental fairness. Servicewomen and military dependents stationed abroad do not expect special treatment, only the right to receive the same legally protected medical services that women in the United States receive. We had the opportunity to finally put a stop to the misguided law that has endangered our servicewomen's lives for far too long. It is unfortunate that the full committee did not follow the subcommittee's direction.

The Department of Defense, American Public Health Association, the American Medical Women's Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and the Planned Parenthood Federation of America have all indicated their support for the subcommittee's decision.

If we are to attract the best and brightest of our nation's young people to our Armed Forces we must act to restore this fundamental right. We cannot expect to attain our readiness and recruitment goals when potential soldiers know they will not have the same right to access to health care when they are stationed overseas.

It is our responsibility to restore the right of freedom of choice to women serving overseas in our nation's Armed Forces. Members of the military and their families already give up many freedoms and risk their lives to defend our country. They should not have to sacrifice their privacy, their health or their basic constitutional rights because of a policy with no valid military purpose.

LORETTA SANCHEZ.
LANE EVANS.
ROBERT A. BRADY.
THOMAS H. ALLEN.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
MIKE THOMPSON.
PATRICK J. KENNEDY.
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN IKE SKELTON

H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, is an excellent bill which deserves the support of the Members of the House. I want to commend Chairman Floyd Spence and the Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Members for their leadership and diligence in putting this legislation together. The overwhelming 55–1 vote of approval for this bill in Committee demonstrates that they were successful in their efforts to draft a truly bipartisan measure reflecting the consensus among Members of both parties for an increase in defense spending.

H.R. 1401 is a very strong bill for U.S. national security, which builds upon the President's proposal to increase defense spending by $112 billion over the next six years—a good starting point for a much needed long-term increase in defense spending. It makes vital readiness and modernization improvements which will keep our forces the best trained and the best equipped in the world. But most important, the bill addresses quality of life issues that are at the top of the agenda for service members and their families.

For some time now, I have been saying that we must make this the "Year of the Troops." This bill goes a long way toward showing the men and women in our military that we are committed to taking care of them and taking care of their families. The compensation package, which includes a 4.8 percent pay raise, pay table reform to further increase pay for mid-grade officers and NCOs, and reform of the retirement system, will help address problems our Armed Forces have been experiencing in recruiting and retention. The bill's provisions extending current pay and bonus authorities and expanding recruiting and retention bonus and special pay authorities for specific skills will also help in this area, as will other much-needed quality of life provisions in the bill, including improvements in the TRICARE military health care system, and an increase in funding for military family housing. These pay increases and quality of life improvements are essential to ensuring a decent standard of living for our military personnel and their families.

In addition to the quality of life improvements, I am pleased that H.R. 1401 includes increases in funding for the procurement of weapons, ammunition, and equipment, for research and development, and for operations and maintenance, so that we can modernize our forces while maintaining a high level of readiness and training. In the procurement area, precision weapons and munitions were appropriately emphasized.

My only reservation about H.R. 1401 concerns the Committee's provision relating to operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. I will address this issue, along with a number of my colleagues, in separate Additional Views.

IKE SKELTON.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON FY 2000 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL, H.R. 1401

We regret that the committee included section 1006. We understand and agree with the fundamental intent of the provision, to protect the FY 2000 defense budget, especially individual service readiness accounts, from another unfunded contingency. The current combat operations in Yugoslavia were not contemplated late last year when the Department of Defense was putting together its budget submission which it sent to the Congress early this year. Paragraph (b) of section 1006 requires the President to submit a supplemental appropriations request to pay for any such operation in FY 2000.

Our concern is with paragraph (a), which prohibits the use of funds in FY 2000 for the purpose of conducting combat or peacekeeping operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. We believe it sends the wrong message to Slobodan Milosevic and to our forces now engaged in combat operations.

The May 20th edition of the Washington Post described our work by saying, "The House Armed Services Committee voted to impose new spending restrictions on President Clinton's conduct of the military operation in Yugoslovia." Milosevic may get the impression that he merely has to wait until October 1, 1999 and that U.S. participation in military operations over Yugoslavia will end at that time. Our personnel engaged in military operations may wonder about the mixed signals that Congress is sending once again.

Our colleague, Gene Taylor, offered an amendment during full committee mark up. He did so with the intent to protect the defense budget. The amendment eliminated paragraph (a) and required the President to submit to the Congress, not later than October 1, 1999, a supplemental appropriations request for "such amounts as necessary for the costs during fiscal year 2000 of any combat or peacekeeping operation in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia." There would be no message here for Slobodan Milosevic to misinterpret.

As H.R. 1401 continues on its legislative course, we hope that section 1006 can be improved to address the concerns we have with the current provision.

IKE SKELTON.
NORMAN SISISKY.
JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.
OWEN PICKETT.
LANE EVANS.
GENE TAYLOR.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
MARTIN T. MEEHAN.
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD.
PATRICK J. KENNEDY.
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH.
SILVESTRE REYES.
THOMAS H. ALLEN.
JIM TURNER.
ADAM SMITH.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
JAMES H. MALONEY.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
ROBERT A. BRADY.
ROBERT E. ANDREWS.
BARON P. HILL.
MIKE THOMPSON.
JOHN B. LARSON.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF JAMES M. TALENT

ARMY LOGISTICS MODERNIZATION

Over the past nearly two years, the Army has attempted to develop a plan for how to comprehensively modernize its logistics system, the process by which it supports its installations and, more importantly, its deployed forces. As I have stated previously, no one should dispute the need to undertake this important action. The proper question is not whether to modernize. To the contrary, the central question should be what level of risk is acceptable during that eight to ten year process.

A central focus of the larger effort centers on two small agencies, the Logistics Systems Support Center (LSSC), located in St. Louis, and the Industrial Logistics Systems Center (ILSC), located in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania. Together, LSSC and ILSC are each responsible for designing, maintaining and upgrading major business and logistics software operating systems that support the Army Materiel Command (AMC), the Army, and DoD.

LSSC maintains the Command Commodity Standard System (CCSS), while ILSC maintains the Standard Depot System (SDS). Collectively, these two systems underpin the Army's 24–hour-per-day logistics efforts both stateside and overseas. In principle, their function is not unlike that of the software system that automatically requisitions, for example, retail stock for stores within the Wal-Mart chain. As items are purchased, or as supplies are expended, the system tabulates these facts and automatically reorders. The successful operation of these systems, from anyone's standpoint, is central to the Army's day-to-day operations and, to a lesser extent, the other services. If CCSS and SDS do not operate as required, the Army doesn't either.

Neither system utilizes the up-to-date features and logistics processes that today's modern, private-sector support systems employ. The Army describes CCSS and SDS as "complex, tightly integrated systems that are unique to the Army and difficult to maintain." That description is certainly appropriate. CCSS alone is one of the largest operating system in the world, containing over 10 million lines of computer code, most of it written in COBOL 74. In addition, it has external interfaces, or bridges, to the computer systems of nearly 70 separate DoD agencies. SDS contains over 12 million lines of code and interfaces with two dozen DoD agencies. Both systems are 30 years old, and even though they have been substantially enhanced over that period, they must be modernized.

Yet any modernization effort must first and foremost take into account the complexity of the task.

In short, (1) these two systems play a central role in the Army's logistics operations in peace and war, (2) they are extraordinarily complex systems, (3) they must be modernized, (4) modernization

will require almost a decade by the Army's own determination, and (5) that modernization these systems entails great risk.

The real question is not whether CCSS and SDS should or should not be modernized. The answer to that question is very clear. The question we must ask is how to mitigate risk throughout the process in order to protect readiness.

The Army proposes to modernize CCSS and SDS by turning the effort over to a private-sector contractor. Everyone involved concedes that the Army lacks the technical expertise to design its own system. Unfortunately, it is also clear that after nearly two years of study the Army lacks even a clear conceptual framework of what logistics processes will best support Force XXI or the Army After Next. In brief, the service intends to turn over to a contractor (1) the responsibility of analyzing and determining its logistics requirements, (2) developing new logistics processes that take advantage of cost-saving commercial practices, (3) designing an upgraded CCSS system, and then (4) integrating that new system into the Army's day-to-day operations. This process, using the Army's own analysis, is expected to take as long as ten years.

My primary concern is readiness. Under any scenario, logistics modernization as it relates to CCSS and SDS will be divided into three overlapping phases: (1) sustaining the old system, (2) development of a new operating system, and (3) transitioning from the old system to the new. Throughout most of this process, given the central role of both systems to Army readiness, it is essential that the system remain fully operational until some replacement is defined, developed and running properly.

Under the Army plan, the same information technology specialists and logisticians who have maintained CCSS for 30 years are to be released one year after a prime contractor takes over the LSSC and ILSC centers next May. Most of these same people will undoubtedly find private-sector employment. COBOL programmers in St. Louis can readily find employment. And that is the problem: how can we operate CCSS, and by extension support soldier readiness when these key personnel are gone? As the Army has stated, the only people who have the expertise to maintain CCSS are the very people performing that mission today. The Army is counting on them being hired by the contractor, but there is no guarantee or agreement to that effect. Many will go to work in the private sector. A good number of employees are simply tired of how they have been treated throughout this process. Some workers will retire. Still others will transfer through priority placement to other federal agencies in order to retain their pension benefits.

My amendment directs the Secretary of the Army to provide LSSC and ILSC with the opportunity to reduce their respective centers to their "most efficient organizations" or MEOs. I expect that in St. Louis this would involve the loss of approximately 100 of 300 positions. Each MEO would then partner with the eventual log mod prime contractor and work with them—as a team—through the sustainment and transition phases of CCSS and SDS modernization, gradually reducing their numbers proportionate to what percentage of the old system was still being utilized. In this manner the MEO will "sunset" as their mission is eclipsed by the prime's newer logistics system.

Using this approach, we provide the Army with the necessary readiness 'safety net.' Given the complexity of the current, or legacy, systems, and the difficulties experienced during previous projects of a similar nature, it is entirely likely that any prime contractor will not go smoothly. Through this approach, we will still have on hand the Army's only subject matter experts in sufficient numbers to keep the system running and, more importantly, to support our soldiers. My amendment in no way impedes the Army's efforts to privatize this function. Nor would it delay the effort. It does, however, retain at least a safety net for these two centers so that readiness is protected.

JAMES M. TALENT.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF JAMES M. TALENT

THE NAVY'S F/A–18E/F SUPER HORNET

The House Armed Services Committee has reviewed the F/A–18E/F Super Hornet program in some considerable level of detail as it has progressed through each phase of Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD). In each of the previous three conference reports the Committee has fully supported Navy's requests for low-rate initial production of 12, 20 and 30 aircraft, respectively. In their Fiscal Year 2000 budget submission, the Navy requested 36 E/Fs and authorization for a five-year, multi-year procurement.

The Navy's request makes good sense across the board. First, with literally 99 percent of an exhaustive developmental test program completed as of mid May, "We know," as one test pilot observed in the OT–IIA (operational test) debrief, "more accurate information about how the F/A–18E/F performs in two years than we know about most other aircraft after 20 years of service." Clearly, by any objective measure, flight testing have been intensive—and very successful.

More importantly, regarding the E/F's operational capabilities, Secretary Danzig and the CNO wrote in a recent letter that the Super Hornet "is the aircraft the Navy wants and needs because it gives our warfighters the capability, when compared with current aircraft, to strike twice the number of targets in half the time, while substantially reducing expected losses." And in recent testimony before the Committee, Rear Admiral Nathman, Director, Air Warfare, was unequivocal in his support for the aircraft and for multi-year procurement. In terms of the fleet—where it matters most—these statements, and the facts that back them up, effectively say all that need be said.

Finally, the Super Hornet EMD program is one of only a very few such programs in recent memory to remain below its congressionally mandated cost caps while at the same time meeting schedule, weight and the performance requirements of the service.

The Committee's decision to approve the Navy's Fiscal Year 2000 procurement of 36 aircraft continues a very feasible ramp-up in production. Its further authorization of multi-year procurement pending successful completion of OpEval and achievement of milestone III/recommendation for full-rate production, and the Secretary's assurance of identified savings through multi-year procurement, ensures good value to the American taxpayer and makes for sound defense policy.

JAMES M. TALENT.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF GENE TAYLOR ON H.R. 1401, THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FY 2000

The bill reported from committee is, in my estimation, worthy of support, and I voted for final passage. It is an important piece of legislation that will contribute to the defense of our nation. Also, in the words of our committee ranking member, Ike Skelton, the measure will go a long way toward making this the "year of the troops." I feel additionally that the military construction titles of this bill were prepared in such a way that this important aspect of defense spending will have avoided a serious catastrophe as represented in the underfunded Presidential budget request.

However, I feel compelled to express my extreme disappointment with one section of the bill. I tried to offer an amendment to remove Section 1006 from the bill. I believe this provision will send the wrong message to both our adversary in Serbia and to our own troops who have been sent to the Balkans. Perhaps an unintended consequence of this section is that it will set a date certain for the removal of American military presence.

In essence, paragraph (a) of this section would tell President Milosevic to hang on until October 1, 1999, and no funds would be available for US military operations in Yugoslavia after that date. Nothing can be more harmful to our negotiating position, our military strategy, or the morale of our troops than to send this sort of message.

Paragraph (b), in my opinion, says that Congress refuses to fulfill its duty to provide for our troops as stated in Article 1, section 8, of the Constitution. With the enactment of this section, we will have instead delegated that responsibility to the President of the United States. This is an abdication of our responsibilities as members of Congress, and does further harm to this institution by continuing to add further precedent to the notion that the President, not the Congress, has the right and responsibility to declare war.

My amendment was straightforward. It would have required the President to submit to the Congress, not later than October 1, 1999, a supplemental appropriations request for "such amounts as necessary for the costs during fiscal year 2000 of any combat or peacekeeping operation in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia." Under my amendment, Congress would still retain the authority to determine when and where to commit our forces, and no one would have questions about our nation's resolve or its support for our troops.

During the debate on my amendment, I warned that the press would ignore all of the good contained in this important legislation and report only that Congress had cut funds for troops in the field. Unfortunately, as I feared, the May 20, 1999, Washington Post contained an article titled "Lawmakers Vote to Limit War Powers." The lead sentence of the article reads, "The House Armed Services

Committee voted to impose new spending restrictions on President Clinton's conduct of the military operation in Yugoslavia."

While I disagree with the committee's decision to retain section 1006, I sincerely hope that the provision may be improved to address the real concerns I have referenced above.

GENE TAYLOR.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD ON RE-ESTABLISHING THE 54TH WEATHER RECONNAISSANCE SQUADRON IN GUAM

The 54th Weather Reconnaissance Squadron (WRS) was once based out of Andersen, AFB, Guam. The group was famed for its squadron of "Typhoon Chasers" that flew into emerging and verified Pacific typhoons. Sharing this responsibility for a time, there was also a Navy Airborne Early Warning Squadron based at the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam flying the Navy's weather reconnaissance aircraft. This valuable and brave team of pilots, aviators, airmen and technicians provided accurate early-warnings for Guam, Hawaii and neighboring Pacific nations of impending typhoons.

In the late 1980s, these units were inactivated when it was deemed too costly to justify. The underlying decision was based on the deactivation of several air force wings at Andersen, AFB, the WRS was no longer needed. Defense officials claimed that since there were no aircraft assets permanently stationed there its mission could not be justified. Furthermore, it was maintained that improved weather imagery reconnaissance satellites would be adequate to protect the remaining military assets and the civilian population.

There is today, one squadron—the 53rd WRS (an air force reserve unit) located at Keesler, AFB—performing the vital function of flying into and tracking hurricanes on America's eastern seaboard, the gulf coast, Hawaii, and areas east of the international dateline. Members of Congress have found it desirable to continue to fund and maintain this squadron to supplement the weather satellites, which have limited capabilities. However, in the Western Pacific there is currently no such capability.

Guam is geographically located in an area known to meteorologists as "typhoon alley." Guam depends on information and typhoon warning from the Navy's Joint Typhoon Warning Center (JTWC) and the National Weather Service (NWS), along with satellite information to warn its population of an on-coming storm. The JTWC, once located on Guam, is now located in Hawaii.

The data that is collected by the "typhoon hunters" is invaluable. It is very accurate as it provides exact location, temperature, barometric pressure and windspeed of the typhoon or hurricane. The collective information the WRS WC–130's provide, improves the accuracy of computer models. Used in conjunction with weather satellites, the data can save thousands of lives and millions of dollars in property damage. In the case of an island, accurate notice of a typhoon can make all the difference. Often a severe typhoon devastates an island's port facilities, thus hampering recovery as a port is an island's economic and transportation lifeline.

Nationwide 1500 people a day relocate to coastal areas, thus making accurate storm forecasting all the more vital. We in Con-

gress have a responsibility to ensure that every means necessary be employed to protect our coastal and island citizens. There are countless numbers of Americans living in the Western Pacific who today do not enjoy the security and science afforded by a WRS, while the remainder of the nation does. The Air Force and the JTWC should study this inequity. I strongly urge the reactivation of a Weather Reconnaissance Squadron in the Western Pacific.

ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, LANE EVANS, NORMAN SISISKY, THOMAS H. ALLEN, SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, & NEIL ABERCROMBIE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND OMB CIRCULAR A–76

It has long been a concern of ours that the Department of Defense (DoD) has placed so high a stake in the outsourcing and privatization process known as OMB Circular A–76. This year DoD has announced that by FY05 over 230,000 positions will have been studied for possible outsourcing. The department estimates that they will have saved some $11.2 billion and achieve a steady state savings rate, beginning in FY05, of approximately $3.4 billion annually. The problem with touting numbers such as these are the are based on too many assumptions. Indeed the individual services often do not account for the cost of performing the study, especially when they extol their anticipated savings. These costs can include the paying of the cost-comparison study itself as well as associated costs for voluntary separation incentive pay, early retirement benefits, and general reductions in forces (RiFs).

Utilizing the Quadrennial Defense Review as the progenitor, DoD is conveniently provided with a mandate to plow the anticipated savings back into modernization projects. The department is fond of claiming that through the synthesis of private sector innovations into government operational practices they will be able to mete out "the best value" for the taxpayer. Interestingly, best value is not necessarily the lowest cost.

To be fair, the department claims that the entire point of a commercial activities study is to determine if the function will be performed "in-house", by government employees, or outsourced to private contractors. Should it be determined that the best value requires a function to remain "in-house" there it shall remain for a while—it can be re-studied a few years later. Indeed the department claims the study will wrest out savings regardless because the "in-house" team will have had to become more effective in order to compete with the private sector.

This point harkens the DoD initiative called Defense Reform Initiative Directive #20 (DRID #20). This initiative created the complete inventory review of each military service's functions, to determine what positions are classified as inherently governmental, and thus be available for possible outsourcing. DRID #20 determined that 228,000 military positions were non-inherently governmental and therefore could be studied. Yet in what amounts to a mixed signal by DoD, an order was made to re-examine several of the areas previously slated as non-inherently governmental. DoD's apparent apprehension was caused by the fear that this drastic measure may be undercutting vital support and combat service functions in the name of savings. This, ironically, is the same argument that many members of Congress have been making for years.

Finally, our beleaguered civil servants are beginning to emerge as an endangered species. As times and practices change, they too, will have to adapt in order to remain relevant in the national defense arena. In spite of this they should not have to endure negative fallout as a result of the DoD's panacea called outsourcing, notwithstanding their own admitted skepticism. The DoD must do better in bridging the benefits gap to alleviate displaced employees especially when, inevitably, many will lose their livelihoods.

In the end, all that DoD may be left with is reduced readiness, a degraded military capability, and an exiled civil-service workforce that collectively contributes to the weakening of America's national security policy.

NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
NORMAN SISISKY.
LANE EVANS.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.
THOMAS H. ALLEN.
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

I am deeply concerned with the language added by amendment in committee to the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2000 requiring the Air Force to prematurely identify the core logistics capability requirements for maintenance and repair of the C–17 aircraft. This myopic provision would force the Air Force to make a hasty decision on the long-term maintenance of the C–17 possibly resulting in an incorrect and costly maintenance concept.

Similar language requiring an Air Force report was included in last year's authorization bill. The Air Force provided the required report on the C–17 outlining the service's plan to establish core capabilities for the aircraft. As part of that plan, the Air Force will review the current contract maintenance strategy (Flexible Sustainment) in 2003 to make the long-term support decision. Since initial production of the C–17 is scheduled through fiscal year 2005 with continuing improvements to the plane, now is not the time to make a final, and possibly wasteful, organic capabilities decision based upon an evolving aircraft.

Contrary to the language in question, the Air Force is in compliance regarding the C–17 with Title 10 United States Code 2464 provisions necessitating an organic core logistics capability. The Air Force determines core capabilities on commodities rather than weapon systems, e.g., a landing gear versus the entire C–17 aircraft. In the report required by last year's authorization bill, the Air Force clearly stated its organic capability to maintain the commodities of the C–17 due to the capability to support other large military transports, such as the C–141, C–135, and C–130.

Currently, the C–17 is provided maintenance support under an interim contract between the Air Force and the Boeing Company, the plane's manufacturer. By every measure the current Flexible Sustainment maintenance contract of the C–17 is an overwhelming success. Last year, the Air Force saved tens of millions of dollars in either cost avoidance or reduced expenses when compared to the budget allocated for C–17 support. The contractor continues to perform at less than negotiated contract cost.

Current C–17 logistics performance is setting a new standard for airlifters. The C–17 is the airlifter of choice because it is ready when needed and reliable when called upon. In the current Balkans operations the C–17 has a 96% mission capable rate. This extremely high rate is in spite of flying 150% of the missions of the C–141, C–5, and C–130 combined. In addition, despite the sudden surge of activity due to the Kosovo operations, the contractor has responded whenever needed, including oversees deployments with the C–17.

I am deeply concerned the language requiring the Air Force to identify, by February 1, 2000, the core logistics capability requirements for maintenance and repair of the C–17 aircraft would im-

pose a hasty decision upon the Air Force and preclude the service from making the best long-term maintenance decision on the C–17.

CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ.

DISSENTING VIEWS OF CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY

With some reservation I oppose reporting this bill out of committee. To be sure, the chairman's mark contains provision that I strongly support, including the cooperative threat reduction programs with the states of the former Soviet Union, increased pay for members of the uniformed services and increases in benefits for veterans.

Although I oppose this bill, I want to acknowledge and commend the hard work of my colleagues and the committee staff for their sincere efforts to provide for the common defense.

I also acknowledge that not all of the excesses in military spending in this bill are the fault of the committee. The House Armed Services Committee is charged with the responsibility to provide the armed forces with the resources to achieve their mission. That mission calls on the military to be prepared to fight two significant wars at the same time, without allies and while maintaining a credible reserve. In effect, the mission calls upon us to maintain a cold-war era military and its incumbent cost irrespective of any realistic assessment of threat. We also maintain, at tremendous expense, a cold war nuclear arsenal.

I strongly believe we must leave behind the military structure and devices that we depended upon to win the cold war. Yet this years budget includes the Presidents request for the largest increase in military spending since the end of the cold war. On top of that, we have added an emergency supplemental appropriation loaded with pork that takes funds from social security, low-income housing and nutrition programs. Frankly, I find that appalling.

In my dissent of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1999, I wrote: ". . . this authorization is only part of the defense spending. The Congress just passed the supplemental emergency appropriation that provides additional spending for our forces in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf. As well, the emergency appropriation bill became a vehicle by which a new ballistic missile system was paid for. This additional spending of 2.9 billion not only fills out of the budget agreement, but important domestic programs were cut in order to pay for it. I am deeply disturbed that this might become our practice for supporting out military activities."

Obviously, my concerns were well founded. I remain deeply concerned that the supplementals are becoming the budget gimmick of choice for loading political pork into the military budget.

It is clear to me that our national security cannot be measured in bombers alone. I believe out national security depends equally on our domestic programs and on constructive foreign policy initiatives.

We can no longer continue to spend nearly half of all federal discretionary dollars on military programs. This misplaced priority compromises our national security by shortchanging our invest-

ments in programs that make for real security—a healthy, well-educated, properly housed citizenry.

My good friend Joe Volk, Executive Secretary of the Friends Committee on National Legislation is right on the mark in his May 21 letter thanking me for opposing Committee's version of the FY2000 Defense Authorization bill. He wrote:

Dear Cynthia: We at the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) recognize you as one of the only members who has critically examined this new tide of increased military spending, and one of the only members who acknowledges existing opportunities to achieve both increased security and significant savings in the current military budget through changes in U.S. foreign and military policies and spending choices.

As the sole member of the Armed Services Committee to vote against the bill, you alone have addressed the important questions about U.S. military and security policy.

Does the U.S. really need a military that is big enough to simultaneously fight two major regional wars alone? In practice, most threats to international security today are handled through cooperative efforts by regional alliances or through the UN Security Council—not unilateral action.

Why does the U.S. need to continue to station 100,000 troops in Europe? The cold war is over, and Europe is quite capable of defending itself.

Why is the U.S. spending $35 billion per year maintaining over 6,000 nuclear weapons on high alert against an enemy that no longer exists?

Why should the U.S. spend another $11 billion on a missile "defense" system that is technologically infeasible and strategically destabilizing? Investing a fraction of this on arms control and disarmament initiatives could do far more to preserve U.S. security.

Why not close the military bases that the Department of Defense (DOD) no longer needs and support converting them into profitable commercial and industrial centers?

Why should the DOD get more money when it cannot match over $22 billion in expenditures with obligations, it cannot find over $9 billion worth of inventory, and it continues to give away millions in overpayments to contractors? More money is not the answer to Pentagon waste.

Courageous leadership will one day change key U.S. foreign and military policies. Then, many of the current excuses for increasing military spending will disappear and significant budgetary savings can be achieved.

End the obsolete and provocative U.S. cold war military strategy and reduce U.S. forces in Europe and elsewhere accordingly. Invest instead in developing multilateral civil institutions such as the Organization for Cooperation and Security in Europe (OSCE).

Begin immediately to reduce the U.S. nuclear arsenal to START II levels, take these weapons of mass destruction off of high alert, and support programs that assist the Russians in safely dismantling their nuclear weapons systems.

Stop bombing Serbia and Kosovo. Bombing has failed to stop the genocide. In fact, the bombing has fueled the fire and made the

task of finding a just, lasting, political solution more difficult and costly for all who live there.

Stop exporting advanced weapons systems and production facilities to other countries. Then the U.S. will no longer be compelled to compete against its own advanced weapons abroad.

Control and reduce the international supply of military weapons. Weapons transfers by the U.S. and other countries have fueled violent conflicts around the world, creating humanitarian tragedies and causing a boomerang effect against U.S. military personnel and UN peacekeepers.

Pay U.S. arrears and dues to the UN in full and on time, and strengthen and reform the UN system so that it can play a more effective role in preventing violent conflicts.

These steps would reduce costs to the U.S. government by more than $40 billion per year and greatly enhance U.S. and global security. Also, other governments will likely respond positively in kind to such initiatives, reducing their own military spending. More money would go to basic human needs and economic trade and development. Perhaps most importantly, many of these actions would reduce tensions with the Russian and Chinese governments.

Congress and the President would do well to listen to your "voice in the wilderness" before they launch what could become another, more dangerous and destabilizing global arms race. True, sustainable human security can be achieved at much less cost by redirecting military spending to meeting human needs at home and abroad and by investing and participating in cooperative international institutions and processes that protect human rights and prevent violent conflicts. Thank you for your conscientious stand for real security at home and abroad. Sincerely, Joe Volk.

I would like to thank my friends at FCNL and the many other non-government organizations that work with me to bring about sensible budget priorities and real security through my work on the House Armed Services Committee. Peace.

CYNTHIA MCKINNEY.

○